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Rowland, as well as many of the contributors—is that Ned Keenan represents for us the innovator, who laid the foundation for many of our own views. He opened the windows and let us breathe the fresh air of invigorating ideas. He did this by somehow almost always providing the perceptive, and sometimes surprising, insight we needed whenever we would come to him with research problems. I will cite three brief but significant examples from my own experience.

In the fall of 1973, when I was beginning full-time research on my dissertation, I had a meeting with him in his office. I was stymied by the contradictory evidence the primary sources were providing me. During the course of the conversation, he remarked that I had two kinds of sources. A simple insight perhaps, but one that cut to the core of the issue. As it turned out, the fault line of contradictory evidence lay exactly along that division of the sources. It was at that moment that the main argument of my dissertation on the 1503 Church Council emerged.

Another, more codicological example. The next year, I was in Moscow doing research on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century manuscripts. Part of what I was trying to do was figure out how each codex was put together. The simple ones were easy—quires sewn and bound together in the sequence in which they were copied by the scribe. Others were not so easy, especially the rearranged and rebound ones. One codex in particular, with many water and grease stains, as if it had been dunked successively in vats of water and oil, was giving me fits because it seemed to have no beginning or end. As in *Finnegan's Wake*, the first line on the first folio began in the middle of the sentence and completed the last sentence of the last folio. I wrote a letter to Ned about this peculiar phenomenon, and wondered how it could have happened. From over four thousand miles away, he wrote back with the answer: the monks had taken the codex apart, thrown away the beginning and end folios (that is, those most badly damaged), and, then, in the rebinding, had simply reversed the two remaining parts. When I read his letter, I thought he must be wrong. But when I reexamined the manuscript, I found a telltale water stain line, which I had not seen before, that indicated this was exactly what had happened.

Finally, it would be remiss not to mention the impact his lecture course on Muscovite history has had on me. For those of us raised on the stuffy certitudes of Solov'ev and the Akademiia nauk SSSR, Ned's lectures were mind-openers. I credit him with planting the seed in the fall of 1973, when I first sat in on that course, for my own theory of Muscovite political culture. In that course, Ned eloquently described the sophistication of nomadic society in general and of the Mongols in particular. Yet despite his best efforts to awaken the sensibility of all his students to this important point, I did not integrate it into my comprehension of Muscovy. Other influences at Harvard University also prodded me in the direction of looking at both Turkic and Byzantine influences. Nevertheless, my
mind remained obdurate. Then, in the summer of 1987, two events occurred in juxtaposition. I was teaching early Ukrainian history at the Harvard University Summer School and reading a recently published history of Muscovy. In the course, I was contesting the views of Ukrainian nationalist historians that Muscovite government was despotic and the Russians were servile because of the Mongols, while Ukrainians were not because they had escaped the worst influences of the Tatar Yoke. At the same time, I was trying to understand the exact nature of the impact of the Mongols on Muscovy. If not what the Ukrainian nationalist historians were asserting, then what? It was here that the idea that Ned had so elegantly planted in my mind almost fourteen years earlier coalesced with my own research on Church history.

In some measure, then, to return the favor of the many remarkable insights that he has given us, we present him with this festschrift, with pages that are not as yet stained with water or grease—pages that are, instead, filled with ideas in honor of the numerous ideas he has provided us over the years.

Don Ostrowski

*Notes on Edward L. Keenan as a Historian*

A skeptic, in the traditional Russian understanding, is a skeptic, and Keenan is such a skeptic. To him a nation’s history is not a collection of assorted treasures, not a cabinet of curiosities nor a strongbox of precious gems, but an arena for never-ending debate. He knows how to debate, and if something does not satisfy his understanding of history, he is prepared to subject commonly accepted ideas to scrutiny, even ideas which are thought to be indisputable. He reexamines the accepted, although the scrutiny is not done for its own sake. Rather, he seeks out what is weak in strongly held beliefs, or what is minor in a grand theory. Things that have long been a matter of firm belief among scholars he holds up to the cold light of reason. He never follows the path of deduction, moving from the general to the specific in a text. Nor does he allow himself an inductive analysis on the basis of a single source. But rather he places a source in the context of all that history has preserved for us—with everything that culture and tradition transmit to us. What shall we call his style? The difficulty in analyzing his work comes from the fact that what is most important in a text is often not said, it is implicit. He knows that his subject, early Slavic history, is embedded in texts in which the meaning lies hidden beneath the surface. Therefore a very important place in his
life is occupied not by what is written, but rather by the element of the spoken, the
narrated, the recounted.

In typical American style, Keenan came late to his subject, when he was well
past twenty-five. The search for his field began with the study of languages; an
article about the revolutionary movement in Baku (1962); an article about young
Americans abroad (1963); reviews of the finest books on Russian history,
published in Russia; Slavic-Muslim contacts; a dissertation (1965) written of a
"pragmatic history," which apparently did not entirely satisfy its author; a few
translations of Evtushenko, done with John Updike. And after that followed a
period of "Sturm und Drang."

This was the period of the works about the History of Kazan' (1968), the Iarlyk
of Ahmed Khan (1969), the correspondence of Ivan the Terrible with Prince
Kurbskii (1971, published as a book, which won a prize and gave its author a
permanent position at Harvard), about paper production for the tsar (1971)—an
intermission—about the Council of 1503 (1977, with Donald Ostrowski; I at the
time was especially influenced by this students' collection), the History of the
Grand Prince of Muscovy (1978), about Russian political culture (1979), the
beginning of work on the biography of Ivan the Terrible (1981—) and on the
process of the creation of Slovo o polku Igoreve (1994—).

The intervals between articles became longer, finished works fewer, and
themes increasingly sweeping. During this time he spoke, taught, gave lectures,
and told jokes, while others took down his words. How can one define his style
of searching? He understands history to be the history of texts. His works do not
describe social and political processes and events. It is the history of language,
of style, of consciousness. He has been attracted by the philological approach of
Roman Jakobson (Slovo o polku Igoreve, and the entire tradition of Russian
humanities research, all the way back—and forth—to OPOIAZ); by Omeljan
Pritsak's grasp of different spheres of research (Altaic studies, Eastern studies of
Medieval Rus', the German and Ukrainian traditions); by Father Georges
Florovsky's profound understanding of confessional problems in history (his
book of 1937, and mostly his conversations; he was a conversationalist, like
Keenan himself, and his wife, constantly reproving him, grumbled that: "Father
Georges has two passions: tobacco and books, and they are both filth.") Som-
times Keenan says about himself: "I am a structuralist." But not in the sense of the
Tartu school of Lotman and Uspenskii, but a structuralist of the French anthropo-
logical school like Claude Lévi-Strauss.

First and foremost he has remained outside the gravitational field of the state
school, hence the rare independence of his views. In his work there are no parallels
between Russia and Western Europe, but only with the Golden Horde, and its
splinter groups—the smaller hordes of the East (Kazan') and the South (Crimea).
Keenan's lecture course is an analysis of the archaic society of the Eastern Slavs
using the methods of anthropological research, not the usual course of lectures, a
narrative bound together with general conceptions that fleetingly embrace facts
and events in a swift progress through "Russian" history. In his concrete historical
and philological investigations one finds a critical analysis of the most basic
humanist myths, the most characteristic problem of which is the tendency to blur
distinctions between the Western European and Russian middle ages, and thereby
smoothing over all the zigzags of Russian history. However, Lenin, revolution,
socialism, the dictatorship of squadrons of semi-intellectuals, the Marxist experi-
ment in the twentieth century—are these not in fact proof of just the opposite?
Does all this not beg the question of dissimilarity, not virtual identity?

Keenan’s Russianness often finds expression in the everyday life of the men
of the sixties, the time when he lived as a student in Leningrad and easily passed
unnoticed in a crowd (a facility which the officers of the KGB found unpardon-
able). In his intonation, his use of certain words (glukho kak v tanke, zdorovo
khorosho, briaknut’ in lieu of pozvonit’), Keenan is a man of the sixties in the
positive Russian sense of the word, a representative of the generation of Evtushenko
and Voznesenskii, an admirer of Okudzhava, a believer in reason, in the normality
of human existence, in the inevitable Europeanization of Russian society.

At the same time he is an Irishman who does not want to remain Irish in
America (“like my father,” he says; “my father never wanted to be an immigrant
and he never went into Irish bars”), and a Democrat.

Keenan is a historian of the other. Distinctions are more important to him than
similarities. Otherness is his life’s blood, the subject of his research and of his
debates. His discourse is the discourse of things which are different, of things
which will never be similar. Like history itself, like human life, everything
happens only once, and nothing can return. Keenan is a historian of borders and
limits, of contingent spaces and times. He knows what goes here, and what goes
there, where others do not dare to look. His Russia is not an open space, though
it is not enclosed upon itself: it simply comprises the intersection of different
cultures, and stands on the border. That is why the medieval Russian court culture
is so accessible and interesting to him, the culture of rulers as the conjugation of
different traditions, as the gathering of different cultures.

His students agree that he is a remarkable teacher, not only a professor who
lectures because he is obliged to, but a Teacher, a raconteur, an aide, an expert on
almost every subject under the sun, an inveterate squash player. People emulate
him, people are always observing him, how he talks, how he walks, what he is
wearing, what he is reading, whom he is arguing with. I have not been one of his
students, but I think of the whole course of our relationship as an extended lesson,
a single unending explanation of the various complexities of our profession.
Certain moments of that lesson were altogether unexpected and at the same time
absolutely inevitable. I remember a Masonic cemetery in Maine, not far from his
Edward L. Keenan: An Appreciation

Edward L. Keenan has been at the center of a reinterpretation of Russian history in the early modern period so thorough that it warrants the term revolution in the making. Naturally, he has not accomplished this task by himself, but, through his hard work behind the scenes to sustain the field, his skeptical approach, his evocative and stimulating rhetoric, and, most important, his imaginative and unconventional reconstructions of the Muscovite past, he has done more than anyone to inspire an overall revision of the period.

Keenan’s dismay with the received wisdom (still largely based on the turn-of-the-century master narrative of V. O. Kliuchevskii and the even earlier work of S. M. Solov’ev) that dominated the field when he began his scholarly career struck a responsive chord in many scholars of my generation. While reading for an undergraduate degree in Modern History at Oxford University, I attended a course of lectures by Sir Dimitri Obolensky on Muscovite history. Since my studies focussed on the early modern period in English and “foreign” (i.e., European) history, I was struck over and over again with the similarity between Professor Obolensky’s picture of Muscovy and the picture of early modern England drawn by historians around 1900. I reasoned that if these views had long since been proved inappropriate for England, they must be even less appropriate for Russia. I was therefore on the lookout for new images of the Muscovite past. Although individual historians were revising important parts of our picture of Muscovy, the overall scheme remained alarmingly intact, at least from my point of view. For me, Professor Keenan’s greatest contribution was, and is, his insistent questioning of
almost every part of the received picture and his often astonishing alternative hypotheses. In spite of many hours spent discussing with him this or that point about Muscovy and listening to his lectures, I still am frequently amazed, even flabbergasted, at his totally unexpected answer to a question that had seemed to me quite routine. Although I have not agreed with every detail of his revolutionary hypotheses, each has forced me to rethink my old assumptions and to reexamine the sources on which those assumptions were based. A great many of these ideas have become so integrated with my own conceptions that I often forget that they are not my own. I would be surprised if the great majority of the contributors to this volume did not have similar experiences.

Professor Keenan’s methods for inspiring this revolution have been as unconventional as his views on Russian history. His published work, the usual means of influencing an academic field, has obviously played a major role. He has devoted an enormous amount of attention to demonstrating that the famous correspondence (and other works) traditionally ascribed to Ivan the Terrible and Prince A. M. Kurbskii were in fact written in several stages during the seventeenth century. He has examined with equal skepticism (but in less detail) a whole series of other texts crucial to our conceptions of Muscovy. Although I, like the other editors of this volume, remain convinced that he is right on these questions, most of the scholarly community has resisted his conclusions, a resistance that has surely been a source of great frustration to him. Nevertheless, no one can treat any of these sources with the easy assumption of authenticity that was routine before. This generally heightened sensitivity to source problems is a giant step forward; in particular, we no longer place the “Kurbskii/Groznyi” Correspondence at the center of our discussions of sixteenth-century Russian political views, and are bringing in other important texts, visual as well as verbal, to take its place. Professor Keenan’s other major scholarly venture to date, his reappraisal of Muscovite-Tatar relations, has quietly been accepted by most scholars. His most wide-ranging essay, “Russian Political Folkways,” which circulated for years in manuscript and was finally published in the *Russian Review* in 1986, though no less controversial than much of his other work, has attracted a great deal of attention and is likely to influence grand theorizing about Russia for years to come. (His incisive reviews also offer seeds of revisionist views on a wide variety of subjects, but, scattered over time and space, they have received much less attention.) Finally, Professor Keenan has spent more energy than many of his professional colleagues addressing larger questions for a wider, non-professional audience. He has published in the *New York Times* and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* as well as in the *Slavic Review*, and has given talks at the Metropolitan Museum of Modern Art and the State Department as well as at professional conventions and at other universities. He has undertaken these tasks in part because he is keenly aware of the dependence of all of our efforts on the support
of the larger society, on public and private financial support, and on library resources. He has worked tirelessly, over many years, behind the scenes and on official committees, to defend the interests of the field of Slavic studies as a whole. My own experience has led me to appreciate in particular his efforts on behalf of Slavic and East European library collections not only at Harvard, but all over the United States.

This last point obviously leads us beyond Professor Keenan's remarkable publications. I would argue that Professor Keenan's unpublished ideas have had a larger impact on reshaping our ideas of Muscovite Russia than his published ones, that his indirect effect on the field has been even greater than his direct effect. Most obviously, several of his students have become mature scholars in their own right and have produced an impressive body of work which has, among other things, revolutionized our views of the boyar elite and the origins of the Old Believer movement. His influence through his own students is now extending to a fourth generation: Valerie Kivelson, a student of Ned's student Nancy Kollmann, now has her own Ph.D. students at Michigan. One of the most remarkable aspects of Ned's academic career has been his role in the intellectual formation of those who were not formally his students. For decades now, he has attracted students from other universities either doing final work on their dissertations or at an early stage in their careers. Three of the four editors of this festschrift benefited from Ned's generosity in this way. He was (and is) incredibly generous with his time, providing detailed comments and often crucial interpretative ideas for our early projects. In many cases he helped us find money or employment while we revised our work and prepared for the job market. At that point, he tirelessly wrote us recommendations, and later welcomed us back and helped us arrange other visits, often through two remarkable institutions: the Ukrainian Research Institute and the Russian Research Center (now the Davis Center for Russian Studies) at Harvard. In this way he has become a patron to a whole generation of scholars in Muscovite history.

Why did these young historians come to Harvard, and what did we find when we got there? First, there was Keenan himself, with his intellectual agility, his dazzling linguistic gifts, his knowledge of things (like the history of the Steppe) that most of us knew very little about. Then there were his undergraduate lectures. It is hard to convey to the reader the excitement, the pleasure, even the astonishment that engulfed me as I listened to each lecture. Many familiar subjects had disappeared altogether, some were presented in barely recognizable form, and a host of unfamiliar (or scarcely familiar) topics, like the taste of the Muscovite court for ceremonial military objects, occupied whole lectures. Each lecture would be carefully dissected and argued over by a small circle of formal and informal students. These discussions were sometimes given a slightly more formal tone at regular meetings with Keenan over lunch, where we could discuss
each other’s work and construct in our imaginations new master narratives encompassing the discoveries and new insights that we fondly imagined, rightly or wrongly, that we were all making. Naturally, the riches of the Harvard library system and of the Harvard community in general played a major role in whatever progress we made, but it was the intellectual energy generated by Keenan and the small but intense group of Muscovite historians clustered around him and largely sustained by his efforts that made our time at Harvard such a heady experience and had such a lasting effect on so many of our most basic ideas about Russian history.

Why was Keenan able to exercise this remarkable influence? Among the many intellectual qualities mentioned above and by my editorial colleagues, I would single out two: his emphasis on rigorous source criticism and his rhetorical skill. The advantage of the first quality is obvious to any historian, at least at a theoretical level, but Keenan’s thorough-going scepticism and his unparalleled mastery of the various skills needed in source criticism have made his contributions to our knowledge of the source base for Muscovite history uniquely valuable. His rhetorical skill, though much less important in Professor Keenan’s own view, has also played a major role. History is at its base a story, and Professor Keenan is a master storyteller. His texts, and even more his lectures and discussions, are studded with striking and illuminating metaphors that in a flash make an abstract idea about a remote society seem not only very clear, but very convincing. His comparison of the Scandinavians of Kievan Rus’ with the Mafia is perhaps the best-known example. His love of language and its expressive capabilities allows his interlocutor, even in the context of an informal conversation, not only to see just what he means, but to sense and somehow buy into the intellectual excitement of his point.

Because of this unique combination of intellectual daring, rhetorical brilliance, unequaled knowledge in many spheres, generosity to all who display a sincere desire to learn, and selfless devotion to Muscovite history and to Slavic studies in general, Professor Keenan has had a profound impact on our field and on our lives. We are proud to offer him this volume.

Dan Rowland

Thoughts on Mentoring

Ned Keenan first got me thinking about genres by making the point that if you only know the genre of limerick, it’s going to be hard to write a love letter (at least one that gets you anywhere in romance). This was with regard to cultural borrowing and Muscovite literary life, as I recall. Well, this particular genre—of homage to
one's mentor—is particularly challenging, because it's so open-ended. It's not easy to be specific enough to encapsulate what makes Ned Keenan the unparalleled mentor and teacher that we all know, particularly when you're blessed with only the mere mortal's abilities to write the English language, compared to Ned's own sublime and wittily crafted art. But it is fairly easy to paint the broad strokes, for his talents are manifest.

Take, for example, the evidence gathered here, of the breadth of participation in this collection. Many of the contributors were not "officially" Ned's students, that is, not formally enrolled Ph.D. candidates at Harvard. Many who consider themselves his students, or who credit him with deeply influencing their thinking, came specially to Harvard from other programs to study at his feet, or encountered him as undergraduates or in the Russian Research Center's Soviet Union Program, and were forever changed. We are all here gathered because of his generosity of spirit—he welcomed all serious comers, he shared his knowledge, he treated us all as colleagues, no matter how ignorant many of us felt at the start. That's the first trait of a great mentor—generosity and respect.

Those qualities probably grow out of another great characteristic that leaps to my mind about Ned, and that is his deep commitment to our common intellectual endeavor, the study of Russian history. Ned loves ideas and loves to share them—he seems most energized when he's mixing it up intellectually with other people, whether in class, at lunches for the "medievalists" at the Faculty Club, or offering a quick consultation while rushing across campus to yet another meeting. (He also seems to love being a dean, but that's so inscrutable a taste for me that I won't even begin to fathom it. I'm just grateful that the many departments, programs, institutes, and committees that have benefitted from his leadership have never succeeded in wooing him away from teaching, research, and writing.) I have vivid memories of working through sixteenth-century Muscovite chronicles with Ned in seminar, puzzling over translations, or gleaning every bit of meaning from those intentionally opaque texts. Many of us have "memories of a lifetime" of participating in the 1973 seminar on documents associated with the 1503 Church Council—about ten of us attacked those documents with a zeal inspired by Ned's obvious enthusiasm for ferreting out the provenance and textual history of each and every text.

Many people who haven't studied with Ned have the wrong idea about him—they think he's an iconoclast or a nihilist, desperate to discredit any and all old Rus' texts just for the sake of debunking. I never read him that way—in fact, it makes no sense to me. What drives Ned intellectually, I think, is a quest not to destroy knowledge but to create it from the bottom up, clearly and self-consciously. A mantra I carry with me from him is, "What do we know and how do we know it?" In other words, are our hypotheses, questions, logical leaps and conclusions built on primary sources or on received secondary opinion? How solid is that received
word? How dependable are the primary sources? That, by the way, is where genre comes in—he taught us to be sensitive to the dictates of genre, not to take literally statements that might be formulaic tropes, not to read more into a source than it can give. And he taught us to start from the primary sources, to build one’s history from the texts—which is of course what keeps it alive for us. There is nothing like the face to face encounter with real voices from the past—directly quoted in legal cases, muted through layers of artifice in historical *povesti* and *vitae*. It’s that encounter, and the quest to decode the puzzles of language, genre, and context, that seems to drive him and inspire us.

Another mantra that I owe to Ned Keenan is, “What’s really going on here?” applied to the art of book reviewing (remember *Kritika*) as well as to broad interpretation. When all is said and done, has the historian noticed the big picture? asked the fundamental question? moved historical understanding farther into the clear? Or has he or she simply replicated what the historiography would have predicted? Ned has an uncanny ability to figure out “what’s really going on here” by thinking freshly, or perhaps by thinking like the people whose history is under study in a given question. He wants us to see in particular the strangeness of premodern societies to modern sensibilities, how unlike us they and their institutions were, how differently they lived their lives, thought about themselves, organized their politics and associated in groups. He has an anthropologist’s keen awareness of the way any outside observer, let alone centuries of them, contaminates the data as he or she reports it. It’s as if studying the historical past meant having to machete our way through the tangle of meaning in primary and secondary sources alike, meanings all the more tangled because arising from the dictates of genre, from the hindsight of the present and the mentality of the premodern past. With so bold a conception of historical analysis, it’s no wonder he rankles guardians of traditional historiography. But isn’t that what research is supposed to do?

Not many fine scholars are great mentors and teachers. Ned is, because of his basic decency towards others. I certainly have benefited from his generous support—he goes the extra mile for his students and colleagues. I once learned through the grapevine (thank you, Mary Towle) that Ned had intervened to see that I wasn’t displaced from my RRC office the year I was writing my dissertation; the tale was that he had to go head to head with a senior professor who coveted that space (thank you, Ned). But I was his student, after all. More remarkable is that we’ve all benefited from his willingness to help regardless of our particular status. We’ve seen his generosity to other people in their careers, heard him temper his intellectual critique of a colleague with sincere kindness and empathy. He could have been the aloof and respected Harvard scholar in the old ivory tower—instead, he touches people not only intellectually but personally.
Perhaps he’s such an unusual teacher and mentor because of his ability to engage—to engage people on a personal level, to engage with ideas, to engage with the past. We all feel like mere shadows in the light of his vast erudition, originality, linguistic prowess, not to speak of wit. But none of us were crumpled by the dominance of such a mentor. Rather, he gave us all the skills and confidence to think on our own, to pursue our own interests, to consult and disagree with him, to make our own paths in the exciting task of decoding the mysteries of the past. That is a great gift to us, and we are grateful.

Nancy S. Kollmann
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S. G. Barkhudarov et al., Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв., in: Kritika, v 14, n 1, p 1–20 (translated into Ukrainian; see 1979f)

1978e Article


1978f Lecture


1978g Lecture

1978h Lecture

"Russian Politics and Russian Culture," Dalhousie University, April 1, 1978.

1978i Lecture

"The Russian of History and the History of Russian," lecture prepared for delivery at the University of Washington, Seattle [not given because of travel problems].

1979a Article


1979b Article


1979c Reply


1979d Review


1979e Review

1979f Reprint


1979g Lecture


1979h Lecture


1980

1980a Article


1980b Article


1980c Review


1980d Obituary

1980e Obituary


1980f Lectures


1980g Lecture


1980h Lecture

“Second and n-th Thoughts on the Kurbskii-Groznyi Correspondence,” American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Philadelphia, November 6, 1980.

1980i Lecture


1981

1981a Lecture

“The Search for Ivan the Terrible,” Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y., May 1, 1981.

1981b Lecture

“The Language of the Russian Cradle and the Cradle of the Russian Language,” Conference on ‘Language and History in the Middle Ages,’ Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto, November 6, 1981.

1981c Lecture

1982

1982a Article


1982b Review Article


1982c Memorial Minute

[With George H. Williams] "Georges Florovsky," *Harvard University Gazette*, v 78, n 5 (October 1, 1982).

1982d Lecture

"Muscovite Perceptions of Other East Slavs before 1654—An Agenda for Historians," Paper delivered at Conference on Ukrainian History, Hamilton, Ontario (see 1992c)

1983

1983a Review


1983b Lecture

1984

1984a Review Article

"Russian History and Soviet Politics," *Problems of Communism*, v 33, n 1 (January–February), 1984, p 68–72 [see also next item]

1984b Letter

*Problems of Communism*, v 33, n 4 (July–August), 1984, p 90.

1984c Lecture


1984d Lecture


1985

1985a Article


1985b Lectures

1986

1986a Article


1986b Article


1986b Review Article


1986c Reprint


1987

1987a Article


1987b Article


1987c Article

1988

1988a Article

"The Millennium of the Baptism of Rus' and Russian Self-Awareness," *The Harriman Institute Forum*, v 1, n 7, July 1988, p 7 (reprinted; see 1989c)

1988b Edited Volumes [General Editor]


1989

1989a Article


1989b Research Report


1989c Reprint


1990

1990a Article


1990b Review

1990c Map (Principal Consultant)

"The Soviet Union," Supplement to v 177, mp. 3 of National Geographic, March 1990.

1991

1991a Article


1991b Reprint


1992

1992a Article


1992b Article


1992c Reprint

1992d Reprint


1993

1993a Article


1993b Article


1993c Review


1993d Revised edition

"Russia, History to 1700," in New Encyclopedia Britannica, 15th edition [volume and page vary with printing]

1993e Encyclopedia article

"Ivan IV" [article submitted, accepted, and set up in type, then rejected "because our fact-checkers could not corroborate some statements"]
1993f Translation/reprint

1994

1994 Article

1995

1995a Paper [Unpublished]
"Avvakum, la Folie, et la déraison." Manuscript of paper prepared for the Old Belief Conference at St. Olaf College organized by Georg Michels. Finished but not delivered.

1995b Address
"What Have We Learned? (What Have Taught? What Have We Forgotten? What Must We Not Forget?) Presidential Address, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Newsnet,* v 35, n 1, January, 1995, p 1, 3–6.

1996

1996a Obituary:
1997a Article


1997b Review Article

Correspondence concerning the “Correspondence”

I no longer have to take the corrupt, incomplete, and dirty product of my mind, the marked-up draft, and hand it to a young woman to clean up—in effect—to wash the shirt. I do the cleaning myself, and can with the push of a key get the product printed as a letter, untouched by a secretary.

What changes we have seen since the Harvard Graduate Society Newsletter published those comments of Ned Keenan’s in 1980 in its lead story under the sensational title “Dean Keenan Uses Word Processor.” How fortunate I feel to have begun my acquaintance with Ned before the advent of the word processor. My Keenan file includes a version of his Apocrypha replete with cuttings, pastings, and handwritten editorial changes, and much of a correspondence that began in 1968 and like the book manuscript reveals something of the “corrupt, incomplete and dirty product of [both his and] my mind[s].” At one point, I scrawled across the top of one letter: “PS I hope you are saving all my letters—I would like copies as a Хроника for personal archive.” Ned responded with a PS of his own: “I am, of course, saving all of your letters. They’re more interesting than many Barsukov published.” It seems appropriate to share some of this correspondence now, since it provides interesting insights into the genesis of Apocrypha, its reception, and Ned’s response.

Although I have chosen few selections deliberately to emphasize this, the letters depict a mentor/graduate student relationship that I would venture was extraordinarily fruitful for both parties. On my side, I note, for example, his reminders about the interest of the Stroev Collection, to which eventually I did devote some systematic attention. With the perspective of half a lifetime again and the privilege of having supervised the work of some excellent graduate students, I can appreciate perhaps even better than I did back then how much we were sharing the genuine excitement of discovery. At the time, I was still very much the learner and often failed to appreciate the nuances of Ned’s work or the positions taken by his critics.

Until I began rereading the letters for the present occasion, my memory had dimmed about what it was like to be thrown headlong into a heady world of scholarly debate and to experience the arcane pleasures of deciphering my first watermarks and skoropis'. My reaction to the world of Russian academia ranged from awe—at finding myself conversing with D. S. Likhachev, who
was seated at the desk bearing a plaque indicating this had been the desk of A. A. Shakhamatov!—to brash, youthful impatience that some might interpret as disrespect. These letters exhibit a frequent irreverence toward established authorities that may strike some readers as not always appropriate or even polite, but I would point out it is hardly out of keeping with the passions so evident in many of the Russian scholarly debates I witnessed. Now older and grayer, if not wiser, I encounter with some amusement lines such as those typed the day after my birthday in 1968: “I am beginning to feel old and gray, having just turned 27 yesterday with no end to the thesis in sight. I guess the aging aspirant, certainly here, is no strange phenomenon.”

The setting for the beginning of the correspondence was my arrival in the Soviet Union in August 1968 for an academic exchange year to work on my dissertation concerning Muscovite literature with Turkish themes. While the formal adviser for the thesis was Prof. Robert Lee Wolff, Ned Keenan provided much of the inspiration and actual guidance for the project. That year spent principally in Leningrad introduced me to Soviet academic meetings, which I attended with some regularity, especially in the Sector of Old Russian Literature of the Academy of Sciences Institute of Russian Literature. While in retrospect I wonder whether my Russian was really up to the task, I sent back generally detailed reports on such meetings, including observations on the often heated discussions that never made it into print when the papers were published.

My first knowledge of Ned’s undertaking a major reevaluation of the “Correspondence” came from his letter of January 4, 1969. Since my research topic quite honestly involved me in studying many of the relevant manuscripts, and since much of what I wanted to see was in anonymous sborniki, I had the opportunity to examine many of the manuscripts relevant to his project. My initial response to the letter of January 4 was a nineteen-page single-spaced typescript, consisting largely of manuscript descriptions. Additional work involved checking manuscripts of the first Kurbskii letter for textual variants.

His book manuscript complete and in editorial process by summer of 1970, Ned left for a half-year sabbatical in England, which gave him the opportunity to check several of the significant collections of Muscovite manuscript material in Europe. Our correspondence for 1970–71 includes news of discoveries, discussion of the editorial work on the book, which I was facilitating back in Cambridge, and ample indication that Ned was keeping his eyes out for materials relevant to my thesis and spending time in, e.g., the British Museum checking materials I had requested he examine.
By late summer 1971, I was back in the Soviet Union, carrying proofs of the book and showing them around, correcting many of the oversights from my earlier work on the manuscripts and texts relevant to my thesis, and making arrangements (Ned alone knew my secret) to get married. Back in Cambridge, Ned was shepherding the thesis through the typing process and working hard to land me the job I still hold. Our letters of my second year abroad are full of material about the thesis and about the reactions of the Soviet academic establishment to the bombshell that had been thrown at it. Negotiations to have Ned deliver a paper on the book in Leningrad never worked out; even though there was some thought to my standing in for him, it was well that never happened.

The correspondence tails off after 1972, although there are occasional letters of interest regarding reactions to the book and regarding Ned's further work on the Kurbskii "History" and on the first Grozny letter to Kurbskii. Since much of the post-1972 give and take concerning Ned's "heresy" is in any event well known from numerous reviews and articles, my concluding selection is one from 1973 that indicates some of his thinking about the "History" and describes reaction to his book by a significant assemblage of largely American scholars in a seminar at Columbia.

There is a character to many of the letters that the printed page will not capture—while some of his letters are typed, Ned frequently wrote, often with fountain pen, in his characteristic neat calligraphic hand. He added diagrams and notes in the margins, some in different inks. I have used carbons of my letters, made as I typed the originals, or (in the case of the letters from 1971–1972) generally faint photocopies. Editorial intervention has been confined to an occasional explanatory note in brackets and the correction of some obvious typos and lapses in punctuation. I will have to live with the lapses in syntax, although my students today would never be permitted the same. Where needed, I have identified individuals, but in most cases, I felt it unnecessary to provide first names or initials, and similarly have not filled out references to publications that are easily identifiable. The interested reader will easily be able to locate in Ned's book identifications for the many abbreviations of redactions of the Kurbskii-Grozny texts or the manuscripts that contain them.

Dan Waugh

University of Washington
Excerpts from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, December 5, 1968, carbon copy of typescript. A significant portion of this letter reported on a seminar in Pushkinskii dom on November 25, devoted to discussion of a paper by Gellian Mikhailovich Prokhorov, “O Lavrent’evskoi letopisi.” Following the formal presentation was a particularly acrimonious dispute between Prokhorov (who had, inter alia, defended the views of Komarovich) and Iakov Solomonovich Lur’e, in which the latter defended his mentor Priselkov’s conclusions about the chronicle. Likhachev was forced to intervene in an unsuccessful effort to soothe frayed tempers. Obviously there was much more going on here in interpersonal relations than I understood.

[...] Likhachev had been defending Prokhorov’s conclusion and methods; Lur’e turned to the great man at one point and said rather rudely—“And here you are, the author of Tekstologiia, trying to tell me that what I am saying about methodology is wrong?” To which Likhachev calmly replied, “I refuse to say one word more to you, Iakov Solomonovich, so as not to overstep the bounds of propriety.” Clearly no one present liked the way Lur’e had turned on Likhachev.

Usually after everyone has had his say about the doklad Likhachev makes his comments; it is simply unbelievable how clear and concise he is—even though I don’t care about the topic of a doklad or don’t understand half of what is going on, it is worth attending to hear what Likhachev has to say, since he usually sums up the essence of the discussion so perfectly. He pointed out how valuable the doklad was, since, as he indicated, people had done a lot of analysis of chronicles on the basis of purely textual evidence, but few studies had been done using paleographic analysis of the type Prokhorov had done. For this reason, Likhachev considered that Lur’e’s comments were somewhat beside the point. He spent a couple of minutes commenting on how personal relations had clouded the work of Priselkov and Komarovich. Apparently relations between the two had always been strained. Likhachev recalled that just before the war as work on the multi-volume history of Russ. Lit. had begun, instead of writing his section on the Laurentian chronicle out of the top of his head, Komarovich had sat down to do a major study of the chronicle; the manuscript of it remains unpublished in the archives of Pushkinskii dom. He delivered a doklad summarizing the study; before the session, he asked Priselkov to read over the MS and comment on it. Priselkov returned the MS with no comments and indicated he would think about it and talk with Komarovich about it later. Then Priselkov never came to the oral presentation. A little later Priselkov’s book [on the history of Russian chronicle writing—DW] came out; Likhachev
recalls meeting Komarovich in the book store of the University just after K. had bought a copy of the book. He looked through it on the spot and then turned to Likhachev and said rather sadly, “And he didn’t even mention or give any consideration to my work.” The war came; one of the two starved to death and the other met some equally grim fate; so Priselkov never did come to grips with Komarovich’s view of the text. As Likhachev noted, Priselkov’s work has to be considered with the context of all Russian chronicle writing in mind. His method was such that only in that context can some of his views be understood; as one can see on almost any page of his book, individual conclusions can be questioned and their source sought in vain [...]
the subject: can you obtain any impression or information concerning the
dates and origins of the following: Pog 1567, Pog 1573; Pog 1311. These are
rather crucial, I suspect, to the matter of the Ivan-Kurbsskii correspondence,
and I would appreciate anything that a de visu impression would provide [...]
passages which appear only in B—they are general complaints and would fit the Isaiah-Ioasaf relationship just as well as the K-Gr one; if we assume a consistent change of second to third person, why doesn’t A change na tia, za tia and pred toboiu the same way? Finally, B was written, kak is supposed to be izvestno, in 1564, while the probable (only!) date of A is 1566–7. There are many other details, but the long and short of it is that I think the time has come to say, in print, that something is definitely fishy here. I have shown the texts to Pritsak, Ševčenko, Fennell, Cherniavskii and by mail (still no answers) to Fr. Florovskii [in margin: Answer today: no common source that he can recall, although of course many clichés—but texts so close as to make the question “striking & challenging”] and Lure. Unless these last two come up with some objections, I’m going to get the thing off my chest (the alternative is to go slowly mad over the thing). You could do me a big favor, if you will:

1) Publichka, O.XVII.70 […]: this contains Isaiah’s works and is rather crucial to my present pursuits. Are there any watermarks? Any vladetel’skie zapisi? Anything about the history of the Sbornik? It was bought from Pligin coll. (I think through an intermediary or heir) in 1905. Is there anything about the physical nature of the text (change of hands, marginalia etc.) which is of interest? In particular, how does the hand compare with Pog. 1567, 1573, 1311, and 1615? (in tetradi containing K/Gr.) Is a microfilm of II. [in margin: i.e. лл.] 174–180 ob. possible? If not, could you copy for me the fragment on 180 ob. which begins with the rubric “Spisok s listochka...” and ends “Pisano roku [1562] v zemli moskovskoi na Vologdu”?

2) Could you check ll. 49ob.–53ob. of Pog. 1573 against the enclosed xerox, in particular for variants in the places I have marked? Also Pog. 1615? (If they ask why you want the latter, tell them it has the “Povest’ o dvukh poso.tvakh” in an interesting version.)

I hate to load you with these errands—anything will be a help. My last request: Before he died in 1925, Kuntsevich sent to the Arkh. kom. the second volume of his edition of Kurbshii, or rather the manuscript of same, which has never been published. It contains the arkheograficheskii obzor of the sborniki containing K’s oeuvre. It should be among the Arkh. kom.’s legacy in the Archive of the Len. otd. inst. ist. AN. If you could film it, zdorovo—if not, can you steal a glance at what he says about the Pogodins mentioned above and Muz. 2524/42797 (He would have called it Imp. Ross. ist. Muzei im. Imp. Al—dra III)?

Well, enough. All is po-staromu here, although the SDS is raising hell—they broke up a faculty meeting just before Christmas and I suppose
something will have to be done with them. [Added in pen: Kritika is mailed tomorrow, & I'll send you one airmail to Moscow.]

[Added in margin in pen:]

PS: Is anyone working on Kurbskii? Let me know if you hear of anyone.

PPS: All of this is for the time a bit confidential—because, if it turns out as I suspect, it will raise bloody hell with the whole of what we pretend we know about both Kurbskii & Ivan. In view of the sad business w/ the Слово, and of the considerable chance that much of Kurbskii's work was written by learned Ukrainian Orthodox exiles [although I guess not by Isaiah] like poor old Йоль Биковський, I think we should go very slow with it. Лурье, I expect, will give me some hint of how to proceed—that is, if he doesn't just tell me to go back to "Go" & not collect $200! Between you & me & the lamppost, I see no good evidence that either K. or Gr. was even literate! [...]
that my original notes, which are coming along with this letter, are incomprehensible or contradictory (often I decide different things at different times on change of pocherk, for example). Please be sure to save all notes that come, since I need some of them on return for my work. In general my sketches of watermarks are not to scale and they vary in accuracy—some being better than sketches in some of the albums seem to be (e.g., Geraklitov); others being worse or only partial, singling out features of the WM that are of interest. You might Xerox the watermark pictures and send the copy back to me right away, since I may want to have them to cross check should similar ones crop up later [...]

Thirteen pages of manuscript descriptions follow.

With regard to a rather crucial aspect of my watermarking—whether or not WMs on earlier listy are the same as ones later in the same MS. I try to check closely on this. Sometimes it is hard, as with some of the fools in Muz. 2524; however, I try to be reasonably conservative in my conclusions. It seems to me this is something people don’t take the time to do with these sborniki; to me it seems crucial for establishing the composition of the sbornik. For example, I am working on Pogod 1604 now, a huge thing of 900 listy, where Zimin noted the WM in the Peresvetov tetrad and the fact that the table of contents at start of MS indicates it was in one piece already in the 17th c. What he didn’t notice is that the wm of the Peresvetov tetrad crops up later; though I haven’t checked this yet, I think a good many of the fools in various parts of the MS are the same. Damn time consuming, but where texts are all published, if you are going to work with the sbornik, you might as well spend a day or two on the watermarks if need be [...]

Best to all. Sorry about Kritika article. I think you can see from the above I haven’t been wasting time lately and have little to spare....

Excerpts from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, March 15, 1969, carbon copy of typescript.

Since I last wrote, I have turned up some more interesting things regarding Pogod. 1573 and Muz. 2524. I told you about Lur’e’s doklad and planned publication of the Kholmogorskaia Letopis’. Well, I looked at the manuscript of it (Pogod. 1405) and discovered that in fact the first two pages plus a little of the letopisets dvinskikh voevod that forms an appendix to the main chronicle (ll. 446–447 are relevant listy) are identical with the northern information in the letopisets contained in the two other manuscripts. If one checks this against the text printed by Novikov in DRV, ch. 18, one finds the essence of this same information, much of it identical in wording, but with other material thrown in. It is also noteworthy that the pocherk in part of the
main Kholmogorskaia letopis', while not identical with that in part of Muz. 2524 and Pogod. 1573 is so similar that one might see in the three manuscripts the work of a school of copyists. This is only a wild idea perhaps, but I hope to have pictures for comparison sake; I will take snaps from the two here to Moscow with me in order to compare there. I would appreciate it if you can Xerox all the Muz. 2524 notes and send either the copy or the original to me in Moscow so I can have it to use there when I look at the manuscript again. Try to make the package small like a fat letter, or the embassy mail people may get angry.

In addition to that discovery, which is most relevant for you, I determined some other things about the manuscript which rather surprised me, since it leads me to be somewhat skeptical of the work that is going into some of the publication here—unfortunately Lu’re himself is the target of that remark in this case, since he did most of the work on the Kholmogorskaia letopis’. First of all, the last item in the MS is one some one should have caught as existing in another copy and in fact as having been published—it is the Znameniia v tsaregrade 1652g., which Sobolevskii published, if imperfectly, from a GPB MS I have already looked at, in his Perevodnaia literatura. The title of the thing as given in Lu’re’s article, even though it didn’t mention Turks, made me suspicious that it was of interest; that is the reason I asked him to let me see the MS to begin with. Some interesting variants from the Sobolevskii version. The second find in the MS, and by far the more disturbing one, was about half dozen watermarks that Lu’re didn’t see or couldn’t make out and hence didn’t mention in his introduction to the volume of PSRL. For the most part they are not uncommon 17th c. marks; I am rather shocked to find out that such a sloppy job of watermarking is being done. He was very grateful for my finds and is rewriting the relevant sections of the introduction to take them into account. To switch back to where I began, I feel quite certain that the two sborniki are of northern origin (as I recall there is a Kholmogory zapis’ on the Muz. copy, which lends support to the idea) [...]

Incidentally, while still basking in the glow of all those extra watermarks in Pogod. 1405, let me pass on the conversation I had with Lu’re when I showed him what I had found. It went something like this: “How long have you been working with manuscripts?” “Just since I arrived here.” “Really?” “Uh-huh.” “Do you have any old Slavic manuscripts in the United States?” “I really don’t know, I’ve never seen any.” Of course one comes back down to earth after looking through notes on some of the first MSS I worked on here; in some cases I fear I have been sloppy in the watermarking, but I doubt I will have time to go back and pick up any loose ends [...]

I have just received your magnificent letter and the detailed notes, for which how can I thank you? They are of great value, and I think at first glance that they confirm all of my suspicions, which means either that I am going progressively madder or that we are really onto a vast international conspiracy [...] 

Before I get on to comments about your excellent and really virtuoznyi MS description, let me give you a resumé of my present thinking about the K-G business, so you will have an idea of the way the land seems to lie. With reference to the enclosed diagram, a few general comments: on the basis of language and the coefficient of konvoinost, and also on the crude dates of the manuscripts involved, it seems that we have here a typical apocryphal corpus, which grew by stages, and was written by a number of different people at different times: the kernel from Isaiah led to Kla (as in Pog 1573 & Muz 2524) which (maybe in same stage) is parent of Gkrat and a (very slightly) different Klb. Probably in the next stage, Gpol. was written on the basis of Gkrat (with reference to Kla). Gpol. then, at still a later stage, produced, largely because of miserable corruptions, Gkhron and later Gsbor., the time of writing of the latter being roughly the same as the appearance of the rest of Kurbskii's letters. Ivan's second letter stands apart, although it too may have appeared at this stage—in any case, it is but a plain style (i.e. literary but not Slavonic) epitome of the contents of Gpol. 

[change of ink and margin width] The second diagram, composed since I started this letter, indicates the textual relationships which I have been able to establish between the various Mss on the basis of all texts (i.e. in some cases not K-Gr., but e.g. “Pov. o 2-x posol'stvax” etc.). Although it is of course tentative, it has worked out amazingly well, and with the possible addition of some hypothetical spiski (largely as hedges) seems adequate. It is quite surprising, both for the fact that we seem to have so many of the mss involved (i.e. there are few, if indeed any, textual problems which have to be solved by hypothesis of missing copies) and for the chronological compactness of the crucial copies. Another interesting thing is the fact that the copies which are seemingly close in textual ways are in the same collections now (e.g. Pog 1573 and Pog 1567 both seem to come from Muz 2524, itself derived from Muz 4469; Pog 1311 and Pog 1567 seem to have been together etc.). Do we know anything about these Pog’s before the Stroev stage? [added in blue ink:] (Now I do; see below.)
Also since I began this letter, I have used your materials: they are fantastic, better, as I am sure you know, than not only Bychkov etc. but voobshche any descriptions I know of. If you continue to collect such materials, I think they should be published.

I now have a letter from Lur'e, in which he responds to roughly the same things (texts of Isaiah and K etc.) which I sent you [written in margin, in place of crossed out: him]. I am very much relieved and encouraged, because he cannot think of any possible common source of the two (always a possibility, although now I am all but certain that there could have been none). He hasn't really, however, understood the implications of what I wrote him, and his reasoning within the traditional frame is really remarkable. Although he can think of none, he thinks "vsë zhe" that there must be a common source, because 'Predpolozhit' vliianie Isaii na Kurbskogo do 1564 deistvitel'no trudno—khota mozhno bylo bylo by dumat', chto on sochiniil svoe oblichenie Ioasafo ran'she chem "list do v. k. Iv. Vas."...Kurbskii prochel ego mezhdu 1560–1564gg. i ispol'zoval." Possible, but unlikely, and besides I now have found new, fragmentary correspondences between K's letter and other things of Isaiah dated 1566. He goes on, later, 'Predpolozhit' sochinenie vseh perepiski zadnim chislom (no ran'she nachala XVII v – daty Pog. 1567 (you agree that he's wrong about this)) sugubо somnitel'no (my znaem vimyshlennye pis'ma Grozного—oni sovsem inye [does he really think that fabrications attributed to one man have to be as alike as one man's own writings?]; a tut vse skhodno s drugimi poslaniami tsaria [but they too are three dollar bills]). At least I'm relieved that I'm not entirely mad, and if, as Stalin said to Pasternak about Mandel'shtam, that is the best he can defend his friends, they are in bad shape.

Lots of other things are coming out, and I wish I had more time to work on this...I'll keep you informed. Now I must go and check your Polish and Greek titles in Widener so I can send this in good conscience. While I think of it though—and please don't put yourself to the trouble of copying out whole texts—could you take a look at Muz 4469 (it has Peresvetov cf Zimin) and its copy of Kurbskii letter vsavis Lur'e? I hate to ask it, but I'm getting pretty sure this is close to protograph and if you could compare K's letter to Vas'ian (it's short) vsavis Kuntsevich ed., I'd be very grateful. Or film...same goes for sister text Uvarov 1584, also Peresvetov...but for god's sake do it only if you're going to look at them anyway. Out of curiosity, by the way, you might sneak a glance at book 8 of the Pol'skii dvor (TsGADA f. 79). These are gramoty attributed to G., but fishy in that they are bound alone, and interrupt the normal chron. order (cf. book 7). Lur'e calls hand and paper contemporary, but I wonder if they weren't slipped in later.
Excuse the pizhonista paper—it's the lightest I have, and I can see that I'm going to run into extra weight. I have completed your list, and enclose it—we have more than I suspected, but still far from everything, although some of these damn pamphlets may be bound together with other things and not catalogued. I have been doing some more work (since my last page) and have come on what seem to be some hot leads, which I shall try to set forth in simple form (but as hypotheses, they are very fuzzy in some respects, even tho' they seem very attractive to me now). The basic element is the close connection of some part of the K-G corpus with the Antonievo-Siiskii Mon. near Kholmogory. Study of the history of the Stroev-Pogodin mss. and of the Pugin coll. leads one there in a number of ways, and from the catalog of Stroev (Pub. by Viktorov) it is clear that many of the G-K mss. are sisters of ones in A-S Mon. (see also A-S mss. in Opis. BAN). In particular this is true of khrkonograf-type texts (incl Bielski) which, I am quite sure, were used in the comp. of the second version of Ivan's first letter, and in K's Istoriia. It is quite evident that in the middle and late seventeenth century at least, someone in A-S was very interested in history, and apparently in Turcica as well (thus you are right in drawing attention to the fragments of Dvinskaia let. in some G-K mss. and Lur'e is prescient in getting ready to publish Kholmogorskaia let.). The bit "Iz Kyzylbashskikh otpisok..." is also a constant companion both of GK and of many Ant-Siiskii mss., for what it is worth.

Now some visual aids: first the basic chron.-literary history, on basis of texts.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real 1560's</th>
<th>Hanukkah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Kor I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>GR. T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>GR. L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Kor II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>GR. K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>GR. K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>GR. K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>GR. K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>GR. K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

"Literary time," i.e. references to "previous" letters etc. —→
Over for 2nd chart. I am in an airplane, coming back from IUCTG meeting where I discussed these ideas w/ Backus & Dewey. Former has just been working on some legal docs. of K. in Vilno & says that he was so struck by childishness of K's signature on his will [NB in Latin characters] that he made a tracing of it which he will send.

Keep your eye out for Ант.-Сийский мои. & for late [mid 1640's–1680's] copies of Пересветов connected w Романовы, also [for KI & GRI] Филарет. [I]

Ned
I've done this out of my head, so there might be a few transpositions of numbers or ошибки, but in general this is how it looks now.

N.

PS. Каган mentions in "Легендарная переписка" a MS. Арх. 43 [above line: Арх. ком.? Арх. общ.?] which, she says, contains the переписка & also KI. This could be very important—Could you glance at it? Thanks.[...]

Excerpts from ELK to DCW, undated, reply to letter of March 15, 1969, typescript.

[...] About our friend Kurbskii: as you have learned from the letter which crossed your most recent one, the whole Kholmogorskii milieu is, somehow, associated with at least some stages of the K-G saga. A number of new things have now arisen, including the discovery that other parts of K’s first letter are verbatim parallels to parts of an introduction written by Iv. Khvorostinin—and precisely the parts which interrupt the otherwise sploshnoi citation from Isaiah. Indeed, all of these things are in one or another way connected with close friends of enemies of the Romanov family, at various stages of the 17th c., and people like Khvorostinin, Shakhovskoi, Katyrev-Rostovskii (all related, if distantly to one another, and to Kurbskii, for that matter) and even Griboedov, Aşarîn, and our friend Almaz Ivanov are very much to be watched [...]

But getting back to Khvorostinin: I came to him just as I had to Isaiah: in reexamining the textual evidence, I realized that the so-called Khronograficheskaia redaktsiia of the first letter of Ivan is really nothing but a version of the polnaia redaktsiia, with a few list out of place, and then that one of the best copies of the khron red is Uvar. 330, which as Leonid points out, is in the same hand as what he calls the khrnograf Khvorostinina. Thence to Khv., etc. I don’t have, by the way, the pages where Leonid speaks of the khron. Khvor.: could you look at his opis. ruk. Uvarova, No 1581, and then at the khron khv. which he mentions? It probably contains something on Peresvetov, so you might get a look at it. For heaven’s sake, don’t squander your valuable time on a detailed description: your own impression after ten minutes will probably be all one needs unless your own feeling is that you’re on to something [...]

Excerpts from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, April 10, 1969, carbon copy of typescript. Most of three-page letter is a detailed description of MS. GPB, Sobranie Russkogo Arkheologicheskogo obschestva No. 43.

[...] We head for the airport in an hour and a half and by tomorrow AM will be in Bukhara, so must run. Hope this will keep you fueled for a while. A couple of suggestions. Why not publish this thing as a small monograph and let me put an appendix in at end on the manuscripts? In general on my work I plan to start my Thesis with the appendices and have texts and a long hairy section describing manuscripts at the back, the total volume of which may exceed that of the text of the thesis. A second suggestion, what is the chance of getting together next spring semester on a course in Diplomats and Paleography? I would be willing to prepare the paleography (god knows where the time would come, since finishing said thesis will be touch and go) if you would do diplomacy. Third note. Hope you will not have finished with this thing before I return. I undoubtedly will have more to add to what I will have sent by then. I plan to work the little chronicle in the three MSS mentioned earlier [Pogod. 1405, 1573; Muz. 2524—DW] up into an article where I can comment at length on the three MSS. May investigate the possibility of aiming it for the Trudy if they would have it [...]
comes into the act because Shakhovskoi used a letter of his for part of the original letter of 1622. All of this is for your information and thoughts: I’d just as soon that you keep it in pectore for a time, until I can get something out. I don’t expect it’s going to go down very easily just at the moment, and it will have to be provided with “overkill” argumentation.

I do have one little final request, which may reach you too late: in 1625 Shakhovskoi was asked by Filaret to write a letter to Abbas, apparently as part of a Muscovite attempt to screw other foreigners in Persia, and particularly Catholics. As a part of the same exchange of ambassadors (I don’t remember now whether it was before or after) Abbas sent what was represented as Jesus’ robe (riza gospodnia or elsewhere srachitsa) as a little giftee to Mikhail (Muscovy was the last of the great relic markets in Europe by the way). Now in addition to the letter to Abbas (ref. in Rus biogr. slovar’ art. Shakhovskoi or Platonov’s Drevneruss skaz i pov. o smutnom vr.=ZhMNP 1888 i itd.) Shakhovskoi wrote, according to Stroev (Bibliogr. slovar’ art. Shakhovskoi) a “Povest’ preslavna...,o prenesenii...rizy Spasa...v Moskvu”.

Now a similar story, variously titled, often accompanies or may even be a part of the “vypiska iz kyzylbashskikh knig” which appears in a number of our manuscripts, such as Pogod 1615, Muz 4469 and 2524, and, I suspect, Pog 1573 (the obliterated fragment on l. one) (I think this is also called the posol’stvo Korob’ina i Kuvshinova). It would seem that the similarity of these povesti etc with the Ottoman belletristika-diplomatika might permit you to get a film of this text of texts...in any case I’d like your impression of them (ll. 146ff. in Muz 2524).

I very much like your idea about a seminar on paleography and diplomatics, and would very much like to give it in the spring of next year. I have been tinkering with some new ideas about paleographic identification (perhaps even using machine analysis) which seem, on the face of it, promising...we’ll talk [...]
Dear Dan,

Wow! I walked into the “Kongelige” on a hunch [added in margin in green ink: I was on my way to the Rigsarkivet] & discovered all sorts of treasures—including MSS. of—get this—Kurbuskii’s letters, the “Повесть о двух послольствах” [added in margin in green ink: “ходил...Шеин; Селенбеку”] [haven’t seen this yet: tomorrow] and many others, includ. what seems [added in margin in green ink: “Theatrum Vitae Humanae” attrib to “A. A. B”] to be a trans. by Vinius [!]. All hunches to be checked tomorrow & seq., if I can. Of course, the only copies of Briquet, Тромонин et al., are on the other side of town. More soon.

Ned

[added in green ink as postscript:]

Today—Russian WM of 1564: “Царь Иван Васильевич Всеа Руси, Князь Великий Московский”. They are making β-radiograph.

Excerpts from ELK to DCW, Wheatley, Oxford, postmarked September 7, 1970, handwritten. Letter includes further detail on Copenhagen watermark, including a sketch.

[...]I was glad to see that the new information on the Риза confirms your previous conclusions. What an enormous amount of work lies ahead for those who will unravel the history of liturgical literature! I’m reading that Kanonnik book now, and the poor man has to say in almost every ¶ “but the final judgement must await…”

I much appreciate your shepherding of the Kurbuskii MS. through the Press—don’t bother about detail, that can be more time-consuming than is justified. There really are only a couple of main notions in the book, and they won’t stand or fall on the basis of additional details. [Judging from Fennell’s brief remarks yesterday—I saw him just for a moment—Лурье & Зимин just haven’t gotten the point yet—I wonder if they ever will…]

As to your подложные грамоты [by the way, I am beginning to think that we should find another term: it was not really подлог, but a kind of literary travesty, don’t you think?—I mean the Russian ones—as to the translations, I don’t know, but I do wonder sometimes how seriously these things were meant to be taken.], things do seem to become more complicated, but it may just be the normal problem of mass, rather than complexity—sort
out the significant—the singular fact, Freud used to say—and as you do—even if your original guess as to what is significant was off—the minor business will sort itself [...]

More news: Milan provided no surprises—I was able to look through stuff very quickly, since they were on vacation and I was working in the Director’s office with the aid of his staff. As it turns out, their materials are very [written in place of crossed out: rather] disorganized, but it seems that they have only one original Muscovite document [with no WM!] plus a lot of Latin and Italian materials which indirectly reflect Muscovite affairs. There is an article in it [mostly to correct Barbieri’s errors], but not much more. But there is an enormous amount of material about Hungarian affairs [Corvinus etc.] including piles of cyphered messages [with keys] and in general the impression of the level of sophistication of the Sforza chancelleries is, for a poor Muscovite, staggering. One fascinating [and beautifully written] volume, for example, contains formularies with intitulaciones & salutations for dozens of rulers, & probably hundreds of English, French, Spanish & Italian dukes, barons, merchants & gentlemen (& women!). I had hoped to find our Albus Imperator there, but found only “Illustrissimo Principe Joanni Volodymirae Novgorodie Pascovae Magno Ducì Rossiae” for Ivan III & “Magno Ducì Rhossiae... Illus. et potentissimo Domino Joanni Magno Domino totius Rhossiae” for Ivan IV.

The most interesting item from Milan is that Luigi [?] Luongo, nephew of the head of the CPI, who lives in Moscow and is apparently a medievalist [do you know anything about him?] recently visited on a командировка and took microfilms of everything concerning Russia. So we should see something on the subject soon [...]

Excerpts from ELK to DCW, Oxford, September 16, 1970 (postmarked September 21), handwritten. The beginning of the letter is responding to my informing him of my “discovery” of the Belosel’skii-Belozerskii collection of Muscovite svitki in Harvard’s Houghton Library, a collection that apparently had not been studied and was in need of restoration for that to be possible. The reference to the paper by Ihor Sevcenko is to his proof that the so-called “Fragments of the Gothic Toparch” is a nineteenth-century forgery.

An exciting find, indeed! I remember vaguely R.O.J. [Roman O. Jakobson—DW] talking about them, but I somehow got the impression that they were some kind of дворянское гнездо of family relics of the XVIII–XIX вв., and never gave them a thought. I become more convinced each day that
there is plenty to be done in Western collections—and if done right, it can show the way for some proper “коллективные” big jobs on the other side. When I say “each day”, I mean it literally; yesterday Simmons showed me five calligraphic azbuki from the Bodleian, some of them very fine, XVI & XVII century which he is in the process of publishing. There are three others in the B. M.—and God knows what all else.

I have just written a brief note to Miss Jakeman, mainly to support what you say in your letter and to urge her to be guided by what you say. I shall see Simmons again tomorrow, and ask him for any special ideas he might have about the preservation of свитки. The ones here, which, being prize specimens of calligraphy, are probably on better paper, have been kept rolled since they were acquired [in the XVI & XVII cents.] but have been “backed” with new paper. The important thing, I believe, is a kind of paper preservative which can be “painted” on—I saw them doing it in Copenhagen—without smearing or discoloring anything, and “feeds” the paper somehow.

I would be chary of separation just yet—especially if the свитки were pasted as, & not after, the texts were written. If [as in the cases in the Bodleian] the seams bear no text, it is less important, but the sheets should be numbered before separation—in fact, every sheet should be numbered now, before the restoration people begin shuffling them about, & catalogued briefly—as archeologists “tag” items & photograph them, with tag, in situ.

They will be a good thesis topic—maybe more than one—and great aids in training [...]

Your citation from Скрынникова’s letter р Шевченко’s доклад is really baffling. If they don’t believe Ihor, I don’t have a chance.—The more so now that Лихачев [so he writes Simmons] is preparing an edition of an unknown канон [as I mentioned] & no less an authority than Сигурд О. Шмидт is coming out with a “Сочинения Курбского”, presumably in the standard series. Now there’s a book I will do for Kritika.

I had better get back to Носов. [But should add that, since I wrote the above, I spent yesterday with Max Hayward, who bought from an old bookseller a свиток of Але—ей Мих—ч, ca. 1650—so you see what I mean. Another odd bit of lore—one of the Bodleian scrolls was attributed to Иван IV himself on the basis of the inscription in Horsey’s hand, although the attribution is false & impossible, since the scribe gives his name in the text & it was written in Холмогоры.

Final note: when you tire of James Bond—if you do—try the latest Jahrbücher, where—in the back—you will find a fascinating desc. of Крупская’s illness and the fact that in April 1917 the “Patientin” was “an
Klimacterium". Now it is clear—Nadezhda’s premature & apparently traumatic menopause is the cause of it all!

Excerpts from ELK to DCW, Oxford, September 26, 1970, handwritten.

[...] I judge by your despair that you must indeed be close to finishing. Please keep in mind that this version is "для служебного пользования"; I’m sure that even now the textological base is adequate & indeed impressive. Don’t worry about the non-Russian scope—in fact you are in history & all of what you discuss is germane. Certainly I would be surprised if RLW [Robert Lee Wolff—DW] would complain of "non-Russianness". The occasional comments one hears about that usually have to do with the problem of making clear to prospective employers that Russia is the main field, etc., no problem in your case. So plow ahead, mixing, if you can, hours of paperwork [copying, editing, checking] with writing on an empty pad, and you will find that it is finished before you expected. And don’t worry about the book’s literary or even “general interest” value at this stage. Think how dull, really, are the great & useful similar studies of a complex “swatch” of literature [e.g., Ключевский, "Жития"; Платонов, "Повести"; Попов, "Хронографы"]. But such studies must be done, and this is really the way to cut one’s teeth. Later, you might write a shorter лит-ист. essay on this stuff, but if the thesis were a glittering & speculative salon piece on “The Crescent & the Onion Dome,” based on secondary stuff, the wrong people would be impressed for the wrong reasons, and you would be the loser [...]

Simmons is a mine of odd bibliographical knowledge. Told me an interesting sidelight yesterday: "Беспамятная собака" appears in Б & Э [Entsiklopedicheskii slovar', ed. Brokgauz & Efron—DW], oddly, because the editor, one Марголин, was cheap, and, when reminded by contributors that he had not paid them, he would strike his forehead & say, “Ах, какая беспамятная собака, забыл совершенно”. They got their revenge, with the help of the typesetter. Look at the definition [added in margin: NB old orthog. “з”].

Excerpts from ELK to DCW, Oxford, November 25, 1970, handwritten. The discussion here concerns the title for the book—the Harvard Press editor had suggested that there should be something short and catchy; Ned’s first choice was “Post Scriptum.” I have a vague recollection of being the one to propose “Apocrypha,” a title which turned out, of itself, to be very annoying to Ned’s critics.
Just got yours about "Post Scriptum." I guess I should have trusted Joan’s first reaction, which was just the same as yours. If Miss D. [Dexter, the editor—DW] has the same, I shall begin to wonder what I did mean in choosing it. Obviously, it won’t float—but did what I intended come through? I didn’t mean “P.S.” or “Postscript”, but “Post Scriptum,” i.e. a notation meaning that the text so marked was “written later.” If it were for “Nauka” we would write “Написано позднее, другой рукой”, & make a title out of it. Cf. “Address Unknown” etc.

Fact is I just don’t think any gimmicky title is going to make any difference in the fate of the book, but I’ll keep trying. How about “Best wishes from all of us” or “Yours, Semen and Artamon and Vasilii and the boys”?

More seriously, I may settle for “The Groznyi-Kurbskii Apocrypha” which is no poetry, but will make sense to potential readers [both of them] [...]

Excerpts from ELK to DCW, undated, with my notation “rec’d Dec. 23” [1970], typescript.

[... ] I agree with you about Lur’e [added note in margin: i.e. that he is marvellous], but wonder why he is not scratching his head a little more over some of the things we’ve sent him. These arguments about “а как тогда быт’ s drugimi poslaniami Groznogo” as you know do not intrigue me very much. I understand that Valerie Tumins is publishing her dissertation on the Rokyta “answers,” which eventually will probably require a separate treatment, if only to satisfy Roman Osipovich (although I don’t expect it will). I had a long—three-hour—talk with Nørretranders in Copenhagen this time—he was not prepared for the type of tack I took, but seemed at least willing to accept the possibility—although later, after Schnaps, he allowed as how he could accept the business about the first letter of Kurbskii and the Istoriiia, but that first letter of Ivan’s must be genuine, on psychological grounds. (?) Same with Grobovsky (of the izbrannaia rada) whom I see a lot of. He’s now writing an essay on Siivestr, but he just won’t listen to me about checking up on the Delo Viskovatogo etc (at the very least, a poorly published and studied text, and at the outer limit, a mistifikatsiia of one kind or another) and although he agrees about most “revisionist” views of historiography, he just won’t take the texts and bite into them. He thinks, in spite of my passionate arguments and I think adequate proofs, that AI shmats was right on all counts about the pripiski [...]

I read Kashtanov *Ocherki russkoi diplomatiki—DW* instead of sleeping in my hotel room—some pretty good stuff, and well worth reviewing—especially good on the Troitse-Serg 518ff vs Pogod 1905 (I think those are the numbers). Did you see what he says about Stroev? (cf. *ukazatel*). As I read it—although he doesn’t say so in so many words—the old boy is accused and convicted of stealing parts of mss. and doctoring the remaining pages, so as to fill up his own collection and this explains *handwritten note above the line: (I think—Каштанов is very polite)*] the “repaired” portions of so many of our sborniki. If you haven’t noticed this, look at it (ca pp 350ff) via index, because it might give some clues about 2524/1573. Have you ever wondered where in Hell Stroev got all the mss from which he “filled in” the sborniki we have? The answer seems to be that like the counterfeiters who split a bill and forge half of it, he was supplementing his income without damaging nauka, in the manner of so many penurious nineteenth-c. scholars who hated their rich patrons and loved to fool them and any amateurs [...

*Excerpts from ELK to DCW, Cambridge, October 4, 1971, handwritten.*

This is a response to my first letters from my second academic year in Leningrad. The check from *Literaturnaia gazeta* was payment for a short article published there about the “first Muscovite watermark” which Ned had discovered in Copenhagen (see above).

[...] I should write Лурье, but I must write you, so perhaps you can pass on—on second thought, no, don’t—the following thoughts: As you report his comments, I am, like yourself, disappointed. As you know I am familiar w/ the “stylistic” arguments, and don’t find them very convincing. As to the “common source” and “influence” of Kurbskii arguments, they don’t begin to answer the questions I pose in the text about how the “borrowed” sections were “borrowed” in a mutually exclusive way. I don’t worry about the chronicles; the “parallels” are nothing like what I have cited. Of course I read his “Был ли Иван Грозный писатель?” but [if I didn’t in fact cite it] disregarded it because it was a part of the foolishness involving Дубровский, with whom [although of course I agree with some of his notions] I didn’t want to be associated. As to the question of why С. И. Ш. [S. I. Shakhovskoi—DW] addressed Мих. Фед., he should read fn. 60, Ch II, where [I think] it is pointed out that the letter goes together with those to Филарет and Киприан, and with them forms a kind of Compleat Petition to all власть имущие.
And in general, if this (and the comments of Скрынников in «Неделя» reprinted [tell him!] in Новое р. слово) is the best they can do, I doubt that we'll even get a "Son of Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha" out of the whole thing.

I'm game for a доклад, providing they send me some concrete antithesis. I wonder whether it might not be interesting to try to get some money from IREX & make a short trip. I'd be interested in various reactions to that—But, unless they come up with something more substantive than what you report, I'm inclined to think that we might as well just let the primary message of the book sink in for a time. Zimin writes—did you know this?—via Greg [Shesko—DW] that he won't review the book, but will send a detailed отзыв [...]

You won't believe it, but Литгазета sent, unsolicited and unannounced, a dollar check on the Bank of America for $33.00 for the little WM. piece! Adam [Ulam—DW] says only Howard Fast ever got such treatment [...]
Incidentally, since Greg looked at Shakhovskoi’s works in the MDA MSS on my request, no one else has touched them...

I am going to try looking at all the relevant 17th century (and 16th century) editions in TsGADA that might have been used in the compilation of KG works—just to see what zapisi there are [...]

Excerpt from DCW to ELK, Moscow, December 18, 1971, photocopy of typescript. Regarding the reference to a letter addressed to King Stefan Bathory allegedly by Ivan IV, I should note that I had “discovered” it in 1968–1969 but not looked at the text carefully enough to determine that it was not one of the published letters. When I sought further information from Cambridge in 1970, A. A. Zimin was the one who checked the letter and recognized it for what it was, but he generously did not attempt to publish it. My concern here over whether S. O. Shmidt would be as honorable was obviously unfounded; I owe him an apology. He was the one who kindly arranged to have the letter published in Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik. Here I should also note the particular generosity of Iu. D. Rykov in sharing his unpublished work and in keeping me and Ned informed of new manuscript discoveries.

[...] Just returned from AAZ [Zimin—DW] and his critique of the book. All his comments must be read in the light of what he wrote in that Istochnikovedenie book you reviewed, and more recently repeated in a little piece in—hold your hat—Znanie—Sila, 1971, No. 8, entitled: “Sushchestvoval li ‘nevidimka’ XVI veka?”, doing in the dogadki of one Nikitin published in the two previous-numbers on the imaginary son of Solomonia. In short, on the prerequisites of a satisfactory historical proof—the differences between dogadka and gipotez, the need to consider all vozmozhnosti, etc.

First, on the plus side for the book, his opening comments were that it is “blestiaushchaja i vazhnaia”; he lists 12 reasons: 1. New postanovka. 2. Metodika. 3. Paleograficheskoe issled. of rukop. and relating question of time of MSS to time of appearance of works. 4. genealogia tekstov at basis of work; new and kompleksnaia genealogiiia (in sense of inclusion of convoy genealogies etc. too). [Handwritten note added here in margin: But NB he did not attempt to check your re-ordering of GKI redactions, nor do I think he fully realized the import of that for basic arguments.] 5. proof the Kurbskii
sborniki of late origin—although this does not necessarily prove late origin of the works therein. 6. consideration of iazykovye plasty (but later noted you never gave any of the evidence for the separation of texts by language—I pointed out this was done by Damerau, although I haven’t read his book). 7. Use of evidence of convoys and owners and demonstr. of value of this evid. 8. Textual closeness of KGI to the three “sources” shown—but not necessarily direction of borrowing; he added here, note that the texts of Isaiah and Vas’ian letter perekreshchivaiutsia. 9. Proof that text from Apostol is a second redaction vstavka—and in general proof that second redaction is such. 10 Once again proof of our need to study Posol’skii prikaz lit. activities. 11. Indic. of impt. of Shakhovskoi and the many other questions this raises. 12. Literaturovedcheskie and ideologicheskie voprosy posed by work need to be examined again now.

Basic weaknesses: gives one of several possibilities calling it the only possible or the most possible—does not treat, if only to dispose of them—the other possibilities for each point.

leggkomyslennyi podkhod to many important problems—eg. question of whole lit. deiatelnost of Ivan and K. Garmonia of slovo i delo of what we know about Ivan from other sources and from the perepiska. Other letters etc.—specifically Teterin, Polubenskii etc. dismissed too casually.

AAZ concluded he could not prove you wrong, but you have not proven your point and the fact so many questions were only touched on in passing leaves the work incomplete. neobiazatelnost of conclusions.

He also added later to above list a third point—what other examples in 16th and 17th c. do we have of works written under pseudonyms?

Specifically regarding chapters:

I. Haven’t proven paleographically that kratk. red. GKI is in earlier group. Noted here his own view in descr. of [GBL, Muz.—DW] 4469 in Soch. Peresvetova that K. letter first separate and only later united with G. letter—Z. feels Ivan took the K. letter and related works in [?] Pechory and then added his reply to the collection, with the final stage in the growth of the material coming with addition of materials from Kurbskii archive in 17th c. Haven’t proven that letters were not in the Tsar’s archive; this possibility that they were is in his view equally likely.

II. Strongest point is textual argument on 1st letter. But need to search in church literature of time. Z. misunderstood here an important point—that Isaiah wrote in Muscovy not in Ukraine; here he indicated that the location of Isaiah and Kurbskii outside of Muscovy suggested possible connection—I corrected his misunderstanding. Possible that Shakhovskoi knew the works of Kurbskii—I objected here about the direction of borrowing shown by the
textology, but Z. didn’t buy that. Regarding the spletenie tekstov he referred me to his article on the Pskov apostol and Slovo. A strong argument, but here not convincing. Biographical facts of the letters—he insists nothing in K’s biography contradicts possibility that he wrote letters—which means coincidence with Shakhov biog. does not weight arg. in your favor. Also noted sources better for 17th c. to establ. facts of Shakhovskoi biog. Specifically passage in letter to Vas. about potrebota zhizni—K. could have asked for them before left.

Z. claims never did buy open letter argument of Lurd and hence nothing added by what you said on score. Much lost argument—opis’ after 1626 fire shows why some things lost and some not (incidentally the opis’ is coming out soon—in index compiling stage Schmidt has told me—expect it in the coming year). Argument from silence here not disposed of—Z. says he has similar passage about lost copies in his work on Slovo and there the argumentation sound but here it is not: No Fedorov copy if 2nd red. is in fact 17th c. No Isaiah copy if obshchii istochnik—etc.—all would disappear but for Ivan’s copy in the archive and Kurbskii’s copy. Here according to Z you have 2-oi etazh dogadki.

Does not buy the textology of Lyzlov to Istoriia, but thinks in fact comparison shows reverse (says he checked this). EG. ty/my opposition or mili/versty proves nothing for you.

In general feels you have too many dogadki instead of gipotezy and in this respect puts the work in the category of “romanticheskie” works (he would include work of Skrynnikov here).

A couple of specific refs.: note A. P. Barsukov, Spiski gorodovykh voevod for Shakhovskoi refs. and note Tikhomirov, Russkaia kultura collection of articles, p. 339 on Fedorov/Kurbskii connection or lack thereof. Mentioned also his (Z’s) article on Pesni ob Ivane as works of 1630’s—but this in connection now fuzzy. He used as one example of onesidedness in considering possibilities your passing disposal of Ivan’s library, without mentioning views to contrary such as his and Tikhomirov’s articles.

Z. concluded when I pressed the point that he will continue to accept the traditional datings and authenticity of texts as supported by the complex of the other writings, facts of 16th c. etc. etc.—at least for now.

I spent most of the time listening and didn’t attempt to rebut each of his points—for what does one say when the argument has all been laid out clearly and the opponent in the debate says that there is this and this alternative each or all of which might be considered in his view equally likely. A couple of times I tried insisting that his alternatives were not equally likely, but he wouldn’t buy that. While I would in general agree with his and Lure’s views
on dogadka, gipotez, need to consider all sides and dispose of the contrary ones, etc., I don’t think in most cases he applies such points fairly to the book, and I sense a certain tendency toward a nihilism that says anything is equally likely and hence you can’t prove a thing. If someone wants to argue that way, what can one say?

Anyway, so much for today’s session (at which, incidentally, Rykov was present—will get to him in a minute). Last week spent a delightful 5 or 6 hours with AAZ on first meeting—having both obed and uzhin u nego and running over a range of topics from the book and Rykov’s work to a checklist of which Soviet colleagues in Z’s view are good historians and which bad, to some remarks in the direction of one R. Jakobson of a nature you can well imagine, to philosophizing on human existence, to problems of raising or as it were not being able to raise a hippie-inclined teenager, etc.

[...] All in all he is such a marvellous person one wonders what the hell the Inst. Ist. SSSR did to deserve someone like him.

Shmidt—one of Z.’s enemies to whom he does not speak—is, as one might expect, a different type. Vague, a bit condescending, ready to polemicize with your book before he sees it etc. He introduced himself to me in the library. His book is in final stages and will appear in the coming year. When I offered to show him yours, he took a look (after informing me it would be easier for him in German) and then quickly remarked, perhaps he had better not as he might want to hold up his own to polemicize with you. Among other things in his work, he peels off several sections of the K. history and concludes that it was probably put together from unfinished notes left by K. at his death. Z. tells me S. has dated the litsevoi svod to 1580 at earliest on basis of WMs; this of course affects conclusions on the supposed relationship of pipiski to History. One ref. from S. that you may have missed: S. D. Balukhatyi, “Perevody kn. Kurbskago i Tsiseron,” Germes: illustrirovannyi nauchno-pop. vestnik antichnago mira, t. 18 (1916), Nos. 5/6, 109–122. He did compare carefully the translation with Latin original, but with the original given by Kunts.—noting that the variants suggest a definite ed. but among those he knew of prior to time of translation (late 3rd quarter 16th c) one did not find them. Notes translation not very accurate. Article of course sidesteps the big issue, but will collect a Xerox for future ref. I finally decided to tell Shmidt about the new letter to Bathory [in MS. GIM, Muz. 1551—DW]—he suggested publishing it here; I told him fine, providing I would be permitted a skeptical introduction. The question of publ. may be more firmly answered this week. If S. steals the letter I will raise holy hell. Incidentally, Z. was the one who checked it out last year for me via NNB [Bolkhovitinov—DW]. Shmidt clearly has nothing new for us
and his book probably will be a sorry affair. He has given considerable attention to translations supposedly by Kurbskii; remains to be seen what he has to say on that score. Is checking the 16th c. copies of Novyi Magarit, of which there would appear to be some—I must look at them too sometime.

Rykov, to change to a more likeable person, but hardly personality, did his work as a senior thesis under Zimin’s direction. It is more substantial than his article or other article in similar publication would lead one to believe—he has studied around 70 copies of the ist. (many of them late), and a preliminary classification of the redactions is to appear in AE some time in the near future. His textology is spotty though and he has not really sorted on the fine level—eg. ideas about the Golitsyn series being the earliest one had not really crossed his mind. He is presently working in RO GBL describing MSS and has little time for independent naukaia rabota. Have gotten a number of new MS numbers from him—including a 17th (?) c. copy in Kharkov with the Gol. inscription, and another archival copy he thinks might be the oldest on the basis of WMs. The work is focussed on the Istoriia as a source for the oprichnina; he is carefully comparing its information with that of all other sources. I don’t think he is terribly sharp, but it would appear he is head and shoulders above Konstantin Andreevich Uvarov, who had been working on the Slovo; whose work with MSS raises doubts among previously mentioned individuals; whose advisor, incidentally, is Robinson. People I have talked with so far would not be at all surprised if he erred in dating the Undoli’skii MS [GPB, Undol. 720—DW] which I hope to see tomorrow have looked at the pocherk on film and it is very suspicious for 16th c. [...] Despite Likhachev’s letter, Archive is refusing me material in the Pol’skie dela, claiming it has no relevance to a literary topic. Also, Avtokratova, the head of the place, lied to my face about one delo I got a ref. to from Belobrova—in Grecheskie dela—claimed they have no such work [...] Did check Simeon Bekbulatovich and for some reason did get the poslania ot imeni boiar. The former has a fragment of a 16th century WM, and in my opinion, even though this does not tell us whose joke, it must be considered from paper and pocherk to be 16th c. The poslania ot imeni boiar are correctly dated on paper evidence by Lur’e; only other note is that title of Ivan, which L. did not give in texts includes vsia sibirskie zemli. Regarding the chelobitsnaia, it is probable that the article indicating that was 17th c. term is simply in error. In other words, we have added plus and minus, as Zimin does in weighing your work, and arrived at zero [...] I am systematically checking all editions of Guagnini in GBL—surprised there are so many Swiss, Dutch and other eds. Did find one passage you may have missed in the 1578 Latin original:
Quidam etiam Wlodimirus Morozow cognominatus, vir celebrita te famae insignio & maturae aetatis, grauitateque plenus Palatinus, semel quadam misericordia motus cendere fecit humi miserum hominem, qui Magni Ducis imperio interfecit fuerat. Is autem homo fuerat famulus Ducis Curpiskij, qui ad Regem Poloniae defecerat. Hanc itaque ab causam Magnus Dux arguebat hunc Wlodimirus perfidiae, acsi a partibus fugitui Curpskij staret, & in Lithuaniam ad ipsum literas dedisset. Itaque subito coniectus est in carceres, ubi cum longissimo temporis interuallo haesisset, extractus & oblatus est Magni Duci, cum esset in suo palatio & aula Regia, Alexandrowa dicta, discruciatusque est maximis tormentis, cum ab eo nihil extorquere potuissent, tandem mortuus & cadauer in aquas coniectum est. (Descr. of Muscovy, fol. 37).

Also have begun to check L'vov Apostol. Only one copy in TsGADA and it tells us nothing—a late acquisition. There apparently [are] no eds. of Cicero of what one needs—if there is one, it is misshelved and cannot be located. I have gotten the librarian there to cooperate with me in searching for these; so the information should be ok. I plan to check Fedorov in GIM (4 copies) and GBL before returning to Leningrad where will do the same in repositories there.

I am in passing getting some of own work done [...]

Regarding Zimin’s comments on the book—the above is all you get—he had me take notes as he is not going to write them to you himself [...]

I am toying with the idea of trying to get Likhachev to accept for the Trudy a “Reply to D. N. Al'shits” on the question of manuscript descriptions (new AE I sent you). If you have any ideas po etomu povodu, please send them. I can of course do a review for Kritika—including the new BAN vol. that is nearly out, the continuation of G&N [Gorskii and Nevostruev—DW] by GIM and Al'shits own Erm. Sobr. along with his article. But I really think we must come down hard on that here in print. Someone else well may, but perhaps they need a push. I am told that they had a three day conference in Leningrad a year ago on the problems of MS descriptions—in particular with regard to this union catalogue of pre-15th c. MSS; the various khranilishche could not agree on a standard form and left with the understanding that each would follow its own rules. There really is no rationality in the world. Likhachev proposed to Shmidt long ago the beginning of a kartoteka of pocherki under central auspices (arkheografich. kom. for eg.); I mentioned this to Shmidt when I saw him, along with the idea of a kartoteka filigranei. He clearly is not interested.
Spent a delightful evening with Klepikov, who is well into his 70's but still actively working on the history of paper manufacture in 18th c. Russia [...] 

Undol'skii No. 720 is from the 1630's—good WM identifications. That Uvarov clearly must be an idiot judging from his notes on the WMs and moreover, had he looked at the pencilled note from Undol'. or some reader of half a century ago, he would have seen a ref. to precisely the Tromonin mark one finds on the pp. with the Kurbskii letter. It is dangerous to have someone like Uvarov around. Incidentally, Zimin does not expect we will ever find a 16th c. MS of the perepiska—but for rather different reasons—his vymysl' about the archive.

I have Rykov's dissertation in hand and will try to go through it by the beginning of next week. Uvarov has apparently stolen some of Rykov's work—beginning his study of the "Istoriia" and K. works at a later date and not doing independent searching at first to find MSS. All concerned missed the pencilled note in MGAMID no. 60 telling the last 50 or 60 years of scholars that the Guagnini translations there are from the Polish edition of 1611....Likhachev clearly was right in his lament for the decline of philology, etc. Come to think of it, undoubtedly his remarks on that occasion were as much directed against Z. as anyone else [...]

[Added in pen: ]

P.S. Have found Egyptian Hieroglyphs in w/ papers of Приказ Тайных дел—need to date though...

[Added in pen at top of p. 1 of letter:]

PS I hope you are saving all my letters—I would like copies as a Хроника for personal archive.

*Excerpts from ELK to DCW, Cambridge, January 5, 1972, typescript.*

Just got yours of Dec 18, with news of AAZ's reaction, about which more later [...] 

Obviously AAZ read the thing more sympathetically and more attentively than anyone so far over there (although judging from a few of the misconceptions which you corrected for him, maybe a few points still haven't gotten to him). It was nice of him to find 12 pliusy. As to the basic weakness—giving only one of the several possibilities, he is right, of course,
but I agree with you that not all of the the possibilities are ravnoznachny, and I just didn’t want to go into every little point, since the purpose of the whole exercise was to make one, I think major, point.

He is annoyed by my legkomyslennost in general—he mentioned it in some other connection in a nice letter he sent me before you saw him. But better legkomyslennost than tiashelodumnost. I would say, and as to the lit. deiatefnost of K & G, nous verrons. As to his question of other pseudonymous works of the 16th and 17th centuries, I would be only half-joking if I were to name, naprimer, Ivashka Peresvetov....

I can’t say I’m flattered to be a “romantik” along with Skrynnikov....

I did see Barsukov, Spiski... while in Oxford, but didn’t think it added anything worth stopping the presses for. I’ll add it in “Son of G-K Apocrypha”. Also saw Tikhomirov on Fedorov, and AAZ on the library. Perhaps should of mentioned them, but it would just have involved space and time devoted to citing them then putting their arguments down, and I didn’t want to include AAZ in the rather sharptongued things I said about the mythical library. Legkomyslennost.

Of course if Isaiia pereklikaetsia with Vas‘ian (it is not too striking, as I recall) then my dogadka that Sh. is somehow involved with the Vas‘ian letters becomes, byt’ mozhet, a gipotez?

Your account of your encounter with S. O. Sh. is classic, but I do look forward to the things he is publishing. I hope he has some good evidence about the Litsevoi svod [handwritten addition in margin: Grobovsky writes that he is not convinced about K-G, because of the Al’shits primpiski business, which he takes as proof of ca 1565 existence of переписка...] and the “layers of the Istoria”. They will be useful in the next round.

Don’t get a xerox of the Balukhatyi because I read it and got a xerox in Helsinki last year. I didn’t add it because as you say, it sidesteps the big issue [...]

[handwritten note in margin:] PS. I am, of course, saving all of your letters. They’re more interesting than many Barsukov published.
 [...] Talked at length with Lure yesterday, agitating him a bit on the subject of the book. I stressed the importance of his sending you his critique as soon as possible. He has made some progress in his thoughts about it (perhaps under the influence of conversation with AAZ?), and is at least willing to concede you raise many important questions that cannot be swept under the rug. It is incredible though how little he knows about some of the sticky problems raised by the manuscript traditions. E.g., the difference in trad. of the Vas'ian letters 1 and 2 from No. 3, the fact the best MS of 1 and 2 not attributed to Kurbskii, and of course all the new questions raised about the composition of the original Kurbskii sborniki (see my somewhat incomplete and perhaps not entirely accurate supplement to the material for my chapter 4 that I sent with corrections a week or so ago). It appears that Likhachev is going to review the book for Russkaia literatura; since in recent memory they have printed both sides of a hot argument, perhaps they would give you space for a reply... I made it clear to Lufe (who is talking in terms of an article or the like in Jahrbücher [rather than a review here?]) that it was important above all if one was going to say the book raises many important questions that must be answered, to say that in print here where people can get to the MSS. He of course still does not buy the arguments, but I am beginning to wonder how carefully he has read it—he did not remember that in the book you spelled out the reasons why Isaiah must be first and Kurbskii second (he did recall you had written this in a letter); I really think he has not come to grips with a lot of the argument. He still falls back on stylistic things, the connection with apparently real letters (e.g., cited Johann) in the sense of style and manners or lack thereof. He says this would have to mean that the author of the letters looked in the archive (I said, why not?). He then went on to say he was quite sure Ivan personally probably did not put pen to paper but worked through secretaries. He keeps falling to Ivan's letter as the point d'appui, but I reminded him that the Kurbskii letter is the one that has to be dealt with first, and that that is precisely the reason why you did not treat fully (and as Z would have it, treated legkomyslenno) the remainder of the "corpus" [...]

Excerpt from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, undated (between February 9 and February 23, 1972), photocopy of typescript. The paper given by Gol'dberg appeared subsequently in TODRL.

[...] Gol'dberg doklad in PD last week brilliant: thorough textual and manuscript analysis of letters of Filofei reveals he did not write any but for the one to Misiur-Munekhin. That is dated po Gol'dbergu ca. 1523; others probably ca. 1526 and ca. 1550. Latter two dates not too solid, but in general a marvellous piece of work, despite Likhachev's comment that it was "simuliruiushchii [sic], no nichego ne dokazano." With that thought, I close for now. D.

[Added handwritten note in margin:]
P.S. In commentary about doklad more намеки about the book without specifying whom they were referring to—seem to think you have improperly used convoy analysis & imply you have placed its evidence above textual evidence.

Excerpt from ELK to DCW, Cambridge, February 14, 1972, typescript.

[...] Very interesting to hear of Gol'dberg's doklad. Your typewriter produced DSL's comment as "simuliruiushchii, no nichego ne dokazano". As is, I would apply to certain well known works. DSL must wonder whether the times are out of joint [...]
Excerpts from DCW to ELK, Moscow, March 14, 1972, photocopy of typescript.

[Uvarov has published the first of his pirated work on Kurbskii: K. A. Uvarov, “Istoriia o velikom kniaze moskovskom’ A. M. Kurbskogo v russkoi rukopisnoi traditsii XVII–XIX vv. (Arkheograficheskii obzor spiskov pamiatnika),” in Mosk. gos. ped. inst. im. Lenina, Kafedra russk. lit., Uchenye zapiski, t. 455: Voprosy russkoi literatury (k semidesiatiletiu doktora filologicheskikh nauk prof. kafedry russkoi literatury Nikolaia Vasil'evicha Vodovozova), M., 1971, 61–78. There are two or three other articles of interest in the same Festschrift. No surprises in Uvarov’s list—he claims to have divided the History into three redactions, but the work that did that was Rykov’s, not Uvarov’s; there are some other sweeping statements about how he does this or that on the basis of studying the language, style, etc. etc. of the History and other K. texts, but he of course hasn’t done any of that. Rykov has put me on to another copy or two of KGI—of no particular interest but 17th c [...]

Have found in the Undol’skii collection a partial opis’ of the books in fond 181 (MGAMID) of the archive. There is a typescript by Shumilov now for that fond, but I have yet to see it... Also have looked at Stroev’s opis’ of his MSS, also in Undol’skii. Barsukov published most of it as is; the entries for the sborniki, which he did not publish, merely give the no. of “articles” and the format, date and no. of folios. I do hope to do some matching of Stroev
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pieces when I return to Leningrad. I have a third piece of the 1573 sbornik
now, the last page of which, crossed out and pasted over, is the first page of
my Povest' o Pakhomii from 1573. Pogod. 1503, 1573, and 1629 were thus
all part of the same sbornik; my guess is that there is at least one more part of
it to go. I hope to get permission to poke in the khranilishche so I can pull
the things down off the shelf and match them more quickly. NB that in the
big black “Slovo” book, Dmitrieva has a note about Stroev cutting out a piece
of a Kirillov-Belooz. mon. sbornik and putting it in what is now Pogod.
1556 (if I recall correctly). I am going to try doing a little soobshchenie for
the Trudy if I get some additional material [...]

Excerpt from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, April 5, 1972, photocopy of
handwritten text.

[...] Finally in LOII where have looked at Cossack переписка—just like
куранты physically but nothing in text that helps much. Can only be a copy
I think—not the orig. for other copies. Began on the Лихачев copy of Посл.
Кирилло-Белоозерск. мон.—MS of mid-17th c. (WM two-headed eagle of
G. types 1640’s & ca. 1650, w. cm PDB). Very suspicious for what Лихачев
(Д.С.) claims it to be—1st 10 or 12 лл. are normal neat скороп. with the
marginalia & instructions on 3-4 pp. in text & in margin; then at end final
portion of text, which seems to have been copied separately with 1st part of
text—again neat & normal. Will check more closely soon. MS was in
Александро-Свирский мон. in last century & passed through Stroev’s hands
at one pt. [...]

Excerpt from ELK to DCW, Cambridge, April 11, 1972, typescript.

[...] As you can imagine, I am not astonished that that Likhachev copy of
the Poslanie v KBM turns out to be as you describe—indeed I would be
astonished if it were to be as he described it...Also not surprised at Rykov’s
article on the spiski, which I have now read in Greg’s copy of AE: I am in
particular struck by the so-called “kompiliativnaia redaktsiia” which “omits”
precisely the portions which I assume to have been taken from the Skifskaia
(or the Zasekina, as you suggest) istoriia and also the description of the
Livonian campaigns which will eventually, unless I miss my guess, be
identified with one or another of the Polish accounts of those campaigns.
Thus again we have a [handwritten addition in margin: double] textological
triangle, and the preferred assumption is that Rykov's is not kompiliativnaja, but kompilatorskaia, i.e. used by the compiler of the so-called polnaja. The komp. red. is known in only three copies (GIM sinod 483; GBL Nevostruev, 42; GPB F.XVII, No. 11/iz sobr F. A. Tolstoia) of which I know the convoy only of the last. If you get a glance...

Another mad idea, about Peresvetov. If one speaks only of spiski which have the chelobitnaye (esp. kratkaj), one gets a rannija gran' of perhaps ca. 1640, n'est-ce pas? Now take a few minutes to read the Moldovskaia perepiska of A. L. Ordin-Nashchekin recently published by someone whose name I can't recall [handwritten note added in margin: И. В. Галактионов, Ранняя переписка А. Л. О-Н. (1642-45) Саратов, 1968], and tell me whether his letters—esp. the more obsequious and opportunate ones—aren't a parody of Peresvetov (or byt' mozhet naoborot?). How do you like those apples? Tut i izrecheniia moldavskogo voevody i opisanie turetskogo dvora i vsevozmozhnye "kak tebe nравится моя службница..."


Excerpts from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, April 11, 1972, photocopy of typescript

[...] I had a long session with Skrynnikov about the book—rather a peculiar affair, but typical I guess—he insisted that I recount for him the major points before he reads it (the question then arises, will he actually read it) and indicate to him what pages certain things are found on. He had some explanation or another for all the points you raise about the letter to Vasyian: eg., the profound peace is due to the successes in the war that put all of the territory SE of Pechory in Muscovite hands and cut off attacks from that direction; he insists on Kurbskii being forced to leave without his valuables (including wife and son); he cites Adashev being sent to Iur'ev effectively in exile as an example of using it as a place of exile. And in general, he falls back on citing KGI to support authenticity of Vasyian or vice versa. Thinks you didn't read his article carefully—but it seemed to me he had a hard time finding the arguments he thought were there. And, of course, he has yet to read the book (much less, carefully, which one doubts he will do). I will undoubtedly have a long session with him in another couple of weeks, but I don't expect much [...]

Have been having some interesting conversations in the Publichka lately on questions of descriptions in general and the Pogodin coll. in particular. I do hope to have time to sort out the Stroev sborniki before I leave; I am rounding up some support for the effort (Granström is particularly enthusiastic). They are still discussing the fate of the description project for the collection—the woman who has been working on it has let the thing drag on over years (if I heard G. correctly—17 to date) and is simply not up to putting things in order so that any of what she has done can be used. I gather they are talking now about reproducing her cards—making usable copies of them or the like—but that still covers only the first 1000 MSS or so. G. and others are really down on the head of the person who has been working on the collection (Kopreeva). Judging from the conversation with Kop. I can see why. I didn’t realize that she is the author of a couple of articles on Russo-Polish relations in the 1660’s—which was the subject of her dissertation [...]

Have indirectly Crummey’s reaction to the book—perhaps will be able to give you a quote next time I write. At its worst—and he seems to feel this goes for a lot of it I gather—it is cavalier, and at its best stimulating but not convincing. He advised his grad student here to beware of the Harvard school of sceptical textology or whatever he called it. His grad. student (Rowland), has discovered an interesting link for the Khvorostinin tale about the smuta in Q.IV.172. The zapis’ there appears to be part of a much longer one found on at least two MSS now in BAN that were given to the Antoniev Siiskii Monastery by Patr. Adrian in the last quarter of the 17th c. The hand in the Khvorostinin may well be the same as in one of the BAN MSS that apparently was copied in the Patriarchal scriptorium late in the 17th c.

Made a not half bad lemon meringue pie recently that was quite a revelation to those here who had never seen such a thing before, much less tasted one...

On that mouthwatering note, I remain, etc.

Excerpts from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, April 21, 1972, photocopy of typescript.

Thanks for yours of the 11th, which came today. I think somewhere I wondered the same about the ‘kompil. red.’; I tried to get the Sinod. 483 text on film but was refused it because of the state of the MS I gather. It is short enough so that if I get back, which I hope to do, I will try to copy it and describe the MS properly. I have looked at that MS a couple of times but never got around to doing a description. It is fascinating—contains Dorofei
and or Kigala (see the passing reference somewhere in Lebedeva [handwritten note added in margin: See also Спаша under Хрон. Дорофея]) in a copy full of all sorts of corrections, pasted in listy, notations in Greek Latin and Georgian etc. The MS also contains adjoining the Kurbsky (sic) a fragment from Guagnini, the tale of Two Embassies and I don't know off hand what else. It undoubtedly holds clues to the circle responsible for the Kurbskii; the dating is 1680's or thereabouts—but I doubt earlier [...] I am preparing a doklad on the Stroev MSS—at present am looking at as many as I can get my hands on and hope to shove the bezdel'tsy here off in the right direction. Has created a flap in GPB that I am doing this—they fear my paper will be another revelation to their embarrassment as was the one by Joan Afferica a couple of months ago. They have not gotten over that. I hope to give the paper in the OR to be able to show examples (latest finds: last part of Pogod. 1576 is first part of 1503, 1573, 1629; some of that MS is still missing. Rowland, Crummey's student, has established to my satisfaction that Khvorostinin in Q.IV.172 is from the beginning of BAN D.412 (descr. in Op. III, 1 or IV, 1 - Khrizography etc.). A few pieces in Pogod. 1568 and in 1562 or thereabouts were cut out of Sinod. 850, which Stroev gives extensive contents from throughout bibliol. slovar'). It is clear that the vast majority of the Stroev sborniki consist of fragments stolen from all hell and gone all over the place—it is really incredible. And what a job to put everything back together again. There is bound to be some general obsuzhdenie of the problems of descriptions which will mean that Al'shits will get it in the other ear—Kukushkina is preparing a blast against his AE article in an obsuzhdenie of the last three years of AE coming up in a week [...] I'm afraid you will have to throw the petition to Simeon Bekbul out of the 17th century at least for the time being and at least for the reason you gave for putting it there. See S. S. Volkov, "Iz istorii russkoi leksiki. II. Chelobitnaia," LGU, Russkaia istoricheskaia leksikologii i leksikografii, I, Izd. LGU, 1972, esp. 53-54. Appears term used in 16th c.; the Petition is not the only evidence. Will send you that sbornik if I get to another copy—some other interesting materials. Interesting that Lur'e even confessed that his first impression of the Letter to Stefan Bathory from Muz. 1551 is that it is too good to be true and might well be a 17th c. forgery. Progress? Likhachev wanted to publ. it in Trudy and was I think a bit peeved that Shmidt got it first. Hope to give them my Stroev coll. piece and the Vlahos pamphlet Odolenie before leaving. Granstrem compared the latter for me with the Greek fragment of the original and sees the peculiarities of the language largely as due to the slavish
rendering from the Greek—didn’t note any particular South Slavisms or the like and thinks most likely the trans. is the work of one of the Greeks in Muscovy of mid-century [...]

*Excerpts from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, May 9, 1972, photocopy of typescript with long handwritten addition.*

[... ] Skrynnikov is up to his ears in your book, but it is clear he simply does not understand the language, much less more serious questions. We will hash the whole thing over before I leave, if he gets through it by then. Have met one of his studentki who is working on the “History”—trying to show that the author of it used GKI and K-Vas’ian. Her work I would guess is too much that of studentka to be of interest—judging from the general trend of conversation. Rykov is defending his piece (basically the diplomn. rabota that I looked through) as a kandidat: it is interesting to note some of the changes made as a result of his conversations with me. Will give you a comparison of texts at some point. I am to talk about my G.-Bathory letter in the kafedra this week, raising of course the issue of authenticity of other works, which I think will be quite new to all present who probably have not yet heard of the book. Have a copy of the komp. red. of the Istoriia from F.XVII.11; have ordered a film of that text from the Nevostruev MS, without any guarantee I will get it. Have more on Sin. 483 from Kuntsevich’s partial description in the proofs for Vol. II [...]

Incidentally, we know at least that Скрынников has had the book on his mind—that студентка says he has been talking about it all year. The session in LOII devoted to обсуждение of AE за последние три года was rather dull. Альшиц was only partially kicked around as Шмидт carefully diverted a full-scale discussion [...]

*Excerpt from ELK to DCW, Cambridge, May 15, 1972, typescript.*

[... ] Have I told you about Grobovsky’s letter about Skrynnikov? S. wrote him asking about my book, more precisely about where on which pages the main points were...I have already sent something like ten copies of the book, and heard not a word about any arriving. I think I shall have to get a subsidy and some plain brown wrappers...No comments from any western colleagues yet, save a cordial but noncommittal note from Fennell [...]

Excerpt from DCW to ELK, Leningrad, May 15, 1972, photocopy of typescript.

[...] Gave my otchet today, expecting at least a question or two about The K-G Apocrypha, which I very pointedly brought into the discussion of my Groznyi-Bathory letter. There was utter, total and dead silence when I finished talking, but for a rather peculiar commentary on me and my work (as is customary) by my advisor Demkova. She has really been getting on my back lately; I sense that either because I push too hard and am trying to cover too much ground, or for some other reason, there is a certain frost in the air where I go here these days. Had a long talk with Dvoretskaia, now heading the old MS group in GPB; it took a while to convince her I needed to see something with Shakhovskoi in it and in general to explain why I was looking at such a wide variety of things under such a broad topic—I’m not sure she was convinced either. Clearly my presence there has upset some people in the organization...Dvoretskaia, as I understand it, is a good friend of Kagan and apparently thinks I’ve done the latter in [...]

Excerpt from ELK to DCW, Cambridge, April 7, 1973, typescript with added handwritten note dated April 23 and enclosed photocopies showing textual relationships of the “first Kurbskii letter” to its sources (including the short chronicle published by Koretskii) and the “Relation of presumed sources to ‘Istoriia o vel. kn. moskovskom’, both of which appeared in print later in approximately the same form. I seem to have mislaid the third enclosure which he describes. Some of the comments refer to the account of K. A. Uvarov’s dissertation defense which Iu. D. Rykov sent me in a letter dated March 8, 1973.

[...] Since our friend Uvarov seems to specialize in otkrytie razlichnikh amerik, I suppose the Ukrainian archival documents he mentions are those published in Ivanishev (i.e. not Kuntsevich) or in (less likely) Akty Vi'nenso/k kommissii or the Kiev kom dlia razbora... I’ll take a look when I get time (probably not until summer, which I hope to devote entirely to my own work). As to Uvarov’s thesis (IMLI I suppose is Inst mirovoi lit. i iskusstva) I can’t say much other than to express my tentative agreement with you and Rykov that that feller’s mighty strange. All of that business about the Swedish diplomat is in fact mentioned in the book (p. 91) [...] I enclose a tentative chart of the way the Istoriia seems to go together—I have pages and pages of parallel examples—and since reading Kappeler’s book (actually I have not finished it) I want to look again at some possible other sources.
The full historical evolution of the text is of course much more complex than that shown here; there are [crossed out: almost] certainly sources which I haven't yet noticed. The striking thing is how little of what one might call original matter there is in a text that is in a number of ways— in zamysel and genre—something of an innovation. One thinks of course of Istoriia skifov...

Other enclosures: one a graphic spread gotten up for the Columbia seminar about which more below. It shows—the only thing of interest for you—how the piece from that Koretskii "letopisets" fits in. The ms is interesting in a number of ways, as you know, including a rather extensive textual relationship with the "second" letter to Vasian NB esp Kuntsevich col 391 etc. And, as you know, the rest of the convoy...

The other thing enclosed is a graphic representation of the probabilities of preservation of mss of the Istoriia given a) fixed rate of reproduction (i.e. avg.) based on number of copies in existence (i.e. probability not of appearance but of copying); b) fixed probability of destruction in any year between base year (1570 or 1670) and present. What the thing seems to show is that under the same rates of production and presentation [sic] exhibited by the known extant mss the number of extant mss for years before 1670 should be as on the second curve (the lightest one; somewhat illegibly marked "Estimated extant number of copies, base 1570"). As you can see, the curve goes off the chart fifty or so years before the real one, and as I understand what the statisticians say the odds that all pre-1670 copies of a text that behaves the way this one does after ca 1670 being lost are very small. Now if one were to be consistent about degrees of probability and certitude in such matters, one might think of this evidence alone as sufficient to place the burden of proof on the yea-sayers. But everyone—really quite universally—rejects this notion, and even the attempt, so I shall not pursue it further.

I took this and other items to the Columbia seminar the other day (Ševčenko, Roublev, Cherniavsky, Haimson, Monas, Mathewson, Picchio, Raeff, Belnap, Levin, Wortman, Kaminski, and a couple of others [added in margin: also Peter Scheibert]) but what they really wanted to talk about was the Correspondence, so we went at it hard and heavy for about four hours. Little to report for the annals of science, but it was a good tussle and people had done their homework (with the aid, particularly, of DSL's review). Principal objections concern cui bono and particularly the "whole 'kitaiskaia rabota'" of the seventeenth century, and resistance to the "directions" indicated in the textual quadrangle or polygon. Most interesting to me were Kaminski's report that, beginning as a skeptic, he set out to find in the Polish documentation of the various elections to the throne for which either Ivan or any Russian was a candidate, on the assumption that works like Kurbskii's if
they existed must have been known to members of the Sejm and would have been mentioned. He says he kept going, having found no mention in the 16th c., and found nothing until after the election of 1668. This he feels is a kind of independent negative evidence—in a well-documented context—that makes him accept my basic thesis. Also, Ševčenko finally declared himself that "as a matter of belief" he now held to the view that, whatever the other problems involved in the genesis and growth of the Corr., it must be later than the Khvorostinin text. [Added in pen in margin: Since then—indication that Cherniavsky coming over.] [...] 

[In handwritten note of April 23 at end, giving various advice concerning in part my career:] [...] And it probably would not be a bad idea to get yourself firmly established in people’s minds independently of Keenan’s mad fantasy [...]

Marx and Herberstein: Notes on a Possible Affinity

SAMUEL H. BARON

Could there be a connection between Sigismund von Herberstein (1486–1566) and Karl Marx (1818–1883), men whose lives were separated by well over 300 years? The question seems fanciful at first glance, not only because the two lived in radically different ages but also because they were men of radically different stripe. Herberstein, a noble by birth, became a distinguished diplomat and a high-ranking member of the Hapsburg establishment; Marx was a passionate revolutionary intellectual who spent most of his life in exile. One exercised his powers to maintain the European order, the other strove to undo it. For his dedicated service, Herberstein was rewarded with estates and other properties, while Marx experienced harrowing poverty. Herberstein was a faithful son of the Catholic church, Marx a militant atheist. But they had some things in common as well, and it is in this realm that we must look for a possible affinity.

Of course, both men were well educated and both had a deep interest in Russia. Herberstein’s engagement with Russia grew out of two diplomatic missions that necessitated his spending some sixteen months in Muscovy (1517–1518 and 1526–1527). This experience impelled him to write Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii (1549), surely the most influential treatise on Russia ever composed by a foreigner. Marx never set foot on Russian soil, but that country became a major focus of his interest as well. In the 1860s and 1870s, he devoted especially close attention to Russian internal affairs. Indeed, so serious was his concern that in 1869 he began to study the Russian language in order to gain first-hand access to sources of interest to him. Pride of place went to materials concerning the post-Emancipation agrarian problem and the revolutionary movement, matters he hopefully regarded as harbingers of the demise of the tsarist regime he detested. His burning hatred of that regime stemmed from his earlier-formed and deeply held conviction that Russia was the arch-foe of revolution in Europe. He had also forcefully envisaged Russia as the embodiment of despotism and the enslavement of the

---

1 For basic biographical information on Herberstein, see the Nachwort by Walter Leitsch to Sigismund von Herberstein, Das alte Russland (Zürich, 1984), 539f.; a brief account in English is the Editor’s Preface by Bertold Picard to an abridged edition of Herberstein’s work: Description of Moscow and Muscovy (London, 1969). For a good biography of Marx, see Isaiah Berlin, Karl Marx, His Life and Environment, 3rd ed. (New York, 1963).

2 Engels had begun studying Russian much earlier, in 1850. See Russkie knigi v bibliotekakh K. Marksa i F. Engel’sa (Moscow, 1979), ix.
peoples, and an engine of perpetual aggrandizement. The latter views are
decidedly reminiscent of well-known positions laid out in Herberstein's
classic work, and they constitute the primary focus of our inquiry.3

It may not be amiss to begin by recalling several of the key components of
Herberstein's image of Russia. First and foremost is his description of the
Russian government: "in the sway that he holds over his people, the ruler of
Muscovy surpasses all the monarchs of the whole world." He has "unlimited
control of the lives and property of his subjects"; and "all confess themselves
to be chlopos, that is, serfs of the prince." He "uses his authority as much
over ecclesiastics as laymen," and "no one dares oppose him." The awesome
relationship of the people to their lord is expressed in their byword: "The will
of the prince is the will of God." His subjects, including the greatest, are as
obsequious to him as the rulers themselves had earlier been to their Tatar
masters. As for the common people, they "enjoy slavery more than
freedom."4 Perplexed by what he had witnessed, Herberstein posed but did
d not resolve a famous conundrum: "It is a matter of doubt whether the brutality
of the people has made the prince a tyrant, or whether the people themselves
have become brutal and cruel through the tyranny of the prince."5

Herberstein provides a chilling account of the subjugation of one
principality after another by the grand dukes of Moscow as they carried out
the unification of the Russian lands. The process comes across as a sort of
plague emanating from Moscow, that strikes down and engulfs everything in
its path. The conquerors, Ivan ΠI and Vasilii ΙΙΙ, are portrayed as utterly
unscrupulous, readily resorting to every kind of treachery, ruthlessness, and
brutality, as they drive out one prince after another and appropriate their lands.
The case of Novgorod is most shockingly told. Ivan ΠI attacked the city under
false pretenses, and then "despoiled the archbishop, the citizens, merchants,
and foreigners of all their goods." Not content with that, he "reduced the
inhabitants to abject servitude," deported the leading citizens, and turned their

3 The two have something else in common. Because of their markedly negative attitude
toward Russia, both were pressed into service during the Cold War. Between 1951 and 1957,
at least six editions of Herberstein in five languages were published. Editions of Marx's anti-
Russian writings are: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Russian Menace to Europe, ed.
Paul W. Blackstock and Bert F. Hoselitz (Glencoe, Ill., 1952); K. Marx, La Russie et
l'Europe, trans. and introduction by B. P. Hepner (Paris, 1954); Marx Contra Russland, ed.
J. A. Doerig (Stuttgart, 1960); and an English translation: Marx vs. Russia (New York,
1962). The work translated by Hepner is Marx's Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the
Eighteenth Century, which was also published in English, German, Polish, and Italian in the
1960s and 1970s.

4 Sigismund von Herberstein, Notes on Russia, ed. and trans. R. H. Major, 2 vols.
(London, 1851-1852), 1:30, 32, 95, 25.

5 Ibid., 1: 32.
lands over to the minions whom he sent to replace them. Moscow’s ascendency is represented as the victory of a distinctly inferior, indeed barbarian, culture—“the Russian contagion”—over a genuinely civilized population, which has since become most degraded.6

Herberstein also recounts Russian campaigns against Lithuania and Kazan, which suggests that the appetite of Moscow’s rulers for territory was insatiable. When, not long after the appearance of Rerum Moscoviticae Commentarii, Ivan the Terrible launched the invasion of Livonia, others would see the campaign as a logical and inevitable continuation of the insidious process Herberstein had described. A veritable flood of publicistic writing portrayed Moscow as a frightful menace to Europe. Two items especially deserve notice. When Heinrich Pantaleon translated Herberstein’s work into German (1563, and further revised in 1567), he added some material on the Livonian War. Therein, he remarked, the Muscovite Grand Prince “perpetrated deeds of violence against men, women, children and old people... and forcibly took possession of almost the whole realm.... In January 1567 it was widely reported that the Muscovite grand prince was already fully prepared for a new campaign against Lithuania and adjacent lands the next year.... After so many campaigns... the Muscovite name has become a source of fear among all adjoining peoples and even in the German lands. Fear has arisen that because of our great sins and crimes the Lord will subject us to frightful and dreadful experiences at the hands of the Muscovites [or] Turks.”7

Characteristic, too, is the alarmist letter King Sigismund of Poland dispatched in 1569 to Elizabeth of England, warning of the great danger “not only to our parts, but also to the open destruction of all Christian and liberal nations” that would result from the provision of arms to Russia. “Your majesty can not be ignorant,” he continued, “how great the cruelty is of the said enemy, of what force he is, what tyranny he useth on his subjects, and what servile sort they be under him.... We that know best, and border upon him, do admonish other Christian princes in time that they do not betray their dignity, liberty and life of them and their subjects, to a most barbarous and cruel enemy.... Except other princes take this admonition, the

---

Muscovite... will make assault this way on Christendom, to slay or make bound all that shall withstand him: which God defend!”

Herberstein’s image of Russia was enormously influential for a very long time. Recognized almost immediately as a classic, it was published in over a score of editions in Latin, German, Italian, the majority of them in the sixteenth century. Andreas Kappeler has given us an excellent account of the extensive borrowings from it made by virtually every continental author who wrote about Russia in the last half of the sixteenth century. Another study demonstrates how importantly it figured in the descriptions by Fletcher and Olearius—the latter the most widely known work on Russia in the seventeenth century. Marshall Poe’s recent doctoral dissertation gives some indication of the persistence of the Herberstein depiction of Russia in the eighteenth century. Evidently this image crossed the ocean and became lodged in the newly created United States, as well.

By the mid-nineteenth century, the Muscovite Russia described by Herberstein seemed long gone, eclipsed by the westernization of the country, which Peter the Great had vigorously promoted and his successors had more or less continued. This circumstance, however, had not necessarily relegated to oblivion the image of Russia drawn in Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii. According to the eminent Marx scholar Maximilien Rubel, “the contrast between Russian barbarism and western civilization [was] current among the important bourgeois historians of the nineteenth century” and it

---

12 We cannot refrain from bringing into play a fascinating bit of evidence. In 1781–1782, as a youth of fourteen years, John Quincy Adams wrote a brief “essay on Russia.” “The Government of Russia,” he stated, “is entirely despotical the Sovereign is absolute in all the extent of the word, the persons the estates the fortunes of the nobility depend entirely upon his Caprice.... The Nation is composed wholly of Nobles & Serfs or in other words of Masters & Slaves.” See Eugene Anschel, *The American Image of Russia 1775–1917*, ed. (New York, 1974), 30–32. This suggestive passage is bolstered by Adams’s inclusion of another characteristic Herberstein remark: “it is said... that women think their husbands despise them or don’t Love them, if they don’t thrash them now and then.” It is of course possible that young Adams picked up these ideas from a source derivative of Herberstein. Anschel observes that the essay “sets the tone for many opinions of Russia voiced by Americans in the next century and one-half.”
was "unhesitatingly appropriated" by Marx and Engels.\footnote{Maximilien Rubel, \textit{Rubel on Marx} (Cambridge, 1981), 246.} This is, of course, a very general statement and, besides, Rubel did not trace what had in fact become a cliché specifically to the Hapsburg diplomat. But who can doubt that this view owed a great deal to the enduring influence of Herberstein or the many subsequent writers who perpetuated his image of Russia? Our further investigation will seek to determine whether there were other, more proximate and more specific ties between Marx and Herberstein.

In their earliest writings, Marx and Engels devoted scant attention to Russia, but they already had some definite views on the subject. In the early 1840s, Engels indicted Russia as one of "the sworn enemies of European progress," and Nicholas I as a "despot." He pointed specifically to Poland, where "Russian despotism rules," and whose every inhabitant is "a slave."\footnote{Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, \textit{Collected Works}, 46 vols. (London, 1975-1992), 2:48; 3:519–20, 524. Most of the writings cited herein were produced by Marx, but Engels authored some, and still others were jointly composed. Needless to say, theirs were shared views. We will therefore consider Marx and Engels to be a single entity. An able study that treats Marx's views with reference to Russia is Helmut Krause, \textit{Marx und Engels und das zeitgenössische Russland} (Giessen, 1958). See especially chapter II for their views in the 1840s and 1850s, the decades of primary importance for our inquiry.} These remarks, made in 1844, could have derived from the Marquis de Custine's \textit{Russia in 1839}, published in Paris in 1843, with a second edition the following year. Rubel notes that the radical German newspaper \textit{Vorwärts}, published in Paris, and in which Marx collaborated, devoted a good deal of attention to the de Custine account. In one of his works, Rubel flatly states that Marx read de Custine in 1843; in another he supposes that Marx knew the work, for "in many of Marx's later anti-Russian writings there are thoughts and stylistic usages that recall de Custine's formulations... Passages from de Custine's report of his travels [some of which Rubel quotes] may well have been deeply inscribed in Marx's memory."\footnote{Maximilien Rubel and Margaret Manale, \textit{Marx without Myth} (Oxford, 1975), 9; Rubel, \textit{Rubel on Marx}, 244–49.} Of course, de Custine's book was based mainly upon observations he made during his sojourn in Russia, but not entirely. At one point, he speaks of the extravagant power of the tsars and the people's "love" of slavery. Then he twice mentions Herberstein, and quotes the very words on the subject that we have adduced above. He ends by citing, and seconding, Herberstein's conundrum "I [too] ask myself whether the character of the nation created the autocracy or whether the autocracy created the Russian character."\footnote{\textit{The Journals of Marquis de Custine, Journey for Our Time}, trans. Phyllis Penn Kohler (New York, 1951), 72. De Custine quoted the words of Herberstein from Karamzin. It} Assuming, with Rubel, that...
Marx had read *Russia in 1839*, this would have been his first direct—albeit fleeting—encounter with Herberstein.

With the onset of the revolutions of 1848, of course concern with Russia quickened. Engels reported the immediate response of Tsar Nicholas I upon hearing of the uprising in Paris: "Gentlemen, saddle your horses!" His inclination to move without delay to suppress revolution at its source was directed as well at reverberating risings that erupted in many parts of Europe. In short order, Marx and Engels were warning of a "new Holy Alliance" (of Prussia, Austria, and Russia), whose "soul," "by the grace of God and of the knout is Russia." They considered a note, made public in Germany, from Russia's Foreign Minister Nesselrode, "menacing"—a threat of intervention against the German revolution. Russia's leaders were motivated by fear that the German revolution "would speed the advance of democracy not only to the Vistula but even as far as the Dvina and the Dnieper." To keep that from happening, Nicholas had concentrated in Poland his troops ("half a million barbarians"), who "were only waiting for an opportunity to fall on Germany and turn us [Germans] into the feudal serfs of the Orthodox Tsar." Again and again they denounced Russia's intervention against the Hungarian revolution ("a traitorous attack... on our Magyar brothers") as "typical Russian perfidy" and "the most villainous breach of international law in history."

Marx discerned in Russian policy not only an implacable desire to combat revolution but a persistent tendency to aggrandizement. This perception is especially evident in his numerous writings during the Crimean War, one of which, indeed, was entitled "The Turkish Question.—The Times.—The Russian Aggrandizement." But already in 1848–1849, he had sounded the alarm about Russia's purportedly incessant drive to expand its power and influence. He referred to the King of Prussia and other German princes as the tsar's "subordinate knyazes," who were already prepared and willing to assist the tsar in his nefarious initiatives. Russia, together with the Hohenzollerns, was bent upon "a new rape of Poland." The tsar had "made himself the de facto sovereign of the Austrian Slavs"; he was seen not only as the master of the Poles but as the suzerain of Turkey; and the next step in his evolving relation to the Hapsburg realm would make him the suzerain of Austria as

___

should be noted that Herberstein's name does not appear in any of the indices of Marx and Engels, *Collected Works.*

17 Ibid., 7:309; 8:211.
19 Ibid., 8:438.
well. "The ultimate supreme aim" of the new Holy Alliance was "nothing other than the conquest, and this time, perhaps, the partition of France."21

The commencement of the Crimean War occasioned an outpouring of writings on the subject by Marx and Engels.22 They viewed the crisis as the latest episode in Russia’s long-term imperialistic career. Characterizing Russia as a “conquering nation,” they traced the progressive movement of Russia southward against the Ottoman Empire, beginning with Catherine II, and, more broadly, catalogued the huge territorial acquisitions in almost every direction made since the time of Peter I. “Having come this far on the way to universal empire, is it probable,” they asked, “that this gigantic and swollen power will pause in its career?” Replying with an emphatic negative, they foresaw—unless Russia was decisively opposed in its push against Turkey—its further expansion to a line from Dantzic [sic] or Stettin to Trieste. “And, as sure as conquest follows conquest, and annexation follows annexation, so sure would the conquest of Turkey by Russia be only the prelude for the annexation of Hungary, Prussia, Galicia, and for the ultimate realization of the Slavonic Empire.” To prevent this “unspeakable calamity... the arrest of the Russian scheme of annexation is a matter of the highest moment.” And not only because of the radical upsetting of the balance of power it would entail, but because it would vastly extend “the Russian autocratic system, accompanied with its concomitant corruption, half-military bureaucracy and pasha-like extortion.”23

In many of the articles that he wrote in 1853–1854, the editors of the relevant Marx-Engels volume observe, Marx “made use of factual material from the articles and brochures of [the Tory politician] David Urquhart, then a leading figure in the propaganda about the ‘Russian menace’ to Britain.”24 The message to be conveyed by this remark is that Marx could and did distinguish between factual material and propaganda—a proposition far from self-evident. Although Marx made occasional disparaging remarks about Urquhart, there can be no doubt that his appreciation of Urquhart’s endeavors outweighed his reservations. Late in 1853, Marx found a “fitting occasion” to give his due to Urquhart for his “indefatigible” publicistic opposition to the allegedly pro-Russian Lord Palmerston’s diplomacy. Around the same time, 

---

22 Most of their writings on the subject, originally published in the New York Tribune, are reprinted in volume 12 of the Collected Works. Parts of many of these articles are included in a section of Marx and Engels, The Russian Menace to Europe, entitled “The Background of the Dispute (1853–1854).” The first of these works should be used rather than the second, in which the articles are sometimes wrongly dated, and their integrity violated.
24 Preface to ibid., xxix; also Rabel and Marale, Marx Without Myth, 110.
he dismissed as harmless Urquhart’s faulty historical views, while characterizing the publicist as a “dyed-in-the-wool Russophobe,” who conducts his campaign against Russia “with monomaniacal acumen and a great deal of expert knowledge.” In 1854, Marx met and was complimented by Urquhart, whose remark that some of the radical’s writings sounded as though they had been written by a Turk, Marx did not appreciate. Marx complimented Urquhart by devoting almost four very closely printed pages, more than half of one of his articles, to the text of a speech Urquhart had recently made. In its most sensational assertion, Urquhart warned that if England and France did not take action to block Russia, “Turkey is doomed, and the universal dominion of the Muscovy Cossacks will sway the destiny of the world!” If Marx drew upon Urquhart for “factual material,” Urquhart may well have drawn upon Marx for some of his ideas. With Marx himself qualifying as a militant (if not “monomaniacal”) Russophobe, the two became allies (though for limited purposes), and it is therefore not surprising that presently Marx would be writing for The Free Press, a newspaper Urquhart had founded.

Our purpose thus far has been to examine briefly Marx’s thoughts about Russia in the nineteenth century and, in so far as he touched on it, in the eighteenth. The discussion serves as a background to the more crucial part of our inquiry, at whose threshold we have now arrived. The case to be made must be based primarily upon a series of articles that Marx wrote for Urquhart’s newspaper in 1856–1857. They were later published as Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century (1899), and more recently as Secret Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century (1969). The bulk of this treatise is designed to demonstrate a dubious proposition: that English Whig foreign policy, dating back to the Great Northern War (1700–1721), was consistently pro-Russian, despite the threat

\[\text{\textsuperscript{25} Collected Works, 12:477.} \] Shortly thereafter, Marx credited Urquhart—and claimed some credit for himself—for having succeeded in turning British public opinion against Palmerston and Russia. See ibid., 545. For the development of Russophobia in England in the preceding decades, see John Howes Gleason, The Genesis of Russophobia in Great Britain (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).

\[\text{\textsuperscript{26} Rubel and Marale, Marx Without Myth, 115.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{27} Collected Works, 12:567.} \]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{28} They are reproduced as “Revelations of the Diplomatic History of the Eighteenth Century” in ibid., 15:27–87. For obvious reasons, this work was omitted from the Russian edition of Marx and Engels, Collected Works. Nor did it appear elsewhere in Soviet Russia until the advent of glasnost’, when it was serialized in Voprosy istorii 1989, nos. 1–4. The Introduction, by collaborators in the Institute of Marxism-Leninism (no. 1:3–11), provides some interesting background, as well as a useful publishing history of the work.} \]
that Russian expansionism posed to English interests. There is an obvious fit between its theme and Marx’s anti-Russian tirades in the run-up to, and during, the Crimean War, but it is something else that makes this tract especially important for us. In the fourth chapter, for the first time Marx focuses on pre-Petrine Russia, and unequivocally roots his image of a despotic, enslaving, and self-aggrandizing state in the Muscovite era.

The thrust of the chapter goes as follows. Despite some superficial resemblances, Russia’s history under the Riurik dynasty is fundamentally dissimilar from the Russia of the Muscovite grand princes. “The Gothic period of Russia... forms but a chapter of the Norman conquests.... The bloody mire of Mongolian slavery, not the rude glory of the Norman epoch, forms the cradle of Muscovy, and modern Russia is but a metamorphosis of Muscovy.... The whole policy of Muscovy, from its entrance into the historical arena, is [summed up] in the history of... two individuals [Ivan I, Kalita and Ivan III].... Ivan [III] seemed to have snatched the chain with which the Mongols crushed Muscovy only to [enslave] with it the Russian republics.... A simple substitution of names and dates will prove to evidence that between the policy of Ivan III and that of modern Russia there exists not similarity but sameness. Ivan III, on his part, did but perfect the traditionary policy of Muscovy, bequeathed by Ivan I, Kalita. Ivan Kalita, the Mongolian slave, acquired greatness by wielding the power of his greatest foe, the Tartar, against his minor foes, the Russian princes.... Forced to dissemble before his masters the strength he really gathered, he had to dazzle his fellow-serfs with a power he did not own. To solve his problem he had to elaborate all the ruses of his abject slavery into a system, and to execute that system with the patient labor of a slave.... Singleness of purpose became with him duplicity of action. To encroach by the fraudulent use of a hostile power, to weaken that power by the very act of using it, and to overthrow it at last by the effects produced through its own instrumentality—this policy was inspired to Ivan Kalita by the peculiar character both of the ruling and the serving class. His policy remained still the policy of Ivan III. It is yet the policy of Peter the Great, and of modern Russia.... Peter divested the Muscovite policy of encroachment of its merely local character.... exalting its object from the overthrow of certain given limits of power to the aspiration of unlimited power.... [He] coupled the political craft of the Mongol slave with the proud aspiration of the Mongol master, to whom Genghis Khan had, by will, bequeathed his conquest of the earth.”29

We are in accord, but need not concern ourselves overly, with the judgment rendered by the editors of the volume in which the Revelations is reproduced,

that this piece is "more a political pamphlet than a piece of historical
research." Nor need we be concerned with Marx's claim that modern Russia,
from Peter I onward, is but Muscovite policy writ large. Instead, we must
consider whether Marx's portrayal of Muscovite Russia, which evokes
memories of Herberstein, was indeed indebted to the Austrian diplomat. In
this connection, we learn with great interest that Marx's library included a
copy of Herberstein's opus. It was a Russian edition, published in 1866,
sent to him by the populist economist N. F. Daniel'son, who translated Das
Kapital into Russian. Just when the work came into Marx's possession is
uncertain, as it is not mentioned in the considerable correspondence between
the two men. However, they began to correspond only in 1868, and the
book was probably sent in the early 1870s. In as much as the Revelations
was written years before the edition appeared, what at first seemed to be an
exciting discovery turns out to be without significance for our inquiry.

A student of the sources upon which Marx and Engels drew for their
historical writings has identified more than a score of works—scattered
through a 48-page bibliography—for the Revelations. A section of the
bibliography that lists sources on Russia is of special interest. It indicates that
Marx used two general works, eight on Petrine Russia, and none specifically
on Kievan and Muscovite Russia. However, in the chapter of the
Revelations concerned with pre-Petrine Russia, Marx quotes, without naming
him, a "modern author," who turns out to be Count Philippe de Segur, writer
of one of the two general works just referred to. His History of Russia and of
Peter the Great, whose first two hundred pages are devoted to pre-Petrine
Russia, is the source upon which Marx relied most heavily in preparing the
chapter we are considering. H.-P. Harstick, the compiler of the bibliography,

30 Ibid., xxi. In this paper, we do not undertake to examine the Revelations critically.
For some interesting critical observations, see Hepner's Introduction to La Russie et
l'Europe, 68-81.
31 Zapiski o Moskve (St. Petersburg, 1866). See Russkie knigi v bibliotekakh K.
Marksa i F. Engelsa, 48-49.
32 K. Marks, F. Engels i revoliutsionnaia Rossia (Moscow, 1967), 158.
33 The absence of markings in Marx's copy—reported in Russkie knigi, xviii, 48—leaves
us to suppose that Marx did not read it. By the time he received the book, his interests
evidently lay elsewhere.
34 Hans-Peter Harstick, "Karl Marx als Historiker," in Arbeiterbewegung und
35 Only four works on these periods are listed. Among them are volumes by Müller (on
Novgorod), Schlözer (on the chronicles), and W. Thomsen (on the origin of the Russian
state). According to another source, Marx read and took notes on a number of other works on
Russian history prior to writing the Revelations but did not make use of them in composing
the work. See the introduction to the Revelations in Voprosy istorii, 1989, no. 1: 6-7.
36 For Marx's quotation, see Collected Works, 15:78. Segur's book was first published
in Paris in 1826. Marx used the English translation, which came out in London in 1829.
notes that Marx inscribed many underlinings and marginal marks and comments in his personal copy—an assertion we have had an opportunity to verify, by examining the copy in question.\(^37\) In addition, Marx extracted from the book ten pages of notes, mostly word-for-word copies of passages in the text.\(^38\) All this labor was not wasted, for a comparison of the *Revelations* with the *History of Russia* shows that Marx derived from the *History* a plethora of basic historical data, much of his interpretation, and more than a few weighty statements, rendered exactly as in the original or nearly so. The *History*, in short, was the primary source for Chapter Four of the *Revelations*.\(^39\)

It may seem odd that Marx should have relied so heavily on this single volume. His principal concern in composing this piece, however, was the eighteenth century; so he likely did not wish to immerse himself in what would then have been the key work on earlier centuries, Karamzin's *History of the Russian State*.\(^40\) More suitable to his needs was a synthetic, secondary source, such as Segur's book. Not only did it devote a great many pages to Russia's history before the reign of Peter, but it seemingly drew on a bibliography of well over ninety titles, including such authors as Müller, Schlözer, Lomonosov, Tatishchev, Shecherbatov, and various chronicles.\(^41\)

\(^{37}\) The book is among those in the portion of Marx's library held by the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam. I am happy to acknowledge my deep indebtedness to Jürgen Rojahn, a senior member of the IISH, for generous assistance in researching this paper.

\(^{38}\) *Rossiiskii tsentr khraneniia i izuchenii dokumentov noveishei istorii* (formerly *Tsentr'al'nyi partiiy nyi arkhiv. Institut Marksizma-Leninizma*), Moscow. Fond 1, opis' 1, ed. kh. 1001. I am indebted to Galina Golovina, head of the Marx-Engels department of this institution, for a copy of the notes. They are scribbled [sic] in English, and excruciatingly difficult to decipher, as is Marx's handwriting generally.

\(^{39}\) Marx subsequently drew upon this piece for other writings. See, for example, *Collected Works*, 20:159.

\(^{40}\) Krause (*Marx und Engels und das zeitgenössische Russland*, 84) and Rubel (*Rubel on Marx*, 145) intimate that Marx had read Karamzin in the 1840s or early 1850s. Neither presents supporting evidence, and we ourselves have found none, so we are skeptical of this claim. On the other hand it is clear that, at some indeterminate time subsequent to the writing of the *Revelations*, Marx did become acquainted with Karamzin. The evidence is a chronology of Russian history from the beginnings until 1613 that he compiled in the last years of his life, based in good part on Karamzin. See *Arkhiv Marksa i Engelsa*, 8 (1946): iii, 142–73.

\(^{41}\) It is not entirely clear whether Segur knew the Russian language, but he probably did. His father (1753–1828) had served as French ambassador to Russia from 1785 to 1788, so Philippe himself (b. 1780) must have spent about four years of his youth there. His father, a diplomat and historian, and his only tutor, likely would have wanted his son to learn Russian while they resided in St. Petersburg. During the Napoleonic Wars, Philippe served in Poland, was captured by Cossacks, and was interned at Vologda for a year or two. He later wrote his first book dealing with Russia: *Histoire de Napoleon et de la grande armée pendant l'année 1812*. It was translated into several other languages. See *Biographie Universelle* and *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*. 
For Marx, the Segur tome may have served as a surrogate for Karamzin, upon whom it depended far more than any other work for its portrayal of pre-Petrine history. As much or more than all these reasons combined, Segur's opus no doubt appealed to Marx because it dovetailed perfectly with his already deeply held convictions about Russia. And it appeared to trace to their source the origins of the contemptible features that the historically minded Marx discerned in the Russia of his time. One can imagine his glee, for instance, upon reading, early in Segur, of Russia's "perpetual tendency to aggrandizement." He seems to have reveled in Segur's emphasis on the "persevering machiavellianism" of the Muscovite rulers. And he had to be more than pleased with the last part of Segur's section on pre-Petrine Russia, which elaborates the theme: "In Russian history, everything brings us back to the history of despotism," whose other face was slavery.

To verify at a glance the importance of Karamzin for Segur (and Marx!), one can read the summary account of Russia's early history in Karamzin's Memoir of Ancient and Modern Russia, which, as its editor observes, constitutes "an excellent resume" of his views. Especially notable are: the catastrophic effects of the "plague communicated to Europe by the Germanic peoples"—the appanage system that replaced the Kievan state; the single-minded, wily methods by which Kalita managed "to transform the khans themselves into instruments of our liberation"; how the Moscow princes uprooted, "little by little, all the ancient survivals of the republican order"; and how "what Ivan I Kalita had begun, Ivan III completed." It is beyond dispute that Segur adopted the ground-plan of his work (excluding, of course, the part on Peter the Great) from the History of the Russian State.

Among the works listed in Segur's bibliography is Herberstein's Rerum Moscoviticarum. Yet, surprisingly, Herberstein is never once cited in the body of the History. It should not be supposed, on this score, that Herberstein's work had no influence on Segur, though perhaps it did so indirectly. The Frenchman may not actually have read Herberstein, but just as he depended heavily on Karamzin, in turn the latter depended heavily on Herberstein. The fifth, sixth, and eighth volumes of Karamzin's History of the Russian State each contain a scattering of references to Herberstein. The seventh volume, which covers the reign of Grand Prince Vasiliy Ivanovich

---

42 Segur, 25. Marx underlined the word "aggrandizement."
43 Ibid., 177–78. Segur focuses on despotism and its role in Russian history in 172–98.
44 Karamzin's Memoir of Ancient and Modern Russia, ed. and trans. Richard Pipes (New York, 1966), 55. The summary account, up to and including the part of the Time of Troubles, occurs in 103–113.
45 Ibid., 105–109. Of course, as the bard of autocracy, Karamzin gives a positive spin to developments that Segur and Marx thought loathsome.
(1505–1533), cites Herberstein 54 times in its 143 pages. While this is noteworthy, it must also be noted that Segur (and Marx) give little or no attention to the political history of Vasilii’s time. However, the last chapter of the Karamzin volume, entitled “The Condition of Russia, 1462–1533,” is devoted almost entirely to Herberstein, constituting, in fact, a comprehensive précis of his work. It reviews Herberstein’s treatment of Muscovy’s government, including the well-known passage on the extravagant power of the prince; the army; the system of justice; trade and money; state finance; the city of Moscow; customs and mores of the people, including the slave-like status and disposition of the people; and the neighboring lands to the north and east of the realm. In considering these matters, Karamzin manages to give a positive interpretation to what Herberstein and later Western writers viewed negatively, and even incredulously. To Herberstein’s conundrum: “It is a matter of doubt whether the brutality of the people has made the prince a tyrant, or whether the people themselves have become brutal and cruel through the tyranny of the prince,” Karamzin replies: “Without a doubt [the people] granted [this authority] so that Russia would be saved and be a great power.” “Tyranny,” he goes on, “is the abuse of autocracy,” and “no one... ever doubted the monarch’s obligation to care for the popular welfare.”

Karamzin’s final judgment on Rerum Moscovitcarum Commentariorum runs as follows: “In general the Herberstein description of Russia is an important work for our sixteenth-century history, although it contains some errors.”

In our view, Segur’s work was powerfully influenced by Herberstein, through the medium of Karamzin. Even if he did not know Herberstein at first hand, he surely had read Karamzin’s abstract of the Hapsburg diplomat’s work. He obviously did not endorse Karamzin’s attempted refutation of Herberstein on the Russian state order, and, indeed, the leitmotif of his opus is the idea that Russia had for centuries been in bondage to a despotic regime. Of course, this theme resonated with Marx’s thinking on Russia, and he readily assimilated Segur’s representation of the Muscovite era to his own image. By a kind of osmotic process, we suppose, Marx absorbed Herberstein’s conception of the Muscovite regime.

---

46 N. M. Karamzin, Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskago 7 (St. Petersburg, 1892; repr. ed. The Hague, 1969).
47 Karamzin (123–24) renders the Herberstein conundrum in a somewhat muted manner: “I do not know whether the character of the people demands for Russia such autocrats, or whether the autocrats gave ‘the people such a character’.”
48 Ibid., 143.
49 At one point, though (172), Segur concedes to Karamzin’s position, at least in part: “A foreign despotism, that of united central Asia, fettered Russia, which was enfeebled by anarchy; it was by the concentration of power that Russia recovered its independence, and, thence, despotism established itself in Russia, without encountering any obstacle.”
There is one more tantalizing thing to be noted. In the bibliography of his copy of Segur's History, Marx inscribed a star or asterisk next to eleven of the titles listed. One of these markings occurs next to Herberstein, Rerum Moscoviticarum. It is, of course, impossible to say with certainty what this signifies. For one thing, it might suggest that Marx had once read the work, and was indicating that he recognized it. Because we have found no evidence in his writings of first-hand knowledge of Herberstein, however, it is more likely that he was aware of the work, and marked it as an item worth looking into—although he did not follow through. A third possibility is that he had not heard of it, and found the title interesting. Inasmuch as there are no references to Herberstein in the body of Segur's work, and since Marx had little familiarity with pre-Petrine Russia, we are inclined to think that the second option is most probable: that Marx was vaguely familiar with Herberstein's name, but had not read his book. Nevertheless, he had unwittingly been influenced by Herberstein's ideas, which were still current among nineteenth-century historians; and more proximately, if still indirectly, through the mediation perhaps of Custine, and very definitely of Karamzin via Segur.

At some later, indeterminate date, Marx certainly read Karamzin. In doing so, he must have become aware of the latter's heavy reliance on Herberstein and, more importantly, gained a fuller apprehension of the substance of Herberstein’s work. This may have occurred when Marx’s interest in Russia had shifted to those features that gave promise of the downfall of tsarist autocracy. Accordingly, what he then learned about Herberstein would not have made anything like the impact that one might have expected from an earlier discovery. A late encounter with Herberstein might have seemed unremarkable to Marx, moreover, because he had long been familiar with these views, which he had gained through derivative sources. On the other hand, it may have come as a revelation that these views were grounded in Herberstein’s Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

---

50 See supra, n. 39.

51 Marx evidently had only an indirect connection, but the “father of Russian Marxism” had a first-hand knowledge of Herberstein’s opus (the Russian edition of 1866), and used it effectively. In his Istoriia russkoi obshchestvennoi mysli, Plekhanov quoted the Hapsburg diplomat’s famous lines on the extravagant power of the Muscovite rulers and the “slavery” of almost everyone else, to demonstrate that old Russia shared fundamental traits with such oriental despotisms as Persia and Egypt. See G. V. Plekhanov, Sochineniia, 24 vols. (Moscow-Leningrad, 1923–1927), 20:78–79.
Muscovite Ambivalence

JAMES CRACRAFT

This essay focuses briefly on the artist Simon Fedorovich Ushakov (1626–1686), whose career is taken as emblematic of late Muscovite court culture, a position very recently reinforced by research showing that he was a landowning moskovskii dvorianin by birth and not simply by grant of the tsar. Two works by Ushakov as well as two closely related verbal texts—perhaps written by him—are adduced in the effort to contribute in some small way to our understanding of that culture. But it must be admitted at once that these texts have not been subjected to the kind of searching, systematic scrutiny which Professor Keenan has taught us to apply to any and all monuments of Muscovite history—a matter more of time and patience, now, thanks notably to his example, than of access or willingness. In this respect, therefore, the essay is only exploratory in nature, its conclusions tentative: itself emblematic, perhaps, of the state of much of the historiography on Muscovy (thanks notably, again, to Keenan’s efforts).

In the present instance the historiography is also remarkably ambivalent—my first main point. I have in mind not the monographic studies of Ushakov that have been undertaken, in which he is treated as the most important artist of his time, but Russian art-historical scholarship more broadly. Two prominent cases in point, spanning the history of this scholarship, are the Ushakov presented by I. E. Grabar’ in his venerable survey of seventeenth-century Russian painting, published in 1916; and the Ushakov of V. G.

---

1 A. V. Lavrent’ev, “K biografii ‘gosudareva ikonnika’ Simona Ushakova,” Filevskie chteniia, no. 8 (1994):3–18, with thanks to the author. Ushakov’s social origins, hitherto obscure, have usually been located in the posad population (e.g., Bekeneva, Ushakov [note 2 below], 10).

2 G. D. Filimonov, Simon Ushakov i sovremennaya emu epokha russkoj ikonopisi (Moscow, 1873); A. I. Uspenskii, Piat’ vnov’ otkrytykh ikon kisti Simona Ushakova (Moscow, 1901); D. K. Trenev, Ikony tsarskogo izografa Simona Ushakova v Moskovskom Novodevich’em monastyre (Moscow, 1901); idem, Pamiatniki drevnerusskogo iskusstva tserkvi Gruzinskoj Bogomateri (Moscow, 1903); V. P. Gur’ianov, Ikony Spasitel’ pis’ma Simona Ushakova (Moscow, 1907); A. I. Uspenskii, Tsarskie ikonopistsy i zhivopistsy XVII v., vol. 1 (Moscow, 1910), 321–69; V. [N.] Nechaev, Simon Ushakov, Izobrazitel’noe iskusstvo (Leningrad, 1927). Recent biographical studies, drawing on the preceding, include T. A. Anan’eva, Simon Ushakov (Leningrad, 1971) and N. G. Bekeneva, Simon Ushakov, 1626–1686 (Leningrad, 1984). More specialized articles on aspects of Ushakov’s oeuvre, too numerous to list here, have also been published.
Briusova, whose sizable volume of 1984 is by far the most detailed, best documented, and best illustrated study of the same general subject in print.\(^3\)

In his survey, Grabar' highlighted and to some extent documented the European influence to be seen in visual art produced in seventeenth-century Russia, meaning portraiture most obviously but also icon-painting, where new modes of depiction appeared as well as new subject matter, viz., illustrations of the biblical *Song of Songs* or of the theme, an old one in the Latin church, of the “Coronation of Mary.” Innovations like these were introduced by “foreign” masters (Ukrainian, Polish, Armenian in background) when painting panel icons and murals for high-ranking Muscovite patrons and were then adopted by admiring Muscovite artists. Although such innovations promptly provoked hostile reactions, patrons favoring this “Italianate” (*friazhskii*) style were more important than its detractors; “and Russian icon-painting rapidly approached its end.” Muscovite masters were similarly infected by the *friazhskii* spirit through their exposure to various prints in the new style, like those to be found in the illustrated bible first published by Piscator (Jan Visscher) in Amsterdam in 1643. And Ushakov was Grabar’’s outstanding example, indeed casualty, of the whole process: “the tragedy of Ushakov’s art was that he was in essence neither an icon painter nor a painter from life [neither *ikonopisets* nor *zhivopisets*]; having ceased to be the first, he did not become the second” (cf. Plate 1). Nevertheless his “influence on the fate of Russian icon-painting was so great that we can call the entire second half of the seventeenth century, and even a good part of the eighteenth, the era of Ushakov.”\(^4\)

Grabar’ spoke mainly about painting for the court in Moscow. The decline that he saw there in the “era of Ushakov” was not so steep in the provinces, he thought, and particularly not in wall painting. “At the very time that the court churches of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and his successors were being filled almost daily with more and more new images in the feeble *friazhskii* style, in the most wretched taste,” murals were being painted in churches in the old towns north of Moscow—in Iaroslavl', Pereslavl-Zalesskii, Rostov Veliki, and Kostroma—the “beauty of which delights us to this day.” These were the “last echoes of a great style” that had flourished in the sixteenth century and again, following the Time of Troubles, early in the seventeenth. By the end of that century, Grabar' allowed, such murals had ceased being monumental in character—a few massive figures, relatively simple lines, three or four basic


colors—and were now pictorially complex as well as richly colored. Yet here, he implied, the friazhskii spirit was properly restrained by the local genius. Row upon exuberant row of bright pictures, often of biblical episodes never seen before in Russian painting, were painted on walls and vaults of Northern churches well into the eighteenth century, producing art of a high order. "Not in any other country," Grabar' declared, "not excluding Italy, are to be found so many frescoes painted in so short a time."

In this last remark as well as elsewhere in his survey Grabar' was suggesting perhaps that by the late seventeenth century visual art in Russia (particularly in the North), analogously with that of Italy (Tuscany) in the early fourteenth, had embarked on a renaissance. It was a notion that Grabar' himself did not pursue. But in one form or another it has haunted Russian art scholarship ever since, as in Briusova's volume, where, near its end, the analogy becomes explicit.

Briusova hugely accentuates Grabar' s distinction between late Muscovite court and provincial art, arguing that several major "schools and trends" flourished in the period, one of which, that of the Upper Volga region (Povol'zhe), rivaled and eventually surpassed that of Moscow itself in both artistic quality and historical importance. In her view, the expansion of the Muscovite state and concurrent centralization of artistic forces in and around Moscow had led by the later sixteenth century to the imposition on icon-painting of a "state tutelage" that was "ruinous [gubitel'naia] for art." And such tutelage accounts for Ushakov's shortcomings as a painter: "the world of the court—his true element—did not facilitate the development of self-consciousness and an understanding of the responsibilities of the artist before society on the social plane; having unswervingly placed his talent at the feet of the almighty Moscow rulers, Ushakov put himself in the position of a willing servant, receiving in return only noble rank and a better salary than his colleagues'." As time went on, Ushakov's art, like that of his fellow court painters, acquired "an ever more superficial character, an attraction to mastery

---

5 Ibid., 481–82, 495, 512–14, 497. I must quibble with Grabar's use of the term fresco—freska—here, as in virtually all subsequent Russian art scholarship, where it tends to be used interchangeably with stenopis', meaning a mural or wall painting, and even with rospis', which can mean painting more generally as well as a mural or wall-painting. In true fresco (buon fresco), as revived classically by Giotto in his cycle of ca. 1305–1306 covering the walls of the Arena Chapel in Padua, colors are applied section by section to the artist's design while the plaster ground is still wet, making the images when dry one with the wall and extremely durable. Since there is considerable doubt as to whether true frescoes were ever painted in Old Russia, the more inclusive term "mural" or "wall painting," in which colors are typically applied to dry surfaces (a much simpler technique), is preferred here.

6 Briusova, Russkaia zhivopis', 6–8, 11, 14–15, and passim.
for mastery's sake," and was "devoid of inspiration and creativity." It was "purely external and mindless," its ideals were "moribund," its "sole aim a formal virtuosity"; it was an "ecclesiastical-salon art" and, at base, "sterile" (cf. Plate 1). This was not to deny the "obvious fact that precisely Moscow with its material and ideological tutelage of the cultural life of Russia created in this period all the necessary conditions for the development of art in both the capital and the periphery." But it was to assert that truly "progressive" development took place only or mainly in the latter.7

Briusova clearly shares Grabar's negative assessment of late Muscovite court art in general and of Ushakov's in particular, although she is rather more ebullient in describing the rot. But we follow her to the northern towns with some trepidation, perhaps, sensing in her approach a whiff of special pleading. Indeed, she finds in the North not only a vibrant "upper Volga school" (shkola Povolzh'ia) but distinct "schools" within it, particularly those of Iaroslavl' and Kostroma, whose finest exponent was the "school," again, of Gurii Nikitin. He was the leading Kostroma icon-painter from 1660 to about 1690, she asserts, and more—the greatest Russian painter of the age. Briusova admits that next to nothing is known about Gurii Nikitin's life, including the years of his birth and death. Yet on the basis of her long and close study of the painting of the region she can detect unmistakably his "style" or "hand."8

Briusova does not link the obvious foreign influence on later seventeenth-century Upper Volga painting to the region's greatly increased trade with Europe and particularly Holland; she cares only for the contribution of the ensuing economic upsurge to the strengthening of the industrial and commercial classes within the northern towns and for the role of these posadkie liudi as patrons of art. Her best examples of this art (following Grabar' and other pioneers9) are the abundant murals and related panel icons painted in 1680–1681 in the merchant church of the Prophet Elijah in Iaroslavl' by a team of local and Kostroma artists—the team led, she is sure, by Gurii Nikitin. The aesthetic qualities as well as "progressive" character of this astounding display, she argues, make it patently superior to that of the court, a distinction seen most plainly in its greater "realism," in which tendency, she infers, it eluded the iconic strictures of the central authorities and reflected the influence of popular culture. The wall paintings of the church of St. John the Baptist in nearby Tolchkovo, executed in 1694–1695 by a new generation of local artists, surpassed even those of the church of Elijah.

7 Ibid., 9, 42, 44, 49, 51–52, 172, et seq.
8 Ibid., 77–88, 94ff.
9 E.g., I. A. Vakhromeev, Tserkov' vo imia sviatago i slavnago proroka Illii v g. Iaroslavl' (Iaroslavl', 1906), copiously illustrated.
Here the posad folk "realized itself as the true protector of the traditional national culture and set out to be its worthy heir."  

Briusova does not go so far as to call the later seventeenth century in Russian painting "the Upper Volga era" or "the era of Gurii Nikitin." She recognizes that even Simon Ushakov, that leading exponent of the decadent court school, "nonetheless possessed undoubted creative individuality, as manifested in his special attention to the representation of the human face as bearer of the idea of the 'God-man' [cf. Plate 1] and in his unending zeal to find in this respect every new nuance for the expression of spiritual and psychological character." In this respect, as in his organizational work as head of the court school at a time of "maximal creative exertion," Ushakov, for all his shortcomings, achieved a "uniquely high position among the most important actors of pre-Petrine Russian culture." Briusova thus amplifies rather than revises Grabar's ambivalence towards Ushakov, a point borne out by her handling of the larger friazhskii question. For it was this "foreign" style, she insists, that engendered the "deep contradictions" and "symptoms of imminent decline" afflicting court art even as it "flourished" from the 1650s to the 1680s. Under its pressure, court art moved away from tradition and the concerns of the people (narod) and finally succumbed to the attractions of "Western Art," which entailed learning a whole new way of representation (zhivopisanie) and a whole new technique (painting with oil-based colors on canvas) as well as a whole new genre (portraiture) and new iconic subject matter. More foreign masters—German and Dutch now as well as Ukrainian or Polish—found work in Moscow, where they trained local artists while executing choice commissions. The jig was nearly up. If at first Ushakov would have nothing to do with the "foreign artists" who worked alongside him for the tsar, eventually he and his students "mastered the new painting" themselves—and so hastened the downfall of traditional Russian art.

Briusova has nothing to say about the Muscovite patrons of the new art (who seem to have included virtually the entire core elite) or about the factors (aesthetic, psychic, political, social) animating their increasingly obvious preference for it; nor does she link this instance of cultural diffusion with the wider movements in Europe and lands beyond known as the Renaissance and

---

10 Briusova, Russkaia zhivopis', 96-100 with figs. 87–93, 96, 97, 143, 145 and pls. 51, 55-59, 63, 66, 126, 131–36, 144, 148, 171–78, 180, 181; also pp. 173–74, 123.
11 Ibid., 69, 78, 42.
12 Ibid., 16, 29, 39, 53, 55.
the Baroque. In any event, the “crisis” she depicts in Moscow court painting by 1690 did not spread, she emphasizes, to the North: not yet. There, artists “sought new means of expanding the potential latent in the traditional method of Old-Russian painting,” producing art that remained “thoroughly alive.” As for the patently foreign influences reflected in this art, too, influences long since documented by Grabar’ and other early students, Briusova has only this to say:

The murals of the church of the Prophet Elijah [in Iaroslavl] are often cited as an example of the wide use of Western models.... Indeed, the artists enthusiastically used Western and other [? Ukrainian?] engravings but only as subsidiary material. Guri Nikitin used them only for motives of the most general kind, creating completely new compositions....

Further:

It is possible to say that the realism of the Western engravings emancipated the eyes of the [Russian] artist, permitting him to see and to express in painting the beauty of life around him, of man. But the [Western engraver] would have recognized his original here only with difficulty. The [Russian] adaptation is not in the least to be explained by a different stage of development or by a different level of painting conception, but by the different tasks, the different problems of method and style posed and resolved by Western and Russian artists of the seventeenth century. Most important, the adaptation definitely accompanied a process of development in culture and art. In the same way that the masters of the Renaissance took off from Byzantine and antique painting, creating a new style, Russian artists used the experience of Western European painting to expand the possibilities of their own art, the development of which flowed along its own internal course.

Similarly Briusova later draws not a link but a “parallel” between seventeenth-century murals in Kostroma and “frescoes of the early Renaissance.” She also occasionally applies the term “baroque” to her

---

14 Briusova, Russkaiia zhivopisi’, 29ff.
16 Briusova, Russkaiia zhivopisi’, 98-99.
subjects, as when describing icons painted by the court artist Fedor Zubov as "examples of the developing baroque style in seventeenth-century Russian painting" or a detail of a mural she attributes to Guri Nikitin as a "baroque twist." Her apparent authority for both usages is the literary scholar D. S. Likhachev, whom she quotes (ellipses hers):

The seventeenth century in Russia took on the function of the era of the Renaissance, although in special conditions and complex circumstances.... The significance of the seventeenth century in the history of [Russian] culture approximates that of the Renaissance in the cultural history of Western Europe.... [It was] an era in which archaic influences merged with new ones, in which local and Byzantine traditions were united with influences coming from Poland, the Ukraine, Belorussia.... The Baroque [also] appeared in Russia from outside: from Poland, Ukraine, Belorussia.... The Baroque fulfilled the role in seventeenth-century Russia of the Renaissance.... The Russian Baroque... was humanistic, not otherworldly... [and] closely tied to realism.17

Likhachev was of course referring to literature, which he may have meant to serve as a paradigm of contemporary Russian court or elite (or even posad) culture. With respect to visual art, however, one can only respond by noting that such assertions are, at a minimum, counterfactual. Neither the Renaissance nor the Baroque in European painting had arrived in Russia by the end of the seventeenth century in anything like their full force. And if a "parallel" is to be drawn between Russian visual art at this juncture and that of Italy at any time, it surely would be with various products of the late Middle Ages or very early Renaissance—as Grabar seemingly once suggested and as D. K. Trenev, another pioneer, plainly proposed. Trenev thought that at their best Ushakov's iconic faces reached the level of late Gothic examples from northern Europe or others of the Italian Trecento.18

In her conclusion Briusova rejects the "widely accepted view that there existed only one path to the new art" in Russia, the "path of destruction of the traditional method, as adumbrated by the art of Simon Ushakov and his circle... or by the method introduced by immigrant Western masters." She grants that "realism," once absorbed under Peter I, "lifted Russian art to a new, on the whole higher level of artistic culture"; equally, that "it is impossible to deny the positive [elements] which entered our national culture with this method." But was it necessary, she complains, "so drastically to eradicate the traditional method, as was dictated by official policy?" Briusova

18 Trenev, Ikony Ushakova, 7.
also contests the view that traditional Russian art "was 'doomed' because it had reached a dead end." If this were so, she says, it was not because that art had "exhausted its possibilities; it was doomed as a consequence of the social-historical development of Russia and of Russian culture." More precisely, "mastery of the new artistic method did not necessarily have to mean rejection of the creative achievements of the deeply popular [narodnoe] art of the preceding periods"; it was only that "he who held the reins governing artistic life completely in his hands" decided otherwise—an allusion, again, to Peter I. The "harshness of the [Petrine] reform" meant that the "centuries-old art of Russia was thus bled white and reduced to provinciality."19

Unrivaled to date in its scope and detail, Briusova’s study of seventeenth-century Russian painting remains ambivalent to the end in its assessment of developments and is overcome at last by a kind of nationalist nostalgia. We are reminded in some measure of the romantic medievalism of the Gothic Revival in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Europe, or of the Pre-Raphaelite Movement in England. Yet European art scholarship has surely never been marked to the same degree by the atavism characteristic not only of Briusova’s work and, less so, of Grabar’s, but of almost all Russian scholarship devoted to the history of visual art in Muscovite times. And it might well be asked why this is so.

Part of the answer to this pressing historiographical question could lie in history itself—and so to the second main point of this essay. I offer in evidence two writings produced in Moscow in the Ushakov era, texts which together constitute the first known attempt in Russia to raise discussion of painting to the level of theory. They also provide testimony (if they may be taken as authentic) of what Ushakov and his “school” thought they were doing, or trying to do, in their painting. More striking still, both texts exude a pervasive ambivalence.

The first was written by Joseph (Iosif, also Osip) Vladimirov sometime between 1656 and 1666 and is rather tellingly entitled, in the fullest of its surviving manuscript copies, which dates to the 1680s, "Epistle of a certain icon-painter Joseph to the royal icon-painter and most sage life-painter

19 Briusova, Russkaia zhivopis’, 171–76 with notes, 187–88. In a culminating footnote (ibid., 176, 188 n. 27) Briusova quotes with apparent sympathy the “extreme attitude” expressed by a Russian scholar in 1909: "Had it not been for Peter’s devastation [razgrom] our art would have developed still further, would have grown strong with Russian blood alone, by [the efforts of] the Russian people, and we would have had our own, original, characteristic art. But the thunder struck, and there was no Russian art; nor will there ever be."
[zhivopisets] Simon Fedorovich [Ushakov].”

Vladimirov came it seems from Iaroslavl' and worked as a designer and painter of icons in Moscow from the 1640s to the 1660s, evidently as a pupil of Ushakov; his “Epistle” responds to criticisms of the latter’s innovative “abuses” in icon-painting ascribed to an immigrant Serbian archdeacon, Ioann Pleshkovich, who apparently also lived in Iaroslavl'.

And a close reading of the text reveals not the straightforward champion of the new art represented by later scholars, but an artist, we might agree, of quite ambivalent views.

On the one hand, Vladimirov bases himself squarely on the authority of the “Stoglav of Tsar Ivan Vasilevich” (Ivan IV), at one point citing all of its relevant passages and elsewhere twice quoting its admonitions on the proper painting of icons, in accordance with good models and with an eye to the old masters. He also invokes St. John of Damascus (twice), various Byzantine precedents, numerous passages from the Old and New Testaments, hagiographical sources, recent polemical works of both Ukrainian and Polish origin, and the example of the reigning Moscow patriarch, Nikon, whose “great zeal for the skillful painting of icons” as against the work of “crude and mindless icon painters, whether Latin or Russian,” Vladimirov fully affirms. Earlier in his “Epistle” he alludes to Nikon’s more general campaign to reform the “old [liturgical] customs” in accordance with “Greek [service] books,” and with equal approval: “So also, sir [Ushakov], it is with icons: much Russian painting is not in accord with the good Greek models themselves.”

In these ways Vladimirov asserted his loyalty to the Byzantine or Greek tradition of sacred imagery in Russia—although by comparison with the authors of the Stoglav, it may be noted, he demonstrates a much stronger grasp of the tradition’s theology.

20 E. S. Ovchinnikova, ed., “Poslanie nekogo izugrafa Iosifa k tsarevu izugrafu i mudreishemu zhivopistu Simonu Fedorovichu,” in V. N. Lazarev et al., Dreverusskoe iskusstvo: XVII vek (Moscow, 1964), 24–61; the manuscript, in 78 quarto leaves, is now at GIM (Sobr. Uvarova No. 915). In her introductory remarks (ibid., 17–21), Ovchinnikova suggests that the work was in preparation in 1660–1664 and completed not before 1665–1666; but Saltykov more recently argues that it was written in 1656–1658: A. A. Saltykov, “Esteticheskie vzgliady Iosifa Vladimirova (po ‘Poslaniiu k Simonu Ushakovu’),” TODRL 28 (1974): 272–73.

21 For the only surviving painting definitely attributable to Vladimirov (it is signed on the back), see Ovchinnikova, “Poslanie Izugrafa Iosifa,” 10; A. A. Fedorov-Davydov, “Iosif Vladimirov,” in idem, ed., Russkoe iskusstvo XV–XVII v. (Moscow/Leningrad, 1937), 25; and Briusova, Russkaia zhivopis’, 27–28 and fig. 18.

22 Ibid., 167–70.


24 “Poslanie izugrafa Iosifa,” 53, 57 (for John Damascene) and 55, 25 (for Patrarch Nikon and his reforms).
At the same time, in his “Epistle” Vladimirov frequently defends the new or expanded iconography of his time—of his own painting and that of Ushakov—by direct reference to the Bible rather than Byzantine or Russian precedent, thus asserting the artist’s own authority as an interpreter of Scripture for the purposes of depicting its personages and scenes, its truths and mysteries. Also, he repeatedly emphasizes one element of the Byzantino-Muscovite tradition to the virtual exclusion of all others, namely, the principle of similitude or likeness \( (podobie) \) in icon-painting. He insists in effect that the entire matter was reducible to whether a likeness is well or badly rendered—and this with respect not only to any prototype it may have had, living or dead (or divine), but to such things as shading, coloring, “perspective \([perspektiva]\),” and scale. His criteria, in short, clearly also reflect the new art. It was badly painted “Latin” or “German” images that were to be condemned equally with foreign works as such. At one point he upbraids his opponent for saying that only Russians could paint icons and that only Russian icons may be venerated, when marvellous images drawn from Scripture, including the “Apocalypse \([Apokalipsis]\),” had been executed “as if from life” in “other lands.” He appends a list of prints to be found in Piscator’s \( Theatrum Biblicum \), various of which (as Grabar first demonstrated) would soon inspire Russian painters.\(^25\) The principle of \( podobie \) had become \( zhivopodobie \) or “life-likeness,” a term that Vladimirov apparently invented.

In sum, Vladimirov emerges from his “Epistle” as both Europeanizer and traditionalist on the subject of holy images, ever a most sensitive one in Muscovy. Invoking the authority of Byzanto-Muscovite tradition he nevertheless asserts, like a Renaissance man, the autonomy of the artist. Sensible of outside criticism of the quality of Russian painting, he urges that it be improved by the standards of what he knew, with Piscator’s help, of the new European art. One might even say that in claiming, implicitly, the right to interpret Scripture and in denouncing, indirectly, the Russian tendency to idolize icons (that frequent criticism of foreigners), Vladimirov reveals a Protestant aspect. The very language of his “Epistle” inclined him to the larger European world: often colloquial (Russian) rather than bookish (Slavonic) in the traditional manner, its text abounds in Ukrainianisms and Polonisms, and features numerous Latin calques as well as outright borrowings and neologisms. Examples of the latter include \( perspektiva \), as mentioned, and \( personigrafiia \), meaning the art of depicting persons: “I would write to thee, sir [Ushakov], about the most skillful art of true

\(^25\) Ibid., 48, 45, 11 (and n. 3). Cf. Grabar’, \( Istoriia zhivopisi \), 518–33; also Sachavets-Fedorovich, “Bibliia Piskatora.”
personigrafia, to thee who has spoken of the fine mastery [needed by] those who would be icon painters.”

26 But then it is clear from his “Epistle” (as from his own painting) that at bottom Vladimirov shared the basic Byzantine-Russian conception of art as idealized imagery, however skillfully done. It was imagery of a more or less symbolical kind executed in accordance with certain technical conventions and purely religious in significance. Lamenting the widespread ignorance in Russia, even among “those who consider themselves grand and intelligent,” of what constituted good painting, essentially a problem, he seems to have thought, of excessive deference to the “old ways,” Vladimirov was still loyal to his religious heritage. We approach here the source, perhaps, of late Muscovite ambivalence about the new art: the unrivaled sacralization, going back to early Muscovite times, of religious imagery in Russia and the attendant aversion to change. “The sacred,” as Weber found, “is the uniquely unalterable.”

27 Ushakov, to whom the “Epistle” is addressed, replied in kind. Or so it would seem. Filiminov found in a manuscript podlinnik of the later seventeenth century an “Address [slovo] to a Lover of Icon-Painting” which he then published (1874), tentatively attributing it to Ushakov, an attribution that scholars since have more or less tentatively accepted. The text itself of the “Address” certainly suggests composition in the later 1660s in that Moscow circle of erudites and aesthetes among whom Ushakov was a leading figure. And it certainly is, in context, a remarkable statement of the artist’s vocation. It might be paraphrased thus:

God, who created man in his image and likeness (po obrazu i po podobiiu svoemu), endowed him with a special capacity, called fantasy (fantazia), to represent in images all things; but some are able to use this natural gift with great facility while others must develop it by intensive study. Among the many and various arts and crafts known to man only seven are considered liberal arts; and among these, according to Pliny, the ancient Greeks (“Hellenes”) considered image-making (ikonotvorenie) preeminent. Image-making is divided into six kinds: carving in gems, wood, or ivory; working

26 “Poslanie Iosifa,” 24.
in various metals; sculpting in stone; modeling in clay, wax, etc.; and engraving on copper plates for reproduction on paper. Among these in turn the sixth kind, painting in colors (sharopisatelnoe ikonotvorenien), is preeminent, as it more exactly and vividly recreates the original and more fully conveys its likeness; it is also used (approved of) by the Church (also an allusion to the traditional abhorrence of graven images). Image-making in its several forms has been honored in all ages, lands, and classes because of its great utility; for images are the stuff of memory, memorials of the dead, witnesses of the times, heralds of good deeds, immortal expressions of praise and glory. Images bring near that which is far. Therefore in ancient times this honorable art was so loved that not only the well-born learned it, but even famous kings, thus joining brush to scepter (kist' skipetru prisovokup'i she). For if the King of kings and Lord of lords was the first creator of images (obrazotvoret), how could not earthly kings honor image-creating?

Moreover (the “Address” continues), while it is true that in the Ten Commandments God forbade the making of (graven) images, this referred only to idols worshipped as divine and not to simple images, bearers of beauty, bringers of spiritual good, providers of glimpses of the Divine. Christian images are revered not as God nor in themselves but for their prototype (pervoobraz). Christ himself provided an image of himself (a reference to the Mandylion of the ancient legend of King Abgar, or icon of the “Savior not made with hands [Spas nerukotvorny]” in the Russian tradition, a type Ushakov himself painted: cf. Plate I). And not only is the Lord God himself a master of icon-painting, but all living beings with the sense of sight possess this divine skill: if they stand before a mirror, they cast their image in it. More wonderful still, the likeness in the mirror reflects their every movement, although it has neither body nor soul. Similarly in water, in marble, and in other things we see good images emerge without effort. Thus not God alone but man’s own nature teaches him the art of icon-painting. And thus the church has from its beginning blessed images of Christ, his Mother, and the saints, whence have come many miracles.

The “Address” also cites the speech on the martyrdom of St. Barlaam in Antioch in the fourth century traditionally attributed to St. Basil the Great, in which Basil exclaims: “Arise now, O splendid painter of the feats of martyrs. Magnify with your art [Barlaam’s] mutilated image. Adorn with your cunning colors [him] whom I have but dimly described.... Let Christ, too, who

---

31 Icons in this tradition were painted in Russia from the fourteenth century. Vladimirov in his “Epistle” to Ushakov also refers to the legend (Ovchinnikova ed., 30).
presides over the contest [scene of the martyrdom] be depicted on the panel—this an obvious as well as authoritative affirmation of the high value of the painter's art. The "Address" then excoriates the "many of us" who for lack of sufficient training paint badly, attracting divine wrath and the scorn of foreigners; and with all due modesty its author proclaims his God-given "talent" (talant) for icon-painting, which, recalling an injunction of the Stoglav, he would fear to hide. The "Address" closes with the author's promise to produce an "alphabet [primer] of this art [alfavit khudozhhestva sego]" that should include the parts of the human body needed in "our art" and be engraved on copper plates for printing (an art scarcely as yet known in Russia), this for the benefit of all lovers of icon-painting. A lengthy final sentence forms a kind of icon painter's prayer, its close correspondence with an inscription on an icon painted and signed in 1685 by Ushakov is our main external evidence for attributing the "Address" to him.

In European terms, to be sure, Ushakov's "Address" is a curious pastiche of late medieval and Renaissance thought about painting intermixed with elements of the classical Christian doctrine on imagery. In its Russian context, however, it is an altogether extraordinary effort, more erudite as well as more richly ambivalent than the "Epistle" of Vladimirov that may have incited it. Its literary qualities, moreover, along with its explicit references to Pliny (the Elder, a main source of Renaissance art theory) and to several Byzantine authorities (St. Athanasius of Alexandria and the Second Council of Nicæa in addition to St. Basil) suggest that if Ushakov the practicing artist wrote the "Address," he had a good deal of learned help. And such help was close at hand. A "Charter" (Gramota) issued in May 1668 by the patriarch of Moscow together with the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, who had come to Moscow for the recent church council, makes some of the same basic points with a still greater display of recondite learning and rhetorical finesse ("Indeed the skill of icon-painting surpasses in honor the other arts and crafts as the sun surpasses the planets, as fire the other elements, spring the other seasons of the year, the eagle every bird, and the lion all beasts"). The patriarchs would have been assisted in this operation by various of the erudite divines who had also assembled in Moscow for the church council; and their "Charter" is distinguished as well by its call for the tsar's support and

regulation of painters of both icons and "secular things"—the latter referring no doubt to the "Italianate" portraits and decorative painting increasingly in favor at court. The call was heeded. In 1669 Aleksei Mikhailovich issued a charter confirming that of the patriarchs and commending it to his subjects. The tsar's charter also makes many of the references and points made in the "Address," also in very similar terms.

The coincidences of language, content, and purpose in these four documents from the 1660s in Moscow concerning icon-painting beg explanation. Briefly, the key figure here may well have been Paisios Ligarides (ca. 1610–1678), who had arrived in the tsar's city in 1662 and quickly become an influential advisor on religious affairs. Born on the island of Chios, educated at the College of St. Athanasius in Rome, Ligarides had thereafter followed a somewhat checkered career mostly in Constantinople and the Balkans. Working at first as a Catholic (Uniate) priest for the Vatican's department for the Propagation of the Faith, he came to be so well regarded by various Orthodox hierarchs that eventually one of them nominated him metropolitan of Gaza in Palestine, in which dignity he descended on Moscow seeking alms. The level of his learning was fairly high by general European standards, as is attested by his literary legacy, which includes replies to sixty-one questions on religion posed by Tsar Aleksei, a history of the patriarchs of Jerusalem (where he had served), and a detailed history of the Moscow Church Council of 1666–1667, in which he played a leading role. Ligarides most probably was responsible for the adroit East-West iconographic compromises enunciated by the council following proposals ostensibly submitted by the attending patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria. He might well have provided historical, theological, and even aesthetic advice to Joseph Vladimirov and to Simon Ushakov in addition to Joasaph, the patriarch of Moscow (1667–1673) in succession to the retired Nikon.

Nor should we overlook that other leading erudite in the Moscow of the 1660s, Simiaon Polatski (Simeon Polotskii, 1629–1680). Belarussian in origin (Polatsk), a graduate of the Kyiv Academy and sometime student of the Jesuit college in Vilnius, Polatski arrived in Moscow in 1663 and was promptly taken up by Ligarides. Polatski acted as interpreter for Ligarides, and through him would have made his own contribution to the deliberations.

36 Ibid., col. 325.
37 Printed in ibid., cols. 326–29.
of the Church Council of 1666–1667. In fact, he was specifically commissioned by the Council to write a treatise refuting the petitions of two dissident priests who had complained of the new and “heretical” tendencies in the Russian Church, a treatise which was published in 1667 and soon denounced by opponents. Polatski’s knowledge of theology and literature in their contemporary Latin, scholastic, Jesuit-Baroque incarnations, not to mention his ability to declaim impressively on short notice (on royal deaths, births, and namedays, on major festivals, and so on), were exceedingly rare in Moscow, and had led to his appointment as tutor to the tsar’s children. He was well positioned accordingly to influence the iconodulic controversy waging in Moscow in the 1660s (not over whether, but over how one made images to venerate). Indeed it has been argued that his “philosophical-aesthetic ideas” dominated the debate, finding expression equally in the patriarchal and royal charters of 1668 and 1669, in Vladimirov’s “Epistle” and Ushakov’s “Address,” and in two works on icon-painting written in 1667 by Polatski himself, neither of which has ever been printed.39

Given Polatski’s personal history, we are not greatly surprised to discover that in the second of these manuscript works, after making suitable reference to Byzantine authorities, he discusses icon-painting in terms borrowed from Baroque poetics. He suggests that every iconic image is nothing more than a painted sign or symbol—znamenie—of some spiritual reality or essence and that to insist otherwise is nothing less than heresy. It is “especially obvious,” he says here, that “among the many thousands of images of the Savior not one approximates the living face of Christ... not one is completely like him.” He thereby strayed from the classic Byzantine conception of images as special channels to and from their divine or saintly prototypes,40 and certainly struck a blow at the Muscovite habit of viewing icons as literally the images, often


miracle-working at that, of their originals. Polatski was opening the door to the widest possible use of symbols in icon-painting, not just conventional symbols but also unusual or even superficially inappropriate ones; artists were to be free to depict the Savior and the saints however they pleased so long as basic propriety (chin tserkovnyi) was maintained. He perhaps sought to justify the actual proliferation in recent Ukrainian, Belarusian, and now Muscovite religious art of new architectural, botanical, sartorial, and other details as well as whole emblems of an increasingly elaborate as well as stylized kind: emblems whose models if not actual sources are to be found in the baroque art of Catholic Europe. At a more practical level, Polatski urged that even “clumsily painted icons,” numerous as they were and needful of “correction,” were worthy of veneration since they hardly dishonored their prototypes but only the artists who painted them, and anyway did not scandalize simple folk. He thus rebuked the Muscovite hierarchy’s incessant demand for strict central control of icon-painting while evincing, to the contrary, a kind of Catholic toleration of holy pictures in popular styles.41

Polatski’s typically baroque musical psalter (Psaltyr’ rifmotvornaia) and his version of the old Tale of Barlaam and Joasaph, both printed in Moscow in 1680–1681, were illustrated with engravings after designs by Ushakov. These designs went further than anything Ushakov ever painted in their adoption of baroque imagery and style. Indeed Ushakov’s title-page for the Tale (Plate 2), with its classical portal and personifications on pedestals of War and Peace, has been designated the first known example of the use of classical symbolism by a Russian artist.42

But we must not leave it at that. For it becomes increasingly obvious, all considered, that both Polatski and Ushakov sought in their literary or artistic endeavors to reconcile what they found attractive in the new art with what they valued in their religious heritage—which heritage, it deserves emphasis, had sacralized imagery to a degree unknown elsewhere in the Christian world. Their ensuing “problem,” as we might call it, was that of true believers eager to assimilate the best of contemporary art, a phenomenon familiar enough to students of the Renaissance or of the Baroque in Europe (or of Patristic times or of Modern art), but here greatly complicated by the intense iconodulism endemic in the Muscovite context. To make matters worse, so to speak,

42 Anan’eva, Ushakov, 18.
Muscovite "image-worship" had naturally acquired, in response to the rising criticism from Reformation-minded foreigners, a decidedly patriotic aspect.\textsuperscript{43}

This is not the place to spell out an alternative interpretation of Ushakov in particular or of seventeenth-century Russian painting (painting in Russia) more generally. Suffice it to observe that ambivalence was an altogether appropriate stance to be taken by the makers of late Muscovite court culture, until their "problem" was decisively resolved, beginning about 1690, by Peter I. In pursuit of this aim, of course, the autocrat received no little help from the new art's other well-placed Russian friends, meaning the sufficiently numerous artists and patrons whose efforts collectively constituted the Petrine revolution in Russian imagery.\textsuperscript{44} Ushakov (died 1686) and Polatski (1680), their works clearly tell us, had learned to live in what we can see was a moment of epic transition, one in which contrarieties coexisted and ambiguity flourished.

Most later Russian students of Muscovite visual art (virtually all prominent ones) have eschewed the religion of the Muscovite tradition while retaining its patriotism, whether in nationalist, populist, or Soviet forms. In so doing, I suggest, they not only retain a distracting ambivalence in assessing crucial developments: they undermine the effort itself to understand and interpret this art, richly informative of its cultural matrix, and pleasing, as it can be. It is hoped that in this field, too, Professor Keenan's rigorously critical methods may be emulated.

\textit{University of Illinois at Chicago}

\textsuperscript{43} On the sacralization of imagery in Muscovy and its patriotic defense against Protestant attacks, see now, with further references, S. Michalski, \textit{The Reformation and the Visual Arts: The Protestant Image Question in Western and Eastern Europe} (New York, 1993), especially 99–101, 131ff. See also, for further comparative study, T. D. Kaufmann, \textit{Court, Cloister, and City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe, 1450–1800} (Chicago, 1995), especially chap. 5.

\textsuperscript{44} The title, and subject, of my forthcoming volume, \textit{The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery} (Chicago, 1997).
Crisis, Conjuncture, and the Causes of the Time of Troubles

CHESTER DUNNING

One of the crucial tasks facing historians of pre-Petrine Russia is to explain why Muscovy, which in the sixteenth century appeared to be emerging as a powerful state capable of challenging its European neighbors on equal terms, suffered a catastrophic internal crisis at the beginning of the seventeenth century which nearly destroyed the country. Muscovy did of course survive its "Time of Troubles" (1598–1613), but the emergence of Russia as a great power was delayed. Why did Muscovy suffer such a setback? Why did the Time of Troubles happen? To many Russians who lived through it the answer was nothing more or less than divine retribution for the sins of Muscovy's rulers or its people.¹ Historians, on the other hand, long ago decided that at the center of the Time of Troubles was a powerful rebellion of the oppressed masses. For this reason they focused primarily on long-term social causes, usually linking the Time of Troubles back to the tumultuous reign of Ivan IV and the enserfment of the Russian peasants.² In 1983, in a panel discussion at the annual convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Edward L. Keenan challenged the traditional theory of long-term social causes of the Time of Troubles. Citing signs of recovery in the 1590s, the extinction of the Danilovich dynasty in 1598, the famine of 1601–1603, and the theory of a general crisis of the seventeenth century, Keenan suggested that the connection between the Time of Troubles and the reign of Ivan IV may have been exaggerated. He urged specialists, "despite our post-

² V. N. Tatishchev was the first historian to connect the Time of Troubles directly to the enserfment of the Russian peasants. See V. N. Tatishchev, Istoriia rossiiskaiia, 7 vols. (Moscow-Leningrad, 1962–1968), 7:367. A similar view was held by M. M. Shcherbatov: Istoriia rossiiskaiia, 7 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1770–1791), vol. 7, part 2:147. S. M. Solov'ev was one of the first historians to view the Time of Troubles as a class war and the first to refer to it as a "peasant war": "Obzor sobytiia russkoi istorii ot konchiny tsaria Feodora Ioannovicha do vstupleniia na prestol doma Romanovykh," Sovremennik, 13, no. 1, part 2 (1849):11. For arguments linking the Time of Troubles to Ivan IV and enserfment, see S. F. Platonov, Smatne vremia (Prague, 1924), 31–59; V. D. Grekov, Krest'iane na Rusi, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1952–1954), 2:310; Richard Hellie, Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy (Chicago, 1971), 102–103; A. A. Zimin, V kanun grovykh postriiasenii: Predposyaki pervoi krest'ianskoj voyny v Rossii (Moscow, 1986).
Annales assumptions," to look for political and cultural causes. It was vintage Keenan: heretical, thoughtful, and stimulating. In this article I wish to explore Keenan's challenge to tradition by examining closely the prevailing social interpretation of the period and by outlining some alternative ways of looking at both short-term and long-term causes of the Troubles.

Before considering Professor Keenan's challenge it will be useful to review briefly the historiography of the traditional social interpretation of the Time of Troubles. The eminent historians Vasilii Kliuchevskii and Sergei Platonov popularized the idea of the Time of Troubles, and especially the Bolotnikov rebellion of 1606–1607, as a social struggle of the masses against the development of serfdom. According to Platonov, the Bolotnikov rebellion marked the beginning of the second phase of the Time of Troubles, the period of "social struggle," which lasted until 1610. Early Soviet scholars also emphasized this social interpretation but rejected the concept of the Time of Troubles as a bourgeois label used to mask class war in the early seventeenth century. Influenced by Lenin and Engels, they preferred labels such as "peasant revolution," "cossack revolution," or "peasant war," but still focused on the Bolotnikov rebellion as the defining event of the period. In the Stalin era, Ivan Smirnov produced the first detailed study of the Bolotnikov rebellion and declared that the rebellion was indeed Russia's first peasant war, the most significant peasant war in Russian history, in which the rebels—mostly slaves and peasants—fought to destroy "feudal" oppression. In the 1950s, Aleksandr Zimin and others put forward the view that the Bolotnikov rebellion was only the culmination of the First Peasant War. In their view, Khlopko's rebellion in 1603, the Bolotnikov rebellion, and cossack unrest up to 1614 all belonged to one large peasant war. Although Smirnov never accepted that view, declaring repeatedly that the peasant war was limited to the Bolotnikov rebellion, the expanded definition came to be accepted by a majority of Soviet historians. During the 1960s and 1970s Vadim Koretskii

made important archival discoveries related to the Bolotnikov rebellion and the timing of the arrival of serfdom in Muscovy. Koretskii placed the critical step in the development of serfdom—suspension of the St. George’s Day privilege of peasant departure—in the 1590s. That decade also saw a sharp decline in the legal status of certain types of slaves. Thus, Koretskii viewed the First Peasant War as the first massive popular rebellion against something like de facto serfdom.7

Thanks to Koretskii and others, an elaborate model of the First Peasant War developed and became standard in Soviet historical literature. According to Vladislav Nazarov’s description, the first period of the peasant war lasted from 1603 to 1605. The central event of the period was the Kholopotko rebellion of 1603. After the rebels were defeated, there was a temporary decline in the war. The second stage of the first period was a mass rising of the lower classes which coincided with the pretender Dmitrii Ivanovich’s campaign for the Muscovite throne in 1604–1605. Once Dmitrii succeeded in becoming tsar, there was another temporary decline in the war. The second period of the First Peasant War lasted from 1606 to 1607; that was the Bolotnikov rebellion. The third period stretched from 1608 to 1614.8 Western scholars have often scoffed at this doctrinaire Marxist model, but their own work either echoes Soviet scholarship or merely falls back on Platonov’s earlier social interpretation of the Time of Troubles.9 The image of revolutionary masses fighting for their freedom in the Time of Troubles has had a powerful impact upon the historical imagination. Most Russian and Western studies of the

7 V. I. Koretskii, Formirovanie krest’ianskogo prava i pervaya krest’ianskaya voina v Rossii (Moscow, 1975), 364–66.
social history of Muscovy, the development of serfdom, popular rebellions, and the "revolutionary tradition" and its origins reflect this class war interpretation.

Professor Keenan's challenge to conventional wisdom about the causes and nature of the Time of Troubles came at a time when similar challenges were being made to the social interpretation of the English Revolution and the French Revolution. Partly inspired by those "revisionist" works about Western revolutions, I published an article in 1983 which challenged Soviet scholarship about the immediate causes of the Bolotnikov rebellion. Since then Ruslan Skrynnikov, Aleksandr Stanislavskii, and I have published several works which collectively challenge virtually every aspect of the Marxist interpretation of the Time of Troubles. Many of our conclusions support Keenan's reservations about the traditional social interpretation of the Time of Troubles, so it is appropriate to review briefly this recent revisionist scholarship.

As we have seen, in discussing the origins of the First Peasant War Soviet scholars emphasized the subjection and radicalization of Russian peasants and slaves by the beginning of the seventeenth century. In contrast, Skrynnikov and Stanislavskii offer a more complex and rigorous view of the origins of the "first civil war" in Russia. Like scholars before him, Skrynnikov traces the origins of the political and social crisis of the early seventeenth century back to the reign of Ivan IV. Like so many others, he also focuses attention on the policies of Boris Godunov, especially the development of serfdom—regarded even by Skrynnikov as the fundamental prerequisite for civil war in the early seventeenth century. Nonetheless, Skrynnikov looks more deeply into the issue than many of his predecessors. He views serfdom as the Muscovite government's response to a severe crisis within the dvoriane militia. As the


11 Skrynnikov, Rossiia v nachale XVII v., 3, 5, 250-51; idem, Bolotnikov, 5-8, 248-52; Stanislavskii, Grazhdanskaia voina, 247.
ranks of the militia swelled, the fund of available land and peasant labor for the tsar’s cavalry force declined, leading to smaller and smaller land grants (with fewer peasants) and a general impoverishment of the lowest ranks of the militia. Many petty pomeshchiki, especially deti boiarskie, were ruined and fell out of the “ruling class” altogether. They were forced to serve as low-status infantry or, in extreme cases, to sell themselves into slavery or to join the cossacks on the southern periphery of the state. In the midst of the dvoriane militia crisis, the government attempted an ambitious program of extending the state south. New towns were built and an attempt was made to transfer the already overstrained pomest’e landholding system to the southern frontier. Almost anyone was accepted into southern military service, even cossacks and peasants. Life was hard for these new pomeshchiki who were forced to plow the land for themselves. Collectively this group was poor and differed sharply from the “lords” of central Muscovy. They were a dissatisfied lot and became important participants in the civil war. Skrynnikov has also spent considerable time analyzing the slaves who participated in the civil war. Traditionally assumed to be lower-class menials and peasants with “anti-feudal” attitudes, many of these men were actually elite military slaves—including many former deti boiarskie. A very large number of them served in the dvoriane militia in the early seventeenth century. Many others, turned out by their masters during the famine years, fled south to join the cossacks. Cossacks receive special attention from Stanislavskii and Skrynnikov. They show that as serfdom spread in central Muscovy, the southern steppe frontier was still free and acted as a magnet for peasants and slaves fleeing oppression. Many joined the cossacks, but cossacks were not just runaway members of the lower classes. They were a diverse group, including many ruined pomeshchiki and elite military slaves. According to Stanislavskii, cossacks were a new military class in formation, a communistic brotherhood of social bandits and mercenary soldiers. They did not regard themselves as peasants or peasant leaders, and the destruction of serfdom was never proclaimed as a cossack goal. Nonetheless, Boris Godunov understood that serfdom could not triumph in Muscovy while the cossack frontier remained free. He therefore tried to subordinate the cossack lands and encountered stiff resistance. Cossacks became extremely important participants in the civil war.12

Let us now turn to the revisionist critique of the First Peasant War itself. First, we should ask whether there was in fact a peasant war raging as early as the period 1603 to 1605. To answer that question, it is necessary to focus on

---

the central event of the period, Khlopko’s rebellion in 1603, which is often regarded as the beginning of the First Peasant War. Smirnov regarded the Khlopko rebellion as a sharp insurrection of hungry slaves during the great famine, a terrible precursor to the Bolotnikov rebellion. Zimin, Nazarov and others, however, saw it as part of the First Peasant War, regarding it as a rebellion of mass character and wide sweep. During the past decade Skrynnikov devoted much attention to the subject and concluded that Zimin’s hypothesis about peasant participation in Khlopko’s rebellion is invalid. He also found no real basis for linking all the various acts of brigandage during the famine years to Khlopko’s rising or for seeing that rising as having a mass character or wide sweep. Skrynnikov emphasizes initiation of such acts of brigandage by elite military slaves, casts doubt on their “anti-feudal” tendencies, and concludes that there is no basis for viewing the Khlopko rebellion as the beginning of the First Peasant War.

According to the expanded version of the First Peasant War, after Khlopko’s rebellion was crushed there was a temporary decline in the peasant war. Then the second phase of the first period coincided with Dmitrii’s campaign for the Muscovite throne. According to Koretskii and others, Dmitrii managed to come to the throne due to a resurgence of the peasant war. Rebels demanded the abolition of serfdom and the “feudal system.” The adventurer Dmitrii supposedly made many rash “anti-feudal” promises in order to take advantage of the peasant rising which was not so much pro-Dmitrii as it was “anti-feudal.” In the view of Kirill Chistov and others, a popular social utopian legend about Dmitrii’s escape from Uglich in 1591 and return as the deliverer of the masses from serfdom grew up before Dmitrii’s campaign and explains the mass support for his struggle for the throne.

There are serious problems with this interpretation. Although there is little doubt that Dmitrii’s campaign was aided by a deep social crisis in famine-weary Muscovy, there is no evidence that the rebellion was a peasant war against serfdom to which Dmitrii attached himself. It was in fact a popular rebellion in support of Dmitrii; and, contrary to Chistov’s argument, the

---

16 K. V. Chistov, Russkie narodnye sotsial’no-utopicheskie legendy XVII-XIX vv. (Moscow, 1967), 40–42.
rebellion was definitely not the result of the circulation of popular social utopian legends about Dmitrii before his invasion of Muscovy in 1604. There is also no evidence of rebel demands for the abolition of serfdom or the “feudal order.” Dmitrii did profit from lower class discontent, but his promises of rewards to his supporters did not include the abolition of serfdom and were not even aimed primarily at the lower classes. Attempts to focus on peasants and slaves with “anti-feudal,” social utopian goals have greatly distorted Dmitrii’s civil war. Peasants were not the main force of the movement in support of Dmitrii; the revolt of towns and southern provinces where few peasants resided was far more important. There was something like a genuine peasant rebellion in the Komaritskii district, but these were prosperous peasants. Attempts to view the urban revolts in Dmitrii’s favor as lower-class, “anti-feudal” risings are also not supportable; dvoriane, deti boyarskie, and other service people often initiated such rebellions. As for slaves, many of them who rallied to Dmitrii’s banner were elite military slaves—ruined pomeschiki who did not advocate the overthrow of the “feudal order” and whose participation in the rebellion is closely related to the dvoriane militia crisis. The Don cossacks were the most important military force in achieving Dmitrii’s victory; however, as Stanislavskii has demonstrated, they were definitely not social revolutionaries. Most cossacks were naïve monarchists. Some were clever enough to use Dmitrii’s cause in order to oppose the encroachment of the state on their territory and freedom. Many others were simply seeking status and salary from the “good tsar.” There is no reason to view the rebellions in Dmitrii’s favor as “anti-feudal” or social utopian. Dmitrii’s civil war in fact united the most varied social strata.

Recently, Skrynnikov bluntly asked whether one could justifiably view the
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period of Dmitrii's campaign for the throne as the second stage of the First Peasant War. The answer is "no."\footnote{22}

According to historians who support the expanded version of the First Peasant War, the war temporarily subsided after Dmitrii became tsar. The second period of the peasant war flared up a year later, in the spring of 1606. Given the problems with Soviet views of the first period of the First Peasant War and the fact that there is no evidence of any peasant war during Dmitrii's reign, I am forced to conclude that there was no peasant war in the period 1603–1605. But what about the Bolotnikov rebellion itself? Was it a peasant war? There are many problems with Soviet scholarship asserting that it was.

How did the Bolotnikov rebellion begin? According to Platonov, the second phase of the Time of Troubles, the period of "social struggle," began in the spring of 1606 with the assassination of Tsar Dmitrii and the seizure of power by Vasilii Shuiskii. This led to a rebellion of many towns and southern provinces against Shuiskii in the name of Dmitrii. Essentially the same view of the beginning of the First Peasant War was held by Smirnov.\footnote{23} Koretskii and others, however, have tried to link the Bolotnikov rebellion to the mythical peasant war raging since 1603. Instead of seeing Dmitrii's assassination as the trigger of the Bolotnikov rebellion, Koretskii believed Tsar Dmitrii himself was facing an impending peasant rebellion before his assassination. Regarding Dmitrii as an adventurer who used the masses to gain power and then betrayed them by ruling in the interests of the dvoriane, Koretskii argued that Tsar Dmitrii suddenly changed his policies in the spring of 1606 in order to appease the peasants. A rebellion was supposedly brewing against Dmitrii and the whole "feudal order," and that forced the tsar to make plans to abolish serfdom. He apparently had no choice; if he had not abolished serfdom, the masses would have rejected him as the "true tsar" who was supposedly forced to fulfill the social utopian dreams of his lower class supporters. Koretskii described a terrified Dmitrii who made plans to restore the St. George's Day privilege of peasant departure but who was assassinated by the boyars before he could implement such a radical policy. The assassination, however, only intensified the peasant war.\footnote{24}

This fantastic theory, which demands the suspension of most of the basic assumptions of the Muscovite political system, is based upon shaky evidence. Koretskii cited unrest in southern Muscovy during the winter of 1605–1606. It is, however, by no means clear that the winter disturbance in the south should have been of any real concern to Tsar Dmitrii. Even Koretskii was

\footnote{22} Skrynnikov, Bolotnikov, 250.
\footnote{23} Platonov, Smutnoe vremia, 120–33; Smirnov, Vosstanie, 88.
\footnote{24} Koretskii, Formirovanie, 249–57.
forced to admit that it was not aimed at Dmitrii, but rather naïvely against
some evil local administrators who acted unfairly and without the tsar's
consent or knowledge. Indeed, in the spring of 1606, just when he was
supposedly most fearful of revolt, Dmitrii ordered punishment for those
responsible for the disturbance.\textsuperscript{25} Whatever one makes of this incident,
Dmitrii's response to it certainly does not lend support to Koretskii's view of
the period. Koretskii also made much of the pretender Tsarevich Petr's
appearance in the south in the spring of 1606. Faced with a growing revolt of
the masses, Dmitrii supposedly intended to invite Petr and his cossacks to
Moscow in order to intimidate the boyars. According to Koretskii, if Dmitrii
had not agreed to placate the cossacks and peasants or perhaps even begin
some kind of class war against the boyars, his own authority over the south
would have evaporated—he would no longer be considered the "true tsar" by
Tsarevich Petr and others. Therefore, Dmitrii must have planned to change his
social policies radically in order to maintain support in the southern
provinces. Koretskii was unable, however, to provide much evidence to
support his theory, which is based primarily on ambiguous statements made
under duress by Tsarevich Petr shortly after his capture by Tsar Vasili Shuiskii's
forces in the fall of 1607. Koretskii conveniently dismissed the
important testimony of Captain Jacques Margeret (commander of Tsar
Dmitrii's bodyguard) simply because it does not agree with his own view of
Tsar Dmitrii's situation in the spring of 1606.\textsuperscript{26} In fact, there is very little
evidence of burning class consciousness and commitment to class war
operating in Petr's mind in the spring of 1606. For all his later representation
as a social revolutionary, at that time Petr was instead just an adventurer.\textsuperscript{27}
Even if Petr had been a true revolutionary in the spring of 1606, he would
probably not have found all that many supporters to join him in rebellion
against Dmitrii. Many southerners, after all, had fought for Dmitrii in 1604–
1605 and later had their tax burden lowered by him.

Koretskii assumed that by the time of Petr's appearance Tsar Dmitrii had
already made up his mind to change his policies in order to placate the
masses. The plots in Moscow against the tsar are cited as evidence that
Dmitrii was probably ready to turn against the Muscovite aristocracy.
Actually, there is no evidence that Dmitrii took any of these plots seriously or

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 252.
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ever considered a radical change in his policies. He clearly favored the lords, as is evidenced by his decrees regarding peasants and slaves issued in early 1606—just when he supposedly should have been worried about revolt. What evidence did Koretskii cite to show that Dmitrii was about to change his social policies in the spring of 1606? He was able to cite only one undated, unsigned document concerning the restoration of the peasants’ right to move after the fall harvest. Koretskii believed that this controversial document (the Svodnyi sudebnik) represented Dmitrii’s desperate attempt to placate the masses, an attempt which virtually guaranteed his assassination by the lords.28 In fact, however, Koretskii has provided a weak case at best for Dmitrii needing to placate the masses, and the Svodnyi sudebnik by itself does not provide enough additional evidence to prove his theory. It is worth noting that not all Soviet historians were convinced that the Svodnyi sudebnik in any way represented Dmitrii’s thinking or even belonged to the period of his reign.29 Koretskii clearly failed to offer enough evidence to prove that Dmitrii was facing an impending peasant rebellion. Despite many historians’ hostility toward Tsar Dmitrii, he was actually a relatively popular ruler when he was killed by Shuiskii’s henchmen.30 It was Vasilii Shuiskii who faced a rebellion. In many ways the assassination of Dmitrii is the key to understanding the real Time of Troubles, the civil war which raged from 1606 to 1612 and nearly destroyed Muscovy.

The Bolotnikov rebellion was clearly triggered by Dmitrii’s assassination and was not part of an on-going peasant war since 1603, but was the Bolotnikov rebellion itself a peasant war against serfdom? Platonov declared that Bolotnikov was a social revolutionary bent on destroying the “feudal order,” a perspective which strongly affected how Soviet scholars viewed the rebellion.31 As we have seen, it has been called a peasant war (or part of a peasant war) against serfdom and the “feudal order”—a simplistic and misleading interpretation. The causes and nature of the rebellion are much more complex. No doubt serfdom and a deep social crisis aggravated the situation and contributed to the violence of the rebellion in places. Many rebels were serfs, slaves, and other “burdened” people, or former serfs and slaves who had joined the cossacks. Many other rebels were, however, dvoriane and deti boiarskie. The rebellion was never a clear-cut lower-class

31 Platonov, Smutnoe vremia, 130–31; idem, Ocherki po istorii Smuty, 305.
rising against oppression. In general, its causes must be sought by looking at each group involved. In many cases, local conditions help to explain why the rebellion took various forms in different places—some more radical than others.

The towns of Seversk and southern Muscovy started the rebellion, the same towns which provided the main base of support for Dmitrii in 1604–1605; and, as was true then, it was not just the lower classes of these towns who were involved. In many cases the initiators of the rebellion were dvoriane and deti boiarskie, who also played a prominent role in military operations. These men were not interested in the abolition of serfdom. As for peasants, they did participate in the rebellion but were by no means its main force. Something like a genuine peasant rebellion did reoccur in the Komaritskii district, the same district of prosperous peasants who rose in favor of Dmitrii in 1604–1605 and who were severely punished by Godunov's army. Their participation in the Bolotnikov rebellion may be explained by something other than serfdom. In fact, serfs of central Muscovy were slow to join the rebellion and played only a secondary role in it.32 The southern provinces where few peasants resided became the center of the rebellion.

In viewing the rebellion as "anti-feudal," much has been written about the participation of slaves. Many slaves did join the rebellion; according to some writers they played a leading role.33 Many of them, however, were elite military slaves whose participation may be more closely related to the dvoriane militia crisis than to serfdom. The overall number of slaves in the rebellion may also have been greatly exaggerated by historians' over-reliance on one contemporary source which mentioned over twenty thousand slaves fleeing to the southern frontier during the famine years at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Skrynnikov has recently challenged that number, pointing out that Avraamii Palitsyn's reference to "slaves" may actually have been a reference to cossacks.34 Cossack participation in the rebellion was great; they provided the main fighting force in the struggle against Shuiskii. As we have seen, though, cossacks were a distinct social group with their own non-revolutionary agenda. They consistently emphasized their uniqueness and separation from other groups in Russian society and were basically indifferent to class origin. Cossacks of all types and backgrounds strongly supported the rebellion in order to oppose the encroachment of the state on their territory and freedom.35
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Soviet scholars went to great lengths to demonstrate that Bolotnikov’s campaign against Shuiskii was “anti-feudal” in nature. To do so, they focused much attention on the composition and behavior of the rebel armies. It is known that two rebel armies marched on Moscow in the fall of 1606. One was led by Bolotnikov; the other was led by a pomeshchik from Tula, Istoma Pashkov, who was later joined by the dvorianin Prokofii Liapunov and his Riazan’ militia. Soviet scholars, following Platonov’s lead, emphasized apparent social differences between the two rebel armies and their commanders. Bolotnikov’s army was supposedly composed of radical lower-class rebels. Pashkov’s army was seen as primarily a “gentry” force. Bolotnikov, a former slave, was seen as a social revolutionary determined to abolish the “feudal order.” Pashkov, on the other hand, was often regarded as a prominent spokesman for the dvoriane and deti boiarskie in the rebel forces.

While on the march to Moscow, Pashkov’s army supposedly treated captured dvoriane “lawfully” by keeping them in captivity or even letting them go. This was seen as evidence of class solidarity binding the Muscovite dvoriane. Bolotnikov’s army, on the other hand, supposedly carried out a wave of executions of dvoriane opponents, determined to exterminate the “feudal lords.” As the rebels approached Moscow, Bolotnikov supposedly alarmed his dvoriane allies even further by sending letters to the Moscow poor urging them to take up arms against their masters who supported Shuiskii, in return for which they would receive their former masters’ property, jobs, titles, and even their wives. This was apparently too much for the likes of such “feudal lords” as Pashkov and Liapunov. During the siege of Moscow, first Liapunov and then Pashkov betrayed the rebel cause. These “gentlemen” supposedly led a desertion of dvoriane and deti boiarskie from the rebel camp—clear evidence of class division in the rebel forces which helped doom the siege and the rebellion itself.36

There are serious problems with this interpretation. In the first place, the two rebel armies and their leaders were not as different as some scholars believe. Both armies had diverse social elements. In fact, the two armies were virtually identical to the rebel forces which supported Dmitrii’s campaign for the throne.37 As for the rebel commanders, Bolotnikov—regarded as a mere slave by some—was actually a runaway elite military slave, possibly of petty pomeshchik background. Pashkov, on the other hand, was not from a
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prominent family nor was he an important landowner; he was a mere petty *pomeshchik* with possible cossack connections. Concerning the conduct of the two rebel armies, careful study reveals that their behavior was basically the same. Pashkov’s army was not particularly lawful and carried out several executions of *dvoriane*, *dei boiarstice*, and rich merchants who supported Shuiskii. According to Skrynnikov, freeing some prisoners had more to do with avoiding the burden of many captives than with class solidarity. As for Bolotnikov’s supposedly more radical army, it did execute a few lords but there was certainly no wave of executions. For *dvoriane* and *dei boiarстве* in the rebel armies these acts against Shuiskii supporters were not seen as an ominous class war against “feudal lords” but as reprisals against their enemies. The drift into greater use of violence in the later stages of the civil war has often been cited as evidence of the “anti-feudal” character of the Bolotnikov rebellion. No doubt such violence did have class-war overtones, but cossack terror—by Tsarevich Petr and others—may actually be linked to Shuiskii’s terror campaign and mass executions of captured rebels, especially cossacks. It was definitely linked to the disarray in rebel leadership and goals in light of the failure of Bolotnikov’s campaign against Moscow and the continued failure of Tsar Dmitrii to appear in the rebel camp. That, however, does not really tell us much about the goals or activities of Bolotnikov in 1606–1607.

The most significant evidence cited by scholars to support the peasant war theory are Bolotnikov’s letters inciting the Moscow poor to rebel. It is very important to note, however, that none of these inflammatory letters has survived. What exist are a few documents referring to them, documents clearly belonging to or influenced by Shuiskii’s vigorous propaganda campaign against the rebels as dangerous social revolutionaries. In an attempt to shore up wavering support, Shuiskii did not hesitate to tell lies. That is understandable, as is the fact that some Marxist historians were eager to credit those lies; but there is no reason why we should accept a class war theory based primarily on Shuiskii’s propaganda. In fact, as Skrynnikov points out, there is no reason to believe the letters sent to Moscow were directed only to the poor, nor is there any reason to assume that Pashkov did not approve of the letters, whatever their content.
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There has been a lot of misinformation in the literature concerning the desertion of Liapunov and Pashkov during the siege of Moscow. Smirnov regarded Liapunov's betrayal as a fully conscious shift in attitude of the Riazan “gentry” toward their lower class allies; Zimin and others described Liapunov leading five hundred dvoriane and deti boiarskie from the rebel camp. Smirnov, Vosstanie, 296; A. A. Zimin, “Krest'ianskaia voina v Rossii v nachale XVII v.” in Istoria SSSR s drevneshikh vremen do nashikh dnei, vol. 2 (Moscow, 1966), 259; V. I. Koretskii, “Novye dokumenty po istorii vossaniiia I. I. Bolotnikova,” Sovetskie arkhivy, 1968, no. 6:70.

Liapunov’s treachery may well have been influenced by social tension, but his departure did not mark any mass exodus of lords from the rebel camp. Pashkov’s betrayal presents even more problems. In addition to confusion over his social status, sources vary widely in their estimations of who joined him. One source incorrectly claimed that he deserted with all the dvoriane and deti boiarskie; another source mentions four hundred cossacks; others mention five hundred or even a thousand deserters joining Pashkov but do not specify who they were. In any case, the overwhelming majority of Pashkov's army, including many dvoriane and deti boiarskie, remained loyal to the rebel cause. In evaluating Pashkov’s motives, Skrynnikov has recently emphasized the personal rivalry between Pashkov and Bolotnikov, a rivalry having nothing to do with social tension or rebel goals. One should also keep in mind that Pashkov was bribed by Shuiskii.

Taking all these things into account, it is difficult to see how the Bolotnikov rebellion can be regarded as a social revolution or peasant war. Rebel political goals were clear—to oust Shuiskii in the name of Tsar Dmitrii; rebel social goals were not at all clear. In fact, no document exists which shows a rebel demand to abolish the “feudal order” or serfdom. The assumptions of many historians writing about this were based on their own preconceived ideas or on the very effective propaganda campaign conducted by Shuiskii in order to frighten his wavering supporters. That is simply too narrow a base to support the theory of a class war. In fact, Stanislavskii has demonstrated that Shuiskii’s persistent efforts to woo cossack rebels into his
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own service shows that he did not believe his own propaganda and had no fear of class war.\textsuperscript{47}

Some Soviet scholars acknowledged the lack of a distinctive “anti-feudal” program on the part of Bolotnikov, explaining it in terms of naïve monarchism. The rebels, it is argued, were ready to bring down the “feudal order” and serfdom but were simply unable to conceive of any other political system besides tsarism. By supporting a rebellion in the name of the “good tsar” Dmitrii, peasants and slaves were hoping for liberation, but their naïve monarchism actually interfered with their conscious (or unconscious) social goals and helped doom the rebellion.\textsuperscript{48} This is a weak argument, one which provides no evidence in support of the peasant war theory. I have real doubts about the use of any variation of the social utopian argument to explain popular support for Dmitrii or the rebellion in his name. There is no doubt that the Bolotnikov rebellion was greatly aided by the popular image of Dmitrii as a “good tsar.” It should be remembered, however, that Dmitrii had ruled in the interest of the lords, not the lower classes; Bolotnikov was never forced to invent a false image of Dmitrii as “anti-feudal” in order to gain supporters.

If the Bolotnikov rebellion was not a peasant war, then what about the later years of the so-called First Peasant War? After the suppression of the Bolotnikov rebellion, Shuiskii was forced to fight against the second False Dmitrii, whose appearance marks a new phase in the civil war. Attempts by historians caught up in the peasant war model to view the second False Dmitrii’s supporters as social revolutionaries do not hold up to close scrutiny. Not only did this “Dmitrii” support serfdom, but there were also peasant rebellions against his regime. Although many lords deserted the second pretender’s chaotic and dangerous Tushino camp, others were enticed away from Shuiskii and received land from “Dmitrii.”\textsuperscript{49} Obviously, the latter group did not fear social revolution. It is generally agreed that cossacks were the main fighting force at Tushino, but, as noted above, these cossacks were not social revolutionaries.

In the final years of the Time of Troubles Muscovy descended into chaos brought on by the combination of the continuing civil war and foreign military intervention. Attempts to organize a national militia to repel the invaders were greatly complicated by civil war divisions and by friction

\textsuperscript{47}Stanislavskii, \textit{Grazhdanskaia voina}, 24–25, 30; Bussow, \textit{Moskovskaia khronika}, 148.


\textsuperscript{49}Bussow, \textit{Moskovskaia khronika}, 149, 157–58, 368 n. 107, 372 n. 130.
between cossacks and the dvoriane militia. Many scholars from Platonov on thought they discerned class conflict in the "social revolutionary" actions of the cossacks during those years. However, Stanislavskii has dealt a mortal blow to such an interpretation. Even though cossacks and dvoriane did compete for status and scarce resources and cossacks may have regarded themselves as an alternative to the weak dvoriane militia, that does not mean cossacks were social revolutionaries. Among other things, Stanislavskii has demonstrated that the conflict between cossacks and militia commander Prokofii Liapunov which led to Liapunov's death was not really about class antagonism and did not result in a frightened dvoriane deserting a radical, cossack-dominated militia. It was hardship and hunger which drove the dvoriane away. Cossacks subsequently worked well with Prince Dmitrii Pozharskii and were instrumental in the liberation of Moscow. Problems in getting cossack forces and dvoriane forces to cooperate in the siege of Moscow had more to do with the ambition of Prince Dmitrii Trubetskoi (a commander of cossack units) and others than with class friction. Cossacks played a principal role in the Time of Troubles, but they were not peasant revolutionaries or promoters of social revolution. They were also not interested in spreading "cossack democracy" to others. In fact, cossacks in the camp of the second False Dmitrii and the national militias preserved their quasi-democratic self-government only at the unit level. There were no elected atamans commanding a monolithic cossack host and only loose contact between more or less independent cossack units. Cossack forces were under the overall command of courtiers, not their own elected leaders. This is a far cry from the view of revolutionary cossacks found in Soviet historical literature.

This brief review of problems with the concept of the First Peasant War clearly shows that the peasant war theory has not been helpful and ought to be abandoned. Instead of social revolution based on horizontal class divisions, at the center of the Time of Troubles was a civil war which produced a vertical split through all layers of Muscovite society. This means that the traditional social interpretation of the Time of Troubles is inadequate. Is Professor

50 Platonov, Ocherki, 460–89; idem, Smutnoe vremia, 190–97; I. S. Shepelev, Osvoboditel'naiia i klassovaia bor'ba v Russkom gosudarstve v 1608–1610 gg. (Piatigorsk, 1957); N. P. Dolinin, Podmoskovnye polki (kazatskie "Tabory") v natsional'no-osvoboditel'nom dvizhenii 1611–1612 gg. (Kharkiv, 1958); L. V. Cherepnin, ed., Voprosy metodologii istoricheskogo issledovaniia (Moscow, 1981), 166–67; Buganov, Krest'ianskie voiny, 49.


52 Stanislavskii, Grazhdanskaiia voina, 7–8, 27–30, 36, 38, 40, 43, 45, 243–47.
Keenan’s skepticism about long-term social causes therefore justified? Can we identify with confidence any long-term causes, or were the Troubles caused merely by a chance conjunction of unfortunate circumstances and events? As it turns out, that is precisely the same dilemma now facing historians of the English and French Revolutions in light of the decline of the Marxist interpretation. Many respected scholars now claim that those Western revolutions had no long-term social causes. While some have suggested that they were mainly the result of bad luck and the failure of political leadership, other revisionists have placed renewed emphasis on “political language,” ideas, belief systems, and culture as determinants—with very interesting results.53 Professor Keenan’s suggestion that we look for political and cultural causes of the Time of Troubles turns out to be just as timely and provocative.

In searching for political causes of the civil war more attention needs to be focused on the dynastic crisis produced by the death of Tsar Fedor in 1598. That crisis sharpened the split within the ruling elite and contributed to the pretender Dmitrii’s success in 1605.54 It must be emphasized, however, that the Godunov dynasty’s political opposition would not have dared to risk open confrontation with the tsar without the existence of the pretender Dmitrii. It is also important to remember that Vasilii Shuiskii and others were utterly powerless to stir the masses against Tsar Dmitrii in 1606. It took the existence of Dmitrii to topple the Godunovs, and it took the assassination of Dmitrii to trigger the civil war. If Tsar Dmitrii had escaped assassination, there would have been no rebellion against his government and there can be little doubt what fate would have awaited Shuiskii and his henchmen. As noted earlier, Tsar Dmitrii was a fairly popular ruler who was not facing mass unrest. Dmitrii’s assassination then was the main cause of the civil war and not a mere “surface event” which triggered the unleashing of pent-up social forces. The civil war which broke out in 1606 was not inevitable. In light of this, there is a real need for more research on Dmitrii himself. The quality of existing scholarship on this fascinating character is not impressive. Russian, Soviet, and Western scholars have long had problems dealing with Dmitrii, invariably underestimating his significance and usually dismissing him as an impostor, a tool of the Polish government or the boyars, or the conscious or


54 A. P. Pavlov, Gosudarev dvor i politicheskaia bor’ba pri Borise Godunove (1584–1605 gg.) (St. Petersburg, 1992).
unconscious leader of social revolutionary masses. Even Skrynnikov’s recent biography of Dmitrii, written without reference to the peasant war model, is not very helpful. Among other things, Skrynnikov fails to make a convincing case for regarding Tsar Dmitrii as a virtual captive of the boyars who was terrified by aristocratic opposition. Although that view tantalizingly coincides with Professor Keenan’s interpretation of Muscovite autocracy (that the tsar was in effect a “hostage” of the boyar oligarchy), there is plenty of evidence to the contrary. Tsar Dmitrii was definitely not a puppet of the boyars; and, as noted earlier, he was not frightened by political opposition nor did he concoct a desperate plan to use Tsarevich Petr against his boyar opponents—as Skrynnikov believes.\(^5\) Tsar Dmitrii is worthy of far more careful study and may turn out to be one of the keys to understanding the Time of Troubles.

In searching for cultural causes of the Time of Troubles specialists need to move beyond the traditional image of the Russian people of that era as essentially passive and apolitical. In the ideal tsarstvo, of course, the tsar ruled and his subjects were “as mute as fish.”\(^5^6\) When things went wrong, however, as they surely did in the Time of Troubles, the Russian people did not sit idly by. They were forced to make choices, sometimes dangerous choices, during the civil war years. Most researchers have sought social explanations for the popular movements of the Time of Troubles; many have denied that they had any true political content. We know, however, that the rebels in the civil war were not fighting for social revolution and were in fact deeply conservative. The other traditional explanation, naïve monarchism, has some validity but has too often been used as a substitute for analysis—allowing scholars to continue viewing the Russian people as essentially apolitical, spontaneous, and unthinking. A closer look at Russian naïve monarchism reveals a somewhat different picture. In the God-centered, tsar-centered political culture of Muscovy, pious Orthodox subjects could legitimately resist a tsar they perceived as evil, one who violated his obligations to God and his people. Indeed, removal of such a tsar’ muchitel’ was apparently encouraged.\(^5^7\) Under these circumstances, truly religious Muscovites of all classes must have had trouble passively accepting Tsar


\(^5^6\) *Vremennik Ivana Timofeeva*, 109.

Dmitrii’s assassination and Vasili Shuiskii’s seizure of power. Not only was Shuiskii (like Boris Godunov before him) a mere “boyar-tsar” instead of a member of the Danilovich dynasty, but he came to power by murdering the “resurrected” last representative of Muscovy’s sanctified ruling family. Russian Orthodox political culture itself immediately provided the rebels with motivation and a powerful tool to use in the struggle against such a usurper tsar’ muchitel’. Shuiskii in turn launched a major propaganda campaign aimed at breaking the religious bond between the masses and the dead tsar precisely because he knew that bond was powerful. Although some believed his claims that Dmitrii had been an evil impostor and false tsar, Shuiskii’s opponents took to the field in large numbers to fight for God and “good Tsar Dmitrii.” So great was their righteous fury that many did not lay down their weapons until long after the usurper was deposed. This violent intrusion of the masses into Muscovite high politics severely shocked the elite and provoked serious efforts to prevent such occurrences in the future. One of the most successful of those efforts was the repeated assertion that revolts by the Russian masses were “senseless.” Historians for too long accepted that false notion at face value, and it became one of the reasons for the predominance of the social interpretation of the Time of Troubles.

It should be clear by now that no monocausal explanation of the Time of Troubles is adequate. There were indeed short-term political and cultural causes, but there were obviously also long-term causes—in spite of the inadequacy of the traditional social interpretation. Muscovy undeniably faced a deep social and economic crisis on the eve of the Time of Troubles. One of the often overlooked causes of that crisis was a change in the global climate. Bad weather associated with the “little ice age” contributed to Muscovy’s growing misery in the late sixteenth century and caused the terrible famine of 1601–1603, which was itself a contributing factor to Muscovy’s social crisis and civil war. So where does this leave us? In fact, it leaves us with the need to use a conjunctural approach to the causes of the Troubles. Trying to make some sense out of the period in light of the collapse of the Marxist interpretation of the Time of Troubles, Skrynnikov recently listed what he regarded as the principal causes of the civil war: Ivan IV’s reign of terror and introduction of an autocratic regime in Muscovy, a crisis in the pomest’e system of service landholding, the enserfment of Russian peasants at the end

---

of the sixteenth century, Boris Godunov's frontier and cossack policies, and the three-year famine. In my view, Skrynnikov's list is too simplistic and still too heavily influenced by the traditional social interpretation. In addition to ignoring Tsar Dmitrii's crucial role in the civil war and the destabilizing potential of tsar-centered Russian Orthodoxy, Skrynnikov does not address the issue of the relative weight of each of the causes he identifies, nor does he differentiate between causes and preconditions. There is also definitely an air of inevitability in his approach. If we accept his list of causes then the civil war can still be regarded largely as the culmination of an impending social struggle—the same view held by Platonov and Soviet historians of the peasant war school. Such deterministic assumptions about the social nature of the Time of Troubles are extremely powerful in the historiography; however, in light of the demise of the peasant war theory, those assumptions need closer scrutiny. Is there a non-Marxist interpretation which might explain the conjunctures of long-term and immediate social, economic, political, cultural, and ecological causes of the Time of Troubles? As it turns out, social scientists and comparative historians studying early modern state crises and revolutions may offer some assistance in answering that question.

The theory of a general crisis of the seventeenth century has been around for a generation, attempting to make sense out of the wave of state crises, rebellions, and revolutions which occurred throughout Europe and Asia in the seventeenth century. Unfortunately, proponents of the general crisis theory have been far better at identifying the existence of crises than they have been at explaining them. There is no consensus among them about the causes of the general crisis. In fact, much of the crisis theory is based upon Marxist assumptions and theories of long-term social and economic causes, often combined with ecological factors such as the "little ice age." Muscovy in the Time of Troubles is rarely included in studies of the general crisis; when it has been, there has been no breakthrough in understanding causes—only a repetition of the traditional social interpretation. Other recent major comparative studies of the early modern period are not much more help.

59 Skrynnikov, "The Civil War in Russia," 70.
60 See, for example, Trevor Aston, ed., Crisis in Europe, 1560-1660 (New York, 1978); Geoffrey Parker and Lesley Smith, eds., The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century (London, 1978); Clark, European Crisis of the 1590s.
61 See, for example, Mousnier, Peasant Uprisings, 153-95.
62 Perry Anderson's comparative study of the origins of absolutism is solidly Marxist and utterly useless concerning Muscovy's Time of Troubles. Skrynnikov's ideas about the possible connection between Ivan IV's attempt to establish autocracy and the Time of Troubles are far more convincing. See Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State (London, 1979), 210–11, 331–34; Skrynnikov, "The Civil War," 70–71. Immanuel Wallerstein's model of the modern world-system of capitalism is also of no help. It combines
There is a rather extensive body of theoretical social science literature concerning revolutions and violence. Some of the models and theories of general social stress, individual stress and discontent, systemic imbalances, and crises of legitimacy sound plausible enough in the abstract; however, they are not really very helpful in dealing with specific historical problems such as the Time of Troubles. The “social-structural” model of revolutions which emerged in the late 1970s was more historically grounded and more useful. In one of the most influential social-structural studies, Theda Skocpol argued that revolutions are caused by a conjuncture of events, each of which may have different causes and require separate explanations. Building upon the foundation provided by the social-structural model, Jack A. Goldstone has recently developed a robust demographic/structural model of early modern state breakdown, revolution, and civil war by combining Skocpol’s multicausal/conjunctural approach to the causes of revolution with a focus on the periodic waves of state crises and revolutions observable in the early modern period. His model may be highly relevant to Muscovy’s Time of Troubles.


65 Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions* (Cambridge, 1979).

demographic patterns of the *longue durée* to “surface” events such as the Time of Troubles. Goldstone is one of the first historians to make use of the insights of the “new history” in work focusing on great political events such as state crises and revolutions. A key insight Goldstone brings from demography is that the approximate doubling of the population of the temperate regions of Eurasia over the course of the sixteenth century had some surprising results. For example, younger sons of elite families who lacked positions to inherit and who therefore sought new positions increased much more rapidly than the increase in overall population. This had a destabilizing effect, increasing intra-elite competition and conflict. Just as that elite competition for resources became sharpest, the state had a diminished ability to respond due to the other result of the long-term population increase—a rise in prices which eventually precipitated a fiscal crisis. Goldstone sees the likelihood of revolution or civil war growing out of these two conditions when they are combined with a “high potential for mobilizing popular groups” due to such things as rising grievances, large numbers of rootless young men, or increasing migration away from the center of the state to the periphery. According to Goldstone, although sudden events may trigger a revolution or rebellion, they are not its true causes. Instead, the key is a shift in elite and popular attitudes toward the state. Rather than identifying specific social, economic, cultural, religious, or political “causes,” he sees them all as related aspects of an underlying causal pattern directly related to long-term population and price increases.

Although he did not focus on Muscovy, I believe Goldstone’s conjunctural demographic/structural model helps explain the Time of Troubles. While there is no agreement among historians about the size of Muscovy’s population, there is general agreement that it grew (and possibly doubled) during the sixteenth century. Prices in Muscovy are also subject to debate, but they did rise during the sixteenth century and shot up dramatically during the famine of 1601–1603. Intra-elite conflict in the form of *dvoriane* competition for

---

67 For example, Fernand Braudel ignored the Time of Troubles in his remarks about the development of a “strong state” in Russia during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. See Fernand Braudel, *The Perspective of the World* (New York, 1984), 444–48.
70 Ibid., 8–9, 35, 462.
scarce resources is well known and, combined with the state’s fiscal problems, definitely precipitated a dvoriane militia crisis by the beginning of the seventeenth century. Intra-elite competition in the form of court rivalries is also well known and seems to have intensified after 1598. Muscovy certainly faced a fiscal crisis in this period. There was also a “high potential for mobilizing popular groups” in Muscovy. The social crisis is well known, as is the famine, peasant unhappiness with serfdom, large-scale migration away from the center of the state to the frontier, and the rise of the cossacks. Under these circumstances, it appears that Goldstone’s model does indeed apply to the Time of Troubles—even to the point of characterizing the conservative nature of elite and folk “ideologies of rectification” and predicting the strengthening of traditional institutions and a certain degree of cultural stagnation in the post-crisis recovery period. In Goldstone’s model, therefore, we may have found not only some of the causes of the Time of Troubles but also a useful framework for the study of elite consciousness and the restoration of order under the early Romanovs.

The causes and nature of the Time of Troubles are far more complex than traditionally thought. Moving beyond a narrow social interpretation will lead not only to a much better understanding of the Time of Troubles and its role in Russian history but also to a better understanding of society, culture, and the development of elite and popular consciousness in Muscovy.

*Texas A & M University*
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71 State finances were in disarray and tax revenues had declined by the end of Ivan IV’s reign. According to Skrynnikov, continued fiscal distress was one of the main reasons Boris Godunov agreed to end the St. George’s Day privilege of peasant departure in the 1590s—in an attempt to shore up a declining dvoriane who were often not paid any salary for years at a time. The famine of 1601–1603 and Boris Godunov’s efforts to alleviate the suffering of the Russian people seriously depleted the treasury. Tsar Dmitrii spent much of the rest. Some said he spent the money frivolously, but it appears that most of his expenditures were made to shore up the dvoriane. Shuiskii inherited a basically empty treasury and was in deep financial trouble when civil war broke out. See R. G. Skrynnikov, *Boris Godunov* (Gulf Breeze, Florida, 1982), 77–78, 121–22; Hellie, *Enserfment*, 37; Ruslan G. Skrynnikov, *Time of Troubles: Russia in Crisis* (Gulf Breeze, Florida, 1988), 28; idem, *Bolotnikov*, 52; Smirnov, *Vostanie Bolotnikova*, 411–15.


75 These are issues I plan to discuss in greater detail in a future article.
When Ivan IV was crowned as tsar in 1547 the surroundings were not only traditional but familiar. The tsar’s entourage moved within the confines of a highly regulated, semiotically charged space in the center of the Kremlin fortress, dominated by its three major churches, each with its own function, each a vital station in the official ceremony of royal procession (see plate 3). Along with the royal palace they served to delimit a politically and spiritually charged field within which the tsar was most closely identified with his divine purpose and the destiny of Rus'. The creation and elaboration of the Muscovite center through royal ritual recalls the general structures of rulership identified by Clifford Geertz in his study of the symbolism of power:

The very thing that the elaborate mystique of court ceremonial is supposed to conceal—that majesty is made, not born—is demonstrated by it.... This comes out as clearly as anywhere else in the ceremonial forms by which kings take symbolic possession of their realm. In particular, royal progresses... locate the society’s center and affirm its connection with transcendent things by stamping out a territory with ritual signs of dominance.¹

No less tangible a sign of royal dominance emerged after the Russian military victory over the Kazan Tatars in 1552. The symbolic space of the ruler was extended from Cathedral Square to Red Square beyond the Kremlin walls with the construction of the Church of the Intercession on the Moat, finally completed in 1561 (see plate 4). The Church of the Intercession, later called Saint Basil’s Cathedral, was erected opposite the main gate leading into the Kremlin, just south of the central marketplace overlooking the moat. The church we see today, however, was not the first to occupy this site. Rather it was the last of several different architectural projects, the end of a progression that reveals a clear change in conception at the highest levels of the Muscovite government during the 1550s. A single stone Church of the Trinity (originally wooden?) was supplemented with a wooden Church of the Intercession and six chapels, that is, a cluster of one plus seven. Later the cluster was

completely replaced with an ensemble, the current stone Church of the Intercession surrounded by eight chapels (see figure 1). The shift in emphasis from Trinity to Intercession, the addition of an extra chapel, and the architectonic change from cluster to axial ensemble have never been properly explained.

I contend that two functions of Ivan’s persona, historical victor and royal progenitor, were responsible for the formal evolution of the commemorative church on the moat outside the Kremlin walls. My analysis interprets this major cultural artifact as a direct expression of Ivan’s dominance of territorial space and patrilinear time. I will review the parallel tracks of Ivan’s struggle with Kazan’ and paternity in order to demonstrate the contribution of each to the church’s ultimate design as encoded in its individual chapels. Consideration of their number, placement, and naming marks a very real attempt at filling in the blanks.

It will be useful at the outset to review the basic structure of the Intercession. The plan of the church represents an octagonal pattern based on orthogonal and diagonal axes (figure 2). According to various chronicle accounts, the chapels were dedicated to the feastdays on which great deeds and victories occurred in the battle for Kazan’, although it is not always possible to discern this motivation in every case. The chapels directly associated with dates important for the campaign against Kazan’ are listed here in chronological order:

---

2 See Nikon Chronicle, PSRL 13, pt. 1 (St. Petersburg, 1906), 251; supplement to the Nikon Chronicle, Synod and Lebedev copies. PSRL 13, pt. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1906), 320, in which all chapels are named in axial order except the last, possibly left off the complete list from an earlier copy; thus east, west, south, north, southwest, southeast, northwest; and a manuscript of the Tale about the Holy Miracle-working Velikoretskii Icon of Saint Nicholas the Miracle-worker, which I have examined and studied in person. Vostokov dated the manuscript to the late seventeenth–early eighteenth century, based on paleography and the latest dated manuscript (1700) in a convoy concerned thematically with miracle-working icons, relics, and epiphanies. The Tale is twelfth in the MS. RGB, Rumiantsev, No. 364, written in late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century cursive, fols. 283r–286v, in quarto. The text was first published in Ivan Kuznetsov, “Eshche novye letopisnye dannye o postroenii Moskovskogo Pokrovskogo (Vasiliia Blazhennogo) sobora,” ChOIDR 1896, bk. 2, pt. 5, pp. 23–36. The eight chapels surrounding the central tower are given in axial order: east, west, north, south, northeast, southeast, southwest, northwest. All but the southern chapel are given their current names; the southern chapel is apparently without name, but destined to have one as God might wish it (ему же имя [не?]—Kuznetsov interpolation) напековався, но его же имя Богъ изволить [fol. 285r]). Later in the Tale the miracle-working Velikoretskii icon is described as the stimulus for Tsar Ivan and Metropolitan Makarii naming the chapel for Saint Nicholas Velikoretskii (fol. 285v).
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CHAPEL LAYOUT AND DEDICATION

CHURCH OF THE INTERCESSION ON THE MOAT (LATER SAINT BASIL'S CATHEDRAL)

MOSCOW, RED SQUARE, 1555-1561.

Fig. 2
The association of two chapels with the date August 30 is unusual and raises the possibility that factors other than merely calendrical are involved, especially since the victory on Arsk Field cannot be understood as carrying greater weight than the actual capture of the city on October 2, which received a single representation. Indeed, both feasts commemorated on August 30, that of the Three Patriarchs of Constantinople and of Aleksandr Svirskii, are mentioned in the description of the battle contained in the "Fragment of a Russian (Novgorod) Chronicle" (covering the years 1445–1553) from the mid-sixteenth-century Resurrection copy of the Sophia II Chronicle.\(^3\) Aleksandr Svirskii appears here not only because his feastday marks a major Russian victory, but because he is a national Russian saint, apparently canonized in 1547, the year Ivan was crowned as tsar. I return to this issue below.

None of the four remaining chapels has received a satisfactory calendrical explanation. The Entry into Jerusalem and Trinity (Chapels 6, 4) are both celebrated during the movable feasts of Palm Sunday and Pentecost, respectively. Their dates in 1552, April 10 and June 5, are irrelevant for Kazan', contra Kämpfer's unsupported assumption that the former must refer to the April planning of the attack on the Volga outpost and the latter to an as yet unknown event connected with the Kazan' campaign.\(^4\)

The feastday of Varlaam Khutynskii (Chapel 8) falls on November 6. Although some scholars have proposed this date as marking Ivan's triumphant return to Moscow,\(^5\) the chronicle accounts place the event in October, specifically on October 29, the feastday of Saint Anastasia.\(^6\)
Nicholas Velikoretskii (Chapel 9) is named in honor of the miracle-working icon of Saint Nicholas from the village of Velikoretskoe near Viatka in the Russian north, an icon that Ivan ordered brought to Moscow for renovation in 1555, three years after the taking of Kazan. The feastdays for Saint Nicholas, May 9 and December 6, are also irrelevant to the campaign.

With no direct calendrical connection to Kazan in four of the nine chapels, we are justified in searching for other more broadly thematic or ideological motives for the naming. In so doing, we look to the architectonics of naming, the placement of the specifically named chapels relative to one another, for clues. The orthogonal axes, east-west, north-south, define the most important chapels of the Intercession. Their towers are higher and their cupolas larger than those on the diagonal. Thematically, the chapels lend themselves to triadic grouping: northern (1, 2, 3), central (4, 5, 6), and southern (7, 8, 9).

Chapels 1, 2, and 3, the northern group, are all calendrical, each representing defining moments in the battle for Kazan. The diagonal northeast and northwest chapels, numbers 2 and 3, mark two victorious battles, Arsk Field and Arsk Tower; the orthogonal north chapel, number 1, celebrates the actual taking of Kazan. All are associated with non-Russian saints: Patriarchs Alexander, John, and Paul of Constantinople, Gregory of Armenia, and Saints Cyprian and Justina.

The central, dominant east-west row, Chapels 4, 5, and 6, bear an ideological-theological rather than a narrowly calendrical relationship to Kazan and the victorious tsar, and are placed in accordance with the cosmological arrangement of a macro-church: the Trinity, representative of heaven, in the position of eastern sanctuary; the Intercession, representative of earth, in the position of central nave; and the Entry into Jerusalem, representative of the kingdom to come, in the position of western narthex.

As for Chapel 4, it was the Trinity that Ivan invoked when he addressed his troops before they left for war against the accursed "sons of Hagar." Once captured, Kazan was sanctified on October 4 in the name of the Trinity, according to Ivan himself in his victory speech to Metropolitan Makarii. It is the dedication of Kazan to the Trinity rather than the precise date of October 4, the feastday of Ierothea, bishop of Athens, that takes precedence in the

---

1972), 292; Kämpfer, "Über die...Konzeption," 487.
8 The narrative of the capture in the Nikon Chronicle states that Kazan was sanctified in the name of the Life-creating Trinity, the Most Pure Mother of God, and the Miracle-working saints, but the tsar's own words are limited to the Trinity, cf. PSRL 13, pt. 1 (1904): 221, 225; pt. 2 (1906): 516, 520.
naming. Ivan's profound devotion to Saint Sergii and his Trinity Monastery is also recognized metonymically in this dedication.

Chapel 6 is dedicated to Christ's Entry into Jerusalem on Palm Sunday. As I have indicated in previous studies,9 the image of an emperor entering a city of unbelievers in triumph was an obvious one to celebrate through the Roman-based metaphors of the imperial adventus inherent in the iconography of Palm Sunday. Likewise Ivan's return to Moscow as conqueror of Kazan' projected the image of the biblical Jerusalem onto the capital itself, the New Jerusalem. From an architectonic perspective, it is the Jerusalem Chapel that is most extraordinary, standing at the spot normally reserved for the main, western entrance of an Orthodox church. As the largest of the eight surrounding chapels, the Jerusalem Chapel served as a focal point of the elaborate Muscovite Palm Sunday Ritual in which the tsar walked on foot from the Kremlin to Red Square, pulling a horse disguised as an ass at the end of a long lead, with the metropolitan seated sidesaddle in imitation of Christ at the center of a huge cross procession. By leading the metropolitan's horse on foot to the Jerusalem Chapel on Palm Sunday, Ivan recalled his own entry into Moscow on foot after his victory over Kazan'. But it is the theological-ideological interpretation of Kazan's capture that inspires the chapel dedication, not the calendrical.

The large, central chapel, surmounted by a tent tower, is dedicated to the Intercession of the Most Pure Mother of God, celebrated on October 1. Although the preparations for the final storming of Kazan and the beginning of that assault occurred on that day, the dominant dedication of the central chapel to the Intercession would seem to have implications beyond the memorialization of a single day.

The Intercession is a major holiday primarily in the Russian Orthodox Church. It commemorates the mid-tenth-century vision of the Mother of God witnessed by Saint Andrew the Fool and his disciple Epiphanius in Constantinople. Appearing at a time when the Byzantine Greeks were being besieged by the Muslim Saracens, Mary entered through the large western
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doors of the Church at Blachernai, supported by Saint John the Forerunner on one side and Saint John the Divine on the other, the precursors of the First and Second Coming of Christ. After praying fervently on her knees, she stood before the altar, raised her maphorion or veil, which shone like lightning over her head, and spread it over all standing in the church as a sign of her protective intercession. The Greeks repelled the invading Saracens. The cult of the Intercession was popularized first in the Russian northeast during the reign of Grand Prince Andrei Bogoliubskii, whose patron saint was Andrew the Fool; eventually it spread to all of Rus'. The maphorion of the Mother of God is characterized in the liturgy of the day as an aid to faithful emperors in battle and as protection for soldiers. Without diminishing the calendrical reference of the Intercession, I suggest that the symbolism of corporate protection of the Orthodox against the Muslim infidels and the specific references to the military roles of the ruler and his army inherent in this feast were in part responsible for the dominant role of the Intercession in the primary dedication of the church.

The chapels of the southern group (7, 8 and 9) are somewhat more intractable. The diagonal chapels, 7 and 8, are dedicated to Saints Aleksandr Svirskii and Varlaam Khutynskii, respectively. Both were miracle-working Russian saints from the north and were held in high esteem by the rulers of Muscovy. As mentioned above, the August 30 date of the former repeats the function of Chapel 2 whereas the November 6 date of the latter has no obvious calendrical reference. The southern orthogonal Chapel 9 is named for a specific miracle-working northern Russian icon, that of Saint Nicholas Velikoretskii. All three southern chapels thus have a specifically Russian, miracle-working orientation, a selection that leads irresistably to Metropolitan Makarii, the archbishop of Novgorod from 1526 to 1542. Makarii oversaw the Councils of 1547 and 1549 that apparently canonized some thirty national saints and actively worked to enhance their role in the history of Muscovy. A

---

10 It is worth noting that when Andrei Bogoliubskii defeated the Volga Bulgars in 1165, a war in which he lost his first son Iziaslav, he commissioned the Church of the Intercession on the River Nerl' not far from the royal compound in Bogoliubovo; see N. N. Voronin, Zodchestvo severo-vostochnoi Rus XII—XV vekov 1 (Moscow, 1961): 262–63. Official Muscovite ideology commonly linked the Bulgars and the Tatars of Kazan'; see Jarosław Pelenski, Russia and Kazan': Conquest and Imperial Ideology (1438–1560s) (The Hague-Paris, 1974), 139–73.


12 E. Golubinskii, Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh v Russkoi tserkvi, 2nd ed., rev. and exp. (Moscow, 1903), 99–101. Sources are listed on p. 99, n. 3. For a contrary view on the actuality of canonization in the early Russian Church and in the major mid-sixteenth-century councils, see
former icon painter himself, Makarii personally restored the Viatka icon of Saint Nicholas Velikoretskii. The northern Russian orientation by no means exhausts the referential functions of the southern chapels. But these can be fully appreciated only after considering the remarkable history of this complex church on the moat.

Once the streets had been cleared of corpses on October 4, Ivan entered Kazan' and planted a cross with his own hands on the site of the new cathedral church, dedicated to the Annunciation, which was constructed in a single day. Another church, of Saints Cyprian and Justina, was quickly erected to honor the saints on whose feastday, October 2, the city had been taken. Although the chronicles make explicit reference to churches built in Kazan' in honor of the Russian victory, there are no entries in 1552 and 1553 for similar construction in Moscow. Yet it seems inconceivable that a memorial church would not have been built in the capital, given the activity in Kazan' and the historical and ideological significance of the victory for state and ruler. Later entries confirm our suspicion.

After the victory of Kazan' a stone Church of the Trinity was constructed near the moat on Red Square in the building season of 1553 (late April or May through October), perhaps replacing an earlier wooden one hastily erected after the return of the Russian forces in late October–early November 1552.


14 V. L. Snegirev, *Pamiatnik arkhitektury krom Vasilii Blazhennogo* (Moscow, 1953), 22–23. The provenience is unclear for the variant reading of the *History of Kazan’* with the heading “Glava 78: O postavlenii v Kazani sobornia tserkvi i na Moskve postavlenii tsarskiia radi pobedy” [PSRL 20 (1914), 557].

15 PSRL 13, pt. 1 (1904): 251–52 <s.a. 7063/1554 (October)>, 254–255 <s.a. 7063/1555 (June)>.

16 Without tangible evidence, Buseva-Davydova has claimed that a wooden, nonvotive Church of the Trinity must have existed on the site near the moat prior to the campaign against Kazan', since Saint Basil the Blessed was buried August 2, 1552, in its graveyard: I. L. Buseva-Davydova, “Ob izmenenii oblika i nazvaniia sobora Pokrova na Rvu,” *Arkhitekturnoe nasledie Moskvy. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, ed. N. F. Gulianitskii (Moscow, 1988), 40, 49 (n2). Her sole primary source for this claim is the Mazurinskii Chronicle (last quarter 17th c.) [PSRL 31 (1968): 131], in which the entire entry for 7060 (September 1551 to August 1552) is devoted to the death of Basil, the Moscow miracleworker and fool-in-Christ. Aside from brief details of his birth, age at death, and the number of years he flourished as a fool-in-Christ, there is no specific indication of the precise date of his death or the place of burial in this text. Although there is no question of Saint Basil being buried at the site (PSRL 14, pt. 1 [1910]: 38), or of churches standing there previously (PSRL 13, pt. 1 [1904]: 252; 20, pt. 2 [1914]: 557), there is no evidence of a church dedicated to the Trinity on the site before the capture of Kazan'. Any reference in a later chronicle to the cemetery of the Church of the Trinity on the Moat is for the benefit of contemporaries but anachronistic for the interment of Basil the Fool.
In 1554, the tsar had a wooden Intercession and six other chapels built around the Trinity. In the summer of 1555, work commenced on a stone Intercession with nine tops, in other words, one church surrounded by eight others, all built on a single base, essentially the very church seen today in Red Square, save the motley, external details. The surrounding chapels were sanctified on October 1, 1559. The large central Church of the Intercession was completed and sanctified in 1561.17

It is striking that the tsar waited some two years after the defeat of Kazan' to order the erection of the Church of the Intercession on the Moat, first in wood, then in stone. What prompted this change of heart, especially since he had dedicated the taking of Kazan' to the Trinity, made frequent pilgrimages to the Trinity Monastery, and had at first ordered a stone Church of the Trinity built on the moat? The answer is not to be found solely in the taking of Kazan'. It is true that the extension of royal space from inside the Kremlin out to Red Square was in itself a symbolic expression of the spread of Muscovite political and spiritual domination over the territory of Kazan'. But symbolic extension in time was no less significant for Ivan: like his father before him, he needed a male heir to continue the royal line.

On his return from Kazan', in the vicinity of Vladimir, Ivan was met by a messenger from Moscow bearing the glad tidings that Anastasiia had borne him a son, Dmitrii.18 When Ivan had left for battle in June 1552, his wife must have been about six months pregnant. The tsar surely anticipated glad tidings on his return to Moscow.

Ivan went immediately to the Convent of the Intercession in Suzdal'—with its churches of the Intercession, the Annunciation, and the Conception of Saint Anne—to pray and give thanks. This was a highly appropriate gesture since his father Vasilii III had rebuilt the convent in 1518 to obtain the help of the Mother of God in overcoming the infertility plaguing him and his wife Solomoniia. Vasilii ultimately divorced her in 1525 and banished her to the convent in order to marry Elena Glinskaia, the future mother of Ivan IV. From the Convent of the Intercession Ivan continued on to the Trinity Monastery to

17 PSRL 13, pt. 2 (1906): 320 <s.a. October 1, 7068/1559>. In the Book of Degrees, a similar passage remarks that Metropolitan Makarii sanctified the church, built cleverly and wonderfully with various churches on a single foundation. Here the church proclaims God's miracles in the capture of Kazan' and Astrakhan' as well: PSRL 21, pt. 2 (1913): 674 <s.a. October 1, 7068/1559>. The Nikon Chronicle supplement reports that in the year 1561 the stone Church of the Intercession, and the Trinity and other chapels were completed: PSR 13, pt. 2 (1906): 334 <apparently late in the year, s.a. 7069/1561>.

18 Dmitrii Ivanovich was named in honor of the Muscovite grand prince who had himself won a great victory over the Tatars in 1380 on Kulikovo Pole; see PSRL 6 (1853): 314.
pay homage to Saint Sergii. These events take on particular importance in the *History of Kazan*, a lengthy narrative ostensibly written in 1564–1565, shortly after the completion of the Church of the Intercession on the Moat. There is disagreement on the date of the nonextant protograph—mid-sixteenth century, late sixteenth–early seventeenth century, mid-seventeenth century—but specialists assume that contemporary sources were used as the basis of the *History*, sources reflective of official government views on the events at Kazan.19 With embellishments, visions, and miracles scattered throughout the text, the *History*, highly favorable to Ivan IV, makes a point of remarking that Ivan saw the victory over Kazan and the birth of a male heir as a twofold gift from God.

A dynastic crisis ensued in March of 1553, when Ivan fell gravely ill with fever and asked his boyars to swear allegiance to his infant son. Some refused to do so at first, favoring Ivan’s adult cousin instead. The tsar forced the issue, but remained doubtful about the loyalty of the nobility. After his recovery, he took his wife and son on a pilgrimage in May to monasteries in the north and east, including the Convent of the Intercession and the Trinity Monastery.21

On the way back to Moscow, Tsarevich Dmitrii, the heir apparent, died (June 1553).22 Once again the *History of Kazan* placed emphasis on the emotional state of affairs:

---


20 [And now I rejoice with two joys. I am happy with two happinesses; I weave joy and happiness together. With both of them I send up praise to the wondrous and glorious incomprehensible and inimitable God, the one for God’s help granted in the victory, and the other for the gift to me of a young offshoot (branch). O great prelate (Saint Sergii)! Pray to Christ, the Emperor of Heaven, that he let me spend the remaining years of my life with my child in peace and humility. God has given him to me through thine prayers.] *PSRL* 19 (1903): 474–75.


22 Dmitrii was born in late September or early October 7061 (1552) and died in June 7061.
Царь же и царица зелною печалью объяти быша, понеже не имуще тог(да) ни единаго чада; прежде бо сего две тщери их, царевна Анна и царевна Мария, к Богу отидоша. Тако самодержавны царь и царица его, сугубо скорбяще приходят же в Ростов и быша у всех их тамо чудотворцов, молящися у честных раки святителя Леонтия: прилежно молишуся, со усердием, просище у Бога милости чадородия, в наследие царству своему.

After a visit to Pereiaslav', they were blessed with the news that Anastasiia had conceived once again. A son was born in March 1554. The birth of Tsarevich Ivan challenged the tragic pattern of failure in sustaining the dynasty. Within a space of three years, Ivan and Anastasiia had experienced three births and three deaths. Given Tsar Ivan's devotion to the Convent of the Intercession in Suzdal', especially its Church of the Conception of Saint Anne, he must have felt the special blessing of the Mother of God in young Ivan's birth nine months after Dmitrii's death. The new heir apparent was born March 28, three days after Annunciation Day, coincident in 1554 with Easter Sunday.

The defeat-turned-into-victory in Tsar Ivan's dynastic crisis provided a personal parallel to his historical struggle with Kazan, the city finally subdued after two unsuccessful major campaigns and viewed as a new birth of the Russian realm. It was in this building season of 1554 that the wooden Church of the Intercession and chapels were erected around the stone Church of the Trinity on the Moat, thus creating a site dominating the marketplace and dedicated to the tsar's great Christian victory and the continuation of his line, both linked to Mary's protective intercession. Once the stone Intercession and chapels were begun in June of the following year, 1555, and the


[And the tsar and tsaritsa were overcome with great sadness, since they had not even a single child then; for before this their two daughters, Tsarevna Anna and Tsarevna Maria had gone to God. Thus the autocratic tsar and his tsaritsa, both grieving deeply, went to Rostov and visited all the miracle-working saints there, praying at the venerable shrine of the prelate Leontii; and they prayed assiduously, fervently, begging God's mercy in the bearing of a child, for the continuity of their tsardom.] PSRL 19 (1903): 484–85. Cf. the corresponding passage in the Stepeniia kniga, PSRL 21, pt. 2 (1913): 651–52.

The chronology is as follows: Anna (August 10, 1549–July 20, 1550), Mariia (March 17, 1551–December 1551), Dmitrii (late September or early October 1552–June 26, 1553).


PSRL 19 (1903): 474. Il'in notes a possible connection of the Moscow Intercession and the Convent of the Intercession in Suzdal', but in the context of the birth of Dmitrii in 1552: "O naimenovanii," 291. Since the Moscow Intercession is not mentioned until the fall of 1554, the association with Dmitrii is anachronistic.
predecessors on the site were demolished, the dedication of the old stone Trinity was shifted to the eastern chapel of the main east-west orthogonal axis, thus transferring greatest honor to the Intercession.27

When the original cluster of Trinity plus seven gave way to the ensemble of Intercession plus eight, more than the simple addition of a chapel was involved. The stone Trinity surrounded by seven wooden chapels suggested in the very difference of materials a cluster of individual, disconnected architectural entities. By contrast the stone Intercession surrounded by stone chapels, all on a single base, presented itself as an architectural unity. But with that unity came a specific architectural mandate: the imposition of axes on what was now a single ensemble. Seven chapels could be built on axes around the central Intercession: four on the diagonal and three on the orthogonal axes on the north, east, and south sides, thus leaving the western pole available for the customary entrance to the central church (see figure 3a). But the theological significance of the Trinity, Intercession, and Jerusalem chapels made imperative their ordered placement—east, central, west—along the dominant orthogonal east-west axis, their current position. With three chapels thus committed, the remaining five chapels would have been distributed asymmetrically, three on one side, two on the other, clearly an unacceptable arrangement (see figure 3b). The solution, of course, was to add another chapel, for a total of eight surrounding the central Intercession (see figure 3c). The documentary account of this innovation defies credulity, but adds an element of mystery and miracle to the ultimate design of the church.

27 The site of the whole ensemble was so tied in the popular mind to the former Church of the Trinity that the new stone Intercession was called interchangeably Trinity on the Moat or Intercession on the Moat well into the eighteenth century. Kuznetsov, "Eshche novye letopisnye dannye," 31–32.
IMPOSITION OF AXES ON THE ENSEMBLE

Fig. 3a. Intercession + 7 chapels. Symmetrical plan on axis

Fig. 3b. Intercession + 7 chapels. Asymmetrical plan on axis

Fig. 3c. Intercession + 8 chapels. Symmetrical plan on axis
И потом дарова ему Бог дву мастеров руских, по реклу Постника и Барму, и быша премудрый и удобни таковому чюдному делу. И по совету святительску повеле им здати церкви каменны заветныя, 8 престолов, мастерры Божым промыслом основаша 9 престолов, не якож повелено им, но яко по Бозе разум даровася им в размерении основания.28

Given that the patron being overruled was no less a personage than the tsar himself, one suspects other forces at work. The unnamed chapel was given over to the miracle-working icon of Saint Nicholas Velikoretskii. Recent research has shown that the tsar had ample time to plan this "divinely inspired" additional chapel well in advance of the foundation of the stone Intercession.29 The tsar ordered the icon to be brought from Velikoretskoe in the north to Moscow by water routes, thus guaranteeing its passage through newly captured territory, including Kazan'. The chronicles record numerous miracles, healings, and conversions of heathen people of both sexes to Christianity. The icon was initially installed in the Kremlin’s Dormition Cathedral, then moved to Red Square, the tsar’s newly marked space, where it was placed in a temporary wooden chapel near the new stone Intercession, already reaching slightly less than a сажен—some six feet—in height. Numerous miracles were recorded in both places.30 According to the Piskarev Chronicle (compilation of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century texts):

И первое основание сам царь касается своими руками. И разсмотриша мастеры, что лишней престол обретеся, и сказаша царю. И царь и митрополит,

28 [Then God granted him (Tsar Ivan) two Russian architects, Postnik and Barma by name, and they were exceedingly wise and well suited for such a wonderful task. And on the advice of the higher clergy, he ordered them to build votive stone churches, eight chapels (altars); but through God’s direction, the architects laid the foundation for nine chapels, not as they were commanded but as their God-given reason suggested in measuring out the foundation.] Tale of the Miracle-working Icon, in Rumiantsev, 364, fols. 284-285, cited in Kuznetsov, “Eshche novye letopisnye dannye,” 25.


30 The wooden chapel was built adjacent to the stone Chapel 9 under construction in order to house a life-size copy of the miracle-working icon, which also produced miracles: PSRL, v. 13, pt. 1 (1904), 254 c.s.a. 7063/1555v; Kuznetsov, “Eshche novye letopisnye dannye,” 26. Unlike the chronicle accounts of the war with Kazan', the History of Kazan' links Saint Nicholas with the final, successful campaign. The saint appeared in a dream to a soldier of the tsar’s court during the final days of the war. The saint urged the soldier to tell the tsar to attack Kazan’ immediately, without fear, on the feastday of the Intercession. God, Saint Nicholas declared, would turn the city over to the tsar, along with the Saracens opposing him. The mention of Saracens in this case is a clear reference to the tenth-century war between the Byzantine Greeks and the Saracens associated with the original vision of the Intercession of the Mother of God at Blachernai. After Saint Nicholas appeared a second time, the now convinced soldier ran to tell Ivan and the storming of the city was begun: PSRL 19 (1903): 142.
The desire of the tsar to link the power of miracle-working Russian saints and their icons with the Church of the Intercession infuses the southern row of chapels (7, 8, 9) with a practical function distinct from the non-Russian calendrical (1, 2, 3) but with affinities to the theological-ideological (4, 5, 6). The saints' active involvement in the political, social, and spiritual life of Muscovy is recalled through direct intercession, intervention through miraculous visions, or through their thaumaturgic icons. The cathedral itself becomes a station for pilgrimage, a site of miracles.

In the case of Chapel 7, Aleksandr Svirskii is one of the national saints specifically singled out as a great miracle-worker in miracles by Metropolitan Makar ii, for example, in his third epistle to Ivan just before the final assault on Kazan. The Tale of the Icon of Saint Nicholas Velikoretskii also documents the miracle-working powers of the icon of Saint Aleksandr Svirskii, installed in Moscow's Cathedral of the Dormition.33

The dedication of Chapel 8 to Saint Varlaam Khutynskii is not apparently motivated by the saint's connection to the battle of Kazan' or by his miracle-working icons. Il'in, citing Sheredega, has proposed that a chapel dedicated to Saint Varlaam is included in the Intercession on the Moat in reference to Ivan's father, Vasilii III, who took his vows under the monastic name of Varlaam shortly before his death. But since Ivan did not dedicate a chapel here to his own patron saint, John the Forerunner, it is doubtful that he would so honor his father, whose primary connection to Kazan' was in being on the losing end of a number of engagements.

According to the Stepennaia kniga (mid-1560s), Varlaam appeared in a vision together with Saint Sergii and interceded on behalf of Vasilii III and the city of Moscow in convincing a large synod of past prelates not to abandon

---

32 [And the tsar himself lays his own hands upon the first layer of the foundation. And the architects saw that there was an extra chapel and told the tsar. And the tsar and the metropolitan and the entire royal entourage were amazed at the fact that there was an extra chapel. And the tsar permitted a chapel of (Saint) Nicholas to be there: “And God apparently wished it so; and Nicholas has grown to love this place, whereas the thought never occurred to me at all.”] PSRL 34 (1978): 189 <s.a. 7068/1559>.
33 PSRL 6 (1853): 309.
35 "O naimenovanii," 292. This ascription is repeated in Buseva-Davydova, "Ob izmenenii," 41.
the capital to the infidels. If we examine Varlaam in his role as intercessor for the Muscovite court, we can uncover the primary motivation for his inclusion.

The *Life of Varlaam Khutynskii* contains an account of the miracle of Varlaam’s prophecy of frost and snow for his return to Novgorod on the first Friday of the Apostolic Fast in the late spring. Archbishop Antonii of Novgorod was horrified at the extraordinary weather timed with Varlaam’s arrival, weather that threatened to destroy the rye crop. Not only would the snow not destroy the rye, retorted Varlaam, the harvest would be even better because the worms in the roots would die. According to legend, Antonii established a service in honor of Varlaam’s prophecy after the saint’s death and whenever Novgorod was threatened by too much rain or by drought, the archbishop would lead a cross procession to the Khutyn Monastery and invoke Varlaam’s aid for good weather. In later, expanded versions of the *Life*, the actual service was described in some detail, with the participants in the cross procession praying not only for good weather but for order in their lives, for the well-being of the whole world and for God’s churches, for the well-being of the pious and Christ-loving tsar and grand prince (insert name) and his pious and Christ-loving tsaritsa and grand princess (insert name), that the Lord God might grant them long life, health, and salvation. There were further prayers for the army and for the gift of victory against the Muslims and the Latins. After this, there was a special prayer begging God for a gift to the tsar and tsaritsa, the fruit of their loins, a noble son. With the exception of the prayer for the weather, the remainder of the material is clearly a later addition, suggesting that in the miracle of the frost and the snow Varlaam had already achieved status as a national saint, an intercessor for the whole Russian land, for the Muscovite tsar and grand prince, and all Orthodox Christians. This intercessor against drought was ultimately invoked to influence royal fertility, although the precise referent here is unknown. The Pskov I Chronicle, however, notes that when Makarii became archbishop of Novgorod in 1524 [actually 1526—MSF], he had to include a prayer in all the litanies to God,

---

35 *PSRL* 21, pt. 2 (1913): 600-602.
36 The Apostolic Fast begins as early as May 17 and extends to June 28, the eve of the feastday of the Apostles Peter and Paul.
37 According to *Slovar’ knizhnikov i knizhnosti drevnei Rusi* [hereafter SKKDR], vol. 1 (*XI–pervaia polovina XIV v.*), (Leningrad, 1987), the earliest redaction of the *Life* arose sometime between 1250 and the beginning of the fourteenth century (139-40). The so-called expanded version arose in 1526 and a second variant thereof in the mid- to second half of the sixteenth century.
the Mother of God, and the miracle-workers for Muscovite grand prince
Vasili III and his new second wife Elena Glinskaia, that God might grant
them the fruit of their loins. Ibn IV was born to them four years later. Thus,
in addition to being a national saint revered by Moscow in general, and Vasili III
in particular, Varlaam was also associated with the successful birth of a
male heir to the throne.

The double orientation of political and dynastic well-being resonates with
the two-fold inspiration of the Intercession on the Moat itself. Corroboration
of this duality in the veneration of Saint Varlaam comes in the form of the
seventeenth-century Pogodin copy (no. 602) of the Life of Varlaam, which
contains annotated variant readings. The presence of such variants
demonstrates that the compiler had access to a copy of the so-called special
(osobaia) redaction of the Life, a variant of the extended redaction that had
first arisen in the second quarter of the sixteenth century. Included in the
prayers after the miracle of the frost and the snow are the same references to
the tsar and tsaritsa. But written in above the spaces marked “insert name”
(imiariek) are Ivan Vasilievich of all Rus’ and Anastasia, unambiguously Ivan
IV and his first wife.

The original text containing the names would have been written between
1547, when Ivan and Anastasiia were married, and 1554, when young Ivan
was born. The birth of the tsarevich prior to October, 1554, when the wooden
Intercession with chapels was sanctified, must have influenced the naming of
the second of the two “national Russian” chapels in honor of Varlaam
Khutynskii. The tradition of appealing to the Mother of God and Varlaam
Khutynskii for a male heir to continue the royal line had been established long
before the war with Kazan’ was even engaged, during the reign of Vasili III
and that of his son, Ivan IV. The memorial church on the Moat provided Ivan
the opportunity to express his devotion to both for the birth of his successor in
1554.

The architectonics of the Church of the Intercession on the Moat constitute
a text as appropriate for reading and interpretation as the chronicles and other
historical documents that provide fleeting glimpses of its development in time
and space. The fact of an evolution of ecclesiastical forms and arrangements
on the moat in Red Square near the Frolov (later Savior) Gate is itself an
index of social and political evolution. The design and placement of so

---

39 Pskovskie letopisi, pt. 1, ed. A. Nasonov (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941), 103 (cited in
Dmitriev, Zhitiinye povesti, 61).
40 SKKDR 1:14041.
important and visible a commission required the attention and involvement of the highest levels of Church and State.

The rearrangement from a cluster into an ensemble was an indication of the deeper unity of external and internal triumph signified by the defeat of Kazan' and the birth of a male heir to the throne. Belying the statements that all the chapels refer to important dates and deeds in the war with Kazan', the resulting Church of the Intercession and eight surrounding chapels present a structure with broader reference and more tangible appeal. It is at once a memorial to a major Russian military victory; a celebration of the eternal truths about Christ, the Mother of God, and the kingdom to come; and a testimony to the power of national Russian saints and icons to work miracles and in so doing, guarantee the viability of the Russian royal line in the face of the millennium to come. This complex of ideas is subsumed under the protective veil of the intercession of the Mother of God.41

Our goal in this study has been to show that the ensemble that arose first as the Church of the Intercession on the Moat is highly structured and hierarchized. From the prominence of the orthogonal (versus diagonal) axes to the triadic arrangement of chapels (military in the north, intercessional-national in the south, and ideological-eschatological in the center), the layout of the church is neither haphazard nor accidental. The interaction of its parts with facts of ecclesiastical prescription, historical conquest, and royal continuity results in a text of great complexity and startling originality, one that Ivan IV in cooperation with his closest advisers was able to use in the aftermath of great personal and professional struggle to express his symbolic dominance over space and time, destiny and dynasty, in the most public venue of his capital. His architectural impulse and its attendant rituals provide significant evidence in a Russian key for Geertz' underlying thesis: majesty is indeed made, not born.
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Sailing to Byzantium: Greek Texts and the Establishment of Authority in Early Modern Muscovy

DAVID A. FRICK

"Alas! He is like some boat, small or large, on a great sea, having no sign to indicate the winds: for intending to sail directly to the East, he finds himself in the West."

(The brothers Joannikios and Sophronios Leichudes on the perils of not knowing Greek.)

In his Manna of 1688 Sil'vestr Medvedev made two arguments against the authority of Greek texts. One argument, said, in essence, that Greek texts written by Greeks were authoritative. The problem was rather that those texts most readily available in Muscovy had been “corrupted by the Germans.” That is to say, they were sixteenth- and seventeenth-century western European printings and not Greek manuscripts themselves, which were two quite different things. Medvedev’s other argument said that all Greek texts were potentially suspect, since they had been subject to corruption by Greek heretics: for “where” (he asked rhetorically) “were there such great heresies as in Greece, in the Greek language, and especially among the clergy?”

One type of questioning has often asked of such testimonies where they allow us to place the given figure in the conflict over the direction of a new, early modern Muscovite culture: was the author an Old Believer or a member of the official Church? Was he a Latinizer or a Hellenophile? In these terms, it would be reasonable to place Medvedev—who was, after all, a student of Simiaon Polatski—in the pro-Latin party of the official Church. But there

---

1 Aleksandr Prozorovskii, “Sil'vestr Medvedev. (Ego zhizn' i deiatel'nost'),” Chteniia v Imperatorskom obschestve istorii i drevnostei rossiskikh pri Moskovskom Universitete (ChOIDR) (1896), 563: “увы, яко кораблецъ нЪкШ малый или великій на великЫмъ мори есть, не имЪя знамя вЪтроуказателное, помышляя бо прямо къ востоку плыти, на западЪ обрЪтается.”


were also some inconsistencies that suggest that the question is not correctly framed.

Another line of interrogation has probed the testimonies for their genealogies—what was the original source of the arguments employed in making the case for a Western-looking or Eastern-looking culture? One common assumption is that the Latinizers drew their arguments from the West and the Hellenophiles from the East. But this approach ignores the requirements of the polemical give-and-take: a standard ploy was to make your opponents' authorities testify against them. Thus we often find “Eastern” arguments in “Western” mouths and vice versa.

In the case I have cited here we can find two different sources for the anti-Greek argument: the “Eastern” one had its origin in the writings of Maksim Grek and was frequently repeated by the Old Believers. The other, “Western” one was probably best known to Medvedev in the works of such disparate Polish biblical philologists as the radical Antitrinitarian Szymon Budny and the Jesuit Jakub Wujek.

First, the “Eastern” argument. Maksim Grek had warned Muscovite society in the sixteenth century that the Greek texts most readily available to them, the printings of the late-humanistic Latin West, were suspect. Even worse—they were the result of a conscious effort to suppress the truth. As the most fully developed version of the story had it, the Latins had plundered Byzantium of its manuscripts and carted them off to the West, where papists and heretics had printed Greek versions that supported their own errors and heresies; and then they had burned the originals. This general argument would enjoy a long and varied career. We find it in one guise in Meletij Smotryts’kyi’s ΘΡΗΝΟΣ of 1610, in another in the tracts of the Old Believers, and in yet another version in the works of Sil’vestr Medvedev.

The second, “Western” argument had a longer genealogy. Its direct origin was in the warnings of the Latin Church against graeca fides, which sought to undermine contemporary Greek authorities (and to support contemporary Latin authorities, especially the Vulgate) by claiming that, although Greek
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texts had originally been authoritative, they had later been corrupted by the many Greek heretics who had willfully altered them to reflect their own doctrinal positions. Its more distant antecedent is perhaps to be sought in the warnings of antiquity against graeculi, who were represented as gift-bearing, crafty, lying, cheating, etc.

Medvedev’s argument against graeca fides had been employed in various guises in the debates over sacred philology of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation. He probably knew it in one of its Polish incarnations. It had been introduced there by the radical Antitrinitarian Szymon Budny, who publicly declared himself cured of his former belief in the authority of the texts of Holy Scripture in the “original languages.” Budny alone of the Polish heterodox philologists argued that the Latin Vulgate was often more reliable than the Greek New Testament, because it had been well translated from as yet uncorrupted Greek sources and had been more carefully transmitted, whereas the available Greek texts were all the result of the corrupting activities of stupid, sleepy, or (especially) malicious scribes. This argument suited the Catholic side as well as it served Budny, and the Polish Jesuit Jakub Wujek gleefully cited this “Protestant” argument against all the other Protestants.

I would seek one of the direct ancestors of Medvedev’s argument against Greek texts in Budny’s formulations (whether in their original context or as cited by Wujek and his editors). Budny and Medvedev used similar formulations in warning their co-confessionalists against their tendencies to make a fetish of the Greek authority allegedly embodied in extant Greek texts. Budny had written that the Greek texts were the most corrupt “because almost all heretics were Greeks, arose in Greece, and lived there; and even if one of
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6 An authoritative modern statement of this medieval argument can be found in Roberto Bellarminie, Opera omnia, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main, 1965), 141-42. For a Polish Catholic version of this argument directed against the Orthodox, see Piotr Skarga, Na Treny y Lament Theophila Orthologa, Do Rusi Greckiego Hابjoenstwa, Przestroga (Cracow, 1610), 53. Cited in David Frick, Meletij Smotryckij (Cambridge, Mass., 1995), 199, 340.


8 Jakub Wujek, trans. Biblia to iesz Księgi Starego y Nowego Testamenty, Według Łacińskiego przekładu starego, w kościele powszechnym przyjętego, na Polski język znou z pilnością przełożone z dokładaniem textu żydowskiego y Greckiego, y z wkładem Katholickim, trudniejszych miejsc, do obrony Wiary świętyę powszechnej przeciw kacerzowom tych czasów należących (Cracow, 1599). Cited in Frick, Polish Sacred Philology, 196-97.
them happened not to be a Greek, he still used the Greek language.\textsuperscript{9}
Medvedev may also have leaned on Budny when he argued that the Muscovites should not reject testimonies correctly translated from correct Latin books.\textsuperscript{10}

And yet, Medvedev also hastened to warn against “Latin” subterfuge. In one of the passages I mentioned at the outset, he employed his two anti-Greek arguments as successive links in a chain of thought, the final message of which was actually anti-Latin: the Romans had purposefully sent a book full of errors to Moscow written in the Greek language, counting on the superstitious idolatry of Muscovites for all Greek books, manuscript or printed, since the Muscovites had forgotten that no nation had given birth to more heretics than the Greeks.\textsuperscript{11}

These genealogies make for an odd family album: on the one side we find Maksim Grek, Meletii Smotryts'kyi, the Old Believers, and Sil'vestr Medvedev; and on the facing page—Szymon Budny, Jakub Wujek, and Medvedev. But if the black sheep of the family were not enough to make us wonder whether we had posed the question correctly, we certainly ought to become a little more suspicious upon noting one further discrepancy: the two arguments Medvedev employed—as part of a single line of reasoning—were, to a great extent, mutually contradictory. The first argument—which was at its base pro-Greek—said that Greek texts were reliable up to the (relatively recent) point where they had been taken to the West and printed there by papists and (other) heretics. The second argument—anti-Greek to a considerable degree—said that Greek texts were reliable only up to the (long-past) point where Greek heretics had begun to corrupt them. One could imagine a scenario that made use of both arguments: the originals were first corrupted by Greek heretics and then by Western heretics. But Medvedev did not make this argument, and to retain some coherence he would have had to emphasize the “overkill” aspects of the reasoning: the Greeks corrupted their own manuscripts, and just to be sure the Latins went them one better. Either argument would have been sufficient for Medvedev’s purposes without adding the other. And yet he used both in this linked fashion.

The point is that Medvedev was not anti-Greek, anti-Latin, etc., for principle’s sake only, in order solely to adhere to some broadly defined worldview. Rather, he was anti-Greek, anti-Latin, etc., in order to oppose two very concrete Greeks, the brothers Joannikios and Sophronios Leichudes,

\textsuperscript{11} Prozorovskii, “Sil’vestr Medvedev,” 528.
who, together with Evfimii Chudovskii, had become his main opponents. Thus, Medvedev’s goal may not have been to oppose Greek authority per se, but to employ first anti-Greek, then anti-Latin arguments, etc.—*without regard for the coherence of the case as a whole*—in order to oppose the Leichudes and Evfimii. In the final analysis, Medvedev was willing to suggest that the Greek brothers might actually have been sent to Muscovy by Lutheran heretics, Calvinists, Roman Catholics, or even by the Turkish sultan. This was guilt by association. Medvedev represented all these groups as sources of evil, with which no real Orthodox Christian would have anything to do. His arguments were that the Leichudes were representatives of anything but Eastern spirituality, and that it was he who was the adherent of real Greek Orthodoxy. Thus, his drift was, in a way, fundamentally Greece-ward: it was an effort to co-opt Greek authority from the Leichudes, Evfimii, and the rest of the “Hellenophiles,” while arrogating that authority to himself.

I am not suggesting that Medvedev did not believe many of the things he said. I mean rather to draw attention to a central epistemological problem: to what degree did these individuals express their “real” convictions in their public and semi-private pronouncements, and to what degree did they seek through these pronouncements to achieve particular (long- or short-range) goals that may or may not have had some direct connection with the content of the pronouncements? Of course, these two possibilities were not mutually exclusive; it may often have been a question of degree. I mean simply to suggest that it may be useful to shift attention from the opinions expressed to the way repertoires of arguments were employed in particular instances. Part of an examination of Muscovite culture in this period could describe how individuals used particular arguments to achieve specific goals at certain junctures in their lives. A series of investigations at this micro-level may reveal some larger patterns of behavior in Muscovite society during the upheavals associated with its entry into early modern Europe.

The practical implication for this sort of investigation of cultural history is that it becomes less interesting (or perhaps: it is only the first step) to determine who was “pro-Greek” and who was “anti-Greek.” More important will be to determine in each instance against whom the arguments were used.

---


and to what end: that is, to establish the general rules for a rhetoric of cultural polemic and to recreate individual instances of the practical use of that rhetoric. I will not, however, make any of these micro-analyses in this paper. My aim here is rather to point out the need for, and the potential usefulness of, such studies and to provide a general guide to one aspect—the sacred-philological aspect—of the rhetorical language in which the episodes were situated.

We should not expect consistency here. It was possible to be pro-Greek and anti-Greek at the same time: anti-Greek against all Greeks who ever lived or against Greeks at only one stage of their historical development; or anti-Greek against the quite specific, flesh-and-blood Greeks who were one’s competitors on a daily basis. But one could also be anti-Greek without a Greek in sight: anti-Greek against the Protestants, against all the Orthodox Slavs, or only against the Ruthenians. There were also those (such as Siľvestr Medvedev, some Old Believers, Szymon Budny, and Jakub Wujek) who were anti-Greek in defense of “real” Greeks. Even the Greeks could be anti-Greek in furthering their own causes. This rhetoric of cultural propaganda could be employed against any of these players for a whole gamut of goals that may have ranged from the shape of a spiritual and proto-national community to the settling of a personal grudge. And most important: a whole range of arguments, opponents, and goals could exist simultaneously in the mind of any individual player, no matter how contradictory those arguments, opponents, and goals might seem to us as spectators from a distance.

The traditional questions—Latin or Greek, West or East—will not take us very far. They reflect a sort of anxiety about influences that ignores the real influence: the decision to play the game at least partially by the new Western rules. Appeal to Greek authority was in many instances a part of the rhetoric used in attempts to further goals that were not necessarily consonant with what we now consider “Greek” spirituality. In fact, that early modern, Russian version of “Greek” spirituality was defined in large measure in the course of the debates of the mid-seventeenth century, which were themselves a response—in part, and at greater and lesser removes—to the controversies of the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. Participants in the debates over this Orthodox Slavic Reform had frequent recourse to the arguments of sacred philology. In these debates, in order to defend their own positions and to attack those of their opponents, a portion of Muscovite society began to employ a philological lexicon—actually, a lexicon of philological invective—borrowed from western European discussions of sacred philology.

---

First, a brief survey of terms and concepts. The term *book* (книга) was used to refer to texts that were either *manuscript* (письменный, рукописный, рукописсменный) or *printed* (печатный). Texts—whether printed or manuscript—were divided into those that were reliable and could command authority and those that were unreliable and could not command authority. Those of the first group were described as right (правый), righteous (праведный), honorable (честный), trustworthy (достоверный), holy (святый), pure (непорочный), correct (справный), or genuine (подлинный). Reliable texts were worthy of honor (честь) or faith (вера). They were characterized by purity (чистота).

The lexicon describing the second, unreliable group of texts was just as highly developed, if not more so. These texts were the result of acts of *corruption* (растлъти, попорчити, непорочити, испортити), distortion (изказити), damage (поврідити), depravation (развратити, превратити), destruction (истребити). They were discordant.
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(раздорный), un-right (неправый), limping (хромый), forsaken (покинутый), non-holy (несвятый), or un-honorable (нечестный).

The act of judging whether or not a text was reliable could itself be evaluated positively or negatively. Neutral terms for the act of textual criticism were to judge (разсуждати), examine (разсматривать), or investigate (испытати). Negatively colored terms were to revile (хулить) or to defile (гадить). The quality of a reading was determined on the basis of whether or not it was in agreement (несогласный, несходится, разгласный) with the "genuine text" (leaving aside for the moment the definition of that last term).

Variance (несходство, несогласие) from the original could be the result of the act of adding to (прибавлять, прикладывать, приносить), deleting from (отнимать), or altering (изменивать) the uncorrupted reading. Errors (погрешение, ошибка, опечатка) might be inadvertent, arising from the carelessness (невнимание), the incompetence (неискусство, неискусный), the ignorance (неизвестие), or the simplicity (простота) of...
the translators, copyists, and typesetters. But they could also be the result of the craftiness (хитрость) of willful falsifiers of the texts.

Errors were to be corrected (исправи, справи, прави, переправи) by skilled (искусный) men. Corrections were to be made by comparing unreliable texts with reliable ones and bringing the former into line with the latter. One spoke of correcting text α against text β (исправи α против β).

Most participants in the debates accorded authority to some original Greek reading, which may or may not have been extant in available Greek texts. Most tacitly assumed that Slavonic texts had once been entirely in agreement with the Greek original. This stance allowed some to ignore Greek altogether. Some admitted the possibility that the Slavonic texts had contained errors from the start. A very few—and only at the turn of the eighteenth century—defended the usefulness of Latin and Polish texts.

Arguments for according authority to texts were based on age: old texts (старый, древний, ветхий) were good; new (новый) texts were bad. Arguments were also based on quantity. Numbers of manuscript witnesses in the hundreds and up to a thousand were marshalled to lend authority to particular readings and revisions. The higher the number, the greater the authority. Opposotions were made between texts that were old-manuscript (старописанный, древлеписанный) and those that were newly-printed (новопечатный) or newly-edited (новоизданный). Old Believers spoke
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respectfully of old printed books (печатных старых книг). A manuscript gained authority with the specificity of its medium: manuscripts were described as written on parchment (на хартіях, харатейний) or on paper (на бумагі). Those written on parchment were considered the older and thus the more authoritative. Texts could also gain authority through their use (употребляти) by people holding offices of authority. The opposite case was represented by texts described as unattested (безсвидітельствованний).

Lurking almost below the surface of this philologically couched debate were the Bible translations of the Polish Reformation and Counter-Reformation that most participants either refused to acknowledge publicly or (later in the debates) made into the negative point of departure for their defense of Orthodoxy. Most members of the official Church and some of the Old Believers who took part in the debates of the second half of the sixteenth century seem to have drawn concepts, terminology, and rhetorical strategies from the discussions over sacred philology that had taken place in the West, and most immediately in Poland in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Let us begin with the textual-philological component of the Nikonian program. Nikon’s reform was described at the outset (and in all likelihood by the Kievian scholar Epifani Slavynets’kyi) as having arisen when Nikon “applied himself to the labor of examining Holy Writ” and discovered there “additions, deletions, and alterations.” This was a traditional formula in western European discussions of sacred philology in the Age of Reform. The participants used it whenever they wished to deny absolute authority to any particular set of extant texts (usually all the texts in a given language) and to
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establish their right to perform textual criticism upon them. Slavynetskyi was not very clear on the question of the authority according to which the “additions, deletions, and alterations” were to be judged. He motivated the correction in these terms. The group of books that were suspect were the “newly introduced Church rules,” “the new Muscovite printed books”; and they were suspect because they contained “many variances, and disagreements, or to speak plainly—errors” when they were compared with the group of texts that Slavynetskyi sought to establish as the main authority: “the old Greek and Slavonic books.” The errors were the result of bad philology: they were made by those who “translated and copied them unskillfully.” Therefore, good philology could undo the harm.

Nikon soon initiated a wide search for Greek and Slavonic manuscripts that reached beyond Muscovy to Mt. Athos, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. An examination of the assembled old Greek and Slavonic manuscripts revealed that the Slavonic were “in every way” in agreement with the Greek and that together they “did not contain one error.” This reasoning was, of course, bogus, and the philology was bad. Obviously, not all Slavonic books were error-free, since many (it was admitted) had been deprived of their reliability by careless translators (in other words, from the very beginning) or by careless scribes (that is to say, somewhat later in their transmission). Thus, what Nikon’s party said here was, in effect, that they had taken all those Slavonic manuscripts that were in agreement with Greek texts, and, after comparing the two groups, they had discovered that the Slavonic manuscripts that were in agreement with the Greek were indeed in agreement with them.

The Nikonian reform movement and its successors employed a set of qualifiers that could be used to establish the authority of (or, rather, confer authority upon) a particular set of texts. For the Nikonians, old texts were more authoritative than new. The antiquity of texts was “established” by calling them “old,” written on vellum or on parchment, or by giving them a date. Nikon’s manuscripts were “five hundred, seven hundred, and even a thousand years” old. Further, authority could be derived from the number of testimonies. Nikon’s manuscripts were “five hundred, seven hundred, and even a thousand years” old. Further, authority could be derived from the number of testimonies. Nikon’s correction drew on “no fewer than five hundred old manuscripts.”
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The weaknesses in a philological argument based upon testimonies that had been dated and counted, but never weighed, were obvious to Nikon’s critics on all sides. Individual Old Believers were no more philologically naive than the elite of the official Church, and no less willing to use a philological lexicon in support of their position. The Nikonian program, according to some of the Old Believers, was flawed not in its principle but in its practice: Nikon had used as his authority not the old Greek manuscripts (which, presumably in this argument, would have supported the Old Believer positions) but the new Western printings, so full of errors and heresies. According to Lazar, the newly “corrected” editions of the Church books were “various, unholy, dishonorable, and incorrect because they disagreed in many things with the old holy printed books.” These “old, holy printed books” were not, of course, so very old. But they were “holy” because they were in agreement with some older “original,” whether Slavonic or Greek.

The rhetoric of textual criticism was also employed in internecine debates among Old Believers. In a discussion portrayed as having been conducted with Avvakum in their shared incarceration, Deacon Fedor pointed out the philological weaknesses in the argument of his fellow prisoner. Avvakum praised his copy of the Psalter as “more correct than all others,” while Fedor sought to convince his companion that it contained a scribal error. According to Fedor, the two argued this point for some time until Avvakum finally retorted ad hominem: “you criticize old books and order me to correct [mine], but I have been tortured for their sake by the Nikonians much longer than you.”

This exchange led Fedor to attribute to Avvakum a (philologically) naive belief in the absolute, literal authority of the old books. While Fedor preferred the old printed books to Nikon’s editions, he noted:

It is not to be wondered if there happen to be and are some sort of scribal errors in the old books; and thus it is proper that they are judged and then corrected by trained men. For a scribal error is one thing, but the distortion and alteration of Church books and dogmas is another.

Like Western European sacred philologists of the Age of Reform (especially of the Catholic camp), Fedor distinguished between two types of errors: the scribal errors that were found in one’s own texts (and were not
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harmful to true doctrine and were easy to correct) and the "distortions and alterations of Church books and dogmas" that characterized the behavior of the opponents (in this case, the official Church). Compare, for example, Jakub Wujek’s response to the Protestant textual-critical challenge:

For such was always the virtue and humility of Catholic people, that they preferred to suffer certain mistakes or variant readings in the holy books, rather than correct them according to their conjecture (as the heretics boldly do) or alter even the smallest letter of Holy Scripture. For no one has this power except either a council, that is, a synod or a general congregation of Catholic bishops, or the highest pastor, after Christ the Lord, of the Universal Church, who, having examined and considered these passages with learned men, can conclude which of these variant readings is genuine and which has been interpolated.

Although Fedor did not specify how these scribal errors were to be "judged and corrected," his philological argument (structurally similar to that of the Catholics) was no more naive than that of Nikon’s party (which had been borrowed from the Protestants); it is even somehow refreshing in its modesty compared to the claims of the dominant party that all old Greek and Slavonic manuscripts were both in complete agreement and absolutely error-free.

The next "generation" of participants in the debates—Sil’vestr Medvedev, the Leichudes, Evfimii Chudovskii, Gavrill Dometskii—sought to draw the lines more precisely between "Hellenophiles" and "Latinizers." In so doing, they drew more subtly and more precisely upon Western, Polish-based terminology and rhetorical strategies. The debate between Evfimii and Dometskii, to take one example, reads very much like two competing Orthodox Slavic glosses on the lengthy Apparatus Sacer that prefaced the authoritative Wujek Bible of 1599. In this by-now standard Polish Catholic reference work all participants could find examples of strategies for appeal to the authority of textual philology as well as to the authority of use for the defense (or criticism) of both the Vulgate and the Septuagint.

Muscovite polemicists of the turn of the century drew heavily on Latin authorities to prove that it was Greek that lay at the foundation of all learning. The author of the so-called "Brief Proof That Helleno-Greek Learning and Language are Most Needfully Useful, More Than the Latin Language and Learning; and in What Way It Benefits the Slavonic Nation" enlisted St. Augustine and Cardinal Cesare Baronio (author of the authoritative Counter-Reformation history of the Church) to prove the inspired nature of the

---

10 Wujek, Nowy Testament, 4, cited in Frick, Polish Sacred Philology, 144.
11 For discussions and some of the primary sources from this polemic, see Smentsovskii, Brat’ia Likhudy, 396-408 and the appendices.
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Septuagint. In good late humanistic style, he made Quintilian, Gellius, Horace, Cicero, and Lucretius confess the Greek basis of their arts. He cited Antonio Possevino’s account of his meeting with a Japanese traveler who is supposed to have claimed that Greek was the tourist’s passport to the world.102

When Paisios Ligarides spoke of the greater “purity of the source than of the rivulet,” he was employing a Protestant polemical ploy often anchored on St. Jerome, which opposed pure Greek (and Hebrew) originals to corrupt Latin translations.103 When Evfimii defended the Septuagint on the basis of its long history of use in the Church he was echoing the Council of Trent and the large body of polemical literature that had grown out of it, which had declared the Vulgate authoritative for faith and morals on precisely those socio-linguistic grounds.104 And anti-Greek arguments presented similar cases. When Old Believers and Silvestr Medvedev criticized the extant Greek texts on philological grounds, they were adapting a line of reasoning that Szymon Budny and Jakub Wujek had employed to meet their mainstream Protestant opponents on their own terms. What all these Hellenizing polemicists failed to acknowledge—or (in a few cases) perhaps even to realize—was that even the pro-Greek arguments and strategies they had come to employ in their culture wars were themselves the “spiritual property” of the Latin West.

Analogies have been drawn between Nikon’s theocratic program and the Counter-Reformation Catholic Church, on the one hand, and the personal piety of the Old Believers and the Protestant Reformation on the other.105 This may make some sense if we are thinking in terms of essences and ideal types. But if we are interested in the rhetorical give-and-take of the polemic, the process whereby the various opposed parties entered into a process of mutual forming and deforming, we should note that both the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation represented to the Muscovites static sources of arguments and strategies, the original, contextual significance of which may have been only murkyly perceived, but which—both the Catholic and Protestant—could be adapted to the “Orthodox” needs of the moment by all
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parties. In positioning themselves in opposition to each other, Nikonites could draw on Protestant strategies for replacing received "vulgates" with "original languages," whereas the Old Believers could draw on those of the Council of Trent for acknowledging the authority of use. But in positioning himself in opposition to "Latinizers," Evfimii Chudovskii could employ the same Counter-Reformation argument from use in defense of the Greek "vulgate."

A few more examples. Simiaon Polatski enlisted the Trinitarian proof text found at 1 Jn. 5.7 ("For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one") in support of Nikon’s "restored" triple alleluia. At the other end of the Muscovite confessional spectrum, the Solovki monks complained of the omission of the same passage in some of the new Nikonian texts. Neither side betrayed an awareness that the passage—the so-called comma Johanneum—had become a cause célèbre thanks to Erasmus’ Greek-inspired criticism of the Vulgate. Nor do they seem to have been aware that it was, at least at first, Erasmus’ Greek philology that had argued against the passage’s authenticity.

Protestants were the people of the book (sola scriptura); Catholics adhered to Scripture and to unwritten traditions. On what was Orthodox spirituality based? On the one hand, Sil’vestr Medvedev argued that one should not "respect one’s own traditions more than the traditions of Jesus Christ." He based his account "on Holy Scripture alone" and not on "deceitful novelties invented by men" (cf. the "Catholic superstitions," so defined by the

---

89 Polatskii, Zhezl pravleniia, 45r.
90 Subbotin, Materialy 4:264.
Protestant camp, of course), and he warned against “introducing human traditions” into God’s law. Nikon claimed that he did not judge “by anything other than the Gospel.” Avvakum fulminated against Nikon’s “newly introduced traditions,” his alterations “according to his own opinions”; and he claimed to rule Christian life “according to Holy Scripture alone.”

All of this was taken from the Protestant handbook on the rhetoric of sacred philology.

But, on the other hand, many of these same figures—sometimes in the same breath—also made room in good Tridentine style for the so-called traditions, written and unwritten. Citing Epifanii Slavynets’kyi, Evfimii warned against “adding one’s own words,” but he also warned against “transgressing the tradition of the God-bearing Fathers.” The Leichudes paired “corruption of Scripture” with “confusion of tradition.” Nikon, who had offered an Orthodox version of sola scriptura, went on to declare that he judged “according to the rules of the Holy Apostles and the Holy Fathers.”

Polatski based his argument on “unwritten traditions.” Lazar pressed into Old Believer service the Protestant proof text at Jn. 5:39 (“search the Scriptures”), as well as the Catholic one at 1 Jn. 4:1 (“believe not every spirit”). The Solovki monks—echoing the Fourth Session of the Council of Trent—urged the faithful “to hold firmly to tradition, written and unwritten.”

Just beneath the surface of this confessional-cultural polemic were the seeds of relativism. Old Believers pointed out that all heretics—Romans, Armenians, Germans, Uniates—called their apostasy “a most clear correction.” Lazar and the Solovki monks, employing a sort of feigned

112 Ibid., 484.
111 Ibid., 1:145.
110 Ibid., 8:150, 143-44, 265.
114 Ibid. 8:150, 143-44, 265.
118 The decree of the fourth session of the Council of Trent (8 April 1546) states: “The holy, ecumenical, and general Council of Trent, also clearly perceiving that these truths and rules are contained in the written books and in the unwritten traditions, ... receives and venerates with an equal feeling of piety and reverence... all the books of both the Old and the New Testaments... as well as the traditions themselves” (emphasis added). Concilium Tridentinum, 91.
119 Ibid., 559.
116 Ibid. 6:177.
lapsus linguae, said of their opponents: “They corrected, that is to say, corrupted ...”

Even here, in both of these instances, the Old Believers were again echoing polemical strategies employed by the Polish Jesuit Jakub Wujek—to choose one authoritative example—in answering Protestant claims. Like their Western counterparts, Muscovite polemicists employed the rhetoric of philology in a struggle for dominance in a context where the confessional was not clearly separated from the cultural and the political. Greeks attempted to make full knowledge of Greek the minimum requirement for entry into the discussions. According to the Leichudes, whoever did not know Greek did not know Latin or Slavonic either. They commanded: “whoever is ignorant of the Greek dialect, let him be silent.” Muscovites from both ends of the spectrum attempted the patriotic card in undermining this argument: Medvedev waxed indignant—“they taunt us with ‘stupid Rus’.” Avvakum waxed proud—“I am a Russian and not a Greek.” Medvedev counter-charged that the Leichudes knew no Slavonic. In this vein, what was originally Catholic, anti-Greek propaganda could now be made “Orthodox.” Medvedev was certainly not the first to announce that “the Cretans are always liars” (not to mention “evil beasts and slow bellies”—the classic anti-Greek proof text at Titus 1:12, which cited the Cretan poet Epimenides); nor were the Solovki monks the first to come to the conclusion that the Greeks had been corrupted by living under Turkish domination.

We should note here that Medvedev was essentially correct: these Greeks were more than part Latin. Although born Greek, the “Greekness” they made into the first item on their dossiers was in many cases the result of their studies in the academies of the Latin West. The tools of their trade had been provided by Erasmus and his students, as well as by the Greek and polyglot editions of sacred texts published in the Latin West of late humanism.
A sort of graded scale from greater to lesser similarity in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century “national” discussions over sacred philology can be drawn from West to East. A first real boundary occurs between Poland and Ukraine Rus’, but a much more definite line can be drawn between Muscovy and the “West” (here including both Poland and Ukraine Rus’). Four main points of comparison come to mind. First, Western debates were conducted largely in print and often in the vernacular; Muscovite debates left their traces almost exclusively in manuscript form and in a more learned language. Thus, Western debates had resonances beyond the narrowest elite (although there is no reason for us to exaggerate in this direction), whereas the Muscovite discussions remained an affair of an extremely circumscribed group (and we should not exclude the leaders of the Old Believers from a sort of elite status).

Second, although we can identify similar concepts and a core of terminology equivalent to that of the Western debates over sacred philology, Muscovite terminology and usage were less well fixed. This terminological fluidity may reflect a less complete assimilation of concepts. Third, the earlier Western debates seem to have been at least partially about questions of textual criticism. In Muscovy, this seems to have been much less the case. Although much work in the correcting and editing of texts was going on behind the scenes in the second half of the seventeenth century, most of the overt discussions of sacred philology seem to have been ancillary to the establishment of authority on a variety of spiritual and political questions.

Fourth, and most crucial—the West had long ago brought the Greeks “under control.” Both sides—Catholic and Protestant—had assimilated what they could use of Greek learning. What they could not use they had either co-opted or removed from the discussion. This is to say, Latins now spoke for the Greeks. The Slavic East had not yet brought the Greeks under control. It was easier for a Muscovite to deny Greek authority than to attempt to exploit it.
What could the terms “Latinizer” or “Hellenophile” have meant in this context? To what extent were Latin and Greek Orthodox cultures well-defined entities to which the participants in the Muscovite debates could give their allegiance and according to which they could shape and represent themselves? Certainly the various confessionally informed versions of Latin culture were, by the end of the sixteenth century, characterized by the high degree of their codification. When a Muscovite cultural figure of the mid-seventeenth century spoke in positive or negative terms of Latin culture, he could have had a reasonably clear picture of what he was invoking, and we could have some hope of reconstructing this culture. This does not mean, however, that the given Muscovite always did have such a clear picture of the Latin West or that he made use of it in his public pronouncements. Murky conceptions about the “Latins” or “Germans” (often undifferentiated between Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, Anabaptists, and Antitrinitarians) served in the public debate as a sort of body. But this same individual Muscovite could have had no such precisely defined idea of what constituted Greek Orthodox culture. Positive statements made by adherents of Eastern spirituality about Greek faith and culture in the seventeenth century were frequently ad hoc responses to a variety of external and internal challenges. There was no one who spoke with authority for Greek faith and culture. Those who made the attempt had agreed, by and large, to play the game by the Western rules. They had agreed to provide “Orthodox” answers to questions that Greek Orthodoxy had either never asked itself or had not asked itself with the same sense of urgency.

“Heresy [it has been said] ... is an opinion held by a minority of men which the majority declares unacceptable and is powerful enough to punish.” The history of orthodoxy and heresy is always written secure in the knowledge that hindsight is able to provide concerning who would eventually be able to impose which views as “mainstream.” The second half of the seventeenth century was a period of great fluidity before such clarity was achieved. Many of the terms we now consider well defined were, in this period, the object of debate and open to redefinition. There was a great discrepancy between, on the one hand, programs that manipulated terms such as “Greek spirituality” in order to lend authority to their arguments and, on the other hand, the practical state of affairs in which no one—not even the dominant parties that would eventually control “Orthodoxy”—quite knew the precise meaning of the terms. In short, the voyage to Byzantium was a matter of imagination and will. It required the strategic negotiation of Latin waters and, frequently, the
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willingness to recreate the tradition-hallowed spiritual manna of the East from the strange and the not-so-strange ingredients encountered in the ports of the West.

University of California, Berkeley
History and Hagiography:
Recent Studies on the Text and Textual Tradition of the *Vita Constantini*

HARVEY GOLDBLATT

Long after A. V. Gorski first acquainted the scholarly community with a detailed analysis and summary of the *Vita Constantini* (hereafter VC) in 1843, and P. J. Šaňařík published the *editio princeps* eight years later, specialists continued to cast doubt on the "trustworthiness" of the work as a historical source. For most scholars, however, it was Francis Dvornik—in his celebrated book on the *vitae* of Constantine-Cyril and Methodius published in 1933—who, as Ihor Sevcenko has put it, "once and forever" established the reliability of the work as a principal source for the mission by fitting it into the framework of European history in the ninth century.

The "reliability" of VC was seemingly confirmed two decades later with the publication in 1955 of a study by Fathers Paul Mayvaert and Paul Devos.
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2. P. J. Šaňařík, Památky dřevního písemnictví Jihočeskoslovanů (Prague, 1851), 1–32.

3. See in particular V. I. Lamanškij, "Slavjanskoe žizne Kirilla kak religioznopoklonskoe proizvedenie i kak istoričeskij istoričnik. Kritičeskie zamenki," *Zurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvečenija* 346 (1903): 345–85; 347 (1903): 136–61, 350–88. According to Ihor Ševčenko ("The Greek Source of the Inscription on Solomon’s Chalice in the *Vita Constantini*, in *Byzantium and the Slavs*, 289), "when Lamanškij impugned the vita’s credibility and claimed that it was riddled with interpolations, he did this to eliminate from it evidence unfavorable to his theory that Constantine’s Khazar mission was in reality a mission to the ‘Russians’.


6. P. Meyvaert and P. Devos, "Trois énigmes cyrillo-méthodiennes de la ‘Légende Italique’ résolues grâce à un document inédit," *Analecta Bollandiana* 73 (1955): 375–471, esp. 433–54. For many scholars, the dating of VC is based on the relationship between the *vita* and the so-called *Legenda Italica*, a work attributed to Gauderich, Bishop of Velletri, and dedicated to Pope John VIII, who died on 15 December 882. According to Fathers Meyvaert and Devos,
in which many foremost scholars found proof that a Slavic vita of Constantine “had been in existence by 882 (that is, before Methodius’ death).” By 1970, in a volume that summarized and updated his seminal contributions to Cyrillo-Methodian studies, Dvornik could declare that the “authenticity [of VC] has been definitely established” and that the “genuineness [of VC], disputed since the time of [its] discovery, is now accepted by all specialists.”

It goes without saying that emphasis on the “reliability” of VC as a historical source does not mean we should ignore the implications of dealing with a hagiographic composition for which the principle of conventionality and the extensive use of what classical rhetoric called the ornatus (κόσμος) are pervasive characteristics. In fact, one might even assert that it is precisely the high degree of formalization and “embellishment” (or “cosmetics”) inherent in the texture of VC which makes it possible for us to treat the work as a product of verbal art. Relying on a long line of authoritative specialists, including Miloš Weingart, Tadeusz Lehr Śpławiński, and Vladimir Vavřínek, recent scholarship has concluded that VC must be examined not only as a source of factual information but also as a hagiographic construct governed by a set of literary models and patterns. Implicit here is the notion that medieval Slavic evidence for the year 882 as the terminus ante quern is provided by a fourteenth-century manuscript that contains the history of St. Clement compiled by Leo Marcianus, Bishop of Ostia (d. 1115), the third part of which is identical with Gauderich’s Legenda italica. In the above-mentioned manuscript, Mayvaert and Devos discovered a hitherto-unknown prologue to the third part of Bishop Leo’s history, which indicated that the author had partially drawn his information from a work written “in Slavic letters” (“sicut partim ex Sclavorum litteris...” [p. 433]). In their opinion, this must be a reference to the source used by Gauderich, which is none other than the Slavic vita of Constantine-Cyril. Hence, if one assumes that the Sclavorum litterae correspond to the text of VC which has come down to us, VC could not have been written later than 882, the year in which Pope John VIII died. Cf. the conclusions drawn by B. N. Florja (Skazanija o načale slavjanskoj pis’mennosti [Moscow, 1981], 10), who posits an even earlier terminus ante quern (i.e., 880).

7 Ševčenko, “Three Paradoxes,” 220.
8 F. Dvornik, Byzantine Missions Among the Slavs. SS. Constantine-Cyril and Methodius (New Brunswick, 1970), 53, 338.
works such as VC can be examined in various ways and from perspectives that, even if different, need not be mutually exclusive. Whereas the historian might be interested primarily in the contents of VC, the literary specialist would focus, above all, on what D. S. Lixačev has called the “artistic peculiarities” of the work and their relation to the set of norms and rules that governed the “literary system” of medieval Slavic literature.\(^{12}\)

Yet what is essential to remember for historians and literary scholars alike is that any serious investigation of medieval Slavic works such as VC must be grounded in the application of a precise philological method that aims to determine the “textual identity” of the work, that is, to identify exactly what we are reading. Unfortunately, many studies continue to focus scant attention on the very notion of “text” and demonstrate little concern for the “material artifacts” of medieval Slavic literature, which is a “manuscript culture per se.”\(^{14}\) In particular, they frequently minimize or even ignore the crucial importance of textual criticism for literary analysis.

It should be obvious, therefore, that a scholarly examination of VC can proceed only after carefully considering the peculiar conditions that conditioned the process of textual transmission among the Orthodox Slavs, where a scribe often performed the role not merely of a “faithful” and “passive” copyist but of a “reviser-coauthor” and “active participant” in the creation of a literary tradition.\(^{15}\) No authorial tradition (traditio auctoris) of VC exists which would permit us to conclude that the approximately sixty extant witnesses of the vita known to date,\(^{16}\) the oldest of which goes back to
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\(^{11}\) D. S. Lixačev, *Prolitka drevnerusskoj literatury* (Leningrad, 1967), 5.

\(^{12}\) On the notion of “literary system” and its application to Orthodox Slavic literature, see R. Picchio, “Slavia ortodossa e Slavia romana,” in *Letteratura della Slavia ortodossa (IX-XVII sec.*)* (Bari, 1991), 8–14.


\(^{16}\) In his “inventory of complete testimonies of VC” Mario Capaldo (“Sulla Vita Constantini. Questioni minori di metodo, di esegesi, di critical testuale,” *Europa Orientalis* 11 [1992]: 341–48) has listed fifty-seven manuscripts whose existence has been confirmed, six testimonies for which we have information but whose existence has not been confirmed, and seven eighteenth-century apographs of known manuscripts. Cf. a recent study by Giorgio Ziffer (“La tradizione russa sud-occidentale della Vita Constantini,” in *Studi slavistici offerti a Alessandro Ivanov nel suo 70. anniversario*, ed. M. L. Ferrazzi [Udine, 1992], 372), where
no earlier than the middle of the fifteenth century, were not affected by the scriptorial activities of an “open tradition” that maximized the possibility for an alleged “original text” to be reshaped at different times in accordance with new needs. It must be stressed that what interests us, in this regard, is not the work, that is, a determinate composition dedicated to Constantine which might have been subject to many types of formal or conceptual revision, but rather the texts, that is, those sets of words and phrases that, if altered beyond certain limits, cease to be what they once were. To put it somewhat differently, “the literary tradition of Orthodox Slavdom is not made up of ‘changing’ texts, but of works (i.e., of literary compositions) which may have preserved their thematic and structural individuality in spite of more or less substantial textual alterations.”

While no one would deny the value of Dvornik’s contribution to Cyrillo-Methodian studies by fitting VC into the framework of ninth-century medieval Christendom, one might wonder whether emphasis on the vita as a “historical source of first-class importance” has always had a positive impact on inquiries into the textual history of the vita. At issue here is not so much that our testimonies are young as the fact that the extant textual documentation does not allow us to determine to what extent the scriptorial activities of an “open tradition” may have preserved or deviated from an alleged earlier phase. Indeed, it may well be inappropriate to refer to an “original text” on which the entire textual documentation of VC is based. One can hardly ask when VC was written if one cannot presume that all components of the work have been “copied” at all stages in the transmission with the aim of preserving them intact. As Riccardo Picchio has noted, “formally, it seems that the common textual material handed down by testimonies of a different nature should be considered part of a textus traditus. However, the mere presence of this ‘preserved textual material’ would not allow us to accept unconditionally as a textus traditus the contextual unit which contains this very material.”

it has been suggested that fifty-eight manuscripts preserve the text of VC. In his “inventory” Capaldo further has noted that nineteen testimonies of VC have been published in full, seventeen witnesses are known through the incomplete (and at times contradictory) variant information presented in the critical apparatus to the editions published by Lavrov, Grivec-Tomšić, and Angelov-Kodov, and the remaining twenty-one manuscripts are known only by their shelf number (pp. 341–42).


I certainly do not seek to discount the possibility that parts of VC go back to the so-called “period of Old Church Slavic.” However, as I indicated in an earlier study, “one should not deduce as a logical result that all the textual material of VC is of the same age or that an “original vita,” allegedly compiled in Slavic before 882, was transmitted faithfully in the late codices known to us.” Thus, while it may not be inappropriate to assume that the textual history of VC begins in the ninth century, how can we be certain that external evidence—such as the prologue to the third part of the history of St. Clement compiled by Leo Marcianus, Bishop of Ostia, which allegedly points to an early dating for VC, and the “discourse” (slovo) by a “certain monk” at the beginning of the Izbornik of 1076, in which it is suggested to the readers of the miscellany that they “should listen [not only] to the Lives of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom but also the [Life] of St. Cyril the Philosopher” refers to the text of VC that has come down to us. Indeed, given the possibility of an open textual tradition, it is essential to seek out evidence that might suggest the extant textual documentation is the product of reelaboration in different periods and diverse situations. If such evidence can

---


21 For most scholars, a reference in the prologue to the use of a work written “in Slavic letters” (“ex Sclavorum litteris”) demonstrates that the so-called Legenda italica, a work written no later than 882, must have used the Slavic vita of Constantine-Cyril as a source (see note 6, above). Yet even if one were to reach the conclusion that the above-mentioned work written in “Slavic letters” should be identified with VC, one would still have to explain the significant textual discrepancies between the extant testimonies of VC and the Legenda italica (see Florja, Skazanija o nacale slavjankoj pis’mennosti, 10–11). In other words, on the basis of external data, one might trace the possible origins of the history of the work known as VC back to the ninth century but not the history of the text.

be found, there will be no justification for assuming that an analysis of an individual textual portion may be generalized to include the entire text. Nor will the conclusions drawn about a particular text be necessarily valid for the entire corpus of texts associated with VC. Such evidence might cast doubt on the "integrity" of the text and lead us to conclude that VC, as it has come down to us, is the result of a compilatory scheme that might be considerably younger than the ninth century. In this regard, the "interpolationist" thesis could hardly be accepted if the textual documentation of VC were obscure and it would prove difficult to determine the precise circumstances in which the textual material of VC was transmitted prior to the fifteenth century. This would be especially true if it could be shown that other textual traditions are reflected in the extant documentation of VC.

A majority of scholars, including those who accept the "interpolationist" thesis, continues to speak of an early dating of VC and thereby proceeds from the assumption that a "complete text" first spread in the Balkan Slavic area and later migrated to East-Slavic territory. However, even if liturgical compositions offer indirect proof of the early circulation of some textual material from VC in the South-Slavic lands, for certain portions of VC there may be insufficient evidence to place any part of their textual history outside the East-Slavic area. 23

Taking as a point of departure Natalino Radovich's meticulous study of the Glagolitic pericopes from VC, 24 Picchio asserted a decade ago that "the formal bipartition of the manuscript documentation of VC into two branches, East-Slavic and South-Slavic, does not imply by necessity any parallel development of these two traditions nor does it prove anything as to their origins." He even hypothesized that "the 'South-Slavic' tradition of VC may be a filiation of the East-Slavic one." 25 More recently, Giorgio Ziffer has concluded, on the basis of his careful examination of approximately sixty textual witnesses of VC, that it is wrong to posit the existence of a South-Slavic redaction in contradistinction to an East-Slavic branch. 26 In reality, the South-Slavic group derives from an East-Slavic branch of the tradition of VC. In an earlier period, according to Ziffer, after its migration to East-Slavic territory, the text of VC must have disappeared among the Balkan Slavs.

23 See note 3, above.
24 See in this regard Picchio, "Chapter XIII of Vita Constantini," 142.
26 Picchio, "Chapter XIII of Vita Constantini," 142.
27 Ibid.
Consequently, in his view, all extant South-Slavic codices go back not to an ancient stage in the tradition of the work, but to a later period closely connected with the East-Slavic area.

II

Recent studies on the “textual integrity” of VC and the possibility of redactional intervention have focused on two pivotal chapters of the work: namely, a passage from VC VIII, which informs us that Constantine found in Kherson “a Gospel and Psalter written in Rusian letters,” and an excerpt from VC XIII, which relates how Constantine deciphered three lines (or “verses”) engraved on a mysterious chalice that pertained to Solomon’s prophecy about the coming of Christ. Scholars have debated whether the readings contained in the two chapters, which are found in all extant copies of VC, are to be regarded as “errors” that go back to its archetype and whether that archetype is of East-Slavic provenance. They have also sought to determine whether—and if so, to what extent—the textual history of VC VIII
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29 Ziffer, “Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione,” 181–83. Relying on the interpretative scheme advanced by N. K. Nikol’skij (Povest’ vremennyx let kak pamjatnik dlja istorii načal’nogo perioda russkoj pis’mennosti i kul’tury. K voprosu o drevnejšem letopisanii [Leningrad, 1930]; idem, “K voprosu o sledax moravo-češskogo vlijanja na literaturnyx pamjatnikax domongošskoj époki,” Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR 3, nos. 8–9 [1933]: 5–18), Ziffer also has sought to underscore the importance of the West Slavic (i.e., Czech) tradition for the origins of East Slavic literary civilization.


and XIII has been connected with other textual traditions that circulated in the
East-Slavic area.

Especially intense discussions have focused on the textual history,
significance, and function of the story about “Solomon’s chalice” contained in
VC XIII. The chalice story in VC XIII, which V. I. Lamanskij had regarded
as a later addition probably inserted by a South-Slavic adapter of the work
but which has usually been considered an integral part of VC, is also found
in numerous apocryphal texts (dating from the thirteenth century and almost
all of which are of East-Slavic origin) that provide an exegesis to the three
verses on the chalice. For many scholars, the notion that the prophetic
inscription on Solomon’s chalice in VC (as well as the “pseudoepigraphic”
version) was a translation from the Greek, made either by Constantine himself
or in the South-Slavic area, was confirmed by Ševčenko’s discovery of an
eleventh-century Byzantine manuscript (Scurialensis ψ.ΙΙΙ.7, fol. 317) wherein one finds a Greek text of the first two verses of the inscription.

Yet it is the third verse of the inscription, which is missing from the
above-mentioned Greek codex, that seems to have provoked the most heated
scholarly controversy. In Picchio’s view, the wording of verse 3 attested by

33 The stages in the ongoing controversy surrounding chapter XIII of VC can be outlined
as follows: (1) In seeking to elucidate a view he had first advanced in 1960 and on the basis of
Ševčenko’s find (see note 37, below), Riccardo Picchio published two critical studies that
offered a new reading and interpretation for VC XIII (“Strutture isocoliche e poesia slava
medievale”; “Chapter XIII of the Vita Constantini”). Cf. R. Picchio, “Compilazione e trama
narrativa nelle ‘Vite’ di Costantino e Metodio,” Ricerche Slavistiche 8 (1960): 80. (2) Mario
Capaldo reacted very negatively to Picchio’s conclusions in a lengthy study that sought to
focus on certain basic philological problems (“Rispetto del testo tràdito”). Cf. M. Capaldo,
“Sulla datazione di un’iscrizione pseudosalomonica ad opera di Costantino il Filosofo,” in
Studi in onore di Santé Graciotti, ed. G. Brogi Bercoff et al. (Rome, 1990), 944–60; idem,
“Sulla Vita Constantini. Questioni minori di metodo, di esegesi, di critica testuale,” Europa
sought to elucidate the views put forward in his earlier studies (“Alle prese con la Vita
Constantini”).

34 V. I. Lamanskij, “Slavjanskòe žitie sv. Kirilla kak religiozno-epičeskoe proizvedenie i
kak istoričeskij istočnik,” Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo
35 For a discussion of the “integralist position,” see Ševčenko, “The Greek Source of the
Inscription,” esp. 288–92.
36 On the two basic Church Slavic versions of the chalice story found outside of VC and
their manuscript traditions, see Capaldo, “Rispetto del testo tràdito,” 545–56. According to
Capaldo, only one (fourteenth-century) South Slavic testimony (RNB F.I.376) of the chalice
story has come down to us (ibid., 547).
37 For a comparison of the Greek and Slavic texts, see Ševčenko, “The Greek Source of the
Inscription,” esp. 294–95.
all extant witnesses of both VC\textsuperscript{38} and the "apocryphal" tradition\textsuperscript{39} betrays a misreading that appears to have resulted from a merging (or confusion) of biblical citations. In other words, if one were to change the word order of verse 3 on the basis of its biblical equivalents,\textsuperscript{40} the verse would reveal "clear references" to Isaiah 35.2 and Ezekiel 34.24, which, from an "orthodox" perspective, convey a precise doctrinal message that affirms Jesus as the true Shepherd and Messiah in the ascendant reign of Christian salvation. In the case of VC, according to Picchio, the correct reading of verse 3 is the "keystone" for an understanding of the symbolic scene described in chapter XIII—namely, the chapter that serves to introduce the culminating section of the hagiographic composition (i.e., Constantine's apostolic mission to the Slavs)\textsuperscript{41}—for the verse defines the chapter's "spiritual meaning" by means of a biblical thematic clue composed of the two citations.\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{38} See note 32, above.

\textsuperscript{39} See, for example, the thirteenth-century East-Slavic codex (RNB Q.1.18): "se knjazь i ouzritь i vьsь sbорь i Davyдь cesarь posredь ixь" (cited after Picchio, "Chapter XIII of \textit{Vita Constantini}," 144).

\textsuperscript{40} I.e., if one alters the position of the initial words in verse 3 (\textit{i se knjazь}), one obtains a reading (\textit{i ouzritь} \textit{vesь sbорь} \textit{i is Davyдь cesarь posredь ixь}) that corresponds to segments of Isaiah 35.2 (\textit{καὶ ὁ λαὸς δῷται τὴν δόξαν κυρίου} ["and my people shall see the glory of the Lord"]) and Ezekiel 34.24 (\textit{και ἐγὼ κύριος εἰσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν, καὶ Δαυίδ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν} ["and I, the Lord, will be to them a God, and David a prince in the midst of them"]), respectively. On the relationship of the Slavic terms to their Greek biblical counterparts, see Picchio, "Chapter XIII of \textit{Vita Constantini}," 145–46. Cf. Capaldo, "Rispetto del testo trádito," 594–99.

\textsuperscript{41} In Picchio’s view, "this short chapter represents a sort of 'pause' in the narrative texture of the \textit{vita}. Its function appears to be that of marking the switch from the 'Life of Constantine the Philosopher,' who had defended the Christian doctrine against the Saracens and the Jews, to the 'Life of Constantine the Apostle to the Slavs.' The two citations from Isaiah and Ezekiel are the keystone of this hagiographic construction. The 'bad shepherds' of the Old Testament tradition are rejected. The 'Philosopher' will no longer argue with them. He will speak, instead, to the Gentiles in the rising reign of Christian salvation because \textit{they will see the glory of the Lord and David shall be the prince among them}" (Picchio, "Chapter XIII of \textit{Vita Constantini}," 150–51).

\textsuperscript{42} While Ševčenko applauded Picchio "for drawing our attention to the analogies between parts of the inscription and the two Old Testament passages (Isaiah 35.2 and Ezekiel 34.24)," he preferred to see them merely as part of the chalice story rather than as "keystones of [the work's] hagiographic construction" connected with the "spiritual salvation of the Slavs" ("Addenda," in \textit{Byzantium and the Slavs}, 731). In Ševčenko’s opinion, “there is no need to correct the 'errors' in these quotations (these 'errors'... were already present in the postulated Greek original), or to wonder why the 'theologically founded interpretation' in [VC XIII] left no trace in the East Slavic tradition" (ibid.). According to Ševčenko, therefore, this interpretation never existed.
The fact that the entire textual documentation of VC betrays an “erroneous” reading of this “semantic signal” is of paramount importance for Picchio. In his opinion, it not only obliges us to wonder whether the “misquotation” in VC XIII is connected with a phase in the history of the work when the value of the “thematic clue” was no longer understood by copyists as essential. It also compels us to ask whether the “damage” found in VC XIII might have been connected with other textual traditions, namely, with the apocryphal texts that betray the same “misreading” of verse 3 of the chalice found in VC. Although the presence of the same “mistake” in both VC XIII and the pseudoepigraphic version of the chalice story may point to a common textual antecedent (i.e., the source of an “original” mechanical error made by a copyist), Picchio emphasizes that the particular function of the “semantic signal” in VC XIII is entirely different from that found in the apocryphal texts. Whereas the contextual role of the chalice story in VC XIII can be understood only if Isaiah 35.2 and Ezekiel 34.24 are cited correctly, the meaning of the chalice inscription in the apocryphal tradition depends largely on a misreading of the two biblical citations. Furthermore, in Picchio’s view, the relationship established between VC XIII and the complex of East-Slavic apocryphal texts that go back to the thirteenth century does not permit us to conclude that the archetype of VC can be dated to the thirteenth century. What is crucial here, according to Picchio, is not only the impossibility of dating the archetype to which all extant testimonies of VC go back but also the difficulty of determining the origins of a traditio textus and

43 It is important to stress here that Picchio’s hypothesis does not aim to introduce a “correction” for a proposed critical edition but rather seeks to offer an explanation for “damage” in the archetype. In other words, given that the antecedents of the archetype are uncertain, a critical edition of VC that scrupulously follows the textus traditus may exclude a conjectural reading that goes beyond the archetype. See Picchio, “Alle prese con la Vita Constantini,” 36-37 n. 23.

44 Indeed, in Picchio’s opinion, an examination of the commentary on verse 3 found in the apocryphal text proves “beyond any possible doubt” that its “author” did not even suspect that he was explaining the Holy Writ: “Knjazh zritb Pilat, a zbor idove. Uzrëîia slavou ego, vbskrësenie ego vidëvSe uzasoäasja. Davydò òe car posredi îxo. Kristosò òe otë plemeni Davyda plotju raspjatie pria posredi vas òidove” (I. E. Evseev, “Slovesa svjatyx prorok, protivoiudejskij pamjatnik po ruskopisi XV v.,” Drevnosti. Trudy Slavjanskoj Komissii imperatorskogo Moskovskogo Arxeologiceskogo ObSchestva 4 [1907]: 173). In this commentary, “the usual mistake in the citation from Isaiah and Ezekiel had already become the source of an apocryphal type of exegesis. The misplaced knjazh was identified with Pilate... and, of course, the symbol of David-Christ was used to blame the Jews” (Picchio, “Chapter XIII of Vita Constantini,” 146-47). On the identification of knjazh and Pontius Pilate in the apocryphal tradition, see Capaldo, “Rispetto del testo trâditot,” 611-12; Picchio, “Alle prese con la Vita Constantini,” 48-49 n. 58.

45 Ibid., 49.
the precise circumstances in which the textual material of VC was transmitted in the period preceding the archetype. Thus, in his opinion, it is true that VC is a hagiographic work which is probably connected with the principal phases of Cyrillo-Methodian history (from the ninth century onwards) and whose textual tradition seems reducible to an archetype (despite perceptible intervention at the level of language). Yet it is no less true that the antecedents of the text of VC (documented by late codices) remain obscure.

In contradistinction to Picchio, Mario Capaldo has insisted that the reading found in the extant textual documentation of VC XIII is in no need of emendation, inasmuch as it is “genuine” and certainly very old. Relying on an interpretative tradition that appears to owe a great deal to Dvornik, Capaldo not only aims to defend the historicity of the chalice story in VC XIII but also seeks to confirm the dating of an “undamaged” archetype to the latter part of the ninth century (Moravia) or, at the very latest, to the early tenth century (Bulgaria). In his opinion, moreover, the notion that the chalice story in VC XIII might have been contaminated by East-Slavic apocrypha has “grave implications” for the history of the tradition of VC, for it legitimizes doubts that verse 3 of the inscription is an isolated case.

In seeking to demonstrate the “textual integrity” of VC and rejecting the notion of a late compilatory scheme for the work, Capaldo offers a “reconstruction” of the history of the chalice story with the aim of restoring the text transmitted to us by VC XIII in an “original form” that is independent of both the Slavic apocryphal tradition and other (i.e., Greek and Slavic) textual sources. Proceeding from the premise that the Slavic text of VC that has come down to us could have been written as early as the ninth century, Capaldo posits a somewhat later dating for the archetype of VC (eleventh century) and, in contrast with Capaldo, places it within the East-Slavic area sometime in the eleventh century (Ziffer, “Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione,” 188-92, esp. 188-89).

---

46 Ibid., 50.
47 Capaldo, “Rispetto del testo trádito,” esp. 577-79.
48 Ibid., 549-50. In a short chapter of his doctoral thesis devoted to the motif of “hagiographic discourse,” Ziffer astutely pointed to the correspondence between Dvornik’s vision of VC as “genuine” and Capaldo’s approach to VC (Ziffer, “Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione,” 188-92, esp. 188-89).
49 Capaldo, “Rispetto del testo trádito,” esp. 577-78. Ziffer posits a somewhat later dating for the archetype of VC (eleventh century) and, in contrast with Capaldo, places it within the East-Slavic area sometime in the eleventh century (Ziffer, “Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione,” 180-81). Cf. V. M. Žírov (“Slavia Christiana v istoriko-kul’turnyj kontekst i Skazanie o russkoj gramote,” in La cultura spirituale russa, ed. L. Magarotto and D. Rizzi [Trent, 1992], 107), who (on the basis of earlier scholarship) asserts that VC could not have spread in Rus’ until after 1116, that is, that the work was unknown to the compilers of the Primary Chronicle (i.e., to the “editors” of the “Sylvester redaction” of 1116) at the beginning of the twelfth century.
50 Capaldo, “Rispetto del testo trádito,” 576.
century, Capaldo provides a diagram that illustrates the "Hebrew, Greek, and Slavic tradition" of the chalice story. By establishing an extremely complex set of hypothetical (or partially hypothetical) textual relationships—from a Hebrew source (*IscrCal-Ebr), which gave birth to a Greek text (*IscrCal-Gr) and its antecedents, to diverse Slavic versions—Capaldo endeavors to demonstrate that (1) the extensive apocryphal text of the chalice story does not rely on the text found in VC XIII, (2) the commentary in the apocryphal version does not present anything at odds with orthodox Christianity, and (3) the terminus post quern for the dating of the two Slavic apocryphal texts may well be the ninth century and their commentary the product of Constantine's missionary activity. More specifically, Capaldo seeks to show that the entire history of the chalice story in Slavic can be traced back to the activity of Methodius (*StorCal-Meth), who allegedly translated a non-extant Greek work written by Constantine himself (*StorCal-Const).

Given the "respect" he professes for the principles of textual criticism established by Paul Maas and his opposition to "conjectural adventure," it is surprising that Capaldo would express views about the "textual integrity" of VC that are based on the hypothetical reconstruction of undocumented stages in the history of the work. One might also question, in this regard, his insistence on restoring the text of VC by adapting it to the linguistic norms of Old Church Slavic. Here, too, Capaldo's *restitutio textus* appears to rely on the mere assumption of an early dating rather than on extant textual documentation.

III

While many scholars continue to maintain that the reading found in verse 3 of the inscription on the chalice—as attested in all extant codices of VC—is not to be considered proof of a corrupted archetype, few contemporary Slavists would deny that the reference to Constantine's discovery in Kherson of a "Gospel and Psalter written in Rusian letters" (euaggeli'e i psáltirb rouskymi písmeny pisano) contained in VC VIII casts doubt on the notion of faithful textual transmission. Indeed, on the basis of studies by André Vaillant and

52 Capaldo, "Rispetto del testo trádito," 618.
53 Ibid., 609.
55 Capaldo, "Rispetto del testo trádito," 578.
56 Ibid., 578–79.
57 See most recently Ziffer, "Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione," 177.
58 One should remember that doubts expressed about the "genuineness" of the phrase rouskymi písmeny should be considered within the context of recent discussions on the
Roman Jakobson that appeared more than fifty years ago, it is now generally accepted by most specialists that the phrase *rous̆bskymi pismeny*, which is included in all extant codices of both the South-Slavic and East-Slavic “branches” of *VC*, originally read “in Syriac letters.” In other words, according to most scholars, the qualifier “Rusian” found in the texts of *VC VIII* derives from a misreading or scribal error, where a “copyist” confused the two roots *sour*- and *rous*. Hence, as Ziffer has concluded, if one acknowledges the “secondary character” of the reading *rous̆bskymi pismeny* and one focuses not on what “must have been the non-extant genuine reading” but
on the variant actually attested by the tradition, one is obliged to conclude that a "corruption" must have been produced in the archetype.

Ziffer is certainly correct to assert that a critical inquiry into the textual tradition of VC must rely on the phrase rouseskymi pismeny, that is, on the reading found in all extant codices of the work. On the other hand, one might wonder whether his acceptance of the Vaillant and Jakobson thesis that the "original" reading was probably soursskymi pismeny continues to place undue emphasis on undocumented stages in the textual history of VC. As I have indicated elsewhere, "if our aim is to provide a 'genuine reading' based on the textual documentation that has been handed down to us, only special circumstances would permit us to accept the notion of a 'misreading' at this point in the text." Thus, the emendation sourbskymi pismeny would be acceptable here only if one could demonstrate that the reading rouseskymi pismeny is "secondary" (i.e., "corrupted") and does not derive from the adaptation of preexistent material that may have incorporated other textual traditions. In my opinion, however, it seems advisable to consider the phrase rouseskymi pismeny not an early "miscopying" or "error" made by a South-Slavic scribe "to whom both peoples [i.e., the "Rousi" and the "Souri"] were equally remote," but a genuine reading which is unquestionably of East-

---

62 See Ziffer, "Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione," 179.
63 In order to defend the Syriac hypothesis, some scholars have referred to the hagiographic account included in the Prolog (which in their opinion was compiled on the basis of VC), where it is stated that Constantine studied four languages, namely, Greek, Latin, Syriac, and Hebrew ("... i četvri jazyki filosofii naučivša: i jėlinbsky, i rimbsky, surbsky, židovbsky" [Lavrov, Materialy po istorii, 101]). On the other hand, the Dormition (Uspenie) of St. Cyril, which closely parallels VC VIII in its treatment of Constantine's mastery of Hebrew and Samaritan, totally omits the entire "Russian episode." In other words, the Dormition shifts from the study of Samaritan to the discovery of St. Clement's relics with no mention whatsoever of a Gospel and Psalter "in Russian letters" ("... i časti načet knígy ty'e [samarënskye], i křiži tégo i slyjna ego. i slyfaren tož, jako i slyvajty Kliménta i ešce vs. mórë lëžita" [Lavrov, Materialy, 155]. On the mastery of a language triad as a hagiographic commonplace, see H. Goldblatt, "On the Place of the Cyrillo-Methodian Tradition in Epiphanius' Life of Saint Stephen of Perm," in Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, vol. 1, Slavic Cultures in the Middle Ages, California Slavic Studies, no. 16, ed. B. Gasparov and O. Raevsky-Hughes (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Oxford, 1993), 158–60.
64 Goldblatt, "On 'rouske pismeny' in the Vita Constantini," 318. In other words, the reading sourskymi pismeny belongs not to the operation of textual restitutio but rather to the realm of divinatio, that is, to the selection of a reading different from those documented by the extant codices.
65 H. Lunt, "Again the 'ruskymi pismeny,'" Cercàri de lingvisticä 3 (1958), Supliment (= Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Emil Petrovici par ses amis étrangers à l'occasion de son soixantième anniversaire), 326. Cf. A. S. L'vov ("K istokam staroslavjanskoj pis'mennosti," Slavia 44 [1975]: 274–85), who suggested that the "Russian episode" is an early (i.e., South-Slavic) interpolation.
Slavic origin and which appears to have conveyed a precise message for an East-Slavic readership and have performed an important contextual function in the extant codices of VC.

In my earlier study on the textual history of VC, I sought to demonstrate that Constantine’s discovery of a “Gospel and Psalter written in Rusian letters” was linked to a “political and religious patriotism” which may well have had its origins in the textual tradition of the so-called Tale on Rusian Writing (hereafter Tale), a work preserved in at least sixteen codices—all of East-Slavic origin—which, as in the case of VC, date from no earlier from the middle of the fifteenth century. There is no doubt that VC VIII and the Tale offer a similar vision that corresponds to what is found in other fifteenth-century writings which stress either the antiquity of “Rusian letters” or the idea of the “Rusian language” as the basis of a supranational Orthodox Slavic standard. Nonetheless, despite the presence of common textual material and other evident connections, VC and the Tale betray radically different

---

66 Ziffer (“Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione,” 178) has noted that, as early as 1843, Gorski (“O sv. Kirille i Mefodii,” 9) suspected East Slavic origins without knowing that the reading was to be found in the entire manuscript tradition.


68 Ibid., esp. 320–28.


70 In my earlier study, relying on the information provided by František Mareš (“Skazanie о slavjanskoj piš’mennosti,” Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury 19 [1963]: 169–76), I referred to six codices. On the manuscript tradition, see now Živov (“Slavia christiana,” 75–78), who has listed fifteen copies and provided valuable codicological information. An additional copy has been discovered by Ziffer (“Ricerche sul testo e la tradizione,” 185).

71 See above all Constantine Kostenecki’s Explanatory Treatise on the Letters (Skazanie izbjavljenno o pismenez), where it is stated that the Slavic language has the “most refined and beautiful Rusian tongue” as its basis (I. V. Jajić, Codex Slovenicus rerum grammaticarum [Berlin, 1896], 108). Recently B. A. Uspenskij (Istoriija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka [XI–XVII vv.] [Munich, 1987], 185–86) has expressed the view that Kostenecki’s “Rusocentric” conception of the Slavic language relies on the “authoritative” reading found in VC VIII. In other words, according to Uspenskij, Balkan Slavic writers such as Kostenecki, who wrote his treatise in the 1420s in Belgrade, would have had access to South Slavic copies of the work. Yet it is more than likely that Kostenecki did not know VC. Indeed, although VC XIV and many other Cyrillo-Methodian writings assign to Constantine-Cyril a singular role in the divinely-inspired action of inventing Slavic letters, Kostenecki attributes the origins of the Slavic language to the activity of certain “wondrous men” (without mentioning Constantine-Cyril). It is only in preparing the first Slavic edition of the divine Writings that, according to Kostenecki, “Cyril the Philosopher” played a preeminent role (and where no reference is made to Methodius). See Goldblatt, Orthography and Orthodoxy, 118–20. Kostenecki’s apparent unfamiliarity with VC in early fifteenth-century Serbia would certainly strengthen the recent argument made by Ziffer that the South Slavic group of manuscripts derives from an East Slavic branch of the tradition. See note 28, above.

72 In a number of codices, including the oldest East Slavic copy, the Tale has been placed
interpretative schemes. Whereas the text of VC VIII unquestionably seeks to celebrate Constantine's achievements and link his missionary activity with Rus', the *Tale*—notwithstanding the fact that several codices bear the title *On the Death of Saint Cyril, the Teacher of the Slavs*—aims to minimize Constantine's accomplishments, advancing as its principal thesis the idea that Rus' had not required the activity of a "foreign apostle," for the "true faith" had been revealed to Rus' by "none but God the almighty" through the inspired actions of the Grand Prince Vladimir.

In my attempt to establish a link between the reading *rus'skymi pismeny* contained in VC VIII and the "Rusian patriotism" found in the late codices of the *Tale*, I was compelled to stress that "one cannot, for lack of information, advance a conjecture on either the circumstances of textual transmission for the *Tale* prior to the fifteenth century or the precise relations between its textual history and that of VC." On the other hand, I suggested that the *Tale* may provide the correct interpretative context in which to place the "Rusian episode" of VC VIII precisely because "it conveys a message conforming perfectly to the ideological atmosphere of the fifteenth-century 'Rusian' lands." In other words, "the notion that Constantine the Philosopher had discovered 'Rusian letters' in Kherson, or that he had studied with a 'Rusian' to whom God had revealed 'Rusian writing,' would be fully accepted in the East-Slavic lands being united under Moscow, the 'new Constantinople,' in the fifteenth century. It would become an essential component of a new ideological vision grounded in the belief that Moscow was now the center of the true Orthodox faith."

73 Likewise, although—as scholars have noted—the *Tale* may have borrowed textual material from the entry in the Primary Chronicle (s.a. 6406 [898 A.D.] which treats the Moravian mission of Constantine and Methodius (known as the *Skazanie o prelojenii knig*), it is important to stress that the two accounts betray distinct ideological orientations (Živov, "Slavia christiana," 96–97). Whereas the *Tale* focuses on the motif of autonomous entry into the family of Christian peoples through the actions of St. Vladimir alone, the chronicle entry not only asserts that the beginnings of Christianity (and literacy) in Rus' are grounded in the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition but insists on the apostolic origins of evangelization among the Slavs (Goldblatt, "On 'rus'kymi pismeny' in the *Vita Constantini*," 326–28).

74 Goldblatt, "On 'rus'kymi pismeny' in the *Vita Constantini*," 325.

75 Ibid. The implications of this statement do not seem to have been fully understood by some scholars: see, for example, Živov, "Slavia christiana," 104–106; Capaldo, "Rispetto del testo trádito," 576–77 n. 95. The fact that I link both the reading found in VC VIII and the *Tale* with the ideological atmosphere of the fifteenth century does not mean that I am prepared to offer a precise date of composition for either work.

76 Goldblatt, "On 'rus'kymi pismeny' in the *Vita Constantini*," 325.
Scholars long have attempted to determine the “authenticity” of the Tale, that is, to resolve the question of whether the work is an early West-Slavic document or a later East-Slavic writing. Particular attention has been focused on the reliability of the account given in the Tale about the activity of St. Vojtëch-Adalbert (d. 997), the second bishop of Prague, missionary to the Polish lands, and martyr for the faith among the Prussians. Few Slavicists would now accept the trustworthiness of the description, unique to the Tale, of St. Vojtëch as the enemy of the “true faith” and “Rusian writing.”

In a meticulous study that aimed to elucidate the “correct” historical and cultural context of the Tale, V. M. Živov sought to demonstrate that the work was an East-Slavic monument which was compiled in the twelfth century, that is, when the “battle” for the division of a unified Christian Slavic community into two opposing communities was still “topical.” According to Živov, it is within the framework of the conflict between Slavia orthodoxa and Slavia romana that followed the schism between Eastern and Western Christians in 1054—and not against the background of the events of the fifteenth century (i.e., when one can observe the growth of “national and religious self-awareness” and the widespread diffusion of the Tale in the Russian lands)—that one can best understand the motivation on the part of an ascendant Orthodox Rus’ community to besmirch the name of St. Vojtëch, one of the most celebrated Western Slavic saints, whose deeds were in fact connected not with the destruction of the “Rusian” (i.e., Slavic) religious and cultural heritage but with the ideas of a Christian Slavic unity (Slavia christiana). Thus, on the basis of its “biased” account of St. Vojtëch’s activity, Živov views the Tale as a twelfth-century monument that provides evidence of the intensity of the struggle to destroy the “ideology” of Slavia christiana, that is, to eliminate a separate religious and cultural community that had coexisted with the Latin and Greek traditions until the end of the eleventh century.

---

77 For a good summary of the discussions, see O. Kralik, “Povest’ o vremennyx let i legenda Kristiana o sviatx Vjaëeslave i Ljudmile,” Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury 19 (1963): 185-91; Živov, “Slavia christiana.”
79 On the concepts of Slavia orthodoxa and Slavia romana, see most recently Picchio, “Slavia ortodossa e Slavia romana.”
80 In seeking to underscore St. Vojtëch’s ecumenical vision, tolerance, and devotion to Slavia christiana, Živov (“Slavia christiana,” 81-91) focuses not on the years spent in Germany but on his stay in Italy, in particular, his connection with the Monastery of S. Alessio.
81 Živov (“Slavia christiana,” 101-102) provides evidence in his study to suggest that hostility to Slavia christiana was a characterizing feature of not only Slavia orthodoxa but
Živov’s commentary on the historical and cultural context of the Tale relies in considerable measure on his analysis of the manuscript tradition and an attempt to “examine the history of the text of the Tale and reconstruct the archetype.” In the appendix to the study he in fact offers not only the “reconstructed text” of the Tale and “basic variants” but also a “textological stemma.” According to Živov, the extant copies of the Tale can be divided into four “redactions,” which are distinguished on the basis of the following features: (1) the presence (or absence) of the heading that refers to the death of St. Cyril; (2) the “unity of the Tale” with the “fragment about St. Vladimir” (or its absence); and (3) the complete (or abbreviated) text of a prayer addressed to the saintly “tsars” Constantine and Vladimir. This mode of classification leads Živov to conclude that it is the “basic text” of the Tale found in redactions C and D (i.e., the text which ends with the death of St. Vojtěch and is without the “fragment about St. Vladimir”) which can be dated to the twelfth century, for “it is precisely to this text that one can ascribe a definite emphasis on Rusian Christianity.” The “united text” found in redactions A and B (i.e., the text which adds the “fragment about St. Vladimir” to the “basic text”), on the other hand, was compiled much later, but before the fifteenth century, that is, before the period of the so-called “Second South-Slavic Influence.”

---

Slavia romana as well. See, for example, the admonition (attributed to Pope John XIII) against the “rite or sect of the people of Bulgaria or Rus’, or the Slavic language” interpolated by Cosmas of Prague into his Chronica Bohemorum: “Veruntamen non secundum ritus aut sectam Bulgariae gentis vel Ruziae, aut sclavonicae gentis, sed magis sequens instituta et decreta apostolica unum pociorem tocius ecclesiae ad placitum eligas in hoc opus clericum, Latinis adprime litteris eruditum, qui verbi vomere novalia cordis gentilium scindera et triticum bonae operationis sere atque manilios frugum vestrae fidei Christo reportare sufficiat” (B. Bretholtz, Die Chronik der Böhmen des Cosmas von Prag, Monumenta Germaniae historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum. Nova series, no. 2 [Berlin, 1923], 44).


83 Ibid., 121–25. It is important to stress that Živov’s “reconstructed text” ends with the death of St. Vojtěch and omits entirely the “fragment about St. Vladimir.” As to the “textological stemma,” which presents five branches that correspond to four “redactions” of the Tale and the so-called Life of St. Vladimir (i.e., a work which, according to Živov, is textually dependent on the Tale), it might seem to some scholars that its purpose is to group witnesses in order to reach conclusions about a stemma codicum. However, inasmuch as Živov’s “stemma” attempts to group manuscripts into “redactions”—and is therefore, it would seem, not based on a collatio—it is difficult to regard Živov’s representation of the relationships of the extant testimonies as a stemma codicum.

84 Živov reaches this conclusion on the basis of two criteria: linguistic forms preserved in testimonies of different “redactions” which antedate the norms of the “Second South Slavic Influence” (e.g., preze, Volodimerb); and textual material from the “united text” which served...
The conclusion that the *Tale* is an East-Slavic monument compiled in the twelfth century also permits Živov to offer insightful remarks on the complex textual relationship between *VC* and the *Tale*. Proceeding from the premise that *VC* did not reach Rus’ until after 1116 (i.e., the work was unknown to “editors” of the “Sylvester redaction” of the *Primary Chronicle*), he asserts that it is possible to assume either that the *Tale* is an amplification of and commentary on *VC* VIII or that the “Rusian episode” appeared in *VC* on the basis of the *Tale*. At issue here, according to Živov, is not so much the validity of a given hypothesis as the remarkable complexity connected with the “history of the text” of *VC* and, concomitantly, the very legitimacy of the “interpolationist thesis.” In any event, as he notes, “the history of the text [of *VC*] turns out to be intertwined—apparently in a rather earlier period—with the history of other monuments that belonged to the East-Slavic literary tradition.”

While there is no doubt that Živov has produced a valuable and erudite study that is of great importance for an understanding of the *Tale*, one might wonder whether his tentative conclusions about the origins and textual history of the *Tale* always rest on a solid philological foundation. It is regrettable, therefore, that a “full textological analysis” of the *Tale* is not included with his analysis but is to be provided in a separate publication.

In the first place, Živov’s division of the extant witnesses into four “redactions” is questionable, inasmuch as his classificatory principle seems to rely on the presence or exclusion of material in the course of textual transmission rather than on the intentional reworking of a text with the aim of violating its essential thematic and structural individuality. Equally important, Živov’s distinction between testimonies that are assigned to redactions C and D, which provide the “basic text” of the *Tale*, and testimonies that belong to redactions A and B, in which the “fragment about St. Vladimir” is added to form a “united text,” offers a single organizing principle that appears to ignore the composite nature and mosaic-like character

---

87 See Živov, “*Slavia christiana*,” 96–97, 106–107.
88 Ibid., 108.
89 Ibid., 72.
of the *Tale* and seems to devote insufficient attention to the possibility that many different traditions might be reflected in the extant textual documentation. Živov has rightly stressed the special relevance for the *Tale* of St. Vojtěch’s role as the implacable foe of the “Rusian” religious and literary tradition. Yet even if one could date the account of St. Vojtěch’s activity to the twelfth century, one would have to recognize that this passage might be the result of compilatory activity, that is, it might have its origins in a textual tradition which was totally distinct from the texts offering descriptions of the accomplishments attributed to either St. Cyril or St. Vladimir. Thus, because it is not possible to advance hypotheses about the textual history of the *Tale* for the period preceding our extant textual documentation, there is no justification for assuming that conclusions about the textual portion dedicated to St. Vojtěch can be generalized and applied to the entire text.

Similar considerations apply to the “fragment about St. Vladimir,” which Živov has dated to the fourteenth century on the basis of certain linguistic forms that do not reflect the impact of the “Second South-Slavic Influence” and textual material which is common to the so-called *Life of St. Vladimir*. In his study Živov sought not only to stress that the “basic text” of the *Tale* fits into the historical and cultural context of the early twelfth century but that the “unified text” must have been compiled at least a century before the growth of a new national and religious self-awareness and the widespread diffusion of the *Tale* in the second half of the fifteenth century. Here, too, however, one might wonder whether it is possible to provide a precise date of composition on the basis of the available evidence.

Of critical importance for Živov, in this regard, is the need to see in the “united text” of the *Tale* not a unified composition but two textual entities which contradict each other at a number of levels. While it is true that—like many other Orthodox Slavic works—the “united text” of the *Tale* may represent the compilation of preexistent textual units put together to produce a new “context” that betrays an absence of stylistic uniformity, one should not deduce as a logical result that the two main parts of the work should be

---

91 I.e., the *Živie blaženago Vladimira*, the third and final textual part of a hagiographic work compiled to venerate both Grand Prince Vladimir and his grandmother Princess Olga (*Pamjati i pozvala knjazju Ruskomu Volodimiru...*). The oldest extant textual witness of the work goes back to the late fifteenth century. Although an earlier copy (dated 1414) was published at the end of the nineteenth century and is known to modern scholarship, the manuscript itself perished in the Moscow fire of 1812. For past and present views on the work, see above all the discussion and bibliography in P. Hollingsworth (ed.), *The Hagiography of Kievian Rus’* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992), lxxxi–xcv.

92 Ibid., 106 n. 19.
viewed as distinct segments, one added to another, which lack a thematic unity. One should recall that it is the "fragment about St. Vladimir"—and not the earlier segment devoted to the activities of St. Cyril—which elaborates on the "patriotic" opening of the Tale, wherein St. Vladimir receives full apostolic dignity against the background of the autonomous entry of Rus’ into the Christian family of peoples. Nor should one forget that not only the "basic text" of the Tale but also the "fragment about St. Vladimir" employs textual material that is found in VC VIII.

Thus, notwithstanding certain inconsistencies in the Tale, it is correct to speak of an organizing principle that unifies the work. By placing the achievements of Constantine-Cyril into a "Russian" historiographic context and invalidating his apostolic and teaching activities among the Western Slavs through the actions of the "Latin bishop Vojtěch," the Tale could highlight the image of St. Vladimir as the supreme ruler inspired by God to christianize the lands of Rus'. Although it may well be inappropriate for us to postulate a "basic text" of the Tale on which the extant textual documentation would depend and it may not be possible to establish a precise date of composition for the work, there is no question that the widespread diffusion of the Tale, beginning in the the second half of the fifteenth century, was closely connected with ascendant religious and political patriotism in the Russian lands. In their efforts to stress the autonomy of Rus’ and the unique role of


95 "Alle prese con la Vita Constantini," 51 n. 64. In an earlier study, I pointed to the close ideological parallels between the Tale and Metropolitan Hilarion’s Sermon on Law and Grace, a work whose textual documentation also dates from the fifteenth century (with the exception of a fragment from the second half of the thirteenth century). It is thus noteworthy that the main themes conveyed in the [Tale]—above all, the superiority of the Christian age of Grace over that of the Jewish Law, the conversion of Rus’ as the confirmation of God’s promise, and the exaltation of Grand Prince Vladimir as the Lord’s chosen instrument—are strikingly similar to the motifs which pervade Metropolitan Hilarion’s composition. One should not forget that in Hilarion’s work, a ‘Sermon on Law and Grace’ is followed by a ‘Eulogy of Vladimir,’ which aims to underscore precisely the idea that Rus’ was converted directly by God through the inspired deeds of St. Vladimir" (Goldblatt, “On the Place of the
its sovereign, fifteenth-century Muscovite writers not only employed traditional images belonging to the ideological patrimony of Orthodox Slavdom but also annexed the achievements of Constantine-Cyril and bestowed them upon their own Apostle.
Who Put the Snake on the Icon and the Tollbooths on the Snake?—A Problem of Last Judgment Iconography

DAVID M. GOLDFRANK

This essay probes a striking change in late medieval Ukrainian and Russian Last Judgment iconography—namely, the insertion of a huge snake with twenty or more rings representing the aerial tollbooths (mytarstva) through which the soul must pass after death. Collectively the tollbooths constitute or symbolize the immediate, personal, “minor” judgment of the soul, as opposed to the final, general, “terrible” judgment of mankind after the Second Coming of Christ.

The direct source for the notion of the tollbooths as expressed in the iconography is the Life of the Greek mystic Basil the Younger (d. 944) by his disciple Gregory, which circulated in two Russian versions by the early sixteenth century.1 A brief extract presents the drama of the immediate judgment. Basil appears just as two angels and a host of demons are taking the soul of the slave girl Theodora from her body:2

... casting from his bosom a scarlet purse filled with pieces of pure gold, he gave them to the two angels and said to them: “Take them and redeem her when she is questioned in the aerial tollbooths (οπότε ἐν τοῖς τελωνίοις τοῦ ἀέρος διέρχεσθε). I happen to be exceedingly wealthy with the grace of Christ upon my soul, having become very worthy with my pains and sweat.” ... The dark and murky demons observed this and indeed were filled with hatred.

In this vision with pagan roots there was a total of twenty-one such stations that the soul had to pass, each earmarked for a different sin: (1) slander, (2) abuse, (3) envy, (4) falsehood, (5) anger and fury, (6) pride, (7)

2 Cited in A. N. Veselovskij, “Razyskanija vo oblast’ russkogo duxovnogo stixa,” Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti (hereafter SORJAs) 46.6 (1889), suppl. 18.
profanity, (8) usury and deceit, (9) indifference and vanity, (10) avarice, (11) drunkenness, (12) unforgivingness, (13) sorcery, (14) gluttony, (15) idolatry and heresy, (16) sodomy and pederasty, (17) adultery, (18) homicide, (19) theft, (20) fornication, (21) stinginess and hard-heartedness. Theological problems notwithstanding, the tollbooths worked their way into liturgies and popular religious poetry and sparked the interest of several pre-Revolutionary Russian scholars.

Theological problems notwithstanding, the tollbooths worked their way into liturgies and popular religious poetry and sparked the interest of several pre-Revolutionary Russian scholars.

We need not dwell upon the variety of learned and popular notions, hopes, and fears concerning the afterlife held by Ukrainians and Russians around 1500. The widespread financing of prayers for the first forty days following death testifies to belief in an immediate judgment that can be influenced. Here we shall limit ourselves to descriptions of the iconographic innovations and an exploration of the evidence concerning their time, place, and circumstances. Perhaps due to what survives, Russian origins, roughly during the period of religious strife during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, appear most likely. The conclusions perfec are tentative.

The standard Christian Last Judgment iconography developed by the time of the conversion of Rus', with basic components taken from Scripture and Apocrypha. Towards the top in the center, as in the cathedral in Torcello, is Christ as Judge in a vertically elongated, pointed mandorla. To his sides are the interceding Theotokos and John the Baptist—what is now called the

---

3 Ibid., 21–41. Gregory was not completely original. A spurious homily attributed to Cyril of Alexandria (d. 411) claimed there were sets of such tollbooths for the sins of each of the five senses: Homily 14, PG 77:1071–99; for Cyril and pseudo-Cyril, see Johannes Quasten, Patrology, 3 vols. (Westminster MD, 1950–60), 3:132.


5 Ludwig Steindorff, Memoria in Altrussland. Untersuchungen zu den formen christlicher Totensorge. Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der östlichen Europa 38 (Stuttgart, 1994), 85–118. Herberstein felt that Russians did not believe in a purgatory, while his contemporary, Johannes Fabri, thought that they did.
deesis,\(^6\) and twelve apostles (Mt 19.28, Lk 22.30) with angels behind them (Rv 5.11).\(^7\) Beneath Christ and flanked or held by angels is the etimasia or prepared throne (Ps 9.7), an early Christian representation of the Last Judgment,\(^8\) with an appropriate Gospel text (Mt 25.34) and some of the instruments of the passion—at least the crucifix, if not also the spear and vinegar sponge (Mt 26.48, Mk 15.36, Jn 19.29,34,37). Below the etimasia are Adam and Eve pleading for their progeny, humanity, as in a representation of the Descent into Hell or Resurrection (Anastasis).\(^9\) Near the etimasia is an angel rolling up heaven as if it were a scroll (Is 34.4, Rv 6.14), and other angels summoning the dead to rise (1 Cr 15.52). Below the apostles on Christ’s right—the viewer’s left—are the righteous awaiting favorable judgment (Mt 25.31–46). Beneath them is an apocryphally based depiction of paradise, with some of these same righteous in line waiting to enter past St. Peter, and also the bosom of Abraham holding the souls of the saved (Lk 16.22), the good thief (Lk 23.43), and the Theotokos.\(^10\) Also below the apostles are representations of the general resurrection, that is, the sea, death, and hell delivering up the dead (Rv 20.13), and well as the fiery lake (Rv 19.20, 20.14), towards which angels are forcing Jews and other sinners, and then the torture chambers of hell (Rv 21.8). Included among the condemned is the rich man of the Lazarus parable, with its unbridgeable gulf between those who heed Moses and the prophets and those who do not (Lk 16.19–31). Elsewhere on the lower registers is an angel holding a balance to weigh good deeds and sins (Jb 31.6), and also a few demons, who together could symbolize the immediate judgment, as surely does the Lazarus parable that refers to the bosom of Abraham. An optional element at top, found at this

---


\(^7\) Sometimes there is one angel behind each apostle, perhaps together comprising the twenty-four elders of Rv 4:10.


time in the West, is the Anastasis.\textsuperscript{11} For our purposes, the most important standard feature is the river of fire (Dn 7.10) leading from Christ as Judge down to the “lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are” (Rv 20.10)—that prophet being Satan (perhaps hypostacized as the Antichrist), holding Judas in his lap [Plate 5].

Remains of four church mosaics and frescos from the eleventh and twelfth centuries prove that southern and northern Rus’ Last Judgments originally followed the Byzantine models that held for icons, flat western walls, and their extensions onto vaults and choirs in Venetia, Thessalonike, Mt. Sinai, and Transcaucasia.\textsuperscript{12} These features are reproduced in the miniatures of the so-called “Kyiv Psalter” of 1397, for which a northern, possibly Moscow origin has been suggested.\textsuperscript{13} In contrast, as shown by the Mšana icon, a series of East Slavic representations, normally attributed to the fifteenth and/or sixteenth century, elaborate certain apocryphal motifs and have in the center a snake with rings representing the tollbooths, sometimes with a sin ascribed to each one. The serpent zigzags up from the beast in the fiery lake through the center of the picture to the right foot of the kneeling, resurrected Adam, who, as in later Anastasis iconography, is invariably opposite Eve, not in front of her.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{13} G. I. Vzdornov, \textit{Issledovanie o Kievskoj Psaltyri} (Moscow, 1978), 9-33, 107, 108, 113, 123, 125, 138; also \textit{Istorija ikonografii narodov SSR} 9 vols. (Moscow, 1971–1984), 3:129, pl. 119 (also included here as Ukrainian). The Psalter has three illustrations of the fiery river, one as part of a miniature Last Judgment, and three truncated depictions of the \textit{anastasis}, the one fully described being clearly of the second type.
\textsuperscript{14} Kartsonis considers the eleventh-century miniature from Iveron Monastery at Mt. Athos to be the earliest surviving example of this third type of \textit{Anastasis}: 150. Extant Orthodox Last Judgment iconography from the eleventh and twelfth century (the Panagia Church in Thessalonike, the Mt. Sinai icons, and the Spaso-Neredickaja Church near Novgorod) has the second type, as does the \textit{Anastasis} in Kyiv’s St. Sofija: N. V. Pokrovskij, “Evangelie v pamiatnikax ikonografii primušestvenno vizantijskix i russkih,” \textit{Trudy VIII
The newer Last Judgment has other common features. The uppermost tier has Heavenly Jerusalem on the viewer’s left (Rv 21.2), two angels rolling up the heavens above Christ enthroned, and Golgotha with the instruments of passion and another representation of the final victory of the angels over demonic forces on the viewer’s right (Rv 12.7–9, 20.14). Christ’s mandorla is circular, and his right hand is pointing somewhat up and left hand somewhat down, rather than evenly outward. Adam and Eve, now on the apostles’ level, join the Theotokos and John the Baptist in pleading for humanity. In the middle levels, the people on the Christ’s right (the viewer’s left), waiting to be saved, are now clearly placed on one or two tiers. Opposite them on Christ’s left on one or two tiers are the sinful of various contemporary nations (Greeks, Turks, Tatars, Poles, Germans, etc., also Rus’) awaiting damnation. They are led by Jews, who are being berated by Moses for crucifying the Lord or otherwise rejecting him. Extending beneath the etimasia is the hand of God—sometimes with faces on the palm—a manifest wisdom and judgment emblem (Wis 3.1)—which now holds the balance to weigh sins and virtues. Four beasts representing the apocalyptic kingdoms (Dn 7.1–8) are present, shown either together or separately in circles. Similarly enclosed in the lower levels are paradise with the Theotokos flanked by Archangels Michael and Gabriel on the viewer’s left and the general resurrection on the viewer’s right. In the center Archangel Michael holds a spear or trident.

We can identify two East Slavic types of this Last Judgment icon: Mšana (West Ukrainian) and Novgorodian. The Mšana type, with twenty-one or twenty-two tollbooths, raises the etimasia to the upper reaches of the apostles’ tier and elevates the enthroned Christ and deesis to the highest level. The three patriarchs (bosom of Abraham) are inside the encircled paradise beneath
the Theotokos and the archangels. Next to it usually is an explicit depiction of death holding a scythe near the rich man from the Lazarus parable. A narrow red stream representing the fiery river curls down from the mandorla past the apostles, through the tier of the damned, along the perimeter of the general resurrection, and opens into the fiery lake. Archangel Michael’s trident or spear is piercing Satan [Plate 6].

The Novgorodian type, with exactly twenty stations, differs from the Mšana one in several ways. The “false prophet” is a dark, winged Satan. The patriarchs are to the left of paradise. There is only one tier each for the saved and damned under the apostles. The upper center or center right has a sophic (Divine Wisdom) and pronoetic (providential) emblem comprised of concentric rings with God the Father in the center as the apocalyptic, judicially delegating Ancient of Days (Dn 7.9–10). The rolling up of heaven is moved over to the upper right. Underneath it is another depiction of Christ, either ascended as judge or as part of a sophic Trinity emblem. Michael’s trident is driving sinners into hell or piercing a demon. In the geometrically more elaborate and refined specimen from Novgorod’s Kirillov Monastery, the river emerges as if from nowhere along the perimeter of the general resurrection and appears to descend from the outer side of the tier of the damned. [Plate 7] In the even more cluttered Boris-and-Gleb Church exemplar, the fiery river descends and expands directly from the Christ of the sophic Trinity along the right side of the icon to the fiery lake; on the left

---

16 An exception is an icon dated to the sixteenth century from the Cosmas and Damian Church of Lukiv-Venecija: Sviatoslav Hordynsky, The Ukrainian Icon of the Xilth-XVIIth Centuries, trans. Walter Dushnyck (Philadelphia, 1973), pl. 141.

17 Lohvyn et al., pl. 48, 83; Janina Klosińska, Ikony (Cracow, 1973), pl. 25, Icônes de Pologne (Warsaw/Paris, 1987), pl. 39. No justification is given for the dating.

18 According to pseudo-Dionysius, the circular bowl containing Wisdom’s wine (Pr 9.2,5) “has to be a symbol of Providence (πρόνοια), which has neither a beginning nor an end, which is open to all and encompasses all... yet remains in itself and continues to be its unaltered self”: G. M. Proxorov, ed., “Poslanie Titu-ierarxu Dionisija Areopagita v slavianskom pervode i ikonografija ‘Premudrost’ sozda sebe dom,“ Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury (hereafter TODRL) 38 (1985): 7–15, 32–35; Pseudo-Dionysius. The Complete Works, trans. Colm Luibheid, New York/Mahwah, N.J., 1987), 285–86. Divine Wisdom, enclosed within a mandorla comprised of concentric circles, is thus also providential—which makes theological sense. Compare the mandorlas and other features of the Novgorod-Kirillov Last Judgment and “Wisdom Hath Builted Herself a House” icons: Vladimir Gormin, Liudmila Yarosh (Jarosh), et al., Novgorod Art Treasures and Architectural Monuments, 11th–18th Centuries (Leningrad, 1984), pl. 175, 196. The emblem in this Last Judgment icon also has a representation of the twelve months, that is, “astrological heaven.”

side angels indicate the direct “path of the saintly to Heavenly Jerusalem” [Plate 8].

II

When and where was the snake with ringed tollbooths first placed on the icon? There has been no systematic study of this question, no concerted attempt to date the most important surviving icons, which came to light after N. N. Pokrovskij wrote his pioneering work on Russian Last Judgment iconography, and no serious analysis of the iconographic conflation of the two judgments and the placing of the snake’s tale inside the hellish beast. Pokrovskij figured that the snake had developed by the seventeenth century as a convenient pathway for the tollbooths when they were added to the icon. But even this many not be the case. There is another type of West Ukrainian Last Judgment with a prominent fiery river and with a varying number of tollbooths and demons, represented by icons from Ruska Bystra, Bahnovaty, and Hankowice and dated sixteenth-early seventeenth century. They have the typically Ruthenian scroll of heaven in the center and earthly Paradise containing the bosom of Abraham, as well as the Theotokos, and at least two have the parable of Lazarus. In addition, there is a sophic medallion in the center of the scroll of heaven without Heavenly Jerusalem or a symbol of Christ’s victory on the top. Most important, these tollbooths are a ladder of boxes along the salvation side of the icon, two of them with a demon inside and an angel outside of each, in one case with a long demon standing behind them [Plate 9].

Janina Kłosińska sees both the ladder and the “serpent of sin” representing the “purification as the soul ascends to heaven,” and believes that the former is Byzantine, the snake Russian, and the Ukrainian variants a mixture of these

---

20 Gormin, Yarosh, et al., pl. 197: it has a more elaborate Heavenly Jerusalem, twelve separate sealed books, two of the tollbooths inside the fiery lake, and a path for the saints.

21 Pokrovskij, “StraŚnyй суд,” 369: “... in the XVII c., the fiery river in its true sense disappeared from the picture of the Last Judgment and its contents were placed together in Hell. In the place of the river... there appears a serpentine ribbon, stylized in the form of a real snake. There is some reason to think that at first the snake-like zigzag... signified simply the pathway of the aerial tollbooths; at least that pathway is completely marked in several manuscripts illustrating the tollbooths of [Basil the Younger’s] Theodora.”

22 Hordynsky, Lohvyn et al., Kłosińska, Icônes: the damaged Ruska Bystra icon (Hordynsky, pl. 140) seems to lack death with the scythe; the Bahnuvaty icon (Hordynsky, pl. 142, Lohvyn, pl. 83, detail), like some later Russian Last Judgments, has several extra tollbooths and a Miána type river; the fourteen on the Hankowice icon (Kłosińska, pl. 40) have only angels.
two and of Western motifs. In fact, each pair from among these three East Slavic types contains common features not found in the third, so no simple developmental scheme presents itself as a working hypothesis. It rather makes sense to probe in turn the possibility that either the Msana or the Novgorodian type is the original one with the serpent.

We can make an argument for the primacy of the Msana variant. The uppermost register of both the Msana and Novgorodian icons corresponds to the anastasis tier on the flat west wall in the Assumption Cathedral in Torcello, but not seen in medieval Orthodox iconography. The inspiration for this addition, and also for the depiction of death carrying a scythe, found only in the Ukrainian Last Judgments, could have been European.

Accordingly the Ruska Bystra type, in which the tollbooths were not yet integrated with the Last Judgment, would have been an intermediary stage. Such a development is consistent with the Life of the twelfth- or early thirteenth-century Avraamij of Smolensk, who is said to have painted icons of both the Last Judgment and the tollbooths. The number twenty-one conforms to the Greek Life of Basil the Younger. There are also twenty-one stations in what Sergej Vilinskij identified as the second redaction of this Life, for which there are Rus’ translations as early as the fourteenth-fifteenth century, as well as a Serbian version. The obvious inspiration for these tollbooths is the spiritual ladder of John Climachus. This motif too had its own development from the simple to the more cluttered. Two late fifteenth-century churches in neighboring northern Moldavia have such a ladder, with angels and demons struggling for souls along the rungs that represent each of Climachus’s thirty virtues to be mastered. On one of the frescos the virtues are identified; the other church has the judicial Christ sitting within a wisdom medallion similar to the Ruska Bystra type of icon. Adding a wisdom motif

---

23 Kłosińska, Icônes, opp. pi. 41. This brief theological interpretation does not probe the conflation of judgments or the resting place of souls after they pass tollbooths. It should be noted that Dionysius of Fournia, op. cit., did not mention the tollbooths in his manual, which is thought to hearken back mostly to late Byzantine standards.


26 John R. Martin, The Illustration of the Heavenly Ladder (Princeton, NJ, 1954), pl. 67, 238; Vasile Drăguț, Petre Lupan, Moldavian Murals from the 15th to the 16th Century (Bucharest, 1982), pl. 201, 203 (Risca), 228 (Suceviţa): all the Moldavian churches have fiery rivers on their Last Judgments. The Ruska Bystra ladder could also be related in some way to the “ladder of purgatory,” a bridge over an abyss found in medieval Western iconography: see The New Catholic Encyclopedia (New York, et al., 1967), 11:1035.
to the Last Judgment most likely occurred in the Balkans (or Byzantium) before Rus'.

The evidence from Russia is richer. A trail of pigment and paper from the fourteenth century onward links Tver and Vladimir, Moscow and Novgorod, Beloozero and Volokolamsk, the Rus' literary convoy of the tollbooths, the master iconographers Andrej Rublev and Dionisij, and the monastic luminaries Nil Sorskij and Iosif Volockij. It enables us to suggest a separate origin or development of the iconographic Last Judgment snake and tollbooths in Russia.

Tver, according to the local chronicle, obtained in 1399 a "holy, miraculous" Last Judgment icon from Constantinople. Its specifics are a mystery, but the renovations by Andrej Rublev and his workshop on the Vladimir Uspenskij Cathedral Last Judgment frescos in 1408 contain several characteristics of the later icons: two angels scrolling up the heavens above Christ, who is in a circular mandorla with the right hand raised and the left hand lowered; Adam and Eve opposite each other and pleading for humanity; the hand of God; and the four apocalyptic beasts or kingdoms. The fiery river is not at all visible [Plate 10].

---

30 Lazarev, Andrej Rublev i ego škola, pl. 45. In the extant East Christian and byzantine European twelfth-century Last Judgments, Christ's enclosure is vertically eye-shaped or elliptical; both hands point symmetrically outward. These features were reproduced in the miniature accompanying Ps 121/122.4–5 in the 1397 Psalter: Istorija iskusstva narodov SSSR 3:129, pl. 119. On the other hand, the ringed mandorla and some changes in arm or hand position are found in later thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Last Judgment frescos in Tuscany, Serbia, Constantinople, and elsewhere: Antonio Paolucci, Il Battistero di San Giovanni a Firenze (Panini, 1994), 402–403; Svetozar Radojičić, Mileševa (Belgrade, 1963), 84–85; Branimir Todić, Gračanica. Slikarstvo (Belgrade, 1988), pl. 95; Paul A. Underwood, ed., The Kariye Djami, 4 vols. (New York, 1966–1975), 3:373.
31 M. V. Alpatov, ed., Andrej Rublev i ego epoca (Moscow, 1971), pl. 36, 38, 409. The descriptions of the restored frescos do not mention the fiery river or its absence. Dare we assume that it was present on the twelfth-century original and that Rublev omitted it?
An anonymous Last Judgment icon, located in the Moscow Uspenskij Sobor, appears to represent an intermediary between Rublev and the Mšana type. V. N. Lazarev considered this work to have been painted in the tradition of Rublev and dated it second quarter of the fifteenth century. More recently G. V. Popov argued for the end of the century. It lacks Heavenly Jerusalem and the victory over death in the upper corners, but otherwise organizes the higher registers similarly to the Mšana icon and the lower part in its own unique fashion. Most importantly, the Uspenskij icon contains a combination of the snake and river, though without the ringed tollbooths. What at first glance appears to be a Mšana-type, narrow red river, is at the very top, inside the mandorla, a snake. This could well be the earliest extant serpent in Last Judgment iconography [Plate 11].

Dionisij’s Ferapontov Monastery Last Judgment frescos, usually dated 1502–1503, seem to represent another type of intermediary or variant. Its vertical organization of space is somewhat closer to the Novgorod-Kirillov icon than to the Mšana type, but on the uppermost level, here on the ceiling of the vault adjoining the west wall, are the parables of the Ten Virgins (Mt 25.1–13) and Prodigal Son (Lk 15.11–32), which inform the Last Judgment. The fiery river emerges as it does in the Novgorod icon, from behind the circular perimeter of the general resurrection. Crucial for our purposes is that the frescos contain an unmistakable set of rings on a semi-transparent, sky-blue pathway that proceeds upward from just inside of the fiery lake. There are no demons within or near these rings and no trace of where the pathway leads at the top (since Christ has been eliminated by a window cut), but it does not end at the feet of Adam as a snake. These might be the earliest iconographic tollbooths to survive [Plate 12].

\[^{33}\] IRI 3:484.
\[^{34}\] Popov pointed to an Italian round hat with a turned up brim on a sinner not seen in Italian painting until the mid-fifteenth century: Živopis’ i miniatjura Moskvy serediny XV–načala XVI veka (Moscow, 1975), 57, 128–29 n. 85.
\[^{35}\] One difference, though, is that Adam and Eve are on the level of those awaiting judgment, as in the thirteenth-century Axtala fresco: Thierry, 150–51.
\[^{37}\] Irina Danilova, Freski Ferapontovo monastyrja/The Frescoes of St. Pherapont Monastery (Moscow, 1971), left side, pl. 81–82, right side, pl. 24, 65.
What does the written evidence tell us? Not much at first. It is an open
question when the notion of the tollhouses first came to Rus’. According to S. G. Vilinskij, the textual proximity of the Primary Chronicle’s 941 entry
concerning a Rus’ attack on Constantinople indicates that the first Rus’ version of the Life of Basil the Younger existed at the latest by the early twelfth
century.39 This argument assumes that the chronicler’s direct or indirect source
was not a Greek text. There is, in fact, no reliable manuscript or literary proof
that the tollbooths were known in Rus’ in the pre-Mongol period. The best
evidence comes from the Life of Avraamij of Smolensk, but we lack any trace
of his purported separate icons of the Last Judgment and the tollbooths. The
earliest extant copies of the first Rus’ Basil the Younger and of Avraamij’s
Life are sixteenth-century.40

Rus’ literati by this time had adapted Basil the Younger’s vision and
integrated it with other, fully eschatological works into the Sermon on the ...
Celestial Powers.41 This piece follows a righteous soul up through the
tollbooths to God’s throne, then on to a forty-day tour of paradise and hell
given by the Archangel Michael, and finally to a wait in paradise for the Last
Judgment. In the popular compendium known as Izmaragd, the sermon was
credited to “Our Holy Father Kirill” or “Kirill the Philosopher.” As a result,
some scholars have attributed it to the shadowy bishop Kirill of Turov (d. ca.
1182).42 Most specialists, however, viewed its doctrines and style as foreign
to Kirill and leaned, rather, toward the even more obscure Avraamij. Recent
scholarship has questioned this attribution as well.43 Whatever the case, both

literatury,” Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveščeniia, Sept. 1914: 203–207, agreed in
substance with Vilinskij as to the provenance of the Rus’ texts, but quibbled over
terminology. Thematic affinities between the Life and Ilarion’s Sermon on Law and Grace
prompted Vilinskij to suggest an eleventh-century translation.
40 Rozanov, ed., Žitija prepodobnogo Avraamija, I–xiv, 8; trans., Paul Hollingsworth,
skepticism, 298, where he calls Avraamij “Suzdal’s.”
41 G. Fedotov gives a précis of Celestial Powers in Russian Religious Mind 1: 169–75; cf.
Gerhard Podskalsky, Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus’ (Munich,
1988), 102–103. The briefest version of the published texts is found in K. F. Kalajdović,
Pamjatniki rossiskoj slovesnosti XII veka (Moscow, 1821), 92–101; a fuller but not
necessarily later version was published by S. V. Ševyrev in Izvestija po Imperatorskoj
42 Kalajdović, accepted by Metropolitan Evgenii and other nineteenth-century publishers
of Kirill’s “complete works”: See Simon Franklin, Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus’
(Cambridge Mass., 1991), xiv–xcv. These attributions may be due to the thematically
related Homily 14 of Pseudo-Cyrill of Alexandria: see above, note 3.
43 Supporters of Avraamij’s authorship included S. P. Ševyrev, F. Buslaev, V. Saxarov, A.
the first Rus' *Basil the Younger* and the *Celestial Powers* cycle reduced the enumeration of the tollbooths from twenty-one to twenty. This figure, reproduced in both Novgorod icons, became the literary standard in Russia.44

The earliest manuscript of *Celestial Powers* has been dated to the early to mid-fourteenth century,45 placing it at least before the Second Byzantine-South Slavic influence in Rus' picked up steam. V. A. Jakovlev identified an extended redaction of *Celestial Powers*, found in the fourteenth- or fifteenth-century second redaction of *Izmaragd*.46 There is also an adaptation of *Celestial Powers*—the Sermon on Mixailovskij Sobor, discovered in a seventeenth- or eighteenth-century manuscript.47

The relations among all of these works and their dates remain to be elucidated.48 Nevertheless, the internal and external evidence is suggestive. The second Rus' *Basil the Younger* and the shorter published redaction of *Celestial Powers* envision the end of the seventh millennium (7000/1491–1492) in the future.49 The extended *Celestial Powers* and Mixailovskij Sobor


44 The norm of twenty tollbooths survived the advent of the second Rus' *Basil the Younger* with the original twenty-one: pseudo-Parfenii Jurodivyj ([?] Ivan IV), “Kanon angelu groznomu voevode,” (ed. D. S. Lixačev), *TODRL* 22 (1964): 24, and the choice that the Ukrainian Dmitrij (Dmytro) Tuptało of Rostov or his official editors made for Russia's authoritative menologium *Life of Basil the Younger: Kniga žiti svjatych*, March 15–31:104–115. Though influenced by Counter-Reformation and Baroque Catholic hagiography, Dmitrij did not purge the tollbooths as did one of the sources of his *Basil the Younger*, the seventeenth-century Catholic version of Johannes Bollandus (Jan van Bolland): Vilinskij, 264–74; c.f. *Acta Sanctorum* (Paris, 1863–1925), under 26 March.

45 As *Slovo* 12 of the first redaction *Izmaragd*, *Celestial Powers* is part of the fragmentary *Troica*-Serg. 204 (presumably now in the former Lenin Library [GBL/BIL]), which Sreznevski figured was pre-1350, and O. V. Tvorogov mid-fourteenth century: V. A. Jakovlev, *K literaturnoj istorii drevnerusskih sbornikov. Opyt issledovanija “Izmaragda”* (Odessa, 1893), 8, 13; *SKKDR* 2, pt. 1, 397–401; Vilinskij refers to *Rum. Muč.* 186 (also GBL/BIL) as the fragmentary fourteenth-century copy: Vilinskij, 312.

46 Jakovlev, 187: the text he cited, published in *Pravoslavnuy sobesednik*, 1859, 1:256, is an extended redaction of only a small portion of the sermon and lacks the tollbooths.


48 Neither *Izmaragd*, which contains the sermon, nor early Rus' eschatology has been thoroughly examined for along time: *SKKDR* 1:1:401. Plugin, 30–41, contains a bare bones sketch of the eschatology that uncritically utilizes the *Nikon Chronicle* as a reliable source for the fifteenth century.

49 Cf. *...poneže vsja veysa mimoidosta i se vsja nova byka: n'bo novo, zemlja nova, č'k' nov'; presto sedmierica i se pride osmerica—the fourteenth-fifteenth-century Moscow Glavnyj Arxiv codex (now in RGADA) noted by: Vilinskij, 218; *Skončavašaja roku žitija, ostaviměšja g' lětom* sedmja tysiæči, budeť v' ta g lěta carstvo Antixristovo. Po skončaní ži ta g lět ... ... Posem' budeť zemlja nova i ravna, jakože bě izkoni .... Kalajdovič, 100–101.
hedge concerning the timing. The former does not even mention "7000," while the latter implies the validity of the eschatology after this date, as if the authors did not wish to be undercut by terrestrial time. References in Mixailovskij Sobor to "those who disdain the traditions of the holy Fathers and even create a schism in the divine church," and to hope for "repose from the heterodox Muslim lands," suggest 1439 as a terminus a quo for the composition. Elsewhere Mixailovskij Sobor is close to Iosif Volockij's invective missive of 1493–1494 to Bishop Nifont of Suzdal against Metropolitan Zosima. The rebuilding of either Čudov Monastery in 1500–1504 or Arxangel'skij Cathedral in 1505–1509 would have provided a perfect pretext for the delivery of a Slovo na Sobor Arxistratiga Mixaila. Thus ca. 1439–1509 is a reasonable hypothetical period for the further development of Celestial Powers and, consequently, of revived interest in the tollbooths

---

30 Ševyrev, 191.
31 Glašoleti že jako po sedmix" tysjačax" let" prirod" Xristov" budet'. Kogda že prijestvie ego budet', nikto ze věst': se bo Gsd i Apostolom" utait" obace uho znamenija nekajaj javi predvariti. Predi že Xva prijestvija pridet' suprotivnik" Xristu, merzost' zapustenija, syn" bezakonnyj, prediteča diavolov", i vsjakomu nečestiju vina, eže est' Antixrist", i roditija, jako že glet Božestvennyj Ippolit", Papa Rimskii, i Prepodobni Efrem" Sirin", iž ženy skvěly dévicy, ot" Evrei suči, kolena Danova, iže bjaše otrok" Jakova; budet' že carstva ego tri lěta ...: Rozov, 19.
32 Ibid., 16–18: i zemli našei oτ" inovérnyx" heserménakix" strand" obleččitsja, ... : Rozov's linking this hope to the Mongol period only does not convince.
33 Compare above, n. 51, Mixailovskij Sobor and Iosif to Nifont: ... nyne sidit skvěly žlobený volk, obolokijsj v pastyrsksu odevu, iže činom svjatičevi, aprižzeniemer ludu predatel' i pričastnik besom, iže oskveni svjačestevi šefski velikij prestol, ovex uho židovstvu učja, inex že zodomskymi skvěnymi skvěnija: zmij pagubnyj, mr"zostii zastupenie/zastupenija na mestom svjatom, ostočcc Xristov ... Antixristov predčija ...: Ja. S. Luč (J. Lurja), A. A. Zimin, Poslanija Iosifa Volockogo (hereafter PIV, Moscow-Leningrad, 1959), 121–27, 160–61. The earliest texts of Iosif's missive are from the mid-sixteenth century, but it served as a source for Skazanie o novojavivšiesja eresi, which survives in a manuscript written by 1514: N. A. Kazakova and Ja. S. Luč, Antifeodal'nye eretičeskie dvizhenija na Rusi XIV–načala XVI veka (hereafter AED, Moscow-Leningrad, 1955), 443, 461.
34 Mixailovskij Sobor also contains several signs of being closer to the first Rus' Basil the Younger than does Celestial Powers, indicating the coexistence of variant recensions of the latter. We see this first in the rendition of sins: for the fifteenth toll-house, where first Celestial Powers has vsjaka eres' ... Mixailovskij Sobor's kumiroslulenie i vsjaka eres' ... is closer to the original Greek and Rus' "idolatry and all other heresy"; the sixteenth tollbooths of first Rus' Basil the Younger had both homosexuality and adultery: homosexuality was lost in the first Celestial Powers, but restored in Mixailovskij Sobor. This is also evident in the listing of the tollbooths. Celestial Powers altered the first Rus' Basil the Younger's (1) oklevetanie, (2) poruganie, (3) zavist', (4) obolganje, (5) jarost' i gnev" to (1) obolganje, (2) oklevetanie, (3) zavist', (4) gnev", (5) jarost' s' gnevom"; Mixailovskij Sobor partially restored the original: (1) poruganie, (2) oklevetanie, (3) zavist', (4) Iza; (5) jarost' s' gnevom". In both works the remaining fifteen tollbooths follow in the original order.
and the greater emphasis upon the minor judgment. We are now in a position to link specific works to the iconography.

V

The textual genesis of the snake on the Moscow Uspenskij icon may be identifiable from the apocalyptic sources of both Mixailovskij Sobor and Iosif’s missive: the related writings attributed to Hippolytus of Rome and Methodius of Patara: 55

For as Christ springs from the tribe of Judah, so Antichrist is to spring from the tribe of Dan.... from the words of Jacob: “Let Dan be a serpent, lying upon the ground, biting the horse’s heel” (Gn 3.1). What, then, is meant by the serpent, but Antichrist, that deceiver mentioned in Genesis .... And the words, “her child was caught up to God and to His throne” (Rv 12.5), signify that he who is always born of her is a heavenly king, and not an earthly, as David also declared of old when he said: “The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool” (Ps 90.1).

This snake thus should be Satan hypostacised as the defeated Antichrist, here both as Christ’s “footstool” and “cast out into the earth” (Rv 12.7–9). Confirmation of such an identity is found in the apocryphal Life of Andrej Jurodivy:56

The Antichrist, already defeated and captured along with his demons and guarded by the blessed angels, will be placed before the judicial tribunal and made to answer for the souls he has destroyed.

Further attestation of this identification comes from the depictions of the Last Judgments, starting with Rublev’s restoration: a snake’s head is on the tail of the ten-horned, fourth beast/kingdom (Dn 7.1–8), which in Revelation becomes that of the Antichrist (Rv 17.1–14).57 The cosmic, eschatological

55 Some of these were known in Rus as early as the eleventh century: V. M. Istrin, Otkrovenie Mefodija Patarskogo (St. Petersburg, 1897), Prilozenie, 113–14; The Writings of Hippolytus, Bishop of PORTA II, trans. S. D. F. Salmond, Edinburgh, 1869), 10, 36 (“Treatise on Christ and Antichrist.” 10, 61); SKDR 1: 283–85, 425–26. Serpents used otherwise in the Byzantine world could have purely positive connotations, as for example, in protective amulets: see Natalia Teteriatnikov, “The Devotional Image in Pre-Mongol Rus,” Christianity and the Arts in Russia, ed. William C. Brumfield and Milos M. Velmirovic (Cambridge et al., 1991), 37, pl. 21.

56 Makarij, Metropolitan of Moscow, Velikija Minei čećii (hereafter VMČ), 22 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1868–1917), 2 October: 220; the earliest copy is from ca. 1400: SKDR 1:131–32.

57 M. V. Alpatov, Andrej Rublev, pl. 34; cf. The Refutation of all Heresies by Hippolytus
warfare of the popular Slavic version of Ephrem of Syria, moreover, has the “serpent himself ... flying in the air.”

Placing the origin of the snake and the tollbooths in Russia in the latter fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries harmonizes with the intellectual and spiritual turmoil of the time: the turmoil over the year “7000” (September 1491–August 1492), the overall problem of religious dissidence, and, perhaps, the ongoing challenge of Roman Catholicism. There was heightened interest in spiritual perfection and eschatology. But what to believe? Some Kirillov-Belozersk monks, or at least their miscellany, displayed outright skepticism toward the Revelation of Methodius of Patara and the Life of Basil the Younger. At the same time, the power at the court of rationalizing dissidents (elite “Judaizers”), as well as the number of European scholars, technicians, and architects active in Moscow and Novgorod in the late fifteenth century, may have influenced the iconographic innovativeness with eschatological subjects.

No thorough-going conflict between Iosifites and Trans-Volgans was at work here. Nil Sorskij, as we now know, was as interested as Iosif in preventing the passing of the year “7000” from discrediting Scripture and the Church, and they shared some artistic tastes. The active and rather

---


58 A. S. Arxangel’skij, Tvorenija otcov cerkvi ν drevnerusskoj pis’mennosti (4 vols., Kazan, 1889–1891), 3:1–118, esp. 65. Cf. Irina Âgren, Parenesis Efrema Sirina. K istorii slavjanskogo perevoda. Studia slavica upsaliensa 26 (1989), 14–18. In this regard it may also be significant that the renovations of Moscow’s Arxangel’skij Sobor (built 1333, rebuilt 1505–1509, repainted 1660s), which include in the west wall Last Judgment a wingless Satan, a ringed snake, and an explicit narrow river, have at the top depictions of the temptations of Eve by the serpent and of Christ by Satan (this data graciously supplied by David Rich); cf. Ju. N. Dmitriev, “Stenopis’ Arxangel’skogo sobora Moskovskogo kremlja,” Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo. XVII Vek (Moscow, 1964), 158.


62 G. B. Popov, 57, paired the Moscow Uspenskij Last Judgment icon with the unique Apocalypse icon also found in Moscow’s Uspenskij Cathedral, which Yves Christe claims betrays European influences: Christe, 59–67. The most detailed study of the latter is Alpatov.

amorphous Trans-Volgans were not in principle hostile to eschatological speculation. One Kirillov monk copied “Blessed Hippolytus” in the same codex where he recorded doubts about Methodius of Patara and Basil the Younger. This combination complements the Uspenskij icon with the defeated snake sans tollbooths [Plate 11].

Stronger arguments favor a connection between early i osifljanstvo and the Moscow Uspenskij iconographic serpent. In Slovo 4 of Prosvetitel (no later than 1504), Iosif says that the heretics “enlisted with the devil and his angels and the new, deadly Judas.” In his letter to Nifont, Iosif calls Metropolitan Zosima (1490–1494, then presiding at Moscow Uspenskij) “a willful Judas the Traitor and partner of the demons, ... the deadly serpent and advocate of darkness, ... the forerunner of the Antichrist,” who denies the general resurrection. The missive begins as does Methodius’s Revelation, cites Hippolytus, groups diverse sins together, and exudes cosmic eschatology. Zosima, in line with the Apostle Paul’s prediction, is “the son of perdition, ...revealed in his time (2 Ths 3.6).” The true Orthodox, as in the apocalyptic
tradition and the Last Judgment icons, must stand as martyrs with God (Christ) or perish as his enemies. On the other hand, in the defense of the eschatology of Ephrem of Syria usually attributed to Iosif, the fiery river plays a central role, so it is difficult imagining him wishing to do away with it altogether. It is not unreasonable to propose that the snake/river appeared after Zosima was deposed, when Moscow’s Uspenskij Cathedral was in the hands of Iosif’s allies—between 1494 and 1511.

VI

Another piece of writing usually attributed to Iosif may help solve the problem of the tollbooths. The testamentary introduction to his Extended Rule indicates genuine concern about the tollbooths within the monastery’s walls:

Basil the Great [sic] speaks similarly: I think that neither the great illuminators and Spirit-bearing fathers nor the holy martyrs passed the demonic tollbooths (besov’skaja mytarstva) at the hour of death without an investigation (istjazani). Therefore, brothers, if even such great men engaged in such great toils can expect to be called to account at the hour of death, how can we, the passionate and the wretched, escape these terrible inquests?

The introduction begins and ends with an invocation of the “terrible tribunal of Christ.” We therefore have one more text combining both judgments—in this case one which has tollbooths and a means to avoid their horrors, namely, the monastic rule. Iosif’s words here may be the clue to the prove that the eschatology of Ephrem of Syria is consistent with Scripture: AEDI, 412.

72 AEDI, 409–414: this third slovo of the Skazanie o končanii sed’moj tyjašči (ProsvetiteV, Slovo 10) has many references to elements of Last Judgment and Apocalypse iconography.
73 E. S. Smirnova thinks it possible that this river was superimposed on the original icon: Moskovskaja ikona, 282.
74 VMČ 1:500–501, 503; Goldfrank trans., 64, 67. Iosif died in 1515; as of 1960, the earliest known copies of this work dated from the 1540s: Lur’e, Ideologiëeskaja bor’ba, 219. Pliguzov surmises that the Extended Rule “was compiled by Iosif’s disciples from his writings” towards the end of his life or after his death: Pliguzov, 1058.
75 Basil “the Great” of Caesarea (d. 379), the authoritative coenobiarich, whom Iosif cites often in his Extended Rule, did not admit to such a fate after death: P. A. Recheis, OSB, Engel, Tod, und Seelenreise. Das Wirken der Geister beim Heimgang des Menschen in der Lehre der alexandrischen und kappadoschen Väter (Temi i Testi 4, Rome, 1958), 177.
76 VMČ 1:499, 503; trans., 63, 67.
77 Ibid., 503: “The holy martyrs submitted their bodies to many lashes, bloodshed, and violent deaths. Similarly, our holy fathers shed blood by their asceticism, mortification, and bloody sweat, so that they would not be put on trial (istjazani) at the terrible hour of death. We need not shed our blood or bloody sweat, but merely must cut off a few trivial and
standard tollbooths and to the non-demonic ones in Ferapontov, which depict a more user-friendly immediate judgment. Surely the elders, who commissioned these frescos in the heartland of Russian neo-hesychasm, had their own sense of the place of demons in an iconographic program. The iconostasis icon of the Descent/Resurrection, which Dionisij’s workshop painted for them ca. 1495–1503, depicted the victory of symbolic angels, each over a paired demon: resurrection—fall; life—death; love—hate; simplicity—bitterness; *sanctity—corruption; wisdom—despair; humility—arrogance; understanding—folly; purity—filth; joy—grief; *righteousness—crookedness.78

Dionisij also painted the Uspenskij Cathedral at Iosif’s Monastery in 1485 or soon thereafter, during the heyday of the “Jewish-thinking Novgorod Heretics,” as he called them.79 Did the Iosifov Last Judgment have demonic tollbooths? The text of the Extended Rule indicates that Iosif, his council of elders, and their immediate successors favored such an image. But this does not prove origins, just utility. After the victory in 1504–1505 over the heretics, whom Iosif characterized as “the devil himself and his entire army,”80 he should have welcomed a depiction of their being cast down into the hell by Michael’s band of angels, as in both the Novgorod and Msana icon types. If Iosif’s writings can serve as a guide, a specifically Iosifite Last Judgment would also have had a fiery river engulfing the earth, and perhaps the direct pathway for saints to Heavenly Jerusalem, as in the Novgorod Boris-and-Gleb icon [Plate 8].

At any rate, the Novgorod variants, with their Old Testament, apocalyptic “Ancient of Days” and joining of sophic and pronoetic motifs at the top, indicate the possibilities of such iconography to further the official Church’s vision of the cosmos. In Prosvetitel’, Iosif (and Nil) defended Jesus as the true Messiah, whose (apocryphal) descent into Hell and tricking Satan released the unnecessary nothings and be concerned over these traditions in a meek and prudent manner.”

78 Smirnova, Moskovskaja ikona, 291, pl. 145 (the asterisk indicates my own surmise, where the letters are lost). V. K. Laurina links this icon to Nil Sorskij’s writings: “Vnov’ raskrytaja ikona ‘SoiSestvie vo ad’ iz Ferapontova monastyrja i moskovskaja literatura konca XV veka,” TODRL 22 (1966): 174–77. Nil, as leading contemporary theorist of the struggle against spiritual vices, may have influenced this icon, but he should not have been totally opposed to demonic tollbooths. The oldest manuscript of the first Rus’ Basil the Younger comes from his hermitage: Vilinskij, 129.
79 PIV, 270.
80 AED, 474.
81 Cf. another Russian Last Judgment icon of unknown origin, but dated second half of the sixteenth century in Garidis, pl. 37. The Arxangešskij Cathedral frescos of ca. 1508, may also have had both tollbooths and river, if the later renovations can serve as evidence: see above, note 58.
righteous, and whose Second Coming will signal the Last Judgment.\(^{82}\) The differences between Iosif and the Ferapontov elders may have been more nuanced than fundamental. Iosif also linked the redemptive value of virtues to Christ's victory over Satan,\(^{83}\) and the Ferapontov frescos confidently affirm Orthodoxy against heresy.\(^{84}\)

The specific attention to geometric form and symmetry and the apparent "astrological heaven" of the Novgorod-Kirillov Last Judgment icon could be the key to its dating. Iosif's writings are virtually devoid of any neo-Pythagoreanism. On the other hand, the slightly later polemics of Filofej of Pskov and Maksim Grek pit Divine Providence against the astrology and mathematical theology of the djak Misjur-Munexin and the German physician Nikolaj Bulev (Nemčin).\(^{85}\) Therefore the 1520s–1530s is a reasonable guess for the time of composition of this icon.\(^{86}\)

This dating allows for an earlier appearance of the snake cum "demonic tollbooths" when Iosif was hegumen of his own monastery, 1479–1515. We also have grounds to place at this time an original snake without tollbooths and tollbooths without a snake or demons—precisely during the turbulent period when Moscow annexed Novgorod and Pskov. Finally, we should note

---


\(^{83}\) Ibid. (Slovo 4), 157–69.

\(^{84}\) Danilova, left side, 8–9, but with reservations; also T. N. Mixel'ison, "Živopisnyj cikl Ferapontova monastyrja," TORDR 22 (1966), 152.

\(^{85}\) In addition, Filofej’s specific reliance upon Hippolytus’s eschatology points to serpentine Last Judgment iconography, and, as in Iosif’s missive to Nifont, Filofej lumped together sodomy, murder, and hardheartedness, suggesting the diverse selection of sins earmarked by the tollbooths: V. N. Malinin, Sverec Eliazarova Monastyrya Filofej i ego poslanija (Kyiv, 1901), Priložnentje, 33–56, 71–75; V. S. Ikonnikov, Maksim Grek i ego vremja (2nd ed., Kyiv, 1915), 243–44; N. V. Sinicyna, Maksim Grek v Rossii (Moscow, 1977), 86–87; Arno Langeier, Maksim Grek, Byzantijn en Humanist in Rusland (Amsterdam, 1986), 97–101. There seems to have been no overt, speculative, geometric consciousness in East Slavic theological discourse until the early sixteenth century, when Maksim Grek lowered his sights against Bulev and his apparent neo-Pythagorean explanation of the Trinity.

a practical reason for Iosif's wishing to emphasize the immediate judgment: he was at the forefront of the rationalizing of memorial services for the dead—a crucial element of the monastery's economy. A cynic might even suggest that the iconographic tollbooths owe their inspiration to crass materialism and orchestrated fear.

The invention of the snake who rises up to the foot of Adam and is the pathway for the aerial tollbooths remains somewhat of a mystery. A symbol of a redemptive victory over original sin for any soul that successfully traverses them, and of a likely terminal fall for those who fail, the snake facilitated the visual joining of the immediate and final judgments. Circumstances and texts indicate plausible origins and addition to Last Judgment iconography of the iconographic serpent and tollbooths having occurred in Russia during the period when Nil Sorskij and Iosif Volockij were collaborating to combat skepticism and heresy, despite their quite distinct programs of monastic reform. However, as the Western Ukrainian variants show, it is not at all to be excluded that the iconographic notion of combining the minor and major judgments with a submissive serpent leading up from Hell to Adam originated in part or wholly elsewhere in Rus' or in Byzantium or southeastern Europe. Ottoman conquests, European cultural developments, or the Council of Florence and the doctrine on Purgatory, which the Orthodox rejected when they repudiated the council, could have been catalysts. Accordingly, the Moscow Uspenskij icon, the Ferapontov frescos, and the Novgorod type all would have been secondary developments. These, however, are problems beyond the purview of the present study.

Georgetown University

---

Recent developments in the world of Eastern Christianity have brought to the fore two major ecclesiastical events the four-hundreth anniversary of which, in one case, recently has been, and in the other soon will be, commemorated. The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe has raised the issue of the Russian Church's role not only in Russian society but also in the greater Orthodox movement. Facing the challenges of a new playing field, the various autocephalous and would-be-autocephalous Orthodox Churches are jockeying for position on the axis between the Church of Constantinople and the Church of Moscow, the autocephaly of which was formally recognized by its elevation to the status of a patriarchate in 1589. The reemergence of the various Eastern Catholic Churches in Slovakia, Romania, and most prominently in Ukraine has opened anew scholarly and polemical discussion concerning the issue of "Uniatism" and the nature, genesis, and legacy of the Union of Brest (1595/1596). The journey of Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople to Muscovy in 1588–1589 was the occasion for the establishment of the Moscow Patriarchate and variously a catalyst for the process that led to the Union of Brest. Here I would like to present a series of considerations and fontological observations towards a fresh appraisal of the interconnectedness of these late sixteenth-century ecclesiastical processes.

These prolegomena are in preparation for a series of forthcoming studies including a book-length examination of the genesis of the Union of Brest. I believe the Union of Brest and the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate are interconnected. As I intend to show in a separate article, however, it is the trip of Patriarch Jeremiah, not his creation of the Moscow Patriarchate, that was a central factor in pushing the hierarchy of the Kievan Metropolitanate toward union with Rome. I attempt to characterize, as far as it is possible, the experience of Patriarch Jeremiah and his entourage while in Muscovy in an article forthcoming in *Logos: A Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* (Sheptytsky Institute, University of Saint Paul, Ottawa). There I focus on the predicament of the Ecumenical Patriarch in Muscovy. By paying close attention to the sources that document Jeremiah's stay in Muscovy from the beginning to the end, it is possible to view the creation of the patriarchate as part of an extended odyssey. An examination of the various aspects of Jeremiah's one-year sojourn in Muscovy reflected in the sources serves as a prelude to and elucidation of his activity in the Kievan metropolitan province in the autumn of 1589. In the present article, I concentrate on the sources for Patriarch Jeremiah's stay in Muscovy and the establishment of the Moscow Patriarchate.
HISTORIOGRAPHY

Relatively little attention has been devoted to the establishment of the Moscow Patriarchate in recent literature. Furthermore, much of the historiography of the event and the period is not entirely satisfying. In fact the last major study of Jeremiah’s sojourn in Muscovy is that by Aleksei Ia. Shpakov, a comprehensive work that nevertheless is a mediocre example of late imperial Russian Church historiography. In addressing issues of sixteenth-century Russian ecclesiastical development and the historical literature about it, one confronts numerous hackneyed formulations that are formidable obstacles in understanding the underlying texture and course of Russian Church history of the period. Overarching ideological constructs have been viewed by historians as primary forces driving sixteenth-century


3 There is no adequate study of Russian Church historiography. A. V. Kartashev provided a historiographic essay covering only the main surveys and not the monographic literature, Ocherki po istorii Russkoi tserkvi 1 (Paris, 1959): 12–39. Sergey G. Pushkarev completed the Church history section of George Vernadsky’s posthumously published Russian Historiography: A History (Belmont, Mass., 1978), 374–448. Pushkarev’s chapter, as well as the entire volume, is selective in its coverage, erratic, very poorly edited, and hopelessly out-of-date.
Muscovite ecclesiastical developments. Thus, despite meager evidence supporting such a view, the “Possessor/Non-possessor” struggle is seen to be implicit throughout the century's Church affairs. So too, the theory of “Moscow the Third Rome” has been used to explain various trajectories in early modern Russian Church history without any critical assessment of how the Muscovites understood the theory or determining the parameters of a “Third Rome consciousness.”

Much has been written on the question of “Moscow, the Third Rome.” For bibliographical indications and further references, see Richard W. F. Pope, “A Possible South Slavic Source for the Doctrine: Moscow the Third Rome,” Slavia 44 (1975): 246 n. 1 as well as the series of publications that have resulted from the above-mentioned conferences in Rome, “Da Roma alla Terza Roma.” Given the scarcity of sixteenth-century references to the theory it is unclear that sixteenth-century Muscovites conceived of their state and Church in Third-Rome categories. In any case, they did not generally interpret the “Third Rome” according to the universalist imperial ideology of the first two Romes. Speaking about his intentions concerning the “East,” Ivan IV told Antonio Possevino, the Jesuit emissary of Pope Gregory XIII, who in 1581–1582 travelled to Moscow to mediate in the peace talks between Muscovy and King Stefan Batory hoping that thereby Muscovy could be brought into an anti-Ottoman coalition and won over for Church union, “Здешнего государства все святое не хотим” Pamiatniki diplomaticheskikh snoshenii drevnei Rossi s derzhavami inostrannymi (St. Petersburg, 1851–1871) part 1, vol. 10, p. 174. Throughout the sixteenth century the references to “Moscow, the Third Rome” are few and far between. Nina V. Sinitsyna points out that the use of the “Third Rome” formula in the documents destined for foreign consumption at the time of the establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow was circumspect, “Uchrezhdenie patriarshestva i Tretii Rim,” IV Centenario dell'istituzione del patriarcato in Russia, 59–80. See Daniel B. Rowland, “Moscow—the Third Rome or the New Israel?” The Russian Review 55, no. 4 (October, 1996), 591–612. Much has been made of the fact that Jeremiah signed the gramota announcing the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate which includes a “Third Rome” formulation, Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1818), no. 59, p. 97. Juraj Križanič attributes the formulation to the patriarch: “I do not know what the patriarch Jeremiah was thinking of when he called Moscow the Third Rome. It would follow from that that the empire of Moscow is one of the three heads of the eagle (of Ezra), doomed to damnation and perdition.” For Križanič the three heads symbolized the Roman, Greek, and German Empires, the last of which came to an end with the demise of Charles V. Križanič, “Tolkovanie istoricheskikh prorochev,” Chetniia (Moscow), 1881, 2, pp. 11, and his Russkoe gosudarstwo v polovine XVII v. 1:354–56. Cf. Hildegard Schaeder, Moskau das dritte Rom (Hamburg, 1929), 118. [republished as Moskau das dritte Rom: Studien zur Geschichte der politischen Theorien in der slavischen Welt (Darmstadt, 1957) originally published in Osteuropäische Studien, vol. 1, 1929.] The source for Filofei was the Apocalypse of Ezra, translated from the Vulgate into Slavonic as part of the preparation of the Genadii Bible. According to Ezra Daniel had a vision of a twelve-winged, three-headed eagle. An angle explained that the eagle was the fourth animal of Daniel’s vision (i.e. the Roman Empire) and that the heads symbolize three reigns (IV Ezra, xii, 23), interpreted as Rome, Constantinople, and Moscow. For a discussion of the genesis of the Third Rome formulation and its connection with the vision of Ezra, as well as the English translation of the quote from Križanič, see Dmitri Strémooukhoff, “Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine,” Speculum (January, 1953): 84–101; reprinted in The Structure of Russian History, ed. Michael Cherniavsky, 108–125. O. Ohloblyn, Moskov’ska Teoria III Rymu (Munich, 1951)
In twentieth-century historiography, the life of the sixteenth-century Muscovite Church *per se* has not received much focused attention. Historians functioning within the conceptual confines of the Soviet scholarly establishment treated ecclesiastical processes in reductionist terms, and, therefore, could not treat religious history seriously. Western historians have concentrated their research on sixteenth-century Muscovite political history, its ideology, and criticism of the sources. The social history of the Muscovite religious life of that period has yet to be seriously broached. Here, the availability of evidence is an important factor. The historian of the East Slavic *Cinquecento* can envy the source base that has allowed his/her colleagues to reappraise early modern West European religious history. Consequently, the outlines and themes of Muscovite sixteenth-century religious history, as established by prerevolutionary historians, have not been comprehensively challenged.

The student of Ruthenian-Muscovite ecclesiastical interaction stands before particularly formidable historiographical constructs. The *kursy* of Russian Church history, written by members of the Russian school of ecclesiastical historians from Metropolitan Platon (Levshin) and Makarii (Bulgakov), both of Moscow, to the layman Anton V. Kartashev, who wrote in Paris as an émigré, are characterized by a more or less conscious subordination of East Slavic ecclesiastical developments—spanning a broad geographical, cultural, and chronological gradient—to specific historiographic themes, especially the rise of the Muscovite and modern Russian state. Within these parameters, Ruthenian developments were subsumed as “West Russian” episodes in the “all-Russian” experience. The latter served as the point of departure for the former. Ruthenian processes were more or less “Russian.” The Russian school of ecclesiastical history-writing tended to view Ruthenian Church history as a series of rifts with, and necessary returns to, the Russian mainstream. As such, Ruthenian ecclesiastical life did not constitute a history with its own dynamic. The teleological monism, so vividly preached by Karamzin, greatly influenced Russian ecclesiastical historiography, even the scholarship of recent decades. Thus, Kartashev argues “that on the expansive plains of Eastern Europe, history created not a variegated juxtaposition of a multitude of Filofei’s theory became the official doctrine of Moscow. Maslennikov, “Ideologicheskaia bor’ba v pskovskoi literature v periode obrazovaniia russkogo centralizovanogo gosudarstva,” in *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury*, 8, following Likhachev *Natsional’noe samosoznanie v drevnej Rusi* (1945), 100-104 denies it. A critical reassessment of the sixteenth-century genesis and subsequent importance of the notion of “Moscow, the Third Rome,” beyond the boundaries of this topic, is being prepared by Donald Ostrowski.
disparate races, languages, and states, but one imperial body, one nation, one culture, and one organically, not violently, prevailing Russian Orthodox Church. It is pointless to endeavor to cover the sunlight of the day with an obfuscating shroud.5

These deterministic presuppositions, frequently accompanied by a propensity for value judgment, are particularly entrenched in history-writing concerning the period "leading up to" the creation of the patriarchate. Traditional Russian historiography has argued that the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate was a necessary result of the "progress" of Muscovite Church history. Throughout the fourteenth century, the paternalistic attitude of the Patriarchate of Constantinople towards the East Slavs, extending to the political sphere, caused increasing tension between Moscow and Constantinople. The exercise of the Patriarch's prerogative to nominate metropolitans for the East Slavs led to Muscovite disenchantment with Greek ecclesiastical overlordship. According to the traditional thesis, in the fourteenth century, at a time when the Kievan see was an important bone of contention in the struggle for territory and political power between Muscovy and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, the Muscovites found the nomination of Kievan metropolitans increasingly objectionable.6 The independence of the Moscow Metropolitanate in the fifteenth century and the creation of the patriarchate in the sixteenth grew "inevitably" out of this incongruity.

---

5 Kartashev expressed the principle of this historiographic vision in criticizing the change in title between the first, Italian-language edition and the subsequent, German-language edition of Albert M. Ammann's East Slavic Church history, *Storia della Chiesa russa e dei paesi limitrofi* (Turin, 1948); *Abriss der ostslawischen Kirchengeschichte* (Vienna, 1950): “что история на обширной равнине Восточной Европы соткала не пестрое подлеположение множества разрозненных рас, языков и государств, а единое имперское тело, единую нацию, единую культуру и единую органически, а не насильственно первенствующую Русскую православную церковь. Безполезно пытаться скрыть дневный свет солнца затемняющей занавесью.” A. V. Kartashev, *Ocherki po istorii Russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1960), 38-39. Such declarations concerning the peaceful and natural development of political, national, cultural, and ecclesiastical imperial hegemony, be it Russian or otherwise, cannot but alert even the uninitiated reader.

6 A reinterpretation of the fourteenth century, with particular attention to Byzantine sources, has been offered by John Meyendorff in his *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1981); cf. the review by Sophia Senyk in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 47 (1981): 513–16. The period from the end of the fourteenth century until the establishment of the patriarchate has received little recent attention. For a recent discussion of some aspects, see Boris N. Floria, *Otnosheniia gosudarstva i tserkvi u vostochnykh i zapadnykh slavian: Epokha sredinevik’ia* (Moscow, 1992). Floria and E. M. Lomize are preparing a major study of the Florentine union which will devote considerable attention to its repercussions among the East Slavs.
These historiographical views have deep roots. Contemporary foreigners recording their impressions of sixteenth-century Muscovy took at face value the image of the political system projected by the court ceremonial. According to this image, the tsar presided over a fundamentally static pyramid of power as sole decision-maker and autocrat. This notion was propagated in Muscovite chronicles written mostly by churchmen who framed this ideology in theocratic terms. Most subsequent history-writing on Muscovy has taken the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century sources as good coin and has, therefore, been profoundly influenced by this theocratic vision. Because of progressive Muscovite political consolidation, later Russian imperial administrative centralization and the looming image of Tsar Ivan IV, Russian historiography on the sixteenth century has generally focused attention on the person of the grand prince, viewed as a “literal autocrat” when, in fact, he and the whole political system were dependent on those “maintaining a social consensus supporting his power.”7 Correspondingly, ecclesiastical history must have been dominated by the question of how the Church and its institutions contributed to the growth of central state structures and an imperial ideology.

---


8 On the use of narrative sources for Muscovite history, the historiography about the Muscovite political system, and the “façade of autocracy,” see Nancy Shields Kollmann, Kinship and Politics: The Making of the Muscovite Political System, 1345–1547 (Stanford, 1987), 1–22, 146–151, here 2. Kollmann expresses the problem concisely: “[Muscovite] sources do not use terminology that would reveal the existence of corporate or institutional bodies, nor do they include constitutions or charters of corporate estates’ rights. These deficiencies force the historian to devise his or her own conceptual framework of politics based on a considered understanding of the society as it presents itself. For most historians, this has meant taking the narrative sources at face value when assessing the autocratic power of the sovereign and analyzing political groups and struggles in terms of the social classes to which the members and participants belonged. But this means filling in the gaps with implicit comparison of Muscovite political relations to contemporaneous European politics, and such an approach has led to conflicting and unsatisfactory historiography. A more serviceable framework can be built by following the lead of the sources with their emphasis on family and on harmony at court, and by reading narrative sources with a sensitivity to their implicit meanings” (4).
This preoccupation has led to sweeping theories about ecclesiastical issues, a lack of attentiveness to the life of the Russian Church as a community of believers, and much premature assessment. More detailed research on the post-Florence period in East Slavic Church history is needed before the causal connections between the political and ecclesiastical processes can be enunciated so categorically. In fact, much about sixteenth-century Muscovite ecclesiastical developments remains unclear and even standard theses about this period have come to be viewed with a new skepticism.9

Prerevolutionary Russian Church historiography was dominated by representatives of the Church hierarchy or intelligentsia with a clerical outlook, conservative in their interpretation and evaluation of the historical development of Muscovite and imperial Russia. Their history-writing exhibited a tendency to view the Church’s role in the growth of centralization and autocracy as a primary and positive historical contribution.10 The creation of the Moscow Patriarchate has been at the center of the “Third Rome”

9 See for example Donald Ostrowski’s “Church Polemics and Monastic Land Acquisition in Sixteenth-Century Muscovy,” Slavonic and East European Review 64 (1986): 355–79, in which the author, on the basis of a careful consideration of the source base, rejects the notion that Josephites and Non-possessors comprised and acted as distinct Church parties. See also, The Council of 1503: Source Studies and Questions of Ecclesiastical Landowning in Sixteenth-Century Muscovy, A Collection of Seminar Papers, ed. Edward L. Keenan and Donald G. Ostrowski (Cambridge, Mass., 1977). Jack E. Kollmann pointed out that the “possessor”/“non-possessor” labels cannot be applied to the hierarchs at the Stoglav council and that the conflict over monastic landholding in sixteenth-century Muscovy, as traditionally framed, was not an identifiable issue at the Stoglav. Although previous scholarship has categorized Stoglav hierarchs according to the landholding conflict, there is no evidence about the views of the council fathers on Josephitism, monastic landholding, or “anything else,” see “The Moscow Stoglav (‘Hundred Chapters’) Church Council of 1551” Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1978, 1:88–92, 200–207.

10 An analogous but opposite current dominated secular and positivistic nineteenth- and early twentieth-century analysis of Russian intellectual history. This historiographical tradition dealt with earlier periods “in the perspective of the secular and socio-political concerns of its own day. Heresies and the spiritualists (non-possessors) of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were discussed from the point of view of their impact on the consolidation of Muscovite autocracy, the fate of old ruling elites, and the origins of serfdom.” The Schism was treated likewise. In regard to the nineteenth century, attention was focused on the precursors and development of modern revolutionary thought. All emphasis was on the “progressive” intelligentsia, the avant-garde of social and political change. Conservative thinkers and religious influence on social thought were neglected, as were most aspects of the life of the Church. In this way, by viewing the stuff of history through a positivistic framework “sub specie revolutionis,” this historiographical tradition failed to apprehend historical events or ideologies in “terms of their own presuppositions and the immanent logic of their inner structure and cultural context,” see Marc Raeff, “Enticements and Rifts: Georges Florovsky as Historian of the Life of the Mind and the Life of the Church,” Modern Greek Studies Yearbook 6 (1990): 188–89.
understanding of sixteenth-century Muscovite ideology. The mention of Moscow as the “Third Rome” in the charter officially documenting the elevation of Iov to the patriarchate has been taken as proof that the Muscovites secured a patriarchate for their realm because they had been consciously advancing and acting according to a “Third Rome” ideology throughout most of the sixteenth century. Shpakov stresses that an analogous theory determined the development of the Muscovite ecclesiastical polity. Because of the “theocratic” character of the Muscovite state, it was inevitable for the civic authority to be adorned with an ecclesiastical emanation of the highest dignity, hence the creation of the patriarchate. Despite the fact that the theocratic character of the Muscovite state, viewed as a reflection of Byzantine models, acts as an operative concept throughout Shpakov’s book, it is not analyzed. Various aspects of the Byzantine paradigm are discussed in detail and are presumed to have been appropriated in Muscovy. More attention must be devoted to the way in which Byzantine models were received among the East Slavs. There are many direct religious, cultural, and ideological links between Byzantium or the Byzantine legacy and Muscovy. Yet it is an appreciation of the differences and the specific adaptation of the Byzantine legacy—producing distinctly Muscovite hieratic-religious institutions, culture, ideology, and style—that will cast new light on sixteenth-century Muscovite ecclesiastical history.

Shpakov’s Uchrezhdenie patriarshestva summarizes and reiterates the traditional historiography of nineteenth-century Russian Church historians who viewed the establishment of the patriarchate as being a determined, in fact necessary, outcome of sixteenth-century Muscovite history. The author carefully published most of the known sources for the topic. He provides hundreds of pages of more or less relevant background discussions culled mostly from secondary literature and arrives at the conclusions of his predecessors. In fact, Shpakov adds little but pathos to previous formulations. His own words sum up his teleological approach: “The entire march of historical events with a natural inexorability drew Russia to the establishment of the patriarchate.” Contemporary reinterpretation of sixteenth-century Muscovy warrants a fresh look at the events of 1588–1589.

---

11 For specific references to the theocratic nature of the Muscovite polity, see Gosudarstvo i tserkov', II, throughout but especially 19, 86, 385–87.
12 For Shpakov’s discussion of the sources, see Gosudarstvo i tserkov’ 2:244–56.
13 “Весь ход исторических событий с естественной необходимостью вел Россию к учреждению патриаршества” (Shpakov, Gosudarstvo i tserkov’ 2:260, emphasis in the original).
14 A complete reassessment of the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate requires a careful
The most important collection of information on Jeremiah’s Muscovite stay consists of the so-called Grecheskie posol’skie knigi. The Grecheskie posol’skie knigi are registers of documents, letters, reports, and directives received or issued by the sixteenth-century Muscovite Posol’skii prikaz concerning Muscovite-Greek relations. Most of the material recorded was occasioned by the travel of Greek ecclesiastics to Muscovy. At the end of the eighteenth century, in describing archival holdings, Nikolai N. Bantysh-Kamenskii numbered the three posol’skie knigi holding the Grecheskie stateinye spiski (reports of envoys to the Greek East) and dela (documents in general) covering the years 1516–1594. These records are particularly important because they were meant for internal use only and, consequently, have remained generally unembellished, as is indicated by their bureaucratic terseness. Although generally matter-of-fact and rhetorically reserved, the Grecheskie dela contain copies of documents, not all uniform in style. Besides the internal memos of the Posol’skii prikaz, the dela include copies of letters exchanged between the court and Eastern Orthodox dignitaries. These letters stand out clearly from the rest of the text. The Posol’skie knigi provide the greatest degree of detail in describing the arrival and departure of foreigners. Those pertaining to Greek affairs cast light upon the initial court reaction to
oncoming parties of travelling Greeks and reflect the development of the court’s policy towards ecclesiastical visitors. To date, not all of the grecheskie knigi have been critically published. The third posol’skaia kniga for Greek affairs covers the years 1588–1594 and is one of the most important sources of information about Patriarch Jeremiah’s trip to East Slavic territories in 1588–1589. At the end of the eighteenth century, Nikolai F. Novikov first published excerpts from the grecheskie dela in the Drevniaia Rossiiskaia vivlioﬁka.\(^1\) He included material from the third posol’skaia kniga. Nikolai M. Karamzin printed some fragments in his Istoriaia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo,\(^1\) while Khrisanf M. Loparev published the lists of the alms distributed in 1593–1594 by Trifon Korobeinikov to hierarchs and monasteries in the Greek East.

The most extensive use of the three manuscript volumes was made by Andrei N. Murav’ev. In the first volume of his Snosheniia Rossii s Vostokom po delam tserkovnym, published in St. Petersburg in 1858, Murav’ev reproduced many passages from all three posol’skie knigi. He presented a chronological discussion of the trips made by Greek ecclesiastics to Muscovy during the sixteenth and early seventeenth century up to and including the journey of Patriarch Theophanes of Jerusalem through East Slavic lands in 1619–1620. The study consists of a rather casual rendering of the documentary material. Some of it is quoted, some paraphrased.\(^2\) Information from other sources, without clear indication of its provenance, is interpolated into the narrative based on the grecheskie dela and references to the manuscript are not always correct.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Second ed., pt. 12 (Moscow, 1789; reprinted, The Hague, 1970), 334–449 reproduces most of the text from folios 119–460 of the third posol’skaia kniga, not just the material pertaining to Trifon Korobeinikov’s gift-bearing trip to the Orthodox East in 1593–1594 (pages 432–60 of the spisok), as is stated in the introduction to the Posol’skaia kniga po sviazam Rossii s Gretsiei (pravoslavnymi ierarkhami i monastyryami) 1588–1594, ed. M. P. Lukichev and N. M. Rogozhin (Moscow, 1984) [henceforth, Posol’skaia kniga.], 7. Part 16 (Moscow, 1791; reprinted The Hague, 1970), 119–32 consists of short extracts from the second and third knigi.


\(^3\) “Ocher Trifona Korobeinikova v rozdannoi tsarskoi milostyni,” Pravoslavnyi palestinskii sbornik, vol. 9, no. 27, pt. 3 (1888), 84–103.

\(^4\) Pages 24–127 of Snosheniia Rossii s Vostokom po delam tserkovnym follow Stateiniy spisok No. 1, with materials dated from 1516 to 1583. According to Murav’ev’s last citation, this first manuscript has 238 pages. Stateiniy spisok No. 2 is rendered on pp. 128–188, with documents dated from September 1583 to March 1588. From Shpakov’s publication we know that this manuscript has 433 pages. Pages 189–278 of Murav’ev’s study correspond to the third stateiniy spisok, see note 7.

The sections of the *Posol'skie knigi* Nos. 2 and 3 pertaining to the establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow were published by Shpakov in the first part of the volume of sources appended to his analysis of the event. This material consists of documents pertaining to the trips to Muscovy of Patriarch Joachim of Antioch and Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah in 1586 and 1588–1589. As part of the same study, Shpakov also published an additional extract from *Posol'skaia kniga* No. 3, one of the letters that Tsar Fedor sent with Metropolitan Dionisii of Tûrnovo to Constantinople to Patriarch Jeremiah in 1591. Shpakov’s editions of the documents preserve the orthography of the original without standardization, including the faithful rendering of superscript letters and abbreviations. Recently, the third *posol'skaia kniga* was edited and published in its entirety for the first time by M. P. Lukichev and Nikolai M. Rogozhin. The editors use the postrevolutionary standard Russian alphabet. Variant spellings of the original are preserved. No textual differences between this edition and Shpakov’s are noted.

Besides the *grecheskie dela*, there are a few additional Muscovite sources, albeit of a secondary significance for our purposes. The manuscript *sbornik* entitled the “Book of the *d’iak* Larion Ermolaev,” formerly held in the Moscow Synodal Library and numbered 703 in Savva’s catalogue, includes among other texts a copy of the ceremonial for Fedor Ivanovich’s enthronement as tsar, the rite for the ordination of a bishop and a metropolitan, and accounts of the trips to Moscow made by Patriarchs Joachim of Antioch and Jeremiah of Constantinople, all published in Shpakov’s appendix. These descriptions of

---

22 Shpakov, *Prilozheniia*, part 1, pp. 1–73 from *Spisok* No. 2, pp. 77–161 from *Spisok* No. 3. I know Shpakov’s study from a microfilm copy, from which it is not clear whether parts 1 and 2 of the *Prilozheniia* comprise one or two separate volumes.
23 This appears as *Prilozhenie* I, appended directly to *Gosudarstvo i tservkov’ v ikh vzaimnykh otnosheniakh v Moskovskom gosudarstve*, vol. 2, *Tsarstvovanie Feodora Ivanovicha. Uchrezhdenie patriarshestva v Rossi* (not to be confused with the first part of the separate volume[s] of appendices cited in the previous note).
24 For reference, see n. 17 above. The original manuscript of 460 pages is held in the *Tsentral’nyi gosudarstvennyi arkiv drevnikh aktov*, fond 52, opis’ I, delo 3, see *Introduction, Posol’skaia kniga*, 8.
25 Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tservkov’,* II, *Prilozheniia*, pt. 2, pp. 95–192. The collection of the Synodal Library is now held in the State Historical Museum in Moscow. A close examination of this manuscript might offer more clues about its date of composition. It is possible that the *grecheskie dela* served as a source for this *sbornik*. In relating Jeremiah’s vicissitudes in Constantinople both texts state that the sultan began to “stroiti mizgit,” see *Posol’skaia kniga*, 21–22 and *Gosudarstvo i tservkov’,* vol. 2, *Prilozheniia*, pt. 2, p. 137, 140. For another, more extensive exact parallels, see *Posol’skaia kniga*, 36–39 and *Gosudarstvo i tservkov’,* vol. 2, *Prilozheniia*, pt. 2, pp. 140–44, 185–192 about Jeremiah’s trip.
the patriarchal journeys serve to explain the creation of the Patriarchate of Moscow in a manner consistent with a contemporary (early seventeenth-century?) Muscovite consciousness that had already assimilated the patriarchal notion and began developing an ideology about the patriarchate and its genesis. Such a consciousness would not have been possible at the time of the genesis itself, when the uncertainty of whether the patriarchate would come into being or not prevailed. Internal information reveals that Joachim’s discussions with Boris Godunov concerning a Muscovite patriarchate, as related in the account of Joachim’s trip, could not have taken place as presented and must be a later re-creation. Thus, for example, according to the sbornik, Godunov told Joachim that Jeremiah should travel to Muscovy to settle the question of a patriarchate. In fact, throughout the account, Jeremiah is considered to be Patriarch of Constantinople. Yet Joachim was already in Lithuania in mid-May 1586.26 When Joachim had left for Muscovy earlier that year, Jeremiah had not yet been reinstated as Patriarch of Constantinople and possibly was still in exile. Even two years later, when Jeremiah appeared in Muscovy, his hosts questioned him carefully to determine whether he was truly the Patriarch.27 Therefore, in 1586, Godunov and Joachim could not have discussed Patriarch Jeremiah’s future plans. Shenkov also published relevant extracts from another manuscript sbornik, the former No. 852 of the Kazan’ Theological Academy library. Here are included descriptions of Jeremiah’s arrival in Moscow, Iov’s patriarchal nomination and consecration, and a copy of the official Muscovite decree about the newly created patriarchate.28 The remaining known Muscovite primary literature includes a number of charters and seventeenth-century narrative accounts. While the former are important documentary witnesses, the latter are thoroughly imbued with an ideology of the later period and are not reliable as sources for understanding Jeremiah’s sojourn in Moscow.

26On May 29 (19) the voevoda Prince Petr Khvorostinin and Ermola Korobov wrote from Chernihiv to the tsar, informing him that Patriarch Joachim was heading towards Muscovy. See the second stateiny spisok, Shenkov, Gosudarstvo i tserkov', vol. 2, Prilozenia, pt. 1, p. 3. The account in the sbornik continues and records the Muscovites’ request that Joachim consult with the patriarchs, including Jeremiah

27Posol’skaia kniga, 16.

28Gosudarstvo i tserkov', II, Prilozenia, pt. 2, pp. 1–48. The manuscripts from the Kazan Theological Academy library are now in St. Petersburg, in the M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, Solovetskii manuscript collection.

29The gramotas expressing the readiness of Jeremiah and the Moscow synod to proceed with the nomination of a patriarch and officially announcing the new patriarchate are published in the Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, vol. 2, Nos. 58, 59 (St. Petersburg, 1818), 94–103; the latter appears in Shenkov, Gosudarstvo i tserkov', vol. 2,
Three Greek accounts of the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate offer indirect evidence for the understanding of Greek-Ruthenian contacts in the last part of the sixteenth century. Two were written by Arsenios, archbishop of Elassona (today a village in Thessaly, in the province of Janina). Arsenios first travelled to Moscow in 1586 to petition for alms. On his return journey he stopped in L'viv, where he taught at the L'viv confraternity school for two years from June 1586 to May 1588. From L'viv, Arsenios returned to Muscovy with Patriarch Jeremiah in 1588 where he remained with the title of archbishop of Tver' and later of Suzdal' until his death in 1626. Arsenios wrote two memoirs describing events that he witnessed among the East Slavs. The first, entitled "The Toils and Travels of the Humble Archbishop Arsenios, with an Account of the Creation [Erection] of the Moscow Patriarchate" was composed between 1590 and 1593, that is at the time when the recognition of the new patriarchate by the synod of Eastern patriarchs was pending and its position in the hierarchy of Orthodox patriarchates was being determined. It


Arsenios was called Archbishop of the Archangel because he was resident in the Cathedral of the Archangel in the Kremlin. For Arsenios's biography see Phòtios Ar. Dèmètrakopoulos, Arsenios Elassonos (1550–1626). Bios kai ergo. Symbolè sti meletè tôn metabyzantínôn logiôn tês Anatolês (Athens: Imago, 1984), 19–116; see also his "On Arsenios, Archbishop of Elasson," Byzantinoslavica 42 (1981):145–53. Dèmètrakopoulos summarizes the earlier scholarship on Arsenios, especially the work of Dmitrievskii, fills in some details from his early life in Greece, before Arsenios's departure for Slavic lands, and includes an appendix with documents. His main contribution is the discovery and publication of an additional autograph by Arsenios, the "Akolouthia [service] to St. Basil the Fool of Moscow," Arsenios Elassonos (1550–1626), 127–34; the text is found on pp. 181–93.

Kopiî kai diatribe tou tapeinou archiepiskopou Arseniou gráphi kai tîn proibiran tou Patriarchou Moschovias. For a outline of its contents and cursory comments on literary aspects, see Dèmètrakopoulos, Arsenios Elassonos (1550–1626), 135–46. For the dating of the verses see 137–38. Cf. Dmitrievskii, who argues that the freshness and detail of the account indicate that it was written soon after the events, in any case, no later than 1595, when the "main hero" of the memoir, Patriarch Jeremiah, died. Dmitrievskii does not elaborate his point. Presumably, the scholar was implying that since there are no references to Jeremiah's death or any events thereafter, and since Jeremiah's passing would have been somehow reflected in the text, the verses must have been completed while the patriarch was still alive, Arkhiepiskop Elassoniskii Arsenii i memuary ego iz russkoi istorii po rukopisi Trapezantskogo Sumeliiskogo monasteriya (Kiev, 1899), 26–30. [Originally published as "Arkhiepiskop Elassoniskii Arsenii (Suzdal'skii tozh) i ego vno' otkrytie istoricheskie memuary," Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi
was first published in 1749 from a manuscript copy held in Turin by Giuseppe Pasini, Antonio Rivautella, and Francesco Berta. The Turin edition of the Greek text is accompanied by a Latin translation. However, Arsenios’s text, originally versified, with lines of fifteen syllables, was rendered in a prosaic form. In 1809, 1820, and 1842 the Latin translation of the Turin edition was republished by, respectively, Johann Beckmann, Burchard von Wichmann, and Adalbert Starczewski [Starchevskii]. The Jesuit priest, Prince Augustin Galitzin, published a French translation in 1857. Two years later the Greek text was published by Spyridon Zampelios. Zampelios corrected some of the erroneous readings of the Italian editors and presented the text in its original versified format, although, as Dmitrievskii pointed out, the Greek editor, like his predecessors, had trouble with some of the Slavicized terms that Arsenios employed. The Greek text was reprinted by Konstantinos Sathas in 1870 and by Shpakov in 1912. A Russian translation based on Wichmann’s edition was published in 1879 by Nikolai N. Ogloblin. Relying on both the Greek

akademii (1898), no. 1, pp. 3–74; no. 3, pp. 345–71; no. 4, pp. 559–95; no. 5, pp. 88–129; (1899), no. 2, pp. 268–99; no. 4, pp. 618–38.)

Codices manuscipti Bibliothecae regii Taurinensis athenaei, per linguas digesti, & binas in partes distributi, in quorum prima hebraei, & graeci, in altera latin, italic, & gallici. Recensuerunt, & animadversionibus illustrarunt Josephus Pasininus... Antonius Rivautella, & Franciscus Berta... Insertis parvis quibusdam opusculis hactenus ineditis, adjecto in fine scriptorum, & eorum operum indice, praeter characterum specimina, & varia codicum ornamenta partim aere, partim ligno incisa, vol. 1 (Turin, 1749), 433–69 (Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Cataloghi Italia 10 [1–2] Folio). Listed as Codex 337. b. I. 5, the manuscript is described briefly: "Chartaceus, foliis constans 57, circa finem saeculi XVI," ibid. 433. For additional comments on the manuscript, now presumed to be lost, see Demetrakopoulos, Arsenios Elassonos (1550–1626), 21–23.

Johann Beckmann, Literatur der ältern Reisebeschreibungen, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1809), 404–20 (does not reproduce the entire text); Burchard von Wichmann, Sammlung bisher noch ungedruckter kleiner Schriften zur ältern Geschichte und Kenntiss des Russischen Reichs (Berlin, 1820); Adalbertus [Wojciech] de Starczewski [Starchevskii], ed., Historiae Ruthenicae Scriptores Exteri Saeculi XVI, vol. 2 (Berlin and St. Petersburg, 1842), 357–84.


Spyridon Zampelios, Kathidrysis Patriarchou en Rossia (Athens, 1859).

Dmitrievskii, Arkhiepiskop Elasssonii, 26–27 n. 3. According to Demetrakopoulos, the Turin manuscript has been lost, Arsenios Elassonos (1550–1626), 21–23.


Nikolai N. Ogloblin, "Arsenii, arkhipiskop Elasssonii, i ego 'Opisanie puteshchestviia v Moskoviiu,'" Istoriitcheskaia biblioteka, 1879, no. 8, pp. 1–44; no. 9, pp. 45–97. Ogloblin provides an extensive introduction, which consists of a biography of Arsenios and a bibliographic essay about “The Toils and Travels,” 36–44. He was not,
and Latin versions, Bishop Pitirim retranslated Arsenios’s versified memoirs into Russian.  

Arsenios’s second memoir was discovered in a manuscript codex of the Soumela Monastery and carefully analyzed in a monographic study by Dmitrievskii. The preeminent Russian liturgical scholar and editor of Greek manuscripts included extensive extracts from the manuscript in the study. Unlike the “The Toils and Travels,” these memoirs do not focus on the events surrounding the creation of the patriarchate in 1588–1589 but span over Arsenios’s stay in Muscovy from 1588 up to 1613. They do, however, provide a few important details concerning Jeremiah’s stay in Muscovy. Here Arsenios offers a fuller account of the Greeks’ reception in Smolensk and Moscow but, more importantly, gives the names of those in the Greek party who, along with Metropolitan Hierotheos of Monemvasia, opposed the establishment of a Patriarchate of Moscow without the consent of the synod of Eastern patriarchs and bishops. Together the memoirs also give the researcher grounds for evaluating Arsenios’s point of view in describing events in Muscovy. Although “The Toils and Travels” is devoted strictly to Jeremiah’s stay in Muscovy and the creation of the Muscovite patriarchate while this topic is only a small part of the memoirs in the Soumela manuscript, the two accounts share a common partiality. A careful reading of the texts supports the observation made by Nikolaevskii and repeated by Shpakov that Arsenios, having become a client of Muscovy, had every reason to describe the establishment of the patriarchate in laudatory terms and, therefore, presented the tsar, the Muscovite Church, and his adopted homeland in the best possible light.

—

however, able to see any of the editions other than Wichmann’s. The translation itself can be found on pages 45–74 and the annotations on pages 83–97.


Dmitrievskii, Arkhiepiskop Elassonskii Arsenii і memuary ego iz russkoi istorii po rukopisi Trapezuntskogo Sumeliiskogo monastyria (Kiev, 1899). The section of the Soumela text dealing specifically with the events of 1588–1589 appears on pp. 78–86. About the manuscript, see also the catalogue of Athanasios Papadopoulos-Kerameus, “Hellenikoi kódiikes en tê bibliotèkê tês Monês Soumela,” Vizantiiskii vremennik 19 (1921): 309–312. According to Demetrakopoulos, the manuscript of the memoir is no longer extant, Arsenios Elassonos (1550–1626), 27.

41 For an appreciation of Dmitrievskii’s contribution to liturgics and the publication of Greek manuscripts and sources see Bogoslovskie trudy, 4 (1964) including an outline of his scholarly career and a catalogue of dissertations he directed, B. I. Sove, “Russkii Goar i ego shkola,” 39–84; and a bibliography compiled by O. L. Makhno, “Spisok trudov prof. A. A. Dmitrievskogo v poriadke ikh publikatsii,” 95–107.

42 Pavel Nikolaevskii, “Uchrezhdenie patriarshestva v Rossii,” Khristianskoe chtenie,
Thus, for example, in "The Toils and Travels," Arsenios completely ignores the issue of Greek opposition to the creation of a patriarchate. According to the second memoir, despite "being deeply moved by the sweet words of Boris Godunov and Andrei Shchelkalov," Jeremiah initially refused the proposition to remain as Patriarch of Moscow and All Rus' because of opposition from members of his suite. However, "after not many days," when the tsar again sent them (presumably Godunov and Shchelkalov) to request that Jeremiah elevate Iov to patriarchal dignity, the patriarch "with glad welcome accepted the request" and decided to fulfill it. Shortly thereafter, Iov was elected, officially nominated, and consecrated. The Greek bishop then dwells on the sumptuous Muscovite hospitality and generosity. In this way, in both memoirs Arsenios glosses over sources of strain in the Greco-Russian relationship, creating an impression that the establishment of the Moscow patriarchate was serene, graceful, almost matter-of-fact.

A decidedly more critical view of the Muscovites and a surprisingly stern assessment of Patriarch Jeremiah is provided by the Biblion istorikon attributed by its 1631 publisher to a still unidentified metropolitan of Monemvasia, Dörotheos. In the literature frequently referred to as Pseudo-

1879, 2:553–54 n. 1 and Shpakov, Gosudarstvo i tservov' 2:322–25.

Dmitrievskii, Archiepiskop Elassonskii, 83–85.

The authorship of the chronicle, has yet to be definitively established. Konstantinos Satass, Meseiônikê biblionêkê, vol. 3 (Venice, 1873), prologue, 15–19, attributes Pseudo-Dörotheos to Hierotheos of Monemvasia, whose stay in Moldavia coincides with the completion of the manuscript published in 1631. The information about the creation of the Patriarchate of Moscow comes from an eyewitness, and Hierotheos, who is frequently mentioned in the last section of the chronicle, is the probable source. Finally, since there was no known Metropolitan Dörotheos of Monemvasia at the end of the sixteenth century, Satass considers the attribution to Dörotheos a mistake of the publishers: Hierotheos was inadvertently changed to Dörotheos. Satass passes over in silence the fact that earlier (see Biographikon schediasma, Appendix, 3 n. I) he had considered Dörotheos the author and criticized Konstantinos. The latter, Patriarch of Constantinople 1830–34, attributed the chronicle to Hierotheos in his description of the Byzantine and Christian architecture and urban topography of Constantinople, see Konstantinias palaiâ kai neôtera stoi perigraphê Konstantinopolis (Venice, 1920), 78; cf. Aleksei P. Lebedev, Istoria Greko-Vostochnoi tservkvi pod vlastiu turok, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg, 1903; 1904 appears on the cover)(=Sobranie tservkovno-istoricheskikh sochinenii, 7), 11–12. Theodor Preger, "Die Chronik vom Jahre 1570. ("Dörotheos" von Monembasia und Manuel Malaxos.)," Byzantinische Zeitschrift 11 (1902): 4–15 surmises that an unknown Greek in Venice composed the narrative up to the year 1570. It was later supplemented by Hierotheos, who copied earlier material and compiled the final version. Archbishop Chrysostomos (Papadopoulos) considers Manouel Malaxos the primary author-compiler of the chronicle up to 1570 and argues that although the last section of Pseudo-Dörotheos is probably based on Hierotheos's account, the nature of the narrative suggests that it was not recorded by the eyewitness himself but was written down from a fresh oral tradition, "Peri tês hellénikês chronographias tou XVI aiônôs,"
Dorotheos or in Greek simply as the Chronikon ("Chronicle"), the Bibliion historikon was “one of the most profitable enterprises" of the Greek publishers in Venice and one of the “most avidly read" publications of the Tourkokratia. In her study of sixteenth-century Greek historical chronicles, Irina N. Lebedeva lists 21 editions of Pseudo-Dorotheos between 1631 and 1818, and catalogues an additional 51 manuscripts, generally less complete than the printed versions. Lebedeva puts forth a new hypothesis, based on a comparison of manuscripts and editions, for the redaction of Pseudo-Dorotheos: the first version, completed in 1570 and now lost, was in itself a complex

Ekklesiastikos pharos 9 (Alexandria, 1912): 410-54. According to Demostene Russo, "Cronograful lui Doretei al Monembaziei," in Studii istorice greco-române. Opere postume, vol. 1 (Bucharest, 1939), 68-86, a fifteenth-century Dorotheos of Monemvasia is probably responsible for an early version of the chronicle. The chronicle was supplemented in the sixteenth century by an anonymous author who produced the 1570 version then copied by Manouel Malaxos. Hierotheos could very well have been in possession of such a copy. It is likely that he brought it to Moldavia where it was completed, based on his and Patriarch Jeremia'h's accounts and other sources. Gyula Moravcsik, Byzantinoturcica, 2d ed., vol. 1 (Budapest, 1958), 412-14 follows Papadopoulos. According to Moravcsik both Malaxos and Hierotheos appended the Chronicle of 1570. See also D. V. Oikonomidou, "Chronographiou tou Dorotheou ta Laographika," Laographia, 18 (1959): 133-39. The above are surveyed by Tasos Ath. Grisopoulos, "Hierotheos. Metropolites Monembasias," in Threskeiutike kai ethnik euklylopaidia, vol. 6 (Athens, 1965), col. 796-98. Irina N. Lebedeva, in the fullest examination of the question to date, makes important textological advances for the understanding of Pseudo-Dorotheos in her monograph Pozdnie grecheskie khroniki i ikh russkie i vostochnye perevody (Leningrad, 1968) (=Palestinskii sbornik 18/81/). Lebedeva considers the question of authorship unresolved given the present state of knowledge about the chronicle but finds much common ground with Russo's analysis, especially in his argument that the repeated mention of a Dorotheos of Monemvasia in the editio princeps precludes Sathas's hypothesis of a typographical error and, therefore, probably refers to a historical Dorotheos.

45 Sathas, MesaiOnike bibliotheke vol. 3 (Venice, 1873), prologue, 18.

46 Lebedeva, Pozdnie grecheskie khroniki, 18-21: 31-61. To the three copies of the 1631 edition mentioned by Lebedeva (Paris, Gottingen, Moscow) should be added the volume in Harvard's Houghton Library, call number *MG 1223.4.

47 This version included a copy of the so-called Chronicle of 1570, of which an unedited variant attributed to Damaskenos the Studite, Metropolitan of Arta, was in the patriarchal library in Constantinople (MS. 569), Lebedev, Istoryia, 41-43 and Steven Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity: A Study of the Patriarchate of Constantinople from the Eve of the Turkish Conquest to the Greek War of Independence (London, 1968), 210 n. 2. Marios Philippides, a contemporary scholar working on sixteenth-century Greek historical chronicles, informs me that during a recent visit to the patriarchal archives he was not able to find the manuscript. According to Philippides, the collection was renumbered in the 1930s and Damaskenos's manuscript did receive a new number, but has subsequently been misplaced. (Curiously, Runciman in the reference cited gives the same number as does Lebedev, even though his book was published in 1968.) Martin Crusius, a sixteenth-century Lutheran philhellene and professor at the University of Tübingen, published a version of this chronicle as the Historia patriarchica, which, along with the Historia politica, comprises the first two books of his Turcogreciae libri
compilation consisting of “late reworkings [possibly by a fifteenth-century Dörotheos of Monemvasia] of Byzantine chronicles, translations from the works of Italian historians, and short chronicles describing the life of the Greek nation and the Greek Church under Turkish rule.” The final compilation, made at the court of Voivode Peter before his demise in 1591, includes information about Patriarch Jeremiah II’s 1588–1589 stay in Muscovy. Although she does not dispute that Hierotheos of Monemvasia was the probable source for this information, Lebedeva does not view him as the final compiler or author of the last section devoted to the reign of Murad III and Patriarch Jeremiah II. Rather, according to Lebedeva, the information was preserved orally in the circle of Voivode Peter and then recorded in the brief span before the end of Peter’s reign in 1591. This is as far as the evidence takes her. It should be added, however, that Hierotheos is known to have engaged in book-copying while in Moldavia, at Voivode Peter’s court, and while in Moscow. The manuscript of the chronicle can be traced back to Peter’s circle, more specifically to Zotos Tsigaras. Apostolos Tsigaras, who underwrote the 1631 edition, inherited the manuscript from his brother Zotos.

octo (Basel, 1584; reprinted, Modena, 1972), a post-Byzantine history covering the years 1453–1578. The Greek text was published with a Latin translation and Crusius’s extensive notes. For Historia politica see 1–43 and Historia patriarchica see 105–184. The Historia patriarchica was reprinted without Crusius’s notes in the Corpus Scriptorum Byzantinorum, vol. 17, ed. I. Bekker (Bonn, 1849), 78–204; see also Runciman, Great Church, 256–57, n. 4 and his “The Greek Church under the Turks: Problems of Research,” 229. For a new hypothesis about the relationship among these chronicles stressing Damaskenos’s primacy, see Marios Philippides, “The Patriarchal Chronicles of the Sixteenth Century.”


50 Papadopoulos-Kerameus describes a manuscript copied by Hierotheos Hierosolymitike bibliothekë, etoi katalogos ton en tais bibliothekais tou hagiotatou apostolikou te kai katholikou orthodoxou patriarchikou thronou ton Hierosolymon kai pastis Palaistinës apokeiménon hellénikon kódkon syntachheisena men kai phototypikos kosméthisea pinaxin, hypo..., vol. I (St. Petersburg, 1891), 194–97. Referring only to Dmitrievskii, who mentions that this manuscript had been sent by Arsenios of Elassona from Moscow to Constantinople in 1602 Arkhipiskop Elassonski, 64–65, Shpakov mistakenly identifies it with a manuscript of the Pseudo-Dörotheos chronicle containing information about the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate, Shpakov 2:252–54. Papadopoulos-Kerameus’s description clearly shows that the manuscript copied by Hierotheos, as indicated by his own inscription, was a typical monastic compendium and did not include any materials from Pseudo-Dörotheos. About Hierotheos’s contacts with the voivode Peter, see Pseudo-Dörotheos, in Sathas, Biographikon schediasma, Appendix, 25. See also Hierotheos’s inscription in the manuscript described by Papadopoulos-Kerameus that indicates that Hierotheos copied the first part of the manuscript in Moscow (up to f. 193 v.) and ff. 197–396 v. en Blachia, 194. About Peter Şchiopul, Voivode of Moldavia (1574–1577, 1577–1579, 1582–1591), see Nicoile Iorga, Byzance après Byzance. Continuation de l’”Histoire de la vie byzantine” (Bucharest, 1935), 114ff.
who died in 1599. In the absence of a viable alternative hypothesis identifying an author, the attribution of the final version to Hierotheos should not be hastily discounted.

In 1665 in Moscow, Arsenios the Greek (Arsenii Grek) and Dionysios the Greek (Dionissii Grek) completed a Russian translation of the 1631 edition of the Pseudo-Dörotheos that was to be published in 1666. The translation was never printed, apparently because of Arsenios’s intimate connections with the disgraced and soon-to-be-condemned Patriarch Nikon and the concomitant wane of Greek influence in Muscovy, already negligible by the time of Peter I. It did, however, circulate in manuscript form. The translation was used by Dimitri of Rostov, who in preparing his Lëtopisets commissioned a copy. Pseudo-Dörotheos was read by nineteenth-century peasants, as is evident from the inscriptions left in a number of the manuscripts. In the middle and second half of the seventeenth century, the chronicle was translated into Romanian and Arabic, and in the early eighteenth century into Georgian. In Romania and Georgia, the Greek legacy reflected in Pseudo-Dörotheos could be used as a weapon and model in the ideological struggle against, respectively, the Turkish and Turkish-Persian political and cultural threat. In Muscovy, the Russian translation was made just after the zenith of Greek ecclesiastical and cultural influence under Patriarch Nikon, who zealously sought to align Russian with Greek Church practice. It is symptomatic of the Western orientation of contemporary Ruthenian culture that Pseudo-Dörotheos was apparently never translated during the seventeenth-century Ukrainian Orthodox revival spearheaded by Peter Mohyla and centered at the Kievan Academy.

Hierotheos had been in Moscow with Patriarch Jeremiah in 1588–1589, when Jeremiah installed Metropolitan Iov of Moscow onto the throne of the

52 In this regard it is interesting to note that the stateiny spišok at least on one occasion refers to the metropolitan of Monemvasia that accompanied Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople to Muscovy (i.e. Hierotheos) as Dörotheos. See the March 1592 letter sent by Patriarch Iov of Moscow to Jeremiah, Posol’skaia kniga, 127. For other examples in the Muscovite sources, see the “Book of D'jak Larion Ermolaev,” Shpakov, Gosudarstvo i tserkov', II, Prilozhenia, pt. 2, pp. 170, 173; Sbornik No. 852 of the former Kazan' Theological Academy consistently refers to Dörotheos of Monemvasia, see extracts published by Shpakov, Gosudarstvo i tserkov', II, Prilozhenia, pt. 2, for example, pp. 6, 9, 11, 12, 17, 22, 27.
53 Lebedeva discusses the circumstances of the translation and provides an analysis of it, along with biographical and bibliographical data on the translators, an excerpt from the translation narrating patriarch Jeremiah’s stay in Muscovy, and a list of 30 manuscripts of the Russian version of Pseudo-Dörotheos, Pozdnie grecheskie khroniki, 71–106.
54 Lebedeva, Pozdnie grecheskie khroniki, 100.
new patriarchate. The text published by Sathas reproduces pages 584–605 of the 1631 edition. It comprises the end of the second part of Pseudo-Dörotheos, which consists of a history of Rome, Byzantium, and the Turkish sultans up to Murad III, who ruled from 1574 to 1595. Runciman, who viewed the creation of the Patriarchate of Moscow as Jeremiah's "supreme diplomatic achievement,"56 considers the source biased against Jeremiah and dismisses it completely on the grounds that it speaks of the patriarch as being an uneducated man.57 Lebedev, who, following Sathas, believed the final version of the chronicle to be the work of Hierotheos of Monemvasia, showed that the last section of the Pseudo-Dörotheos is inconsistent in many details concerning Métrophanès III, Pachômios II, and Theoléptos II, as well as Jeremiah II. Lebedev considers the chronicle to be tendentiously critical of Greek clerics in general, and that the Metropolitan of Monemvasia himself is the only cleric to receive an unconditionally positive characterization. Lebedev cautions against the uncritical use of Pseudo-Dörotheos for late sixteenth-century events, while at the same time recognizing that for much concerning the above-mentioned patriarchs, the chronicle remains the sole source, and therefore cannot be ignored.58 It is important to note, however, that various

56 Runciman, "Patriarch Jeremiah II and the Patriarchate of Moscow," 240. Earlier Runciman had called "Jeremiah's solution... ingenious and intelligent," Great Church, 332–33. The opinion of the renowned scholar should be in this case taken cum grano salis. The casually researched article relies on a selective use of source material and contains many factual errors. In discussing the sources no reference is made to the textological literature. It seems that Runciman follows Moravcsik in the question of authorship; however, he does not refer to the literature, including Lebedeva's monograph. The declaration about the unreliability of the chronicle is based on a general evaluation without illustrative examples and on the one comment about Jeremiah. Ultimately, the accuracy of the information concerning Jeremiah's journey can be evaluated only through comparison with the other sources. Although the sources that have been discussed above each differ in some way in their account of the creation of the patriarchate, Pseudo-Dörotheos is not confuted by them. In the most important details, such as Hierotheos's vigorous opposition to the whole project, the chronicle is corroborated by Arsenioi's memoir.


58 Lebedev, Istorìa, 285–88 n. 2. Lebedev believes that internal evidence, including the glowing picture of the Metropolitan of Monemvasia, supports Sathas's attribution of the chronicle to Hierotheos. As additional evidence he points out that the author uses the first person plural pronoun hêmeis in reference to the Metropolitan of Monemvasia (Hierotheos)
details of the account of Jeremiah’s stay in Muscovy are corroborated by
Muscovite sources or by the accounts of Arsenios of Elassona (especially, the
opposition of Hierotheos and other Greeks to the creation of the patriarchate).
Internal evidence (specific facts reflecting an eyewitness informant and the
repeated, positive references to Hierotheos) supports the hypothesis that
Hierotheos was at least the source for, if not the author of, the last section of
the chronicle narrating events from Jeremiah’s three tenures as patriarch. 59

Institute of Church History,
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and Theoléptos of Philippopolis. See the extract from Pseudo-Dorotheos in Sathas,
Biographikon schediaisma, Appendix, 13.

59 For a translation of the sections of the Biblion historikon describing Jeremiah’s sojourn in
Muscovy, see the Appendix.
I write in detail concerning Muscovy. In the place where they [the Muscovites] held Jeremiah they would not let anyone from the local people come to see him, nor would they allow him to go out. Only the monks [in Jeremiah’s suite], when they so desired, would go out with the people of the Tsar into the marketplace and the Muscovites guarded the monks until they returned to their quarters. The Muscovites announced to Patriarch Jeremiah that they wanted him to create a patriarchate for them. First, Jeremiah said that this could not be done; he would only install an archbishop, as in Ohrid. And when they were one on one, the Metropolitan of Monemvasia [Hierotheos] said to the Patriarch: “My Lord, this cannot be done, because Constantine the Great created the patriarchates together with an ecumenical council. And Justinian the Great together with the Fifth Ecumenical Council made Ohrid an archbishopric and Jerusalem a patriarchate, on account of the venerable sufferings of Christ. There are only three of us here. ([This is so] because one, the Archbishop of Elassona, Arsenios, who did not have a see of his own, joined up with us in Poland and came to Muscovy with the Patriarch.) [My] Lord, we came to the Tsar for alms and on account of the debts incurred in our days.” And he [Jeremiah] answered: “Neither do I want this. But if they wish, I will dwell [here] as Patriarch.” And the Metropolitan of Monemvasia

---

Footnotes:


61 The use of the plural in Greek reflects the Eastern Christian nuance according to which all of what Christ endured was part of His salvific activity. The West has focussed more specifically on the Crucifixion as the efficacious soteriological moment of the Passion.
said to him: “Blessed Lord, this is impossible, for you speak a different language, you are not used to the place, they have different ordinances and customs, and they do not want you. Do not embarrass yourself!” But he did not want to listen at all. He had mischievous and cruel men on his heels, and everything that they heard they passed on to the interpreters, who in turn told the Tsar. Then cunningly the Muscovites devised a scheme and said: “My Lord, if you determine to stay here, we will have you.” But these words were said to them neither by the Tsar nor by any of the boyars of the palace, but only by those who guarded them. Jeremiah thoughtlessly and without sizing things up, and without the advice of anyone said: “I am staying.” And he had this habit, that he never listened to good advice from anyone, even from those subject to him. And for this reason both he and the Church were ruined in his days.

Then the Muscovites, seeing that he was not about to consecrate [someone else as Patriarch], and that he wanted to remain, told him: “Because, my Lord, you want to stay, we want this as well; however, since the ancient Rus' throne is in Vladimir, take pains to stay there.” And that was a place worse than Koukousos. Then with the assistance of certain Christians [presumably Hierotheos of Monemvasia and the other Greeks who counselled Jeremiah], the Patriarch said: “Do not tell such a story [about going to Vladimir]. I will not do this.” Then they said to him: “The Tsar’s order is that you should create a patriarchate for us.” Then Jeremiah responded in a different tone: “Unless he was a double [twofold] bishop it would not be canonical.”

---

62 These last two sentences are omitted in the seventeenth-century Russian translation. See the excerpt published by Lebedeva, *Pozdnie grecheskie khroniki*, 93.

63 The Church father and Archbishop of Constantinople St. John Chrysostom was banished to this Armenian frontier post in 404. Chrysostom never returned from exile and died in 407 while being transferred to an even more severe location. His *vita* would have been familiar to the sixteenth-century Greek reader schooled primarily in the monastic literary culture and perhaps even to the illiterate church-going Greek who would hear the *vita* read on Chrysostom’s feast day.

64 In the mind of a Greek living and writing under the Turks the term “Christians” was often a synonym for “Greek.” See, for example, the brief memorandum written 29 (19) March 1590 by Leontios Eustratios at the request of Martin Crusius describing ecclesiastical events in Constantinople in the 1580s published by Otto Kreşten, *Das Patriarchat von Konstantinopel im Ausgehenden 16. Jahrhundert*, 40, 44, 46. The Greeks from Jeremiah’s party opposing the creation of a patriarchate in Muscovy are identified by Arsenios of Elassona, Dmitrievskii, *Arkhiepiskop Elassonskii*, 83.

65 The meaning here is unclear. “Καὶ ὁ Ἰερεμίας εἶπεν ἄλλον. ἀμή αὐτὸς εἶναι δισεπίσκοπος, καὶ δὲν εἶναι νόμιμον” (Sathas, *Biographikon schediasma*, Appendix, 22). The punctuation is slightly different in the 1631 edition, p. 601: “Καὶ ὁ Ἰερεμίας εἶπεν ἄλλον. ἀμὴ αὐτὸς εἶναι δισεπίσκοπος, καὶ δὲν εἶναι νόμιμον.” It is interesting to note that Arsenios and Dionysios, the seventeenth-century Greeks translating Pseudo-Dorotheos into Muscovite
Jeremiah responded “[I will consecrate] another one. For this one is a double bishop and it would not be canonical.”] Finally, he unwillingly consecrated the [or him] Patriarch of Rus'. And they brought a large, exceedingly wide parchment document written in Bulgarian letters. And the Patriarch signed it. But the Metropolitan of Monemvasia asked: “[What is written here? [When you tell me] then I will sign.” And the first one [i.e., the overseer], 66 Andrei Tzalkanos [Shchelkalov] by name, answered: “It is written how you installed the Patriarch and how you came here.” And the Metropolitan of Monemvasia said: “It should have been written in Greek, not in Russian.” But they did not listen to him. The Patriarch’s hieromonks signed as well, as did the Archbishop of Elassona. But the Metropolitan of Monemvasia was completely against this, lest the Church should be divided and another head and a great schism be created. He was in danger of being thrown into the river, until the Patriarch took an oath that the Metropolitan of Monemvasia had said nothing.

Tsar Fedor was a peaceful man, in all things similar to Theodosius the Younger, simple, quiet. 67 But the Tsar’s brother-in-law, Boris by name, was in all things skillful, wise, and cunning. It was he who did everything and to whom everyone listened. The Tsaritsa [Irina] was good, but she was still childless, and her brother was Boris; she summoned the Patriarch and the Metropolitan of Monemvasia, and he blessed her. And she said: “Beseech God that I may have a child” and [she said] many other things. And the Tsar gave

Slavonic, skipped over this troublesome sentence. It is omitted in the extract from their translation (State Historical Museum, ms. No. 343, p. 75) provided by Lebedeva, 93. Charles du Cange used the Biblion historikon in compiling his dictionary, see Glossarium ad scriptores mediei et infimae graecitatis, 2 vols. (Lyon [Lugduni], 1688; reprinted in Bratislava, 1891 and Graz, 1958), index of authors cited vol. 1, p. 47: “Dorothei Metropolitae Monembasiensis Synopsis Historiarum, ex editione Véneta.” The term disepiskopos, however, is not entered. Kartashev without explanation reconstrues the term to be disepiskolos— “что он не уполномочен епископами” (Ocherki po istorii Russkoj tserkvi 2:26).

66 Andrei Shchelkalov, the posol'skii d'iak (“foreign minister”), was responsible for surveillance over Jeremiah and his suite, see Posol'skaia kniga, 26. Pseudo-Dorothaeus is not alone in accusing Shchelkalov of mistreating foreigners. Giles Fletcher, Queen Elizabeth’s ambassador to Moscow in 1588—1589, complained about the firm treatment he had received from Shchelkalov. See Fletcher’s report on his embassy published as Appendix A in Of the Russe Commonwealth by Giles Fletcher 1591. Facsimile Edition with Variants, with an Introduction by Richard Pipes and a Glossary-index by John V. A. Fine, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass., 1966), 43–53.

67 Probably in reference to Roman Emperor Theodosius II (408–450), during whose rule powerful individuals in the court influenced decisions and themselves conducted much of the policy. For general comments and bibliography, see the entry in Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium 3:2051–52. The author’s allusion to Theodosius is not completely appropriate, since the emperor is known to have had scholarly inclinations, while Tsar Fedor’s mental infirmity is well documented.
the Patriarch thirty thousand silver pieces when he came [to Moscow], and another thirty thousand when he left to go back to the City [Constantinople]. And he gave the Metropolitan of Monemvasia first five [thousand] and five more afterwards. 68 [He gave] cups, gowns, and sables to the Patriarch of Rus’, Iov by name, on January 26, in the year 7097 [1589], 69 in the second indiction. And Lord Jeremiah and all of them departed and with much exertion arrived in Poland. There were wars between the Tatars and the Poles. Jan Zamoyski, a man of much wisdom and kindness, paid great honor to the Patriarch and gave [him a retinue of] two hundred men and brought him to Kam’ianets’, because the illustrious Sir Jan Zamoyski was the lawkeeper [Grand Chancellor] and protector 71 [Grand Hetman] of Poland.

Pseudo-Dörotheos from Sathas, Biographikon schediasma, Appendix, 24–25.

And at that time, that is, in the year 1589, Jeremiah went from Muscovy to Moldavia, and Voivode Peter received him again marvelously, and he found a chavush 72 who met him to take him [to Constantinople] because the Sultan

---

68 Although the Grecheskaia posol’skaia kniga corroborates the fact that Jeremiah and his retinue received gifts from the Tsar, the sums recorded therein are significantly more modest than those in Pseudo-Dörotheos. This kind of exaggeration, as well as the use of round numbers, can be seen as evidence supporting the view that the information in the chronicle concerning Jeremiah’s sojourn in Muscovy was registered from oral accounts and not written down by Hierotheos himself.

69 The date in Sathas is mistakenly given as 7099 [1591]. Here it is corrected according to the 1631 edition, p. 602 and the seventeenth-century Russian translation, Lebedeva, Pozdnie grecheskie khroniki, 94.

70 The syntax is somewhat ambiguous: "Και [ἐδήκεν ὁ Βασιλεύς] εἰς τὸν Μονεμβασία πέντε πρώτα, καὶ πέντε ίστερα, ποτήρια, φορέματα, σαμούρια, εἰς τὸν Πατριαρχὴν ἑρουσίας..." Sathas, Biographikon schediasma, Appendix, 22. Sathas’s rendition of the text from the 1631 edition includes some slight variation in punctuation and the addition of the preposition eis. The 1631 version is as follows: "Και [ἐδήκεν ὁ Βασιλεύς] τον Μονεμβασια πέντε πρώτα, καὶ πέντε ίστερα, ποτήρια φορέματα, σαμούρια, εἰς τὸν Πατριαρχὴν ἑρουσίας...". That Iov, and not only the visiting hierarchs, received gifts from the Tsar on the day of Iov’s installation as patriarch is indicated by Arsenios in his versified account of the creation of the Moscow Patriarchate, see “The Toils and Travels,” in Sathas, Biographikon schediasma, Appendix, 51–52. The seventeenth-century Russian translation interprets the text as I have done, see Lebedeva, 94.

71 Perhaps πρωτοστάτωρ should be read πρωτοστράτωρ. See Sathas, Biographikon schediasma, Appendix, 23.

had decided that he again should take his see in Constantinople, because the
unstable Nikephoros had caused so much instability and made countless and
senseless expenditures, and everyone great and small hated him. They talked to
the Sultan, and he gave the patriarchate to Jeremiah, who was eager for the
first place, and he paid the two thousand florins. And the most prudent Peter
gave him the offering. And thus it happened and Jeremiah went to
Constantinople.

73 The Greek is unclear here: "θέλων εἰς τὴν πρώτην τάχξιν, καθὼς ἦτον εἰς δύο χιλίαδες
Great Wealth in Muscovy: The Case of V. V. Golitsyn
and Prices of the 1600–1725 Period

RICHARD HELLIE

V. V. Golitsyn (1643–1714) was certainly one of the wealthiest men in late Muscovy. At the time of his fall from power in 1689, it is difficult to imagine that anyone had more property than he did. In this respect, he reminds one of Boris Ivanovich Morozov, certainly the most ostentatious man of the 1650s and 1660s.

Golitsyn was interesting not only because of the quantity of his wealth, but also because of its variety. He had opulent taste, and obviously devoted enormous effort to consumption. In this latter respect, he was like the new rich in today’s Russia or China. His situation was probably comparable to the 1990s in another respect as well: Muscovy had been so incredibly poor that, prior to the middle of the seventeenth century, there were relatively small differences in consumption in Muscovy. Everybody lived in wooden houses, whose sole distinction was their size. After 1650, however, the elite began to live in stone houses, and in general differentiate themselves from the masses, much as in China or Russia today, where in the past the ruling ideologies forbade excessively ostentatious consumption or displays of “prestige” that would differentiate the elite from the masses. How this was paid for will be commented on at the end of the article.

In this presentation Golitsyn’s vast wealth will be summarized in eighteen tables. From time to time, references will be made to data and other materials that will appear in my book The Economy and Material Culture of Late Muscovy, 1600–1725.

First a word about the data set from which this presentation is drawn. Data accumulation began in the summer of 1985. It was greatly facilitated by two major grants, one from the Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation of Milwaukee, the other from NSF (Economics). In the intervening years, 105,000 records have been accumulated of prices in the period 1600–1725. These records include over 8,500 distinct commodities, wages, and taxes. In addition to the relevant price information, the data set includes available

\[1 \text{ NSF Grant SES87-20661. The author (and the students who were paid the funds) were and remain grateful for the support of the two organizations, neither of which is responsible for the views expressed here, which are those solely of the author.}\]
information on the transactors involved (buyers and sellers, donors and recipients, employers and employees, of which there are now 32,500 different ones).

The data subset on the assets of V. V. Golitsyn comes from the remarkable four-volume collection Rozysknye dela o Fedore Shaklovitom i ego soobshchnikakh (St. Petersburg, 1884–1893). The value of those assets was approximately 71,242 rubles, coded in the data set in 2,874 records. The history of the compilation of the original records is worthy of a separate presentation, but in a nutshell the story is as follows: Golitsyn, who was Tsaritsa Sofia’s mentor and perhaps her lover as well, was overthrown in 1689 because of his disastrous management of the Second Crimean Campaign. (This followed upon the disastrous First Crimean Campaign two years earlier, in 1687.) With Golitsyn removed from his offices and exiled, his possessions were carefully inventoried and evaluated by government agents. The agents were used clothing/goods merchants, diamond and silver merchants, vegetable merchants, pot merchants, cloth merchants, chemical and dye merchants, booksellers, paper merchants, butter and oil merchants, container merchants, wine merchants, iron merchants, flour merchants, horse traders, gun merchants, bow and arrow and quiver merchants, saddle merchants, carriage and sleigh merchants, jewelers, and foresters about whom I know nothing more. These men were probably the elite of the Moscow merchantry, drafted to perform government service without compensation. As we shall see, three centuries later we can say that the numerous men (many of whom were literate and signed their reports) performed their task very competently. Be that as it may, the evaluators went from building to building and room to room in Golitsyn’s various possessions (quite a saga in and of itself!) and described what they saw. Some other assessors in the so-called “Shaklovityi case/affair” only listed what they saw without evaluating it. The Golitsyn appraisers, however, put an individual price on each item (except the wall murals, which were done collectively [193.50 rubles—see Table 18] and which must have been stunning, for they are described in detail) and most of the icons. (This is indeed unfortunate, for Golitsyn spent a fortune on murals and icons, and it would be nice to know the price of each.)

After they had been used by Peter’s palace coup forces who purged Sofia and Golitsyn, the documents were stored in a sealed box in the Armory. In 1837 Emperor Nikolai Pavlovich, ever alert to traitors after the 1825

---

2 At this point the author must acknowledge the devoted service of Meng Li, who coded and entered in the computer all the data used from the Shaklovityi collection in this essay. The thirty-five other people who assisted in the collection of the entire data set are too numerous to list here. Acknowledgment must be made, however, of the valiant services of Marianne Grin, who began the project, and Susan Jones and Matt Payne, who are still with it.
Decembrist uprising, heard about the Shaklovityi case and ordered it brought to St. Petersburg. Following the tsar’s orders, Minister of the Imperial Court Prince P. M. Volkonskii brought the box from Moscow to Privy Counsellor D. N. Bludov in St. Petersburg. Bludov learned that Count M. Iu. Vél’gorskii had in his possession additional papers on the Shaklovityi case, and in 1843 Bludov ordered that these be added to the case. Bludov reported to Nicholas the results of his review of ten scrolls from the Investigations Chancellery (Rozysknyï prikaz), whereupon the tsar ordered them published by the Archeographic Commission. Apparently he had in mind their publication in the Akty Arkheograficheskoi kommissii, an otherwise non-political, four-volume effort. For some unknown reason, the publication was never effected, although most of the documents continued to be at the disposal of scholars. The papers that had belonged to Vél’gorskii remained inaccessible.

The assassination of Aleksandr II on March 1, 1881, brought the Shaklovityi case to mind once again. The Archeographic Commission in session on February 9, 1883, decided to publish all of the documents, and in the process revealed that the Vél’gorskii documents had been at some time or another taken from the scrolls in the box discovered in the Armory. The Commission discovered that the scrolls had been disassembled, and restored them to their original order. Seven investigations were found, plus two administrative cases. The second of the latter was the case on the exile of Price Vasilii Golitsyn and his son Aleksei to Pustoozero and another case on the distribution to petitioners of “the traitors’” property. These cases provide the data about Golitsyn’s possessions.

My presentation does not include quite all of Golitsyn’s property, for a very few of the confiscators did not append any prices to their lists and, for lack of time, I did not copy out those lists. They were for a handful of small villages: Bogoroditskoe (the former Chornaia Griaž in Moscow uezd, Sokolovo, Spasskii, Medvedkovo, Bulatnikovo, Troetskoe, and Ivanovskoe in Borisov uezd.

The strategy of this presentation will be to discuss/highlight some of the items in each of the eighteen tables below, and then to compare the Golitsyn confiscation inventory prices with average prices for similar goods in the

---

3 Needless to say, Golitsyn was not the first person in Russian history to endure complete confiscation of assets. Another case, from the beginning of the seventeenth century, was that of Mikhail Tatischev. Even though the beginning of the document is lost, the Tatischev assets obviously pale in comparison with the possessions of Golitsyn. They were appraised at 2,487 rubles (about one-thirtieth of what Golitsyn had) and were coded in 533 records (less than one-fifth of what Golitsyn had). See “Opis’ i prodazha s publichnoego torga ostavshego imeniia po ubienii narodem obvinennogo v izmene Mikhaily Tatischeva vo 1616 godu,” Vremennik 8 (1850): 1-40.

seventeenth century. One thesis is that many surviving Muscovite prices are to a significant degree source-dependent: if "sale" prices are the norm, then sometimes prices resulting from government processes such as confiscations are lower than the norm, evaluations of commodities given as charity to institutions such as monasteries are higher than the norm, and, quite surprisingly (given the historiography of the issue), prices from customs documents are at the norm.

When the Golitsyn evaluations were made, Russia was entering a period of declining prices, which corrected the inflationary level of the previous years and which lasted until Peter's Great Northern War initiated another inflationary era.

Table 1, "Livestock. Agricultural Implements," may not be an accurate gauge of Golitsyn's holdings for a number of reasons. In the same

Table 1. Livestock. Agricultural Implements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gelding</td>
<td>Merin</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65.59</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>Kon'</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>Voznik</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>61.30</td>
<td>16.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>Zhmot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plowshare</td>
<td>Soshnik</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooster Indian</td>
<td>Petukh Ind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scythe</td>
<td>Kosa</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thresher Copper</td>
<td>Chepa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also Table 2 for draft power items used both in farming and transportation.

5 Some historians argue that prices in customs documents are too low because of merchant pressure to keep them that way to avoid imposts. Presumably, in that case, bribes would have been paid to get the customs agents to grant a discount. The other argument is that customs prices were higher than purchase prices because the customs agents jacked the evaluations up in order to increase their revenue. The evidence from this data set is that customs evaluations prices were very close to sale prices.
confiscation series, such as the cases of Andrei Bezobrazov and Leontii Nepliuev, there is a much broader range of livestock and fowl (including cows, calves, bulls, mares, pigs, rams, goats, a camel, ducks, geese, hens), but it seems possible that Golitsyn did not have such things. It may have been that his peasant serfs owned most of those items, and he collected them as rent or purchased them in the market when he needed them. The only indication that Golitsyn may have engaged in farming "directly" is the presence of plowshares (soshniki) in his inventory. (We must recall that one reason that serfs were not slaves was that the former owned their own agricultural inventory—plows, draft power, seeds—whereas slaves did not.)

The horse stock in Table 1 looks more like his resources for transportation and warfare (see Tables 2 and 17) than for agricultural pursuits. The horses known in Russian as vozniki were something special and might be translated as "draft horses," although that also might be misleading. One of them was valued at half a ruble, another at a bit over 5 rubles. Three pairs of dark gray vozniki, however, were evaluated at 30, 40, and 60 rubles a pair—an enormous sum of money in a land where the average craftsman's wage was 4 kopeks a day and a slave could be purchased for 3 rubles. The only other times such high prices for horses appeared were for a few so-called "Arabian horses" (argamaki), at the times of highest inflation, and for evaluations of donations to monasteries.

Golitsyn's holdings included 58 geldings, which were evaluated at an average of 1 ruble 13 kopeks apiece. They ranged from a low of 30 kopeks apiece to one for 5 rubles and one for 15 rubles. One may assume that these were the creatures on which he and his retinue of slaves rode off to war. In my larger data set, the median price of 514 geldings in the seventeenth century was 3 rubles 40 kopeks (the mean price was 5 rubles 8 kopeks—greatly inflated by donations to monasteries; the mean price for sales was 3.57). Note that the lowest prices in the entire data set are from the Golitsyn confiscation materials, which would indicate that the assessors underpriced Golitsyn's horses.

Late Muscovites had numerous names for horses. We have already seen argamak, voznik, and merin. "Horse" was loshad' (perhaps a female horse; median price in the general data set of 2.50 rubles, N = 438), a mare was a kobyla (median price was 2 rubles; mean price was 3.83 rubles, N = 143). Then there was the Polish horse, zhmar, evaluated in Golitsyn's holdings more highly on average than all but the vozniki and not appearing elsewhere in the data set. Then there was the kon', valued at an average 1.23 rubles for the 18 in Golitsyn's stable. This should be compared with the median price of 12

---

7 Ibid., 611–18, 719–26.
rubles apiece in the entire data set (N = 155), once again lower than one might expect from other data of the era.

Table 2 summarizes the Golitsyn possessions in the transportation sector (besides horses). Most notable are his 20 carriages, his 19 carts, 53 saddles, and 15 sleighs. That quantity of possessions probably rivalled those of almost any contemporary in the world, and would be equivalent in some way to what the richest people in the world now possess. One of Golitsyn’s carriages had an evaluation of 500 rubles placed on it by the governmental assessors, another 200 rubles, a third 150 rubles. The 500-ruble vehicle was described as follows:

A large, gilded, carved ‘German’ carriage, upholstered in black leather along the windows, with large panes of glass in the windows and doors. Along the panes were red, silken, braided tassles. Inside, the carriage was upholstered with red velvet and gold edging. The cushions and overhangs were of the same velvet. On the upper part [of the inside] of the carriage, it was upholstered with braided lace and had merlons and tassels of scarlet silk and gold. Along the doors were four red silken braids with silk tassels and gold. In the carriage the middle was upholstered in red leather with gilded copper nails. It had posts with carved and gilded scutcheons. The driver’s seat and the wheels were painted vermilion. The wheels were bound with iron. Over [the carriage] was a linen cover. Price 500 rubles.

This unquestionably was the Rolls Royce of its day. Like many of Golitsyn’s more expensive possessions, it was imported, in this case from the West. The acquisition process is unknown to me (among the appraisers were carriage merchants; perhaps they had “showrooms” where the wealthy could come to spend their money), but it would be fair to assume that much finer, more expensive carriages could not be acquired on the face of the earth. Remember that 500 rubles was enough to purchase 165 slaves, and if the carriage was as undervalued as were the horses (by a factor of at least 3, which would seem unlikely), then Golitsyn could have purchased 500 slaves rather than the carriage. No other seventeenth-century conveyance (at least that I am aware of) cost nearly as much as Golitsyn’s five-hundred-ruble carriage.

In addition to the vehicles themselves, Golitsyn’s possessions included everything else needed to hitch up the horses and go. Just think of it: 54 bits (including 4 from Arabia), 87 blinkers, 119 bridles, 20 horse collars, harnesses, hobbles, and so forth. In addition, he had trunks worth more than a human being in which to transport his possessions.

---

8 Rozysknye dela o Fedore Shkolovitom, 4 (1893): 153.
Table 2. Items for Transportation and Conveyance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bit, Arabic</td>
<td>Udila Arab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bit, Iron</td>
<td>Udila Zhelez</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blinkers</td>
<td>Shory</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>297.45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridle</td>
<td>Uzda</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>469.00</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridle Decoration</td>
<td>Nachelok</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage</td>
<td>Kareta/Koliaska</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,476.00</td>
<td>.73.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart</td>
<td>Telega</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb-bit</td>
<td>Mundshtuk</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>154.30</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear for Cart</td>
<td>Shesternia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harness</td>
<td>Priprezha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbles</td>
<td>Obnozhi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsecloth</td>
<td>Popona</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>57.80</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse collar</td>
<td>Khomut</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse shaft</td>
<td>Duga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limber</td>
<td>Peredok</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle covers</td>
<td>Namët</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle</td>
<td>ArchagSedloChaprak</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>795.70</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saddle girth</td>
<td>Podpruga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semicarriage</td>
<td>Polukoreta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-in-hand</td>
<td>Shesterik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleigh</td>
<td>Sani Vozok</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>279.20</td>
<td>14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleigh stand</td>
<td>Stanok Kaptannyi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strap Hole German</td>
<td>Pakhva</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitcase</td>
<td>Chemodan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surcingle</td>
<td>Trok</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk</td>
<td>Sunduk Skrin'</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49.30</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Name</td>
<td>Russian Name</td>
<td>How Many</td>
<td>Total Sum</td>
<td>Price @</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anise</td>
<td>Anis (Kul')</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anise</td>
<td>Anis (Pood)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apples</td>
<td>Iabloki (Bochka)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>Maslo (Pood)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.5.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candy</td>
<td>Pastile (Korobka)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.4.20</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessert</td>
<td>Zaedka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit drink</td>
<td>Mors (Bochenok)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginger</td>
<td>Imbir' (Stavnia)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>Vetchina (Polot')</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardtack</td>
<td>Sukhar' (Kul')</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardtack</td>
<td>Sukhar' (Chetvert')</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hempseed Oil</td>
<td>Maslo Konop (Vedro)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honey</td>
<td>Med (Pood)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millet</td>
<td>Psheeno (Kul')</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork</td>
<td>Kabanina (Mesto)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>Sol' (Pood)</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>Sakhar (Punt)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
<td>Sakhar (Golova)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Cake</td>
<td>Kovrishka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar Candy</td>
<td>SakharLede (Punt)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar (Milk)</td>
<td>SakharRiaz (Korobka)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar White</td>
<td>SakharBel (Golova)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinegar French</td>
<td>Uksus Fr (Ankerok)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinegar Hungarian</td>
<td>UksusVeng (Bochenok)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinegar Rhine</td>
<td>Uksus Ren (Ankerok)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinegar Rhine</td>
<td>Uksus Ren (Galenok)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinegar White</td>
<td>Uksus Bel (Punt)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>Alkan (Bochka)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>Alkan (Suleia)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine</td>
<td>Ramaneia (Bochka)</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Rhine</td>
<td>VinoRen (Bochka)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>26.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Rhine</td>
<td>VinoRen (Ankerok)</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Rhine</td>
<td>VinoRen (Suleia)</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Rhine</td>
<td>VinoRen (Meshechek)</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 lists the food and spices still on hand when the appraisers got around to enumerating them. Except for the apples, everything else in Table 3 is non-perishable. Probably even the 37 sides of ham and 8 lots of pork were cured so that they would last for some time. Regrettably, this table gives us very little idea of what a magnate of Golitsyn’s eminence consumed at his table. (Such information, fortunately, can be found elsewhere, such as in B. I. Morozov’s correspondence with his stewards and Patriarch Adrian’s expense book [without prices!] two years before his death.\textsuperscript{9}) From the material in our general data set, we know that the diet of most Muscovites must have been extraordinarily monotonous, and perhaps often less than optimally nutritious. Vegetables consisted of cabbage, cucumbers, garlic, and onions. Fruits were apples, cherries, and pears. Nuts appeared occasionally. Grains were rye, oats, occasionally barley and wheat, and rarely millet (see Table 3). Millet appears only a dozen times in our data set, for prices ranging from 55 kopeks to 7.20 rubles per pood and once for 90 kopeks per chetvert'; at no other time is the price given by the bag. Millet was an expensive grain. I do not know whether Golitsyn consumed it as a form of porridge, or in some other manner. (It is possible that he fed it to his captive birds, as Americans do today.) The 60 bags and 144 pounds (4 chetverti) of hardtack (sukhar') may have been left over from the Crimean campaign of 1689, but their presence would indicate that the diet of the great man himself was probably not always an experience in variety and luxury. (Of course the hardtack may have been meant to feed the slaves of his campaign retinue.) Fish in a large assortment was available for the rich, but the poor probably ate it rarely. Poultry was undoubtedly a similar luxury item. Meat (rather infrequently for ordinary people) consisted of beef, pork, lamb, and goat.

In a land without refrigeration, the presence of butter in a list of non-perishable commodities seems unusual. We know from export data of the nineteenth century that the Russians managed to keep butter for quite some time (although some exported butter was rancid). The 396 pounds (11 poods) of butter in Golitsyn’s larder were appraised at 50 kopeks per pood, about half the “real” price of butter: for 71 cases, the median price of butter per pood was 1 ruble, the mean price was 1.009225 rubles per pood.

Most of the items in Table 3 are luxury items. This includes the two spices, anise (half a bag [kuli] and 306 pounds [8.5 poods]) and ginger (1

\textsuperscript{9}Khoziaistvo krupnogo feodala-krepostnika 17 veka, ed. by S. G. Tomsinskii and B. D. Grekov, 2 vols. (Leningrad, 1933, 1936); Akty khoziaistva boiarina B. I. Morozova, ed. by A. I. Iakovlev, 2 vols. (Moscow and Leningrad, 1940, 1945).

Pepper was not uncommon in late Muscovy, and it is somewhat surprising that none was inventoried among Golitsyn's possessions. Sugar was a luxury sweetener, and it is likely that Golitsyn himself (or someone else who had control over expenditures) had a sweet tooth, as evidenced by the presence of the sweeteners, dessert mix, and candies in the inventory.

Honey was the classic Russian sweetener, and the 108 pounds (3 poods) discovered among his possessions would be expected to be present in some quantity in almost every household. In the larger data set, the median price of honey (N = 170) was a ruble per pood throughout the period; the mean was 1.75. The median sale price was also a ruble per pood, the mean sale price was 1.61 rubles per pood (N = 114)—both significantly above the 30 kopeks per pood assigned by those who evaluated Golitsyn’s possessions. For 15 known cases, the median Moscow price of honey was 1.10 rubles per pood, the mean 1.31. In general, honey was dearer in places such as the North [Khlynov] and Siberia [Tobol'sk]; it was cheaper in the South, such as in Elets.

Notable are Golitsyn’s vinegar holdings: white (perhaps Russian, but then perhaps not, considering the price), French, Hungarian, and Rhine (French-German). Vinegar was known to eleventh-century East Slavs (the word is Greek in origin), and by the seventeenth century was a relative commonplace. The price of ordinary vinegar in the second half of the century ranged from 4 to 15 kopeks a bucket (vedro—whose precise volume dimensions are unknown). Ordinary Russian vinegar was relatively inexpensive (a day’s pay would buy a bucket of vinegar), but the white vinegar in Golitsyn’s inventory was some form of liquid gold: 5 rubles for about a pint! The bottles of foreign vinegar were also very expensive.

Golitsyn’s wine cellar seems to have been relatively lean for a person of his pretensions. Based on other episodes in Russian history, it would seem to be fair to speculate that those who suppressed Golitsyn and inventoried his goods regarded his wine cellar as part of their just compensation, so that only a small fraction of the original remains. Be that as it may, an interesting collection of units is associated with the wine collection: ankerok (also ankirek, anker) was a keg, cask, or small barrel; a bochka was a barrel; a meshochek very small bag, probably made of leather; and a suleia was a flat glass bottle, probably akin in form to a modern pint alcohol bottle. His total holdings were declared to be worth 130.30, a not-inconsiderable sum, of course, but they only amounted to about 5 barrels. Alkan was a form of Spanish brandy, ramaneia (also romaneia) was a kind of red table wine imported from France, and then there was Rhine wine. Russia itself did not produce wine, except perhaps some around Astrakhan. What the Muscovites called vino has been translated in our project as “spirits,” probably vodka.
This cost about 55 kopeks per bucket (vedro), and its price dropped at the rate of .5 percent per year between the years 1608 and 1711 (N = 418), slightly less than the price of rye (presumably the main ingredient of vodka) fell in the period 1601–1720 (.067 percent per year, N = 805). When an adjective was put in front of vino, it was usually some form of wine—Alsatian, church, red, Canary, Rhine, Roman, Spanish, and so on. Its price per barrel was significantly less than that assessed from Golitsyn’s cellar. In 21 cases where the price of a barrel (bochka) of wine was mentioned in our data set, the median price was 12 rubles, the mean 16.95 rubles. One may only hope that Golitsyn’s liquor was of higher quality than that drunk by others, for it certainly cost more! Although the price of vodka was falling in the years 1608–1711, the price of wine was rising at the rate of .89 percent per year (N = 67), typical for many imported items.

Table 4 enumerates the tools and hardware found among Golitsyn’s possessions by the assessors. Most of the basic handtools we know today are listed, with some significant exceptions. One sees no hammers, although molot/molotok did exist in the seventeenth century. Similarly, there are very few nails in the Golitsyn inventory (see Table 6), although our data set has hundreds of cases of gvozdi of all types. A modern carpenter would be surprised by the absence of the saw, even though the pila certainly existed. (The peasant is alleged much to have preferred the axe because of its more favorable interaction with the grain of wood.) Be that as it may, the woodworking handtools present would allow the shaping of almost any piece of wood into almost any form: adze, axe, brace and bit, brushes, chisel, drawknife, joiner’s tool, knives, try square, and vise are still the basic hand tools of today’s woodworkers. Metalworking tools are also in evidence: bellows, brazier, die. More serious metalworking would demand hammers, tongs, and other such tools. It would seem plausible that Golitsyn purchased many finished goods in the market (especially, obviously, imports), and he made no pretense at domestic autarky. (Golitsyn had a blacksmith shop, which was on “the itinerary” of the confiscation assessors.) As for the tool prices, they seem to be very low-ball estimates: if Golitsyn’s adzes were deemed to be worth 3 kopeks apiece, the others in our data set were 12, 30, and 40 kopeks each. Golitsyn’s fire axes must have been something special, for they are unique in the data set. Rarely did axes cost only 5 or 10 kopeks: typically, they were from 10 to 30 kopeks. Golitsyn’s chisels were evaluated at 3 kopeks apiece, whereas others in the data set cost 9, 15, and 20 kopeks each. The discussion could go on, but the point should be clear: the tools listed in Table 4 are priced at less than most such tools in Muscovy. Perhaps this was because they were used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adze</td>
<td>Teslo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe</td>
<td>Topor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe, Fire</td>
<td>Toporik Ogn.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe, iron</td>
<td>Bagor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe, iron rod</td>
<td>Toporik Zhelez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellows</td>
<td>Mekh Kuznetskii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brace (Drill)</td>
<td>Kolovorot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand</td>
<td>Piatno</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier</td>
<td>Zharovnia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier</td>
<td>Zharovnia(Zolotnik)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush</td>
<td>Shchitka/Kist'</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chisel</td>
<td>Paznik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowbar</td>
<td>Lom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die</td>
<td>Chekan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawknife</td>
<td>Skobel'</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiner's tool</td>
<td>Dorozhnik</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Nozh/Nozhik</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife</td>
<td>Rogatina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penknife German</td>
<td>Nozh NePer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scissors</td>
<td>Nozhnitsy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TackerJoiner's</td>
<td>Snast'</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try square</td>
<td>Naugol'nik</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vise</td>
<td>Tisk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 lists the metals inventoried in Golitsyn's possessions: copper, iron, tin, and gold coins. One assumes that he had these items on hand to make repairs and as raw materials should he want something made. (Table 6 lists his wood supplies.) Note that the world's best iron at the time was made in Sweden, and at least part of Golitsyn's supplies came from the country that was Muscovy's third most important enemy, after Crimea and the Rzeczpospolita. Most of Golitsyn's iron holdings are not classified in ways comparable to others in our data set, but in 294 observations in 40 different places in 59 of the years between 1610 and 1725 of 38 different commodities denominated in pooods of iron the median price of a poood was 50 kopeks and the mean was 76 kopeks. As a rule, the high-price places for iron represent remote places in Siberia and Astrakhan', the low-price places near Tula or in the Urals after 1700. The median price of unworked iron (N = 68) and iron rods (N = 52) was 50 kopeks. Half of all prices were between 20 and 80 kopeks, 80 percent between 15 kopeks and 1.50. Once again, then, the 25-kopek evaluation for a poood of an iron commodity in Golitsyn's possession was on the low side. The median price of iron in Moscow was 60 kopeks (mean: 76 kopeks, N = 95); in Novgorod the median price was 43 kopeks (mean: 50 kopeks, N = 18); in Ustiug, 20 kopeks (21 kopeks, N = 40); in Tikhvin, 26 kopeks (27 kopeks, N = 11); in Tobolsk, 2.05 rubles (mean: 2.93, N = 16); Urals, 26 kopeks (32 kopeks, N = 23).

Table 6 enumerates the building and construction materials found in Golitsyn's possession. This includes the main house itself, evaluated at 12,833.60 rubles—which must be contrasted with the average peasant hut
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beams</td>
<td>Brus</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, wooden</td>
<td>Doska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, cedar</td>
<td>Doska Kedr</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, nut</td>
<td>Doska Orekh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, oak</td>
<td>Doska Dubvoi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board, wall</td>
<td>Doska Sten</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricks, slate</td>
<td>KirpichiAsp</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice</td>
<td>Podzor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadbolt/lock</td>
<td>ZamokNutr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door</td>
<td>Dver</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Steklo (Arshin)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House itself</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,833.60</td>
<td>12,833.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Roofing</td>
<td>ZhelezoKrish(Pood)</td>
<td>225.25</td>
<td>157.68</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logs</td>
<td>Brëvna</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logs, chair</td>
<td>Derevo Stul</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logs, oak</td>
<td>Bricvna Dub</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logs, Kalmyk</td>
<td>Derevo Kalmyk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nails, copper</td>
<td>Gvozd' Med</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>1.40@100nails</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint</td>
<td>Kraska (Funt)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe, blued</td>
<td>Truba Vorozheshch.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipe, copper</td>
<td>Truba Medn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rod, iron</td>
<td>Batog Zhelez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rods</td>
<td>Prut'ia (Pood)</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutters</td>
<td>Stavnia</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shutters, mica</td>
<td>Zatvory Slud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staple, copper</td>
<td>Skoba Medn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staple, copper</td>
<td>Skoba Medn (Funt)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone, slab</td>
<td>Kamen' (Doska)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strap Iron</td>
<td>Pomochi</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tar</td>
<td>Dëgot' (Vedro)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows w. mica</td>
<td>OkonnitsaSliud</td>
<td>104.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows w. mica</td>
<td>OkonnitsaSliud</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window frames</td>
<td>Okonnitsa</td>
<td>91.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window frames</td>
<td>Okonnitsa</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>90.70</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WindowW/IronShutter</td>
<td>OknoZhZat</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(izba); 37 of them scattered throughout Muscovy cost 317 rubles, or about 8.50 rubles apiece. The “house” (dom) was typically more elaborate, ranging in price (in this data set) from 5 rubles to 50, 200, 403.56, 1,360, to 5,000 rubles, and then Golitsyn’s at nearly 13,000 rubles.

The appraisers of Golitsyn’s possessions were very interested in windows. This is not surprising, when one recalls that even two centuries later, in the nineteenth century, most peasant huts did not have chimneys, much less windows, to save heat. Thus, the fact that Golitsyn had about 270 windows was indeed interesting, as was the fact that they alone were assessed at half a ruble apiece. Window frames (okonnitsy) do not appear in the sources very often. Most of the dozen others in this data set come from the 1674 records of the Secret Chancellery (Tainyi prikaz), Tsar Aleksei’s private domain set up first to finance the Thirteen Years’ War, then to serve as his secret police and to run his household. The cost of those window frames was about the same as Golitsyn’s. Into the window frames could go glass, mica, translucent fish bladders, and probably other things as well. Glass seems to have been so rare that even Golitsyn had a preference for mica in his windows. At 4 rubles for an arshin (= ca. 28 inches) of glass (I have no idea how wide it was), one can understand the need to find substitutes. Comparable prices are not at hand.

About a dozen pounds of paint (kraska) were found in Golitsyn’s possession, evaluated at a ruble a funt (a funt equals approximately .9 pound). Paint was usually measured in units of a pood, a funt, or a zolotnik. (There were 40 funts in a pood, and 96 zolotniks in a funt.) An entire essay could (and will) be written about Muscovite paints, but in general the price depended on the color, which presumably was determined by the cost of pigments. (As we shall see in the discussion of textiles, Table 15, the same was often true for cloth.) White was the cheapest, then yellow and orange were next. Green was often still more expensive, and then blue, especially something called krutik and golubets. A crimson paint called bakan could be the most expensive. In only a few other cases, however, did bakan, golubets, vinitsiskaia iar’ (light green), and krutik cost a ruble a funt, so Golitsyn’s paint must have been of very high quality or something rare.

Golitsyn had in stock any number of forest products (such as beams, boards, and logs). The median price of all boards in seventeenth-century Muscovy was 7 kopeks (N = 231). In Moscow, the median price was 12 kopeks (N = 51). In the North, in Ustiug Velikii, the median price was 3 kopeks (N = 33). The median price of an otherwise-undefined board was 7 kopeks (N = 130; the mean was 13 kopeks). Boards specifically defined as “pine” were cheaper: the median was only half a kopek (the mean 5.52
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kopeks; N = 53), whereas oak boards were much more expensive, a median of 24.2 kopeks (mean 39.49 kopeks; N = 17). Once again, we find that Golitsyn’s oak boards, at 7.5 kopeks apiece, were probably undervalued. On the other hand, his “wooden boards” seem to have been significantly overpriced, although there may have been something special about them that made them worth far more than average boards. The forester-assessors should have known. Golitsyn’s cedar boards were imported, as were probably his “nut” boards.

Unfortunately the assessors did not report how many “logs” (brëvna) there were in Golitsyn’s possession, only that they were worth 17.50 rubles. One would doubt that this was firewood, which had a special name, drova, that, to my knowledge, was always used when relevant. The median price of firewood was 10 kopeks a load, so that sum would have purchased 175 loads, which would seem to be an excessive quantity even for someone like Golitsyn. Golitsyn was, we might recall, arrested in the autumn. Be that as it may, someone with an establishment like Golitsyn’s probably did store up many loads of firewood for the winter. The median log in Muscovy cost 4.5 kopeks (the average = mean log cost 14.66 kopeks; N = 269), which means that there should have been something between 120 and 390 logs in Golitsyn’s stockpile— quite a few, in any case.

A few words may be in order about the metal products in Table 6. Counting all 4,500 copper nails must have provided someone with diversion for some time, and one wonders why the same person did not count the logs. As today copper nails are a rare luxury item hard to find, so they were in Muscovy. Golitsyn’s are the sole example in the data set excepting one from 1710. The first point to make is that Golitsyn’s copper nails were grossly underpriced at 3 kopeks for 100 nails. That was often the price for 10 regular nails in the seventeenth century. Another reason to suspect undervaluation is the fact that, in the 1710 case, ten copper nails cost 12 kopeks. Raw copper in 1710 cost about twice as much as it had two decades earlier, 7 rubles a pood vs. ca. 3.50 rubles. The copper staples are overvalued at 12 kopeks per funt, which translates into 4.80 rubles per pood. Lastly, there are the iron rods, valued at 40 kopeks per pood. This was close to the median price for iron in 1690, but that should be increased slightly for what we might term “the Moscow premium.”

Table 7 summarizes the containers in Golitsyn’s possession at the time of his arrest: barrels, bottles, boxes, cases, jars, and sacks made out of wood, cloth, metal, and glass. The assortment was not equivalent to what one might have today, but is hardly anything to sneeze at. The list hardly does justice to the assortment, some of whose luxury aspects can be ascertained by looking at the prices for the items. Obviously someone in the Golitsyn menage had a
passion for collecting bottles, boxes, cases, jars, and sacks. Note that silver objects were routinely weighed and valued at 8 rubles per funt and tin items were valued at about 10 kopeks per funt. Tin, from England, Holland, and Georgia in the Caucasus, had a market price of from 3 to 4 rubles per pood in 1689–1690, so the assessors’ assigning a price of 3.60 per pood of tin objects was not far from the mark. Of course this assigns no value to craftsmanship or labor. Some of these objects survive in the Moscow Kremlin Armory (Oruzheinaia palata).

Table 7. Containers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrel Tin</td>
<td>Bochka B2h</td>
<td>...19</td>
<td>.187.00</td>
<td>...9.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrel Placer/Mining</td>
<td>Bochka Rossypana</td>
<td>...1</td>
<td>...6.00</td>
<td>...6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottle</td>
<td>Suleia/Chetvertin</td>
<td>...29</td>
<td>...9.89</td>
<td>...34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box</td>
<td>Runduk/Korobka</td>
<td>...15</td>
<td>...9.90</td>
<td>...6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Shkatulka/Lagolishch</td>
<td>...55</td>
<td>...819.51</td>
<td>...14.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case, kid leather</td>
<td>Shkatulka (Funt)</td>
<td>...95.5</td>
<td>...788.33</td>
<td>...8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container</td>
<td>Stav/Stavik</td>
<td>...7</td>
<td>...8.17</td>
<td>...1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crate</td>
<td>Iashchik</td>
<td>...69</td>
<td>...40.80</td>
<td>...59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crate/box silver</td>
<td>Iashchik Sereb (Funt)</td>
<td>...3.13</td>
<td>...25.00</td>
<td>...8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jar, glass</td>
<td>Sklianitsa</td>
<td>...51</td>
<td>...5.91</td>
<td>...1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepper box Silver</td>
<td>Perechnitsa</td>
<td>...1</td>
<td>...5.00</td>
<td>...5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sack</td>
<td>Mesok/Kul’</td>
<td>...58</td>
<td>...25</td>
<td>...0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin container</td>
<td>Olovenik</td>
<td>...28</td>
<td>...15.84</td>
<td>...57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin container</td>
<td>Olovenik (Funt)</td>
<td>...8.275</td>
<td>...9.44</td>
<td>...114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 lists Golitsyn’s furniture. Not everyone in the world even today owns 154 chairs, and probably very few people did in 1689–1690. These were not the kind of chairs peasants would have sat on to milk cows (if peasants had chairs at all), for they were assessed as being worth from 30 kopeks to 2.50 rubles apiece. It would be fun to describe them all, but it should be enough to note that velvet and gold are frequently mentioned. The less expensive ones are often described as “worn”—vetkhi.

---
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Golitsyn had at least 39 tables, for which he paid an average of 3.44 rubles apiece. Oak was a favorite construction material; some of the more expensive tables had slate tops. There are no such comparable tables elsewhere in the data set.

Table 8. Furniture, Appliances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name.........</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armchair...</td>
<td>Kreslo..................</td>
<td>.........8</td>
<td>.28.80</td>
<td>...3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed..........</td>
<td>Krovet'/Spal'nia.......</td>
<td>.........12</td>
<td>.527.95</td>
<td>.44.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench.......</td>
<td>Skami'/Skat'ia........</td>
<td>.........14</td>
<td>.4.90</td>
<td>.......35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier.....</td>
<td>Zharovnia..............</td>
<td>.........3</td>
<td>....5.10</td>
<td>.......1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazier.....</td>
<td>Zharovnia (Zolotnik)..</td>
<td>.........76</td>
<td>.4.50</td>
<td>.......0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair........</td>
<td>Stul....................</td>
<td>.........154</td>
<td>.155.72</td>
<td>.......1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest.......</td>
<td>Larets Pogrebets.......</td>
<td>.........10</td>
<td>.38.48</td>
<td>.......3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupboard....</td>
<td>Shkaf Postavets........</td>
<td>.........19</td>
<td>.421.10</td>
<td>.......22.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headrest....</td>
<td>Podgolovok...............</td>
<td>.........4</td>
<td>.26.40</td>
<td>.......6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattress.....</td>
<td>Rumazhnik Tiufiak.......</td>
<td>.........12</td>
<td>.71.65</td>
<td>.......5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove........</td>
<td>Pech'....................</td>
<td>.........20</td>
<td>.113.50</td>
<td>.......5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table.........</td>
<td>Stol.......................</td>
<td>.........39</td>
<td>.134.20</td>
<td>.......3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tableleg.....</td>
<td>Noga.......................</td>
<td>.........1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.......0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warming oven</td>
<td>Plitka Nemetsk........</td>
<td>.........2</td>
<td>.60.00</td>
<td>.......30.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Golitsyn loved his beds, and paid handsomely for them. “Gilded” and “walnut” are the essential adjectives of his 150-ruble resting places. Others cost less, of course. Then he had expensive mattresses to go on the beds. Various chests and cupboards were present for storing goods. The most expensive ones were imported (from Germany? Nemetskii really means “Northern European” in many cases rather than “German”) and were listed as being worth 50 and 150 rubles. Wardrobes and armoires apparently did not exist (the word garderob had not entered the Russian language), as far as I know closets did not exist, and in general one can say that his furniture storage pieces were inadequate for all of his possessions. What the storage solution was remains to be determined.

Heating has been a major winter problem in Russia for some time, and Golitsyn solved it by having a stove in practically every room. These could be extraordinarily expensive. One was evaluated as being worth 112.50 rubles. He also had what we might translate as “German warming ovens” (nemetskii plitki) that cost 30 rubles apiece and “braziers” (zharovni), at least one of which must have been a luxury item because it was evaluated in precious-metal weights (zolotniyi).
The furnishings in the Golitsyn establishment must have been stunning. Table 9 includes the ornaments and other “do-dads” and “knick-knacks” found among his possessions. They included wooden and glass apples, little bells, a gold-and-silver burdock, copper horses, an ornamental deer head (olen' golova), a copper eagle, a gilded eagle, various statues, a copper lion, a wooden raven, a wooden snake—items that were intended to reveal their owner’s taste and sensibilities. Perhaps significant is the presence of 5 shells (rakoviny), the symbol of the Baroque, which was just coming into Muscovy at the time Golitsyn was flourishing.

Very interesting in Table 9 are the 95 mirrors, appraised at the enormous sum of 801.20, or an average of 8.43 apiece. One of the mirrors with silver and gold was assessed at 60 rubles. No form of extravagance was too extreme for Golitsyn’s mirrors, whose frames were made out of rare woods and amber. One even had a “tortoise frame” (cherepakhovaia rama) and was assessed as being worth 20 rubles, the price of six slaves. One may assume that the mirror had special significance in Baroque high culture, and that Golitsyn was living at the peak of that culture.

Lighting is always a precious commodity in Russia. For much of the year there is very little sunlight, and in order to retain heat, the windows typically were smaller than in more clement climes. These conditions placed a premium on artificial illumination provided by candles. Golitsyn spent at least 461.20 on 19 chandeliers. The average is distorted by the fact that one of them, made out of white bone, was assessed at 200 rubles. Chandeliers illuminated most of the rooms of his mansion. In addition to the chandeliers, Golitsyn had 65 candleholders which cost on average about 1.30 apiece. One of them cost 15 rubles, a far cry from the few kopeks paid for a candleholder by most people. Most of Golitsyn’s candleholders were made out of copper (brass, bronze?), whereas often ordinary ones were made out of wood or iron. Six of them must have been made out of silver, for they were weighed and their value appraised at 7.00, 7.50, 8.00, or 9.00 per funt.

As for the candles providing the illumination, Golitsyn’s inventoried supplies were not as large as I would have preferred—only 4 “big candles” valued at 17.5 kopeks apiece, among the most expensive such instruments in this data set. “Ordinary Muscovites,” including those who worked in government offices, purchased either tallow or the more expensive wax candles. The median price of a tallow candle was 0.4 kopeks (the mean was the same; N = 702). Wax candles were frequently sold by weight, but when the price was recorded by the piece, they seem to have cost as much as ten times as much as the smoky tallow ones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple ornament</td>
<td>Iabloko De i St</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basin</td>
<td>Taz Rukomoinik</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td>Kutaz Skilanochka</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burdock, gld&amp;siv</td>
<td>Repei ZoSe</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candies Big</td>
<td>Svechi Bolshoi</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candleholder</td>
<td>Shandal Podsvtechnik</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>84.69</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candleholder</td>
<td>Shandal (Punt)</td>
<td>.14.90</td>
<td>118.266</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandelier</td>
<td>Panikadilo</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>461.20</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandelier</td>
<td>Panikadilo (Pood)</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>43.60</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chandelier</td>
<td>Panikadilo (Punt)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clock</td>
<td>Chasy</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>522.00</td>
<td>32.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Horse</td>
<td>Loshad' Med'</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Horse</td>
<td>Loshad' Med' (Punt)</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer silver</td>
<td>Olen' Serebr</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer head</td>
<td>Olen' Golova</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle copper</td>
<td>Skopa Medn</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle gilded</td>
<td>Okiol Zoloch</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egg</td>
<td>Iaitsc Trusov</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame gilded</td>
<td>Rama Zoloch</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame wooden</td>
<td>Rama Derev</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame silvgild</td>
<td>Rama Zol-Sere</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icon case</td>
<td>Kiot</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icon lamp</td>
<td>Lampada</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconostasis</td>
<td>Ikonoostas</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamp</td>
<td>Fonar'</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantern mica</td>
<td>Fonar' Slud</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion copper</td>
<td>Lev Mednyi</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion copper</td>
<td>Lev Mednyi (Punt)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror</td>
<td>Zerkalo</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>801.20</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nest</td>
<td>Gnezdo</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nut wooden</td>
<td>Gaika Derev</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raven wooden</td>
<td>Voron Derev</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rug</td>
<td>Kovær</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>397.60</td>
<td>10.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>Rakovina</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake wooden</td>
<td>Zmeia</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue Glass</td>
<td>Figura Stekl</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statue German</td>
<td>Figura Nemetsk</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan sugar</td>
<td>Lebed' Sakhar</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol Sign</td>
<td>Zhnak</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapestry</td>
<td>Shpaler</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>334.80</td>
<td>17.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtub</td>
<td>Lokhan</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Golitsyn probably was some form of Orthodox believer. As noted earlier, his house had murals painted on many of the walls and icons greeted the visitor to almost every room. Other cult objects were items such as the iconostasis (icon frame), on which icons were hung in a specific order to tell the Biblical story. The iconostasis was a church cult object rarely found in private homes. In addition, the icon lamps (16 of them) give some notion of how many major icons Golitsyn had. Major rooms had a “red corner” in which there was an icon, an icon lamp in front of it, and other cult objects.

Also important were Golitsyn’s tapestries and oriental rugs. His 19 tapestries must have been stunning. They were appraised at an average of 17.62 rubles apiece. The most valuable pieces were deemed to be worth 65, 60, 40, and 30 rubles. Among others, the tapestries were made of velvet, silk, and worsted. They had pictures of trees and birds on them. The oriental rugs were appraised as being worth about 10 rubles each, but they ranged in price from 50, 40, 35, 30, and 25 rubles down to 40 kopeks for a “worn” rug. Most of the rugs came from Persia, some from India. The most expensive of them had gold in them; silk was the most prominent fabric in others.

Table 9 also lists various vessels used for washing laundry and the person. Soap is in Table 18.

Among Golitsyn’s most interesting possessions unquestionably were his clocks. Golitsyn in 1689 had at least 17 clocks, appraised at 542 rubles. As usual, the average price tells little in this world of luxury goods. The most expensive one was valued at 200 rubles, the next at 70. The 200-ruble piece had a tortoise-shell case. Most of the clocks had chimes (boevye). Golitsyn did not own all the clocks in Muscovy, of course. To my knowledge, their history has not been written, but the first one in this data set comes from 1607, and they were almost always expensive—tens of rubles, sometimes 100, 130, or 150 rubles. No one came any closer, however, to Golitsyn’s 200-ruble masterpiece. Let us hope it kept good time!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Kubok</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Kubok (Funt)</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl</td>
<td>Kubok (Zolotnik)</td>
<td>16.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl copper</td>
<td>Chasha</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl copper</td>
<td>Chasha</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl copper</td>
<td>Peredacha</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl glass</td>
<td>Bratina St</td>
<td>98.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl glass</td>
<td>Kubok Stekl</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl gold</td>
<td>Bratina Zol</td>
<td>34.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl gold</td>
<td>Bratina Zol (Funt)</td>
<td>34.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl jasper</td>
<td>Chasha Tas</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl jasper</td>
<td>Chasha Tas</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl pewter</td>
<td>Peredacha Ol</td>
<td>2.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl pewter</td>
<td>Peredacha Ol (Funt)</td>
<td>2.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl tin</td>
<td>Chasha OKr</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl wooden</td>
<td>Misa Derev</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowl other</td>
<td>Chasha, Kubok</td>
<td>55.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka Bratina</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka Bratina</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Stopa</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka Alebas</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Stupa</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Chashka lamp</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Dostakan</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Dostakan</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>Dostakan</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Bluido</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Rosol</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Rosol Ikantar</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Bluido Stekl</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Rosol Stekl</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Veko Zhelez</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Bluido Serebr</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Rosol Serepet</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Posuda Serebr</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Koronovatika</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Bluido Olovian</td>
<td>33.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Bluido Olo (Pood)</td>
<td>43.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>Rosol Derevian</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Stakan</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Price 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Stakan (Punt)</td>
<td>27.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Stakan (Zolotnik)</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass wine</td>
<td>Riumka</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jam dish</td>
<td>Bludechek</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Krushka</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Krushka (Punt)</td>
<td>.9965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mug</td>
<td>Krushka (Zolotnik)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitcher</td>
<td>Kuvshin</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Tarelka</td>
<td>.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>Podshandan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plate amber</td>
<td>Tarelka Iantar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltshaker</td>
<td>Solonka</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltshaker</td>
<td>Solonka (Zolotnik)</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltshaker</td>
<td>Solonka (Punt)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Podbliudni</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Podbliudni (Punt)</td>
<td>.1375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Poddon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop[er]</td>
<td>Cherpak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop[er]</td>
<td>Churich (Punt)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop[er]</td>
<td>Kovsh (Punt)</td>
<td>2.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop[er]</td>
<td>Nalivka</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoop[er]</td>
<td>Nalivka (Punt)</td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverware set</td>
<td>Monastyrek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon amber</td>
<td>Lozhka Iantar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon apple</td>
<td>Lozhka Tablo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon bone</td>
<td>Lozhka Kostei</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon cornelian</td>
<td>Lozhka Serdolikovaia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon dripping</td>
<td>Lozhka Kar</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon gilded</td>
<td>Lozhka Zol (Punt)</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon root</td>
<td>Lozhka Korenchat</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon shell</td>
<td>Lozhka Rakovin</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoon wooden</td>
<td>Lozhka Derev/Kop.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 enumerates Golitsyn's dishware and serving utensils. His objects were made out of nearly every practical substance known to man in his era: alabaster, amber, bone, clay, copper, glass, gold, iron, jasper, limestone, pewter, shell, silver, stone, tin, and wood. He had bowls, cups, dishes, glasses, mugs, pitchers, plates, saltshakers, saucers, scoopers, and serving spoons. He even had sets of knives, forks, and spoons. Whether he or anyone else used them is unknown. At least he had them—something residents of the Ukrainian village of Viriatino did not have until the 1930s. Here, as elsewhere, modesty was not called for. His 400-ruble set of silver dishes must have been absolutely world class. His 184 glasses must have allowed quite a few to quench their thirst as they boasted about Golitsyn's ill-fated (and erroneously advertised) campaigns of 1687 and 1689, which led to his overthrow. They varied in appraised value from 2.3 kopeks apiece to 7.44 rubles apiece. One should note in Table 10 that Golitsyn had every form (defined by different names in Russian) of every kind of dishware. What are translated as "bowls" were in Russian bratina, chasha, kubok, misa, and peredacha. The Russian name for "dish" was bliudo, posuda, rosol, and veko. One can only imagine what it was like when Golitsyn and his cavalrymen sat down to dine off this finery. We know that, when the tsar sat down to eat in the Kremlin and desired to commence the meal, the call went out "Tsariu khochetsia est'!" ("The Tsar wants to eat!"). There must have been a similar scene at Golitsyn's.

Golitsyn also had saltshakers for his table, some of them grandiose centerpieces. One of them cost 9 rubles, another 7.50. Others, presumably the individual-use type, cost much less. One made out of tin was estimated to be worth 5 kopeks, others were 3 kopeks. Of course Golitsyn had salt to go in the saltshakers (see Table 3), about 440 pounds of it. One lot was appraised at 12 kopeks per pood, the other at 15 kopeks per pood. This was close to the median price of 10 kopeks per pood (and also the mean price of 15 kopeks per pood; N = 1132).

An establishment such as Golitsyn's demanded many linens. Those listed by the appraisers are reproduced in Table 11. There hardly seem to be enough of some items, such as bed sheets, so perhaps they had been stolen by someone. Thirty-two bed sheets and 19 blankets would hardly seem to be adequate for the furniture listed in Table 8. This is in spite of the fact that one
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Table 11. Linens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed curtain</td>
<td>Polog</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedspread</td>
<td>Chekhol</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bench cover</td>
<td>Polavochnik</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket gold</td>
<td>Odeialo Zolot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket ordinary</td>
<td>Odeialo</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>269.00</td>
<td>14.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornice curtain</td>
<td>Podzor Zaves</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64.60</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover</td>
<td>Pokrov (-ets)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtain</td>
<td>Zaves</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>348.23</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillow</td>
<td>Isgolov'e</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillow</td>
<td>Podushka</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.85</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillowcase</td>
<td>Navolka</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillowcase</td>
<td>Zastenok</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller (footpillow)</td>
<td>Valik</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet, bed</td>
<td>Prostynia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table cloth</td>
<td>Skatert'</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towel</td>
<td>Polotentse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A blanket, with gold in it, was appraised at 150 rubles. (The appraisers did not explain the warmth value of gold.) As bedsheets do not appear elsewhere in my data set, it is not possible to claim that they were widely used by other Russians. The numbers of pillows (30) and pillowcases (24) seem more in keeping with the size of the Golitsyn household, although again one wonders whether the pillowcases were ever washed. (Soap is found in Table 18, but hardly in quantities comparable to the salt.)

Golitsyn spent a lot of money on curtains, both for his bed and for his windows. Bed curtains were hardly everyday items in Muscovy, although others do appear in the data set in the possession of what would seem to be quite ordinary people. In 1632, for example, a group of peasants from Ustiug petitioned the tsar to complain about the theft of quite a bit of their property. Included was a bed curtain alleged to be worth 2.50 rubles. Two years later, a widow, also from Ustiug, complained about the theft of her bed curtain, which she valued at 1.20 rubles. In 1671, in yet another theft involving a bed curtain, a peasant in Temnikov complained of the loss of one that he alleged was worth 8 rubles. (Theft prices often were exaggerated.) Then in

---

17 RIB 25(1): 163.
1692 a townsman of Tikhvin imported a load of things from Sweden, and among them was a bed curtain alleged to be worth 20 kopeks.\(^\text{19}\) It is probable that these possessors of bed curtains were among the most wealthy peasants and townsmen of Muscovy, if one judges by the prices quoted, for ordinary persons were unlikely to have so much money. Regardless, one cannot fail to note that Golitsyn’s bed curtains, at nearly 6 rubles apiece, were far more expensive than what anyone else had. This was particularly true in the case of one set of bed curtains valued at 20 rubles and made of Chinese silk and velvet.

An extended discussion could also be made of Golitsyn’s window curtains (zaves), on which he expended what easily would have been an ordinary person’s lifetime wages. One set of six curtains was evaluated at 200 rubles; they were made of gold and silk (ob’iar). While it is true that Golitsyn’s curtains in general were made of various forms of silk and otherwise extravagant, he did have one set that was appraised at 2 kopeks per curtain.

The Golitsyn household was also well equipped with tablecloths and towels. As one might expect, he had one tablecloth appraised at 20 rubles. Gold thread was found in the most expensive ones. His towels, at 8 kopeks apiece, were hardly noteworthy.

Table 12. Kitchen Tools, Supplies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cauldron iron</td>
<td>Kotiol Zhelez</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frying pan</td>
<td>Skorovoda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid, bowl</td>
<td>Krovlia s Kubka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid, bowl</td>
<td>Krovlia (Zolotnik)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid pot copper</td>
<td>Krovlia Gor Med</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortar copper</td>
<td>Igot'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sack cloth</td>
<td>Meshok Sukonnoi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove “German”</td>
<td>Plitka Nemetsk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60.00</td>
<td>.30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stove Russian</td>
<td>Pech'</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.226.00</td>
<td>.11.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 12 lists what the appraisers found of Golitsyn’s kitchen equipment. This can hardly have been all there was, for it would hardly arouse the envy of a late twentieth-century customer in a Chef’s Kitchen store. Two iron pots, 3 frying pans, 3 pot lids (2 of copper, the third of precious metal), a copper mortar, some of the tools listed in Table 10, and a stove hardly would have been adequate to prepare the food for the Golitsyn household. Perhaps his slaves, hearing of his arrest on treason charges, “liberated” most of the kitchen utensils in anticipation of their own liberation. Slaves were ordinarily freed after their owners had been arrested on treason charges. This was the fate of Golitsyn’s slaves who wanted to be freed. Others of his slaves accompanied him into exile in the northern Urals. One source indicates that Golitsyn owned at least 227 slaves.

Table 13 lists Golitsyn’s confiscated clothing and jewelry. Most of it is men’s clothing, although there are a few dresses. A glance at the table makes it apparent that Golitsyn was a clotheshorse. His 138 caftans (the Russian kaftan comes from the Ottoman Turkish kaftan, which may have its origin in the Persian haftan) probably have been rarely equalled either in the possession of a single individual or in their variety and luxuriousness. A reading of the inventory makes one convinced that many of them had been purchased (or specially made for him), but never worn, for they had not yet had buttons sewn on them. Buttons sometimes were the major part of the cost of a coat. An extreme example is the set of 4 gold and diamond buttons worth 200 rubles, or 50 rubles per button. His gold and diamond cufflinks cost almost as much apiece. This is the juncture to point out that Golitsyn seems to have been able to resist purchasing very many of the diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and other precious stones that existed in Muscovy. His major “weaknesses,” rather, were for gold and silk.

Golitsyn had over three thousand rubles worth of caftans when his property was assessed in 1689–1690. Other sources reveal the methods by which he acquired garments of such extraordinary value. Thus, he was awarded (basically by himself, of course: he was running the government) a caftan worth 400 rubles in 1686 for his role in negotiating the Eternal Peace with Poland. For some reason it took a year and a half to make the garment (of gold and silk) in the Treasury Chancellery (Kazennyi prikaz) and send it to the Military Chancellery (Razriad), which had ordered it. Whether the coat

---

20 Richard Hellie, *Slavery in Russia, 1450–1725* (Chicago, 1982).
21 “Sluzhiye kabaly proshlykh let,” Rozysknye dela, 4 (1893): 264–76. This total is arrived at by calculating each “with children” (s det’mi) as the listed adults plus 2 for the children.
22 Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov (Moscow, 1828), 4: 524, no. 178 (June 29, 1686); Ivan Zabelin, *Domashnii byt russkikh tsarei v XVI i XVII st.* (Moscow, 1915), 2: 811 (December 30, 1687).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band taffeta, wool</td>
<td>Poviazka</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beads silver</td>
<td>Pronizka Ser</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt satin silk</td>
<td>Podviazka</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt silk</td>
<td>Poias</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belt leather</td>
<td>Remen'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
<td>Grud'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boots Chinese</td>
<td>Sapogi Kitai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button gold</td>
<td>Pugovitsa Zolot</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button g.diam</td>
<td>Pugov.Zol/Almaz</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>221.00</td>
<td>20.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Button other</td>
<td>Pugovitsa</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caftan</td>
<td>Aziam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caftan</td>
<td>Kaftan</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>303.00</td>
<td>23.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caftan</td>
<td>Zipun</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap satin</td>
<td>Koipak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clasp silver</td>
<td>Gapel'ka Ser</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claw crawfish</td>
<td>KleshniaRakov</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloak felt</td>
<td>Burka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat cover</td>
<td>Sporok</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat dinner</td>
<td>Shuba Stolov</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collar silk</td>
<td>Patrakhel'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comb tortise</td>
<td>Greben' Cherep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown diamond</td>
<td>Venets Almaz/Zhem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>700.00</td>
<td>700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown silver</td>
<td>Venets Serebr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cufflink</td>
<td>Zaponau</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>732.75</td>
<td>45.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Chinese</td>
<td>Portishche Kitai</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress long wom</td>
<td>Telogreia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>403.20</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress summer</td>
<td>Letnik</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fan</td>
<td>Opakhalo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footwrap</td>
<td>Shkarpetki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat cloth</td>
<td>Kaptur</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat cloth</td>
<td>Shapka</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat copper</td>
<td>Shapka Medn</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat metal</td>
<td>Shapka Erikhonka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat sleeping</td>
<td>Shapka Spal'naia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat steel</td>
<td>Shapka Er. Stal'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Price 1</td>
<td>Price 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat velvet</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>282.00</td>
<td>56.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat w/gold&amp;silv</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat woman's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat shliapa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat verkh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerchief</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining fox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining sable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mittens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necklace diamond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pants deer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pants silk</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pants wool Germ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearls</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring coat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring diamond</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring gold &amp; sil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring gold &amp; sil</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring pear&amp;diam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sash silk, taf Per</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sash</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequined ornament</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt, man's</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirt &amp; pants</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skirt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skullcap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeve</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>268.15</td>
<td>.53.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>.5.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform coachm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking stick</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was delivered to Golitsyn is unknown, but one would assume that it was. The most expensive caftan in the confiscation inventory was valued at 150 rubles. It was made out of a special kind of orange silk twist called *baiberek* trimmed with sables, and probably most of the coat was made with sables as well; there was silver lace around it and the sleeves were lined with squirrel belly fur. This discussion could go on for some time—easily to a piece of article length—but the point must be clear by now that Golitsyn really loved his coats! Note that he even had 14 coat covers (*sporki*) appraised at 5.14 rubles apiece.

Only one pair of boots (Chinese at that!) is inventoried, plus 14 pairs of shoes. These shoes (*bashmaki*) were probably not the ones Golitsyn wore when inspecting his pigs, for they were made out of goatskin, calfskin, velvet, or wool. Perhaps they might better be termed “house slippers.” At 16 kopeks a pair, Golitsyn’s used shoes were valued at less than the average such object in our data set. Perhaps used shoes were heavily discounted. Regardless, even Golitsyn’s used shoes were valued 35 times more than typical peasant bast shoes (*lapti*), which cost less than half a kopek a pair—and probably were new besides.

The inventory also lists a pair of footwraps, hats for sundry occasions ranging from sleeping to military service (see also Table 17 for more military wear), linings, mittens, shirts and pants, belts and sashes, stockings, sleeves, and even walking sticks. (Presumably Golitsyn rode into exile.)

Women’s clothing was minimal: 24 long dresses (*telogrei*), 7 summer dresses (one specified as having been made in China), a couple of hats, some kerchiefs. It is hard to imagine that Princess Avdot’ia Golitsyna’s wardrobe was so grossly inferior to her husband’s. Perhaps she was permitted to take most of it with her into exile.

Aside from the cufflinks, there was surprisingly little jewelry in the Golitsyn collection. The 60-ruble diamond necklace is interesting, but there is only one of them. One gold and silver ring worth 42 kopeks might be more than a poor peasant would have, but it is hardly a king’s ransom. One wonders what the silver crown was for, and how it got into the Golitsyn possessions—and especially what it meant to anyone, wearer or observer. Maybe it was a piece of woman’s jewelry. Again, there was only one. One concludes that either much is missing, or else the Golitsyns placed almost no value on jewelry. Other wealthy individuals left more in their wills than this, so Golitsyn must have concluded that gold, silver, and gems in the form of jewelry was not for him. Perhaps this had something to do with baroque tastes. I simply do not know.

Golitsyn’s property contained a number of more or less “raw” pelts and hides, i.e., those materials not made into their final product. (See Table 14.)
Table 14. Fur, Leather

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear, polar</td>
<td>Medved' Belyi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>.3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear, polar</td>
<td>Medvedna Bela</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow hide</td>
<td>Kozha</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>140.10</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow hide gilded</td>
<td>Kozha Zolotnaia</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow hide gild Ger</td>
<td>Kozha Pozol Nem</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow hide green</td>
<td>Kozha Zelionnaia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow hide pressed</td>
<td>Kozha Paituinaia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow hide saddle</td>
<td>Kozha Sedel'naia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk</td>
<td>Losina</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox belly</td>
<td>Mekh Lisii Cher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox blue</td>
<td>Mekh Golub Pests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox polar belly</td>
<td>Mekh Pests Cher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox red</td>
<td>Lisa Buraia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox scraps</td>
<td>Loskut Lisii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUR</td>
<td>Mekh Treshchachent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat</td>
<td>Saf'ian</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide rough</td>
<td>Khoz Alyi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard snow</td>
<td>Kozha Barsov</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynx</td>
<td>Mekh Rysei Lap.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable belly</td>
<td>Mekh Cherev Shakh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable belly</td>
<td>Sobol'Pupok Port.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>.7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable lining</td>
<td>Sobol' Podkroika</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.105.00</td>
<td>.13.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sable plate</td>
<td>Tska Sobol'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seal skin</td>
<td>Kozha Nerpovalia</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepskin</td>
<td>Ovchina</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>.23.33</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheepskin gray</td>
<td>Ovchina Seraia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrel</td>
<td>Mekh Bel'ii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan skin</td>
<td>Meshina Lebed'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger pelt</td>
<td>Babr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is somewhat similar to the building materials in Table 6. Presumably craftsmen in the Golitsyn establishment converted these raw materials into finished products. The American “just in time” manufacturing system was not developed until 300 years later, so the late Muscovites had to have all supplies on hand in the eventuality that they might be needed. This probably explains the presence of the single elk hide, lynx fur, sable bellies, swan skin, the two polar bear hides and squirrel pelts, the three cow saddle hides and tiger pelts, and so on. It does not, however, explain the 45 seal skins, the 91 “German” gilded cow hides, the 304 apparently Russian gilded cow hides, the 351 plain cow hides, and the 518 sheepskins. Whether some of those products (particularly the enormous numbers of cow hides and sheepskins) were grouped on the Golitsyn properties as rent from peasants awaiting sale, or whether perhaps Golitsyn had workshops specializing in finished products using these products, is unknown. If one considers the appraisals of these items, one concludes that they were rather on the mark. There are numerous cow hides in the data set, and they range in price from 30 to 50 kopeks apiece, right around the 40 kopeks assigned to Golitsyn’s expropriated property.

Sable was one of the major luxury items in Muscovy. We have already noted its presence in various garments. Sables were one of the government’s major revenue sources. Moreover, the government, which had the right of first refusal to purchase sables, to some extent controlled the price of the fur by dumping its supplies on the market should prices rise too high. The Russians had a practice of sewing furs into a “plate” (tska), and Golitsyn’s holdings reveal a sable plate valued at 400 rubles. (The coincidence between this plate and the award caftan is at least apparent, if not real. It seems possible that the assessors merged the one into the other.) Sable prices moved upward in the period 1600–1725. This may be attributable to the gradual exhaustion of easily harvestable sables in Siberia, which led to the Russian jump across the Pacific to North America.

In addition to supplies of lumber, furs, and hides, Golitsyn had significant supplies of textiles in stock. The presence of the remnants (ostatki) would indicate that Golitsyn had been in possession of a workshop where clothes for his family and slaves were made. Further evidence of this would seem to be the presence of supplies of thread and yarn. As usual, his oecumenical tastes spring out from the data: braid, brocade, silk (both raw and textiles), and taffeta from the Middle East, lace from Persia, satin from China, and woolens from western Europe and England. The sackcloth was probably Russian, as likely were the felts. The origin of the velvets cannot be determined.

---

The basic textile unit of measure was the *arshin* (about 28 inches). Except for the outrageously priced Persian lace (2.53 rubles an *arshin*: more than four times the price of the most expensive laces in the data set, which peak at 60 kopeks per *arshin*), the prices for Golitsyn’s laces seem to correspond with those from elsewhere in Muscovy. One piece of gilded lace was evaluated at 20 kopeks per *arshin*, and some silver lace was evaluated at 19 kopeks per *arshin*, whereas the median price of lace was 4 kopeks per *arshin*. (This figure is heavily influenced by the fact that most of the data come from 1614 and are concentrated in two kinds of lace: tinsel lace, whose median price was 3 kopeks per *arshin* [N = 142], and lace woven with gold, whose median price was 5 kopeks per *arshin* [N = 134]).

Silk was the luxury textile of choice in Muscovy. The data set now has 2,227 silk entries in it. Silk typically was measured by the *arshin*, but it was also sold by weight—the *ansyr’* (= 128 zolotnikov or 1-1/3 funt), *funt* (= 9/10 lb; 1/40 pood), the *pood*, and the *zolotnik*. There were two additional measures, the *kosiak* (a bolt of fabric of unknown dimensions, in the literature ranging from 8 to 36 to 100 *arshins*) and the *zaviazka* (perhaps “skein” would be the best rendition). The median price of an *arshin* of silk was 80 kopeks (N = 977), the same as the median price in Moscow (N = 724). In China, it was 50 kopeks (N = 94). In the data set, 345 cases originate in Persia (v. 115 of the silk cases in China), but silk there was either sold by weight or by some seemingly rather uniform measurements that have yet to be determined. There were numerous kinds of silk (as is evident in Table 15) circulating in Russia. The median price of an *arshin* of each was as follows: *fata*, 15.5 kopeks (N = 1); *doroga*, 27 kopeks (N = 74); *kutnia*, 45 kopeks (N = 8); *katka*, 80 kopeks (N = 546); *baiberek*, 1.18 rubles (N = 22); and *ob’iar*, 1.20 rubles (N = 88). These prices can then be compared with those from the Golitsyn confiscation, listed in Table 15: *fata*, 15.5 kopeks (the same case); *katka*, 52 kopeks; *baiberek*, 50 kopeks; *kutnia*, 53.3 kopeks; and finally, *ob’iar*, 1.15 rubles. We must bear in mind that there were wide variations in the prices of silks by the same name (they were typically described in much greater detail in the sources than simply their name such as *katka*—color, weave, probably width [never specified] all played a role), as shown in Table 15. Be that as it may, the Golitsyn-assessment prices and the prices of silk in the larger data set are in the same ballpark.

The entire data set has 311 cases involving taffeta. Among them are 94 different kinds of taffeta and objects made of taffeta. The median price of taffeta valued in *arshin* units is 70 kopeks per *arshin* (the mean is 66 kopeks; N = 204). Again, these prices correspond rather well with the 311.45 *arshins* of taffeta found in Golitsyn’s possession valued at 52 kopeks per *arshin*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braid silk</td>
<td>Tes'mash (Arshin)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocade</td>
<td>Izorbaf (Arshin)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>1.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocade</td>
<td>Zarbaf (Arshin)</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloth (?)</td>
<td>Polmet (Arshin)</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>8.245</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cord cotton</td>
<td>Verv'Bumazh. (Punt)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cord silk</td>
<td>Shnurok Sholk</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cord worsted</td>
<td>Shnurok Garus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down goose</td>
<td>Pukh Gusin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embroidery</td>
<td>Vymetka</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>Kozha Voilochnaia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>Polst'</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>31.10</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt</td>
<td>Vollok</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt fabric</td>
<td>Plat s Vollekom</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat fabric</td>
<td>Plat Shapochnyi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace gilded</td>
<td>Kruzheva Zo (Arshin)</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace Persian</td>
<td>Kruzheva K (Arshin)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace Persian</td>
<td>Kruzheva Kyzl</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace silver</td>
<td>Kruzheva S (Arshin)</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lace silver</td>
<td>Kruzheva Sereb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linen</td>
<td>Polotno</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remnant</td>
<td>Ostatak (Arshin)</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ribbon</td>
<td>Lenta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackcloth</td>
<td>Kholst</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satin Chinese</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satin various</td>
<td>Atlas (Arshin)</td>
<td>197.21</td>
<td>227.91</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraps various</td>
<td>Loskut</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.44</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraps various</td>
<td>Loskut (Arshin)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Baiberek (Arshin)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Fata (Arshin)</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Ramka (Arshin)</td>
<td>108.81</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Ramka</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Rutnia (Arshin)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Ob'iar (Arshin)</td>
<td>86.03</td>
<td>99.277</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Sholk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silk</td>
<td>Sholk (Ansyr')</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>87.05</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taffeta</td>
<td>Tafta (Arshin)</td>
<td>311.45</td>
<td>162.023</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taffeta various</td>
<td>Tafta (Arshin)</td>
<td>311.45</td>
<td>162.023</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread</td>
<td>Nitki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thread, skein</td>
<td>Motok Nitok</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet</td>
<td>Barkhat (Arshin)</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>.792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet</td>
<td>Barkhat (Arshin)</td>
<td>89.13</td>
<td>123.80</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet</td>
<td>Barkhat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.50</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velvet woolen</td>
<td>Trip (Arshin)</td>
<td>360.7</td>
<td>219.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens</td>
<td>Liatchina (Arshin)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens</td>
<td>Mukhoiar (Arshin)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens</td>
<td>Plat Sukonnyi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens</td>
<td>Polas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens</td>
<td>Sukno (Pieces/Bolts)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.20</td>
<td>.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolens</td>
<td>Sukno (Arshin)</td>
<td>360.7</td>
<td>219.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarn, skein</td>
<td>Motok Priazh</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another major textile among the elite was velvet. Its use in many end products has already been noted. Golitsyn had 89.13 arshins in stock evaluated at 1.39 ruble per arshin. This is very close to the median price of velvet (1.50 rubles per arshin; N = 190) in my entire data set.

Books have been written about woolens, and certainly one could be written about the woolens in this data set. Woolens were one of the major objects of commerce with western Europe. The basic name for wool cloth seems to have been suknost, of which Golitsyn had 18 pieces or bolts and 360.7 arshins (evaluated at a mean of 61 kopeks each). In my data set, all the woolens measured in arshins had a median value of 50 kopeks per arshin (N = 1566; the mean value was 78.2 kopeks per arshin). Of these, 1254 cases were suknost of one description or another whose median price was 52.5 kopeks and mean price 78.3 kopeks per arshin—close to that belonging to Golitsyn. Golitsyn had a form of wool cloth known as mukhoiar (see Table 15), not otherwise present in my big data set. Golitsyn also had 10 arshins of a wool cloth known as liatchina, evaluated at 10 kopeks per arshin. My data set contains a total of 14 cases of liatchina, whose median value was 21.25 kopeks per arshin and mean value 24.67 kopeks per arshin—probably the most inexpensive of the woolens excepting sackcloth and crash (derived from the Russian word krashenina). Russians knew many other forms of woolens as well. The names of some of them were: dzhanzhin, gams, grafin, iarenka, karmazin, kufter, nastrafil', and zuf'. These textiles did not appear in the Golitsyn inventory.

The history of leisure time in late Muscovy has yet to be written. A good place to start might be Table 16, the listing of Golitsyn's toys, games, and musical instruments. In his possession were two toy watchtowers and two toy carriages. He had two chess boards and one chess set. He also had a number of musical instruments. The Russian flutes (surna) were probably military instruments. Whether the “German flute” was a domestic or military musical instrument is unknown. The domra was a three-stringed banjo-type instrument used by folk singers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. How such an instrument came into Golitsyn's possession is unknown—the jesters (skomorokhi) who used them were in bad odor with the Church. A major expression of Golitsyn's Western outlook was the presence of the clavichord in his household (almost certainly underpriced at 3 rubles), as well as the existence of four organs, whose evaluations ranged from 1 (sic) to 30 to 200 (two of them) rubles apiece.

24 G. V. Keldysh, ed., Muzykal'nyi eksiklopedicheskii slovar' (Moscow, 1990), 180.
### Table 16. Toys. Musical Instruments. Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carriage toy</td>
<td>Koliaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chess board</td>
<td>Doska Shakhmat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chess set bone</td>
<td>Shakhmaty Kost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clavicord</td>
<td>Klevikort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domra</td>
<td>Domra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute German</td>
<td>Fleita Nemets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute iron</td>
<td>Surna Zhelez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute wood</td>
<td>Surna Derevian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ</td>
<td>Argan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>431.00</td>
<td>107.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchtower</td>
<td>Kalancha</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 17. Weapons and Military Gear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armor Bakhterets</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor Laty</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor chainmail</td>
<td>Kol'chuga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor chainmail</td>
<td>Pantsyr'</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>225.20</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor hand</td>
<td>Naruchi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>154.20</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor horse</td>
<td>Chaldar</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>320.70</td>
<td>20.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armor plate</td>
<td>Kuiak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arquebus</td>
<td>Polosa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrow various</td>
<td>Strela</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe battle</td>
<td>Berdysh</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe battle</td>
<td>Obokh</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axe battle</td>
<td>Podobushni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade axe</td>
<td>Polosa Bulav</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade sabre</td>
<td>Polosa Sabel</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90.70</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade sword</td>
<td>Polosa Palach</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade unknown</td>
<td>Polosa Gancher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blade unspecif</td>
<td>Polosa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolt arqueb</td>
<td>Zamok Fishchal'</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Chinese</td>
<td>Luk Kitaiskii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow cover</td>
<td>Lub' e Saadak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Crimean</td>
<td>Luk Krymekii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow other/old</td>
<td>Luk Vetkhii</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow string</td>
<td>Tetiva</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bow Turkish</td>
<td>Luk Turetskii</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadword</td>
<td>Palash</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon</td>
<td>Drobovik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon barrel</td>
<td>Drobovik Stvol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannon carriage</td>
<td>Drobovikozha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbine</td>
<td>Karabin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Unit Price</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheval-de-frise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover armor, gun</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagger</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flintlock</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring, cooking</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring, linen</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring, strong</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring, white</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glove chainmail</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunpowder</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunpowder horn</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunpowder measure</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunstock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat infantry</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmet</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holster</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holster worn</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettledrum</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>34.60</td>
<td>16.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longgun hunting</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mace</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musket</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musket</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>65.20</td>
<td>97.80</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musket</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistol</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>94.50</td>
<td>269.40</td>
<td>94.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistol worn</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiver</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapier</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabre worn</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scabbard sabre</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield gold</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shield steel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeve chainmail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sword</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tambour cradle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>149.70</td>
<td>119.76</td>
<td>19.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>285.00</td>
<td>142.50</td>
<td>28.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent poles</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tip of banner</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also Flutes in Table 16.
V. V. Golitsyn, like almost all the other members of the civil (non-Church) elite in late Muscovy, was supposed to be a military man. This was true throughout Russian history, almost categorically until 1762, when Peter III freed the gentry from compulsory military service while allowing them to keep their serfs, and in fact until about 1900, when the landed elite began to be replaced at the helm of Russia by other members of society who had little connection if any with the military (merchants and members of the professions that had begun to develop since 1864). In Golitsyn’s case, we must recall that it was he who “led” the Russian forces on their ill-fated 1687 and 1689 expeditions to the Crimea. Thus, it should hardly surprise us that many of his possessions had a military connection, from weapons and armor to clothing and tents. Many of the horses of Table 1 and the “transportation gear” of Table 2 unquestionably also were intended primarily for military use.

Golitsyn’s military possessions (see Table 17) are a museum of the gunpowder revolution, which had triumphed in Muscovy by 1689. Although the Crimean Tatars still shot bows and arrows, it is doubtful that the Muscovites did very often. If we look at Golitsyn’s bow and arrow supplies, most of them seem to be museum pieces, not battlefield weapons. Thus, there are 3 Chinese bows, a Crimean bow, and 3 Turkish bows. The 9 Russian bows are noted to be “old, decrepit” (vetkhie). If bows were actual field weapons, there should have been considerably more of them, for the retainers Golitsyn took with him on campaign were certainly armed, either to protect his goods in the baggage train or to shoot at the enemy as his slaves went with him to the front. There are 300 arrows, many of them also vetkhie. One quiver hardly would have been adequate for an active archer and his slave retinue. A military variation on the arrow was the lance, and Golitsyn’s arsenal contained nearly a couple dozen of those—probably for his slave retainers guarding the baggage train.

Although the Russians themselves probably fired bows rarely, they still had to defend themselves against the Crimean arrows. For this the steel shield might have been of use. (I should imagine that the golden shield was a ceremonial object, something used to demonstrate its owner’s authority—if it ever went out into the field at all.) More useful against enemy arrows would have been the various forms of armor, especially the body and horse armor. One may assume that Golitsyn possessed 60 sets of chainmail not because he was a kleptomaniac or because he felt that he needed one set of chainmail for every two coats he owned, but because by law he was required to provide them to his slave retainers who accompanied him on campaign.

— Hellie, Enserfment and Military Change in Muscovy.
Golitsyn's cold weapons were for hand-to-hand combat. Most notable are the 99 battle axes. The extraordinarily low price (6 kopeks apiece) of the 91 berdysches is nearly inexplicable, although their number is not hard to fathom: they were issued to slaves whose primary task in a combat zone had come to be, after the 1630s, guarding the baggage train. It so happens that two decades earlier, Velikii Ustiug expended 15.78 rubles for the labor to produce 263 berdysches out of fear that the Razin uprising might spread there. However, those 6 kopeks apiece were for the labor alone, not the cost of the metal, profit, etc. Berdysches first appear in the data set in 1660. They typically cost from 10 to 21 kopeks apiece. Perhaps those were for nice shiny new ones, guaranteed to slice off a head with one swipe, whereas Golitsyn's supply were tarnished and had nicks in them from overuse. Golitsyn had two "big berdysches" appraised at 30 and 40 kopeks apiece, which must have been monster butcher instruments. His two cheval-de-frises (rogatinas) were similar two-hands-on swinging axes.

Golitsyn's armory also contained a number of other striking instruments, swords, sabres, daggers, a rapier, as well as sundry blades for such instruments. He also had a number of lances, most of which presumably would have been used to arm his slave retainers. He also owned bludgeons (maces) whose principal function was to cave in an enemy's head in hand-to-hand combat. At least three of the maces were ceremonial: a golden one was appraised at 200 rubles; a silver and gold one at 50 rubles; and a silver one at 12 rubles. It is doubtful that those were made to cave in the heads of Tatars, Poles, or Swedes. His other maces may have been intended for such gory duty—they were made of copper, ivory, or walrus tusk.

All the tools of war discussed so far were descendants of those used by the mediaeval ancestors of the Muscovites centuries earlier: percussion or cutting instruments to fight hand to hand, bows and arrows to fight at a distance. The intervening centuries witnessed the gunpowder revolution, which by 1689 was fundamentally completed in Muscovy. Golitsyn's confiscated arsenal included every up-to-date weapon an individual might own—it must be noted that "government issue" did not exist; every combatant had to provide his own. Golitsyn had 1 gunpowder horn, 8 gunpowder measures, and 18 pounds of gunpowder. Gunpowder ordinarily was sold by weight, 5 to 22 kopeks a funt and 0.20 to 2.90 rubles a pood. The evaluation of 80 kopeks a pood is at the low end of these typical prices. (One can only wonder whether modern warfare would be so bloody if soldiers had to pay for the gunpowder they used.)

Gunpowder means guns, and Golitsyn had them aplenty. Because of terminological confusions, it is sometimes difficult to determine precisely

\[26\] Krest'ianskaia voina ... Razina 4:131, no. 129.
what was what. He had 11 arquebuses—pishchali—the proper translation in the sixteenth century; in the seventeenth century, these became “flintlocks” and “muskets.” But those who inventoried Golitsyn’s possessions used other terms that also mean “flintlock” and “musket”: 12 flintlocks (pishchali zavesnye), evaluated at 1.67 apiece, and 15 fuzei and 4 mushkety, evaluated at 4.35 apiece for the former and 80 kopeks apiece for the latter. In addition, he had 25 carbines (karabiny), probably issued to his slave retainers for use on horseback, valued at 39 kopeks apiece.

In addition, he had 18 hunting long guns (pishchal’nye vintovki), which may have been rifled, evaluated at 3.11 apiece. Finally, he owned 28 apparently functioning pistols, evaluated at 3.38 each, and 16 worn out pistols listed at 5 kopeks apiece. Unless he was personally “gun-crazy,” one might assume that his slave retainers wore sidearms in addition to carrying long guns. All of these are on the low side of contemporary market prices.

Gunnery have to have something to shoot at, and so Golitsyn had 48 targets for practice.

All of this military hardware any Muscovite might have had, although of course some of the more expensive guns were manufactured (or imported) for the elite. But Golitsyn had more: his own cannon. One was ready to go, then there were two barrels and one carriage for a gun barrel. To the best of my knowledge, this was atypical. Others did not own cannons.

Golitsyn and his retinue had to be housed while on campaign, and for this he owned 35 tents, which must have ranged in size from something not much bigger than pup-tents (izbushki and palaty) evaluated in the range of 4 to 4.50 rubles apiece to probably the biggest tents in Muscovy—one Turkish shatër was appraised at 250 rubles, one his most highly valued possessions. The Golitsyn tent menage must have been quite a sight: his tents came not only from Turkey but also from Persia and the Kalmyks. Some were red (one was made of red velvet), others were blue, one was made of white silk, another (valued at 100 rubles) was waxed. Some were made of goatskin, others of linen. With those tents, the steppe and the Near East came to Moscow.

The tents had special poles, of which 26 are noted in the confiscation inventory. Many of the tents had special floors. Golitsyn owned 5 “cooking floors” and 16 others, some made of linen, others of calico, and a third group described only as “strong.”

Lastly, mention must be made of Golitsyn’s military musical instruments. His flutes have been noted above. In addition, he had 16 kettledrums, appraised at 3.74 rubles apiece. The flutes and kettledrums, however, probably were more effective on the western front against the Poles and

---

27 On the use of these “musical instruments” in warfare, see W. H. McNeill, Keeping Together in Time: Dance and Drill in Human History (Cambridge, 1995).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Name</th>
<th>Russian Name</th>
<th>How Many</th>
<th>Total Sum</th>
<th>Price @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor iron.</td>
<td>Iakor' Zhelez</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>Angel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird cage</td>
<td>Kletka Ptich</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Kniga</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>59.93</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chain minted.</td>
<td>Tsep' Grem (Funt)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coat-of-arms.</td>
<td>Gerb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowberries.</td>
<td>Tsvety Brusnichnye</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crutch</td>
<td>Kluchka</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engraving</td>
<td>Evangeli (Zolotnik)</td>
<td>181.5</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handle lash.</td>
<td>Pletnik</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn buffalo.</td>
<td>Rog Buiv</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn deer.</td>
<td>Rog Olenii</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnif. glass.</td>
<td>Trubka Bol Stek</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of World.</td>
<td>Chertiozh Zemel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of Europe.</td>
<td>Chertiozh Evrop</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Siber.</td>
<td>Lekarstvo Sibi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murals in house Rospis' Sten.</td>
<td></td>
<td>193.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pen</td>
<td>Pero</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print.matterGer</td>
<td>List Nemetsk</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.99</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Bezmen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Kontar'</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Terezi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Veski</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap</td>
<td>Mylo (Funt)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soap German.</td>
<td>Mylo Nemetskoe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telescope Germ.</td>
<td>Trubka Zr. Nem.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermometer</td>
<td>Termometr</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torch German.</td>
<td>Luchina Nemets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusk walrus.</td>
<td>Zuba Ryb'ia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tusk walrus.</td>
<td>Zuba Ryb (Pood)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax first flow.</td>
<td>Stok Voshii</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wax red sealing</td>
<td>Surguch (Mesto)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wig</td>
<td>Volosy Nakladnye</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Swedes than they were against the Crimean Tatars. This once again illustrates the Muscovite military dilemma: the need to be prepared on two very different fronts, the southern front against the Crimean light cavalrymen armed with bows and arrows, and the western front against the Poles and Swedes, increasingly infantry equipped with firearms.

Table 18 is a catch-all of various things, many of them representing Western influence. Thus Golitsyn had two varieties of soap, apparently Russian soap appraised at 12.5 kopeks per funt and “German” soap for 3 kopeks a bar. He also had a “German” torch (some kind of lighting instrument). Then there was a “German” telescope, 3 Western mercury thermometers, and a magnifying glass. The set of Western proto-scientific instruments were all essentially baroque curiosities in Muscovy valued as much for their enormous expense and “exotic” foreign origin as for what they could actually see or measure.

The 8 bird cages almost certainly were part of the baroque interest in things unusual that helped create the modern scientific spirit. They represent part of the same mentality as the telescope, magnifying glass, and thermometer: trying to press the boundary of what primitive man unaided in a state of nature could learn by himself. This led to the creation of zoos and menageries; apparently some contemporary Romanov households also had this spirit and were full of caged birds, freaks, and other oddities of nature.

The Western printed matter of various kinds perhaps more than anything else portrays Golitsyn’s mindset. He had what was probably a map of the earth (chertiozh zemel) as well as 5 maps of Europe. It is indeed dubious that there were many other such maps in all of Muscovy, especially considering their cost of at least half a ruble apiece. There was a Western engraving of the Gospels and something otherwise unknown called “‘German’ printed matter” (nemetskii list—the appraisers themselves probably did not know what it was precisely), which they estimated was worth the large sum of 20.99 rubles.

The 92 books inventoried among Golitsyn’s things are perhaps his most interesting possessions. He was a man who could read German and Greek, and spoke Latin freely, one of the most educated and probably most cultured men of his era. One may assume that consumer sovereignty reigned in his acquisition of books, that very few of them were gifts from others or forced on him by the Church or government (which, recall, he ran from his position as head of the Foreign Affairs Chancellery between 1682 and his fall in 1689). According to the works by Luppov and others on seventeenth-century book-collecting, few personal libraries were larger than Golitsyn’s, and few institutional (primarily monastic) collections were much bigger, either.

---

Certainly there were few larger collections of primarily secular works, or of those imported from the West. Thanks to the pre-Revolutionary work of Adrianova-Peretts, we have a ready source of book prices.\footnote{V. Adrianova, “Materialy dlia istorii tsen na knigi v drevnei Rusi XVI–XVIII vv.,” Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva 178 (1912): 9–105.}

In the data set of which the Golitsyn material is a part, the median price of a book in this period was a ruble (N = 634). Perhaps not surprisingly, the prices of books follows the general level of prices in the period. Several other facts should be reported: the median price of books bought and sold was also one ruble (N = 270), whereas the median evaluation of the 90 books confiscated from Golitsyn was only 30 kopeks. This would indicate that his books were probably undervalued, although of course it is possible that used books in Muscovy had only one-third the value of new ones.

As nearly as I can calculate, Golitsyn’s personal library was more secular than religious—quite a feat in a place that has the reputation that did pre-Petrine Muscovy. Of the books confiscated from him, 48 dealt with religious subjects: a Bible, a Psalter, service books, saints’ lives, Gospels, something on the Antichrist, a book on schismatics, and so forth. Fifty-four of the books seem to have been on secular themes. Two were translated from Polish, another was in Polish, and there was a history of Polish and a grammar of Polish and Latin. Seven books were in German: one portraying “all the fish and animals in the world,” another on land surveying, a calendar. The non-Church books in Middle Russian included the Law Code (Sudebnik) of 1550 (surprisingly, the Law Code [Sobornoe ulozhenie] of 1649 was not there), 4 books on comedy and one on poetry, a book on doctoring horses, several books on rulership, one on ambassadors, and two on military affairs. It would be interesting to compare this collection with those in the possession of the rulers of the other European states in the 1680s. The premium that Golitsyn placed on literacy was marked not only by the books but also by the 36 pens that had been in his possession. We must bear in mind that relatively few people outside the court were literate in the sixteenth century, and that Muscovy had begun to move from a society that placed a premium on oral tradition to written records only about the middle of the sixteenth century. The promulgation of the Sudebnik of 1550 was probably a significant landmark in that respect, as was the introduction of numerous governmental chancelleries (prikazy) with increasing specialization about the same time. The first book was printed in Muscovy in 1564. The next stage of literacy was probably instigated by the publication of the Ulozhenie of 1649 in two editions of 1200 apiece, which became widely known and used throughout Muscovy with its demand for literacy in many areas of life. This led to the publication of 300,000 ABC primers in the next half century as some
Muscovites tried to respond to the demand for literacy. The presence of the pens indicates that writing was probably a major activity of the Golitsyn household, for they were not sufficiently valuable or distinctive to serve as objects of consumption and ostentation, as were many of Golitsyn's commodities. The wax may have been used to authenticate Golitsyn's written documents, either his own private affairs or government work he carried home.

More down-to-earth were Golitsyn's 13 scales, whose very existence implies that considerable buying and/or selling was done on the premises. The walrus tusk and "buffalo" and deer horns were almost certainly raw materials for objects manufactured on the Golitsyn premises, or by off-premises craftsmen who would not have such valuable commodities in stock (much like the textiles discussed above). The cowberries were apparently some kind of ornamentation to be sewn on a garment. The coat-of-arms may have been carried into battle, or more likely used as an ornament in the house.

Concern for health is evident in the "Siberian medicine" as well as the crutch.

The two wigs may represent a balding Golitsyn, or more likely another importation from western Europe, another manifestation of his desire for modernity.

What have we learned from this brief journey through Golitsyn's possessions and their comparison with some of the most common commodities of late Muscovy? First, we have learned that Golitsyn was a very wealthy man, the likes of which were rare (if non-existent) prior to his time, were very rare during his time, and became more common in the eighteenth century thanks to a combination of increasing exploitation of the enserfed peasantry and perhaps increasing productivity in a few spheres (transportation may have been one). It should be of at least marginal interest that a similar differentiation and creation of great wealth began in western Europe at approximately the same time we see this happening with Golitsyn in Muscovy. As Arcadius Kahan observed some years ago about the later eighteenth century, this was a major aspect of Westernization, as the elite came to believe that possession of Western commodities was a major mark of modernity, which, incidentally, increasingly differentiated them from their "traditional," enserfed subjects who furthermore adhered to the Old Belief.30

This differentiation was paid for, of course, by the working population of Muscovy (most of them serfs) who were susceptible to greater exploitation both by their individual lords and by the tax-collecting state after the codification of legal stratification by the Ulozhenie of 1649. V. V. Golitsyn

---

possessed a world of commodities that M. I. Tatischev hardly could have dreamed of eight decades earlier. Many of Golitsyn's imported possessions, costing buckets of money, simply were unavailable during the Time of Troubles. Whether the rise of expenditures on imported luxuries was complemented by any lower costs resulting from increased efficiencies in Muscovy remains to be determined, but the declining level of many domestic prices hints that this may have been occurring. Probably few late-twentieth-century Americans would want to exchange their material culture for Golitsyn's, but from his we can learn what there was in the world of material goods in Russia in 1689.31

Finally, the confiscation and inventorying of Golitsyn's possessions was a major event in Russian price history because it produced over three thousand prices for individual items. This occurred during the fall of prices in the 1690s. As we have repeatedly observed, the appraisers seem to have been very aware of what they were doing, extraordinarily aware of the current state of prices. Sometimes they low-balled the market, perhaps because the items were used, perhaps because they did not understand what they were. In general, however, they were "in the ball park," which makes their estimations the useful addition to price history they are.

The University of Chicago

31 Golitsyn may be the eastern outpost of the "consumer revolution," which Prof. Jan de Vries of the University of California at Berkeley postulates commenced about 1650 in western Europe and served as a major stimulus for the ensuing "industrial revolution."
Proper names, Lévi-Strauss maintained, "form the fringe of a general system of classification: they are both its extension and its limit...the quanta of signification below which one no longer does anything but point." However, the totemic classificatory systems to which Lévi-Strauss looked developed out of relatively "untamed" impulses, primary efforts at classifying and organizing social experience. Like most peoples whom Lévi-Strauss examined, the Sauk of North America drew their names from clan animals, "either because they mention the name of the animal itself, or because they suggest one of its habits, attributes, or characteristic qualities..., or because they refer to some animal or object with which it is associated." Lévi-Strauss likened this process to biological classification, dividing "...species into parts of the body and attitudes, and... social segments into individuals and roles."

Because others bestow names on us, naming is a deeply social activity, and the study of naming can reveal much about the society and culture of the named. Although some names, like Ichabod's, may derive from individuation, more often names function as signs of social states or processes. Given names honor the dead or the living, identify the bearer with kin or class, or join

---

*I was the beneficiary of helpful comments from many colleagues at presentations of earlier versions of this paper. I owe special thanks to Lindsey Hughes, Ann Kleimola, Kira Stevens, David Ransel, and the anonymous referee of this journal.

2 Ibid., 219, 173–75.
individuals across several generations; naming patterns may show differences across gender and race, and may reflect class distinctions. Name preferences can remain static over prolonged periods, or alter abruptly in the context of broader social upheaval. If, for example, in Revolutionary France new names rapidly displaced the old, then for centuries prior to 1789 the dynamic of name selection was remarkably stable, depending for the most part on names deriving from another, pre-rationalist ideology. Similarly, when Puritan emigrants arrived in colonial Massachusetts, they promptly introduced a new universe of Biblical given names, thereby inventing a tradition which came to dominate name choices in the colony.

The history of Russian names suggests a similar story. When the Russian Revolution of 1917 ushered in dramatic social and political changes, the reservoir of Russian names likewise expanded and changed. Freed from previous naming conventions, parents in a revolutionary era borrowed names from the mechanical world around them (Elektra, Elevator, Industriia), celebrated the Revolution (Oktiabrina, Rev and Reva [from revoliutsiia]) and the new order it initiated (Serp, Molot, Agitprop, Ateist, Borets), and also devised entirely new names from the institutions of the communist world (Kim [komunisticheskii internatsional molodezhi], Karm [Krasnaia armiia], Revditi [revolutionnoe ditia]). In pre-revolutionary Russia personal names reflected another ideology, the dominant values of Christian Orthodoxy, associating newborns with saints of the Church calendar.

What names did Muscovite children bear? Christian baptism required that the christened child take a name from the list of saints, reflecting a Christian metaphysic that linked temporal and celestial citizens. Despite the Christianization of Rus' in the tenth century, however, the Christian naming
system did not win a prompt and complete victory over traditional naming practices. For some time, newborns in Rus' bore names which did not depend upon Christian inspiration but stemmed from other traditions. For example, surveys of Novgorod birch bark charters for the period stretching from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries show that about a third of all persons identified in these texts bore non-Christian names, borrowed mainly from early Slavic usage (Borislav, Dobromir, Gostiata, and the like). Study of names in Northeast Rus' in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries found that Christian names accounted for about three-quarters of all names mentioned in surviving documents. In more remote places where Christianity had yet to put down deep roots, rival systems were especially in evidence. Twice early in the sixteenth century the Novgorod archbishop wrote to parishioners in far-off Votsk, condemning native customs there, one of which involved having local shamans name a child before the priest was summoned.9

Non-Christian names remained usual even in central Muscovy centuries after the official introduction of Christian ritual. For example, the late sixteenth-century sinodicon which commemorated victims of Ivan IV reveals that churchmen of that time, whom one might expect to have been sensitive on this point, nevertheless employed Christian and non-Christian names alike to recall the slain in prayer. Customs books, tax lists, and many other sources prove that the so-called “non-calendric” names remained very usual in Muscovy.10 Personal characteristics, geographic location, birth order, and likenesses to animals and objects found frequent expression in common names.


A. N. Miroslavskaia, “O drevnerusskikh imenakh, prozvishchakh, i prozvaniiakh,” in Perspektivy razvitiia slavianskoi onomastiki (Moscow, 1980), 203. For other examples confirming Miroslavskaia’s view, see Hagar Sundberg, The Novgorod Kabala Book of 1614–1616: Text and Commentary (Stockholm, 1982), 193–94. For a handy concordance to these names, see N. M. Tupikov, Slovari drevnerusskikh lichnykh sobstvennykh imen (St. Petersburg,
A data set which includes more than 8,000 names drawn from 391 Muscovite testaments and more than 300 marriage agreements confirms these reports.\footnote{Cherneva provides a supplementary listing of names which do not appear in Tupikov ("Lichnye imena," 31–32).} Names reflecting birth order are especially frequent, and in a surprising way: there are only a handful (6) of names associated with “first” (Pervyi, Pervoi, Pervushka, Odinets); “second” (Vtoroi) appears only a few times (3) as well, but “third” (Tret'ïak) shows up 34 times, and “fifth” (Piatoi) another 15 times. Other names appear in much lower frequencies, but in extraordinary variety. One meets, of course, individuals named after their ethnic origin (Chiudin [Finn], Litvin [Lithuanian]), but personal characteristics seem the more fruitful source of inspiration. In addition to the obvious qualifiers of size (Big [Boi'shoy] and Little [Malyi, Men'shoy, Men'shak]), one also meets other vivid depictions: Meat-eater (Miasoed); Proud (Gordei); Dark (Chernivo); Unlucky (Bezchasnyi); Slow or Late (Dolgoi); Melon (Dynia); Messy (Neustroi); Dry (Sukhoi); Lame (Khromets); Stay-at-Home (Domashnei); and Angry (Serdit). Other characterization liken individuals to things: Bulat (Sword); Tulup (Sheepskin Coat); Almaz (Diamond); and Voronets (Crow). Still others hint at personal misery: Sleepless (Bezson); Ugly (Nekras); No Good (Nekhoroshka, Plokhoets); and Unloved (Neliubov'). Although all such names account for only a fraction of the whole group of more than 8,000 individuals recorded in the data set, their persistent appearance in testaments and dowries confirms the prolonged use of names which did not come from the Christian naming system.

Several attempts to explain this circumstance have appeared. It may be, as Uspenskii and others have argued, that children born in Muscovy received a secular name at birth, and only later—perhaps at baptism or when celebrating a child's first birthday—a Christian name. Alternatively, parents might change a child's name in connection with magic rituals. For example, in imperial Russia, parents of an ill infant, despairing of any help and convinced that powerful spirits had conspired to do the child harm, would usher their baby out of the house, announcing loudly their intention of exchanging the child for another. Some time later, they would return home with their same child, but having given the newborn a new name indicating happenstance acquisition, in this way perhaps fooling the spirits who threatened the infant's health. This would explain names like Nenash (Not Ours), Naiden (Found), Kraden

---

There is not space here to detail the locations of all these texts which originate from a wide variety of published and archival sources. However, in the monograph on Family Life in Early Modern Russia on which I am now working I expect to publish the complete list.
(Stolen) and Prodan (Sold). But, as Uspenskii points out, some second names also came from the Church calendar, although how this happened is not clear. The well-known seventeenth-century icon-painter Ushakov, for example, bore the baptismal name Pimen, together with a second Christian name, as a 1673 inscription shows: “painted by the icon painter Pimin, son of Fedor, called Simon Ushakov.” Samuel Collins reported a similar case, noting that the secretary of the Foreign Affairs Chancellery was “...called Boris Iuanoidg, but his right name is Eliah Iuanoidg.” Collins also claimed that mothers gave their children “Love-names,” like “Almaus, my Diamond” over and above their baptismal, Christian names.

Another explanation for the persistence of non-calendric names in Muscovy is that all non-Christian names were simply nicknames, and not proper names at all, just as today, a person in Muscovy might normally have employed an informal name, gained perhaps in childhood as a reflection of some personal characteristic, but all the same also bear a Christian name. Others disagree, however, observing that even in Muscovite legal texts individuals who had every reason to guarantee that their legal name was used nevertheless appear in the record bearing non-Christian names. For example, the *Tysiachnaia kniga* of 1550, which allotted Moscow lands to select servitors, knows one “Shestak [Sixth] Fedorov syn Vasil’chikov,” “Ivan da Posnik [Faster] Semenovy deti Solovtseva,” and similar formulations. These examples indicate that non-Christian names continued in use, and not simply as nicknames, but as fully acceptable legal identifiers.

Muscovite anthroponyms seem to have been of two kinds, each functioning differently. The first were associated exclusively with birth, especially birth order (Pervoi [First], Vtoroi [Second], Pozdei [Late], etc.), physical appearance or character (Beliai [Pale], Khudiak [Unwell], Bezson [Sleepless]), or parents’ attitude toward the child’s birth (Nezhdan [Unexpected]). Almost certainly these names stuck to their bearers from birth. A second group probably originated later in life, taking their inspiration from an individual’s occupation (Banshchik [Bathhouse attendant]), ethnic or

---

geographic origin (Belozer [someone from the White Lake region], Kazanets [resident of Kazan]), resemblance to an animal (Volk [Wolf], Voronets [Crow]), or some other defining external trait, whether physical (Sedoi [Grey], Krivoi [Crooked or One-eyed], Gorbun [Hunchback]) or behavioral (Balagur [Joker or Clown]). Both groups of names appear regularly in Muscovite documents, but names from the first group often stand alone, without any Christian name, while those from the second group often take a subsidiary place, and not infrequently texts identify them specifically as nicknames. The bi-modal character of name-giving indicates that unofficial, folk naming practices remained dynamic in Muscovy, thriving alongside Christian naming fully into the seventeenth century, by the end of which time non-calendric forenames begin to disappear, especially in towns.¹⁶

Kobrin found in the 1551–1552 Court Register (Dvorovaia tetrad') that although more than 14% of all individuals listed there bore a non-calendric name, Men'shik, the most frequently employed non-Christian name, appeared only 29 times, accounting for less than 1% of all the 3,500 or so names. By contrast, Ivan, the most usual calendar name, registered in the list 580 times (16.6%); 19 other Christian names were more usual than Men'shik. Consequently, even though the non-calendric names as a group continued to be important in Muscovy, Christian names were more usual and much more concentrated.¹⁷

Muscovite slavery contracts make the same point. Studying more than 7,500 names drawn from slavery contracts, mainly from early in the seventeenth century, Richard Hellie found that for the most part both chattel and master shared the same Christian names. In both groups, for example, Ivan was by far the most usual male name; Vasilii, Fedor and other Christian names were also common among both master and slave. Female slaveowners, too, shared names with their human property; both were likely to be called Anna, Mariia, or Avdotiiia.¹⁸

Unlike the Court Register of the mid-sixteenth century, the service rosters (razriadnye knigi) of the early seventeenth century know almost no names which did not belong to the Orthodox calendar. Ivan proved especially popular: about one man in nine answered to that name. Vasilii was second-most usual, borne by about 5% of those identified in the roster; Grigorii


¹⁷ Kobrin, “Genealogia,” 82, 87–89.

(3.5%), Fedor (3%), and Semen (3%) followed. These five names together account for more than a quarter of all servitors mentioned for the years 1612–1622, indicative of the concentration of these names and the dominance of the Christian naming system as a whole.\(^\text{19}\)

Similar frequencies have been reported for other populations. According to evidence from the southern frontier towns in the second half of the seventeenth century, less than 10% of all provincial servitors did not have a Christian name, even though considerable numbers of Tatars were resident here. Among males the same names predominated: Ivan (12%); Fedor (5.2%); Vasilii (4.2%); Grigorii (3.7%); Semen and Stepan (each 2.7%). The population inventory (\textit{perepisnaj kniga}) of Toropets in 1678 produced similar results: Ivan accounted for 14.2% of all men, Fedor for 5.3%, Vasilii for 5.0%, Semen and Mikhail for 3.7% each, and Grigorii for 3.6%; few non-calendric names appear in the list.\(^\text{20}\) These records indicate that by the end of the seventeenth century, \textit{more and more often} Muscovite children bore exclusively Christian names.

Certainly censuses of central Russian towns early in the eighteenth century (see Table 1) contain very few names not met in the Church’s list of saints. In the 1720 Tula census, for example, one meets a Sredneva, but such a name is quite exceptional; very nearly every one of the more than 38,000 names recorded in twelve censuses was a Christian name, indicating perhaps that at long last the Christian naming system had by this time conquered its rivals. The same concentration of names remarked on above also prevailed here. No name was so usual as Ivan (see Table 1): 7.8% of the population bore that name, meaning that approximately one of every six men identified in the censuses was an Ivan. Furthermore, Ivan was popular everywhere: in every

---

\(^{19}\) L. M. Shchetinin, \textit{Imena i nazvaniia} (Rostov, 1968), 171–209. The same names seem to have predominated even earlier; see Wójtowicz, \textit{Drevnerusskaia antroponimia}, 22, who suggests that (male) naming patterns seem to have stabilized by the sixteenth century.

\(^{20}\) Carol Stevens, “The Naming of Warriors: Name and Name Usage on Muscovy’s Southern Frontier, 1650–1700,” unpublished paper, 17; \textit{Toropets: Materialy dlia istorii goroda XVII i XVIII stoletii} (Moscow, 1883), 9–16. Calculations of the Toropets name frequencies are mine.


\(^{22}\) Of course, it may also be the case that the census takers insisted on receiving a Christian name, although firm evidence on this point is lacking. A 1701 decree in fact did demand “complete” (presumably Christian) names in official documents; as many texts show, however, practice diverged widely from this ideal (Bondalevov, \textit{Russkaia onomastika}, 113). For purposes of reporting name frequencies in the present article, variants and diminutives are listed under a single, formal name. Hence Irina for all occurrences of Irina, Arina, Orina, and Petr for all occurrences of Petr, Petrushka, etc.
Table 1

TOTAL NAME FREQUENCIES, EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY:
Ten Central Russian Towns (12 Censuses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Absolute Number</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>2978</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilii</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedor</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petr</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhail</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksei</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semen</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigorii</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrei</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepan</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakov</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afonasiia</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Absolute Number</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avdotiia/Evdokiia</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>1553</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praskoviia</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irina</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrena</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marfa</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dariia</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelageia</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksintia</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akulina</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Author's data set.
one of the twelve censuses carried out in the ten towns, Ivan was the most popular name (see Table 2).

Among women’s names, the predominance was less pronounced. If one combines Avdotiia with its Orthodox equivalent, Evdokiia, then these names demonstrated considerable popularity in all the census towns.23 Like Ivan, Avdotiia was the most usual woman’s name in every one of the twelve inventories, and overall about 10% of the population answered to these names. However, the difference in frequency between Avdotiia and other women’s names was less dramatic. Anna, which almost everywhere was the second most popular woman’s name, identified almost 8% (about one in thirteen) of all women in the twelve censuses.

Among men, name frequency drops precipitously after Ivan; Vasilii was clearly next, accounting for 5.9% of all men’s names (one out of every seventeen men), followed by Fedor and Petr (4.8% and 4.3% respectively). Other names follow in a long list. The same preferences emerge when names are considered by rank order: Vasilii was clearly the second most popular name, followed by Fedor and Petr. Altogether sixteen different male names occupied at least one space among the top ten names in the twelve census lists examined here.

The concentration of names is understandably tighter among females, reflecting a narrower circle of names from which to choose. Praskoviia was about as usual as Vasilii, accounting for 5.7% of all female names; Mariia followed close behind (5.6%), after which came Irina, Matrena, and Marfa. However, nineteen different female names occupied one of the top ten places in one or another of the ten towns surveyed. Avdotiia and Anna led the way; Praskoviia, third in total frequency, was also third in rank order, followed by Mariia, Irina, Matrena, Marfa, and Dariia, the same sequence observed by total frequencies. Consequently, although some regional favorites emerge, it appears that the name frequencies represent rather well the general name preferences in these central Russian towns early in the eighteenth century.

23 On the conflation of Avdotiia and Evdokiia, see A. V. Suslova, A. V. Superanskaia, O russkikh imenakh (Leningrad, 1991), 109; B. I. Uspenskii, Iz istorii russkikh kanonicheskikh imen (Moscow, 1969), 52–53. There is some reason, nevertheless, for tracing their frequencies separately. In half the twelve censuses used here Evdokiia barely makes an appearance. In Riazan’, for example, one counts 93 instances of Avdotiia but none of Evdokiia; in Uglich 237 cases of Avdotiia and but two of Evdokiia. In the other six inventories, however, Evdokiia and Avdotiia both appear with considerable frequency. In Belev, for example, the 1718 census found 139 Avdotiias and 112 Evdokiias.

24 V. A. Nikonov observes a geographical distinction in the relative popularity of these two women’s names. Evidently in part because of a seventeenth-century canonization of the Tver’ princess Anna, the name Anna came to dominate Avdotiia in northern areas; elsewhere, Avdotiia prevailed (Imia i obshchestvo [Moscow, 1974], 49–50).
Table 2

NAME PREFERENCES BY RANK ORDER*
Early Eighteenth-Century Russian Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilii</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedor</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petr</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhail</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksei</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semen</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigorii</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepan</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrei</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakov</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afonasii</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitrii</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efim</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filip</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timofei</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To combat the imbalance which the unequal size of the different populations reflected, I determined the rank order of names for each of the twelve censuses for which I had information, assigning points for the first ten places for each sex in each town: the most popular name in a given town earned ten points, the second most popular name nine points, and so on. As a result, the maximum score for any one name was 120 points (first place in all twelve censuses), but a name which appeared only once among the top ten places might receive as few as one point (one tenth-place finish).
Table 3
FREQUENCY OF SAINTS’ DAYS
RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CALENDAR
(In Order of Total Frequency in Reported Populations)

**MALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number Diff. Days</th>
<th>% Days in Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivan (Ioann)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilii</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petr</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhail</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksei</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grigorii</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrei</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakov</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afonasii</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEMALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number Diff. Days</th>
<th>% Days in Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avdotiia (Evdokiia)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praskoviia (Paraskeva)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrena</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dariia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelageia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksiniia (Ksenia)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akulina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** S. V. Bulgakov, *Nastol’naia kniga dlia sviaschennykh-tserkovno-sluzhitelei*, 2d ed. (Kharkiv, 1900), 652–68.
In these circumstances, it is hardly surprising that Ivan should appear so often in these lists. No other Christian name was recalled more frequently in the lists of commemoration which governed Orthodox liturgy (see Table 3). The Church calendar remembered Ivan (or Ioann) on more than 60 days of the year; to put it another way, the Orthodox liturgy celebrated some Ivan about every sixth day of the Church year, far more often than any other name, male or female. Furthermore, this frequency corresponds almost exactly to the observed frequency of the name in the towns of early eighteenth-century Russia, corroborating the suggestion advanced above that the Christian naming system had taken firm root by the turn of the century.

On the other hand, most of the other name frequencies accord less well with the Church calendar. For example, Vasilii was remembered in the liturgy 16 times a year, just 4.4% of all days in the year, but townsmen in eighteenth-century Russia bore the name Vasilii more often (5.9%) than the Church calendar predicts. To be sure, the differential is not great, but it is striking that the Church calendar recalls both Fedor and Petr, the third- and fourth-most-frequent names in the census towns (4.8% and 4.3% respectively), far more often than Vasilii: Church calendars celebrated Fedor and Petr each 29 times during the year (7.9% of days in the year), but Vasilii, recalled less often in Church calendars, was nonetheless the more usual name in practice. Even more remarkable is the fact that Aleksei, whom clerics remembered on just six days in the year, proved a much more usual name than Semen, Grigorii, Andrei, Stepan, Iakov and Afonasii, all of which figured in the Church calendar two or three times as often as Aleksei.

A similar picture emerges from considering women’s names. Anna was one of the most celebrated of women in the annual Church calendar. Although recalled much less often than many of the men, Anna nevertheless appeared on the Church schedule much more often than did most women’s names; only Mariia was honored more often, but from ancient times the Orthodox Church preserved “the honorable custom not to give to those newly christened the names of the Lord Jesus Christ or His Most Holy Mother....” Therefore, it

25 Although it is usual to count Ivan the equivalent of the calendric Ioann, Uspenskii points out that the relationship is more complicated (Iz istorii russkikh kanonicheskikh imen [Moscow, 1969], 16–19).

26 It is possible that the frequency of the name Aleksei is connected with the popularity of the seventeenth-century sovereign, Aleksei Mikhailovich, but the names of other sovereigns of the era, Fedor and Petr, did not share in that popularity.

27 Bulgakov, Nastol’naja kniga, 875. Although one sometimes meets in the record persons named Mariia, that name evidently honored women other than the Virgin. Uspenskii points out that prior to the mid-seventeenth century Mariia served only to denote the Virgin, whereas Máriia (later modified in colloquial speech to Mária) honored other saints, such as Mary Magdalene; the situation in the southwest was different (Iz istorii, 39–47).
Table 4

NAME FREQUENCIES IN
KUBENSK RURAL DISTRICT, VOLOGDA PROVINCE, 1717

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>% Total</th>
<th>% Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedor</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilii</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukian</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mikhail</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrei</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petr</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitrii</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semen</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepan</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksei</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iakov</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Total</td>
<td>% Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariia</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avdotiia</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uliiana</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irina</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marfa</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praskovia</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aksiniia</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daria</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedora</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efrosiniia</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedosiia</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelageia</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feklia</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efimiia</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akulina</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is not surprising that Anna should have been so usual a name in the eighteenth-century Russian cities. Avdotiia, however, represents a very different case. Recalled on only four days in the Church list of festivals, Avdotiia nevertheless emerged as the single most popular woman’s name in these ten Russian towns, outdistancing both Anna and Mariia. By the same token, three other women’s names in the top twelve were recalled in the Church calendar only one time each: Dariia, Tatiana, and Aksinia. Celebrated in Church services less than one percent of the days of the year, these names all the same accounted for 3.6%, 3.4%, and 3.0% of all women’s names. These variations indicate that, although the Church calendar was influential in deciding names early in the eighteenth century, it was not always determinative.

Inasmuch as the twelve censuses used here depend upon urban populations, a comparison with rural name frequencies of the time would be helpful. E. N. Baklanova has studied one such population, the residents of Kubensk rural district (tret') near Vologda in north-central Russia. Inventoried several times in the seventeenth century (males only except for widow household heads), and again twice early in the eighteenth century, the population of Kubensk district in 1717 totalled 12,583 persons; males outnumbered females, registering about 117 males for every 100 females. Baklanova found examples of more than 205 different male names in Kubensk, but only 64 different female names, reflecting that same differential of name possibilities noted above. Despite the potential for distributing names across this range, the peasants of Kubensk district showed a marked inclination to concentrate their name choices. Table 4 shows that many of the same names usual in the cities of the time were also popular in the countryside. Ivan, for example, was almost exactly as usual a name in Kubensk as it was in the twelve city inventories: about one in six men bore that name. Fedor, however, was even more usual among peasants than among their city cousins, more closely reflecting the Church calendar frequencies. But the same names dominate the top dozen choices in both city and country. Only one name not cited in any of the frequency charts for the twelve city inventories appears in Kubensk district, Luk’ian, the fourth-most popular name in these villages. Recalled on five separate days in the annual Church cycle, Luk’ian was much less likely to

---

28 N. A. Baklanova, “Perepisnye knigi 1678 i 1717 gg. po vologodskomu uezdu kak onomasticheskiy istochnik,” in Etnografiiia imen (Moscow, 1971); idem, “Lichnye imena vologodskikh krest’ian po perepis 1717 g.,” in Lichnye imena v proshlom, nastroianii i budushchem (Moscow, 1970), 308–314; idem, “Antroponimiia.” In these three pieces Baklanova gives slightly different totals for the number of names inventoried.

be selected than any of the top twelve names identified in the city censuses. All the same, among the Vologda peasants it was a very popular name. The women of Kubensk district were less likely than men to bear the same name as a neighbor. Whereas among the men the twelve most usual names accounted for more than half the inventoried population, the top nineteen women’s names account for barely one-fifth of all women’s names. Furthermore, men’s names show less variability between country and city; eleven of the twelve men’s names most frequently met in the city censuses were also most frequently met in the country. Among women the parallel was not nearly so strong. One has to examine the first nineteen village names to find eleven of the twelve names most usual in the city inventories. In addition, the fourth most usual name among Vologda peasant women, Uliiana, did not even make the top twelve in the cities.

In Church lists Uliiana (Iulianiia) appears rather often, being celebrated on eight separate days during the year, less often than either Anna or Mariia, but far more frequently than most women’s names. Nevertheless, in the cities Uliiana was not a usual name. Fedora and Efrosiniia also appeared reasonably often in the Church calendar (eight and six days respectively), which may account for their popularity among Kubensk peasants. But neither name was usual in the census cities. Although more case studies will be necessary to confirm the point, this comparison indicates that, although the name bank for villagers and town residents was very similar, by the early eighteenth century differences had begun to appear (especially among women), and found their reflection in naming conventions.

Examining name frequencies in this way conveys the impression of static preferences, but of course the early modern Russian naming system was dynamic, just like its modern counterparts. By comparing name frequencies among different generations, Baklanova established that some names, already usual in the seventeenth century, became even more popular later. Ivan, for

---

30 Why is not clear; a certain Luk’ian, who died in 1654 after having founded a hermitage near Aleksandrova, might have been the inspiration (Nikolai Barsukov, Istochniki russkoi agiografii [St. Petersburg, 1882], 334).

31 Lieberson and Bell found that in names given to children in New York between 1973 and 1985 a similar dynamic was at work. Female names were more subject to change, whereas male names were generally more conservative, hence associated with higher frequencies and less variation: “...[R]elatively speaking, novelty [in name choice] is more appealing for girls, and traditional names more appealing for boys” (“Children’s First Names,” 516–22). Of course, the naming system of late twentieth-century New York is different in many ways from that which prevailed in Petrine Russia. Nevertheless, the possibility that gender played a similar function in eighteenth-century Russian naming practices is arresting, and deserves special study.

32 Several Iulianiias were known to Muscovite Christians, but which was influential among the peasants of Kubensk is not known (Barsukov, Istochniki, 282).
example, accounted for about 17.6% of all names entered in the books for the years from 1650-1717; but for those born between 1700-1717, Ivan represented 21.6% of men’s names. Indeed, several of the most frequently-cited names grew still more usual early in the eighteenth century, testifying to a growing tendency to settle upon an ever narrower range of names. The same tendency is not so marked among women. Although early in the eighteenth century Anna grew more popular, improving from 7.1% to 9.0% of all women, Maria, Evdokiia, and Uliiana all lost ground, while Irina increased its share from 4.0% to 5.4%. Among other women’s names, Praskovia, Fedora, and Pelageia all found increasing favor among the peasants of these villages.

This information points unmistakably to an evolving system of naming which came to distinguish social layers. If early in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries elite society and their inferiors shared a similar name fund, one which came to depend increasingly upon the reservoir of Orthodox saints’ names, the eighteenth century witnessed the beginnings of a process of social separation evident in name choices. Name preferences in both city and village gave unwitting expression to different cultural values, marking perhaps the first stages of the separation between town and country which has played so dramatic a role in modern European history. The full expression of this tendency came later, however.

What meaning Christian names had for Muscovite families is far from clear. We know almost nothing about how ordinary people settled on names. According to the prescription of clerical handbooks and outsiders’ testimony, the naming ritual took little cognizance of parental wishes, since ritual prevented parents themselves from attending the baptism. And in any case, in theory, the Church calendar determined the child’s name: Christian children received the name of a saint whose festival coincided with the date of baptism, normally eight days after birth. However, we know from the experience of

33 Baklanova, “Antroponimia,” 38–39. Even more revealing would be a study of the frequency and character of inter-generational naming. However, such a study would require access to a secular series of nominal data for a given community. For the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, study of parish registers would serve, but for the earlier period no sources seem suitable to the task.


35 A. Tereshchenko, Byt russkogo naroda (St. Petersburg, 1848), 3:56. Eve Levin claims that in pre-Petrine Russia naming took place on the eighth day and baptism on the fortieth, though she does not explain how the one could take place without the other (“Childbirth in Pre-Petrine Russia: Canon Law and Popular Traditions,” in Russia’s Women: Accommodation, Resistance and Rebellion, ed. Barbara Clement et al. [Berkeley, 1991], 54). A. Makarenko maintains that in nineteenth-century Siberian peasant society “…it was usual to give newborns names of those saints associated with the greatest percent of surviving children” (“Materialy po narodnoi meditsine, Uzhurskoi voestii, Achinskogo okruga, Eniseiskoi gubernii …,” Zhivaia starina 7[1897]:98).
Table 5

BIRTHDAYS AND NAMEDAYS FOR
SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY TSAREVICHES AND TSAREVNAS
(All Dates According to Old Style)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Birthday</th>
<th>Nameday</th>
<th>Interval (in Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irina Mikhailovna (1627)</td>
<td>22.IV</td>
<td>6.V</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelageia Mikhailovna (1628)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksei Mikhailovich (1629)</td>
<td>10.III</td>
<td>17.III</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Mikhailovna (1630)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Mikhailovich (1633)</td>
<td>2.VI</td>
<td>2.VI</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia Mikhailovna (1634)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana Mikhailovna (1636)</td>
<td>5.I</td>
<td>12.I</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evdokia Mikhailovna (1637)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasili Mikhailovich (1639)</td>
<td>14.III</td>
<td>22.III</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmitrii Alekseevich (1648; 1649?)</td>
<td>23.X</td>
<td>26.X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evdokia Alekseevna (1650)</td>
<td>18.II</td>
<td>1.III</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina Alekseevna (1652)</td>
<td>26.VIII</td>
<td>1.IX</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksei Alekseevich (1654)</td>
<td>5.II</td>
<td>12.II</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Alekseevna (1655)</td>
<td>23.I</td>
<td>3.II</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia Alekseevna (1657)</td>
<td>17.IX</td>
<td>17.IX</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekaterina Alekseevna (1658)</td>
<td>27.XI</td>
<td>24.XI</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Alekseevna (1660)</td>
<td>18.I</td>
<td>26.I</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedor Alekseevich (1661)</td>
<td>30.V</td>
<td>[5.VI]</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feodosia Alekseevna (1662)</td>
<td>28.V</td>
<td>29.V</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simion Alekseevich (1665)</td>
<td>3.IV</td>
<td>17.IV</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioann Alekseevich (1666)</td>
<td>27.VIII</td>
<td>29.VIII</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evdokia Alekseevna (1669)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petr Alekseevich (1672)</td>
<td>30.V</td>
<td>29.VI</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Alekseevna (1673)</td>
<td>22.VIII</td>
<td>26.VIII</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fedora Alekseevna (1674)</td>
<td>4.IX</td>
<td>11.IX</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Ioannovna (1689)</td>
<td>21.III</td>
<td>1.IV</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleksei Petrovich (1690)</td>
<td>18.II</td>
<td>23.II</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feodosia Ioannovna (1690)</td>
<td>4.VI</td>
<td>20.VI</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekaterina Ioannovna (1691)</td>
<td>29.X</td>
<td>8.XI</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Ioannovna (1693)</td>
<td>28.I</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraskeva Ioannovna (1694)</td>
<td>24.IX</td>
<td>14.X</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES: Akty sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arhivakh Rossiskoi imperii Arkhieograficheskoi komitseii, 12 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1846-72), vol. 6, no. 91; Drevesia rossiiskoi vivilofika 20 pts. (Moscow, 1788-91), 11:182-89, 192-93; Russkia istoricheskaiia biblioteka, 39 vols. (St. Petersburg-Leningrad, 1872-1927), vol. 35, nos. 420, 422, 448, 478; Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiskoi imperii. Sobranie pervoe. 45 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1830), vol. 1, no. 523; Dopolnenia k vseim III-iu dvortsovykh razriadov (St. Petersburg, 1854), 46-84; Drevy Romanovskih, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg, 1992).
the children of the seventeenth-century sovereigns that sometimes considerable intervals separated births from name days (see Table 5). For the children of Mikhail, an average of five days passed between birth and baptism. Aleksei, for example, was born on the tenth of March, but his nameday was March 17; Vasilii gained his baptismal name eight days after his birth in March 1639. Ivan Mikhailovich, on the other hand, took his name from the very day on which he was born, June 2. The children born of Aleksei's marriage to Mariia Miloslavskaiia also received a name on average about five days distant from their birthdays. Dmitrii was born on October 23, 1648, and his nameday was October 26; Marfa, who was born August 26, 1652, took September 1 as her name day. Evdokiia, on the other hand, was born February 18, 1650, and did not take her name until March 1. Similarly irregular intervals prevailed for other children of Mariia Miloslavskaiia: Sofiiia's name day was the same as her birthday, while Simeon (born 1665) took as his nameday April 17, a full two weeks after his birth.

Children born of Aleksei's second marriage, like those born later to Peter and Ivan, all took namedays some distance from their birthdays. An average of two weeks separated birthdays from namedays. Peter himself was born on May 30, 1672, but was baptized a month later, June 29; Paraskeva Ioannovna was born September 24, 1694, though her name day was nearly three weeks later, October 14. Others received namedays closer to their birthdays, but the average for this whole cohort was much longer than for the sovereign's children born earlier in the century. Clearly, then, the name day did not necessarily correspond to the eighth day after birth, as clerical sources maintain that it should have.

A child's name day need not even correspond to the date of baptism. Mariia Ioannovna, for example, was born March 21, 1689 and was baptized four days later (March 25). However, the newborn took as her name day the first of April, a date which followed baptism by almost a week. How far into the future the priest might go is not clear, but the experience of the royal family suggests that normal practice prevented the selection of a name whose festival did not occur within a week or two of birth. Furthermore, all names had to be chosen from saints whose festivals lay in the future, and not from the name of any saint whose life the Church had already celebrated that year.36

However, priests and godparents might violate even this rule if the child to be baptized were a girl. Because the list of Orthodox saints included more

36 Baiburin, Ritual, 45. N. A. Minenko observes, on the basis of parish registers, that in eighteenth-century Siberia, the interval between birth and baptism might stretch from as few as nine to ten days to as long as five to seven months (Russkaia krest'ianskaia sem'ia v zapadnoi Sibiri [XVIII—pervoi poloviny XIX v.] [Novosibirsk, 1979], 256).
than twice as many men as women, the list of names available to Muscovite females was considerably smaller than that available to males. As a result, far from every day in the Church calendar featured a woman, obliging those giving a name to a young female to search further afield than might those baptizing a boy. In this circumstance, then, Orthodox clergymen sometimes allowed godparents to select a name from a recently-celebrated festival. In fact, from the list of seventeenth-century tsareviches and tsarevnas, only one child received a nameday from a date already past: Ekaterina Alekseevna was born November 27, 1658, but her nameday was November 24, three days before her mother delivered her.

Of course, without reconstituting families whose birth records are less well known, it is impossible to know whether the same patterns that prevailed in the sovereign’s household also obtained in the rest of the society. However, it does not seem unreasonable to think that the seventeenth-century tsars, several of whom had reputations of deep piety, would have conformed by and large to acceptable practice. Not only might their convictions have restrained them from violating canonical prescription, but their actions were much more public than any peasant’s, and likely therefore to have drawn comment had they been regularly at variance with clerical expectations.

In any case, it seems that the parish priest himself was the most influential actor in naming ceremonies. Ethnographies from the nineteenth century confirm that priests wielded considerable power in naming children brought to them. As one student of family rituals astutely observed, the naming ceremony was really a gift exchange: “the priest receives bread, millet, a chicken, and other goods while the child receives a name.” When the exchange did not meet the priest’s expectations, he might correspondingly devalue the name, bestowing upon the newborn an unpronounceable or “inhuman” name. Parents, then, would find it necessary to petition (and bribe) him to rename the child. A similar dynamic may have operated in Muscovy, but no surviving records document the practice.

37 V. Stepanov reported that in Moscow guberniia early in the twentieth century, irrespective of Church rules, peasants were reluctant to name a boy after a saint whose festival had been celebrated prior to the boy’s birth; for girls, however, such a deviation was allowed (“Svedeniia o rodil’nih i krestinnih obriadakh v Klinskiom uezde Moskovskoi gubernii,” Etnograficheskoе obozrenie 70-71[1906]:233). Etnografiia vostochnykh slavian, on the other hand, maintains that newborns could receive the name of any saint commemorated in the Church calendar in the interval spanning “eight days before to eight days after” the child’s birth (398).

38 Baiburin, Ritual, 46.

39 Ibid.; Olga Semyonova Tian-Shanskaia, Village Life in Late Tsarist Russia, ed. David L. Ransel (Bloomington, 1993), 15; N. K. Gavriliuk, Kartografirovanie iavlenii dukhovnoi kultury (po materialam rodil’noi obrudnosti Ukraintsev) (Kiev, 1981), 73. In turn-of-the-century Olonetsk guberniia peasants are reported to have bargained with the priest over a pleasing-
Naming names in early modern Russia, then, confirms the dynamic pattern of naming cultures elsewhere. Pre-Christian Rus' depended upon an "untamed" system of naming whose anthroponyms looked to nature, physical characteristics, and parental attitudes; the Christian naming system gradually displaced this culture, substituting a list of "disembodied" names which simultaneously identified large numbers of men and women. The new system, consequently, sacrificed individuation for other values. But for all its innovation, the Christian naming system also evolved, adapting foreign names to the Russian tongue and supplementing the name bank with saints newly entered into the approved universe. Except perhaps in moments of intoxication or perverseness, even the officiants of Muscovite Christian culture were not rigid in imposing names on newborns; parents and godparents operated within relatively relaxed rules which linked baptism to a Christian name.

Within this new system, names continued to serve as important social signs. Throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries few Christian given names were class-typed, but the process of social differentiation was surely underway, and given names gradually came to reflect this process. Already in the villages of Petrine Russia some names were distinctively rural, especially among women. Even so, townsfolk in the 1760s still bore the same basic group of names popular with their equals in Petrine Russian towns, suggesting that the Russian naming culture achieved some stability in these years. By the end of the century, however, the process had gone much further, especially among women: peasant, urban, and noble society each had its own name preferences, and these names displayed their bearers' social origins as sharply as any footwear might. As before, some names were usual in all three groups, but among eighteenth-century peasants Vasilisa, Glikeriiia, Mavra, Fedosiia, and Fekla were more than twice as usual as they were among townswomen or noblewomen. By the same token, few peasant women answered to Aleksandra or Elizaveta, names borne most often by gentry daughters.\footnote{During his exile in Viatka in the 1830s, Aleksandr Herzen encountered a case in which a drunken priest had inadvertently given a boy's name to a baby girl (Byloe i duma, 2 vols. [Moscow, 1969], 1:231).}

\footnote{H. Bondalevov, Russkaja onomastika, 115-16.}

\footnote{Ibid., 117-18; Nikonov, "Zhenskie imena," 129-30; idem, Imia, 54.}
By late in the nineteenth century, the process had apparently accelerated. In Penza, for example, name frequencies almost fully reversed those apparent in the census towns of early eighteenth-century Russia. Among the eleven most usual women’s names in nineteenth-century Penza, only four (Mariia, Anna, Pelageia, and Tatiana) survived from the names most popular among women in the eighteenth-century census frequencies. Furthermore, many of the names most common among eighteenth-century women practically went out of use in Penza. Praskoviia, for example, a name which 5.7% of all women in the census towns had borne, lost considerable popularity, accounting for just 1.6% of the total in Penza. Other names went out of favor even more sharply: Irina, Matrena, Marfa, Daria, Aksinia, and Akulina, each evidently having become firmly associated with rural rather than urban dwellers, fell into desuetude. In their place an entire cadre of newly popular names appeared: Aleksandra, Elizaveta, Ol’ga, Nataliia, and Anastasiia. Among men Aleksandr, Boris, Georgii, Konstantin, and Sergei achieved frequencies unknown a century earlier.

The naming culture of early modern Russia, then, testifies to a dynamic process. Muscovite naming conventions illustrate first the persistence of traditional, “untamed” values, then the gradual victory of Christian name signs, and finally a further evolution in the functions of these names which became, in later imperial Russia, markers not only of Christian identity but also social class. If earlier generations combined their children’s names and their birth order, or likened their children to the natural world around them, then Christian parents increasingly adapted the system of Christian names to mark off their children not only as members of a heavenly kingdom, but also as members of distinct social classes.

Grinnell College
Any student who has the good fortune to study with Professor Keenan learns early on that no analysis of a political event at the Muscovite court is complete without due consideration to the kinship ties among the major figures involved. So important, in fact, were the bonds of birth and marriage among Muscovy’s clans that they constituted, in Professor Keenan’s felicitous phrase, “the grammar of Muscovite court politics.” The use of kinship as a fundamental ordering principle in high politics was something Muscovy shared with the pastoralist societies in the Steppe. At the same time that the Glinskii and Shuiskii clans were forging alliances and counter alliances through strategic marriages in Moscow, the Argyn, Shirin, Mangit, and Taibug clan leaders were doing much the same in the neighboring Turco-Tatar polities. Indeed, the evidence suggests that during this period clan ties were at the heart of court politics in all four corners of Central Eurasia, from Moscow to Mogulistan, and from Tuimen’ to the Tauride Peninsula.¹

Throughout the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—after the collapse of the Qipchaq Khanate at Sarai—the Muscovite court maintained intensive diplomatic relations with many of these neighboring Turco-Tatar polities. In numerous instances these diplomatic contacts led to the forging of formal, personal alliances between Muscovite grand princes and certain khans, beks, and mirzas. These personal ties were of considerable importance to the Muscovite state, a fact that is evident from the immense administrative energy and material resources expended on negotiating and maintaining them. It was in part thanks to these personal alliances that Muscovite grand princes

achieved such notable success in pursuing their interests at Kazan' and Astrakhan', in Sibir and the Crimea and among the Nogai tribal confederation.²

Given that kinship ties played a central role in defining political alliances in both Muscovite and Steppe society, one is not surprised to find, on occasion, the alliances between the grand princes and the Tatar elite were confirmed through the contracting of marriage ties. This may help explain why the Muscovite genealogical registers (rodoslovnye knigi) for many decades gave prominence to the genealogies of several of the Steppe's leading families.³

During this period, several members of the Tatar royal dynasty married into the Muscovite elite. The most notable of these were the marriages of Sultan Khudaikul (Peter) to Evdokiia, sister of Vasilii III early in 1506,⁴ and of Khan Sain Bulat (Semen) to Anastasia, a daughter of I. F. Mstislavskii around 1575.⁵ Somewhat more common was the marriage of non-royal members of the Tatar elite into the leading families of Muscovy. Among the best known of such cases was that of the Cherkessian princess, Mariia Temriukovna, who in the early 1560s settled in Muscovy with several of her kinsmen and married Ivan IV.⁶ Also important were marriages between members of the Tatar elite who had resettled in Muscovite territory and those who remained in the Steppe.⁷

In addition to their political importance, all of these marriage ties are of interest to social historians, spanning as they did a considerable cultural gap between different religions, languages, and ways of life. Alas, the breadth of such a topic makes for a very complex set of issues, none of which can be adequately addressed in the scope of a single article.

Instead, this article examines a separate, rather more unusual set of “kinship” relations that existed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries between the

³ M. E. Bychkova, Rodoslovnye knigi XVI-XVII vv. kak istoricheskii izochnik (Moscow, 1975).
⁴ A. A. Zimin, ed., Ioatovskaia letopis' (Moscow, 1957), 148.
⁵ Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, 40 vols. to date (St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1846–1930, 34:192 [= PSRL].
⁶ PSRL 13:312–13, 333. The Hungarian Turkologist, István Vásáry is preparing a study of the influx of Tatar aristocratic families into Muscovy.
⁷ Such was the case when the Nogai leader, Iusuf, married his daughter to the powerful Chinggisid dynast Shah Ali, who was born and spent most of his life in Muscovy, Prodolzhenie drevnej rossiiskoi vivliografii 11 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1786–1801), 8:144 [= PDRV].
Muscovite court and the Steppe elite. There are various labels one might apply to this curious category of ties: “foster kinship,” “sworn kinship,” “fictive kinship,” etc. (the sources themselves, one should hasten to add, have no generic term for these ties). But for reasons that will soon be apparent, we shall refer to this category of ties as “metaphorical kinship.”

Evidence of the recognition of metaphorical kinship ties can be found throughout the Muscovite-Tatar diplomatic correspondence of this period. However, as with so many other features of Muscovite-Steppe relations, they have attracted little scholarly attention. In order to explain what metaphorical kinship ties were, it is helpful to compare them to the bonds of marriage, which in many regards they resembled. Like marriage ties, metaphorical kinship ties were elective, not inherited. Like marriage, they were confirmed through a formal ceremony in which solemn oaths were sworn. And like marriage ties, they were employed to help give substance and definition to political relationships. Unlike the affinal ties of marriage, however, those of metaphorical kinship could be formed between members of the same sex as well as the opposite. And unlike marriage, metaphorical kinship pretended to be consanguineous; that is to say, those who acquired these ties did so by declaring each other their brother, father, or son, mother, sister, or daughter, etc.

Consider, for example, the following two diplomatic messages. The first is a note of 1474 from Ivan III to his new ally Khan Mengli Girei of the Crimea:

А в ярлыке твоем пишет [sic], жалуючи мене, братом собе и другом назвал еси.*

In your iarlyk it is written that you have shown me favor and named me your brother and friend.

The second is a letter sent to Ivan III some fifteen years later by the Nogai leader Musa:

Дед мой Едигей князь с твоим дедом в дружбе и братстве были, а отец мой с твоим отцем также в дружбе и в братстве были, а дядя мой Темир князь с тобою в дружбе и в братстве был. ЬЬ Ты бы пожаловал, яз хочу с тобою потомуж в дружбе быти, сыном или братом собе меня учинишь, как пожалуешь.”

---

9 RIO 41:89–90.
My grandfather, Edigei Bek, had a relationship of friendship and brotherhood with your grandfather. My father likewise had a relationship of friendship and brotherhood with your father. My uncle, Temir Bek, had a relationship of friendship and brotherhood with you. If you would grant it, I would likewise desire to have a relationship of friendship with you. Make me your son or brother, whichever you would grant.

In both of these letters, the terms “brother” and “son,” were not, of course, being used in their literal, biological sense, but in a figurative, metaphorical one. What blood ties, if any, there were between Ivan and his Tatar correspondents were distant ones at most. Moreover, the context makes clear that the relationships of “brotherhood” and “sonhood” being spoken of were elective ones, relationships into which both parties chose to enter of their own volition. While one’s descent did play a role, as Musa’s letter clearly shows, one was not born into these relationships; one proposed or accepted them.

Given the clear figurative use of these terms, it might be asked, is it justified to speak here of a “kinship system” at all? Based on the two examples we have just seen, one might be tempted to dismiss the terms “brother,” “brotherhood,” and “son” as little more than diplomatic politesse of the sort that obliged Western European royalty to address one another as brother and sister, even when biologically they were not such.

To dismiss these terms as mere figures of speech, however, would be to overlook a subtler significance they held. Their use in the Muscovite-Steppe political discourse was not merely a hollow diplomatic convention. They constituted a meaningful system that both sides used with consistency and deliberateness. Herein lies their value to the historian. Rather than simply marking mutual respect, this metaphorical use of consanguineous kinship terms performed an important role in the process of forging cross-cultural political relations.

Whenever the grand prince acquired an alliance with a member of the Steppe elite, both sides seem to have felt it necessary to fix and explicitly articulate the relative political status of each individual to the other. This, naturally, forced the question of how each party regarded the other’s relative political status. Did they regard themselves as equals? or did one recognize the superiority of the other? and if so, how great a degree?

The answers to these questions were not necessarily self-evident. With the disintegration of centralized authority in Central Eurasia following the collapse of the Qipchaq Khanate, the regional balance of power became extremely fluid. The titles and positions a leader held within his or her respective polity, while important, by no means fixed one’s status vis-à-vis
other regional leaders. A Muscovite grand prince was not, by dint of his leadership in Muscovy, necessarily recognized as the political superior or inferior to a Kazanian khan. Nor was, say, a Nogai ulug bek inherently greater or lesser than a Crimean khan, simply on the basis of his leadership of his tribal confederation.\(^\text{10}\)

Status appears to have been far more circumstantial. It depended more on an individual's actual influence over key groupings in the Steppe at a given moment in time than on his or her nominal office. Ivan IV alluded to the circumstantial quality of power when he wrote to a Nogai murza: "You know quite well yourself that even khans of certain iurts [have to] request brotherhood from us" (that is to say, they could not presume to be worthy of it, but neither could he say precisely which khans of which iurts.)\(^\text{11}\) Hence, when forging bilateral ties, individuals sought to fix their respective place within a complex, ever-shifting web of interpersonal ties. This fixing of relative status in a bilateral relationship served as one of the most important means by which a regional political hierarchy was established and maintained as the region began to reintegrate in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

This process of haggling over relative status is evident in the diplomatic materials cited above concerning Ivan III's relationships both with Mengli Girei and Musa. In the case of Musa, it was rather straightforward. The Nogai leader was willing to accept from Ivan either the status of "brother" or "son." He left it to Ivan's discretion.

Ivan's relationship with Mengli Girei was more complicated. Mengli Girei's father and predecessor on the Crimean throne, Hadji Girei, had formed an alliance (or "friendship") with Ivan. Just what mutual status they accorded one another is not clear, but apparently they were not "brothers." This is evident from a letter of safe passage Ivan III sent in 1490 to Sultan Devlesh, a nephew of Mengli Girei:

Дед твоїй Азі-Гирея царь с нами был в дружбе, а дядя твої Нурдовлат царь и Менли-Гирей царь с нами в дружбе и в братстве. Ныщца слышели есьма, что в чюжом юрте стоишь, а конь твой потен; и мы, помимая к собе деда твоего дружбу и дядя твоих, Нурдовлатову цареву и Менли-Гирееву цареву дружбу и братство, тебе хотим дружбу свою чинити. Похочешь у нас опочива, и ты к нам поеди, а мы тебе в своей земли опочив учним и добро свое, как даст Бог,

\(^\text{10}\)This is not to say that there was no regard for titles as an expression of status; see Halil Inalcik, "Power Relationships Between Russia, the Crimea and the Ottoman Empire as Reflected in Titulature," in \textit{Passé Turco-Tatar, Présent Soviétique: études offertes à Alexandre Bennigsen} 175–214 (Paris, 1986).

\(^\text{11}\) "Vedomo tebe i samomu, kotorykh iurtov tsari i te u nas bratstvo vyprashivaiut," \textit{PDRV} 9:231 (from 1556).
Your grandfather Hadji Girei khan and I had a relationship of friendship. Your uncles Nur Devlet khan and Mengli Girei khan have relationships of friendship and brotherhood with me. I have recently heard that you are in a stranger’s iurt, and that your horse is sweating [from fatigue]. And as I recall the friendship [I had with] your grandfather and the friendship and brotherhood I share with your uncles, I desire to extend my friendship to you [too]. Should you wish refuge here with me, then come to me, and I shall give you refuge and I shall extend my goodwill towards you, if God permits it. And toward any of your people who might come with you, I shall, for your sake, show them my favor.

If Hadji Girei had recognized Ivan as his “brother,” this surely would have been mentioned along with the relationships of brotherhood Ivan enjoyed with two of Hadji Girei’s sons. The omission of any mention of kinship in Ivan’s recollection of his alliance with Hadji Girei leads one to suspect that Ivan had been obliged to accept a junior status, perhaps “younger brother” or even “son.” Authorities in Moscow probably felt there was no advantage to be gained in future negotiations with Devlesh by recalling Ivan’s earlier subordination to the Crimean khans.

If, as one suspects, Ivan had accepted a junior kinship status to Hadji Girei, then Mengli Girei’s acknowledgement of Ivan as his “brother” in 1474 marked an elevation of the grand prince’s status in the Crimea. This suspicion gains further support from two other documents. The first is from Ivan himself. Writing to a Muscovite agent soon after receiving Mengli Girei’s iarlyk, Ivan declared:

You have informed me of the royal favor, that the khan is granting me everything the way I wanted. And Isup has told me that the khan wants to show further favor to me—to confirm me in brotherhood and friendship with himself, in the same manner that the king is in brotherhood with him.

The “king” being referred to here is the Polish-Lithuanian sovereign, who, over preceding decades, had enjoyed higher prestige in the Crimea than had
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12 RIO 41:100.
13 RIO 41:7. An alternative reading of the second sentence might be: “And Isup has told me that the khan wants to show me favor and to elevate me to brotherhood and friendship with him, as the king is in brotherhood with him.”
Muscovite rulers. Some years later, Sigismund I, in a diplomatic overture to
the new khan Muhammed Girei, would recall Moscow's earlier subordinate
status:

Помнишь царь сам из старины которой князь великий московской царю брат
был? А нынече князь великий московской и тебе царю братом чинится. А наша
старина с вами братство и дружба; и ты бы ныне меня учинил себе прямым
братом и другом, а от московского бы еси отстал.14

O khan, you yourself remember, what Muscovite grand prince from the old days had
been a brother to a khan? And now, khan, the Muscovite grand prince is making
himself your brother. Our past has been [one of] brotherhood and friendship with
you. And likewise now you should make me your true brother and friend, and
foresake the Muscovite.

The intensity with which the topic of metaphorical kinship was discussed
suggests strongly that it was not merely a hollow diplomatic convention;
rather, it was charged with considerable political significance.

The hierarchy of consanguineous kinship provided a set of metaphors quite
well suited to the task of fixing political status. To begin with, the system of
biological kinship ties was one that both societies understood and recognized.
Moreover, both Tatars and Muscovies accorded political importance to birth
order and generation. Both khan and grand prince alike appreciated the fact
that, in the political scheme of things, a father was superior to his son, and—
to a lesser degree—an older brother was superior to a younger one. As we
shall see, the hierarchy of metaphysical kinship ties could also be modified
beyond the structure of normal biological ones in order to express political
relationships that were nuanced or ambiguous.

The Rusian term bratstvo ("brotherhood") which was frequently applied to
relationships between Muscovite and Tatar leaders was normally rendered by
the Tatar term qarindašliq. This term, in turn, derived from the Tatar term
"qarindaš." Taken in its literal sense, the Tatar word means "womb-
companion," and connotes a fraternal relationship between perfect peers. It
stands in contrast to two other Tatar terms for brother: aqa (or aga) meaning
"older brother" (R. staršii brat) and ini meaning "younger brother" (R.
mladšii brat).

Birth order within both of these societies was politically significant. Take
for example, an early chapter of the Chingiz-name, a Qipchaq-Turkic historical

14 RIO 95:360 (from 1517).
narrative written in the early sixteenth century. Two sons of the late Juchi khan, Edjan, and his younger brother Sain (a.k.a. Batu) are debating which of them should succeed their father in the khanship. Sain shows the deference appropriate for a younger brother: "Atam ornuğa ağam sän. Häman atam turursän" ("You are my older brother, [who has] replaced my father. This means, you are my father"). When Edjen insists that Sain become khan (on the grounds that Jochi had always favored him) Sain protests: "Ol tegän nä söz bolur? Yosaqçi ağam turgandâ manga nä oxṣar ki xan bolgaymän" ("What are you saying! How would it befit me to become khan when I have an older brother according to yasak [i.e., customary law]?" ).

The system of metaphorical kinship exploited this distinction between older brothers and younger brothers. In circumstances where two parties recognized one another as roughly on a par with one another, but not absolute peers, the metaphor of older brother-younger brother relationship could be invoked. Such, for example, was the relationship between Grand Prince Vasiliy III and the Crimean sultan Bogatyr, as is evident by the latter's inscription to the former: "от брата твоего меньшего Богатыр царевича." In circumstances where the disparity in status was more clear cut, the metaphor of the father-son relationship could be used: "с твоим дедом, с великим князем, наш дед, князь великий, отчье и сыновство меж ими бывало." The establishment of metaphorical ties of kinship was not limited to men alone. The sources contain several examples of metaphorical kinship between a woman and a man. Mengli Girei's senior wife, for example, Nur Sultan, was "daughter" to the Turkish sultan and "sister" to Ivan III. Ivan and Nur Sultan frequently spoke of the bratsvo (here, "siblinghood") between themselves.

At times, the customary set of kinship terms alone did not suffice to express the relative status of the two individuals. In such circumstances the two parties would combine two different kinship ties to create a hybrid tie not normally found in these societies. For example, Ivan III customarily referred

---

15 Utemish Hadji, Chingiz-name, edited by V. P. Iudin (Alma-Ata, 1992), 38a [= Chingiz-name].
16 Chingiz-name, 38a.
17 "From your younger brother Sultan Bogatyr," RİO 95:37.
18 "Between your grandfather, the grand prince and our grandfather, the grand prince [i.e., the ulug bek], there were [relationships of] fatherhood and 'sonhood'," Posol'skaia kniga po sviaziam Rossii s nogaiiskoi ordoi, 1489–1508 gg. (Moscow, 1984), list 58 (a letter from a Nogai mirza to Vasiliy III, ca. 1508).
19 RİO 41:109.
20 For example, RİO 41:266.
to his protegé Muhammed Amin, sometime khan of Kazan’, as his “brother and son”; “И посадили есмя на том юрте на Казани своего брата и сына Магмет Аминя царя.” At about the same time, the Nogai noble Talach wrote to Ivan asking that the grand prince make him his “younger brother and son.” Several decades later, the mother of one of the young Ivan IV’s Nogai allies declared the grand prince to be her “brother and son.” In the late 1520s, Vasilii III became “father and brother” to Islam Girei and remained so during the latter’s brief reign as the Crimean khan.

One gets the sense that such hybrid ties were invoked when the subtleties of a relationship were difficult to pin down. Such could be the case, for example, when vast differences in age were not reflected by similar disparities in power, or when one’s titular status was not consonant with one’s actual might.

Metaphorical kinship was not restricted exclusively to cross-cultural alliances. At least on occasion, they were employed to help define political alliances formed within these two societies, that is to say, among Tatars or among Muscovites. For example, before (according to the semi-fictional Chingiz-name) the celebrated Tatar Khan Toqtamiš had emerged as one of the great leaders of the Steppe, he sought refuge with Khan Kan-bai, a provincial ruler from a cadet branch of the Chinggisid line. Toqtamiš declared his protector to be his “father and brother.”

A treaty among several allied Muscovite princes during the 1440s also shows the fixing of metaphorical kinship ties among powerful Muscovite politicos. The treaty involved four princes, the father and son Dmitrii Iurevich and Ivan Dmitrievich of Galich on the one side, and the two brothers Vasilii and Fedor Iurevich of Suzdal’ on the other. There was no discussion of kinship between the father and son, or the two brothers: these had been clearly established by birth. The matter being negotiated was how the Galich princes and the Suzdal’ princes should regard one another. If one goes back far enough (to Iaroslav II), one can find an agnatic link between the two branches. That, however, is not what the two parties chose to do here. Rather, they agreed upon a set of provisional metaphorical kinship ties that satisfactorily expressed the relative political status of the two branches at that point in time (here the oath is being pledged by Vasilii and Fedor Iurevich to Dmitrii Iurevich):
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21 “I placed on that iurt, in Kazan’, my brother and son Khan Muhammed Amin,” RIO 41:83 (1487).
22 “Меня собе меньшим братом и сыном учинишь.” RIO 41:83 (ca. 1489).
23 “Нам братом и сыном стоиш.” PDRV 8:14.
24 Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov, fond 123, kniga 7, list 2.
25 “Аiam аğam,” Chingiz-name, 58a.
You shall regard me, prince Vasilii Iur'evich, as your son. You shall regard my younger brother, prince Fedor Iur'evich, as your nephew. My lord, your son, prince Ivan Dmitr'evich, shall regard me, prince Vasilii Iur'evich, as his equal brother. My lord, prince Ivan shall regard me, prince Fedor Iur'evich, as his younger brother. I, prince Vasilii Iur'evich, will regard you as my lord and father, and your son, prince Ivan Dmitr'evich, as my equal brother. I, prince Fedor Iur'evich, will regard you as my lord and uncle, and, my lord, your son, prince Ivan Dmitr'evich, I shall regard as my older brother.

Since the practice of metaphorical kinship bonding was found both cross-culturally, between Muscovites and Tatars, and inner-culturally, among Muscovites and among Tatars, one is naturally tempted to posit an organic link among all these occurrences, and to speculate on where the practice might have originated. Was the practice indigenous to the Steppe and borrowed into East Slavic society at some early date? or vice versa? or did it arise as a result of efforts to fix status cross-culturally? Efforts to pursue such speculation, however, quickly run up against a wall of silence. The surviving sources on the early history of Slavic-Turkic relations are much too scant to permit any solid conclusions. One thing can, however, be concluded with confidence: the widespread phenomenon of metaphorical kinship provides yet further evidence of the profound degree to which blood ties shaped the politics of Central Eurasia in the Early Modern period.

Moscow
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Patrolling the Boundaries: Witchcraft Accusations and Household Strife in Seventeenth-Century Muscovy

VALERIE KIVELSON

In 1676/1677 a dragoon of the Komaritskii region complained in the local governor’s court that a fellow dragoon of the same village had threatened him, in the presence of witnesses, saying, “Mikitka, your wife Okulka will swell up. And you too will swell up because of me.” As a result of those ominous words, Mikitka reported, “since that day, my little wife has been in pain, swollen up and covered with ulcers.” In his testimony at the governor’s court, Mikitka conveyed a sense of violation and moral indignation, heightened by the fact that the alleged sorcerer, Emel'ka, was none other than his kum, the godfather of his child, a man with whom he had formed a spiritual bond at the baptismal font. Worse yet, Emel'ka had uttered his curse while Mikitka and his wife were visiting his house as his guests. It would be hard to imagine a more heinous act of treachery than an attack on the wife of a guest and spiritual kinsman.

In Muscovite courts, the particular boundaries that witches and sorcerers were accused of transgressing very often were those circumscribing family, affinal, and extended household relations. The majority of witchcraft accusations targeted outsiders, but in a remarkable subgroup of cases, plaintiffs leveled witchcraft accusations against their own family members or members

* I would like to thank Nancy Shields Kollmann, Eve Levin, Laura Downs, Miriam Bodian, and Sueann Caulfield, Susan Juster, and Susan Johnson for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Also, thanks to Elizabeth Wood for her help and insights and to Mona Yousif for her interesting work on children’s accusations against parents in England.

1 “Pokhvalialsia pri liudekh: ‘pukhnet de zhena tvoia Mikita, Okulka. Budesh de i ty ot menia pukhnut.’” “I byv u nego v gostekh preshed domoi zhenishka moia s togo chisla skorbeet rozpukhla v izvy.” Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov (RGADA), fond 210, Novgorodskii stol, stolbets 272, listy 143, 144. Swelling and “withering” were commonly attributed to witchcraft. Swelling was most likely dropsy, congestive heart failure, while withering may well have been caused by cancers or tuberculosis.

Kum refers to the relation forged at baptism by the godparenting relationship. It can refer to the godparent of one’s child, the parent of one’s godchild, or even to another person with whom one shares the role of godparent to a particular child. In this case, I have no way of telling which permutation of the relationship is the relevant one.
of a closely-knit extended family or household community. While accusations against servants were common in other parts of the Christian world, the prevalence of accusations against blood relatives is surprising. In Western Europe at the same time accusations rarely named blood relatives or even spouses, except when exacted under torture. There may well have been an element of self-preservation in refraining from calling family members witches in the West, since witchcraft was commonly thought to run in families through tainted blood. In such a context, publicizing the presence of a witch in one’s own family would have been ill advised. Muscovites, despite or rather because of their marked focus on familial and community organization, departed from this European norm and accused members of their own families and households with some regularity. The case of the dragoon’s swollen wife exemplifies the points of vulnerability inherent in a society that placed high reliance on community solidarity. Intensely intimate, and frequently lethal interchanges among relatives and friends emerged from Muscovite notions of family and community. Perception of violation of community might provoke a person to apply the terrible label of “witch” or “sorcerer” to a kum, spouse, mother-in-law, nephew, brother, or servant. This article explores the dynamics underlying this anomalous pattern in witchcraft accusations. An appreciation of what soured relations among intimates to such a deadly degree will, in turn, allow us to outline a Muscovite understanding of community, its boundaries, and its enemies.

As understood by their contemporaries, Muscovite witches were defined above all by their use of hexes (maleficium in Latin, porcha in Russian), that is, by their use of supernatural means to inflict harm upon others. Muscovy did not develop any equivalent to the elaborate lore of satanic pacts and demonism that enveloped witchcraft belief in Western Europe at the time, and so the activities of witches and sorcerers remained much earthier, much more closely linked to ordinary criminality than in the West. The connection was so close, in fact, that the potions that witches were thought to use to bewitch their victims were often scarcely differentiated from poison, and their magical incantations easily blurred into more standard legal categories of abuse and threatening words. Constellations of charges clustering witchcraft together with ordinary criminality were not uncommon, as, for instance, in a lawsuit in
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which a woman was charged with conspiracy, battery, fornication, and sorcery (koldovan'e, koldovstvo), or another where a man called his son a “destroyer and ruffian and brigand and witch (razoritel' i grubitel' i vor i vedun).” Given this hazy line dividing magical from other criminal behavior, the particular sites in which accusers thought to lodge allegations of witchcraft reveal a great deal about the notions of moral community that held Muscovite society together. In defining particular infractions as magical rather than simply criminal, Muscovites marked and protected the moral norms of their community.

Moral communities and familial relationships, particularly relationships of kinship and marriage, lay at the heart of Muscovite perceptions of all aspects of their world. This held true not only in the realm of social organization, where these would be quite standard building blocks, but also in conceptions of the political and the religious spheres. Marriage and kinship among boyar clans provided the unifying logic of the Muscovite political system, as Edward Keenan and Nancy Kollmann have established. Adding a quite different angle to this literature on high politics, Daniel Rowland has emphasized the importance of imagery and rhetoric stressing piety and moral community in Muscovite semiotic codes. If these studies have depicted the positive image of Muscovite political, moral, and social organization, the image of the witch and the discourse of sorcery present its negative, or inversion. Like the discourse of high politics and religion, the tropes in which witchcraft was discussed stressed marriage, kinship, and procreation and rested on assumptions about mutual obligation and moral community; however, witchcraft discourse cast these relationships in more problematic terms, revealing dimensions of ambiguity and danger within those relationships. Muscovites lodged charges of witchcraft not only in defense of family members presumed to be bewitched, but also against family members or members of other closely bonded communities, including not only kin but also masters and servants, hosts and guests. The family and household community as a contested site of mutual
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dependency and mutual suspicion underscores the centrality of those relationships.

Assaults within marriage, kinship groups, and the extended household were considered violations of vast proportions. To explain to themselves painful attacks on the primary organizing principles of their society and their world, Muscovites sometimes applied the labels of witch and sorcerer to those who upset the community order. Conversely, those accused of witchcraft frequently used the same logic to defend their actions, claiming that they had turned to magic to right wrongs inflicted upon them by others. In this regard, numerous court cases document that otherwise defenseless individuals, particularly female slaves and servants and widows, used charms to gain righteous revenge or restitution. Both the crime of sorcery and the response to it resulted from a shared sense of what was right in reciprocal relations of kin, community, or hierarchy.

Discussion of the motivations of the practitioners of magic, the putative witches and sorcerers, raises the perennial question of the “reality” of witchcraft. Did Muscovites actually practice witchcraft and consult witches and sorcerers? The answer seems quite unambiguous. Magic was a routine part of Muscovite life. In a society devoid of a professionalized medical establishment, all healing was necessarily carried out by folk healers, who used a combination of magical rituals, herbal cures, prayers and incantations. Furthermore, tangible evidence of herbaries and books of spells demonstrate that people employed magical spells and rituals to avenge themselves on their enemies, gain sexual power over members of the opposite sex, drum up business, tell fortunes, find lost objects or missing people, or win the hearts of their beloved. In contrast to the Western European trials, where it is quite clear that the charges of Satanic pacts, night flying, and attending black sabbaths that were leveled against tens of thousands of unfortunates were completely spurious, in the Muscovite case, many of the accusations may well have corresponded to actual practice.


This is not to deny that magic was commonly practiced in the West as well. A similar kind of down-to-earth magic was widespread in the West, but no evidence of witches' covens or Satanism has been found in the West.
Whether or not the testimony in any given case reflected actual events, however, is quite a different question, and one which cannot be resolved. A host of confounding factors ranging from malice to insanity to torture (discussed below) may have entered into forming the testimony of accusers and accused alike. Consequently, I have not attempted to sort out genuine from invented testimony, but rather I have accepted all testimony as representative of a cultural understanding of what comprised witchcraft and sorcery, of who made a likely witch, and of what would pass as a plausible story. Whether real, imagined, or fabricated, the testimony recorded in Muscovite courts reflects seventeenth-century notions of what constituted magic and where it was likely to strike.

Witchcraft beliefs and practices were by no means confined to the lower classes or rural masses. They united much if not all of Muscovite society in the seventeenth century. Court cases reveal that men and women of all social categories, ranks, and territorial affiliations made charges and were themselves charged with practicing magic. Grand princesses, boyars, cossacks, soldiers’ wives, peasants, priests, monks, and townspeople all participated in witchcraft trials, assuming a variety of roles in court, from suspect, to witness, to victim. Witchcraft belief even extended beyond the Christian world to include Mordvinians, Cheremis’, and other Muscovite pagans; however, here the focus will remain on Christian variants. Witchcraft beliefs may be labeled “popular,” therefore, with the understanding that “popular” denotes a comprehensive, society-wide belief system belonging to no particular segment of society.

Witchcraft litigation that grew out of disputes within families displays a particularly sharp animus, deriving from the sense of violation of moral responsibility and betrayal of trust. Cases that shattered the close and supposedly tight-knit solidarity of blood kin usually involved disputes over property and inheritance. The case of Iakov Logvinov, who accused his own nephew of witchcraft in 1629, serves as a case in point. Iakov submitted a petition asserting that he had been summoned home one day by his own blood nephew, Petr Tarotukhin. When he arrived at home, Petr Tarotukhin “began to threaten him, Iakov, with bewitchment by a root.”
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9 See particularly interesting cases involving Mordvinians and Cheremis’: RGADA fond 210, Prikaznyi stol, stbl. 33; listy 617–38 (inquiry into summoning of spirits, healing, telling the future by Mordvin peasants); listy 708–19 (about a Mordvin and Cheremis’ gathering involving sorcery (volkhovstvo, vedovstvo), horse sacrifice, and an all-out attack on Russian passers-by.

RGADA fond 210, Prikaznyi stol, stbl. 36, list 144.
began to swear and to chase after his own brother Aleksandr Tarotukhin with a knife. And Aleksandr ran away from him from my little yard to his house, and after that Petr came to me in my house and started to brag about bewitching with a root. “I bewitched Andrei Terekhov’s son Prokofii with a root,” he said. “And I will [bewitch] his father Andrei too. And I will burn his, Andrei’s, village.” And I started to calm him, saying “Stop before you say something you regret,” and he said to me, “You’ll get something from me too, Uncle! I’d rather die than not get back at you! I’ll beat you to death and burn you up.” And he started to swear at my wife, who was sitting at the table, and to beat her on the cheeks.

The family saga continued to unfold when the accused, Petr, gave his own very different version of the story at the local governor’s office. He reported that he had gone to Iakov Logvinov’s house “by his bidding [and] by kinship, because he is my uncle.’’ He categorically denied all of his uncle’s charges and proceeded to explain the source of his uncle’s malicious slander:

With that he slanders me, because he, Iakov Logvinov, gave my mother, that is, his sister, the widow Anna, in marriage to Andrei Terekhov with my father’s property.

Petr’s uncle had thus given away much of Petr’s patrimony as dowry to his mother’s new husband, Terekhov, thereby depriving Petr and his brother of their expected and rightful inheritance. From Petr’s point of view it was bad enough that his mother’s new husband, Andrei Terekhov, received Logvinov’s land, but, even worse, Terekhov had a son by a previous marriage, who might manage eventually to inherit that land from his father. According to the uncle’s denunciation, Andrei and Prokofii Terekhov, Petr’s new stepfather and stepbrother, were the people whom Petr had threatened to bewitch and burn out of house and home. Clearly Petr had good reason for his hostility to the Terekhovs and his uncle. To top it all off, the greedy uncle had also grabbed...
part of his late brother’s *votchina* estate for himself and had by-passed some
important administrative formalities through his connections with the town
clerk. Uncle Iakov, thus, had real cause for a guilty conscience. This
altercation, in other words, originated in a family dispute over property rights,
but assumed an intensely bitter character because of the intimacy of the bonds
between the rival parties and because of the sense of violation when the
affronts came from close family members. The transgressive powers of
witchcraft provided an explanation for such unthinkable family fissures.

Numerous cases reveal how family squabbles turned deadly when witchcraft
charges were stirred into the pot. In Lukh a provincial servitor charged his
brother with witchcraft, but the issue turned out to revolve around competition
over the paternal inheritance. A military servitor in Akhtyrki along the
southern frontier called his son, among other unflattering names, “a witch
(*vedurn*) and fornicator” and charged him with insolence and with stealing his
possessions and his peasants. In 1686 a townsman of Veneva was accused of
bewitching his nephew with a “sweet drink.” As evident from this partial
listing, charges were not uncommon within families.

More common than accusations among blood kin were accusations
exchanged among in-laws, illustrating the tensions inherent in the relationship
created between two families by marriage. In 1640 Tito Osipov, a Mosal’sk
cossack, charged Pavel Dolgoi, a fellow cossack, with threatening him with
bewitchment, but Tito admitted up front that the real issue between them was
that Pavel wanted to marry his son to a girl with whom Tito’s son had
contracted to marry: “By God’s judgement, I, Tito, arranged to have my son
marry cossack Ivan Minin’s daughter! And therefore your wife and children
threaten me, Tito, and my son and that girl, Ivan’s daughter, with
bewitchment.” The grudge between the two families had a long history,
“because prior to this his, Pavel’s, son Semen beat my little son half to death
and robbed [him],” but only with the rivalry over the potential bride did the
charges spill over from the mundane to the supernatural. In Murom a
widower charged his mother-in-law and her household slaves with witchcraft

---

14 RGADA fond 210, Prikaznyi stol, stlb. 861.
16 Nephew/uncle: RGADA fond 210, Prikaznyi stol, stlb. 872 (1683–1686).
17 “I bozhim sudom sosvatolsia de ia Tit za sna svoego u togo u Ivana Minina docheri
prinialsia (?) tomu tomu pokhvaliaetsa de tvoia zhena i deti tvoi na menia na Tita i na sna
moavo i na tu Ivanovu doch na devku porcheiu.” RGADA fond 210, Vladimirskii stol, stlb. 60,
list 263 (1640).
18 “potomu chto prezhe sevo evo Pavlov syn Semen moavo synishka ubil do polusmerti i
ograbil.” Ibid., list 269.
when she tried to reclaim some of her daughter’s dowry after the daughter’s death. A Zemliansk servitor brought charges against his daughter-in-law and her mother and sister-in-law, all priests’ wives and widows, for poisoning his wife with enchanted grasses, inducing a painful death. A gentrywoman of Murom admitted that she had attempted to cast spells on her husband and his parents, but she later retracted her confession.

Court testimony in numerous cases reveals the centrality of marriage and the extended household community in the popular imagination about uses of magic. In a case in Velikiie Luki in 1628, a peasant woman named Katerinka found herself facing witchcraft charges because her mistress, Prince Fedor Eletskoi’s pregnant wife, had mysteriously sickened and miscarried. Katerinka’s master had conducted a search and had found in her possession some suspicious items: a locked box containing something wrapped in a kerchief and three paper packets, wrapped and tied, containing crushed grasses, “but what those grasses are is unknown.” In her initial testimony, Katerinka explained that “in the big paper was water-pepper and in the smallest paper packet, if it looks like powder, is strekil’, or in Russian, vish. And in the third paper packet was plain old grass.” Tied up in the kerchief she had some soap made of crushed ginger. Katerinka said that she had used these items as soaps and salves for her eyes and face: “And I kept that strekil’ not for magic and I didn’t put it in anyone’s food, and I kept it to rub on my face for cleanliness.” These innocent explanations did not satisfy her interrogators, who subjected her to several rounds of torture, which, according to the tsar’s command, was to be administered “na krepko (forcefully).” Suspicious ingredients, in conjunction with the princess’s illness and miscarriage, were enough to engender witchcraft charges.

---

19 RGADA fond. 210, Prikaznyi stol, stlb. 861. For an exactly parallel case which did not produce witchcraft accusations, see RGADA fond 210, Belgorodskii stol, stlb. 83 (1636/1637).
20 RGADA fond 210, Prikaznyi stol, stlb. 2346, 64 listy (1700–1701).
21 N. Ia. Novombergskii, Vrachebnoe stroenie v do-Petrovskoi Rusi (Tomsk, 1907), no. 35.
22 “Tovo zh chisla zhonka Katerinka rosprashivana a v rosprose v s’ezzhei izbe skazala chto u nee trava v bolshoi bumashki perets vodenoi a v samoi malenkoi bumashki kaby pesok viditssa strekil’, a po-nuki vish. A v tretei bumashki trava tak.” RGADA fond 210, Prikaznyi stol, stlb. 46, list 250.

Elsewhere Katerinka explains that strekil’ is the name “po moskovskii.” The area had a large Mordvin population, some of whom were involved in this case. Katerinka herself was not Mordvin, but the local name of the root may have derived from the local language. Plants often had local names. I have not been able to identify strekil’/vish, but it is described as a black, shaggy root that grows in or near rivers.

"la de strekil derzhala ne dlia porchi i v’estvakh tovo ne davyvala nikomu a derzhala de ia to dla tovo tern de ia litso mazala sebe dla chistoty." RGADA fond 210, Prikaznyi stol, stlb. 46, list 256.
In Katerinka’s case, witchcraft charges were used to explain and to avenge transgressions of the reciprocal moral compact between community members. Katerinka confessed during torture:

I sprinkled the salt that Baba Okulinka gave me in the princess’s food, and I took that salt from the old woman because, you see, I am a widow. Many people have tried to arrange marriages for me, but the prince and princess refuse to give me out in marriage. And that old woman, Okulinka, told me, “When you give the princess that salt in her food, they will let you marry.” And I took about a pinch of that salt from Baba Okulinka, and I gave her for that salt a headdress (povoets) worth about a grivna. And that salt all went into the princess’s food, and I don’t have any of that salt left. And I gave the princess that salt . . . because she had a grudge against me. But I never intended to bewitch the princess. And unfortunately, the illness started, and she miscarried her baby, but not from bewitchment.

Katerinka had a legitimate gripe against her masters. When landlords assumed title to young, unmarried peasants, they assumed an obligation to arrange marriages for them. A standard memorandum transferring ownership of a peasant girl to a new landlord asserts, “and it is up to Semen [the new master] and his wife and their children, to give her out in marriage while keeping her within their household, or wherever outside the house they wish to give her.” The Church exerted pressure on landlords to arrange timely marriages for their peasants in order to prevent them from falling into sin outside of marriage. Masters who refused to allow their peasants to marry failed to fulfill their moral obligations and were guilty of undermining the values and behavior of the community at large. Nonetheless, since neither Orthodoxy nor Muscovite law acknowledged any difference between “white” and “black” magic, and both were equally condemned, Katerinka’s protestations would not have counted for much in court, no matter how just her grievance.

While Katerinka explained her resort to witchcraft as a response to her master and mistress’s breach of their moral obligations, the reverse also held

---

15 “Sypała de ia kngine w’estvu sol chto mne dala baba Oklulinka a dlia de ia tovo u baby sol’ vzila chto de ia vdova. Mnogie de menia svataiuttsa i kniaz de i knginia menia zamuzh ne otdauiat. A ta de baba Okulinka mne skazała, kak de ty tu sol’ uchnešh kngine w’estve davat i oni de tebia i zamuzh otdadat. A soli de ia u baby Okulinki vzila sschepot a dala de za tu sol’ povoets v grivnu. I ta de sol’ vsia kngine w’estve izoshla a u menia toe soli ne osatalos nchevo. A davala de ia kngine tu sol’ dlia togo (chtob u kngini ruki otniat?), chto de ona na menia byla kručhinnovata.” Ibid., list 256.

16 Akty istoricheskie, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoiu komissieiu (St. Petersbourg, 1841–1842), no. 407.