

# TSAR AND GOD: SEMIOTIC ASPECTS OF THE SACRALIZATION OF THE MONARCH IN RUSSIA

*B. A. Uspenskij and V. M. Zhivov*

“I finally got the boys so worked up that they demanded to see the major. But earlier that morning I’d borrowed the rascal [a knife] from my neighbor and I took it and tucked it away, you know, just in case. The major comes over, all in a rage. He’s coming. Well, don’t fear, my boys, I say. But they were so afraid their hearts sank right down into their boots. The major ran in, drunk. ‘Who’s here! What’s going on! I am tsar and God!’

“As soon as he said ‘I am tsar and God!’—I came forward,” continued Luchka, “with the knife in my sleeve.

“No, your Excellency,’ I say, moving closer and closer to him, “no, that’s impossible, your Excellency,’ I say, ‘how can you be our tsar and God?’

“Oh, so it’s you, it’s you,’ screamed the major. ‘The ringleader!’

“No, I say, (moving nearer and nearer all the time), no, I say, your Excellency, as you yourself probably know, our God, who is all-powerful and omnipresent, is one, I say. And there is also only one tsar, who is put over us all by God Himself. He, your Excellency, I say, is the monarch. And you, your Excellency, I say, are only a major—our boss, your Excellency, by the tsar’s grace, I say, and by your own deserts.’

“Wh-at-t-t-t!’ he clucked, unable to speak, choking with anger; he was so surprised.

“That’s how it is,’ I say, and suddenly throw myself at him and stick the knife right into his stomach, all the way in. Neatly done. He started to move but his legs only jerked. I ditched the knife.

“Look, I say, boys, lift him up now!’

“Here I’ll make a short digression. Unfortunately, expressions like ‘I am tsar and God’ and many similar things were quite common among many of the commanding officers in the old days.”

—F. M. Dostoevskii, *Notes from the House of the Dead*, chap. 8

The present study simultaneously belongs to literary studies and to social history, as well as to the history of culture and of political ideas. It concerns attitudes toward the tsar in Russia during various periods of Russian history,

and the linguistic—and more generally speaking, semiotic—means by which these attitudes were manifested. Obviously, this is connected to the history of political views. At the same time, insofar as we are speaking of the sacralization of the monarch, a series of problems necessarily arise which, generally speaking, belong to the sphere of religious psychology. We would like to show how differing attitudes toward the tsar correlate with various stages of Russian political and cultural history; how diverse aspects of Russian cultural life converged around this question; and how in different periods the very same texts could be interpreted as having very different content, as they related to the interests of the particular historical period.

From a certain moment the attitude toward the monarch in Russia assumed a religious character. This feature of Russian religious consciousness struck foreigners strongly. Isaak Massa, for example, wrote that Russians “consider their tsar to be a supreme divinity”<sup>1</sup>; and other writers repeat this as well. Thus in the words of Henrik Sederberg, the Russians “consider the tsar almost as God,”<sup>2</sup> and Johann Georg Korb remarked that Muscovites “obey their Sovereign not so much as citizens as much as slaves, considering him more God than Sovereign.”<sup>3</sup> But it was not only foreigners who testified to this. At the All-Russian Church Council of 1917-1918, the opinion was voiced that for the imperial period “one should not speak of Orthodoxy [*Pravoslavie*, literally, “correct glorifying”] but of glorifying the tsar (*ne o pravoslavii, a o tsareslavii*).”<sup>4</sup> The priestless Old Believers also characteristically declared that what differentiated their belief from Orthodoxy was that “there is no tsar in our religion.”<sup>5</sup>

Such statements will not seem tendentious if we recall that M. N. Katkov, for example, wrote, “For the people that constitute the Orthodox Church the Russian tsar is an object not only of respect, to which any legitimate power has the right to expect, but also of a holy feeling by right of his significance in the economy of the Church.”<sup>6</sup> Elsewhere, Katkov wrote, “The Russian tsar is not simply the head of state but the guardian and custodian of the eastern Apostolic Church which has renounced all secular powers and entrusted the tasks of its preservation and daily affairs to the Divinely Anointed One.”<sup>7</sup> In the words of Pavel Florenskii, “in the consciousness of the Russian people autocracy is not a juridical right but a fact, manifested by God and God’s mercy, and not a human convention, so that the tsar’s autocracy belongs to the category not of political rights but of religious dogma; it belongs to the sphere of faith and is not derived from extra-religious principles that consider social or governmental utility.”<sup>8</sup> “The truth of Orthodox tsars’ autocracy . . . is raised in some sense to the level of a tenet of faith,” explains the monarchist brochure *The Power of*

*Autocracy According to Divine Teaching and the Russian Orthodox Church.*<sup>9</sup> “Who does not know how we Russians look at our tsars and their children? Who has not felt that lofty feeling of ecstasy that overcomes Russians when they look upon the tsar or the tsar’s son? Only Russians call their tsar ‘the earthly God,’” wrote P. I. Mel`nikov-Pecherskii.<sup>10</sup>

How should we interpret these pronouncements? What is the origin of this tradition? Is it something ancient and indigenous or new to Russia? How did the deification of the monarch, something that so clearly suggests paganism, reconcile itself to a Christian outlook? These questions demand answers. Let us begin with chronology.

## I. THE SACRALIZATION OF THE MONARCH IN THE CONTEXT OF HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

### 1. *Early Russian Notions of State Power and the Beginning of the Sacralization of the Monarch*

**1.1.** Russian religious and political thought developed under the direct influence of Byzantium. It was precisely from Byzantium that the idea of the parallelism of tsar and God was borrowed. However, this idea in and of itself in no way presumes the sacralization of the monarch. Sacralization involves not only comparing the monarch to God, but the monarch’s acquisition of a special charisma, special gifts of grace due to which he begins to be seen as a supernatural being. The Byzantine texts that came to ancient Rus` in Church Slavonic translations say nothing about this kind of perception.

The parallelism of the monarch and God as “mortal” versus “imperishable” tsar came to Russia with the work of the sixth-century Byzantine writer Agapetos (Agapit), which was well known to early Russia writers.<sup>11</sup> In the twenty-first chapter of his work Agapetos states that in his perishable nature the tsar is like all people, but that in his power he is like God; from this association of the tsar’s power with God’s it is concluded that the tsar’s power is not autonomous but God-given and therefore must be subordinated to God’s moral law. This chapter was included in the early Russian anthology *Bee (Pchela)*. In a copy of the fourteenth-fifteenth century the passage goes like this: “The tsar’s fleshly nature is equal to that of all humans, yet in power of rank [he is] like God Almighty, because there is no one higher than him on earth, and it is proper for him not to be prideful, since he is mortal, and neither to become enraged, since he is like God and is honored for his divine nature

(although he also partakes of mortal nature), and through this mortal nature he should learn to act toward everyone with simplicity."<sup>12</sup> The idea of a moral limitation on the tsar's power as a power derived from God is expressed here with complete clarity.<sup>13</sup>

Agapetos' juxtapositions are often encountered in early Russian writing. Thus in the Hypatian Chronicle in the story of Andrei Bogoliubskii's murder in 1175 we find an echo of his idea: "Although the tsar's earthly nature is like that of every man, the power of his rank is higher, like God;"<sup>14</sup> and the same words are found in the same place in the Laurentian and Pereiaslavl' Chronicles.<sup>15</sup> The same quotation is also found in Iosif Volotskii, both in a fragment of his epistle to the grand prince (which, generally speaking, represents an abbreviation of Agapetos' chapter)<sup>16</sup> and also in the sixteenth sermon of the *Enlightener* (*Prosvetitel'*).<sup>17</sup> In the *Enlightener* we find the monarch referred to directly as "the perishable (*tlennyi*) tsar." In proving that it is wicked to demand that God give account of the world's end, Joseph writes: "If you began to interrogate the earthly and fleshly tsar and to say: why didn't you do this the way I thought it should be done, or in the way I know; you would not have accepted bitter suffering, like an impudent, evil, proud and disobedient slave. And you dare to interrogate and to test the Tsar of tsars and Creator of everything . . ." <sup>18</sup>

In the Nikonian Chronicle Mikhail Tverskoi says to Baty: "To you, tsar, a mortal and perishable man, we give honor and obeisance as to one who has power, because the kingdom and the glory of this quickly perishing world is given you by God."<sup>19</sup> It is noteworthy that these words which one could also take as an echo of Agapetos' ideas are addressed to a non-Christian monarch; it is clear that the point in this case (as with the juxtaposition of a "mortal" and "imperishable" tsar) is connected to the notion of the divine sanction of all power,<sup>20</sup> the idea of the monarch's responsibility for what has been given into his care, but in no way concerning the ruler's special charisma.

Finally, Aleksei Mikhailovich (1629-1676) often referred to himself as a "perishable tsar" (*tlennyi tsar*). For example, in documents addressed to V. B. Sheremet'ev he wrote: "You know yourself how the great Tsar, the eternal, was pleased to be with us (*izvolil byt' u nas*), the great sovereign and perishable tsar, you [know this], Vasilii Borisovich, [who are] not a boyar for nothing . . . Not simply did it please God that we, great sovereign and perishable tsar, render honor to you and for you accept it. . . . Thus [it should be], according to God's will and our command, [that of the] great sovereign and perishable tsar . . ." <sup>21</sup> We find the same expression in his epistles to the Trinity-Sergius Monastery of 1661 announcing his victory over the Poles.

Here he refers to himself in the following way: “Faithful and sinful slave of Christ . . . seated on the tsar’s throne of this transient world and preserving . . . the scepter of the Russian kingdom and its borders by God’s will, the perishable Tsar Aleksei.”<sup>22</sup>

The above characterized attitude to the monarch expressed in the appellation “fleshly tsar” is also clearly stated in the forty-first sermon of Nikon of the Black Mountain’s *Taktikon*, which was well known in Rus’. In particular, in the excerpt from John Chrysostom there is a specific distinction made between divinely-established power as a principle and God’s sanction of a particular ruler: “It is said there is no power but of God, and you ask if every prince is appointed by God. Nothing is said about that and I would not speak about any particular prince. But we shall speak about the principle that power has to exist and that some have to possess it and others have to be possessed by it, so as not to move about randomly, here and there, like waves . . . so don’t say that there are no princes not installed by God. In the same way, when a wise man says that a bride is betrothed to a groom by God, it means that the marriage was created by God but not that He necessarily unites everyone alive with a wife, since we see some people living in sinful and unlawful marriage with each other, and we do not ascribe it to God.”<sup>23</sup> There is an ample number of occasions in the ancient tradition when the tsar is called “god.” However, until a particular period this label only occurs in a special context. The most well known example is the statement of Iosif Volotskii who, addressing tsars in *The Enlightener* (sixteenth sermon), says: “You gods and sons of the Most High, beware that you not be sons of anger and do not die as human beings and take the place of a dog in hell. Tsars and princes, heed this, and fear the horror of the Most High: it was written for your salvation, do God’s will, accept his grace, because God put you in His place on the throne.”<sup>24</sup> This is how M. A. D`iakonov interprets this passage: “Tsars are not only servants of the divine who have been chosen and placed on the throne by God; they themselves are gods, like people only in nature, but in power like God Himself. This is no longer a theory of the divine derivation of tsarist power but the utter deification of the tsar’s person.”<sup>25</sup> D`iakonov’s opinion is suggestive, but does not accurately correspond to the true state of affairs, as it is the result of a mistaken reading of the text.<sup>26</sup>

First of all, it is necessary to note that most of the passage cited from *The Enlightener* does not belong to Joseph himself. The same words are repeated with greater or lesser accuracy in other old Russian texts, all of which are based on one common source, the “Sermon of Our Holy Father Vasilii, Archbishop of Cesarea, On Judges and Rulers,” a monument apparently of Russian derivation,

sometimes ascribed to Metropolitan Kirill II (1224-1233). Here we read: “Heed, as it is written: you are gods and sons of the Almighty. Princes and all earthly judges are servants of God, about whom the Lord says, where I will be, there also will be my servant. Beware, and do not be the progeny of anger; being gods, do not die as human beings, and do not take the place of a dog in hell, as that is a place for the devil and for His angels, but not for you. For God Himself chose for you a place on earth and placed you up on the throne, giving you life and grace. Therefore be like fathers to the world; as it is written: princes of this world are truth.”<sup>27</sup> With variations this text is reproduced in the *Scales of Righteousness* (*Merilo pravednoe*) and in Iosif Volotskii—both in *The Enlightener* and in the *Fourth Sermon on Punishments* (*Ob epitimiiakh*).<sup>28</sup>

Until a certain period—precisely, before the eighteenth century—calling the tsar “god” is only encountered in this context, in which it carries a special meaning. Just what is this? Significantly—and this has escaped the attention of commentators on Joseph’s text and the other cited works—the phrase “you are gods and sons of the Most High” (*bogi este i synove Vyshiago*) is a quotation from the eighty-first psalm, line 6.<sup>29</sup> But if this is so, first of all, the given usage goes beyond the Russian tradition alone, and secondly, we can define rather clearly the specific meaning put into these words. There is no doubt that both the authors and readers of the given texts knew the biblical source and hence would have understood them in the sense in which they found them used in the Psalter. And this meaning is precisely defined in the *Explanatory Psalter* (*Tolkovyi Psaltyr*), which Iosif Volotskii and the other authors also certainly knew. The issue concerned earthly judges whose power over human fates made them comparable to God,<sup>30</sup> i.e., a functional comparison of tsar and God concerning power and the right to judge and make decisions. Understandably, this interpretation of the Psalm made its citation natural in texts of a didactic and juridical character, a category to which all of the above-cited monuments belong; moreover, the very appearance of this quotation in monuments concerning law indicates that this very interpretation of the Psalm was in mind.<sup>31</sup>

Hence the fact that early Russian texts testify to calling the tsar “god” by no means signifies the identity of God and tsar or some kind of actual similarity between them. The issue only concerned a parallelism between them, and the parallel itself only served to underscore the infinite difference between the earthly tsar and Heavenly Tsar. Both the power of the prince and his right to judge thus do not appear absolute at all, but delegated by God with strict conditions whose violation would lead to the complete disidentification of ruler and God, to someone God would renounce, condemn and overthrow.<sup>32</sup>

The Florentine Union and fall of Byzantium, as a result of which Russia found itself the single Orthodox kingdom (not counting Georgia, which was suffering from feudal divisions and played no part in the political arena), introduced a new element into Russian religious and political thinking. Significantly, the fall of Constantinople (1453) almost coincided with Russia's final overthrow of Tatar overlordship (1480). These two events were connected in Rus': at the same time as in Byzantium Islam triumphed over Orthodoxy, in Russia the opposite occurred—the victory of Orthodoxy over Islam. Thus Russia took the place of Byzantium and the Russian grand prince the place of the Byzantine basileus. This opened up new possibilities for a religious understanding of the Russian monarch.

The conception of Moscow as Third Rome defined the Russian grand prince as successor to the Byzantine emperor and at the same time put him in a position that had no direct precedent in the Byzantine model. The conception of Moscow as Third Rome was eschatological, and in this context the Russian monarch as head of the last Orthodox kingdom was endowed with a messianic role. In the *Epistle about the Sign of the Cross*, sometimes ascribed to the elder Filofei (Philotheus) of the Eleazarov (Yelizarov) Monastery, it says that “today's single holy Catholic apostolic eastern church shines more brightly than the sun in all the heavens, like Noah in the ark saved from the flood.”<sup>33</sup> For all of the importance of the Byzantine emperor for Byzantine religious life he had no such messianic role. Christianity and empire existed in Byzantium as connected but independent spheres, so that Orthodoxy could be considered separately from the Orthodox empire.<sup>34</sup> For this reason transferring the status of the Byzantine emperor onto the Russian monarch necessarily led to rethinking its status.

Starting with Vasilii II (the Blind) who ruled during the fall of Constantinople, Russian rulers were more or less consistently called “tsars,” that is, the way in which Byzantine emperors were referred to in Rus' (earlier such usage had merely been occasional).<sup>35</sup> In 1547 Ivan IV (the Terrible) became the crowned head of the kingdom, and the title of tsar, fixed by sacred rite, became an official attribute of the Russian monarch. In the Russian context this title had different connotations than in Byzantium. In Byzantium calling the emperor “basileus” (tsar) referred primarily to the imperial tradition; the Byzantine sovereign acted as legal successor to the Roman emperors. In Russia the title of the monarch referred primarily to the religious tradition, and to the texts in which God was called “tsar”; and in Russia the imperial tradition was not relevant.<sup>36</sup> Thus if in Byzantium the name tsar (basileus) was perceived as describing the office of supreme ruler (which metaphorically could be applied

to God), in Russia the same title was perceived, in essence, as a proper name, as one of the divine names; in these circumstances, calling a person a tsar could take on mystical meaning.

In this context the evidence of Russian grammatical works that described the writing of sacred words using an abbreviation mark (*pod titlom*) is extremely indicative of what was happening. In principle, the same word could be written with a “titlo” above or without one depending on whether it signified a sacred object or not. According to the oldest tradition, the word “tsar” would be written with a “titlo” only if it referred to God: “[The name] of the heavenly King, the creator of all creations visible and invisible is only [to be written] with a titlo, while the earthly tsar, even if he is holy, is to be written syllable by syllable, without a titlo.”<sup>37</sup> In other texts, however, this use of the “titlo” was extrapolated onto the names of pious tsars: “Do write [the name] of the Heavenly King and a holy tsar with a titlo, but [when naming] an unlawful tsar write out all of the syllables without a titlo.”<sup>38</sup> Clearly, such extrapolation presumes incorporating a pious tsar into the religious tradition, transferring the attributes of the Heavenly Tsar onto him. In his travel notes of 1607 Captain Margeret described the Russians’ special perception of the title of tsar. According to him, Russians believe that the word “tsar” was created by God and not by men; accordingly, the tsar’s title sets him apart from all others that lack this divine nature.<sup>39</sup>

Thus having taken the place of the Byzantine basileus, the Russian tsar, in the opinion of his subordinates, as well as his own, acquired special charismatic power. One might presume that this perception developed gradually and was not universal. However, it is very clear that the first Russian tsar, Ivan the Terrible, believed that he himself unconditionally possessed such special charisma. It was precisely this perception that led Ivan to believe that his actions were not liable to human judgment. “For whom do you place as judge or ruler over me?” he asked Prince Kurbskii.<sup>40</sup> The tsar’s acts are not subject to review or in need of justification, just like those of God; to his subordinates the tsar acts as God, and it is only in his relations with God Himself that his human nature manifests itself.

“Why do you not agree to suffer from me, stubborn ruler, and inherit the crown of life?” he asks Kurbskii, demanding from him the same unthinking obedience as that which God demands.<sup>41</sup> Kurbskii on the other hand does not share this view of the tsar’s power. In Ivan’s excesses Kurbskii sees his departure from the ideal of the just tsar and his transformation from a pious monarch into a “torturer.” For Ivan, to the contrary, these excesses may serve as the mark of his charismatic exceptionalism. No canon of charismatic



behavior existed, so that Ivan could interpret his new status as permission for complete license.<sup>42</sup>

This view of the tsar's power sharply contrasts with traditional views as presented in logically consistent form, for example, in Iosif Volotskii's seventh sermon from *The Enlightener*: "If there is a tsar ruling over people and that tsar is ruled by foul passions and sins, greed and anger, craft and falsehood, pride and frenzy, . . . lack of faith and blasphemy, such a tsar is not God's servant, but the devil's, not a tsar but a torturer . . . And you should not obey such a tsar or prince who leads you into dishonor and craftiness, even if he applies torture to you and threatens you with death."<sup>43</sup> Thus, in Joseph's opinion, one should only obey a just tsar, while opposition to an evil one is justified. A subject must decide him or herself whether or not the tsar is just or evil, guided by religious and moral criteria, and alter their behavior accordingly. Kurbskii apparently adheres to these traditional ideas.<sup>44</sup>

Calling the tsar "the righteous sun" (*pravednoe solntse*) which in liturgical texts refers only to Christ testifies to the developing sacralization of the tsar's power.<sup>45</sup> In any case, this label was used for the False Dmitrii; in the Barkulabovskii Chronicle it is said of him: "He is the true indisputable tsar, Dimitrii Ivanovich the righteous sun."<sup>46</sup> According to the testimony of Konrad Bussow, after the False Dmitrii's entrance into Moscow in 1605 the Muscovites fell down before him exclaiming (in his outlandish transcription): "Da Aspoidi, thy Aspodar Sdroby. Gott spare dich Herr gesund . . . Thy brabda solniska. Du biist die rehte Sohne," that is, "Let the Lord give you, sovereign, health. You are the righteous sun!"<sup>47</sup> Later (in 1656) Simeon Polotskii addressed Aleksei Mikhailovich the same way: "We greet thee (*Vitaem tia*) Orthodox tsar, righteous sun."<sup>48</sup>

At the same time we have evidence that this kind of sacralization was not universal. For those for whom this perception of the tsar was alien, the expression "righteous sun" when applied to the tsar or to any mortal individual in general sounded like blasphemy. We may conclude this from a special work that has come down to us in a seventeenth-century copy, apparently composed at that time, the "Opinion (*povest'*)" about the chosen words about the righteous sun and about not heeding divine commandments, since people call each other righteous sun, flattering themselves.<sup>49</sup> Here we read:

In ignorance and thoughtlessness many people apply words of grace to a mortal person in affectionate phrases. I will tell you about such as these, brothers; for people use flattering and affectionate words, and making a request they may say to one another: "righteous sun"! My soul is horrified at this human lack of understanding and my spirit quakes . . . because righteous

sun is god's name. Sinful and mortal people assume God's glory and . . . call each other by Christ's name . . . Understand this, beloved brethren; never call anyone righteous sun, not even the earthly tsar himself, [since] no one of earthly power can be called righteous sun; for this is God's name, not that of perishable man . . . And you, terrestrial rulers, learn from the Lord and serve Him with fear, and accept this teaching about this word and take special care not to call yourself "righteous sun," and do not order simple folk to call you "righteous sun" . . .

It is completely clear that this work opposes the sacralization of the monarch and applying sacred names to him.

Sacralization is also evident in depictions of the tsar which to a great degree recall those of saints. Thus, according to the testimony of Ivan Timofeev, Boris Godunov ordered his picture painted on a fresco with his name inscribed in the same way as saints' were: "He intended to create an adorned image of his likeness on the walls, and [to place] his name together with those of the saints."<sup>50</sup> In an analogous way depictions of Aleksei Mikhailovich were made later that contemporaries would interpret as his claim for holy status. In this connection Patriarch Nikon wrote: "And let us learn not to prescribe Divine glory prophesied by prophets and apostles to ourselves, nor to be painted freely amid the Divine mysteries of the Old and New Testaments, as it was done in the Bible printed in Moscow: the depiction of the tsar on an eagle and on a horse is indeed pride, ascribing to him prophesies prophesied about Christ."<sup>51</sup> Subsequently, a depiction of the reigning monarch could appear on the *panagia* [an image worn around the neck of Orthodox bishops], and here the raising of the tsar to sacred status is indisputable; in 1721 Ekaterina Alekseevna granted such a panagia with a portrait of Peter I (with a Crucifixion on the other side) to Feodosii Ianovskii.<sup>52</sup>

The conception of the tsar's special charismatic power fundamentally altered traditional notions, as the juxtaposition of just and unjust tsar now became that of genuine and false tsar. In this new context "just" may signify not "acting justly" but "correct," where correctness is defined as chosen by God. Thus the true tsar is determined not by behavior but by providence. At the same time the problem arises of distinguishing between true and false tsar, since it is not amenable to rational solution; if true tsars receive their power from God, then evil ones get theirs from the devil. Even the church rite of sacred anointment and crowning cannot confer grace on a false tsar, insofar as these are only visible actions, and in actuality it may be demons that crown and anoint at the bidding of the devil.<sup>53</sup>

Because of this the phenomenon of pretendership (*samozvanstvo*) or imposture also testifies to the sacralization of the tsar and the charismatic

nature of his power. Pretendship appears in Russia when tsars appear, that is, after the establishment and stabilization of tsarist power; it is itself a claim for the sacred status of a tsar. The violation of the natural order of succession gave rise to the appearance of pretenders; in this situation the question naturally arose whether or not the true tsar was sitting on the throne, and thus created an opening for rival claimants to this power. Neither Boris Godunov nor Vasilii Shuiskii, for all the correctness of their ascensions, could be seen as authentic tsars,<sup>54</sup> and they themselves thus turn out to be a kind of pretender (“false tsars,” “seeming tsars,” etc.). The presence of a false tsar on the throne provokes the appearance of more false tsars, as there occurs a kind of competition between claimants, each of whom insists that he is the chosen one. However paradoxical it may be, such a way of thinking is based on the conviction that the only one who can judge who the genuine tsar is is not a person, but God. Pretendship is thus a fully natural and logically justified consequence of the sacralization of the tsar’s power.

**1.2.** And so, with the assumption of the title of tsar, Russian monarchs began to be seen as endowed with special charismatic power. The sacralization of the monarch which we are observing here is far from a unique phenomenon. In particular, it was to some extent characteristic of both Byzantium and Western Europe.<sup>55</sup> However, neither in Byzantium nor in Western Europe was the sacralization of the monarch so directly connected to the problem of authenticity as it was in Russia. Although the character of monarchical charisma could be understood in different ways, charisma itself was ascribed to the status of the monarch, to his functions rather than to his natural qualities.

In Byzantium, ancient notions of the emperor as a god that had become part of the official cult of the Roman Empire were reworked in terms of Christianity. In their Christianized variant, these notions developed into a parallelism between the emperor and god, in the framework of which sacralization could occur, or be preserved. This sacralization did not fundamentally differ from the sacralizing of the clergy, which was based on a similar parallelism, according to which the higher clerics represented a living image (icon) of Christ. Thus, in Byzantium the emperor was perceived as part of the church hierarchy and could be perceived as a man of the church.<sup>56</sup> One could say that in the conditions of “symphony” between church and state as existed in Byzantium the sacralization of the tsar consisted in his participation in priesthood and priestly charisma; possibly, this derived to some extent from traditions of the Roman Empire, where the emperor functioned as *pontifex maximus* in the pagan hierarchy.<sup>57</sup>

In Western Europe, the sacralization of the monarch had other roots. It developed from magical notions about the leader on whom the well-being of the tribe depended. Upon Christianization, these notions transformed into the belief in the personal charismatic power of the king who possessed miraculous powers. The monarch was perceived as source of well-being, and in particular, it was thought that touching him would cure sickness or ensure a good harvest.<sup>58</sup> It is no accident that the canonization of monarchs was more characteristic of Western Europe than Byzantium; one may hypothesize that the most ancient Russian princely canonizations were oriented precisely on Western, first of all Western Slavic, models.

If in Byzantium and Western Europe sacralization of the monarch had definite traditions, in Russia it developed at a relatively late period as a result of the assumption of the title of tsar and rethinking the role of the ruler. The idea of the parallelism of tsar and God was assimilated from Byzantium; this was characteristic of both traditional and newly developed ideas about supreme power. On the other hand, similarity with the West was manifested in the understanding of the monarch's charismatic power as a personal gift. The tsar was seen as partaking in the divine as an individual, which defined his relations both to God and to man.

*2. New Ideas about the Tsar in Connection with Foreign Cultural Influences: The Reconstruction of the Byzantine Model and Assimilation of Baroque Culture*

**2.1.** As we have seen, the sacralization of the monarch in Russia began within the framework of the conception of Moscow as the Third Rome. This conception presumes a separation from external cultural influences almost by definition. And it is true that it arose from a negative attitude toward Greeks, insofar as Moscow became the Third Rome precisely because they were unable to maintain Constantinople as the Second Rome; having concluded an alliance with the Catholics (the Florentine Union), the Greeks betrayed Orthodoxy and were punished by the destruction of the empire. Hence it was natural for Russians to distance themselves from the Byzantine model; what was important was to preserve Orthodox traditions, not Greek cultural models. So if earlier Byzantium had taken on the role of teacher, and Rus' its pupil, now it could be thought that Russia became the teacher. Furthermore, the connection to Byzantium was defined not by cultural orientation but the fact of succession itself. The Russian tsar assumed the place of the Byzantine emperor, but

Russians derived their notions about the tsar's power from their own tradition which was only connected to Byzantium in its origin.

The political and religious ideology that was conditioned by the perception of Moscow as Third Rome may be defined as a theocratic eschatology: Moscow remains the only Orthodox kingdom, so the tsar's mission takes on a messianic character. Russia as the last outpost of Orthodoxy is juxtaposed to the rest of the world, and this conditions the negative attitude toward foreign cultural influences (to the extent that they are perceived as such). The purity of Orthodoxy is confined to the borders of the new Orthodox kingdom, which was alien to the task of universally spreading the faith; cultural isolationism is perceived as a condition for preserving its purity. The Russian state is itself taken to stand for the entire universe in an isomorphic relation and therefore has no need to spread or propagandize its ideas. Conversing with representatives of the Greek Church in 1649, Arsenii Sukhanov argued that:

In Moscow they would even kick out the four patriarchs, just like the pope, if they weren't Orthodox . . . Indeed you Greeks can't do anything without your four patriarchs, because in Tsargrad [Constantinople] there was a pious tsar alone under the sun, and he appointed the four patriarchs and the pope in the first place; and those four patriarchs were in one kingdom under one tsar and the patriarchs gathered in councils at his royal pleasure. But today instead of that tsar there is a pious tsar in Moscow, the single pious tsar in the world—and God has glorified our Christian kingdom. And in this kingdom the sovereign tsar established a patriarch instead of a pope in the ruling city of Moscow . . . and instead of your four patriarchs he established four metropolitans in ruling capacity. So we can carry out God's law without your four patriarchs.<sup>59</sup>

This ideology underwent a basic transformation in the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich. Moscow was confirmed as the Orthodox capital, but at this stage the conception of Moscow as Third Rome acquired not theocratic but political meaning. This presupposed a rejection of cultural isolationism and a return to the idea of a universal Orthodox empire. In consequence, the Byzantine cultural legacy again became relevant. Aleksei Mikhailovich strove in principle for a rebirth of the Byzantine Empire with its center in Moscow as a universal monarchy that would unite all of the Orthodox into a single state. The Russian tsar did not merely need to occupy the place of the Byzantine emperor but also to *become* him. For this new function, traditional Russian notions of kingship were clearly insufficient. The Russian tsar was conceived according to the Byzantine model, and this stimulated its active reconstruction. Russian traditions were seen as provincial and insufficient;

hence there was a new positive attitude toward Greeks, who were seen as carriers of the Byzantine cultural tradition.

The attempt to renew a universal Orthodox kingdom was realized first of all on a semiotic level. The Russian tsar tried to behave like a Byzantine emperor, and because of this Byzantine texts (texts in a broad semiotic sense) took on new life. One may say that they borrowed the text of imperial behavior which was supposed to give Russia new political status. From this point of view it is exceptionally indicative that both Aleksei Mikhailovich as well as his successor Fedor Alekseevich assumed the symbolic attributes of the Constantinopolitan basileus. Aleksei Mikhailovich ordered an orb and diadem from Constantinople to be made “following the image of [those belonging to] the pious Greek Tsar Constantine.”<sup>60</sup> During the coronation of Tsar Fedor Alekseevich, he took communion at the altar according to the priests’ rite, as Byzantine emperors did.<sup>61</sup> In this way the Russian tsar seemed to acquire a definite place in the church hierarchy, as it was with Byzantine emperors (see section I-1.2.1). Since the time of Aleksei Mikhailovich references to the tsar during the church service gradually broadened to include the entire reigning house.<sup>62</sup> Thus the church blessing was not only given to those who bore the burdens of rule but to those who were in one way or another connected to the sacred status of the monarch. It seems possible that in publishing the Law Code (*Ulozhenie*) of 1649 Aleksei Mikhailovich was also acting in the footsteps of the Byzantine emperors. For them lawgiving, including the publication of juridical codes, was one of the most important privileges of the supreme power, insofar as the emperor here acted as the formal source of the law and even, in Justinian’s phrase, “the living law (*odushvevlennyi zakon*).”<sup>63</sup> Lawgiving was a crucial mark of the emperor’s worth, and it was precisely in this capacity that Aleksei Mikhailovich took over the practice.

The borrowing of new texts also presumes the borrowing of the new language in which they are written. Generally speaking, in order to identify Aleksei Mikhailovich as a Byzantine emperor one needs Byzantines who know all of the requisite symbolism. As far as Russia was concerned, one may say with assuredness that there were very few who were familiar with it, and that the majority of people could only read it using the old language.

What sort of message could be garnered from such a reading? As we already know (see section I-1.2.1), in Byzantium the sacralization of the monarch was marked by his connection to the church hierarchy. To Russians this was unfamiliar and could be interpreted as the infringement of the state on the church, as the monarch’s usurpation of ecclesiastical power. This is because in the old cultural language this kind of sacralization was read as blasphemy.

Dressed in Greek robes and according himself the sacred status of a Byzantine emperor, Aleksei Mikhailovich was transformed in traditional Russian consciousness from an Orthodox tsar into Nebuchadnezzar, who compared himself to God, and into Manasseh, who made the church submit to him. This is what Archpriest Avvakum, in particular, wrote about him. He charged the tsar with breaking Orthodox traditions and with a contemptuous attitude toward Russian saints. "Our Russian saints were fools," he spoke, echoing the tsar, "they were illiterate!" Avvakum ascribed Nebuchadnezzar's blasphemous sentiments to him: "I am God! Who is my equal? The Heavenly One, really? He rules in heaven, and I on earth, His equal!" At the same time he compared the tsar to Manasseh, likening his ecclesiastical policies that led to the schism to the forced introduction of paganism, and he saw Aleksei Mikhailovich's behavior as the sacrilegious appropriation of church power: "In whose law does it say the tsar should control the church, change the dogmas, burn holy incense? His proper role is to look after it and protect it from the wolves that are destroying it, not to instruct it in how to keep the faith and how to make the sign of the cross. For this is not the tsar's affair, but that of the Orthodox hierarchs and true pastors . . ."64

Objections to the tsar's usurpation of church prerogatives in the second half of the seventeenth century did not only come from Old Believers. Avvakum's nemesis Patriarch Nikon criticized Aleksei Mikhailovich in similar terms, also charging him with improper claims on church power. From Nikon's point of view, the tsar was aiming at leadership of the church. He stated: "When is the tsar head of the church? Never, and the head of the church is Christ, as the apostle writes. The tsar is not, nor can he be head of the church, but is one of its members, and therefore can do nothing in the church more than the lowest rank of reader."<sup>65</sup> So accusations of this sort came from various opposing parties, and one must admit that Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich actually did give reason for such reproofs, in many ways anticipating Peter I's church policies (see section II-2.1). These new aspects of the tsar's relations with the church merged in the cultural consciousness of the era with the growing sacralization of the monarch.

In the sphere of practical activity the tsar's new relations with the church were expressed predominantly in the establishment of the Monastery Office (*Monastyrskii prikaz*) which was supposed to administer church property and fulfill a series of administrative and judicial functions that were formerly under the jurisdiction of the church. This reform was carried out by the Law Code of 1649 (chapter 13), and elicited a sharply negative response from the clergy.<sup>66</sup> The establishment of the Monastery Office was clearly perceived as

the tsar's infringement on the power that had formerly belonged to the pastors of the church.

A change in the formulas of certificates of ordination (*stavlenye gramoty*) given out upon elevation to the priesthood was also perceived as an infringement on church authority. These now included a declaration that the elevation was carried out "by order of the sovereign tsar." Protesting against this, Patriarch Nikon wrote to the tsar around 1663: "Your hand controls both all episcopal courts and property, and it is terrifying to say much less to endure if [it is true] what we hear, that bishops are installed and archimandrites and abbots are ordained by your order, and that in certificates of ordination you are given equal honor to the Holy Spirit, since it is written that [they are ordained] by the grace of the Holy Spirit and command of the great monarch. [As if] the Holy Spirit wouldn't be able to ordain without your order."<sup>67</sup> Likewise, arguing with the boyar Semen Streshnev, Nikon wrote: "You say, interlocutor, that our most gentle and most fortunate tsar entrusted Nikon with watching over the church's fate; it was not the tsar that entrusted Nikon with watching over the church's fate, but the grace of the Holy Spirit; but the tsar demeans and dishonors the grace of the Holy Spirit, and treats it as powerless, as if without his order this or that archimandrite, abbot or presbyter, cannot be ordained on the basis of the Holy Spirit's grace, but only by the command of the great monarch, as it is written [that one may] bury someone who's been strangled or killed, or [say] a prayer for a child born in sin—all by the monarch's order. The monarch does not respect the high clergy, but dishonors it in a way that is indescribable, [bringing] more dishonor than pagan tsars did."<sup>68</sup> It is clear from these quotes that the change in formulaic conventions was perceived as the tsar's appropriation of the high clergy's authority.

No less characteristic was Nikon's protest against Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's Law Code (*Ulozhenie*), which he similarly perceived as a claim on religious authority.<sup>69</sup> Nikon objects in particular to the formula: "the judgment of the sovereign Tsar and Grand Prince Aleksei Mikhailovich" (chapter 10, article 1). He argued that true judgment belongs to God alone; from this perspective, Aleksei Mikhailovich was misappropriating divine authority.<sup>70</sup> Thus according to Nikon tsarist power was being illegitimately sacralized. We should note that the given formula in the Law Code was traditional for Russian jurisprudence,<sup>71</sup> but in the context of the increasing sacralization of tsarist power it became semiotically significant.

Behind these semiotic changes that Aleksei Mikhailovich was introducing stood a profound transformation of notions about the nature of the tsar's power. If this power had originally been connected with the tsar's piety and



justice (see section I-1.1), and then with his divine election, that is, with his charismatic nature (see section I-1.2), now its relationship to the Byzantine cultural model took precedence. From the point of view of these new notions, Russia's inclusion in the centuries'-old tradition of the Roman and Byzantine empires became fundamentally important. In this tradition the king's charisma took on more or less definite contours. If earlier it had been expressed in certain special powers, bestowed from above and inaccessible to simple mortals, now it was manifested in a definite norm of behavior; a certain canon of charismatic behavior replaces fortuitous charisma. In this canon the most semiotically significant are the relations between church and state; the tsar's new prerogatives in this area manifest his sacral status.

Understandably, older conceptions of the tsar's power continued to live on in the cultural consciousness of Russian society; they could interact variously with the orientation on Byzantine cultural models. At the same time these models themselves could be interpreted differently. All of this created the basis for new cultural conflicts. One should keep in mind that in Byzantium itself relations with the emperor were not without ambiguity;<sup>72</sup> thus the Byzantine theory of a symphony between church and state could be understood very differently in Russia. We may presume that the conflict between Aleksei Mikhailovich and Patriarch Nikon was based on opposing interpretations of the very same Byzantine ideas.<sup>73</sup> It is no less indicative that Patriarch Nikon, who apparently considered that Aleksei Mikhailovich's behavior deviated from the correct Byzantine model, condemned him in very traditional Russian terms, describing him as an unjust tsar.<sup>74</sup>

Aleksei Mikhailovich's early cultural reforms were defined by Byzantinization. Borrowed forms were torn from their original context in which their meaning had been defined by historically established interpretations. Transferred into a new cultural context, they took on new life, which could only have had indirect connection to their previous existence. Furthermore, new signs could also create new content; torn from their traditional signification they take on a meaning-generating function. This gives them stability and independence from passing cultural trends (e.g., fashion). This is exactly what happened in the case of Byzantinization. It might seem that in the Petrine era, a time of intensive westernization, it would have ceased, the more so since Peter's negative attitude toward Byzantium is well known.<sup>75</sup> However, this is not what happened. Byzantinization was not only compatible with Europeanization, but as concerns the sacralization of the tsar's power, it combined with Europeanization, forming a single whole. This combination had its origins in the pre-Petrine epoch.

2.2. Thus under Aleksei Mikhailovich a Byzantinizing of Russian culture took place. This process, generally speaking, was internal, insofar as Byzantium as such had not existed for a long time. The issue had to do with reconstructing the Byzantine tradition, and this led to a search for those who had preserved it (as opposed to those in Moscow who had repudiated it after the Union of Florence). This is why Greeks and Ruthenians who had preserved the connection with the Greek church became so important at this time. If at one time a part of the Russian church had rejected subordination to Constantinople, connecting preservation of the Orthodox tradition with its autocephaly, now attention turned to those in the church who had preserved that connection. The Ruthenian tradition thus played a key role in the combination of Byzantinization and Europeanization discussed above.

Indeed the Ruthenian cultural tradition simultaneously connected Muscovite Rus` with Constantinople (southwestern Rus` came under the jurisdiction of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate) and with Western Europe (southwestern Rus` was part of the Polish kingdom). Together with Greek cultural traditions came panegyric texts modeled on the Latino-Polish Baroque. Independent of origin, Greek or Western, the imported texts were inscribed into the Great Russian cultural tradition and here subjected to reinterpretation. The mechanisms of this reinterpretation were uniform and revolved around the same cultural disputes: if, for traditional consciousness, things both Byzantine and Western could be taken as new and blasphemous,<sup>76</sup> in the reformist, Kulturträger perception they both appeared as the means to transform Russia and to aid Russia's assimilation of universal cultural values. In relation to the monarch, both of these external traditions combined organically to create a certain resonance that led to the ever increasing sacralization of the tsar's power.

As a result, Byzantine and Western influence led to the creation of a new culture that contained features of both traditions. This new culture was juxtaposed to the traditional first of all in its attitude toward the sign and the ways of interpreting the new texts. Starting with the era of Aleksei Mikhailovich, semiotic behavior (and, in particular, linguistic activity) ceased to be homogeneous in Russia. Two attitudes toward the sign came into conflict: on the one hand, the sign as a convention, which was characteristic of southwest Russian learning (and which ultimately derived from Latino-Polish Baroque culture), that is, one which was based on Western sources of the new culture; and on the other, a view of the sign as non-conventional, characteristic of the Great Russian tradition.<sup>77</sup> Thus the very same texts could function in two keys, and what for some could represent a conventional figure

of speech for others could suggest sacrilege. This conflict became more serious with time and became especially obvious in the Petrine period. When, for example, Feofan Prokopovich greeted Peter who had unexpectedly dropped in on one of his little nocturnal feasts with the words of the troparion “Behold the Bridegroom cometh at midnight!”,<sup>78</sup> for some this was nothing more than a metaphorical image while for others it sounded like blasphemy.

Metaphorical usage is but one particular aspect of the Baroque attitude to the word; characteristic of the Baroque was not only play with words but play with meanings. In particular, in Baroque culture quotations are primarily used for ornamentation, and consequently the goal of a citation was by no means to be faithful to the main idea of the words; on the contrary, putting a quotation in an unexpected context to create a new resonance, a play with alien speech, was one of its most sophisticated rhetorical devices. Thus a Baroque author could seem externally similar to a medieval bookman or theologian but profoundly different in terms of his basic attitude to language.

A striking example of this attitude is from Prokopovich’s treatise “On the Tsar’s Power and Honor” (1718). In laying out his theory of tsarist power, Feofan writes:

Let us also add to this teaching, like a crown, names or titles appropriate to high power, names that are not vain, as they are given by God Himself, which are the best adornment of kings, better than porphyry and diadems, better than all the most magnificent external paraphernalia and its glory, that all together demonstrate that such power comes from God Himself. What titles? What names? They call them God and Christ. The words of the Psalm are splendid: *I said, “You are ‘gods;’ you are all sons of the Most High;”*<sup>79</sup> for this is addressed to rulers. The Apostle Paul is in agreement with this: *Indeed there are many “gods” and many “lords.”*<sup>80</sup> But even before both of these Moses referred to rulers the same way: *Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people.*<sup>81</sup> But what is the reason for such lofty names? The Lord Himself says in John the Evangelist that people to whom the word of God came are called gods.<sup>82</sup> What other word should be used? Was it not given by God as an admonition to them to uphold justice, as we read in the Psalm we cited? For the power given by God they are called gods, that is, God’s deputies on earth. And Theodoret<sup>83</sup> says this well: *Since there is God the true judge, judgment is also entrusted to man; therefore they are called gods because in this they imitate God.*<sup>84</sup>

On the one hand, Feofan’s reasoning is a typical example of a Baroque play on meanings, and on the other, it makes a clear political argument. The texts he cites do not make the point he derives from them, and Feofan of course was perfectly aware of this. Thus in the citation from the Epistle to the

Corinthians “gods” does not refer to rulers but to pagan idols, and hence cannot serve as exegesis of Psalm 81. Just as baseless is the reference to Theodoret’s commentary, which was part of the Explanatory Psalter (Tolkovyǐ psaltyr’). According to Theodoret, the name “gods” is given to rulers and judges as a sign of their responsibility before God and not as a title meant to glorify them. This kind of free use of quotes was fully appropriate in the framework of Baroque culture and also consistently served the political aims of the given treatise; Baroque rhetoric was used as an instrument to sacralize the monarch. It apparently did not bother Feofan that his readers and listeners who were familiar with the New Testament and the Explanatory Psalter could not help but understand the quoted texts in quite a different way. This polemical challenge was also part of the Baroque play of meanings, although Baroque culture itself did not necessarily presume an opposition (as in the current case) between the “enlightened” adherents of Petrine ideology and the “ignorant masses” that held to traditional notions.

It is completely understandable that the traditional audience perceived reasoning like this in the context of its habitual language rather than via that which was being imposed on it, that is, it saw here a direct identification of the tsar with God, which it could only regard as sacrilege.<sup>85</sup> In the polemical Old Believer treatise “A Collection from Holy Writ About the Antichrist” it says of Peter: “And this false-Christ began to exalt himself beyond all so-called gods, that is, the anointed.”<sup>86</sup> It is not difficult to take this as a response to Feofan Prokopovich’s words quoted above, when Feofan calls Peter (as the anointed one) god and Christ, which the Old Believers took to be the realization of the prophesy that the antichrist would be revealed as one who will “exalt himself over everything that is called God or is worshiped, so that he sets himself up in God’s temple, proclaiming himself to be God.”<sup>87</sup>

We find another example of this sort of response to Baroque texts of an analogous political tendency in the anonymous Old Believer *Testimony of a Spiritual Son to a Spiritual Father* (1676) in which the death of Aleksei Mikhailovich is reported: “They did not expect this death, [as] their very own published books [called] him immortal. They have a new book—‘Nikon’s Sabre,’ which they call ‘The Spiritual Sword,’ by the Chernigov Bishop Baranovich. And in the preface of the book there is a picture of the tsar, and tsaritsa, and all their offspring, cunningly done, in a picture. And right there they exalt him criminally, poor ones, saying ‘You, sovereign tsar, reign here as long as the sun is in its orbit, and in the world to come reign without end.’”<sup>88</sup> The reference is to the book by the Bishop of Chernigov Lazar Baranovich, “The Spiritual Sword”; on the second page of the preface is an engraving of Aleksei Mikhailovich and

his family. The Old Believer's objection is evidently to Baranovich's words: "There is no end to the Kingdom and its tsar, indeed the Kingdom of Your Serene Majesty abides forever."<sup>89</sup>

Thus two traditions, the southwestern and Great Russian, clashed, but it is important that the collision took place on Great Russian soil. This created the potential for, one might say, the realization of the metaphor, that is, any Baroque image could begin to be perceived not as a convention but literally. Therefore the comparison of God and tsar could be interpreted in a direct and non-figurative sense, and not be dismissed as mere rhetoric. Two kinds of facts testify to this. On the one hand, there is the response to this practice as blasphemous, implying that the tsar's power was that of the antichrist (as in the examples cited above);<sup>90</sup> on the other there is the evidence of religious adoration of the monarch, about which we will speak below. Here we should also note that both of these perceptions were grounded in the same world-view.

## II. THE SACRALIZATION OF THE MONARCH AS A SEMIOTIC PROCESS

### 1. *Semiotic Attributes of the Monarch: Tsar and God*

1.1. The orientation on foreign cultural traditions had a clearly expressed semiotic character. In the process of borrowing, borrowed forms themselves take on a new function: namely, they indicate a connection with the corresponding cultural tradition. A German wearing a cloak means nothing, while a German cloak on a Russian is transformed into a symbol of adherence to European culture. In the sphere under investigation this sort of process acquires special significance. This is the case with a whole series of phenomena, in particular, with the various ways of naming and addressing the monarch. The Russian monarch could be addressed in the same way as a Byzantine basileus or as a European emperor. The primary function of these new denominations was to symbolize a corresponding cultural and political orientation, that is, to testify to the new status of the Russian monarch. In the cases when these titles were connected to the semantics of holiness, in the Russian cultural context they could be taken literally. This literalism could have two results: if taken in the positive sense, it could lead to the sacralization of the monarch's power, if in the negative, to the rejection of the entire state system, insofar as attributing sacred attributes to the tsar could be perceived as blasphemy. Naturally, this

latter attitude could be seen as disloyalty and be persecuted by the state. Moreover, apologists for state power insisted on the appropriateness of sacral attributes, which made the external marks of sacralization a matter of state policy. Thus sacralization of the tsar turned into a state cult. As a result of this development, the history of these external attributes of the tsar's power was directly connected to the struggle between church and state and to associated ideological controversies. Hence the disputes that arose from these conflicts are especially significant, insofar as they expose the different types of semiosis that set the two opposing sides apart.

In the following section, we will examine the various attributes of the tsar's power that were connected in one way or another with the semantics of holiness, focusing particularly on linguistic behavior as most revealing in this respect. Our discussion naturally falls into two parts. First we will look at those attributes which are directly related to the tsar's personal charisma and then at those attributes of sacralization which depend on his perception as head of the church.

1.2. We will begin by analyzing the history of calling the tsar "holy." This epithet (*sviatoi*, ἅγιος) was part of the title of Byzantine emperors. This fact was more or less known in Russia, as evidenced both by the fact that this epithet was applied to Byzantine emperors in documents from Constantinopolitan patriarchs to Russian grand princes and metropolitans, and by fact that Russian grand princes and metropolitans themselves used the phrase in relation to the Byzantine emperor.<sup>91</sup> At the same time, neither before nor after the fall of Constantinople was this epithet used for Russian tsars and grand princes, neither by Russian tsars and grand princes themselves nor by Russian metropolitans and patriarchs.<sup>92</sup> On the other hand, after the fall of the Byzantine monarchy Greek hierarchs began to address Muscovite tsars and grand princes as "holy."<sup>93</sup> Addressing the Russian tsar in this way was characteristic not only for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but also for the eighteenth.<sup>94</sup> In particular, we may note that in the letters of the Eastern patriarchs of 1723 recognizing the establishment of Synodal administration, it says that the Synod was founded "by the holy Tsar of all Moskovia, Little and White Russia and ruler of all northern countries, Sovereign Peter Alekseevich, Emperor, beloved in the Holy Spirit and our most adored brother."<sup>95</sup>

The Greek hierarchs' form of address, however, did not influence Russians' usage until a particular moment. In this connection, it is quite characteristic that the epithet "holy," introduced into the tsar's titles by Patriarch Jeremiah

in the Greek ordination rite for the first Russian patriarch, was omitted in the Russian adaptation of this rite used to ordain Patriarch Job.<sup>96</sup>

Under Aleksei Mikhailovich the monarch began to be called holy during the church service, which quickly provoked protest on the part of the Old Believer party. Archpriest Avvakum wrote indignantly: “Nowadays they [the Nikonians] do everything backwards (*vse nakos` da popereg*); go and call a living person holy to his face . . . In the commemoration of the dead it is printed: ‘we will pray for the holy sovereign lord tsar.’ How unfortunate for a man! But in the Paterikon (*Otechnik*) it is written: when, it says, you praise a person to his face, you give him over to Satan with a word. It is unheard of at any time that someone order himself to be called holy to his face, apart perhaps from Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon!”<sup>97</sup>

In the following period this usage spread. Thus in his testament Patriarch Ioakim wishes Tsars Ioann and Petr Alekseevich “to live in purity, in abstinence and in holiness, as befits holy anointed ones [or: “anointed saints,” *pomazannikam sviatym*].”<sup>98</sup> Stefan Iavorskii speaks in 1703 of tsars as of “a holy clan of God’s anointed.”<sup>99</sup> A. A. Vinius characteristically addresses Peter I in a letter of March 9, 1709 in the following way: “I pray the Lord and Almighty God to preserve your holy person in health.”<sup>100</sup> In the first version of V. P. Petrov’s ode “On the Composition of a New Law Code” (1767) appear these lines:

*Great [was] the Lord in Peter the Great,  
Great he was in Elizabeth,  
[And] in Your holy Catherine,  
In the miracles She performed!*<sup>101</sup>

Subsequently, the epithet “holy” could be applied to anything relating to the tsar. Thus in 1801 Metropolitan Platon (Levshin) spoke of the “holy blood” of Empress Maria Fedorovna that flowed in Emperor Alexander’s veins,<sup>102</sup> and in the 1810s Archbishop Avgustin (Vinogradskii), administrator of the Moscow diocese, refers to the “holy will” and “holy prayers” of the tsar.<sup>103</sup>

Notably, a phrase with the epithet “holy” (“*Gospodi sviatyi, bogovenchannyi tsariu*” [Holy Lord tsar, crowned by God]) was removed from the coronation rite for Tsar Fedor Alekseevich.<sup>104</sup> This phrase had been included in the coronation rite of Fedor Ioannovich, Mikhail Fedorovich, and Aleksei Mikhailovich.<sup>105</sup> In this context “holy” evidently signified the same thing as the final exclamation (*vozglas*) of the liturgical rite, “Holy of holies.”<sup>106</sup> This refers to the holiness that is required of every believer in order to take the Eucharist. Just as believers who are preparing for communion are called “holy,” insofar as

they have been purified by confession and repentance, so too is the tsar when he takes communion as part of the coronation ritual. The elimination of the epithet was due to a change in the word's meaning. It was precisely because the tsar began to be called "holy" independent of context that it came to be connected with the special status of the tsar as the anointed one, so that its use before his consecration seemed improper. Thus the removal of the epithet from the coronation ritual by no means contradicted the general tendency to sacralize the monarch, but on the contrary, represented one of its special manifestations.

**1.2.1.** As we see, the tendency toward sacralization of the monarch was manifested not only in using sacred signs but also in their elimination. This was conditioned by the fact that the development of this sacralization caused certain elements of traditional practice to be associated with the cult of the tsar that had had no such associations before. Traditional practice itself could only exist insofar as this kind of association was impossible. Its new semiotic significance becomes an indicator of the changed attitude toward the tsar. Thus Fedor Alekseevich forbade comparison of himself with God in petitions to him. In an imperial ukase of June 8, 1680, it says that "In your petitions you write that he, the Great Lord, should *deign to be merciful, like God*, but writing this word in petitions is improper, and you should write of your affairs in petitions [rather, for example] *for the sake of the upcoming holiday and for the Sovereign's continuing health*."<sup>107</sup> We should keep in mind that the forbidden form of petition had existed long before Fedor Alekseevich (at least, already in the sixteenth century), but clearly had not been connected to the sacralization of the monarch, but rather indicated his duty to rule justly, like God, and to his responsibility before God. Doing away with the form was definitely connected to a change in this conception. In this case, under Fedor Alekseevich, the comparison of the tsar as a person (not as a ruler) to God was seen as too direct and could at this time still seem inappropriate. We see a very analogous train of thought a century and a half later in 1832 when an imperial directive was issued to remove portraits of the tsar and representatives of the ruling family from churches.<sup>108</sup> Apparently this directive was due to the fact that these portraits could be taken to be icons.<sup>109</sup> The very fear that such a misunderstanding might occur indicates the sacralized status of the monarch.

**1.3.** From these examples it may already be clear that calling the tsar "holy" was in a certain definite way connected to calling him the anointed one. Indeed, from the time of Aleksei Mikhailovich, the moment of anointing or



consecration took on extreme importance for the perception of the monarch in Russia.<sup>110</sup> And it is characteristic that at least from the start of the eighteenth century the monarch could be called not only “the anointed one,” but also “Christ.” The word Christ in the meaning of “the anointed” is an obvious Grecicism,<sup>111</sup> and in this sense we may speak of the convergence of the Greek and Russian traditions. In the epistle of the Eastern Patriarchs to Aleksei Mikhailovich of 1663, loyalty to the tsar was presented as a requirement of the faith, in view of the fact that the tsar was named Christ (χριστός, that is, the anointed); hence it was impossible to be a Christian if one was not a loyal citizen. “Just as God’s power in the heavens embraces everything, so too the tsar’s power extends to all of his subjects. And just as an apostate from the faith is separated from the bosom of the Orthodox, so too those unfaithful to the tsar’s authority are unworthy to be called Christian (ανάξιος ἡμῖν δοκᾶ από χριστοῦ κεκληθῆσθαι καὶ δνομάζεσθαι), for the tsar is God’s anointed one (χριστός), with a scepter, and orb, and diadem from God.”<sup>112</sup> Here it is quite clear how the Byzantinization of Russian culture proceeded in the matter under consideration.

Nevertheless, the use of the word “Christ” together with the older and more usual term “anointed” (*pomazannik*) fundamentally distinguishes the Russian situation from the Greek and lends the title of tsar as “Christ” a special connotation. Although in the sermon “On the Tsar’s Power and Honor” (1718) Feofan Prokopovich defends the legitimacy of such usage, referring to the etymological meaning of Christ as “anointed,”<sup>113</sup> it is clear that he had in mind not merely etymology alone, but also the tsar’s immediate likeness to Christ.<sup>114</sup> Evidence of this is the writing of the word “Christ” with a capital letter and also using a diacritic (*titlo*), as was done with sacred names. It should be stressed that in his justification for calling the tsar “Christ” Feofan not only bases himself on the etymology of the word, but sees the etymology itself as a manifestation of the objective connection between God the Word and the tsar; according to Feofan, being anointed was assimilated to Christ’s nature from the beginning, and so “such a miraculous ceremony” is carried out “so as to create one great and glorious anointment with the Savior.”<sup>115</sup> This juxtaposition of the tsar with Christ, going beyond mere etymology, appears quite unambiguously in texts dedicated to the victory of Poltava. Peter is called Christ, Mazepa is labeled Judas, and Peter’s companions—apostles. Thus in the “Service of Gratitude . . . for the Great God-Given Victory . . . at Poltava,” written in 1709 on Peter’s order by Feofilakt Lopatinskii, and personally edited by the tsar himself,<sup>116</sup> it says (in the sedalen [kathisma] of the seventh voice of the morning service): “A second Judas appeared, a slave

and flatterer, an irredeemable son appeared, a devil by nature and not a man, thrice an apostate, Mazepa, who abandoned the Lord Christ, his lord and benefactor, and attached himself to the evil one.”<sup>117</sup> At the same time, it says here of Peter’s fallen soldiers: “let them be honored as apostles, not yielding to Mazepa the second Judas, but giving their souls for their sovereign.”<sup>118</sup> Correspondingly, in his “Laudatory Sermon on the Battle of Poltava” of 1717, Feofan Prokopovich bases his references to Mazepa as Judas precisely on the fact that Peter is “Christ”: “O unexpected enemy! O pariah to your own mother! O new Judas! And no one should imagine that to call a traitor Judas is excessive indignation . . . The lawfully reigning monarch . . . is Christ the Lord . . . hence it is fitting to call Christ’s betrayer Judas.”<sup>119</sup>

Nonetheless, calling the tsar “Christ” was not limited to merely etymological considerations, but testifies to the fact of their basic proximity in the consciousness of that time. This is clear, in particular, from calling the monarch “Savior” (*Spas*). Thus in his sermon on Peter’s birthday of May 30, 1709, Stefan Iavorskii said: “And about our monarch, what will I proclaim? I bring you great joy, for your Savior is born. Born for you, and not for himself. And what salvation is this? For our eyes have seen his salvation. Oh, great is the salvation of our earthly Savior—our fatherland unjustly stolen and for many years groaning to be free of the enemy yoke, our forefathers’ subjects, like Israelites, truly in Egyptian bondage, to return again to their original state, to purify the province of Livonia and the Izhorian land of infidels.”<sup>120</sup> The phrase “For our eyes have seen his salvation” is a paraphrase of Simeon’s words addressed to Christ,<sup>121</sup> while the line “I bring you great joy, for your Savior is born” comes from Archangel Gabriel’s speech to Mary.<sup>122</sup> Calling the tsar “Savior” (*Spas*) was evidently secondary in relation to calling him “Christ.” The example clearly demonstrates that the etymological arguments cited to justify naming the monarch “Christ” were only a pretext for making a real association between tsar and Savior. Of course, this kind of title was perceived as blasphemy by the traditional Russian cultural consciousness. In this perspective, the etymological arguments were insignificant and rejected as irrelevant on principle, while the attempt to make the real association was the key issue. This kind of reaction is completely apparent in a whole series of Old Believer works. Thus in the “Epistle Against Reverence to the Tsar’s Two-Headed Eagle and to the Four-Pointed Cross” (1789) the Russian tsar is compared to impious pagan kings who tortured Christians, and moreover, it is emphasized that unlike the Russian tsar, “these impious tsars did not openly call themselves Christ.” From this it is concluded that the Russian monarch was not simply impious (according to the traditional theory of “righteous” and “impious” tsars) but a tsar-antichrist.<sup>123</sup> In another

early nineteenth-century Old Believer work by Iakov Petrov of the Fedoseev sect that argued the impossibility of prayers for Nikonian monarchs, we read: “O God, preserve us from such darkening of the mind and absolute insanity, and clear deviation of praying to God for the antichrist. Reader, beware, lest we call on the name of the beast in daily prayer in the divine books instead of pious tsars. For he calls himself tsar, and god, and savior. This is absolute apostasy.”<sup>124</sup> The mention of the tsar calling himself “god and savior” clearly refers to labeling the tsar “Christ,” which is perceived as evidence of the tsar’s nature as antichrist. In precisely the same way, in the Old Believer (Begunskii sect) work entitled “Epistle of Christians on the Notebooks Sent from Pomoria,” the emperor (Peter I is the concrete one in mind) is characterized as “Satan’s anointed, Jewish tsar, exalted above all other so-called gods and idols, a false Christ, dog from hell, two-headed snake, misappropriating for himself church and state power.”<sup>125</sup> The expressions “false Christ” and “Satan’s anointed” indubitably refer to the tradition we are examining of calling the tsar “Christ.” In this context the reference to the tsar as “anointed” could also give offense when seen as suggesting the affinity with Christ.<sup>126</sup>

**1.3.1.** The tradition of calling the tsar “Christ” began to emerge in Great Russia at the very beginning of the eighteenth century. Characteristically, we first hear this label from an emigrant from south-western Russia, namely, Dimitrii Rostovskii, in his speech greeting Peter I of March, 1701.<sup>127</sup> “Even before we receive the opportunity to see Christ, the Heavenly Lord God, in the future age, and to delight in the sight of his most bright face; now in this age we are honored to see the most bright face of the Lord’s Christ, Anointed of God, the earthly tsar, the Christian Orthodox Monarch, Your Most Bright Tsarist Majesty, and be filled with joy.”<sup>128</sup> This tradition clearly took root in Great Russia and very soon after this we encounter this epithet not only in rhetorical works but also in letters to the tsar.<sup>129</sup> We may also note several precedents in Stefan Iavorskii. Thus in his “Sermon on the Victory over the Swedish King near Poltava in 1709” he exclaimed: “The victor Christ conquered the tribe of Judas through Christ our tsar.”<sup>130</sup> And in the “Sermon of Thanksgiving on the Taking of the Swedish City Called Vyborg in 1710” he said: “. . . But the sun of the most holy Virgin and her son, Christ the Savior, began to shine and send rays of grace to Peter our Christ, strengthening him and defeating the Lion, the Swedish king, who could only find refuge in Turkey and not in his own place of rest.”<sup>131</sup> In the “Sermon for the Week of Pentecost” we read: “O dove, Paraclete, who sends grace unto Christ your David, always show the same protective mercy for our Christ, your anointed one.”<sup>132</sup>

It is understandable that such usage was especially characteristic of Feofan Prokopovich, who as we have seen, repeatedly defended the appropriateness of this epithet in the sermon “On the Tsar’s Power and Honor” (1718),<sup>133</sup> the “Investigation of the Pontifex” (1721),<sup>134</sup> and in the speech on Catherine I’s coronation day (1726).<sup>135</sup> Examples are numerous;<sup>136</sup> worthy of special attention is that this expression also figures in the “Spiritual Regulation,” the juridicial act written by Prokopovich that remained in force over the church until 1917. Here we find that “perfidious people . . . do not hesitate to raise their hands against the Lord Christ.”<sup>137</sup>

In this same period calling the tsar “Christ” also made its way into liturgical texts. We already cited such usage in the “Service of Thanksgiving for the Victory near Poltava,” and we find here a whole series of similar examples. Thus in the sedalen (kathisma) of the fourth voice (*glas*) we read: “Lord send down strength to help us . . . and confuse them [our enemies]; bring your grace on Peter your Christ.”<sup>138</sup> Characteristically, Old Believers considered this usage in liturgical books blasphemous. Ivan Pavlov wrote about the sedalen of the fourth mode from the service on the Poltava victory that “they called him [Peter] in print not only the antichrist, but Christ.”<sup>139</sup>

In the following years of the eighteenth century the epithet we are examining occurred more rarely, insofar as the place of the anointed emperor was mostly occupied by empresses, whom calling “Christ” was somewhat awkward. However, not all writers considered this so. Thus the Tambov priest Ivanov called Catherine II “Christ” in a speech on her coronation day in 1786: “How humble, how far-seeing and how generous, is this, the one anointed and crowned today for the Russian kingdom, the Lord’s Christ!”<sup>140</sup> At the same time, for lack of an emperor the heir to the throne could be called “Christ.” Thus the court teacher, hieromonk Simon Todorskii (later Archbishop of Pskov) in his sermon on the birthday of Grand Prince Petr Fedorovich in 1743 said that “Christ, that is, the anointed to the Russian throne, comes from no other tribe but that of the seed of the Russian David, Peter the First.”<sup>141</sup>

With Paul I’s ascension this awkwardness disappeared and the tradition we are examining was renewed. Thus in the ode “The Triumphal Coronation and Consecration to the Kingdom of His Imperial Majesty Paul the First on April 5, 1797,” V. P. Petrov spoke of Paul: “Do not touch him! He is the Lord’s Christ!”<sup>142</sup> The reign of Alexander I offers abundant similar material. In the classic sermon of the Moscow Metropolitan Platon (Levshin) at Alexander I’s coronation, it says: “Thus, seeing [Russia] everywhere protected and strengthened, we rejoice in You, Great Sovereign, and exult, and hail you, and thank the Lord, for He came and brought salvation to his people, and raised high the horn of his Christ.”<sup>143</sup>

Platon also calls Alexander I “Christ” in other places.<sup>144</sup> Platon’s successor to the Moscow archbishop’s pulpit, Avgustin (Vinogradskii) refers to Alexander I as “Christ” extraordinarily often. Thus in the “Sermon on the Occasion of the Taking of the French Capital by Allied Russian Troops,” delivered on April 23, 1814, Avgustin exclaimed: “But what can we say about You, Comfort of Humanity, Savior of Europe, Glory of Russia? What can we say about You, the Lord’s Christ, God’s Friend, Desired Man! We can say nothing.”<sup>145</sup> One could cite many such passages.<sup>146</sup> The well-known Kievan preacher, Archpriest Ioann Levanda, greeted Alexander in 1801 with the words: “Our eyes wanted to see an Angel, to see their Christ, God, who has mercy on us: they now see all this in you.”<sup>147</sup>

Notably, when Levanda’s sermons were reprinted in 1850 the spiritual censors eliminated this form of address as “deviating from the truth and approaching flattery.”<sup>148</sup> Thus calling the tsar “Christ” could still seem inappropriate, as opposed to calling him “the anointed.” We meet the same response in Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov). In 1863 he sent the Synod a report about the book *Service to the Most Holy Mother of God Called Ease My Sorrow* (1862). Metropolitan Filaret’s attention was drawn to a prayer to the God Mother in an appendix in which it says: “Strengthen unseen our true tsars, who have been honored with the awe-inspiring name of Your Only-Begotten Son . . . against the enemies who surround them.” Filaret clearly associated these words with the tradition of calling the tsar “Christ” and wrote that “the *Only-Begotten Son* of the God Mother, who is also the Only-Begotten Son of God, is our Lord Jesus Christ alone, and no created being may be *honored with the awe-inspiring name of the Only-Begotten Son* of God the Father and the *Only-Begotten Son* of the God Mother. If the author of the prayer wanted to suggest the designation *Anointed of God*, he prevented such a meaning by using the expression *honored with the awe-inspiring name*. *Awe-inspiring* (*strashnyi*) rightly refers to God and the God Son, but the words *awe-inspiring name* are inappropriate in reference to someone anointed, which David does not even dare attribute to Saul.”<sup>149</sup> It is clear from this that Filaret wanted to exclude any association between calling the tsar “Christ” with Jesus Christ, and to reject the very tradition of using this term of reference.

This is all the more indicative of the fact that this tradition did not disappear even at the end of the nineteenth century. Thus in the “Sermon on the Day of Coronation and Most Holy Consecration of His Majesty the Most Pious Sovereign Emperor Alexander Nikolaevich, All-Russian Autocrat,” delivered by Archpriest of the Samara cathedral Ioann Khalkolivanov on August 26, 1871, after an unsuccessful attempt on the tsar’s life, it says: “In

the greatest days of Christ's passion, when true Christians grieved over their sins, this new Judas was planning evil against the anointed of God, the Lord Christ, and on the day of Christ's glorious resurrection, when everyone was rejoicing in the resurrected Savior, he rushed to bring death to our tsar, immortal in His glorious acts, our hope and joy!"<sup>150</sup>

Thus the given tradition applied to the entire Synodal period.<sup>151</sup> This was the natural result of the fact that the principle of sacralization of the monarch was part of the very basis for Synodal administration, and no particular limitations (like censors' restrictions) could diminish the influence either of the principle or of the texts that embodied it, which preserved their productive power, and which Synodal authority could not repudiate without harm to itself.

**1.4.** Calling the tsar "earthly god" is another example of Byzantine traditions that were echoed in the new period of Russian history. Similar to calling God the "Heavenly Tsar," the tsar could be referred to as "god on earth." The former designation occurs in liturgical texts (for example, in the prayer "Heavenly Tsar"), while the latter was an everyday commonplace. We know that this designation was possible in Byzantium. In the eleventh century "Advice and Tales of Kekaumenos [Cecaumenus]" in addressing the king it says: "My holy commander, God raised you to the kingly throne and by his mercy (αὐτο) made you, as they say, an earthly god, able to behave and act according to your desire. Therefore may your behavior and acts be filled with reason and truth, and may righteousness abide in your heart."<sup>152</sup> As is apparent, calling the king "earthly god" was usual linguistic practice in Byzantium of that time.<sup>153</sup>

This description of the tsar was also used in Russia, although we can't trace its source to Byzantium. At first it was found among foreigners, and in many cases one can't say for sure whether the phrase was used by Russians or comes from the foreign author himself. Thus in his pamphlet about Ivan the Terrible (1585) Paul Oderborn noted that for his subjects the tsar was both pope and earthly god: "Bey seinem Leben hielyen in sein Unterthanen nicht allein für einem irrdischen Gott, sondern auch für iren Kayser und Papst."<sup>154</sup> Isaac Massa, writing in 1612, remarked apropos of the Russian subjugation of Siberia that "with the help of several locals who had learned Russian from Russian peasants in their villages the Muscovites told the savages about their tsar, asserting that he was almost an earthly god [*dezelve by na eenen aertschen god te zijn*]."<sup>155</sup> In his "Politics" (1663-1666), Iurii Krizhanich compared the Russian tsar with "some God on earth" and calls him an "earthly god," referring to Psalm 81 (82): "Earthly god. The king is like some kind of god on earth. 'I said, You are

gods and all sons of the Most High' (Psalm 81)."<sup>156</sup> A letter from Patriarch Nikon to Aleksei Mikhailovich (apparently from 1663) also testifies to the use of the label. Addressing the tsar, Nikon says: "Woe to those who after death will be thrust into gehenna, who should fear, for those who today are exalted in this world and who are prideful, as if they were immortal and gods, are praised by the foolish, listening with pleasure to senseless words like 'you are an earthly god.' Holy Writ however teaches us that our God created everything in the heavens and on earth that He desired. Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, enjoyed this kind of foolish phrase, and lost his kingdom."<sup>157</sup>

As we see, the expression "earthly god" was known in Russia. However, evidence concerning its use derives from peripheral sources and are absent in the Russian manuscript tradition. On the other hand, it widely entered into Russian literature from the mid-eighteenth century. This could be explained by the fact that it had previously existed outside of the manuscript tradition, evidently as something specifically secular; subsequently, as Russian culture became more secularized, it became part of literature (of cultural texts). Simultaneously, by strength of the growing sacralization of the monarch, the phrase became a permanent part of the cult of the emperor. It took on an almost official character whose new significance was expressed with maximal clarity by E. V. Barsov who wrote in the introduction to his edition of the coronation ritual: "The supreme power, so exalted by the Church, is considered 'holy' before the face of the people and the tsar's ideal image is elevated to the significance of 'earthly god' in the people's consciousness."<sup>158</sup>

In the eighteenth century, one of the earliest examples of the use of this phrase is in a letter from Stefan Iavorskii to Peter I of April 14, 1714: "More than the forgiveness of guilt, what kind of virtue can there be that is more worthy of your tsarist preeminence? For in this way you, earthly gods, resemble the heavenly God Himself."<sup>159</sup> In a story by A. K. Nartov about Peter I it says: "We who had the good fortune to be close to this monarch will die faithful to him, and our burning love for this earthly god will only be buried with ourselves."<sup>160</sup> From the mid-eighteenth century, the expression "earthly god" became completely standard, making its way into religious literature as well. Thus in 1750 the prefect of the Kievan Spiritual Academy Manassii Maksimovich said in the "Sermon on the Choice of a Hetman in Glukhov" (although not speaking of the tsar but about Hetman Kirill Razumovskii): "All . . . republics, magistrates, administrations, from the richest to the smallest, are under the supreme power . . . Divine Providence has established this for us, having placed His deputies, earthly gods, among us."<sup>161</sup> S. Naryshkin wrote in his "Epistle to Catherine II" in 1762: "We call earthly tsars gods," and further, addressing

Catherine directly: “You are an earthly God, and ours, O You, Catherine!”<sup>162</sup> A similar comparison was subsequently used widely by G. R. Derzhavin, though here one can trace the ongoing connection to Psalm 81 (82) (which is also present, by the way, in Naryshkin). In a variant of his “Epistle to I. I. Shuvalov” (1777) Derzhavin writes:

*Pillars of the fatherland! This is your one goal,  
Although you carry thunder with manifest strides,  
Although you secretly conclude peace with earthly gods.*<sup>163</sup>

In the poem “To Rulers and Judges” (1787) we read:

*Almightly God arose, and judges  
The earthly gods in their assembly.*<sup>164</sup>

In the poem “Providence” (1794) Derzhavin writes:

*With the majesty of an earthly god  
Catherine, casting a glance . . .*<sup>165</sup>

In the poem “Desires” (1797) he says:

*I by no means seek  
To be close to earthly gods  
And I in no way want  
To be exalted higher . . .*<sup>166</sup>

Finally, in the ode “To the New Year, 1798” we read:

*We see shattered thrones  
And the earthly gods fallen from them.*<sup>167</sup>

V. P. Petrov expresses himself the same way in a letter to Catherine II of December 3, 1793, speaking of putting his hopes on “the earthly god, so that [she] would deign to restore divine mercy to me.”<sup>168</sup> And Karamzin in his “Ode on the Occasion of the Inhabitants of Moscow Taking the Oath . . . to Paul I . . .” (1796) causes the rivers and thunder to exclaim: “O Paul! You are our earthly god!”<sup>169</sup> In “Treatise on the Fruits of Christ’s Coming to Earth” (1806), Bishop Feofilakt (Rusanov) asks: “Are governments more burdened and



overwhelmed where the Sovereign is considered an earthly god? Or where they see in him only the right of the stronger?"<sup>170</sup>

Together with the expression "earthly god," in the eighteenth century one often encounters the synonymic combination "earthly deity" (*zemnoe bozhestvo*) referring to the tsar in the same function. Thus in his first inscription to a statue of Peter (1750) Lomonosov writes that "Russia honors [Peter] as an earthly deity."<sup>171</sup> Precisely the same title of "all-Russian earthly deity" was subsequently applied to Catherine II, as in A. Perepechin's poem "Heartfelt Feeling of the Most Genuine Zeal, Dedicated With Reverence to the All-Russian Earthly Deity Catherine the Second . . ." (St. Petersburg, 1793): "All villages, lands, cities and the thriving peoples in them sing a song to the all-Russian earthly deity Catherine the Second." Petrov also calls Catherine "earthly deity" in his ode "On Composing a New Law Code" (1782):

*Thus it pleases Catherine;  
The Earthly Deity orders it . . .*<sup>172</sup>

Characteristically, A. S. Pishkevich uses this phrase not in a panegyric text but in his everyday writing about the empress: "Zorich . . . was about to attract the gaze of this earthly deity,"<sup>173</sup> referring to Catherine II. Given the wide use of this phrase in eighteenth-century poetry, it is natural that one encounters a variety of paraphrases of it. Thus, for example, in his ode "On Concluding Peace with the Ottoman Porte" (1775), Petrov calls Catherine "Deity of the earthly dale" (*Bozhestvo zemnogo dola*).<sup>174</sup> N. P. Nikolev gives an even more expressive paraphrase in his ode "On the Taking of Warsaw, 1794," in which a juxtaposition of Heavenly God and earthly god uniquely metamorphozises into a contrast between a general and particular God:

*Tsar—valor! Particular God of the world!  
You will not insult the general God . . .  
(Tsar—doblest`! chastnyi mira Bog! /  
Ty obshchu Bogu ne sogrubish` . . . . .).*<sup>175</sup>

One could cite many similar examples.<sup>176</sup>

It is completely natural that calling the tsar "earthly god" provoked sharp opposition from those who did not accept the official ideology. Thus in 1834 in Petersburg, "under interrogation the peasant Abram Egorov testified that in an Assembly of [the sectarian] Skoptsy, when he called the Sovereign Emperor 'earthly God,' using the expression consecrated in Rus', the deviants

answered him with a wild wail that ‘he is an earthly \*\*\*!’<sup>177</sup> It is curious too that in the notes to his fourth satire, Kantemir condemns the practice of calling a military commander “god” (he apparently had the emperor in mind, considering the etymological meaning of the corresponding Latin word), noting that Romulus and Remus had been “deified due to the people’s superstition.”<sup>178</sup>

**1.5.** The traditions of denominating the monarch described above arose within the context of relating him to liturgical texts, which developed widely starting from the Petrine period. Using liturgical texts for this purpose naturally presumes applying attributes of God to the tsar, and these cases themselves thus testify to the sacralization of the monarch. This tendency, it seems, was not only cultivated by Peter’s entourage but was directly encouraged by the tsar himself. Thus Tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich testified under torture that his teacher, N. K. Viazemskii, told him that: “Stepan Beliaev and his chorus sing before your father [that] if god wants, he overcomes the laws of nature, and similar verses; and they keep singing, gesturing to your father; and he likes being compared to God.”<sup>179</sup> Applying liturgical references to the tsar became a common occurrence. We will cite several examples. A. A. Vinius had the habit of addressing Peter I with the words: “I pray, do not bring your slave to judgment.”<sup>180</sup> These words coincide with those from a prayer from the matins service (“Hear me, Lord, in your truth, and do not bring your slave to judgment”) which derives from the second verse of Psalm 142 (143). Under suspicion for conspiring with Tsarevich Aleksei, Prince Ia. F. Dolgorukii wrote to Peter in February 1718: “Today I am forced to disturb the most precious ears of your majesty with my unworthy wail: I call on you, O God, for you will answer me; lower your ear, Lord, and deign to hear the voice of your slave, crying out to you on the day of my misfortune!”<sup>181</sup>

In his celebrated sermon on the burial of boyar A. S. Shein (1700), Stefan Iavorskii addressed the tsar in the name of the deceased, putting into his mouth the last words to God of St. Simeon the God-Receiver: “Now dismiss your slave, Lord, in peace: For my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared in the sight of all people.”<sup>182</sup> Peter was delighted with the sermon, and this played a decisive role in Iavorskii’s career.<sup>183</sup>

The well known Petrine figure A. A. Kurbatov, in congratulating Peter on his military successes, used the form of the akathist hymn, as a result of which all greetings and praise of the monarch took on the character of prayers.<sup>184</sup> This was the case of his congratulations to Peter on the taking of Narva in 1704:

Rejoice, most glorious tsar, for today people belonging to God and expecting deliverance revive hope through you and choose a better lot. . . . Rejoice, God's follower who takes on the appearance of a slave, for the Lord is with you. . . . Rejoice, our most joyous tsar, strong as adamant. . . . Rejoice, our most merciful sovereign, filled with worthy zeal and truth. . . . Rejoice, anointed of God, in the appointed measure. . . .<sup>185</sup>

His congratulations on the Poltava victory of 1709 was structured on the same model:

Rejoice, for your tsar's heart is forever in God's hands; rejoice, for you are fulfilling the commandment of God's Word, pledging your soul for your servants; rejoice, for your godlike humility lays low those who boast of might; rejoice, for thanks to this humility the armaments of your rule not only have brought glory, but terrified the universe; rejoice, for by your effective and wise bravery your troops have been purified like gold in a crucible; rejoice, for those foreign lips that belittled Russia have not only been silenced, but made to tremble; rejoice that, with God's help, there is hope of fulfilling your immemorial desire to gain the Varangian [Baltic] Sea; rejoice, that all-merciful God is bringing all of your good beginnings to realization, thanks to your humility; rejoice that henceforth, thanks to this same humility and your unswerving trust in Him, all of your good intentions will come to fruition through his omnipotence.<sup>186</sup>

Kurbatov was not alone in delivering this kind of panegyric; see, for example, the greetings to Peter from St. Petersburg typography workers when he returned from abroad in 1717, which was also structured on the model of the akathist hymn.<sup>187</sup> A song in the Poltava cycle indicates that this kind of salutation was common:

*Rejoice, two-headed Russian eagle. . . .  
On this [victory], we offer "rejoicings" to you,  
And pray God for your well-being.*<sup>188</sup>

In the foreword to his "Notes on the History of Peter," P. N. Krekshin addresses him: "Our Father (*Otche nash*), Peter the Great! You brought us from unbeing into being. . . . Before you everyone called us last, but today they call us the first."<sup>189</sup> To what extent such quotation of holy texts in reference to the tsar was usual may be seen by the fact that the Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Novgorod Amvrosii (Podobedov), addressing a petition to Alexander I asking that he be kept on the Novgorod pulpit, began his letter of March 16, 1818, with

the words of the Psalm: “All-Merciful Sovereign! Do not abandon me in my old age . . . ”<sup>190</sup>

Thus one could address the tsar in the same way as God, and Metropolitan Platon (Levshin) justified this practice in his “Speech on the Arrival of His Imperial Majesty [Alexander I] in the Reigning City of Moscow, On his Entry into the Uspenskii Sobor,” delivered on September 8, 1801, a week before his coronation. Platon said:

The Holy Spirit proclaims and commands us: *Lift up your heads, O you gates; be lifted up, you ancient doors, that the King of glory may come in.* [Psalm 23 (24)]. This was said about the great spiritual Tsar, the Lord Jesus Christ, so that we, trapped by sin, would open the gates of our hearts to him, and make a dwelling place for him in our soul. But why should we not take these words to refer to ourselves, and to Your sacred Person, most pious Monarch! You bear the image of the Heavenly Tsar; we contemplate His unseen glory in Your visible glory, and this temple is the image of our hearts, for the external Church images the inner one. The doors of this [external] temple are open to you, but so that our inner temple will open to your coming, we hurry to open the gates of this [inner] temple with the keys of our heart. So descend, Tsar of glory! The gates of the inner and outer temple are lifted up. The path is free. Descend to the divine altar, to God, rejoicing in Your youth. Fall before the feet of the Tsar of tsars. Come in here and together with Yourself lead the most august persons, the one blessed with carrying You in her womb, the other, companion in the holiness of Your bed—and with them also lead all of Your sacred blood. Come in here! And we, preceding and following You, will sing Glory to God in the highest! [Luke 2: 6].<sup>191</sup>

Alexander I’s objection to this way of addressing him is noteworthy. In an order to the Synod of October 27, 1815, he wrote that “During my last trip through the provinces in speeches delivered by clergymen I was unfortunate to hear excessive praise of myself that would have been appropriate for God alone.”<sup>192</sup> Another example is Catherine II’s disapproval of the reference to her as a “deity” in a letter to E. R. Dashkova, who had sent her a draft of her encomium to be presented at the Russian Academy: “Also cross out ‘as a beneficent Deity’—such an apotheosis doesn’t conform to the Christian religion, and I am afraid that I do not have the right to sainthood, insofar as I have imposed various restrictions on church property.”<sup>193</sup>

**1.5.1.** This series of examples could be interpreted simply as the playful citation of sacred texts, so characteristic of the Baroque and post-Baroque traditions. In the context of the growing sacralization of the monarch it is

impossible to distinguish such playfulness from actual deification; they are not only interwoven in our interpretation but in reality itself. It is significant in this connection that together with prayerful addresses to the monarch actual church prayers could serve as panegyrics. In a letter of March 17, 1884, to K. P. Pobedonostsev, N. I. Il'minskii drew special attention to this. He wrote that “the eighteenth century introduced much that was alien, secular, obsessive and servile into the ecclesiastical sphere,” and as an example he cited the service to Saints Zachary and Elizabeth:

The Menalogion under September 5 lists the “ancient service for the holy prophet Zachary, father of the honored John the Baptist” transcribed from Greek. After this comes: “Another service for the same holy prophet Zachary and for the holy righteous Elizabeth” . . . We began to celebrate our Patron Saints’ day [in a church dedicated to the two saints] according to this “other service.” In church I always stand next to the reader. The kontakion hymn amazed me: “As a full moon, you received the light of truth from the Messiah, from the ideal (*myslennyi*) sun” and so on. I imagined a portrait of Elizaveta Petrovna, full and roundfaced—a *full moon*. I suspected that this service had been written during Elizaveta Petrovna’s reign; I read and explored carefully and found this expression in two troparia of the ninth ode of the canon: “And entreat the most gracious Lord to save the souls of your namesake and of all who extol you.” “Pray to the most gracious one and the namesake [i.e., the Empress Elizabeth, celebrating her saint’s day].” Since there is [another] service in honor of Zachary, this “other service” is only so to speak a supplement, and in it Elizabeth is glorified almost exclusively, and Zachary only rarely mentioned. The service is composed as for any holiday: there are paremii and a song of praise with which, instead of a selected psalm, words from Zachary’s song have been very aptly added: Blessed is the Lord . . . for He visits and brings deliverance to His people. It is natural that people felt relieved and elated after the transition from the epoch of “Bironovshchina” to that of the entirely Russian monarch Elizaveta Petrovna, but everything has a limit, and to bring one’s obviously earthly interests into the church, and more subtly and cleverly than sincerely and piously, seems improper. In the presence of Elizaveta Petrovna it seems that all of these seeming praises of St. Elizabeth, mother of John the Baptist, were meant for her, her namesake.<sup>194</sup>

This protest against the cult of the tsar expressed in a letter to the Ober-Procuror of the Synod was for that time exceptionally bold and could have been interpreted as rebellion. Il'minskii understood this very well. At the beginning of the letter he wrote: “Written February 2; having reread it, I am sending it off on February 29, 1884. I beg your indulgence and trust. I have read everything again, made three deep bows, and decided to send it off. God’s blessing! The morning of March 17, 1884.”<sup>195</sup>

## 2. *Semiotic Attributes of the Monarch: The Tsar and the Patriarch*

2.1. As noted above (sections 1-2.1), those processes of sacralizing the monarch that were originally conditioned by the Byzantinization of Russian culture under Aleksei Mikhailovich by no means ended during the period of turning to Western models. Moreover, in the eighteenth century, during the epoch of the active Europeanizing of Russian culture, these processes reached a crescendo. Under Peter I the sacralization of the monarch not only did not abate, but on the contrary, sharply intensified. If for the earlier period (the second half of the seventeenth century) one may speak of the relative similarity of the Russian and Byzantine situations, in the eighteenth the Russian cultural situation markedly differed from the Byzantine—precisely in the greater sacralization of the monarch. It is at this time that the relation to the monarch that characterized the entire imperial period of Russian history, and about which we spoke at the start of this study, definitively took shape.

What changed under Peter? What were the origins of this new attitude toward the monarch in the Petrine and post-Petrine periods? The answer is simple: the tsar began to be perceived as the head of the church, and this had the direct result of associating him with God. The Byzantine perception of the monarch and his having been awarded a place in the church hierarchy perfectly interacted with Protestant notions about the monarch as head of the church that Peter was promoting.<sup>196</sup> A vivid example of this concurrence is Feofan Prokopovich's "Investigation of the Pontifex" (*Rozyshk o pontifekse*) (1721) in which the Protestant idea of the monarch's priority in church administration was casuistically supported precisely on the grounds of Byzantine precedent.

In practice this was manifested in the abolition of the patriarchate and in assigning the monarch a series of prerogatives that had formerly belonged to the patriarch. In this the Russian situation was fundamentally different from the Byzantine insofar as the "symphonic" reciprocity of spiritual and secular powers (however it may have operated in practice) was replaced by the single and all-encompassing authority of the secular principle. We should keep in mind that in its time the need to establish the patriarchate in Russia had been motivated precisely by the Russian monarch's assumption of tsarist power, since the title of tsar presumed that where there was a tsar there had to be a patriarch.<sup>197</sup> Calling the tsar and patriarch a "god-chosen, holy and divinely wise double" (*dvoitsa*), an "eternally abiding pair" (*dvoitsa*), and a "divinely-chosen duo" (*sugubitsa*) in the Nikonian service book is an exceptionally expressive example of this.<sup>198</sup> After the fall of Byzantium and Moscow's

assumption of the function of Constantinople (as the Third Rome—see section 1-1.2), the Russian monarch became the head of the Orthodox ecumene and thus took the place of the Byzantine basileus (or “tsar” as he was called in Russia). Accordingly, the first hierarch of the Russian church in some sense also replaced the Constantinopolitan patriarch and should therefore receive that title.<sup>199</sup> One of the reasons for ordaining a Moscow patriarch was that the tsar, in the words of the eastern patriarchs, “alone . . . is a great tsar on earth, as well as Orthodox.”<sup>200</sup> Priesthood and kingship, according to Justinian’s sixth Novella,<sup>201</sup> should develop harmonious relations and therefore be of equal honor.<sup>202</sup>

At the same time, under Peter the opposite idea took root—that having a tsar (emperor) not only does not presume the presence of a patriarch, but excludes the possibility, insofar as any independent ecclesiastical rule was perceived as an encroachment on the tsar’s autocratic power.<sup>203</sup> Hence the former conception became the subject of constant attack on the part of adherents of the Petrine reforms. Thus, for example, Feofan Prokopovich wrote in the “Spiritual Regulation” that “the simple folk do not know how the religious power differs from the Autocratic, but, amazed by the great honor and glory of the Supreme pastor, think that such a ruler is a second Sovereign, equal to the Autocrat or even greater than he, and that the spiritual order is different and greater than that of the state . . . Thus simple hearts are [so] corrupted by this opinion that in some situations they may not look at their Autocrat as the Supreme pastor.”<sup>204</sup>

No less indicative in this context is the organizing of the All-Jesting and All-Drunken Council whose activities spanned practically the whole of Peter’s reign.<sup>205</sup> The main goal of this establishment was undoubtedly to discredit religious authority and to challenge the traditional respect that it enjoyed in Russia. At the same time it parodied the principle of symphonic unity between the spiritual and secular authorities, the principle of “doubling” (*dvoitsa*) that Patriarch Nikon had advocated. A “prince-caesar” headed the assembly together with a “prince-pope” who could also be called the “all-jesting and all-drunken patriarch”—a parodic double that was juxtaposed to Peter’s real and undivided power. In line with this conception the patriarchate was replaced by the Spiritual College and, later, the Synod (Feofan’s words cited above provided the basis for this reform); and the monarch was proclaimed the “ultimate judge” (*krainii sudiia*) of this body in 1721.<sup>206</sup> This was directly reflected in the functioning of the church administration, whose court of last appeal was precisely the monarch. In the manifesto establishing the Synod Peter openly referred to his responsibility to reform the ecclesiastical order,<sup>207</sup> which meant

the monarch's direct intervention in the life of the church. In particular, bishops were to be appointed by imperial decree,<sup>208</sup> while in the post-Petrine period the practice became established for the Synod to nominate three candidates from whom the emperor made the final choice.<sup>209</sup> This procedure transformed traditional practice which had been for a council of bishops to propose three candidates from which the patriarch made the choice.<sup>210</sup> Obviously the Synod was taking the function of the council upon itself, with the emperor in the role of the patriarch. Virtually every aspect of Church life was subject to imperial decrees.<sup>211</sup> Finally, any changes in the rules governing the Synod itself could only be carried out with the emperor's consent.<sup>212</sup> In general, the Synod functioned as nothing less than as an auxiliary organ of autocratic power, whose principle was later spelled out in the Fundamental Laws in the following formula: "In ecclesiastical administration the autocratic power acts through the Most Holy Governing Synod, which was established by [this power]."<sup>213</sup> Peter still did not call himself the head of the church, although he was factually in charge of it; notably, foreign contemporaries unanimously recognized him as in this capacity, and in particular could suppose that he was president of the Spiritual College (Synod).<sup>214</sup> This opinion had indisputable basis: thus the Synod itself, in 1721, defending its independence from the Senate, asserted that "today the spiritual administration under His Tsarist Majesty's distinguished and benevolent supervision has not been established on the model of patriarchal administration, but has its own special form, and does not consist in one person, and does not carry out its duties under its own name, but by means of supremely powerful decrees from His Tsarist Majesty, who as the Most Pious monarch, following the example of the ancient Christian tsars, has presented himself to this Holy Synod as Supreme President and Judge."<sup>215</sup> V. N. Tatishchev considered that Peter had "left presiding [*predsedanie*] over the Synod to himself,"<sup>216</sup> which N. M. Karamzin also described in his "Memoir on Ancient and Modern Russia": "Peter declared himself head of the church, having destroyed the patriarchate as dangerous for unlimited autocracy."<sup>217</sup> In this context A. K. Nartov's story is very indicative. According to this, Peter "became head of the church in his state and once, describing the struggle between Nikon and his father Aleksei Mikhailovich, commented: 'It was time to curb the elder's power, which didn't belong to him. God is pleased for me to attend to the citizenry and the clergy, and I am both sovereign and patriarch for them; they have forgotten that in ancient times these were united.'"<sup>218</sup>

One may presume that Peter did not call himself head of the church because according to his lights the administration of the church was a natural prerogative of autocratic power.<sup>219</sup> Moreover, after the Petrine period the



sacralization of the monarch grew, as did the monarchs' conviction of their special charisma, and it was apparently with this charisma that they connected their function as head of the church. And in accordance with this new consciousness they indeed began to call themselves this. Catherine II was the first to call herself head of the church, although still in private correspondence with foreigners.<sup>220</sup> Then in 1797 Paul formally legalized this title in the Act on Succession to the Throne in which it says that "Russian sovereigns are the head of the Church,"<sup>221</sup> moreover, here the formulation is presented as something well known, made in the context of an argument that Russian monarchs must be Orthodox. Thereafter it was used in the Fundamental Laws.<sup>222</sup>

If for one part of Russian society the notion of the tsar's special charisma justified the subordination of the church to the tsar as its head, for another—in particular, the Old Believers—the subordination of the church to the tsar threw the church's own charismatic status into doubt. Old Believer monk Pavel stated (in 1846) that "the Old Believers accepted clergy and simple people from the Great Russian church until the era of Emperor Peter I in the third rank [as those who renounce heresy], and thereafter and until now accept people from there as second rank [through Chrismation as well as from churches without a legal clergy]." The particular reason for this change consisted in the fact that Peter, "having usurped spiritual power, put an end to the existence of the Moscow patriarchate, and wanted to be head of the people and head of the church."<sup>223</sup>

The belief in the charismatic basis of the monarch's function as head of the church may also be seen in the perception of the monarch as a priest. In the words of Joseph de Maistre, among the Russians "it is precisely the emperor who is the patriarch, so there is nothing surprising in the fact that Paul I had the fantasy of officiating at a mass."<sup>224</sup> Fedor Golovkin also testified to Paul's desire right after his coronation "in his capacity of head of the church" to officiate over the liturgy; similarly, Paul wanted to be spiritual confessor to his family and ministers,<sup>225</sup> although the Synod talked him out of it, objecting that "the canon of the Orthodox Church forbids a priest to carry out the sacraments if he's been married for a second time."<sup>226</sup> Grivel likewise reports that Paul expressed the wish of leading the Easter service, referring to the fact that he was the head of the Russian church, which made the clergy subordinate to him; Grivel believed that it was precisely this incident that led the Synod to tell him that a cleric married for a second time could not lead services.<sup>227</sup> Thus at least in words the Synod recognized the emperor as a priest. Accordingly, in his ode "Russia's Well-Being, Established by her Great Autocrat Paul I" (*Blagodenstvie Rossii, ustroiaemoe velikim eia samoderzhtsem Pavlom Pervym*)

of 1797 Zhukovskii calls Paul “bishop, pastor and hierarch” (*vladykoi, pastyrem i ierarkhom*), putting the following words into Russia’s mouth:

*This is Paul, my guardian angel,  
A model, an ornament of crowned heads;  
My protection, my shield and joy,  
Bishop, pastor and hierarch.*<sup>228</sup>

This perception of the tsar as priest led to the paradoxical rethinking of the Byzantine theory of the “symphony” between church and state. Thus at the All-Russian Church Council of 1917-1918 the idea was expressed that “until this time in Russia, tsarist rule combined ‘kingdom’ and ‘priesthood’ [*tsarstvo i sviashchenstvo*].”<sup>229</sup> And as a matter of fact, uniting the functions of head of state and head of church seemed natural, so that when in 1905 the idea arose of reviving the patriarchate, Nicholas II quickly nominated himself for patriarch: “speaking with a deputation of hierarchs who were lobbying to convene an All-Russian Council to select a patriarch, the Sovereign wanted to know who they had in mind for the patriarchal throne, and upon learning that they had no one, he asked if the hierarchs would agree to the Sovereign Emperor putting forward his own candidacy. The deputation fell silent in confusion.”<sup>230</sup>

The perception of the tsar as church representative was also reflected in the semiotics of behavior. Thus members of the clergy had to kiss the tsar’s hand (as did other subjects), at the same time as tsars (as opposed to laymen) did not kiss clergymen’s hands. The kissing of hands was the accepted response to receiving a blessing, but blessings were given by the elder to the younger, so that the kissing of hands testified to hierarchical subordination. The fact that members of the clergy kissed the tsar’s hand, but not the reverse, apparently testifies to their relationship to him precisely as head of the church.<sup>231</sup> When Alexander I kissed the hand of a priest in the village of Dubrovskii after he was brought a cross it was seen as something completely extraordinary. “The priest was so struck by this act of the pious Christian tsar that until his very death he spoke of no one else but Alexander and kissed his hand, which had been touched by the imperial lips.”<sup>232</sup> Such behavior was apparently usual for the pious Alexander,<sup>233</sup> but nevertheless was a deviation from the norm of tsarist behavior. Hence when Alexander met with the Iur’ev Archimandrite Fotii, he kissed his hand after obtaining his blessing.<sup>234</sup> However, when later Fotii blessed Nicholas I and extended his hand to be kissed, the emperor ordered him to be sent to Petersburg to learn proper decorum.<sup>235</sup> In N. K. Shil’der’s words, Fotii “was so flustered that he forgot about all of the rituals rendered

in such cases to the head of the state and church.”<sup>236</sup> No less significant, when bishops entered the imperial palace they had to abandon their crozier staffs.<sup>237</sup> The significance of this fact becomes clear if we keep in mind that according to the decision of the Council of 1675 high church officials had to leave their staffs behind when officiating together with the patriarch.<sup>238</sup> Abandoning the staff clearly signaled hierarchical dependence. In this context the instructions given to Patriarch Job who was to meet with the patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah, and receive his blessing in 1589 are significant. He was ordered to give up his staff if Jeremiah did the same, but in the opposite case not to give it up for any reason; it is perfectly clear that this would have been seen as a sign of the Moscow patriarch’s subordination.<sup>239</sup>

**2.2.** As we have seen, with the abolition of the patriarchate the monarch assimilated the patriarch’s functions, and this directly influenced his image. In particular, the special charismatic power that was attributed to the monarch as head of the church might have been connected to the special charismatic status of the patriarch in pre-Petrine times; this special charisma, as distinguished from that of the episcopate, was defined by the fact that the patriarch’s enthronement service involved a special consecration (chirotony or cheirotonia) that was unknown outside of the Russian church.<sup>240</sup> This helps explain the perception of the monarch as living image of God.<sup>241</sup>

As the visible head of the Church, the patriarch represents the image of Christ as its invisible Head. In principle, this relates to any ruling church hierarch as leader of a self-sufficient ecclesiastical community; in Russia, however, in light of his special ordination, the patriarch possessed not only administrative but also charismatic priority over other bishops. Hence the patriarch also justifiably took first place in being perceived as God’s image. Patriarch Nikon declared that “the Patriarch [acquires] the image of Christ, the city Bishops the image of the twelve Apostles, and rural Bishops the image of the seventy Apostles”<sup>242</sup>; and that “the patriarch is the living image of Christ and in his spirit, acts and words embodies the truth [*zhivopisuiia istinu*].”<sup>243</sup> After the patriarch ceased being head of the church this divine image became associated mainly with the tsar. When in the mid-nineteenth century a regimental chaplain taught that “the earthly tsar is the visible head of the Church,”<sup>244</sup> he clearly had in mind that the tsar was the image of Christ, that is, the image of God. Calling the tsar the image of God may be connected to the Byzantinization of Russian culture (see section II). Indeed, in Byzantium, together with the doctrine of the patriarch as image of God, the idea was also expressed that the emperor too was God’s image.

Thus in a panegyric speech to Constantine by Eusebius of Caesarea it says that the king is “the image of the only tsar of all [the universe]” (εἰκὼν ἐνόου τοῦ παμβασιλέως).<sup>245</sup> Similarly, an anonymous twelfth-century text asserts that “The earthly kingdom is a shining image of the Kingdom of God, and the emperor himself is the image of God.”<sup>246</sup> It should be noted that if the doctrine of the patriarch as image of God was generally accepted in Byzantium, the ascription of analogous merit to the emperor merely remained the opinion of particular individuals.<sup>247</sup>

Occasionally, this opinion could also be voiced in Russia when Byzantine sources were cited. Perhaps the first example of this occurs in Maksim Grek who testified not to the Russian but the Byzantine tradition, although he thus brought the idea to the attention of Russian readers. In his Epistle to Ivan the Terrible (c. 1545),<sup>248</sup> Maksim wrote: “The tsar is none other than the living and visible, that is, animated image of the Heavenly Tsar Himself; as one of the Greek philosophers said to a certain tsar: Confident of [the divine] kingdom, be worthy of it, because the tsar is God’s animated image, that is, His living image.”<sup>249</sup> Metropolitan Filipp (Kolychev) also spoke of the tsar as God’s image when he denounced Ivan the Terrible, denying him blessing as a ruler who had perverted this image: “Because, tsar, you are esteemed God’s image, but have been impressed [i.e., perverted] by an earthly touch”;<sup>250</sup> this was a citation from Agapetos<sup>251</sup> and was fully compatible with ancient Russian theories of the tsar’s power (see section I, 1.1) which juxtaposed just and unjust tsars. The Patriarch of Jerusalem Dositheus also connected the tsar’s righteousness with being “the image of God” in a letter to Tsar Fedor Alekseevich of June 27, 1679: “The tsar worries and grieves, and prays and keeps vigil, and inquires, reads, and studies, and appreciates the good of all of his officials, and may he truly be ‘the image of God’ and the blessed habitation of the greatly praised Trinity.”<sup>252</sup> Be that as it may, all indications are that right up to the eighteenth century there was no appreciable tradition of calling the tsar “the image of God.” In this connection it is characteristic that Nikon made a special protest against calling the tsar the “likeness of God” (*podobnik Bozhii*), pointing out that this title was only appropriate for a bishop.<sup>253</sup> Calling the monarch “the image of God” only became widespread from the reign of Peter the Great. If there was an echo of the earlier tradition, then from this period it took on a fundamentally different meaning. As early as 1701 Dimitrii Rostovskii called the tsar “the living image of Christ,” and referred to him as “Christ” at the same time, directly connecting this title to the tsar’s dominating position in the Church. Thus in the salutary speech to Peter of 1701 cited above (section II, 1.3.1) he said:

The countenance and dignity of the Christian tsar on earth is the living image and likeness of Christ the Tsar living in heaven. Just as a human being is image and likeness of God by virtue of his soul, so Christ of the Lord [on earth], the Divine Anointed, in his royal dignity is the image and likeness of Christ the Lord. The heavenly Christ the Lord presides over the triumphant church. Christ of the Lord on earth by grace and mercy of the heavenly Christ is first leader of the militant church . . . And since the dignity of the Christian tsar on earth is the image and likeness of Christ, the heavenly Tsar, the majesty of [the earthly] Christ of the Lord has some mystical likeness to the majesty of [the heavenly] Christ the Lord.<sup>254</sup>

Official triumphant odes and sermons reflect the perception of the tsar as image of God with special vibrance. Thus, in Lomonosov's ode on Elizabeth's arrival of 1742, God addresses the empress with the words:

*The peoples honor my image in You,  
And the spirit streaming from Me.*<sup>255</sup>

In another instance (the ode on Elizabeth's birthday in 1757) God speaks of Elizabeth: "I myself appeared in Her person."<sup>256</sup> Similarly, in Sumarokov's ode on Catherine's name day of 1766, God addresses the empress with the summons "be My Image on the earth."<sup>257</sup> This sort of address, from God to the empress, becomes a standard cliché of high poetry. For example, V. I. Maikov in his "Ode on the Occasion of the Choice of Deputies for Composing a New Law Code in 1767" writes:

*God manifests His image to us in her  
And through her amazes all of us  
How wise and great He is.*<sup>258</sup>

In the same way God says to Paul in V. P. Petrov's poem "Russia's Lament and Consolation, to His Imperial Majesty Paul I" (1796): "Everyone knows this, that You are My true image."<sup>259</sup> In Petrov's ode "On His Imperial Majesty Paul I's Triumphal Entry into Moscow" of 1797 we find an entire dialogue between Paul and God in which Paul says to Him that "Yes, [I am ] Your image, I agree with Your desires;" and God says to Paul,

*Arise, My Son! Stand high in spirit!  
The God in whom You believe is with You,  
Arise and, my image, shine forth under the sun!*<sup>260</sup>

In the same poem an angel also addresses Paul:

*Here the delicate Alexander, and there  
Constantine holds  
Your Holy frame,  
—These are your angels, closest to the throne,  
You are Divine, and they carry Your image forth.*<sup>261</sup>

Petrov also calls Catherine II “the image of Divinity.”<sup>262</sup> No less characteristic was Derzhavin’s use of this motif, to which he gave unique justification:

*The tsar is the bond of opinion, the cause of all action,  
And the humble power of the one father—  
Pattern of the Living God.*<sup>263</sup>

He addresses Alexander I correspondingly in the poem “The Voice of St. Petersburg Society” of 1805:

*The mirror of the heavens, in which  
We see the clear gleam of the Divinity,  
Oh, beautiful angel of our days,  
The image of the Benificent Essence.*<sup>264</sup>

It is precisely the image of God that Derzhavin honors in the monarch; cf. the drafts to his poem “The Drunk and Sober Philosopher” of 1789:

*I wanted to become a grandee  
And to serve in the presence of tsars,  
To zealously honor the image of God in them  
And to tell them only the truth.*<sup>265</sup>

What was characteristic of the ode was also typical of the sermon. In 1801 Metropolitan Platon addressed Alexander I, “You who bear the image of the Heavenly Tsar.”<sup>266</sup> And Archbishop Avgustin expresses the same idea in general terms in his “Speech on the Coronation Day of Emperor Alexander I” of 1809: “The tsars on earth are the image of the heavenly Tsar.”<sup>267</sup> Analogous expressions also characterize the sermons of Feofilakt Rusanov. Thus, in his “Speech on Reading the Royal Manifesto of War Against the French” (1806) he said that “for every loyal subject the Sovereign is not merely a most holy figure,

but the image on earth of the Divinity itself.”<sup>268</sup> Similarly, in the “Speech on the Taking of Paris,” delivered on May 3, 1814, he asserted that “the Christian people honors its Sovereign as the Anointed of God, and in him hails the image of Divinity itself.”<sup>269</sup> Likewise, the Petersburg Metropolitan Mikhail asserted that “the tsar is by the blessing of God like the great sun, like His image.”<sup>270</sup> Even in the twentieth century we may come across statements like “our tsar is the image of the Heavenly Tsar.”<sup>271</sup> The cited examples by no means exhaust the great many other similar expressions of this idea.<sup>272</sup> Basing himself on this rhetorical tradition but completely ignoring its Baroque, metaphorical character (that is, perceiving it as direct evidence of Russian religious consciousness) N. V. Gogol’ wrote: “Our poets penetrated the supreme significance of the monarch, realizing that he must, finally, entirely become pure love, and it will thus become clear to everyone why the sovereign is the image of God, which our whole land, by the way, recognizes by intuition . . . It has been our poets, and not lawgivers, who have grasped the supreme significance of the monarch, and they have heard with trepidation God’s will to establish it [power] in Russia in its legitimate form—and this is the reason that their tones become biblical every time the word ‘tsar’ flies from their lips.”<sup>273</sup> The idea that the monarch “must become pure love” evidently derives from the Gospel notion of God as love<sup>274</sup>; here this interpretation also defines the perception of the monarch as the image of God.

If at first the perception of the monarch as the image of God derived from literary sources, we may surmise that it gradually became a fact of religious consciousness. The incident that Catherine II describes in a letter to N. I. Panin of May 26, 1767, is indicative: “In one place along the route peasants brought candles to be put in front of me, but they were sent away.”<sup>275</sup> Apparently the peasants thought of Catherine as a living icon. In his memoirs V. A. Rotkirkh testifies to the same attitude. Here some soldiers, responding to a greeting from Nicholas I, crossed themselves devoutly “as if church bells had summoned them to Matins;” later, travelling by rail with Alexander II, the same author had the opportunity to observe how railway workers greeted the tsar’s train by the trackmen’s huts: “the railway men and their entire households crossed themselves and bowed down to the earth to their earthly god.”<sup>276</sup>

**2.3.** That the perception of the monarch as the image of God was connected with the disbanding of the patriarchate and the transferring of the patriarch’s functions to the tsar is clearly illustrated by the history of addressing the monarch with the words “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! . . .,” that is, with the words addressed to Christ on Palm Sunday (the

Lord's Entry into Jerusalem). They come from the Gospels<sup>277</sup> and are repeated during the holiday service.

After the victory of Poltava Peter was greeted in Moscow on December 21, 1709, with the singing of "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord, Hosanna in the highest, the Lord God has appeared to us . . ." as the tsar was met by children dressed in short white sticharions bringing "incense and branches." Similarly, when Peter visited the Spasskii Monastery he was met with the singing of "Hosanna in the highest . . ." and the symbolism was underscored by the fact that Peter wore a crown of thorns.<sup>278</sup> When Peter returned to Moscow in triumph on December 18, 1722, after the Persian campaign he was greeted with a speech by Feofan Prokopovich in the name of the Synod. It began: "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! What can we who are greeting you say that is more appropriate than this, valiant man, our most majestic Monarch?" And it concluded: "Come then quickly, rejoicing, run like a giant, going from strength to strength, from glory to glory, whence the destinies of the Almighty take you, led by the Lord's right hand, whence our precursor Jesus has gone, always and everywhere blessed, coming in the name of the Lord."<sup>279</sup>

Subsequently this type of greeting became a tradition. In blessing Emperor Alexander for the struggle against Napoleon, and sending him an icon of St. Sergius of Radonezh, Mertropolitan Platon wrote to him: "Most gracious Sovereign Emperor! The first capital city, Moscow, the New Jerusalem, takes its Christ like a mother into the embrace of its zealous sons, and through the rising haze foreseeing the brilliant glory of your Power sings in ecstasy: Hosanna, blessed is he who comes!"<sup>280</sup> When Alexander I returned to Russia, to Petersburg, after his victory over Napoleon, Archbishop Avgustin gave a speech in the Uspenskii Cathedral in Moscow on December 5, 1815. Addressing Russia, he exclaimed: "Your sons in victorious laurels proclaim in triumph: Hosanna, blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!"<sup>281</sup> And later, when Alexander himself attended the cathedral, on the day of Assumption, August 15, 1816, Avgustin greeted him with the words: "To you, conqueror of wickedness and falsehood, we shout: Hosanna in the Highest, blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!"<sup>282</sup>

It is characteristic that this same greeting became firmly associated with imperial coronations, that is, the emperor's ascension to the throne was connected to proclaiming Christ king of Jerusalem. For example, the Tambov priest Ivanov, who gave a speech dedicated to the opening of popular schools on Catherine II's coronation day in 1786 (which we quoted above), asserted that the empress is God's "true genuine image." He exclaimed in conclusion:



“How humble, how far-sighted, and how generous is this, the one anointed and crowned today for the Russian kingdom, the Lord’s Christ! And so, may your entrance into the Russian capital to rule be peaceful, our farsighted one! Blessed be you forever who comes in the name of the Lord. Amen.”<sup>283</sup> In this connection it is quite characteristic that Paul I specially timed his arrival into Moscow for his coronation to coincide with Lazarus (Palm) Saturday and the coronation itself to take place on Easter Sunday.<sup>284</sup> In this way Paul equated his entry into Moscow with Christ’s entry into Jerusalem, as Messiah, Tsar and Redeemer, and his coronation to the ultimate glorification of Christ as the enthroned redeemer of mankind. In his sermon at the celebration the Kievan Archpriest Ioann Levanda asked: “Is He [Christ] not sharing the glory of His resurrection with our rightful Monarch?”<sup>285</sup> In his ode dedicated to the event Nikolev wrote:

*The bowing palm branches rejoice!  
Christ has risen . . . and indeed they are crowning  
The successor to his holiness!  
Hosanna! Tsar coming by right,  
To the glory of the Lord’s Name,  
He is the image of the very God.*<sup>286</sup>

In his ode “On the Triumphal Entry of His Imperial Majesty Paul I into Moscow on March 28, 1797,” Petrov responded to the coronation in an analogous way:

*Above the gates inscriptions everywhere shine:  
O You, beloved Man,  
Hope of countless souls,  
Merciful yesterday and forgiving today!  
Blessed are You who comes in the name of the Lord!*<sup>287</sup>

Similarly, Metropolitan Platon, greeting Alexander I who had attended the Uspenskii Cathedral a week before his coronation, proclaimed in the already cited speech: “Enter! And we, preceding and following You, sing out: ‘Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!’”<sup>288</sup> And in the “Song on the Supreme Visit . . . After the Holy Coronation and Anointing” that was presented to Nicholas I at the Moscow Spiritual Academy in 1826 we read:

*Blessed be He on His great path  
Who comes in the name of God.*<sup>289</sup>

This tradition did not die out even in the later period. Thus in the official organ of the Synod, the *Church Herald* (Tserkovnyi Vestnik), it was said of Nicholas II's arrival in Moscow for his coronation on May 6, 1896: "If not with its lips, then with its heart all Moscow, and then all Russia, exclaimed: 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!'"<sup>290</sup> Even later the Archpriest Petr Mirtov proclaimed in his sermon on the coronation day of Nicholas II: "Blessed is the Tsar and Autocrat of All Russia who comes in the name of the Lord."<sup>291</sup>

The emergence of this tradition was undoubtedly connected with the ritual "procession on a donkey" (*shestvie na osliati*),\* abolished under Peter, which the patriarch used to perform in Moscow on Palm Sunday, celebrating the Lord's entry into Jerusalem.<sup>292</sup> In this procession the patriarch rode on a horse which the tsar led by the bridle; during the joint reign of Peter and Ioann the two tsars had led the steed from both sides. The patriarch would be greeted by young boys who scattered cloths and branches along his route and sang: "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the Highest," etc. The ceremony was also carried out during the installation of patriarchs and metropolitans, which was apparently meant to symbolize the fact that they were deputies of Christ in their respective posts; in Moscow the tsar led the horse, and elsewhere the city head.<sup>293</sup> During the procession, the patriarch mystically personified Christ entering Jerusalem and was perceived as His living icon. A letter from Patriarch Nikon to Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich of March 30, 1659, when he had already lost his leading position in the Russian church, eloquently testifies to this. The occasion for the letter was the news Nikon had received that Metropolitan Pitirim whom he had left as his *locum tenens* had performed the ceremony in Moscow on Palm Sunday, March 27, 1659. Nikon says that when he had carried out the ritual on Palm Sunday (*Nedelia vaii*) it had been frightening for him, the patriarch, to assume the place of Christ; he makes it clear that the issue was precisely about the patriarch representing a living icon of Christ, an image of God.<sup>294</sup> But that the ritual had been performed in Moscow by a simple metropolitan, and not a patriarch, Nikon describes as "spiritual adultery" and as an assault on the patriarch's charisma; the culprit should be prohibited from carrying out episcopal duties. Metropolitan Pitirim's repeat of the ritual in 1660 and 1661 was one reason that Nikon anathematized him in 1662.<sup>295</sup> In the cathedral of the Voskresenskii Monastery (New Jeruslaem) it was triumphantly proclaimed that "to Pitirim, who without the blessing of his spiritual father for the last three years assumed the role of the patriarch of all Russia and even that of Christ himself, and thus

---

\* *Translator's note:* In practice this was actually a horse whose ears were tied back.

committed the crime of spiritual adultery, . . . anathema.”<sup>296</sup> Later, responding to Semen Streshnev’s questions, Nikon described the event in a somewhat different light. In his “Objection or Ruin of the Humble Nikon, by God’s Grace Patriarch, Against the Questions of Boyar Simeon Streshnev,” written between December 1663 and January 1665,<sup>297</sup> we read: “And that the sovereign tsar led the Metropolitan of Krutitsk on a horse, [it is] as the sovereign tsar wishes; whoever he seats [on a horse] and leads—it’s his choice.”<sup>298</sup> Here Nikon seems to be avoiding condemnation of the tsar, who had taken part in the ceremony with Metropolitan Pitirim, and at the same time denies their action any religious significance: without the patriarch, the procession becomes merely walking a horse with a rider. It can only assume sacred character when the patriarch takes part, because he alone has the authority to personify Christ on earth.

Significantly, the Council of 1678 assigned the right to conduct the “procession on a donkey” exclusively to the patriarch, whereas before that time the ceremony could be performed in diocesan centers where the local bishop would ride and the local civic leader lead the horse. In the Council’s decision it says:

Such was the decision delivered: let this act as having nothing against the church or rules of the sainted apostles and holy fathers be performed in honor of Christ our Lord and for the piety of godly monarchs only in the royal city of Moscow, in the presence of the scepter-bearer, let it be performed personally by the patriarch, and not by any other hierarchs and not at all during a period between patriarchs, since it is not appropriate for the lower hierarchy to perform an act hardly permissible even for the patriarch. Let no bishop in any town anywhere in the entire Great Russian state dare to mount an ass and ride it in memory of the Lord’s entry into the city of Jerusalem.<sup>299</sup>

This is motivated by the fact that the ritual of “riding an ass” had only recently arisen in dioceses and that it was thought to demean imperial dignity:

[O]n the other hand it does not look very proper; for what was permitted for the piety of sovereigns has begun to be considered incorrectly as unchangeable law. Here in the royal and blessed city of Moscow during the period without a patriarch some bishops also used to perform this act, and in other cities they dare to do this when the one taking the tsar’s part is led on an ass by someone of no high rank. [This decision is taken] in order to guard his [the tsar’s] honor and since this act is not approved by church rules and never existed or exists in any Christian state.<sup>300</sup>

It is worthy of note that while Nikon had protested against anyone other than the patriarch riding the donkey, led by the tsar, the fathers of the 1678

Council were concerned that the tsar not do the leading. In the period between patriarchs, before the selection of Patriarch Ioakim, this role in the ceremony had still been performed by the tsar (on Palm Sunday, April 12, 1674) with Ioakim, still metropolitan of Novgorod, riding<sup>301</sup>; the validity of the ritual was still dependent on the tsar's participation. For the earlier period, however, the patriarch had been the main participant. According to the testimony of Martin Ver,<sup>302</sup> when in 1611, because of the troubles of the interregnum, the military leaders called off the triumphal appearance of the patriarch on Palm Sunday, "the mob . . . loudly grumbled and preferred death to tolerating this outrage; so it was necessary to carry out the people's will; instead of the tsar, the most important grandee of Moscow, Andrei Godunov, took the bridle." Thus the efficacy of the ceremony was defined primarily by the participation of the patriarch, while the tsar's place could be taken by a substitute.

With the greater sacralization of the tsar's power and the struggle to completely subordinate the church to the state, the ritual of "procession on a donkey" began to be perceived as emphasizing the greatness of the patriarch and at the same time belittling the power of the tsar. This is exactly the way Peter I saw it. An episode which Archpriest Petr Alekseev of the Moscow Arkhangel'skii Cathedral related in a letter to Paul I is representative. At a name-day party at a navy captain's house, an officer asked Peter, "Honored tsar, what was the reason that your father, Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, got so angry at Patriarch Nikon that he condemned him and sent him into exile?" Peter answered that Nikon "got it into his head that he was higher than the tsar himself, and people also tried to persuade him of this noxious idea, especially in public ceremonies."<sup>303</sup> Petr Alekseev accompanied this story with the following commentary:

Is it not a kind of papist pride to subordinate a divinely crowned tsar to his equeries, that is, on Holy Week, in imitation of the inimitable Christ's entry into Jerusalem, for the patriarch, with great pomp, riding around the Kremlin on a court donkey, to force the autocrat to lead this beast of burden around by the bit in view of innumerable spectators? And after carrying out this sumptuous ceremony, the patriarch gave the all-Russian sovereign a hundred rubles, as if to be given out as charity, but in actuality, shameful to say, as a reward for his services leading him around. In his minority the Emperor Peter the Great himself was subjected to this indignity when he held the reins of [Patriarch] Ioakim's donkey together with his brother Tsar Ioann Alekseevich at just such a Palm Sunday ceremony. But later this practice that had been newly introduced into the church was completely abandoned, by order of the same great monarch.<sup>304</sup>

The anecdote “On the Repeal of the Procession on Holy Week,” transcribed by I. I. Golikov from Peter the Great’s own words, also describes the “procession on a donkey” as a ritual that demeans “the majesty of the tsarist rank.”<sup>305</sup> Such a view of the “procession on a donkey” had some real basis insofar as the ritual did express the humility of monarchical power before the spiritual principle; as the fathers of the 1678 Council emphasized,

[O]ur most pious Autocrats have the good will to show the Orthodox folk an image of humility and free subordination to the Lord Jesus, because in accepting this most self-effacing custom of seating the patriarch on a donkey in memory of the Lord’s entry into Jerusalem they humble their high tsarist stature and with their scepter-bearing hands deign to hold the donkey’s reins and lead it to the cathedral, serving Christ the Lord; this is a praiseworthy deed, for many will be moved by such humility of the earthly tsar before the Heavenly Tsar, and they will experience . . . a profound saving humility, and from the treasures of their heart give forth a warm cry to Christ the Lord, singing out with devout lips, “Hosanna in the Highest, blessed be He who comes in the name of the Lord, the Tsar of Israel.”<sup>306</sup>

In accord with this, in an anonymous Protestant work of 1725 dedicated to Peter’s activities<sup>307</sup> it is noted that the “procession on a donkey” signified an honor which the tsar bestowed on the patriarch, and connected its abolition to the fact that Peter, having disbanded the patriarchate, assimilated the highest authority in the church to himself.<sup>308</sup> G.-F. Bassevich testified to the fact that the tsar considered this ritual demeaning and also saw the reason for its elimination in the fact that “Petr Alekseevich did not want to recognize anyone as head of the church except himself.”<sup>309</sup> Thus the patriarch was rendered the honor which, according to Peter and his associates, belonged exclusively to the ruling monarch. In his speech “On the Tsar’s Power and Honor” delivered in Petersburg on Palm Sunday, April 6, 1718, Feofan Prokopovich justified the argument that this honor should go to the tsar and not a church hierarch. Having described Christ’s entry into Jerusalem, he said: “Do we not see here what reverence is due the tsar? Does it not behoove us, and will we indeed be silent about how we subjects should evaluate the supreme power? And how far resistance to this duty has appeared at the present time? [the reference is to the case of Tsarevich Aleksei]. Let no one think that our intention is to compare the earthly tsar to the heavenly one; let us not be so senseless; neither did the Jews who met Jesus know that he was the heavenly tsar.”<sup>310</sup> Further, Feofan, with the help of very convoluted exegesis, demonstrates that the Jews who were awaiting the Messiah were waiting precisely for the supreme head of an earthly kingdom, and from this he concludes that kings should be

rendered that honor whose prototype was the greeting which the Jews gave to Jesus when he entered Jerusalem. This reasoning is fully characteristic of the casuistry with which Feofan endeavored to justify the actual sacralization of tsarist power and the debasing of religious authority, by presenting them as the appropriate realization of biblical and patristic commandments.

Thus for Peter the “procession on a donkey” ritual symbolized the power of the patriarch, and because of this a limitation on his own imperial power. Therefore its abolition under Patriarch Adrian (from 1697) signified the fall of the patriarch’s power. The abolition of the patriarchate itself, which, according to contemporaries, Peter decided on right after the patriarch’s death in 1700, soon followed. Hence the “procession on a donkey” was itself an important symbolic act, but it became even more significant from the fact that the tsar introduced a just as symbolic blasphemous ritual in its place, one which served to recall the abolished ceremony and the vanquished patriarchate. In his diary of 1721, F. V. Berkhgol’ts reports: “In former times in Moscow, every year on Palm Sunday a special procession took place in which the patriarch rode on horseback and the tsar led his horse by the reins through the whole city. In place of all this now there is a completely different ceremony: on this day the prince-pope and his cardinals [a reference to the mock patriarch of the All-Joking, All-Drunken Synod, P. I. Buturlin, and his mock bishops] ride through the whole city and make visits riding on oxen and donkeys, or in sleighs drawn by pigs, bears or goats.”<sup>311</sup>

The victory over the patriarchate, however, meant not only the abrogation of patriarchal power, but also its assimilation by the monarch. And together with the fact that the tsar took on the administrative functions of the patriarch he also appropriated elements of patriarchal behavior, first of all the role of living icon of Christ.<sup>312</sup> It was precisely from this that the tradition arose of greeting the tsar with the words “Blessed be He who comes in the name of the Lord.”<sup>313</sup>

**2.4.** We have spent so much space on interpreting the importance of addressing the tsar with the words “Blessed be He who comes in the name of the Lord” primarily because this example shows very clearly how concretely historical events of the Petrine era furthered the sacralization of the monarch. At the same time, it is worth noting that with time the given greeting became associated with a particular semantic context, that of ascending the throne. The development of this kind of connection is familiar in many other cases; starting with the Petrine period it became acceptable to relate liturgical texts to the tsar as long as their use was sanctioned by circumstances.

Still one more tradition of using a sacred image became associated with ascension to the throne, and that was calling the tsarist throne “Favor” (Tabor), thus equating the tsar with the transfigured Christ.\* Thus in a sermon on Alexander I’s ascension day delivered in the Kazan Cathedral on March 12, 1821, Archimandrite Neofit said: “When God’s all-active right hand brought him to the throne, as onto some kind of Tabor, to transfigure His humility into the glory of tsarist majesty, it seems, the voice of the Heavenly Father secretly but perceptibly proclaimed to the sons of Russia: I have Chosen this one as my son, and I will be to him as a Father; and I will strengthen His Kingdom forever [1 Chronicles 28:6-7].”<sup>314</sup> The very well known preacher, Kherson Archbishop Innokentii (Borisov), expressed himself in very similar terms:

Why do our most devout sovereigns ascend the throne? So that from its height they will be closer to heaven, to more constantly and freely commune in spirit with the One in Whose hand lies the fate of peoples and kings. Even pagans know that the well-being of kingdoms does not only depend on the arbitrariness and exertions of men, and Christians more so, who believe that the Most High controls the kingdom of men [Daniel 4:22] and that the rulers of men, for all their greatness, are but servants [Romans 13:4] of the Heavenly Sovereign. This is why there must be an unceasing, vital communion between the heavenly and earthly tsar for the good of the people. Where does this take place? Must it really be amid crowds of people? Amid the clamor of prejudice and passion? Amid the dust and whirlwind of daily cares? Before the eyes of anyone and everyone? Moses ascends Mount Sinai to speak with God and to receive his law [Exodus 19:20]; Elijah is raised up to Mount Horeb to contemplate God’s glory [1 Kings 19:11 (3 Kings 19, Russian Bible)]; the Son of God Himself hears a voice calling him His beloved Son on the silent peak of Tabor [Matthew 17:5]. For the peoples too there must be a continuous Tabor on which the will of the heavenly Lawgiver can be discerned, where the light of God’s glory is reflected on the face of the crowned representatives of the people. This Sinai, this Tabor—is the tsar’s throne.<sup>315</sup>

In a similar way, succession to the throne is equated with Christ’s arrival in the Heavenly Kingdom, and the one who is expected to be seen on the throne is addressed with the plea to “Remember me, Lord, when you come into your kingdom,” which the judicious thief addressed to crucified Christ.<sup>316</sup> A half a year before Elizabeth’s ascension, the new Metropolitan of Tobol’sk Arsenii Matseevich who had been appointed under Anna Leopoldovna paid

---

\* *Translator’s note:* See Matthew 17:1-9, Mark 9:2-8, Luke 9:28-36, and 2 Peter 1:16-18; Mount Tabor is not mentioned, and only became associated with the scene by Origen and later theologians.

her a visit, and upon bidding farewell to the tsarevna, said to her: "Remember me, sovereign, as soon as you come into your kingdom."<sup>317</sup> Pushkin's great grandfather Abram (Petr) Petrovich Hannibal (Gannibal), who had to hide out in the country before the coup of 1741 that brought Elizabeth to the throne, addressed the very same words to her. Pushkin relates in "The Start of an Autobiography": "Minikh saved Hannibal by sending him off secretly to an Estonian village where he lived for around ten years in constant agitation. . . . When Empress Elizabeth ascended the throne, Hannibal wrote her the words from the Gospel: 'Remember me when you have come into your kingdom.' Elizabeth immediately called him to court."<sup>318</sup> A similar appeal was made to Paul when he was heir to the throne. "Once Paul was riding on horseback with his adjutant Kutlubitskii along Meshchanskaia Street in Petersburg. They passed some convicts, and Paul ordered that they be given alms. 'Remember me, Lord, when you come into your kingdom,' said one of the prisoners, Prokhor Matveev. Paul ordered his name written down, and carried the note with him, transferring it from pocket to pocket every day. After Paul ascended to the throne, Prokhor Matveev was freed."<sup>319</sup>

In an analogous way the tsar's arrival was equated with Christ's and the image of "the Bridegroom that cometh at midnight." We already cited the story of how Feofan Prokopovich greeted the tsar who had arrived at a nocturnal feast with the words of the troparion "Behold the Bridegroom cometh at midnight!"<sup>320</sup> Much later, Moscow Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) used the same imagery when alerting the head of the Trinity-Sergiev Monastery Archimandrite Antonii of an upcoming visit of the emperor. In a letter of July 22, 1832, Filaret wrote Antonii that soon "the Sovereign Emperor's procession may happen along the route to the lavra [monastery]," and he expressed the hope that "if the Groom comes at midnight not everyone will be dozing."<sup>321</sup> The same image, with the same semantic motivation, occurs in Filaret's writing more than once; see his letter to Antonii of October 26, 1831 and August 17, 1836.<sup>322</sup>

2.5. Thus, various events in the life of the tsar were perceived in terms of the earthly life of Christ, and for this reason they could also be incorporated into the liturgical practice of the Orthodox Church (in a similar way as Christ's life on earth is the basic theme of the Christian liturgy). It is precisely this that explains the opportunistic use of Gospel imagery for the monarch, illustrated above; in a similar way, as we have seen, this or that phrase from the Gospels came to be used in troparions. The events of the tsar's life began to be celebrated in church, marked by a ceremonial service and usually a sermon (which also



provided an opportunity to make use of material from the Gospels, fitted to the occasion). Thus arose the notion of “high triumphal days” (*vysokotorzhestvennye dni*), that is, church holidays dedicated to the tsar’s birthday, saint’s day, day of ascension and coronation. These became official church holidays which were duly noted in church calendars; the failure of priests to observe them was considered serious misconduct that entailed mandatory ecclesiastical punishment.<sup>323</sup> Furthermore, there were even attempts to create special church prayer services for these days. A project for one was proposed by the priest Razumovskii in the 1830s. We may judge the nature of his proposed service by the following canticle (sixth tone):

Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth, and in the Russian kingdom goodwill; for from the root of the prophet Tsar David, chosen by God, and from the flesh of the most pure Virgin Mary, came shining forth to us Christ, Savior of the world; thus from the root of Prince Vladimir, equal to the apostles, and from the flesh of a noble and most Christian line, and from holy tsarist blood our Emperor Nicholas came shining forth to us, Nicholas, the true image of Jesus Christ, crowned and anointed monarch of the church and of the Russian kingdom, heir to God’s kingdom, placeholder of Christ’s throne and acting Savior of the fatherland. Glory to God in the highest, peace in the church militant, goodwill in the Russian kingdom.<sup>324</sup>

Just as in the church holidays dedicated to the Mother of God and individual saints were celebrated together with the Lord’s feast days, so too in the imperial cult that arose in the eighteenth century not only events in the emperor’s life were celebrated but also those of the empress and the heir to the throne, and in general, members of the ruling house; high triumphal days included the birthdays and saints’ days of all of the grand princes and princesses and their children.<sup>325</sup> They too were mentioned in the litany and their names were printed on the covers of liturgical books. Notably, on high triumphal days it was forbidden to hold funerals or conduct the service for the dead<sup>326</sup>—just as it was forbidden on Sunday holidays, on Holy Week, Passion Week, and so on.<sup>327</sup> Characteristically, associating this kind of “tsarist” holiday with church holidays had already elicited protest from Patriarch Nikon. He condemned the article in the Law Code of 1649 in which the birthday of the tsar and members of his family were declared days off together with church holidays. He wrote: “And what about the tsar? It appears to be a holiday on the sovereign tsar’s birthday and similarly on the tsaritsa’s and their children’s. Are those holidays? Is it a sacrament, if it is only sensual and human? And in everything the human is likened to the divine, only it is preferred to the divine.”<sup>328</sup>

And so the process of sacralization extended to the entire imperial family as the high triumphal days with their pomp and rewards became a special system of religious veneration for the tsar and the imperial household. This struck foreigners very strongly. K. Masson wrote, for example, in his "Notes" that "beyond the fifty-two Sundays Russians celebrate sixty three holidays out of which twenty five are dedicated to a special cult of the goddess Catherine [the Great] and her family."<sup>329</sup> The sacralizing of the monarch and the reigning house was reflected in both religious oratory and in odic poetry. Thus Metropolitan Platon, in the above cited speech on Alexander I's arrival in Moscow in 1801, spoke of "all the sacred blood" of the emperor, by which he meant the tsar's house.<sup>330</sup> Nikolev, addressing Paul I, proclaimed: "Your entire family is heavenly,"<sup>331</sup> and Petrov, in his ode "On the Celebration of Peace" of 1793, wrote of Catherine's grandchildren:

*All are of a Divine breed,  
And an assembly of virtues.*<sup>332</sup>

In his poem "On the Grand Princes Nikolai Pavlovich and Mikhail Pavlovich's Departure from Petersburg for the Army" of 1814 Derzhavin calls the grand princes "from the race of gods,"<sup>333</sup> and in his poem "The Russian Amphytrite's Procession Down the Volkhov [River]" of 1810, dedicated to Grand Princess Ekaterina Pavlovna's trip from Tver` to Petersburg, the imperial family that is awaiting her arrival is described in the following words:

*I see the family so blessed,  
Brothers, sisters—a divine assembly.*<sup>334</sup>

Thus the sacralization of the monarch became a fact of church life and of the religious life of the Russian people. Sacralization affected diverse spheres—government administration, national historical consciousness, church services, religious education (from sermons to the teaching of scripture) and spiritual life itself. Moreover, the tsar's sacralization began to take on the status of confessional dogma. Veneration of the tsar became equated with venerating the saints, and in this way the cult of the tsar became almost a necessary condition of religiosity. We find eloquent testimony to this in the monarchist brochure "Autocratic Power," in which it is precisely the status of the imperial cult as dogma that is emphasized: "The truth of the autocracy of Orthodox tsars, that is, their ordination and affirmation on the thrones of kingdoms by God Himself, is so sacred that in the spirit of church doctrine and statute it is elevated to the level of a dogma of faith whose violation or rejection is

accompanied by excommunication.”<sup>335</sup> In the rite of anathematization, carried out during the Week of Orthodoxy, among the list of main doctrinal heresies, during the imperial period was added (as no. 11): “To those who think that Orthodox tsars are elevated to the throne not by God’s special benevolence toward them, and that at their anointment the grace of the Holy Spirit for the transmission of this great calling does not stream into them, so that rebellion and betrayal is raised against them—anathema.”<sup>336</sup>

### III. THE CIVIL CULT OF THE MONARCH IN THE SYSTEM OF BAROQUE CULTURE

#### 1. *The Cult of the Monarch and the Problem of Confessional Consciousness*

**1.1.** During Peter’s reign panegyric literature moved from the court, where it had been the property of a narrow circle, out onto the streets, where it became an extremely important instrument for the ideological reeducation of society. Here literature was organically combined with spectacle (triumphs, fireworks, masquerades, etc.), the goal of which was to underscore the unlimited nature of autocratic power. This kind of ceremony as a means of mass propaganda was an indispensable part of the cultural transformation of new imperial Russia, and was repeated year in and year out throughout the eighteenth century; panegyric events became state undertakings. In the words of G. A. Gukovskii, “the sphere to which art and ideas were applied was first of all the court, which played the role of political and cultural center . . . as a temple of the monarchy and as a theater in which a magnificent spectacle was played out, whose main idea was a demonstration of the might, greatness, and unearthly character of the earthly power . . . The triumphal ode, the panegyric speech (‘word’) were the most noticeable types of official literary creation that lived not so much in books as in the ceremonial of official celebrations.”<sup>337</sup> The magnification of the monarch was carried out most of all by reference to religious imagery; exalting the emperor above people, panegyrists placed him alongside God. This religious imagery could refer both to Christian as well as classical pagan traditions, which here combined freely, subordinate to the laws of multilayered semantics that characterizes Baroque culture in general.<sup>338</sup> In the context of Baroque culture, with its play of meanings and basic metaphorical quality (see section I-2.2), this kind of panegyric ceremony generally speaking nevertheless testifies to an actual sacralization of the monarch. These celebrations suppose

a different mechanism of understanding in which the question of reality per se becomes illegitimate. In this sense panegyric celebrations have no semblance to church rituals, for which a play of meanings is alien and which hence presuppose a direct, non-metaphorical understanding. The creators of the first panegyric celebrations were careful to underscore just this difference between this kind of ceremony and church activities.

In 1704, on the occasion of the conquest of Livonia, a triumphal entrance into Moscow was arranged for Peter. The prefect of the Moscow Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy Iosif Turoboiskii, who composed a description of the triumph, specially explained that the given ceremony did not have religious significance but was a particular kind of civic event: "This is not a temple or a church, created in the name of some saint, but something political, that is, civic, praise for those who labor for the safety of the fatherland." At the same time Turoboiskii emphasized the metaphorical nature of the imagery that was used and insisted on the necessity and validity of the metaphorical approach to meaning. "You also know, dear reader, how common it is for someone desirous of wisdom to imagine a thing in some strange way. Thus lovers of wisdom depict the truth as a yardstick, wisdom as a clear-seeing eye, courage as a pillar, restraint as a bridle, and so on forever. This should not be seen as some kind of mayhem or the arrogance of vaporous reason, because we see the same thing in divine writings."<sup>339</sup> In this way a special civil cult of the monarch was created that was inscribed into the Baroque culture of the Petrine era.

Even though, as we have seen, there were voices that called for approaching such texts metaphorically, there is reason to believe that they were not always perceived in this way. Turoboiskii in particular himself mentions this when he bids the reader not to follow the "ignoramuses" (*neveglasy*) and what he sees as their traditional opinions; "Because you, pious reader, will not be surprised by what we have written, nor be jealous of the uninformed who know nothing and have seen nothing, but who like a turtle in its shell never ventures out, and as soon as it sees something new is shocked and belches out various unholy claptrap."<sup>340</sup> One suspects that these "ignoramuses" did not take his advice about metaphorical interpretation but understood texts literally and saw in the triumph a blasphemous attempt at deification of the tsar. In the context of the growing sacralization of the monarch such a perception actually had some basis. Because of this, it became impossible to separate religion from the civil cult of the monarch. On the contrary, panegyric texts were read literally and served as an additional source of the very same sacralization.

Thus we see how two perceptions of the sign—conventional and non-conventional (see section I-2.2)—clashed when the civil cult of the monarch

was established by imperial Russian state policy. The non-conventional view of the sign led to the expansion of the civil cult in the religious sphere, although in this case the sacralization of the monarch in one form or another could come into conflict with religious attitudes. However obligatory and widespread the Baroque tradition of verbal glorification of the monarch may have been, the Great Russian cultural context in which this tradition existed made it impossible to completely renounce the possibility of interpreting these verbal expressions literally, and this very possibility, as soon as it became evident, could not help but lead to perplexity and confusion. Significantly, even in the representatives of Baroque culture one may trace successive attempts to avoid conflict with Christian religious consciousness and to exclude the very possibility of improper interpretation. We will see below the problems that arise in this connection, how the panegyric tradition came into conflict with confessional awareness and what compromises were reached in order to avoid this conflict. We will limit ourselves to odic poetry of the eighteenth century. As is well known, the triumphal ode was an integral part of the civil cult of the monarch. As part of secular festivities, it served as functional equivalent of panegyric sermons in religious ceremonies, which was reflected in their constant interaction.<sup>341</sup> The ode's connection to the sermon made the problems which it posed to traditional religious consciousness especially vital.

**1.2.** In this respect, Lomonosov's works are especially indicative. One must keep in mind that panegyric glorification of the monarch using sacral imagery was exceptionally characteristic of odes, and in this Lomonosov was the founder of the entire tradition. Thus in his ode on the day of Elizabeth's ascension to the throne of 1746, Lomonosov compared the court coup of 1741 that brought Elizabeth to power with the biblical story of creation:

*Now our wounded people  
Were dwelling in most miserable night.  
But God, looking to the ends of the universe,  
Raised his gaze to the midnight land,  
Glanced at Russia with tender eye,  
And seeing the profound gloom,  
With authority spake: "Let there be light!"  
And there was! O Master of creation!  
Again you are Creator of light for us  
Having brought Elizabeth to the throne.<sup>342</sup>*

In his 1752 ascension ode to Elizabeth, Lomonosov just as boldly compared Peter's birth to that of Christ, addressing to Peter's mother, Natal'ia Kirillovna, Archangel Gabriel's words to Mary:

*And you, blessed among women,  
Through whom brave Aleksei  
Gave us an incomparable Monarch  
That revealed the light for all of Russia.*<sup>343</sup>

In another place (Elizabeth's ascension ode of 1748) Lomonosov addresses Elizabeth herself as "blessed among women."<sup>344</sup>

In the ode of 1742 on Elizabeth's arrival in Petersburg from Moscow, Lomonosov puts an entire tirade in the mouth of God the Father, addressed to the empress:

*"Be blessed forever,"  
Proclaims the Ancient of Days to Her,  
"And all the people with you,  
That I entrusted to Your power.  
...  
In You the peoples revere my image  
And the spirit that poured from Me . . ."*<sup>345</sup>

In the ode on the arrival of Petr Fedorovich of 1742 Lomonosov speaks of Elizabeth:

*And eternity stands before Her,  
Unfolding the book of all the ages . . .*<sup>346</sup>

Of course, the "unfolded book" (*razgnutaia kniga*) is a symbol of divine revelations about the future.<sup>347</sup>

Nonetheless, one may state that Lomonosov puts the most explicit cases of Baroque identification of God and tsar into an ambiguous context. In cases in which the sacralization of the monarch is not realized by paralleling poetic and biblical texts, but by directly designating the monarch as "God" or some similar word, Lomonosov consciously distances the corresponding texts from the Christian tradition. Elements of biblical imagery that might give rise to sacralization that was unacceptable for Christian consciousness are surrounded by pagan images, and by this means the cult of the emperor is given a neutral pagan rationale that is fully fitting within a Baroque

cultural framework. It seems clear that this was a fully conscious decision on Lomonosov's part; the pagan context obviates the conflict between Baroque texts and religious consciousness. Thus, in the ode on Petr Fedorovich's name day of 1743, Lomonosov says of Peter I:

*He is God, he was your God, Russia,  
In you he took on fleshly limbs,  
Having descended to you from mountain heights.*<sup>348</sup>

For traditional consciousness these words were blasphemous by themselves, and indeed the Old Believers saw in these lines another indication that Peter was the antichrist.<sup>349</sup> However, Lomonosov is not speaking here in his own voice, but puts these words into the mouth of Mars, who is addressing Minerva; in this way the given passage involves an equation with pagan rather than Christian divinity despite the association with Christ's taking on human flesh suggested in the last lines.

Even more typical of Lomonosov is another device for removing the contradiction between sacralization of the monarch and Christianity: avoiding the word "God," Lomonosov regularly calls the empress "goddess." This is a term Lomonosov can call Catherine I,<sup>350</sup> Anna Ioannovna,<sup>351</sup> Elizabeth,<sup>352</sup> and Catherine II.<sup>353</sup> The same word used for the regent Anna Leopoldovna,<sup>354</sup> Tsarevna Anna Petrovna (Elizabeth's sister),<sup>355</sup> and the Austrian Empress Maria Theresa.<sup>356</sup> This kind of denomination effectively took sacralization beyond the bounds of Christianity and directly correlated with Lomonosov's use of pagan goddesses' names for empresses, e.g., Minerva (Pallada) or Diana.<sup>357</sup> In other cases Lomonosov can call the monarch—Peter or Elizabeth—"Divinity." In the ode of thanks to Elizabeth of 1751, the Egyptian pyramids and walls of Semiramis are juxtaposed to the buildings which the empress erected in Tsarskoe Selo:

*Human beings created you—  
Here a divinity creates.  
(Variant: "Here Divinity itself creates.")*

And after this:

*With magnificent tops  
The temples mount to the heavens;  
From them Elizabeth shines at us  
With most luminous eyes.*<sup>358</sup>

That a pagan divinity is being described is quite obvious, insofar as these words are put into the mouth of a nymph who personifies the river Slavena (*Slavianka*) which flows in Tsarskoe Selo. Nonetheless the given device (translation onto the plane of pagan mythology) did not achieve the desired result—the cited lines provoked a determined protest by Trediakovskii, who would not accept such equivocation. In his report to the academic chancellery of September 17, 1750, Trediakovskii indignantly referred to Lomonosov's "false idea" "that the Egyptian pyramids were built over many centuries by human beings while Tsarskoe Selo was built by a divinity."<sup>359</sup>

Lomonosov also uses the word "Divinity" for Peter; see his first inscription to a statue of Peter (1750): "Russia reveres [him] as an earthly divinity."<sup>360</sup> Initially he had written that "Russia reveres [him] as a domestic divinity," but apparently Lomonosov did not like the overly direct association to pagan penates (hearth gods), a comparison which might have demeaned the emperor's status.

The Baroque use of Biblicisms in service of sacralization of the monarch was so common for Lomonosov that he did not always manage to translate sacred terminology into pagan very successfully. Hence arise paradoxical combinations of pagan and Christian terminology. Thus in the already cited ode on Elizabeth's arrival in Petersburg from Moscow of 1742 Lomonosov writes about God the Father (using the specifically Old Testament phrase "Ancient of Days" [*Vetkhii den`mi*]), placing Him on the pagan Olympus:

*Sacred terror overcomes my mind!  
The all-powerful Olympus opened the door.  
All creation attends with great terror,  
Seeing the Daughter of great Monarchs,  
Chosen by all true hearts,  
Crowned by the hand of the All-High,  
Standing before His face,  
Whom He in his light  
Looks to with generous praise,  
Confirms the covenant and consoles.  
"Be blessed forever,"  
Proclaims the Ancient of Days to Her . . .*<sup>361</sup>

Just as the Christian divinity can turn up on pagan Olympus, so a goddess that is unmistakably pagan can be found in the biblical paradise. Thus, in the ode on the marriage of Petr Fedorovich and Ekaterina Alekseevna of 1745, Lomonosov says:



*Is this not a sacred garden I see,  
Planted by the All-High in Eden,  
Where the first marriage was legitimized?  
The Goddess enters the chamber in glory,  
[And] leads in the most gracious couple . . .*<sup>362</sup>

1.3. What we observe in Lomonosov is typical for the mid-eighteenth century. Indeed, we find the same tactics and the very same devices in Sumarokov, at the same time as his literary position may radically differ from that of Lomonosov. For Sumarokov, as for Lomonosov, the use of sacred imagery for the monarch is characteristic. For example, in his speech on the birthday of Pavel Petrovich of 1761 he applies the archangel's words to Mary to Catherine: "Rejoice, Catherine! Blessed be you among women and blessed be the fruits of Your womb!"<sup>363</sup> Remarkably, just like Lomonosov as seen above, in his ode to Peter's victory Sumarokov also addresses the same words to Peter's mother:

*What a blessed time that was  
When Great Peter was born!  
Blessed be the womb  
By which he was brought into the world.*<sup>364</sup>

In the poem "The Russian Bethlehem" Sumarokov writes:

*The Russian Bethlehem: village of Kolomenskoe  
Which brought Peter into the world.*<sup>365</sup>

Like Lomonosov, Sumarokov puts praise of the empress into the mouth of God the Father ("the All-High"). In his ode on Catherine's birthday of 1764, God addresses Russia with the following words:

*Heed what the All-High proclaims,  
And what God doth say to you:  
I decided to reveal beauty,  
Catherine, to nature.  
And I watered her with my dew,  
To reveal the likeness of Divinity;  
With Her hellish malice will be banished,  
Truth will arise from the grave,  
And the age of paradise will return . . .*<sup>366</sup>

Together with this we find in Sumarokov the same device of translating sacral terms into the language of pagan mythology as seen in Lomonosov. Like Lomonosov, Sumarokov avoids calling the empress God and instead calls Catherine II “goddess,”<sup>367</sup> at the same time he identifies her as Pallada, Minerva, and Thetis.<sup>368</sup> Incidentally, Sumarokov doesn’t differentiate among gods and tsars by gender, so that he may call Elizabeth Zeus,<sup>369</sup> and Peter Pallada.<sup>370</sup> We also find in Sumarokov the use of Biblicisms justified by being placed in the mouths of pagan divinities. In the ode dedicated to Catherine’s ascension to the throne in 1762, Sumarokov sees in her a resurrected Peter, but here he speaks through the god Pluto:

*Pluto cries: Great Peter  
Has arisen from the grave, and evil falls,  
Hell now loses its sway . . .*<sup>371</sup>

**1.4.** The things that we have observed in Lomonosov and Sumarokov take on a somewhat a different character in their epigones. At the same time, if, as we have seen, Lomonosov’s system was rather precise (as he consciously avoided calling the tsar God or related words directly, without special motivation), in his followers this system was destroyed, and the sacralization of the monarch did not require any special motivation. It should be kept in mind that the odic language of later poets was to a significant extent composed of stock phrases taken precisely from Lomonosov, taking them out of the original context that justified their use. Thus if Lomonosov, as noted, calls Peter God (“He is God, he was your God, Russia”), discreetly putting these lines into the lips of a pagan god, N. P. Nikolev could use the same words without any equivocation:

*She . . . She is your God, Russia.*<sup>372</sup>

In another case Nikolev can write about Catherine’s two natures, divine and human, in this likening her to the hypostases of God the Word:

*Where Catherine’s Divinity  
Is at one with her humanity!*<sup>373</sup>

In the very same way, V. P. Petrov freely attributed names of God to the tsar, which in some cases may be seen as references to Lomonosov’s poetry. Thus addressing Catherine Petrov writes:

*You are God, You are God, not a person . . .*<sup>374</sup>

In the “People’s Love” Petrov says of Peter: “This God inspired me with new strength.”<sup>375</sup> Petrov also refers to Paul in similar terms:

*Today her [Russia’s] soul strives for Him,  
For her Savior and her God.*<sup>376</sup>

Remarkably, Petrov also refers to Grand Prince Alexander Pavlovich—the future emperor—this way, which evidently reflected Catherine’s desire to see him as heir to the throne. In the ode on Alexander’s birth of 1777 Petrov writes: “Although he is an infant, he’s a god [or: he is god].”<sup>377</sup> This reference is even more eloquent in the ode dedicated to the peace with Turkey (1793), which coincided with the marriage of Alexander and Elizaveta Alekseevna:

*O young and beautiful God!  
Enter, blessed, the bridal chamber,  
Your palace is Russia’s Eden.*<sup>378</sup>

In poets like Petrov and Nikolev, we also find the empress called “goddess,”<sup>379</sup> and also Pallada, Minerva, Themis, Astreia, etc.<sup>380</sup> However, in contrast to Lomonosov these titles were not a conscious poetic device but mere clichés.

We will cite an even more characteristic example from the poem “The Action and Glory of the Creating Spirit” (*Deistvie i slava zizhdushchago dukha*), signed “S. B.”<sup>381</sup> Here it says of Peter I:

*The future generation will remember what this new god  
Brought to life, and [think] what more he could have done.  
This divine image we see in Catherine.  
It is so majestic in this northern goddess  
That embracing near half the world with her might  
It transfigures everything, giving it a new appearance.*

Here, very diverse elements of the tradition we have been examining come together: Peter is called a god, Catherine a goddess, and at the same time Catherine is seen as a divine image of God—of Peter; all of which connects with calling tsars the divine image (see section II-2.2), and at the same time reflects the odic tradition according to which each successive monarch resurrects Peter I.

1.5. Derzhavin occupies a special place here. A whole series of his texts would have us see in him a follower of Lomonosov when, in using sacral terminology for the monarch, the poet gives the context a clearly non-Christian character. Thus, in the cycle of odes dedicated to Catherine as “Felitsa” (“Felitsa,” “Gratitude to Felitsa,” “A Murza’s Vision”), Derzhavin writes of Catherine as a divinity but puts the words in the mouth of a Tatar murza: “My god, my angel in the flesh”<sup>382</sup> or:

*To you alone is it appropriate, Tsarevna,  
To create light from the dark.*<sup>383</sup>

Derzhavin repeats the same device in the ode “To the Tsarevich Khlor,” addressed to Alexander I in the name of an Indian Brahmin.<sup>384</sup> Following Lomonosov Derzhavin often calls the empress a goddess,<sup>385</sup> as well as Minerva, Astrea, and Themis.<sup>386</sup> Similarly, he calls Alexander Apollo.<sup>387</sup> Continuing in the same vein, he calls Catherine “the god of love,”<sup>388</sup> and Alexander—“god of greatness”<sup>389</sup> or “god of love, all-powerful Lel’\*.”<sup>390</sup> At the same time, Derzhavin may also directly call a monarch God without any justifying motivation. Here Derzhavin follows the practice of Lomonosov’s epigones. He may thus call Alexander I “tsar of glory,”<sup>391</sup> that is, the same way Christ is referred to in liturgical texts (possibly, under the influence of the above-cited speech by Metropolitan Platon—see section II-1.5). Derzhavin writes of Alexander’s birth: “Be it known, some god is born”; characteristically, he prefers this line to an earlier variant—“Be it known, a demigod is born.”<sup>392</sup> Of Peter I he writes:

*The mind of the most wise can’t grasp it,  
Is it not God in him descended from heaven?*<sup>393</sup>

Of Catherine we read:

*“O, how great,” proclaims a crowd of people  
“Is God in the one who rules over us!”*<sup>394</sup>

He also calls Grand Prince Pavel Petrovich and his wife Natal’ia Alekseevna, as well as the Grand Princes Nikolai and Mikhail Pavlovich, gods.<sup>395</sup> These

---

\* *Translator’s note:* Lel’ —allegedly an ancient pagan Slavic god of love, first asserted by eighteenth-century Russian poets, apparently on the basis of similar-sounding words in the chorus of wedding songs.

examples indicate that by the end of the eighteenth century it became automatic to call members of the ruling family gods.<sup>396</sup> This testimony is all the more eloquent insofar as Derzhavin—as we will see below—was conscious of the growing problem of confessional conscience. Following the odic clichés that had become standard by the end of the century, Derzhavin also demonstrates the utmost mixing of Christian and pagan terminology. Thus, describing the recently deceased Grand Princess Alexandra Pavlovna, he writes: “The goddess now rests in God.”<sup>397</sup> Of the Empress Maria Fedorovna he says: “Goddess of widows and orphans,”<sup>398</sup> where the expression “widows and orphans” clearly refers back to ecclesiastical books. In the same way he can write about “the Parnassus Eden”<sup>399</sup> and put a commandment about happiness into Themis’ mouth.<sup>400</sup>

1.6. The material we have analyzed shows what difficulties eighteenth-century literature ran up against due to the contradiction between religious consciousness and poetic devices connected with sacralizing the monarch. The very fact that the authors tried very hard, with various degrees of consistency and depending on the period, to translate this sacralization into terms of pagan mythology shows that these attempts to resolve the conflict were quite deliberate. But there is even more obvious evidence about just how much this problem was consciously perceived. Thus in the ode “To the Victories of Sovereign Emperor Peter the Great” Sumarokov wrote of Peter:

*O most wise Divinity!  
From the start of the first age  
Nature has not seen  
Such a Person.*

These lines contain a clear juxtaposition of Peter and Christ; Peter is the first after Christ, and this is a clear hint at his likeness to God. However, Sumarokov immediately finds it necessary to make a significant qualification; immediately after this he says:

*It is not proper in Christianity  
To consider created things Gods;  
But if such a tsar had existed  
Even during paganism  
His fame would only have spread,*

*The entire universe, amazed  
By his marvelous deeds.  
Glory with incessant horn  
Would not proclaim as tsar, but as God,  
The man who had ascended the throne.*<sup>401</sup>

In essence, we see here the same device of translation into the plane of classical mythology, but it is interesting at the same time that Sumarokov immediately takes a step in the direction of Christian sacralization—by means of equivocation, given here in extremely explicit form. Sumarokov repeats the same idea in the inscription “To an Image of Peter the Great, Emperor of All Russia” of 1760, which, by the way, is a rather exact translation of Nikolai Motonis:<sup>402</sup>

*Peter, the number of your good deeds is very great!  
If in an ancient age  
Such a person as you had appeared  
Would the people have called You Father and Great?  
You'd have been called a god.*<sup>403</sup>

Nevertheless, Lomonosov and Derzhavin specially justify the sacralization of the monarch in relation to Peter I, declaring directly that this does not contradict the Orthodox faith. Significantly, in this case Lomonosov recalls pagan cults, but in distinction from Sumarokov asserts that a cult of Peter is appropriate not only for paganism but also for Christianity. Thus he writes in his fourth inscription to a statue of Peter the Great (1750):

*Divine honor was given by the ignorance of the ages  
[Variant: Divine honor given by the Greeks]  
To sculpted images, erected in ancient times  
To heroes for their glorious campaigns,  
And subsequent peoples honored their sacrifice—  
Something that the correct faith [i.e., Orthodoxy] always rejects.  
But you will be forgiven, you later descendants,  
When hearing of Peter's famed deeds,  
You will place an altar before this Heroic image  
(variant: sculpted image)<sup>404</sup>  
Long ago we endorsed you with our example.  
Amazed by His deeds that exceeded human strength  
[We] did not believe that He was a mortal,  
But during His life already considered Him as God.*<sup>405</sup>

Derzhavin in his “Ode on Greatness” (1774) writes:

*If people, with human weaknesses,  
Cannot be gods,  
A person must still compare  
Himself and his deeds to them.  
Why strive for a starry throne?  
Only to behold Peter the Great—  
He who can possess his spirit  
Will be like the gods.*<sup>406</sup>

In the just cited examples, the authors’ justifications for celebrating Peter I could be connected to the kind of canonization of the tsar that was characteristic of Petersburg culture.<sup>407</sup> However, this problem of justification cannot be reduced to Peter’s personality, just as sacralization, which grew more extensive year after year, cannot be reduced to Peter’s influence.

The same Derzhavin writes, addressing Catherine in the ode “Providence,”

*O gracious one! If creation  
May be likened to the Creator,  
Those great tsars  
Have a right to this above all others  
When from their thrones  
They terrify malice with thunder,  
Rain down fair blessings,  
Raise from death to life.  
And you, today generous to an orphan  
Are even more like Divinity.*<sup>408</sup>

No individual justifications, however, could completely resolve the problem. In this regard it is particularly characteristic that Derzhavin, evidently feeling dissatisfied with the usual arguments, came up with an entire theory that reconciled sacralization with Orthodox consciousness.<sup>409</sup> From this perspective on the conscious recognition of the difficulties involved in sacralization, poetic expressions of sacralization most often appear as linguistic clichés that essentially extra-literary processes imposed on poetry.

## 2. *The Preservation of the Baroque Tradition in the Religious Milieu*

2.1. With the passage of time the Baroque tradition in Russia faded away completely, and texts which earlier were meant to be interpreted in ludic terms and within a Baroque framework began to be taken more and more seriously and literally. This process also directly affected the sacralization of the monarch, indeed the very disappearance of the Baroque tradition in fact led to an ever increasing sacralization of the tsar. This intensification of sacralization outside of the Baroque tradition was especially strong during the Napoleonic invasion of 1812, when Biblical symbolism was applied on a scale heretofore unseen in Russia, and historical events were perceived in terms of an apocalyptic battle between Christ and Antichrist. It should be kept in mind, however, that the Baroque tradition held on tenaciously in the religious milieu.<sup>410</sup> Therefore, the disappearance of Baroque culture and texts should not be seen as their absolute elimination but as a sharp curtailing of their sphere of action. In general, the functioning of Baroque culture presumes a certain type—and a relatively high level—of education, including knowledge of rhetoric, classical mythology, and a whole series of standard texts. In the eighteenth century this type of education spread, in principle, to both the secular and religious milieu, while in the nineteenth century clear social limitations began to appear. If secular culture rejected the Baroque, the religious estate, on the strength of its characteristic conservatism, preserved the Baroque attitude toward texts to a significant degree. Characteristically, it was precisely at the start of the nineteenth century that a final rift took place between secular and religious literatures; in particular, the ode, whose poetics were directly connected to sermons (see section III-1.1), ceased its existence as a genre, while Baroque mechanisms continued to act in the sermon.<sup>411</sup> This rift was naturally connected with the differentiation of the secular and religious language that was taking place at the time, that is, with the differentiation between secular and religious literature and the isolation of “seminary language” as a special dialect.

The social limitedness of the Baroque that increased from the later eighteenth century caused its very representatives (the clergy) to perceive Baroque language as coexisting with the languages of other cultures. Earlier, the Baroque understanding of the word seemed to be the only possible one, universal and obvious, while other views seemed beyond the sphere of culture and were therefore ignored. Now, however, carriers of the Baroque tradition could take account of other readings of the corresponding cultural texts insofar as the non-Baroque system of values (first of all, secular aristocratic culture)



had also achieved a certain cultural prestige. In particular, the attention of the clergy could be drawn to two types of reception of the Baroque in the non-Baroque milieu: the literal understanding of Baroque texts that led to the complete deification of the monarch, or the tradition of consistently rejecting any kind of play with sacred images. At the same time, the intensification of the real—not Baroque or ludic—sacralization of the monarch also led to increased conflict between the sacralization of the monarch and Christian consciousness. For this reason, against the background of the sacralizing process that was plainly sustained by the clergy, we may from time to time observe the religious authorities' desire to partially limit this process.

This desire could be realized both in the purely semiotic sphere as well as in real-life practice. We presented a series of examples of this above. Thus, Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov) expressed his dissatisfaction with the tradition of calling the monarch "Christ," evidently apprehensive of identifying the emperor with the Heavenly Tsar (see section II-1.3). He also protested against carrying out a religious procession around the statue of Peter I,<sup>412</sup> and also against having the imperial coat of arms depicted as being supported by Archangels Michael and Gabriel, arguing that this was "the subordination of the idea of the holy to the civic idea."<sup>413</sup> It is no less telling that Archpriest Ioann Levanda's greeting to Emperor Alexander, cited above (see section II-1.3.1), in which he saw in him an angel, Christ, and God, was eliminated fifty years later (1850) by the religious censors when Levanda's sermons were being reissued, as "deviating from the truth and approaching flattery."<sup>414</sup> The religious censorship banned the order of service for "high triumphal days" that had been proposed by Razumovskii (discussed above, see section II-2 5), and from time to time removed particular expressions that testified to the imperial cult.<sup>415</sup> On March 5, 1865, the same Metropolitan Filaret wrote to the Archimandrite Antonii, hegumen of the Trinity-St. Sergius Lavra: "The respected professor Shevyrev did not hesitate to compare the blowing up of Sevastopol [in the Crimean War] with the earthquake during Christ's passion. What confusion! And if we use the Hebrew word, we should say: what a Babylon, not only in the West but here at home."<sup>416</sup> Filaret's reaction to Feofan Prokopovich's "Investigation of the Pontifex" (*Rozysk o pontifikse*) (1721), with which he only became acquainted in 1849, is extremely indicative. Filaret wrote: "The book . . . assumes something unusual in the very need to write it. It puts the pagan pontifex and Christian bishop on one level and reasons about the pagan pontifex more precisely and penetratingly than about the Christian bishop. At times he writes about the pagan pontifex in a Christian way, how, for example, the pontifex Trajan *gave his blessing* (page 7); sometimes he refers to a Christian bishop in a pagan way,

for example, how *the people may call sovereigns bishops*, because *the famous Greek poet Homer calls the Trojan sovereign Hector a bishop* (page 13).<sup>417</sup> This suggests how Baroque mythology was perceived in the middle of the nineteenth century.

All of these instances relate to the sphere of language and, more generally, to the semiotics of behavior. However, they find their equivalence in their attempts to limit the sacralization of the monarch as a phenomenon. In this regard Metropolitan Filaret's position is intriguing. Thus when in 1835 Nicholas I appointed the heir Alexander Nikolaevich (the future Alexander II) a member of the Synod, Filaret (together with other church leaders) protested against it,<sup>418</sup> and when greeting him, they asked him when he had been ordained, making the point that the heir was a layman and had no charisma which would confer on him the right to join the Synod.<sup>419</sup> After the death of Nicholas I, when the possibility arose for some actions independent of the government, Filaret succeeded in limiting the celebration of "high triumphal days" and military victories.<sup>420</sup> In the same way he sent the Ober-Procuror of the Synod a memorandum "On the Necessity of Abridging the Exaltation of Imperial Names of the Most August Family in Divine Services," in which he referred to Greek and ancient Russian practice; Filaret's proposed abridgement was approved by Alexander II.<sup>421</sup> One may find analogous examples among the activities of other religious leaders. Thus the Synodal authorities gave orders to put Feofan Prokopovich's odious "Investigation of the Pontifex" under seal.<sup>422</sup> The religious censors sometimes criticized the fact that the emperor (governmental power) was referred to as the lawgiver in the properly ecclesiastical domain.<sup>423</sup> Such examples could be multiplied.

Nonetheless, these facts do not indicate basic changes in the status quo. Thus Metropolitan Filaret, who fought against various manifestations of the sacralization of the monarch, nevertheless remained a representative of Baroque culture and himself occasionally used its sacralizing language. This was even more characteristic of other representatives of the clergy. Hence we may speak here only of particular objections against this or that Baroque device within a tradition that was itself Baroque. The same goes for other noted instances of limiting sacralization on the part of religious authorities, which stand out on the background of the further development of sacralization. The same Metropolitan Filaret who, as we have seen, advocated relative restraint and caution in this regard, in other cases defended the emperor's cult. He was thus extremely unhappy that Old Believers and Uniates did not mention the emperor in their church services and considered such commemoration one of the required conditions for the reunification of the Uniate with the Orthodox church;<sup>424</sup> the Old Believers, in his opinion, required police prosecution.<sup>425</sup>

Commemoration of the tsar for Filaret thus acquired doctrinal status. Hence even in those cases when a problem with sacralization of the monarch was felt, the position of the church authorities remained internally inconsistent and this could not have been otherwise given its system of governance. The church's system of governance was obviously non-canonical, but at the same time the church's hierarchy not only had no possibility of changing it, but such change would have led to undermining the very basis of that hierarchy's existence, that is, to its self-destruction.<sup>426</sup>

In this respect the clergy's attitude toward oaths in the name of God, which were part of the pledge of allegiance to the emperor, is exceptionally significant. This form of oath, which was introduced by Peter I and Feofan Prokopovich for political reasons,<sup>427</sup> was certainly non-canonical and directly contradicted the Gospels (Matthew 5:34).<sup>428</sup> Nevertheless, throughout practically the entire Synodal period the clergy defended oaths in the name of God. In particular, Filaret laid out the teaching about oaths in his "Extensive Catechism"; this doctrine was omitted as non-canonical in the Greek translation of this catechesis that came out in Constantinople in the 1850s, and it is extremely noteworthy that Filaret registered a strong protest against this change; he clearly considered it an essential part of the Synodal order (and, consequently, that the Greeks were casting doubt on the divine approbation of the Russian church).<sup>429</sup> "The contemporary governmental position of the church in Russia, rooted in Peter's church reform," wrote one of the most authoritative church historians of the Synodal period in 1916, "has always obliged and obliges the clergy to defend and justify not only the given governmental order, irrespective of its moral qualities, but also the events and phenomena that follow from it."<sup>430</sup> These words also apply to the oath in God's name and also, to a lesser extent, to all of the other manifestations of the cult of the emperor (the sacralization of the monarch).

In one way or another, the clergy preserved the Baroque tradition, despite its complete disappearance from secular culture, and the preservation of this tradition was supported by the entire structure of state life into which the church was entirely subsumed. Therefore the differences between religious and secular culture could manifest themselves as a conflict between Baroque and non-Baroque traditions. Notably, representatives of secular culture were at times more sensitive to confessional issues connected to the sacralization of the monarch than were representatives of the religious estate.<sup>431</sup> M. P. Pogodin's correspondence with the famous preacher Innokentii (Borisov) may serve as an illustration of this conflict between religious Baroque and secular non-Baroque culture. The correspondence began over one of Innokentii's sermons

published in the December, 1856, issue of “Christian Reading,” which had been delivered in the Odessa cathedral, and which responded to Alexander II’s recent coronation. In it the emperor’s conversation with Innokentii about Sevastopol\* was likened to a conversation of Christ with Moses and Elijah about Golgotha on Mount Tabor:

On the morning of the wedding day, when everyone around the throne declared [him to be] God’s Anointed one, and all of Russia, in the person of its representatives, hurried with greetings before the face of the Autocrat and His Spouse—receiving these, and me as well, as one of the Church leaders, as a pastor of this country, what do you think He deigned to prophesy about to me? About the fact that this was the last day of our southern [city of] Sevastopol. . . . Tell me yourselves, wasn’t this like the time when the God-man [i.e., Christ] amid the glory of Tabor once conversed with Moses and Elijah about Golgotha (Luke 9:31), which was then still ahead of Him, though now—for us—it is past?<sup>432</sup>

This comparison upset Pogodin and his colleagues, who thought it was blasphemous. Innokentii responded to this objection in a letter to Pogodin on January 17, 1857: “It’s strange and surprising that you keep howling about some sort of blasphemy: where is it? I don’t see it even it now. Neither did the censors see blasphemy, nor did other good people, no one did. The Petersburg Academy didn’t see it, and published it in ‘Christian Reading’; the Holy Synod didn’t see it, because it also saw the sermon before publication. And then your Moscow alone cries blasphemy! . . . So take a closer look yourselves at what offends you and it will seem different to you.”<sup>433</sup> Pogodin wrote in reply on January 26, 1857: “As you will, the comparison is impermissible, and disturbs the soul! I do not understand how habit may blind such a highly intelligent person as you to such an extent. Christ, Golgotha—who and what may be compared to Christ and Golgotha? Believe me, even now the blood is rushing to my head. And what is it you say about censorship? Is this really a matter for censorship? It’s a matter of inner feeling which tells us when to stop. But for you habit acted here. Glinka took God as his chum, said Krylov, so he’d go ahead and summon God to be godfather to his children. Only habit might justify this expression. Filaret himself says this sometimes. In cases such as yours juggling with words plays a role, and you don’t remember at these moments whom they refer to. In general, who may be compared to Christ? But in this

---

\* *Translator’s note:* After a prolonged siege the fall of Sevastopol led to Russia’s loss in the Crimean War.

particular case there's nothing to say . . . I called this comparison blasphemous not in the sense of heresy; this adjective only meant that it was impermissible, reprehensible . . . Feeling, pious feeling is offended by your comparison."<sup>434</sup>

This exchange is curious in many respects. First of all, it is indicative that a layman senses confessional problems arising from such word use more sharply than a man of the cloth. In the second place, it is curious that Pogodin considers this kind of usage characteristic of clergymen like Innokentii Borisov and Filaret Drozdov. Thirdly, it is evident that Baroque traditions in the religious sphere continued. Finally, the correspondence suggests that problems arising from the sacralization of the monarch continued to persist for Orthodox religious consciousness insofar as sacralization could not be organically harmonized with it.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have examined the process of the sacralization of the monarch in Russia in its diverse semiotic manifestations. Understandably, in this process both political as well as cultural factors played a role. The material presented shows how difficult it is to draw a line between the two. Political collisions emerge as cultural ones, and at the same time the formation of new cultural languages may have a fully obvious political underpinning. In diverse historical periods, the sacralization of the monarch in Russia has always been connected, directly or indirectly, with external cultural factors. External models may give the impulse for new developments or be the object of conscious orientation. In both cases, however, an external cultural tradition is refracted through the prism of traditional cultural consciousness. As a result, the reading of texts from an alien tradition turns into the creation of texts that are fundamentally new.

The political preconditions for the sacralization of the monarch were twofold. On the one hand, this was the transference of the functions of the Byzantine basileus onto the tsar of Moscow that could be realized both in the conception of Moscow as the Third Rome, which was contrasted to Byzantium, and in the later Byzantization of the Russian state and ecclesiastical life, beginning in the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich. On the other hand, this was the tsar's assimilation of the functions of head of the church, beginning with the reign of Peter I. The very combination of these two essentially contradictory tendencies only became possible in the conditions of Baroque culture, insofar as texts that were authoritative for cultural consciousness could be reconceptualized in various ways within a single Baroque framework.

The cultural and semiotic precondition for the sacralization of the monarch consisted of the ability of those who spoke the traditional cultural language to read new texts. Thus, in particular the title of tsar, which the grand prince adopted as a result of assimilating the functions of the Byzantine basileus (tsar), acquired distinctly expressed religious connotations in Russia, insofar as for traditional cultural consciousness this word was associated primarily with Christ. In a similar way, the reading of Baroque texts by a non-Baroque audience could condition the later sacralization of the monarch, that is, produce literalist interpretations of what at first had only carried a conditional, figurative, ludic meaning. For this reason, Baroque texts relating to the tsar were perceived by some as blasphemy and gave others an impetus to actual veneration.

Sacralization of the monarch pertained to the whole Synodal era, and during this entire period it continually came into conflict with traditional religious consciousness. Such conflict was unavoidable in principle insofar as the sacralization of the monarch became part of the state mechanism itself, and in particular, of the Synodal system.

*Translated by Marcus C. Levitt*

#### NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Isaak Massa, *Kratkoe izvestie o Moskovii v nachale XVII v.* (Moscow, 1937), 68.
- <sup>2</sup> Henrik Sederberg, "Zametki o religii i nravakh russkogo naroda," *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* 2 (1873): 37.
- <sup>3</sup> Johann Georg Korb, *Dnevnik puteshestvii v Moskoviiu (1698 i 1699 g.)* (St. Petersburg, 1906), 217. G. David's report is also significant. The Russians, he wrote, believe that "when God dies, his place will be taken either by St. Nicholas or the tsar." See: Georgius David, *Status modernus Magnae Russiae seu Moscoviae (1690)* (London, Hague, Paris, 1965), 115; B. A. Uspenskii, *Filologicheskie razyskaniia v oblasti slavianskikh drevnostei (Relikty iazychestva v vostochnoslavianskom kul'te Nikolaia Mirlikiiskogo)* (Moscow, 1982), 38ff.
- <sup>4</sup> *Sviashchennyi Sobor Pravoslavnoi Rossiiskoi Tserkvi. Deianiia* (Moscow-Petrogard, 1918), kn. II, vyp. 2, 351.
- <sup>5</sup> A. F. Belousov, *Literaturnoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi v narodnoi slovesnosti russkikh starozhilov Pribaltiki*. Candidate Thesis (Tartu University, 1980), 148.
- <sup>6</sup> M. N. Katkov, *O samoderzhavii i konstitutsii* (Moscow, 1905), 13.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.
- <sup>8</sup> P. Florenskii, *Okolo Khomiakova (kriticheskie zametki)* (Sergiev Posad, 1916), 26. S. N. Bulgakov writes about the evolution of his attitude toward the tsar, which turns out to be connected with his return to Orthodoxy:

by means of some sort of inner act [or] understanding, the strength for which Orthodoxy gave to me, my relationship to the tsar's power changed, [as well as] my

attitude toward it. I became, in the vulgar street expression, tsarist. I understood that the tsar's power in its essence is the highest kind of power, not in its own name, but in God's . . . I felt that the tsar also bore this power like Christ's cross, and that obedience to Him could also be Christ's cross and in His name. In my soul, the idea of holy tsarist power burned like a bright star, and by the light of this idea features of Russian history were lit up and began to sparkle in a new way, like precious stones; where before I had only seen emptiness, falsehood, Asiatic barbarism, now shone the divine idea of God's mercy, and not the human dispensation. (S. Bulgakov, *Avtobiograficheskie zametki* [Paris, 1946], 81-82; cf. 86.)

As evident, religious veneration of the tsar was not alien to members of the Russian "religious Renaissance," and in their view the sacralization of the monarch was an essential part of Orthodox doctrine that would have to be accommodated in any religious renewal.

<sup>9</sup> *Vlast' Samoderzhavnaia po ucheniiu slova Bozhiia i Pravoslavnoi Russkoi tserkvi* (Moscow, 1906), 19.

<sup>10</sup> P. I. Mel'nikov (Andrei Pecherskii), *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (St. Petersburg, 1897-1898), vol. XII, 367.

Attacks on autocracy in anti-religious (but not anti-monarchist) arguments from late 1917 to early 1918 testify that autocracy could be perceived as a confessional rather than juridical fact. Thus in a program of anti-religious lectures read in the winter of 1917-1918 among the attacks on church doctrine and sacraments was included the thesis: "The dying out of god-tsars: the resurrection of Humanity" (Deianiia, *Sviashchennyi Sobor Pravoslavnoi Rossiiskoi Tserkvi*, kn. VI, vyp. 1, 30, 33). This perception becomes understandable in the context of statements like that of N. S. Suvorov, a well-known canonist: "the bulwark of the Orthodox Church in Russia can only be Imperial power, with whose fall no most holy patriarch will be able to save the Russian Orthodox Church from disintegration" (*Zhurnaly i protokoly zasedanii Vysochaishe uchrezhdenного Predsobornogo Pristutstviia* [St. Petersburg, 1906], vol. I, 203).

<sup>11</sup> See on him: V. Val'denberg, *Drevnerusskie ucheniia o predelakh tsarskoi vlasti* (Petrograd, 1916); I. A. Shevchenko, "Byzantine Source of Muscovite Ideology," *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2 (1954).

<sup>12</sup> V. Semenov, *Drevniaia russkaia Pchela po pergamennomu spisku* (St. Petersburg, 1893), 111-112.

<sup>13</sup> The juxtaposition of supreme and Divine power, indicating the responsibility of the monarch, is present in the first chapter of Agapetos, which was also cited by a series of Russian authors (see I.A. Shevchenko, "Byzantine Source of Muscovite Ideology," *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2 [1954]). Thus in an excerpt of an epistle of Iosif Volotskii to the Grand Prince (*Poslaniia Iosifa Volotskogo* [Moscow, Leningrad, 1959], 183-184) we read: "Because, sovereign, in the likeness of the heavenly power the heavenly tsar gave to you the scepter of the earthly kingdom of power in order to teach men, to preserve the truth, and to drive demonic temptations from us." With insignificant differences, this same quotation is repeated in the epistle of the Novgorod Archbishop Feodosii (*Dopolnenie k Aktam istoricheskim, sobrannym i izdannym Arkheograficheskoiu kommissieiu* [St. Petersburg, 1846-1875], vol. I, no. 4, 56).

The extent to which Agapetos influenced religious literature may be seen by the fact that his formulations were repeated even in the second half of the nineteenth century (although they could be interpreted in a sense that was far from the original).



- Thus in the Sermon on the day of ascension to the throne of 1865, the Samara priest I. Khalkolivanov said: "The tsar, although of one nature as we, and having the same bodily composition, yet He, being God's Anointed, is the divine deputy on earth in regard to the people over whom God has entrusted him power . . ." (I. Khalkolivanov, *Slova i poucheniia na vse nedeli v godu* (Samara, 1873), vol. II, 183).
- 14 *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (St. Petersburg, Petrograd, Leningrad, Moscow, 1841-1989), vol. II, 592.
- 15 *Ibid.*, vol. I, 370.
- 16 *Poslaniia Iosifa Volotskogo* (Moscow, Leningrad, 1959), 184; also see: I. A. Shevchenko, "Byzantine Source of Muscovite Ideology."
- 17 Iosif Volotskii, *Prosvetitel'* (Kazan, 1855), 602.
- 18 *Ibid.*, 420.
- 19 *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. X, 131.
- 20 Rom 13:1.
- 21 *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii imp. Russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva* (St. Petersburg, 1861), vol. II, 751, 753.
- 22 *Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi imperii Arkheograficheskoi ekspeditsieiu imp. Akademii nauk* (St. Petersburg, 1836), vol. IV, no. 127, 172.
- 23 *Kniga prepodobnogo i bogonosnogo otsa nashego Nikona, igumena Chernyia gory* (Pochaev, 1795), 1, 306.
- 24 Iosif Volotskii, *Prosvetitel'*, 602.
- 25 M. A. D'iakonov, *Vlast' moskovskikh gosudarei. Ocherki iz istorii politicheskikh idei drevnei Rusi do kontsa XVI v.* (St. Petersburg, 1889), 99.
- 26 V. Val'denberg, *Drevnerusskie ucheniia o predelakh tsarskoi vlasti*, 210-211; V. Val'denberg, "Poniatie o tirane v drevnerusskoi literature v sravnenii s zapadnoi," *Izvestiia po russkomu iazyku i slovesnosti* III, 1 (1929).
- 27 "Opredeleniia Moskovskogo Sobora 1675 g.," *Pravoslavnyi sobesednik* 1 (1864): 370.
- 28 On the first see: M. N. Tikhomirov, *Merilo pravednoe po rukopisi XIV veka* (Moscow, 1961), 27; Nikolai Kostomarov, ed., *Pamiatniki starinnoi russkoi literatury, izdavaemye grafom Grigoriem Kushelevym-Bezborodko* (St. Petersburg, 1860-1862), vol. IV, 184; and on the latter: S. Smirnov, *Materialy dlia istorii drevnerussoi pokaiannoii distsipliny* (Moscow, 1913), 230, 231.
- 29 Psalm 82 in the Western Psalter.
- 30 It is precisely this kind of exegesis that is presented in commentaries on the Psalter (Tolkovyie Psaltyri) which usually contain the commentaries of Athanasius the Great (of Alexandria) or Theodoret of Cyrrihus (see in particular V. Pogorelov, "Chudovskaia Psaltyr' XI veka" in *Pamiatniki staroslavianskogo iazyka* [St. Petersburg, 1910], vol. III, 192-193). For the commentaries, see: J.P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca* (Paris, 1857-1864), 364d-365b; vol. LXXX, 1528b-1529b.
- In the patristic literature there also exists another tradition of exegesis of this Psalm connected with the idea of the deification of saints, which sees them transfigured "into gods by grace" (see V.M. Zhivov, "Mistagogiia' Maksima Ispovednika i razvitie vizantiiskoi teorii obraza." In *Khudozhestvennyi iazyk srednevekov'ia* [Moscow, 1982], 123; on calling saints "gods" see Vasilii [Krivoshein], Arkhiepiskop, *Prepodobnyi Simeon Novyi Bogoslov [949-1022]* [Paris, 1980], 37, 99, 106, 157, 166, 177, 188, 201, etc.). It is interesting to note that Patriarch Germanos (Germanus) of Constantinople (early eighth century), in an epistle to Thomas of Claudiopolis, writes: ". . . we do not let



any of the holy men be called god, although . . . God gave this name to those who pleased Him, as it is written in the holy book of Psalms [Ps 81 (82): 1-6]" (D. Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum consiliorum nova et amplissima collection* [Venice and Florence, 1759-1798], vol. XIII, 121-124). It may be supposed that in Byzantium the two exegetic traditions opposed one another and belonged to two different ideological trends. In Russia, the second exegetic tradition attracted little interest. In Russia one may find saints being called "gods," but as a rule this is for different reasons; here icons could be called "gods," and therefore saints could be named the same way (for example, "Nikola—god of barge haulers," and so on; see B.A. Uspenskij, "Filologicheskie razyskaniia v oblasti slavianskikh drevnostei" in *Relikty iazychestva v vostochnoslavianskom kul'te Nikolaiia Mirlikiiskogo* [Moscow, 1982], 10, 118-119).

- <sup>31</sup> The "Sermon of Vasiliu Velikii" (Basil the Great) is directly connected to the "Sermon of Jesus son of Sirach on Ungracious Princes Who Judge Untruly," which is textologically related to it, and which was included in several *Kormchie* books (nomocanons) and Prologues (miscellanies) (see, for example, *Kormchii* in RGADA, f. 181, d. 576; RNB, QII, d. 46). In the opinion of V. Val'denberg (V. Val'denberg, *Drevnerusskie ucheniia o predelakh tsarskoi vlasti* [Petrograd, 1916], 129), this work was the source for the "Sermon of Vasiliu Velikii." The monarch is not called "god" here, although it does say that "every true tsar or prince has an angelic or sacerdotal rank" (RGADA, f. 181, d. 576, ll. 454-455 verso); the word "true" (pravdivyi) here means "righteous" (pravednyi), "living according to truth, in accord with Divine commandments." For us it is important that here the same context pertains as above, that is, the issue is the monarch's responsibility before God (primarily for righteous judgments), which defines the specific connections between them. It is characteristic that both sermons were cited in this way by Iosif Volotskii (see "Chetvertoe poslanie ob epitimiakh" in S. Smirnov, *Materialy dlia istorii drevnerussoi pokaiannoii distsipliny* [Moscow, 1913], prilozhenie, 230-231).
- <sup>32</sup> M. Cherniavsky (1961, 32), considering the old Russian period, asserts that "basically, in Russian popular tradition and in Russian political theology, all princes were seen as saints, through actions or in their being, mediators between God and their people in life and in death, and in that sense true images of Christ." This statement is to a large degree based on the unmotivated veneration (from the perspective of the Christian canon of saintliness) of many Russian princes as saints. If we agree that a prince was more or less automatically accepted as holy, this would mean that he acted as a necessary mediator between God and man and in this way—according to old Russian religious and political views—possessed a special charisma. Such an assumption, however, cannot withstand criticism. Indeed, those sources on whose basis we may judge the the sixteenth century (E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh v Russkoi Tserkvi* [Moscow, 1903], 309f) sooner testify to retrospective sacralization, that is, to the spread of the cult of the monarch taking place in Russia at that time. Thus these sources cannot provide evidence of the religious and political views of the oldest period, but reflect later changes in social and religious consciousness.
- <sup>33</sup> A. L. Gol'dberg, "Tri poslamiia Filofeia (Opyt tekstologicheskogo analiza)," *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* XXIV (1974): 87; V. Zhmakin, "Odin iz literaturnykh pamiatnikov XVII v.," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* 221 (1882): 245.
- <sup>34</sup> J. Meyendorff, "Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas," *Patristica sorboniensis* 3 (1959): 158-159.

- 35 Wladimir Vodoff, "Remarques sur la valeur du term 'tsar' appliqué aux princes Russes avant le milieu du XV siècle," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 11 (1978): 1-41.
- 36 The well-known dynastic legend about Riurik's descent from Prus, brother of Emperor Augustus, claims a direct connection between the rulers of Moscow and imperial Rome (R.P. Dmitrieva, *Skazanie o kniaz' iakh Vladimirskikh* [Moscow-Leningrad, 1955]). This legend arose approximately at the time of the notion of "Moscow—Third Rome" and may be seen as its secular, political and dynastic, complement. Although this legend was used in sixteenth century diplomatic relations as proof of the legitimacy of the tsar's title, and possibly also in internal political struggles, its importance for the religious and political consciousness of the era remained peripheral; there could be no comparison here with the significance of the Roman connection for Byzantium.
- 37 I. V. Iagich, ed., *Codex slovenicus rerum grammaticarum. Rassuzhdeniia iuzhnoslavianskoi i russkoi stariny o tserkovnoslavianskom i russkom iazyke* (St. Petersburg, 1885-1895), 437.
- 38 *Ibid.*, 436, 454, 459; RGB, Tikhonrav. 336, ll. 15 verso-16.
- 39 *Rossiiia nachala XVII v. Zapiski kapitana Marzhereta* (Moscow, 1982), 56-57, 148-149; N. Ustrialov, *Skazaniia sovremennikov o Dmitrii Samozvantse* (St. Petersburg, 1859), part I, 254.
- 40 *Perepiska Ivana Groznogo s Andreem Kurbskim* (Leningrad, 1979), 19.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 14.
- 42 A. M. Panchenko, B. A. Uspenskii, "Ivan Groznyi i Petr Velikii: kontseptsii pervogo monarkha," *Trudy Otdela drencherusskoi literatury XXXVII* (1983). Ivan the Terrible's stated opinion that a church may only be erected over the tomb of a tsar (just as over the tomb of a saint) testifies to his view of the special sacral status of the tsar. In his epistle to the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery Ivan protests against the building of a church over the grave of Prince Vorotyenskii, who was not a tsar and not venerated as a saint: "... it is arrogance and an example of inordinate praise to venerate someone like a tsar by [erecting a] church and [honoring him with] a sepulcher and pall" (Ivan Groznyi, *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo* [Moscow, 1951], 173). On the sacral character of the epithet "groznyi," see A.M. Panchenko, B.A. Uspenskii, "Ivan Groznyi i Petr Velikii," 70-71.
- 43 Iosif Volotskii, *Prosvetitel'*, 324-325.
- 44 B. Norretranders, *The Shaping of Czardom under Ivan Groznyi* (Copenhagen, 1964), 45.
- 45 See, for example, the troparion (*tropar*) on the Birth of Christ, on Candelmas (*Sretenie*), the fourth and fifth song of the Paschal canon, etc.
- 46 N. T. Voitovich, *Barkalabauska letapis* (Minsk, 1977), 198.
- 47 Konrad Bussov, *Moskovskaia khronika: 1564-1613* (Moscow, Leningrad, 1961), 109.
- 48 I. Tatarskii, *Simeon Polotskii (ego zhizn' i deiatel'nost')*. *Opyt issledovaniia iz istorii prosveshcheniia i vnutrennei tserkovnoi zhizni vo vtoruiu polovinu XVII veka* (Moscow, 1886).
- 49 *Letopisi russkoi literatury i drevnosti* (Moscow, 1859-1863), vol. V, part III, 90-93.
- 50 *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, izdavaemaia Arkheograficheskoiu komissieiu* (St. Petersburg, Petrograd, Leningrad, 1872-1927), vol. XIII, 313.
- 51 *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii Imperatorskogo Russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. II, 464, 460.
- 52 I. A. Chistovich, *Feofan Prokopovich i ego vremia* (St. Petersburg, 1868), 84, 86. 10. Of course, only depictions of a tsar during his life are relevant in this regard. Posthumous images of this sort are a more or less common phenomenon. These Byzantine notions were possibly reflected in the "Sermon of Jesus son of Sirach" mentioned in note 31, in which it speaks of the "angelic or sacerdotal rank" of the true tsar.

In Byzantium this charismatic perception of the emperor was manifested in a series of imperial court ceremonies, in the emperor's relations with the clergy, in church rituals connected with the emperor, in his titles, and so on. Although in Byzantium itself these external marks of the emperor's charisma could be interpreted in different ways by various parties, the main mass of information available to the Russians (both oral and from books) convinced them that the head of the Orthodox empire was endowed with special spiritual powers and privileges.

It is curious to note that a series of these external marks of the emperor's charisma developed not as a result of the transfer of church ceremonies onto the emperor but due to a reverse process: the development of church ritual in the fourth and fifth centuries to a large degree consisted in transferring ceremonies and practices of the emperor's court into the church (see: L. Bréhier, P. Battifol, *Les Survivances du culte imperial romain* (Paris, 1920); A. Grabar, "L'empereur dans l'art Byzantine." *Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg* 75 [1936]). However, the memory of this in Byzantium had been lost quite early and was all the less relevant for Russia.

- <sup>53</sup> See Ivan Timofeev's *Chronicle (Vremennik)* in *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 373; V. Val'denberg, "Poniatie o tirane v drevnerusskoi literature v sravnenii s zapadnoi," 223-224.
- <sup>54</sup> See, for example, Timofeev's *Chronicle* in *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 326, 389.
- <sup>55</sup> A. Gasquet, *De l'autorité imperial en matière religieuse à Byzance* (Paris, 1879); G. Podskalsky, *Byzantinische Reicheschatologie* (München, 1972); E. H. Kantorowicz, *The King's Two Bodies* (Princeton, 1957).
- <sup>56</sup> Consider the notion of the emperor as an "external bishop," as in calling Byzantine emperor Leo III "bishop and tsar" in the so-called second epistle of Pope Gregory II in D. Mansi, ed., *Sacrorum consiliorum nova et amplissima collection* (Venice and Florence, 1759-1798), vol. XII, 979; or the emperor's assumption of a series of functions in the church ritual—see A. Gasquet, *De l'autorité imperial en matière religieuse à Byzance*, 52-60 and P. Dabin, "Le sacerdoce royal des fidèles dans la taradition ancienne et modern," *Museum Lessianum. Section théologique* 48 (1950): 126-128; in the last work the author indicates several echoes of these Byzantine ideas in the West.
- <sup>57</sup> Despite all of this, it is necessary to note that the ideas under discussion did not come together into a system of views that would unite Russian society. This ideology remained only one of several tendencies in religious and political thought. However, it was manifested clearly in Ivan the Terrible's reign, but was connected here with a whole series of particular issues and led to the splintering of Russian society that was expressed with full clarity in the Time of Troubles. Understandably, this later period did not facilitate the development of theocratic ideas, and it is indicative that at its end the idea of an elected tsar won out; cf. the constraints on electing the Polish prince Vladislav as Russian tsar as formulated by Russian envoys in 1610.
- <sup>58</sup> Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society* (London, 1965), vol. II, 379-388; Marc Bloch, "Les ropios thaumaturges: etude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale, particulièrement en France et en Angleterre," *Publications de la Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg* 19 (1924); F. Barlow, "The King's Evil," in *The English Historical Review* 95 (1980): 374.
- <sup>59</sup> S. Belokurov, *Arsenii Sukhanov* (Moscow, 1891-1892), 85-87.
- <sup>60</sup> E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki sviashchennogo venchaniia tsarei na tsarstvo v sviazi s grecheskimi ikh originalami. S istoricheskim ocherkom chinov tsarskogo venchaniia v sviazi s razvitiem idei tsaria na Rusi* (Moscow, 1883), 138.

- <sup>61</sup> Naturally, changes to the coronation rite that developed during his father's reign only applied to his coronation and should not be retroactively attributed to that of Aleksei Mikhailovich himself. See K. Popov, "Chin sviashchennogo koronovaniia (istoricheskii ocherk obrazovaniia china)," *Bogoslovskii vestnik* II (1896): 191; V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevsy. K voprosu o vliianii Vizantii na obrazovanie idei tsarskoi vlasti moskovskikh gosudarei* (Kharkov, 1901), 147.
- <sup>62</sup> *Pis'ma mitr. Moskovskogo Filareta k namestniku Sviato-Troitskii Sergiev lavry arhimandritu Antoniiu* (Moscow, 1877-1881), vol. IV, 339-340, 342; *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta, mitr. Moskovskogo i Kolomenskogo, po uchebnym i tserkovno-gosudarstvennym voprosam* (Moscow, 1885-1888), dop. tom, 444-450.
- <sup>63</sup> *Corpus juris civilis* (Berlin, 1903-1904), vol. III, 507.
- <sup>64</sup> *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXIX, 466-469.
- <sup>65</sup> N. F. Kapterev, *Patriarkh Nikon i tsar` Aleksei Mikhailovich* (Sergiev Posad, 1909-1912), vol. II, 188.
- <sup>66</sup> For example, see Patriarch Nikon's protests in his letters to the Eastern Patriarchs in RGB, f. 178, d. 9427, l. 110; RGADA, f. XXVII, d. 140, ch. VII, l. 93; ch. VIII, ll. 15-17 verso, 53-56, 91 verso-94, 127-130; and in his "Objection or Ruin" (*Vozrazhenie ili razorenie*), the twenty-sixth question and answer, in RGB, f. 178, d. 9427, l. 291ff.
- After the Council of 1666-1667, judicial functions were removed from the Monastery Office (*Monastyrskii prikaz*) and returned to the church authorities; this was evidently the tsar's payment for the clergy's agreement to depose Patriarch Nikon. After Aleksei Mikhailovich's death on December 19, 1677, the Monastery Office was closed; one may assume that the young tsar (Fedor Alekseevich) acted here under pressure from the church. On January 24, 1701, after the death of Patriarch Adrian, Peter I again instituted a Monastery Office, which was one of his first steps in taking away the independence of church administration.
- <sup>67</sup> *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii Imperatorskogo Russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. II, 521, 546.
- <sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 188-189.
- <sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 430-432; V. M. Zhivov, "Istoriia russkogo prava kak lingvosemioticheskaia problema" in *Semiotics and the History of Culture. In Honor of J. Lotman* (Columbus, OH, 1988); V. M. Undol'skii, "Otzyv patriarkha Nikona ob ulozhenii tsaria Alekseia Mikhailovicha," *Russkii arkhiv* 2 (1886).
- <sup>70</sup> *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii Imperatorskogo Russkogo arkheologicheskogo obshchestva*, vol. II, 428, 430, 434.
- <sup>71</sup> *Pravda russkaia* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1940-1963), vol. I, 104, 117, 122; *Sudebniki XV-XVI vekov* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1952), 141.
- <sup>72</sup> Together with representations of the charismatic status of the emperor in patriotic literature one may find very rare instructions for the basileus on his status as a layman, for example, in St. Ambrosius of Milan or St. Maximus the Confessor. See J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series latina* (Paris, 1857-1864), vol. XVI, 1041, 1038-1039, 1061; J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. LXXXII, 1232-1237; vol. XC, 92, 116-117, 145-148; Theodoret, *Eccl Historia* V, 17.
- <sup>73</sup> See on this conflict: N. F. Kapterev, *Patriarkh Nikon i tsar` Aleksei Mikhailovich*; M. V. Zyz'kin, *Patriarkh Nikon: ego gosudarstvennye i kanonicheskie idei* (Warsaw, 1931-1939); and sections II-2.3.
- <sup>74</sup> Thus, responding to the boyar S. Streshnev, Nikon writes (the twenty-seventh question and answer): "Tell me, o interlocutor, what must be done according to the holy rules

with one who calls our most majestic tsar a torturer and dares call [him] an unjust abuser and predator? Answer: Why do you write anonymously, ‘one who calls our most majestic tsar a torturer.’ If you are speaking about us, it is not we alone who profess this, but all creation sympathizes and sighs with us over the fierce sorrows that we suffered, as has been shown above . . . And the tsar’s injustice and lack of mercy is clear to everyone.” See RGB, f. 178, d. 9427, l. 454.

<sup>75</sup> See, for example, the Spiritual Regulation (*Dukhovnyi Reglament*) in P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii i Dukhovnyi Reglament* (Rostov-na-Donu, 1916), vol. II, 32 (first pagination); vol. I, 89, 183, 283-284, 368.

<sup>76</sup> A paean to Petr Mogila may serve as a typical example of the Ruthenian panegyric style that must have been perceived as blasphemous by the Great Russian audience. Its author asks why Mogila’s birth did not occur on the same day as Christ’s (Mogila was born on December 21). The question is resolved like this: “Petr Mogila should have been born on the same day as Christ, but the applause of the luminaries themselves could not suffice for both of them together. The earth was not in condition to [sufficiently] marvel at these two great miracles of nature. The heavens did not want to have double joy; they divided it up for several days and decided to have Petr born a few days before Christmas so that having experienced and commended their hymns to the first, they could sing them to the second; they decided, however, that Petr should be born not long before Christ so that Petr and Christ could accept the heavenly applause appropriate for each.” See S. Golubev, *Kievskii mitropolit Petr Mogila i ego spodvzhniki* (Kiev, 1883-1898), vol. I, 7, 19.

<sup>77</sup> V. M. Zhivov, B. A. Uspenskii, “Metamorfozy antichnogo iazychestva v istotii russkoi kul’tury XVII-XVIII vv.” in *Antichnost’ v kul’ture i iskusstve posleduiushchikh vekov* (Moscow, 1984).

<sup>78</sup> I. I. Golikov, *Anekdoty, kasaiushchiesia do Gosudaria Imperatora Petra Velikogo* (Moscow, 1807), 422-23; *Rasskazy Nartova o Petre Velikom* (St. Petersburg, 1891), 73.

<sup>79</sup> Psalm 81:6 (Psalm 82:6 in the Western Psalter).

<sup>80</sup> 1 Corinthians 8:5.

<sup>81</sup> Exodus 22:28.

<sup>82</sup> John 10:34-35; Jesus here explains the meaning of the line cited from Psalm 81 (82).

<sup>83</sup> Theodoret of Cyrillus’s commentary on Psalm 82. See J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. 80, 1528C.

<sup>84</sup> Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk, Sviateishago Pravitel’stvuiushchego Sinoda Vitse prezidenta, a potom pervenstvuiushchego Chlena Slova i rechi pouchitel’nyia, pokhval’nyia i pozdravitel’nyia* (St. Petersburg, 1760-1768), part I, 251. 17. The same idea but without such detailed argumentation is repeated by Feofan in the *Investigation of the Pontifex* (1721): “For the Christian law in holy writings more than any other human laws gives power to the highest authorities, and shows them to be quite inviolable, untouchable, and subject to no one’s judgment other than God’s. And therefore they adorn them with most glorious and exceptional names, calling them divine Christs and Gods.” See Feofan Prokopovich, *Rozysk istoricheskii, koikh radi vin, i v iazykovom razume byli i naritalsis’ imperatory rimstii, kak iazychestii, tak i khristianstii, pontifeksami ili arkhierieiami mnogobozhnogo zakona* (St. Petersburg, 1721), 37. Here Feofan gives a curious linguistic basis for applying sacred names to the tsar. See Feofan Prokopovich, *Rozysk istoricheskii*, 23-24. On the fact that tsars “are honored with partaking in divine titles is not due to human flattery but from God Himself who judges truly irrespective of person,” Feofan also speaks in the sermon on the coronation

- of Catherine I in 1726, referring to the same Psalm 81 (82). See Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, part II, 176-178.
- <sup>85</sup> The figurative arts of the Petrine era offer the same possibility of such a dual reading, based on the collision of the two traditions. In this regard Aleksei Zubov's etching of 1717 is very indicative; here "the tsar is depicted in the center in armor and porphyry, above him the word God in an aureole." See P. P. Pekarskii, *Istoriia imp. Akademii nauk v Peterburge* (St. Petersburg, 1870-1873), vol. II, 386. The word "God" here indicates the invisible God; this image derives from the iconography of the Dutch "Piscator Bible" (see A. S. Retkovskaia, "O poiavlenii i razvitii kompozitsii 'Otechestvo' v russkom iskusstve XIV-XVI vekov" in *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo XV—nachala XVI veka* (Moscow, 1963), 258), but to the Russian viewer, brought up on icons (the more so since secular painting had only recently appeared in Russia), this inscription must have been perceived as a title (*titlo*), that is, relating to the name of the person depicted below it.
- <sup>86</sup> V. Kel'siev, *Sbornik pravitel' stvennykh svedenii o raskol' nikakh* (London 1860-1862), vol. II, 248.
- <sup>87</sup> 2 Thessalonians 2:4.
- <sup>88</sup> N. Bubnov, N. Demkova, "Vnov' naidennoe poslanie iz Moskvy v Pustozersk 'Vozvshchenie ot syna dukhovnago ottsu dukhovnomu' i otvet protopopa Avvakuma (1767 g.)," *Trudy otдела drevnerusskoi literatury* 36 (1981): 144.
- <sup>89</sup> Lazar `Baranovich, *Mech dukhovnyi ezhe est` glagol bozhii* (Kiev, 1666), 10 verso.
- <sup>90</sup> There are many examples of this sort of reaction, such as the composition by Ivan Pavlov published by Pekarskii in his article "Voluntary Sufferer for Making the Sign of the Cross with Two Fingers." See P. P. Pekarskii, *Istoricheskie bumagi, sobrannye K. I. Arsen'evym* (St. Petersburg, 1872), 114-132.
- <sup>91</sup> See *Russhaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, 421, 523, 529, 534-536, 540, 558, 576-578, 583, 584; V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevsy*, 68-69.
- <sup>92</sup> It is curious to note that in this and many other issues the southern Slavs (first of all those living in Greek cultural centers) tended much more spontaneously toward the Byzantine tradition than the Russians. Thus in the Serbian typicon of the Holy Laura of St. Sabba (in Jerusalem) we read in the Polychronion (*mnogoletie*): "May many years be granted to our pious and God's anointed, holy Tsar Stephen." This refers to the Serbian King Stephen Urosh (Uroš) III who reigned at the time the typicon was written, and who died in 1371. See A. Dmitrievskii, *Opisanie liturgicheskikh rukopisei, khраниshchikhsia v bibliotekakh pravoslavnogo Vostoka* (Petrograd, 1917), vol. III, part II, 464-465, 469.
- <sup>93</sup> See V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevsy*, 70-71; there are many examples here.
- <sup>94</sup> See for example the documents and letters of the patriarchs of Jerusalem and other bishops in N. F. Kapterev, "Snosheniia Ierusalimskikh patriarkhov s russkim pravitel'stvom," *Pravoslavnyi Palestinskii sbornik* 43 (1895), 17, 18, 102, 109, 118, 136, 169, 178, 247, 259, 284, 304, 348, 350, 374, 377, 420, 421, 424, 436; *Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo* (St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1887-1977), vol. II, 718, vol. VII, 483.
- <sup>95</sup> *Polnoe sobranie postanovlenii i rasporyazhenii po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedaniia* (St. Petersburg-Petrograd, 1869-1916), vol. III, no. 1115, 161.
- <sup>96</sup> The change evidently concerned the exclamations in the Greek rite of enthronement that announced the choice of patriarch: "Our sovereign and holy autocrat and tsar, and the divine . . . council invite your Most Holiness to the Highest Throne of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate." See V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasi-levsy*, 70-71.



- <sup>97</sup> Avvakum's commentary on Psalm 44 in *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXIX, 465-466.
- <sup>98</sup> N. G. Ustrialov, *Istoriia tsarstvovaniia Petra Velikogo* (St. Petersburg, 1858-1859), vol. II, 471.
- <sup>99</sup> *Propovedi blazhennyiia pamiati Stefana Iavorskogo* (Moscow, 1804-1805), vol. II, 154.
- <sup>100</sup> *Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo*, vol. IX, 631.
- <sup>101</sup> V. P. Petrov, *Oda imperatritse Ekaterine Alekseevne vo iz'iaвление chuvstvitel'neishiia synov rossiiskikh radosti i iskrenneishego blagodareniiia, vzbuzhdenного v serdtsakh ikh manifestom o izbranii deputatov k sochineniiu proekta novogo ulozheniia* (Moscow, 1767), 2 verso.
- <sup>102</sup> Platon (Levshin), *Rech` Gosudariu Imperatoru Aleksandru Pavlovichu po sovershenii koronovaniia* (Moscow, 1801), 4 verso.
- <sup>103</sup> Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Rech` pred nachatiem blagodarstvennogo molebstviia po sluchaiu vozvrashcheniia Aleksandra I v Rossiiu* (Moscow, 1815), 6; Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Rech` Ego Imp. Velichestvu Aleksandru Pervomu po sluchaiu pribytiia v Sviato Troitskuiu Sergievu Lavru* (Moscow, 1816), 5.
- <sup>104</sup> *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika* (Moscow, 1788-1791), vol. VII, 357.
- <sup>105</sup> *Ibid.*, 288; *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, khраниashchikhsia v gosudarstvennoi kollegii inostrannykh del* (Moscow, 1813-1894), vol. II, 83, vol. III, 84.
- <sup>106</sup> It is important to emphasize that the exclamations "Holy of holies" and "Holy lord, tsar anointed by God" were directly connected to the rules for the tsar's coronation. See A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov` v ikh vzaimnykh otnosheniiaikh v Moskovskom gosudarstve. Tsarstvovanie Fedora Ioanovicha. Uchrezhdenie patriarshestva v Rossii* (Odessa, 1912), appendix II, 120-121.
- <sup>107</sup> *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, vol. IV, 375-76; some phrases have been left out.
- <sup>108</sup> *Perepiska Filareta mitropolita Moskovskogo s S. D. Nechaevym* (St. Petersburg, 1895), 85-86.
- <sup>109</sup> An actual case of revering the emperor's portrait as an icon was recorded in I. I. Golikov, *Anekdoty*, 532-535.
- <sup>110</sup> This specific view receives a deliberate theological justification: "According to [Russian] Orthodox theologians, anointing, combined with coronation, is a special sacrament: the tsar is not initiated into the religious hierarchy as it was with the Byzantine emperor and does not assume the authority of performing the rite or of teaching, but does receive the authority and wisdom to perform the highest governmental role in both church and state." See F. V. Brokgauz, I. A. Efron, eds., *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar`* (St. Petersburg, 1890-1904), vol. XXXI, 320-321; Kataev, N. *O sviashchennom venchanii i pomazanii tsarei na tsarstvo* (St. Petersburg, 1847). In a sermon on Emperor Paul's coronation, Metropolitan Evgenii (Bolkhovitinov) called the coronation ceremony and anointing the tsar "a God-given sacrament." See Leskov, N. S. "Tsarskaia koronatsiia," *Istoricheskii vestnik*, (1881) vol 5: 284. This point of view, by the way, was not alien to Byzantium, where some saw in the coronation τὸ τῆς βασιλείας μυστήριον. See K. Popov, "Chin sviashchennogo koronovaniia," 68. Whatever the particular differences from Byzantium, the very conferral of exceptional meaning on anointment clearly had Byzantine roots. Byzantium developed the doctrine that anointing the king not only accorded the emperor God-given gifts but also freed him from sin. See *Ibid.*, 67.
- <sup>111</sup> Maksim Grek uses the word "khristos" as a Grecicism in the meaning "anointed one." This word appears as a gloss to "anointed" (*pomazannyi*) several times in the manuscript of a Lectionary Psalter (*Sledovannaia Psaltyr`*) from the late fifteenth century. See glosses to Psalms 104(105):15, 131(132):10 and to the fourth song of Prophet

- Avvakum, verse 13 in RGB, Troitsk. 315, ll. 134 verso, 161, 181. In Maksim's collection of corrections to the Psalter we find the following commentary to the given usage: "И вознесетъ розъ ха [with diacritic] *своєго*. Com[mentary]: in Greek, *khristi*, in Russian it is called *anointed (pomazanii)*." See Ibid., Troitsk. 201, l. 481. Of course, for Maksim this was a purely linguistic correction that had no political significance. (Note that when Maksim corrected the Lectionary Psalter, in the 1540s, in Russia the tsar was not yet "anointed for the kingdom").
- <sup>112</sup> *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, vol. IV, 88. In a Church Slavonic translation contemporary to the epistle, this place reads: "God is in heaven and in everything, and it is the same on earth—God is also in those who are below the tsar's rank and eminence, and just as those who deny faith in God are deprived of the assembly of the faithful, in a similar way those who don't keep faith in the tsar's rank but surreptitiously show themselves false to him are unworthy of to be called Christians because he [the tsar] is God's anointed, having the crown and diadem and strength in himself." See Ibid. Another contemporary translation published by Gibbenet renders the text even less precisely. See N. Gibbenet, *Istoricheskoe issledovanie dela patriarkha Nikona* (St. Petersburg, 1882-1884), vol. II, 672-673.
- <sup>113</sup> Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, part I, 252.
- <sup>114</sup> The etymology of the word *khristos* was also fully obvious to those of conservative views, i.e. for that "ignorant throng" whom Feofan Prokopovich and his cohort strove to enlighten. Archpriest Avvakum wrote in his commentary on Psalm 44: "Christ . . . was anointed by the Father from on high by the Holy Spirit and filled with grace and truth. For this reason he was called Christ, or the anointed, or tsar." See *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXIX, 459; also, see Feofan's exegesis of the same psalm concerning the same issue in Feofan Prokopovich, *Rassuzhdenie o knize Solomonovoi, narekaemoi Pesni Pesnei* (Moscow, 1774), 23-25. It is remarkable that Avvakum connects the kingly dignity of Christ precisely with anointing, however, he concludes from this that Christ may be called "tsar," but not at all that a tsar may be called "Christ." Here we clearly see the difference in attitude toward verbal signs that we discussed above (section I-2.2).
- <sup>115</sup> Ibid., 25-26. This idea also has a Byzantine source. Feofan could have borrowed it from Eusebius' "Church History" which he undoubtedly knew well. Eusebius writes: "And tsars too, by God's determination, were anointed by prophets and through this became prefigurations of Christ, because they bore on themselves the image of the imperial and supreme power of the single and true Christ, the Word of God that reigns over all." See J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. XX, 72; Evsevii Pamfil, *Sochineniia, perevedennye s grecheskogo pri SPb. Duhovoi Akademii* (St. Petersburg, 1850-1858), vol. I, 15; Hist. Eccl. I, 3.
- <sup>116</sup> P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom* (St. Petersburg, 1862), vol. 2, 202.
- <sup>117</sup> Feofilakt Lopatinskii, *Sluzhba blagodarstvennaia, Bogu v Troitse sviatoi slavimomu o velikoi Bogom darovannoi pobeде, nad sveiskim koroleм Karolom 12, i voinstvom ego. Sodeiannoi pod Poltavoiu, v leto 1709* (Moscow, 1709), 16 verso; *Mineia Iiun`* (Moscow, 1766), 237 verso.
- <sup>118</sup> Feofilakt Lopatinskii, *Sluzhba blagodarstvennaia*, 19 verso; *Mineia Iiun`*, 239 verso.
- <sup>119</sup> Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, vol. I, 155.
- <sup>120</sup> P. Morozov, *Feofan Prokopovich kak pisatel`* (St. Petersburg, 1880), 83-84.
- <sup>121</sup> Luke 2:30.
- <sup>122</sup> Luke 2:10-11.



- 123 Ia. S. Gur`ianova, "Neizvestnyi pamiatnik staroobriadcheskoi polemiki kontsa XVII—nachala XIX v. ob imperatorskoi vlasti" in *Drevnerusskaia rukopisnaia kniga i ee bytovanie v Sibiri* (Novosibirsk, 1982), 85.
- 124 Ia. S. Gur`ianova, "Staroobriadcheskie sochineniia XVIII—nachala XIX v. o dogmate nemoleniia za gosudaria v fedoseevskom soglasii" in *Issledovaniia po istorii obschestvennogo soznaniia epokhi feodalizma v Rossii* (Novosibirsk, 1984), 84-85; Ia. S. Gur`ianova, "Staroobriadcheskie sochineniia XVIII—nachala XIX v. o dogmate nemoleniia za gosudaria" in *Rukopisnaia traditsiia XVI-XIX vv. na vostoke Rossii* (Novosibirsk, 1983), 81.
- 125 Ibid., 75.
- 126 The Old Believer tract "Collection About the Antichrist from Holy Writ" cited above says of Peter I that "this false Christ began to exalt himself above all so-called gods." See V. Kel`siev, *Sbornik* vol. II, 248. This work evidently was the source for the Beguny tract also cited above.
- 127 On the circumstances surrounding the speech, see I. A. Shliapkin, *Sv. Dimitrii Rostovskii i ego vremia (1651-1709 gg.)* (St. Petersburg, 1891), 277.
- 128 Dimitrii Rostovskii, *Sobranie raznykh pouchitel`nykh slov i drugikh sochinenii* (Moscow, 1786), vol. I, 1.
- 129 For example, in the letter of Vasilii Rzhetskii to Peter I of September 4, 1704, congratulating him on the victory at Narva: "And I the last slave of you, my Christ, praise God the lord of all, in songs of prayer." See RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, d. 3, l. 212.
- 130 *Propovedi blazhenniya pamiati Stefana Iavorskogo*, vol. III, 242.
- 131 Ibid., 253.
- 132 Ibid., vol. I, 167.
- 133 Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, vol. I, 252.
- 134 Feofan Prokopovich, *Rozysk istoricheskii*, 37.
- 135 Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, vol. II, 178-179.
- 136 See in particular Ibid., vol. I, 31, 217, 253, 267-268; vol. II, 63; P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie*, vol. II, 157 (first pagination).
- 137 *Dukhovnyi Reglament Vsepresvetleishego derzhavneishego gosudaria Petra Pervogo, imperatora i samoderzhtsa vserossiiskogo* (Moscow, 1904), 17. The expression the "Lord's Christ" (*Khristos Gospoden*) was commonly applied to the tsar. One should not conclude, however, that this phrase was specific for the tsar as anointed sovereign; in liturgical texts Jesus Christ could also be called the "Lord's Christ." For example, in the stichera for Candelmas: "What does the old man Symeon see, who cries out to you; Now you let your slave, O Lord, see the Lord's Christ in the arms of the virgin." See *Stikhirar` prazdnichnyi* (mid-twelfth century) in RNB, Sof. 384, l. 41.
- 138 Feofilakt Lopatinskii, *Sluzhba blagodarstvennaia*, 18 verso; *Mineia Iiun`*, 238 verso. See also the stichera of the Small Vespers, first mode: "You have glorified your Christ, and all of the Orthodox" in Ibid., 231-231 verso and Feofilakt Lopatinskii, *Sluzhba blagodarstvennaia*, 1.
- 139 P. P. Pekarskii, *Istoricheskie bumagi*, 124.
- 140 G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia* (St. Petersburg, 1864-1883), vol. IX, 134. In 1757 the Siberian priest Petr Khomiakov was accused of blasphemy because "in front of many guests, for no apparent cause or reason among various conversations made the following statement: 'May God give Christ health, [because] we, sinners, in Christ [our] God receive salvation and remission of our sins.' During the investigation Khomiakov explained that he had had in mind not Jesus Christ but Empress Elizaveta Petrovna

- [Elizabeth]. 'In conversations I incidentally used the expression, God give Christ health, to mean that the Lord God would give the anointed one, our All-merciful Sovereign Empress Elizaveta Petrovna, problem-free prosperity.'" The investigators were apparently satisfied with this answer. See N. D. Zol'nikova, *Soslovnnye problemy vo vzaimootnosheniakh tserkvi i gosudarstva v Sibiri (XVIII v.)* (Novosibirsk, 1981). See also note 278 below.
- <sup>141</sup> Simon Todorskii, *Slovo v vysochaishee prisutstvie eia sviashchenneshago imperatorskago velichestva blagochestiveishiia samoderzhavneishiia velikiia gosudaryni nasheia Elisavety Petrovny imperatritsy vseia Rossii, v vysokotorzhestvennyi den` rozhdeniia ego Imp. Vysochestva Petra Fedorovicha. Propovedannoe Ego Imp. Vysochestva pridvornym uchitelem Ieromonakhom Simonom Todorskim v pridvornoj tserkve v Sanktpeterburge fevralia 10 dnia 1743 goda* (St. Petersburg, 1743), 12; G. A. Voskresenskii, *Pridvornaia i akademicheskaia propoved` v Rossii poltorasta let nazad* (Moscow, 1894), 78). In the same sermon Simon Todorskii compares Petr Fedorovich's arrival in Russia from Holstein to Christ's return to Israel from Egypt: "God spoke with inner inspiration in the heart of magnanimous Elizabeth: Get up, Mother, take the child, take your beloved Nephew to the land of Israel, since some who sought for the child's soul have died and others were exiled." See Simon Todorskii, *Slovo v vysochaishee prisutstvie*, 16. The preacher is paraphrasing Matthew 2:20.
- <sup>142</sup> V. Petrov, *Sochineniia* (St. Petersburg, 1809), part II, 239. See also 1 Chronicles 16:22.
- <sup>143</sup> Platon (Levshin), *Rech` Gosudariu Imperatoru*, 4 verso.
- <sup>144</sup> I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn` moskovskogo mitropolita Platona* (Moscow, 1856), part II, 42.
- <sup>145</sup> Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Sochineniia* (St. Petersburg, 1856), 112.
- <sup>146</sup> See *Ibid.*, 8, 21, 31, 41, 64, 95; Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Slovo pred nachatiem molebstviia po sluchaiu pobedy u Laona* (Moscow, 1814), 3; Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Slovo v prazdnik Rozhdestva Iisusa Khrista* (Moscow, 1814), 4, 11; Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Rech` Aleksandru Pervomu po vysochashem Ego Velichetva pribytii v Moskvu* (Moscow, 1817), 3.
- <sup>147</sup> A. Kotovich, *Dukhovnaia tsenzura v Rossii (1799-1855 gg.)* (St. Petersburg, 1909), 466. See also references to Paul I and Alexander I as "Christ" in *Slova i rechi Ioanna Levandy, protoiereia Kievo-Sofiiskogo Sobora* (St. Petersburg, 1821), part II, 208-209, 251.
- <sup>148</sup> A. Kotovich, *Dukhovnaia tsenzura*, 466.
- <sup>149</sup> *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. V, 392. The quoted prayer was written by Ephrem the Syrian and taken by the publishers of the "Service for the Most Holy God Mother" from the Russian translation of his works, which Filaret didn't realize. See Efrem Sirin, *Tvoreniia* (Moscow, 1848-1853), vol. VIII, 113, and the Latin translation in Efrem, *Sancti patris nostri Ephraemi Syri opera*, ed. D. A. B. Caillau (Paris, 1842), vol. VIII, 287. For us it is not so important what Ephrem had in mind but how this text was perceived on Russian soil.
- <sup>150</sup> I. Khalkolivanov, *Slova i poucheniia*, vol. II, 212-213.
- <sup>151</sup> It is indicative that Mikhail Bakunin, speaking of the tsar as an ideal of the Russian people, calls the emperor "the Russian Christ" in *Narodnoe delo: Romanov, Pugachev, ili Pestel`* (1917), 42. There is clearly confusion here between calling the tsar "Christ" and the expression "the Russian God" as a description of the national idea.
- <sup>152</sup> *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena. Sochinenie vizantiiskogo polkovodtsa XI v.* (Moscow, 1972), 275; V. Vasil'evskii, "Sovety i rasskazy vizantiiskogo boiarina XI veka," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, June-August (1881): 316.
- <sup>153</sup> This usage was most likely based on the doctrine of human deification, widespread in Byzantium, according to which a saintly life could make a person "a god by grace"

(on the calling saints “gods” in Byzantine literature see note 13). The “Advice and Tales of Kekaumenos [Kekavmen]” includes a simplified reflection of this doctrine. “Moreover, I consider that all people, the basileiuses, and the archons, and those who earn their daily bread, are children of one man—Adam. . . . Indeed if he wants, a person, as a rational creature, himself may become a god by means of divine grace (χάρτι θεοῦ).” See *Ibid.*, 345; *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena*, 287. It was evidently also thought that people have a special responsibility for this power, so that righteous behavior making them “gods by grace” was understood as an obligation. In the beginning of this work there is also an exhortation in which the following is addressed to a rich man: “Help the needy in all things, since a rich man is god to the poor, because he does good deeds for him.” See *Ibid.*, 121; V. Vasil’evskii, “Sovety i rasskazy,” 254. However, one can also find examples of calling the tsar “god” in Byzantine literature as a direct expression of his deification. Thus a writer from the end of the fourth century, speaking of the oath “by God and Christ and the Holy Spirit, and the emperor as well,” remarks that one must honor the emperor “as the visible and corporal God [*tamquam praesenti et corporali Deo*].” See F. R. Vegetius, *Epitoma rei militaris* (Leipzig, 1885), 38.

154 P. Oderbornius, *Wunderbare, Erschreckliche, Unerhörte Geschichte, und warhafftige Historien: Nemlich, Des nechst gewesenen Großfürsten in der Moschkaw, Joan Basilidis, (auff jre Sprach Iwan Basilowitz genandt) Leben* (Hörlitz, 1588), 3.

155 M. P. Alekseev, *Sibir` v izvestiakh zapadnoevropeiskikh puteshestvennikov i pisatelei* (Irkutsk, 1932), 252.

156 Iurii Krilsanich, *Politika* (Moscow, 1965), 206.

157 *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii*, vol. II, 552-553; see the same comparison of Aleksei Mikhailovich and Nebuchadnezzar by Archpriest Avvakum cited above (section I-2.1). It is possible that an indirect reflection of this phrase was calling the tsar “Man God” in Lazar Baranovich’s “Trumpets of Homiletic Words” (*Truby sloves propovednykh*). Speaking of the birth of a son to Aleksei Mikhailovich he writes: “Joy to Aleksei Man of God, for he begat a Man God.” See Lazar` Baranovich, *Truby sloves propovednykh* (Kiev, 1674), 16). We may assume that here too Baranovich was playing on the juxtaposition of the God-man (a common title for Jesus) and man-god (as description of the future tsar), a juxtaposition that is analogous to the heavenly and earthly tsar, god of heaven and god of earth, etc.

158 E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, iv.

159 I. A. Chistovich, *Feofan Prokopovich*, 66.

160 *Rasskazy Nartova*, 69.

161 S. I. Maslov, “Pereizdanie propovedi Georgiia Konisskogo i Manassii Maksimovicha,” *Chteniia v istoricheskom obshchestve Nestora Letopistsa I-II* (1909): 87.

162 S. Naryshkin, *Epistola Ekaterine II, imperatritse vsereiiskoi, podnesennaia vsepoddaneishim rabom Semenom Naryshkinym* (St. Petersburg, 1762).

163 G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. I, 53. He has in mind that the pillars of the fatherland, i.e., grandees, have one goal—the well-being of the people, whatever means they must resort to for its realization, including public threats and secret councils with earthly gods, i.e., tsars.

164 *Ibid.*, 109. 35. This poem is a paraphrase of Psalm 81 (82). It is all the more characteristic since Derzhavin, deviating from the original text, calls rulers not “gods” (as in the psalm) but “earthly gods.”

165 *Ibid.*, 565.

- 166 Ibid., vol. II, 102.  
 167 Ibid., 147.  
 168 I. A. Shliapkin, "V. P. Petrov, 'karmannyi' stikhotvorets Ekateriny II (1736-1799)," *Istoricheskii vestnik* 11 (1885), 401.  
 169 N. M. Karamzin, *Polnoe sobranie stikhotvorenii* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1966), 189.  
 170 Feofilakt Rusanov, *Razsuzhdenie o plodakh prishestviiia Khristova na zemliu, odnosite'no k pol'zam chelovecheskikh obshchezhitii* (Moscow, 1806), 15. Compare the use of this phrase in an ironic or negative sense in V. G. Belinskii's "Letter to Gogol" of 1847 in V. G. Belinskii, *Sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow, 1948), vol. III, 711; and also by A. K. Tolstoi in "Song on Potok the Warrior" in A. K. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (St. Petersburg, 1907-1908), vol. I, 298, 299.  
 171 M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1950-1959), vol. VIII, 285.  
 172 V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, vol. I, 31.  
 173 A. S. Pishkevich, *Zhizn' A. S. Pishkevicha, im samim napisannaia, 1764-1805*. (1885), 28.  
 174 V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, vol. I, 89.  
 175 N. P. Nikolev, *Tvoreniiia* (Moscow, 1795-1798), part II, 248.  
 176 We find an echo of this tradition in A. A. Bestuzhev's letter to Ia. N. Tolstoi of March 3, 1824: "The Duchess of Wittenberg died yesterday on my watch, and I saw what an impression this made on people who consider themselves gods . . ." See *Russkaia starina*, November (1889): 375-377.  
 177 V. Kel'siev, *Sbornik*, vol. III, 232; the obscene noun seems especially expressive in the mouths of Skoptsy (Castrates)!  
 178 A. D. Kantemir, *Sochineniia, pis'ma i izbrannye perevody* (St. Petersburg, 1867-1868), vol. I, 260, 273. The title "earthly god" could be transferred from the tsar onto other officials who appear as little tsars in their domains. Thus in the satirical "Petition to God from Crimean Soldiers" it says:

*Adam labored and served the one God,  
 Why have so many little earthly gods (bozhki) appeared . . .*

And further:

*Save us from the power of the little earthly gods  
 And let us not fall into the tyranny of their power.*

(G. Gukovskii, "Soldatskie stikhi XVIII veka."  
*Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 9-10 [1933], 126)

Cf. in this connection the characteristic comments of an Old Believer, a Runner (Begun), about landowners (1851): "Will these gods remain much longer?" (K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial'no-utopicheskie legendy* (Moscow, 1967), 244). In both cases the plural (bozhki, bogi) apparently indicates a connection with pagan idols. The expression "earthly god" could thus describe someone with unlimited power. An episode related by M. A. Dmitriev is representative. A landowner, Major Ivashev, stumbled onto a tent in the Syzran uezd in which the bishop of Kazan was serving vespers. The tent fell, and so did he, the bishop ran out, saw the man lying on the ground, and without bothering to figure out what had happened, ordered him to be flogged. Ivashev then galloped off to the village (Ivashevka) and warned that "the bishop is coming, mighty angry, so angry that

- he flogged him! By early morning all of the gentlewomen of Ivashevka had gathered by the village gates to meet the bishop and when he arrived they fell face down on the ground with loud wails, through which could be heard: ‘Little father, earthly god! Don’t destroy us!’” (M. A. Dmitriev, *Melochi iz zapasa moei pamiati* [Moscow, 1869], 127).
- 179 S. M. Solov’ev, *Istoriia Rossii* (Moscow, 1962-1966), vol. IX, 186.
- 180 See letters from Vinius of April 29, 1701 in *Pis’ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo*, vol. I, 852, and of November 16, 1706 in *Ibid.*, vol. V, 718.
- 181 N. G. Ustrialov, *Istoriia tsarstvovaniia Petra Velikogo*, vol. VI, 493, 197; see also Psalms 16:6 (17:6)], 30:3 (31:3).
- 182 I. Chistovich, “Neizdannye propovedi Stefana Iavorskogo,” *Khristianskoe chtenie* 1-2 (1867): 139; see also Luke 2:29-31.
- 183 J. Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (London, 1971), 123. We will cite one characteristic passage: “That same sweet song he sings for you, o illustrious and never overpowered monarch, when you pass away: Now you let your servant go in peace, my Lord, according to your word. My eyes have seen your salvation, which you prepared for all humans, sparing your tsarist health that is more precious than all treasures, to protect your ardent devotion and all of us. My eyes have seen salvation, which you prepared, bringing down the strong walls of Azov, Kizirm, Tartar and other fortresses. My eyes have seen the salvation which you prepared, passing through and illuminating the entire universe, your face like the sun. I have enjoyed seeing all that and I came, says the defunct, and now you let your servant rest in peace.”
- 184 One should keep in mind that in the Petrine period only two akathyst prayers were accepted in Great Russia: to the God Mother and to “the Sweetest Jesus.” A multitude of akathyst prayers appeared in Great Russia during the Synodal period.
- 185 RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, o. 3, d. 3, ll. 75-75 verso.
- 186 *Pis’ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo*, vol. IX, vyp. 2, 1063-1064; also with unmentioned abridgement in S. M. Solov’ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. VIII, 277; see also *Ibid.*, 335; *Pis’ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo*, vol. X, 648.
- 187 P. P. Pekarskii, *Istoriia imp. Akademii nauk*, vol. II, 392.
- 188 A. V. Pozdneev, “Russkaia patrioticheskaia pesnia v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka” in *Issledovaniia i materialy po drevnerusskoi literature* (Moscow, 1961), 351.
- 189 I. Porfir’ev, *Istoriia russkoi slovestnosti*, vol II: 1, p. 90.
- 190 I. A. Chistovich, “Rukovodiashchie deiateli dukhovnogo prosveshcheniia v Rossii v pervoi polovine tekushchego stoletiiia” in *Komissiiia Dukhovnykh uchilishch* (St. Petersburg, 1894), 183; see also Psalm 70:9 (71:9).
- 191 I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn’ moskovskogo mitropolita Platona*, part II, 114-115.
- 192 *Sbornik Russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* (St. Petersburg, Petrograd, 1867-1916), vol. CXIII, part 1, 416. As a typological parallel with Byzantium one may recall the protest of Emperor Theodosius, who in a letter to Caesarea refused to accept honors appropriate only to God; see A. Gasquet, *De l’authorité imperial*, 43.
- 193 E. R. Dashkova, *Memoirs of the Princess Daschkaw, lady of honor to Catherine II empress of all the Russias, written by herself, comprising letters of the empress and other correspondence* (London, 1840), vol. II, 95. We note in this connection A. V. Nikitenko’s diary entry of January 3, 1834, concerning the book by V. N. Olin, *A Picture of Eight Years: Russia 1825—1834*, that he reviewed as censor, a book which glorified Nicholas’ reign. “A censor finds himself at a spiritual impasse in such cases—one can’t ban such books but it’s uncomfortable to approve them. Fortunately, this time the Sovereign himself clarified

- the matter. I had passed the book, however, having cut several things, for example, the place where the author called Nicholas a god. The Sovereign still did not like the unrestrained praise and charged a minister to explain to the censors that in future they should not allow such works. My thanks to him!" See A. V. Nikitenko, *Dnevnik v trekh tomakh* (Moscow, 1955), vol. I, 131-132.
- <sup>194</sup> N. I. Il'minskii, *Pis'ma* (Kazan, 1895), 78-80.
- <sup>195</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.
- <sup>196</sup> The Protestant approach to the monarch (*Landsherr*) as the highest instance of religious administration became evident under Peter, in particular, in the fact that the tsar also acted as the head of the Protestant communities in Russia. See I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche, 1700-1917* (Leiden, 1964), 131-132.
- <sup>197</sup> See the doctrine of the Epanagoge that the emperor and patriarch are like body and soul in Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Collectio librorum juris graeco-romani ineditorum. Ecloga Leonis et Constantini, Epanagoge Basilii Leonis et Alexandri* (Leipzig, 1852), 68; see also V. Sokol'skii, "O kharaktere i znachenii epanagogi. Ocherk iz istorii vizantiiskogo prava," *Vizantiiskii vremennik* 1 (1894): 29, 31-33, 37-38, 43-45.
- <sup>198</sup> *Sluzhebnik* (Moscow, 1656), 21, 22, 34, 40.
- <sup>199</sup> On the new status of the monarch as reason for instituting the patriarchate, see A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov'*, xi, 219.
- <sup>200</sup> *Kormchaia* (Moscow, 1653), 22, 15.
- <sup>201</sup> *Corpus juris civilis*, vol. III, 35-36; see the citations from it in the Nikonian service book—*Sluzhebnik*, 2, 14-15.
- <sup>202</sup> In this regard the projects that preceded the choice of a Moscow patriarch to transfer the oecumenical Constantinopolitan pulpit to Vladimir, whence Patriarch Jeremiah was to move, are characteristic. See N. F. Kapterev, *Kharakter otnoshenii Rossii k pravoslavnomu Vostoku v XVI i XVII stolietiakh* (1914), 43; A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov'*, 291-295; prilozhenie 1, 117-121.
- <sup>203</sup> The extent to which this perception had become rooted in cultural consciousness is apparent from the fact that when in 1915 the annexation of Constantinople by Russia seemed imminent, there were discussions in Petrograd about abolishing the pulpit of the patriarch of Constantinople and establishing a Metropolitan there who would be subordinate to the Synod. See *Sviashchennyi Sobor Pravoslavnoi Rossiiskoi Tserkvi*, vol. II, vyp. 2, 342.
- <sup>204</sup> *Dukhovnyi Reglament*, 16. Recall that this text remained in juridical force right up to 1917. Feofan clearly hints here at the Catholic position in which the clergy makes up "a state within a state" and he attributes this situation to Russia, thus justifying the reformation being undertaken there. See the attack on this casuistic device of Feofan's by Markell Rodyshevskii in P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. II, 131, 133 (second pagination). Feofan's words about the fact that the people consider the patriarch "the second Sovereign" apparently refer to Patriarch Nikon, who, like the tsar, was called Great Sovereign. On this title see *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii. Sobranoe pervoe* (St. Petersburg, 1830), vol. I, 8, 124, 333; for Nikon's statements on this, see *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii*, vol. II, 515. It is significant that Nikon had assimilated several points of Catholic doctrine concerning secular and religious authority, something that his contemporaries noted. See N. Gibbenet, *Istoricheskoe issledovanie*, part II, 78. Feofan purposefully attributes the same papist claims to Nikon's successors in the patriarchal pulpit.

- 205 The first reports on the Council are from 1692. See P. Gordon, *Dnevnik* (Moscow, 1892), part II, 360; R Wittram, *Peter I, Czar und Kaiser. Zur Geschichte Peters des Grossen in seiner Zeit* (Göttingen, 1964), vol. I, 106f.
- 206 See the oath of members of the Spiritual College and then the Synod in P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. II, 11f (first pagination); this oath was only abolished in 1901; see *Ibid.*, 8. It is worth noting that the words about the “Supreme Judge” were added to the text of the oath by Feofan Prokopovich with his own hand. Later, Arsenii Matseevich, already a member of the Synod, refused to take the oath on the grounds that only Christ can serve as the supreme judge of the church. See M. S. Popov, *Arsenii Matseevich i ego delo* (St. Petersburg, 1912), 97, 390, 430.
- 207 P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. II, 6 (first pagination).
- 208 As noted (section I-2.1), under Aleksei Mikhailovich there appeared a formula in the bishops’ certificates of ordination according to which the ordination was made “by order of the Sovereign tsar,” although this did not change the traditional practice of ordaining bishops, that is, the tsar only confirmed the decision made by the religious authorities. The situation changed completely in the eighteenth century when the emperor’s choice became the official procedure.
- 209 I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, 171, 126. This practice creates the illusion of the church’s relative independence, however even this was not observed consistently. Thus in 1819 Alexander I ordered Archimandrite Innokentii (Smirnov) to be bishop of Orenburg. Characteristically, this provoked an objection from Petersburg Metropolitan Mikhail (Desnitskii), who in the presence of members of the Synod drew the attention of the Minister of Religious Affairs and Popular Education, Prince A. N. Golitsyn, to the fact “that for the first time a bishop was appointed directly by the emperor, without Synodal election and contrary to church procedure.” See *Starina i novizna XV* (1911): 182-183; I. A. Chistovich, “Rukovodiashchie deiateli,” 200.
- 210 *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, 442-443; for the late seventeenth century see GIM, Sin. 344, ll. 7-8 verso.
- 211 Right down to giving permission to tonsure monks, see *Vnutrennii byt Russkogo gosudarstva c 17-go dekabria 1740 g. po 25-e noiabria 1741 g., po dokumentam, khraniaschimsia v Mosovskom Arkhiv Ministerstva Iustitsii* (Moscow, 1880-1886), vol. I, 53-54, 70.
- 212 *Dukhovnyi Reglament*, 6.
- 213 *Svod zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1892), vol. I, part 1, art. 43, 10; see also J. Meyendorf, “Russian Bishops and Church Reform in 1905,” *Russian Orthodoxy Under the Old Regime* (Minneapolis, 1978), 170-171.
- 214 See P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. I, iv, v, vii, xi, xii-xiv, xli, xlii, xliv, lvi.
- 215 *Polnoe sobranie postanovlenii i rasporiazhenii*, vol. I, no. 112, 157.
- 216 V. N. Tatishchev, *Istoriia rossiiskaia s samykh drevneishikh vremen* (Moscow-St. Petersburg, 1768-1848), vol. I, 574.
- 217 N. M. Karamzin, *Zapiska o drevnei i novoi Rossii* (St. Petersburg, 1914), 29; A. N. Pypin, *Istoricheskie ocherki. Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v Rossii pri Aleksandre I* (St. Petersburg, 1900), 491. According to the exceptionally precise formulation of the Decembrist M. A. Fon-Vizin: “By means of the abolition of the patriarchate and establishment of the Synod Peter unconditionally subordinated the church to his arbitrary rule [proizvol]. He appreciated the so-called territorial system of reformation, according to which every powerful sovereign was declared a natural bishop and head of the



- church on his land. Peter, while he did not formally proclaim himself the head of the Orthodox Greco-Russian Church, according to the formula of the oath of allegiance for members of the Synod and high clergy upon their appointment, in essence did become its head; the Synod became one of many administrative departments and came to depend unconditionally on the tsar's arbitrary rule. A worldly and purely military bureaucrat under the strange title of Ober-Procuror of the Most Holy Ruling Synod acts in name of the sovereign with complete power in the church's council and rules the clergy with complete power." See M. A. Fon-Vizin, *Zapiski ochevidtstva smutnykh vremen tsarstvovaniia Pavla I, Aleksandra I i Nikolaia I* (Leipzig, 1859), 22-23; *Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v Rossii v pervuiu polovinu XIX veka . . . Stat' i materialy*. (St. Petersburg, 1905), vol 1, 112.
- 218 *Rasskazy Nartova*, 72. Nartov was a contemporary of Peter's but it is difficult to date his stories precisely.
- 219 Peter's view of the extent of his autocratic power is clearly manifested in the his ukase establishing the Synod (January 25, 1721): "We were afraid to be ungrateful to the All-High, having received divine assistance from him in reforming the military as well as the civil order, but having neglected as yet to reform the religious order." See P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. II, 6 (first pagination). It is completely obvious that Peter in no way separates his activities administering the church from those involving civil administration. The unified nature of his administrative activity is reflected in the fact that even before the establishment of the Synod both civil and religious administration were under control of the Senate, which by the ukase of March 2, 1711, had been granted the full scope of tsarist power. See I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, 81-83; *Polnoe sobranie zakonov*, vol. IV, no. 2328, 634-635. It is clear that even if Peter had believed in the special charismatic status of the tsar's authority, he could only transfer administrative power to the Senate but not charisma; consequently, Peter did not connect his function as head of the church with charisma.
- 220 In correspondence with the Austrian Emperor Joseph II Catherine calls herself head of the Greek church and Joseph head of the Western European church. See P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. I, lvi. The Christian world thus found itself split into two halves: at the head of one stood the Holy Roman Emperor, living in Vienna, and at the head of the other the "head of the Greek church," living in Petersburg.
- 221 *Polnoe sobranie zakonov*, vol. XXIV, no. 17910, 588.
- 222 *Svod zakonov*, vol. I, part. 1, art. 42, 10. The "Project for Basic Laws of the Russian Empire" by G. A. Rosenkampf (1804) states: "The emperor is the supreme ruler of the entire state and head of the Church." See I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, 144. In the "State Charter [*ustavnaia gramota*] of the Russian Empire" by N. N. Novosil'tsev (1819), article 20 states: "As the supreme head of the Orthodox Greek-Russian church, the sovereign consecrates all ranks of the religious hierarchy." See N. K. Shil'der, *Imperator Aleksandr Pervyi. Ego zhizn' i tsarstvovavnie* (St. Petersburg, 1904-1905), vol. IV, 501. Hence A. S. Shishkov, addressing the emperor in a letter of May 22, 1824, calls him "head of the Church and the Fatherland." See A. S. Shishkov, "Zapiski admirala A. S. Shishkova," *Chteniia Obshchestva istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* 3 (1868), 4.
- 223 N. Subbotin, *Istoriia Belokrinit'skoi ierarkhii* (Moscow, 1874), 459.
- 224 Joseph Marie de Maistre, Fidèle de Grivel, *Religion et moeurs des russes* (Paris, 1879), 5.



- 225 Pavel performed the duties of a confessor as “magister” of the Maltese Order; the same Golovkin reports that “Commander Litta publicly confessed his sins, and the great magister accepted this repentance with tears of compassion.” See F. Golovkin, *Dvor i tsarstvovanie Pavla I* (Moscow 1912), 188.
- 226 *Ibid.*, 158.
- 227 Joseph Marie de Maistre, Fidèle de Grivel, *Religion et moeurs des russes*, 99-100. Evidence that Paul I conducted the liturgy may be found in S. N. Marin’s “Parody of Lomonosov’s Ode [Based on] Selections from Job,” in which Marin substitutes a monologue by Paul for Lomonosov’s monologue by God:

*Was not my generosity clear  
When I ordered heads to roll?  
Have you never had the wish  
To shake a bit of incense in church  
Dressed in holy vestments,  
To fancy oneself jester to the world  
Serving mass in place of a priest?  
Is this idea really foolish?*

See S. N. Marin, “Polnoe sobranie sochinenii,” *Letopisi Gos. literaturnogo muzeia* 10 (1948): 176, 177.

- 228 V. A. Zhukovskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (St. Petersburg, 1902), vol. I, 1. This kind of perception might have already arisen in the middle of the previous century. Thus Lomonosov in his “Speech in Praise of Peter the Great” of 1755 writes of Peter: “He awaited the divine service not only as a listener but as the highest ranking [church] official [*chinonachal`nik*] himself.” M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 606.
- 229 *Sviashchennyi Sobor Pravoslavnoi Rossiiskoi Tserkvi*, vol. II, kn. 2, 198.
- 230 N. D. Zhevakhov, *Vospominania* (Nowy Sad, 1928), vol. II, 385-388. The same Prince Zhevakhov writes in his memoirs that Emperor Nicholas “in 1905 asked Petersburg Metropolitan Antonii Vadkovskii for his blessing to abdicate the throne in favor of his son, and to take monastic vows.” See *Ibid.* It is possible that these two reports are connected; if so, one might suspect that Nicholas had in mind the example of Patriarch Filaret who had run the government together with his son, Mikhail Fedorovich. In any case, between these two functions—head of the state and head of the church—Nicholas preferred the second. It is curious to juxtapose this episode with the report of the French envoy to Russia de La Vie concerning rumors circulating in Petersburg that Peter wanted to declare Tsarevich Aleksei patriarch. See *Sbornik Russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva*, vol. XXXIV, 321. La Vie considered these rumors unfounded insofar as in that case the tsar would have had to kiss his son’s hand and call him “father.”
- 231 The old practice—apparently until the time of Aleksei Mikhailovich—consisted of the tsar kissing the hand of the priest blessing him and the priest kissing the hand of the tsar; see the testimony of Pavel Aleppskii in *Puteshestvie antiokhiiskogo patriarkha Makariia v Rossiiu v polovine XVII veka, opisannoe ego synom arkhidiakonom Pavlom Aleppskim* (Moscow, 1896-1900), vyp. III, 95f; vyp. IV, 170; and Archpriest Avvakum in *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXIX, 44, 194. See also N. F. Kapterev, “Snosheniia Ierusalimskikh patriarkhov,” 135-136; I. Rotar, “Epifanii Slavinetskii, literaturnyi deiatel` XVII veka,” *Kievskaiia starina* (1901): 20. Patriarch Nikon speaks of this same practice in his “Objection or Ruin” (see *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii*, vol. II, 492-493):

The Boyar [Semen Streshnev] said to the patriarch: you give your hand to anyone to kiss, like the tsar does, and that's not good, he says. And the patriarch said: who made you speak, was it the tsar or you on your own? And the boyar said: the sovereign ordered me to speak. And the patriarch: so why does the tsar himself kiss the hands of priests whom we consecrated, and, coming for blessing, himself bend his head; it surprises us why the tsar compels bishops and priests to kiss his hands when he is not a bishop or a priest; if he, the sovereign, for his overweening pride considers the priesthood lower than the kingship, he will then learn the difference between the kingship and the priesthood when we will be examined by the authentic Judge, Christ our God.

In 1711 Peter I could still kiss Stefan Iavorskii's hand. See *Zapiski Iusta Iulia, datskogo poslannika pri Petre Velikom* (Moscow, 1900), 293. Later this custom ceased, and one may presume that this was connected with the reorganization of church administration, when the tsar became head of the church. This changed temporarily during the reign of Alexander I who in 1801 issued a special instruction that priests should not kiss the hands of the monarch or members of the royal family when giving blessing. See *Ruskaia starina* XIV (December 1883): 730.

<sup>232</sup> P. I. Mel'nikov (Andrei Pecherskii), *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. XII, 365-366.

<sup>233</sup> See for example N. K. Shil'der, *Imperator Aleksandr Pervyi*, vol. IV, 58; *Rasskazy babushki. Iz vospomimamii piati pokolenii. Zapisannye i sobrannye ee vnukom D. Blagovo* (St. Petersburg, 1885), 395.

<sup>234</sup> Fotii (Spasskii), "Avtobiografia Iur'evskogo arkhimandrita Fotiia," *Ruskaia starina* 2 (1895): 208.

<sup>235</sup> V. F. Chizh, "Psikhologiiia fanatizma (Fotii Spasskii)," *Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii* I-II (1905): 185.

<sup>236</sup> N. K. Shil'der, *Imperator Nikolai Pervyi. Ego zhizn' i tsrstvovavnie* (St. Petersburg, 1903), vol. II, 700.

<sup>237</sup> *Sviashchennyi Sobor Pravoslavnoi Rossiiskoi Tserkvi*, vol. III, 8.

<sup>238</sup> "Opredeleniia Moskovskogo Sobora 1675 g.," 440-441.

<sup>239</sup> A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov'*, prilozhenie, II, 170.

<sup>240</sup> M. V. Zyzkin, *Patriarkh Nikon*, part II, 172-173.

<sup>241</sup> In this connection it is indicative that in the popular imagination the fact that Peter headed the church after having taken the place of the patriarch could be directly connected with his deification. Thus in an Old Believer document entitled *The Tiumen Wanderer*, it relates how Peter, having shaved off his beard, killed the patriarch with his staff and "went into the Faceted Chamber [in the Kremlin], pulled out his sword of steel, and struck the table with it: 'I am your tsar, patriarch, your God,' he repeated three times." See I. K. Piatnitskii, *Sekta Strannikov i ee znachenie v staroobriadchestve* (St. Petersburg, 1912), 110. This story derives from an anecdote which we have in A. K. Nartov's transcription: "His imperial majesty, present at a gathering of church leaders, noting the strong desire of some to choose a [new] patriarch, which had repeatedly been proposed by the clergy, with one hand pulled from his pocket the "Spiritual Regulation" that he had prepared for just such an occasion and said to them threateningly: 'You ask for a patriarch: here's a spiritual patriarch for you, but for those who disagree with this (with his other hand he pulled a dagger from its sheath and banged it on the table), here's a steel patriarch!' Then he got up and left. After this the petition to choose a patriarch was abandoned and the Most Holy Synod was

established.” See *Rasskazy Nartova*, 71; *Podlinnye anekdoty Petra Velikogo slyshannye iz ust znatnykh osob v Moskve i Sanktpeterburge, izdannye v svet Iakovom fon Shchtelinom* (Moscow, 1787), 352-354. Characteristically, the Old Believer reworking presents Peter as not only wanting to usurp the dignity of the patriarch, but also that of God. This perception had very ancient roots. In early Christianity the bishop represented the image of Christ himself for his church. Ignatius of Antioch compared bishops to Christ and the presbyters who helped him run the church to the apostles. See A. Shmeman, *Istoricheskii put' pravoslaviia* (New York, 1954), 50-51. This doctrine was also developed later by the Byzantine church fathers. The later Greek tradition also specified the sense in which a bishop represents an image of God, in opposition to all other people who are the “image and likeness” of God by virtue of creation (cf. Genesis 1: 26) and in contrast to a priest who manifests Christ during the liturgy. Thus Paisios Ligarides writes: “A bishop is in Christ’s image when in his diocese, but not when they [bishops] gather around their head, the Patriarch, to whom they are subordinate.” See M. V. Zzyzkin, *Patriarkh Nikon*, part II, 188. Hence the bishop’s assumption of Christ’s image is directly connected to his running the church, in which the bishop acts as a mediator between God and men, as Patriarch Nikon wrote, extending this function of the bishop to a cosmic scale: “Between God and human nature stands the bishop.” See RGB, f. 178, d. 9427, l. 206. In exactly the same way the tradition of calling the bishop the image of God was characteristic in Rus’ from most ancient times. Thus in the Russian supplement to a letter of Loukas Chrysoberges (twelfth century) it says: “When you celebrate a prelate, you celebrate Christ: for he assumes the image of Christ and occupies Christ’s throne.” See *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, 76. Metropolitan Kirill II (thirteenth century) wrote in his epistle to Novgorodians that “we are heirs to the apostles, having Christ’s image and possessing His power.” See *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. X, 149. In his epistle on adhering to the church council’s verdict of 1504 Iosif Volotskii taught: “For divine law orders bodily obedience to both tsar and to bishop, as well as all other proper tribute, spiritual or not; to the bishop both bodily and spiritual, as successor to the apostles and one who bears the lord’s image.” See N. A. Kazakova and Ia. S. Lur’e, *Antifeodalnye ereticheskie dvizheniia na Rusi XIV-nachala XVI veka* (1905), 509. This tradition was fully alive in Russia even at the end of the seventeenth century. Thus Archbishop Afanasii Kholmogorskii in his “Spiritual Exhortation” (*Uvet dukhovnyi*) speaks of “bishops who bear the image of Jesus Christ the Savior.” See *Uvet dukhovnyi* (Moscow, 1682), 246. Proving the necessity of obedience to the church, he refers to “all bishops [who] assume the image of Christ, all pious tsars [who] adorn thrones with their justice.” See *Ibid.*, 14 verso; note the precise differentiation between the status of bishops and tsars.

<sup>242</sup> M. V. Zzyzkin, *Patriarkh Nikon*, part II, 187.

<sup>243</sup> *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii*, vol. II, 481; see also N. F. Kapterev, *Patriarkh Nikon*, vol. II, 185. The last passage from Nikon is a precise quotation from the Epanagogue, chapter 2, section (*titul*) 3: Πατριάρχης ἐστὶν εἰκὼν ζῶσα χριστοῦ καὶ ἔμψυχος, δι ἔργων καὶ λόγων χαρακτηρίζουσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν. See Zachariae von Lingenthal, *Collectio librorum juris*, 67. Sections 2 and 3 of the Epanagogue went into Leunclavius’ *Jus Graeco-Romanorum*, specially translated for Nikon by Epifanii Slavinskii. See A. Engel’man, *Ob uchenoi obrabotkie greko-rimskago prava*. (St. Petersburg, 1857), 27; V. Sokol’skii, “O kharaktere i znachenii epanagogi,” 50; G. V. Vernadsky, “Die kirchlich-politische Lehre der Epanagoge und ihr Einfluss auf das russische Leben im XVII Jahrhundert,” *Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher* 1/2 (1928): 127, 139.

- 244 A. Kotovich, *Dukhovnaia tsenzura v Rossii*, 465. It is remarkable that the religious censor found this expression unacceptable, arguing that “The Orthodox tsar believes that the Orthodox Church has only an invisible Head and not a visible one.” See *Ibid.* Insofar as the definition of the tsar as “head of the church” was officially legitimized, the word combination “visible head of the church” might have provoked objection for its overly direct equation of the tsar and Christ. This kind of censorship was the result of church authorities’ vacillations concerning the sacralization of the tsar, about which we will speak below (see section III-2).
- 245 J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. XX, 1357a.
- 246 A. Gasquet, *De l'autorité imperial*, 39.
- 247 G. V. Vernadsky, “Die kirchlich-politische Lehre der Epanagoge,” 120.
- 248 A. Ivanov, *Literaturnoe nasledie Maksima Greka; kharakteristika, atributsii, bibliografiia* (Leningrad, 1969), 149.
- 249 Maksim Grek, *Sochineniia* (Kazan, 1859-1862), part II, 350.
- 250 V. Skol'skii, *Uchastie russkogo dukhovenstva i monashestva v razvitii edinoderzhavii i samoderzhavii v Moskovskom gosudarstve v kontse XV i pervoi polovine XVI v.* (Kiev, 1902), 198.
- 251 I. A. Shevchenko, “Byzantine Source of Muscovite Ideology,” 172; see also J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. LXXXVI, 1172.
- 252 N. F. Kaptelev, “Snosheniia Ierusalimskikh patriarkhov,” 239. Ivan Timofeev's *Chronicle* (*Vremennik*) may serve as indirect evidence of the possibility of perceiving the tsar as an icon. Here writes of the False Dmitrii: “Even before, [when he still was] outside the borders of the Russian land, everyone willingly obeyed him, bowing to this veritable idol as the tsar.” See *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 367. Similarly, he writes of the second False Dmitrii: “Those who had come to him, while knowing that he was the false tsar, still bowed to him as to an idol.” See *Ibid.*, 413. To all appearances, here a just tsar, as an icon, is being contrasted to a pretender as a false icon or idol (see section I-1.2).
- 253 M. V. Zzyzkin, *Patriarkh Nikon*, part II, 14.
- 254 Dimitrii Rostovskii, *Sobranie raznykh pouchitel'nykh slov*, vol. I, 1 verso-2.
- 255 M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 85.
- 256 *Ibid.*, 637.
- 257 A. P. Sumarokov, *Polnoe sobranie vsekh sochinenii v stikhakh i proze* (Moscow, 1787), part II, 75.
- 258 V. Maikov, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1966), 200.
- 259 V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, part II, 204.
- 260 *Ibid.*, 233-237.
- 261 *Ibid.* 242.
- 262 *Ibid.*, part I, 107; part II, 130.
- 263 G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. II, 295.
- 264 *Ibid.*, 574.
- 265 *Ibid.*, vol. I, 264. If for Derzhavin the tsar was a living icon, then an unjust tsar (that is, a false one) was not an icon but an idol. Thus in the “Ode on Nobility” (*Oda na znatnost'*) of 1774 he writes:

*Heed, princes of the whole universe:  
Without virtue you are statues!*

—that is, idols. See *Ibid.*, vol. III, 295. And in the “Epistle to I. I. Shuvalov” of 1777 he writes the same thing:

*Oh, pitiful demigod is one who vainly bears his rank:  
He is nothing before the throne, and on the throne—an idol.*

See *Ibid.*, vol. I, 55.

- 266 I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn' moskovskogo mitropolita Platona*, part II, 114.
- 267 Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Sochineniia*, 21.
- 268 *Slovo po prochtenii vysochaishego manifesta o voine protiv frantsuzov, govorennoe v gradskoi Georgievskoi tserkvi, chto za lavkami, preosv. Feofilaktom, ep. Kaluzhskim i Borovskim Dekabria 2 dnia, 1806 goda* (Moscow, 1806), 8.
- 269 I. A. Chistovich, "Rukovodiashchie deiateli dukhovnogo prosveshcheniia v Rossii," 83.
- 270 Mikhail Desnitskii, *Besedy, v raznykh mestakh i v raznyia vremena govorenniia... pokoinym Mikhailom, Mitropolitom Novgorodskim, Sanktpeterburgskim...* (St. Petersburg, 1823), vol. V, 254.
- 271 *Vlast' Samoderzhavnaia*, 25.
- 272 Note also that in the "Opinion of the Reverends Innokentii and Gavriil and the Hieromonk Platon on Catherine II's Instruction" of 1766 it says: "Confessing in all sincerity, as we are obliged to the All-seeing God and to the Monarch who bears His image on earth, we cannot help but declare that of this type of jurisprudence this composition is the most perfect." See I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn' moskovskogo mitropolita Platona*, part II, 117. Even earlier, in a letter to the tsar of November 12, 1740, addressing Ioann Antonovich, Trediakovskii wrote of "the most generous god whose true image and perfect likeness here on earth is your imperial highness." *Pis'ma russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka* (Leningrad, 1980), 49.
- 273 N. V. Gogol', *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1937-1952), vol. VIII, 255-256.
- 274 1 John 4:8, 16.
- 275 S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. XIV, 52.
- 276 *Russkaia starina* (April 1889): 52.
- 277 Matthew 21:9; Mark 11:9-10; Luke 19:38; John 12:13.
- 278 See P. P. Pekarskii, *Istoricheskie bumagi*, 123-124; E. Shmurlo, *Petr Velikii v otsenke sovremennikov i potomstva* (St. Petersburg, 1912), vyp. I, 18; I. I. Golikov, *Anekdoty*, xi, 364. The song in the Poltava cycle concludes with the words: "Hosanna, Hosanna, Hosanna in the highest! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna, Hosanna!" See A. V. Pozdneev, "Russkaia patrioticheskaia pesnia," 352.
- 279 Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, vol. II, 99, 101.
- 280 I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn' moskovskogo mitropolita Platona*, part II, 42. It is interesting to note that Leo Tolstoy, who sought the most striking material for the history of Russian society during the Napoleonic invasion, cited this letter by Metropolitan Platon in *War and Peace*—Prince Vasiliu reads it in Anna Pavlovna Scherer's salon. See L. N. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie khudozhestvennykh proizvedenii* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1928-1930), vol. VII, 8.
- 281 Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Rech' pred nachatiem blagodarstvennogo molebstviia*, 5.
- 282 Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Rech' Ego Imp. Velichestvu Aleksandru Pervomu*, 5; N. K. Shil'der, *Imperator Aleksandr Pervyi*, vol. I, 72.
- 283 G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. IX, 134. See also note 135 above.
- 284 N. K. Shil'der, *Imperator Pavel I. Istoriko-biograficheskii ocherk* (St. Petersburg, 1901), 342-344.
- 285 *Slova i rechi Ioanna Levandy*, part II, 190-191.
- 286 N. P. Nikolev, *Oda Ego Imp. Velichestvu Pavlu Pervomu na den' vsevozhdelennogo Ego pribytiia v Moskvu dlia sviashchennogo miropomazaniia 1797 goda* (Moscow, 1797), 6.

- 287 V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, part II, 215-216.
- 288 I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn' moskovskogo mitropolita Platona*, part II, 115.
- 289 S. Smirnov, *Istoriia Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii do eia preobrazovaniia (1814-1870)* (Moscow, 1879), 623.
- 290 *Tserkovnyi vestnik* 19 (1896): 621.
- 291 P. Mirtov, "Sviashchennnye osnovy tsarskoi vlasti," *Pribavlenie k Tserkovnym vedomostiam, izdavaemym sv. Sinodom* 21 (May 21, 1911): 837.
- 292 On this ritual see K. Nikol'skii, *O sluzhbakh russkoi tserkvi, byvshikh v prezhnikh bogosluzhebnykh knigakh* (St. Petersburg, 1885), 45-97; *Puteshestvie antiokhiiskogo patriarkha Makariia*, vyp. III, 174-180; V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevsy*, 158-175.
- 293 K. Nikol'skii, *O sluzhbakh russkoi tserkvi*, 1-40.
- 294 An incident is recorded, however, that a bishop ordered that he be greeted on Palm Sunday "with icons and lamps and with candles and branches," asserting that "you are greeting Christ." Characteristically, very soon after (in 1659) a complaint was made against him, and the religious authorities condemned this kind of behavior. See I. Rumiantsev, *Nikita Konstantinov Dobrynin ("Pustosviat")*. *Istoriiko-kriticheskii ocherk* (Sergiev Posad, 1916), prilozhenie, 24, 30, 41, 44, 50, 66, 78, 81.
- 295 M. V. Zzyzkin, *Patriarkh Nikon*, part II, 212-213, 372; N. F. Kapterev, *Patriarkh Nikon*, vol. I, 410.
- 296 M. V. Zzyzkin, *Patriarkh Nikon*, part II, 185.
- 297 V. M. Undol'skii, "Otzyv patriarkha Nikona," 616.
- 298 RGB, f. 178, d. 9427, l. 259.
- 299 *Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh*, vol. IV, no. 223, 309; *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika*, part VI, 360-361.
- 300 Ibid.
- 301 *Starina i novizna* XV (1911): 177-178 (second pagination).
- 302 N. Ustrialov, *Skazaniia sovremennikov o Dmitrii Samozvantse*, part I, 137.
- 303 This story seems reliable as Petr Alekseev notes precisely how he got it, and that was via Senator Ivan Ivanovich Kozlov, son of Ivan Polikarpovich Kozlov, who had been procurator of the Admiralty College under Peter, and who was a witness of the scene.
- 304 P. Alekseev, "Rasskaz Petra Velikogo o patriarkhe Nikone. Vsepoddanneishee pis'mo Alekseeva k imp. Pavlu Petrovichu," *Russkii arkhiv* 8-9 (1863): 698-699. When we consider that in pre-Petrine times the rank of equerry that the tsar voluntarily assumed indicated the monarch's necessary respect for the spiritual ideal, we can see very clearly how radically the relation between religious and secular authority had changed, and how secular power illicitly exalted itself, setting itself free of visible marks of the ruler's piety. Thus in the narrative about the Donation of Constantine that went into the supplement to the "Kormchaia" (*nomokanon*) of 1653 (the Nikonian Kormchaia) it is related that Emperor Constantine the Great offers Pope Sylvester imperial clothing and crown. Pope Sylvester refuses the latter, "not wanting to wear a crown of gold." Then Emperor Constantine tells him: "We shall place the crown of white color symbolizing the Ressurrection of the Lord on his (Sylvester's) head with our own hands, and hold the reins of the horse with our hands, having given ourselves to him as an equerry to honor the blessed Peter, and we command that all bishops in their processions [carry out] this rite and custom, following the example of our kingship." Quoted in an Old Believer republication (Warsaw, 1785), second pagination, folio 8-9 verso. This episode from the narrative of the Donation of Constantine is cited with insignificant

variations in Metropolitan Makarii's epistle to Ivan the Terrible. See *Letopisi russkoi literatury i drevnosti*, vol. V, 130. According to an anonymous English witness who was serving in the Moscow court in 1557-1558, Ivan "recognizes the Metropolitan as higher than himself, because he says that 'the Metropolitan is the spiritual deputy of God, but I the tsar am only temporary.'" According to the author, this is manifested in particular by the fact that the tsar "leads the Metropolitan's horse on Palm Sunday." See S. M. Seredonin, ed., *Izvestiia anglichan o Rossii XVI v. (Chensler, Randol'f, Baus)* (Moscow, 1884), 22-23. Patriarch Nikon also cites this passage from the tale of the Donation of Constantine, describing the relations that should obtain between tsar and patriarch in the twenty-sixth answer of his "Objection or Ruin." See RGB, f. 178, d. 9427, l. 243, Hence when Peter I banned the "Palm ceremony," he responded to the current view that he would have been rendering the patriarch the homage which the first Christian emperor, equal to the apostles, Constantine the Great, had ordained be given to prelates. Peter was probably acquainted with the story of the Donation of Constantine as well as with the related Tale of the White Cowl. See I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, 401. Analogous logic was also applied to abolishing the "procession on a donkey" insofar as both the metropolitan's white cowl and the tsar assuming the role of an equerry would have testified to the monarch's humility before the spiritual principle.

305 I. I. Golikov, *Anekdoty*, 55-58.

306 *Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh*, vol. IV, no. 223, 308-309; *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika*, part VI, 359-360.

307 *Curieuse Nachricht von der itzigen Religion Ihro Käyserlichen Majestät in Russland Petri Alexiewiz, und seines grossen Reiches, dass dieselbe itzo nach Evangelisch-Lutherischen Grund-Sätzen eingerichtet sey* ([s.p.], 1725).

308 "Dieser Patriarch hat unter andern am grünen Donnerstag einen Emzug in die Stadt Moscau, nach dem Exempel unsers Heylandes, auf emem Esel zu halten pflegen, da ihm denn der Czaar und Regent von Russland den Esel am Zaum führen, und dabey zu Fusze gehen müssen, um dadurch das grosse Ansehen und die Autorität des Patriarchen anzudeuten . . . Denn, nachdem der letzte Patriarch verstorben, hat Ihro Majest auch die am Grünen-Donnerstage gewöhnliche Ceremonien nicht mehr gelten lassen, keinen Patriarchen an seine Stelle aufs neue eingesetzt, sondern nach der Art Protestirender Fürsten, sich selbst vor den obersten Bischoff seines Landes erklärt." See P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. I, viii-ix. The author of the cited work mistakenly relates the "procession on a donkey" to Holy Thursday rather than Palm Sunday.

309 *Zapiski o Rossii pri Petre Velikom, izvlechennye iz bumag grafa Bassevicha* (Moscow, 1866), 81-82.

310 Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, part I, 238.

311 *Dnevnik kamer-iunkera F. V. Berkhgol'tsa. 1721-1725* (Moscow, 1902-1903), part I, 118-119. In her "Antidote" Catherine II later wrote about the "procession on a donkey" as a rite that demeans the tsar's rank. According to P. Alekseev, she, like Peter I, connected Nikon's deposition with it, as evidence of his "unbounded pretensions." See *Os'mnadsatyi vek IV* (1869): 384.

312 N. Makarov's story about a landowner from Chukhloma may be seen as an example of imitating the tsar's order, a peculiar type of "playing at tsar": "From a multitude of cynical and blasphemous pranks I will tell of one, known then in the Chukhloma district under the name of 'Entry into Jerusalem.' He once gathered



his field and house serfs of both sexes, and even children, and lined them up in two rows between his estate and the nearest village, for a length of several hundred feet. He ordered each person to take a palm frond in their hand, and he himself, seated on an old nag, rode by slowly from the village to his estate between the rows of his subordinates, who waved their palm branches at him." See N. Makarov, *Moi semidesiatiletnie vospominaniia i s tem vmeste moia polnaia predsmertnaia ispoved`* (St. Petersburg, 1881-1882), part I, 28.

<sup>313</sup> Nevertheless, we know of an instance when a similar salutation to the tsar came from the Patriarch of Jerusalem. In a letter to Peter of September 28, 1709, Patriarch Chrysanthos, describing the desire of eastern Christians to be freed from Turkish rule by the Russian tsar, hopes "that they would accept their Orthodox liberator in their lands and would praise and exclaim in unison, Blessed be He who comes in the name of the Lord, king of Israel." See *Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo*, vol. V, 632. We should not assume that the Russian tradition examined above derived from similar Greek texts, which could only play a secondary role.

<sup>314</sup> Neofit, *Slovo na Vysokotorzhestvennyi den` vosshestviia na Vserossiiskii Prestol Ego Imp. Velichestva Imperatora Aleksandra Pavlovicha* (St. Petersburg, 1821), 2-3.

<sup>315</sup> Cited from V. M. Skvortsov, ed., *Tserkovnyi sovet i Gosudarstvennyi Razum. Opyt tserkovno-politicheskoi khrestomatii* (St. Petersburg, 1912), 64. We should keep in mind that in Biblical typology Moses on Sinai was prototype of Christ on Tabor. See, for example, Canon of the Transfiguration, song 8. The equation of the tsar's throne and Sinai (which apparently suggests the divine inspiration of the monarch's law-giving—on which see V. M. Zhivov, "Istoriia russkogo prava," note 82) also had a tradition. Thus V. Petrov addressed Catherine:

*We look at the place of the mirror,  
At Your, Monarch's, law.  
Almost all rulers under the sun  
Are great, in some measure;  
You are God among them, Sinai is Your throne!*

See V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, part I, 167. We see the same expressions in Petrov's ode on the "Triumphal Coronation and Consecration to the Kingdom of His Imperial Majesty Paul I":

*His soul is a paradise of goodness,  
His throne Sinai,  
Without thunder giving  
The Law to the house seething with children . . .*

See *Ibid.*, part II, 229. Typically, in the ode Pavel is compared to Moses descending from Sinai. See *Ibid.*, 244. The same complex of associations may be seen, although less obviously, in Derzhavin. See, for example, G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. I, 274-275.

<sup>316</sup> Luke 23:42.

<sup>317</sup> M. S. Popov, *Arsenii Matseevich*, 57.

<sup>318</sup> A. S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1937-1949), vol. XII, 312-313.

<sup>319</sup> V. V. Andreev, *Predstaviteli vlasti v Rossii posle Petra I* (St. Petersburg, 1871), 265-266.

<sup>320</sup> I. I. Golikov, *Anekdoty*, 422-423; *Rasskazy Nartova o Petre Velikom*, 73.

<sup>321</sup> *Pis'ma mitr. Moskovskogo Filareta*, vol. I, 38.

<sup>322</sup> *Ibid.*, 21, 214.



- 323 “High triumphal (imperial) days” first appeared under Peter, apparently due to Protestant influence, and immediately gave rise to cases against priests who did not celebrate a triumphal mass on them; see, for example, the case of Archimandrite Aleksandr Lampadchik in 1719 in G. V. Esipov, *Raskoll`nich`i dela XVIII veka* (St. Petersburg, 1861-1863), vol. I, 134; N. B. Golikova, *Politicheskie protsessy pri Petre I po materialam Preobrazhenskogo prikaza* (Moscow, 1957), 154; and other similar cases in N. D. Zol`nikova, *Soslovnye problemy*, 152f, 167.
- 324 See A. Kotovich, *Dukhovnaia tsenzura*, 209.
- 325 Even the non-Orthodox confessional affiliation of members of the royal family did not prevent such celebration. Thus during the regency of Anna Leopoldovna the birthday and name day of Duke Anton Ul`rikh, the ruler's spouse, were church holidays, even though he was Protestant. We should keep in mind that Protestants do not venerate saints, and therefore do not celebrate saints' days, so that when Duke Anton Ul`rikh became father of the emperor he had to find an Orthodox patron saint—St. Anthony the Roman. Further, when Anton Ul`rikh died in exile, in Kholmogory, he was refused a church burial, in accordance with Orthodox rules. See *Vnutrennii byt Russkogo gosudarstva*, kn. I, 81, 550, 554. Juxtaposing these two facts, we see that under pressure from the imperial cult the Orthodox Church was forced to celebrate the birth and saint's day of a person who according to Orthodox canons was a heretic.
- 326 *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, dopoln. tom, 174, 517-518.
- 327 K. Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava bogoslužheniia pravoslavnoi tserkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1874), 736.
- 328 *Zapiski Otdeleniia russkoi i slavianskoi arkheologii*, vol. II, 431; RGB, f. 178, d. 9427, l. 348 verso.
- 329 Masson, *Mémoires secrets sur la Russie* (Paris, 1802), vol. 2, 91. Masson notes that on these days they most likely sang “Te Deam” rather than “Te Deum” at court. See *Ibid.* This witticism probably derives from Voltaire's letters to Catherine. In one of them, on October 17, 1769, he had written: “Je supplie Votre Majesté imperiale de lui ordonner . . . d'assister à mon *Te Deum*, où plutôt à mon *Te Deam*.” See F. M. A. Voltaire, *Oeuvres complètes* (Paris, 1877-1885), vol. XLVI, 476. In another (of October 30, 1769) he also made word play of the first words of the “Te Deum,” congratulating Catherine on the victory at Khotin. He wrote: “Je chantais *Te Catharinam laudamus, te dominam confitemur*. L'ange Gabriel m'avait donc instruit de la déroutte entière de l'armée ottomane, de la prise de Choczin.” See *Ibid.*, 481. Thus Voltaire proposes instead of the usual prayer formula “We praise You, God” to sing “We praise You, Catherine” and “You, mistress, we worship.”
- 330 I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn` moskovskogo mitropolita Platona*, part II, 115.
- 331 N. P. Nikolev, *Oda Ego Imp. Velichestvu Pavlu Pervomu*, 9.
- 332 V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, part II, 126.
- 333 G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. III, 190.
- 334 *Ibid.*, 41.
- 335 *Vlast` Samoderzhavnaia*, 19.
- 336 It is curious to note that after the Petrine era enemies of the tsar could be seen as enemies of Christ, subject to excommunication from the church. It was on this very basis that Mazepa was excommunicated (*Polnoe sobranie zakonov*, vol. IV, no. 2213), as well as Stepan Glebov (*Polnoe sobranie postanovlenii i rasporiazhenii*, vol. I, no. 179) and Pugachev (*Polnoe sobranie zakonov*, vol. XX, no. 14233). During Catherine I's reign opponents of the “Charter Concerning the Inheritance of the Throne” were officially anathematized. See P. Morozov, *Feofan Prokopovich*, 305.

- 337 G. Gukovskii, *Očerki po istorii russkoi literatury XVIII veka. Dvorianskaia fronda v literature 1750-1760-kh godov* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1936), 13.
- 338 See V. M. Zhivov, B. A. Uspenskii, "Metamorfozy antichnogo iazychestva," 221f.
- 339 V. P. Grebeniuk, ed., *Panegiricheskaia literatura petrovskogo vremeni* (Moscow, 1979), 155-156.
- 340 *Ibid.*, 156.
- 341 V. M. Zhivov, "Koshchunstvennaia poezia v sisteme russkoi kul'tury kontsa XVIII—nachala XIX v.," *Uchenye zapiski Tartusskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 546 (1981): 65-70.
- 342 M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 140.
- 343 *Ibid.*, 504. See also Lomonosov on Peter in his "Speech of Praise": "If it were possible to find any person like God in our understanding apart from Peter the Great, I can't imagine it." See *Ibid.*, 611.
- 344 *Ibid.*, 225.
- 345 *Ibid.*, 84-85.
- 346 *Ibid.*, 66.
- 347 See Revelation 10:2; Revelation 20:12.
- 348 M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 199.
- 349 V. Kel'siev, *Sbornik pravitel'stvennykh svedenii o raskol'nikakh*, vyp. II, 256.
- 350 M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 773, 789.
- 351 *Ibid.*, 30.
- 352 *Ibid.*, 96, 97, 127, 139, 144, 210, 215, 221, 224, 274, 279, 281, 288, 291, 367, 396, 398, 404, 561, 566, 640, 642, 645, 653, 691, 693, 744, 745, 755, 773.
- 353 *Ibid.*, 774, 777, 789, 793, 796, 799, 801, 810.
- 354 *Ibid.* 41.
- 355 *Ibid.*, 633.
- 356 *Ibid.*, 635.
- 357 See *Ibid.*, 74, 194, 394, 502, 532, 692, 744, 749, 780, 801, 810.
- 358 *Ibid.*, 399.
- 359 P. P. Pekarskii, *Istoriia imp. Akademii nauk*, vol. II, 150.
- 360 M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 285.
- 361 *Ibid.*, 84. See in the subsequent odic tradition the image of a divine voice calling through an open heavenly door. See E. Greshischeva, "Khvalebnaia oda v russkoi literature XVIII v." in V. V. Sipovskii, ed., *M. V. Lomonosov* (St. Petersburg, 1911), 116-118. This tradition was then reflected in sermons as well. See Avgustin (Vinogradskii), *Sochineniia*, 30, 115.
- A characteristic protest against combining the Greek Olympus with the Biblical Ancient of Days may be found in the anonymous "Note on the Slavonic Language and on Russian Secular Speech" (*Russkii vestnik* 7 (1811): 64), whose author was probably S. N. Glinka. "In the same ode by Lomonosov in which Olympus opens a holy door we also see the Ancient of Days. . . . It seems to me that such an opposition spoils the clarity and purity of the style." See V. M. Zhivov, B. A. Uspenskii, "Metamorfozy antichnogo iazychestva," 274.
- 362 M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 127.
- 363 A. P. Sumarokov, *Polnoe sobranie vsekh sochinenii*, part II, 241.
- 364 *Ibid.*, part II, 9.
- 365 *Ibid.*, part VI, 302-303.
- 366 *Ibid.*, part II, 63.

- 367 Ibid., part I, 272, 273; part II, 43, 55, 79, 86, 93, 102, 229, 253.
- 368 Ibid., part I, 279, 283; part II, 8, 46, 62, 69, 95, 100, 108, 119, 229.
- 369 Ibid., part II, 21.
- 370 Ibid., 87.
- 371 Ibid., 41.
- 372 N. P. Nikolev, *Tvoreniia*, part II, 239.
- 373 Ibid., 236.
- 374 V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, part II, 159. See also Ibid., 128 on Catherine: "She is All God."
- 375 Ibid., part 154.
- 376 Ibid., part II, 207.
- 377 Ibid., part I, 157.
- 378 Ibid., part II, 134.
- 379 See Ibid., part I, 50, 89, 91, 151, 152; part II, 123, 124, 132, 139, 149, 174; part III, 227, 265, 340; N. P. Nikolev, *Tvoreniia*, part II, 82, 112, 276, 277; see also poetry of Ermil Kostrov in *Poety XVIII veka* (Leningrad, 1972), vol. II, 130, 134, 136, 137, 140, 142, 147.
- 380 See Ibid., 142, 147, 157; N. P. Nikolev, *Tvoreniia*, part II, 41, 42, 59, 92, 109, 121, 281; V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, part I, 5, 14, 18, 26, 58, 68, 76, 122, 205, 225; part II, 45; part III, 228, 263, 268, 328.
- 381 S. B., "Deistvie i slava zizhdushchago dukha," *Sobesednik liubitelei rossiiskogo slova* 12 (1784): 6.
- 382 G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. I, 166.
- 383 Ibid., 140.
- 384 Ibid., vol. II, 405-412.
- 385 Ibid., vol. I, 96, 101, 163; vol. II, 585, 606, 659, 662, 693, 695, 696; vol. III, 245, 260, 389. In one instance Derzhavin addresses Catherine with the momentous question: "Who are you? goddess or priestess?" See Ibid., vol. I, 165.
- 386 Ibid., 18, 52, 176, 424, 545, 740; vol. III, 240, 251, 298, 371.
- 387 Ibid., vol. II, 380-381; vol. III, 522.
- 388 Ibid., vol. I, 310.
- 389 Ibid., vol. III, 179.
- 390 Ibid., vol. II, 378.
- 391 Ibid., vol. III, 216.
- 392 Ibid., vol. I, 83.
- 393 Ibid., 34.
- 394 Ibid., vol. III, 243.
- 395 Ibid., 190, 261.
- 396 See in this connection the parodic play on this name in the poem "The Dream Vision That I Had on June 4, 1794," written in the early nineteenth century:

*The celebration was so exceedingly great  
That I'm not able to describe it;  
Enlightened, even wildly so,  
I would be happy to include her [Catherine—Felitsa] among the gods!*

See G. Gukovskii, V. Orlov, "Podpol'naia poeziia 1770-1800-kh godov," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 9-10 (1933): 83.

- 397 G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. II, 585.
- 398 Ibid., 606.
- 399 Ibid., vol. I, 52.

<sup>400</sup> Ibid., vol. II, 522.

<sup>401</sup> A. P. Sumarokov, *Polnoe sobranie vsekh sochinenii*, part II, 3-4.

<sup>402</sup> The corresponding lines from Motonis go like this: “Te bene tamn meritum non Magnum Petre vocassent, / Nec patriae Patrem saecula prisca, Deum.” N. Motonis, “In effigiem Petri magni Imperatoris totius Rossiae,” *Prazdnoe vremia v pol`zu upotreblennoe XXXII* (1760): 259.

<sup>403</sup> A. P. Sumarokov, *Polnoe sobranie vsekh sochinenii*, part I, 260. A. A. Rzhevskii gets out of this situation somewhat differently in his ode to Peter the Great of 1761, in which Peter is also compared to Christ. Rzhevskii describes how Russia had dwelt “in darkness,” when God sent her a “savior” in the person of Peter; here there is a clear reference to Christ’s arrival as presented in John 1:5. Then comes the remarkable reservation:

*While one can't consider you God,  
It is no lie that you were sent to us  
By holy will of the most high!*

See *Poety XVIII veka*, vol. I, 245, 247. As we see, Rzhevskii resorts to a different solution, although he is just as clearly aware of the problem.

<sup>404</sup> The source for this semantic move (pagans who would consider Peter a god) was apparently Feofan Prokopovich’s “Sermon in Praise of Peter’s Blessed Memory” (1725). Compare: “And if such a boy had appeared to the ancient Romans who were blinded by pagan superstition they would all have believed in truth that he was born from Mars” in Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, part II, 140. One of Simon Todorskii’s sermons of 1745 suggests that Feofan’s sermon gave rise to a certain tradition: “One may truly say of Great Catherine what was once said of Great Peter, that if this Monarch had been born at the time of pagan, godless polytheism, in their superstition they would have imagined that one of their goddesses had assumed human flesh.” See *Bozhie osobennoe blagoslovenie imzhe vseгда blagoslovil bog i nyne blagoslavliaet Vsepresvetleishii dome Petra Velikogo pervago Imperatora vseia Rossii v den` vysochaishego brakosochetaniia Ego Imp. Vysochestva Petra Fedorovicha c Eia Imp. Vysochestvom Ekaterinoiu Aleksievnoiu. Propovedannoe Simonom Episkopom Pskovskim i Narvskim 1745 goda Avgusta 4 dnia* (St. Petersburg, 1745), 10. In Lomonosov this semantic move is used more than once. In the “Ode on the Arrival of Elizaveta Petrovna in Moscow from St. Petersburg” of 1742 he writes:

*Had ancient ages known  
Your generosity and beauty  
They would have worshiped  
Your beautiful image in a temple with sacrifices.*

See M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 101.

<sup>405</sup> M. V. Lomonosov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, 285-286.

<sup>406</sup> G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. III, 291-292.

<sup>407</sup> One could cite a whole series of facts testifying to the special cult of Peter the Great and his veneration as a holy person. There are cases of the religious veneration of Peter’s portrait as an icon, complete with lighting candles, genuflections and prayers. See the story about the invalid Kirillov in I. I. Golikov, *Anekdoty*, 532-535. In his sermon on the birthday of Grand Prince Petr Fedorovich of 1743, Simon Todorskii calls Peter I “vsepresvetleishii pravednik” (very most serene righteous one). See G. A. Voskresenskii,

*Pridvornaia i akademicheskaja propoved`*, 77. In his well-known sermon on the Chesme victory, delivered in the Peter-Paul Cathedral before Peter's burial chamber, the future Moscow Metropolitan Platon Levshin referred to Peter's "blessed relics" and his "divine spirit." See I. M. Snegirev, *Zhizn' moskovskogo mitropolita Platona*, part I, 137, 139. P. I. Chelishchev, travelling in the Russian north in 1791, set up a big wooden cross in Kholmogory on the place where Peter disembarked with the inscription: "Put off thy shoe from off thy foot; for the foot of Peter the Great, Father of the Fatherland, touched the place where thou standest, and is therefore holy." See P. I. Chelishchev, "Puteshestvie po Severu Rossii v 1791 godu," *Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti i iskusstva* 85 (1886): 121, and illustration on the same page. The deification of Peter is underscored by the fact that the inscription is a quotation from the Bible—the words that the Lord speaks to Moses when he summons him to devotion in a place illuminated by the divine presence in Exodus 3:5; Joshua 5:15; Acts 7:33. In his diary of July 31, 1830, P. A. Viazemskii cited the words of a certain Captain Sushchov, commander of the ship "Emperor Alexander": "What Christ was for Christians, Peter the Great was for Russians." See P. Viazemskii, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (St. Petersburg, 1878-1896), vol. IX, 135. No less indicative is Nicholas I's resolution about M. P. Pogodin's tragedy "Peter I" on December 22, 1831: "The person of Emperor Peter the Great must be the object of devotion and love for every Russian; to put him on the stage would almost be the violation of something sacred, and is therefore completely improper. I forbid publication." See *Russkaia starina* 2 (1903): 315-316; *Starina i novizna* VII (1904): 161-162; Peter must not be presented on stage just as an icon or cleric must not be represented. This religious veneration is one of the profound themes of Pushkin's "Bronze Horseman": Evgenii's rebellion against Peter amounts to an attempt to overthrow something sacred, and his insanity—that of one who challenges God. For Evgenii Peter changes from a god, a "wonder-working builder," into "an idol on a bronze steed," "a haughty statue." All of these expressions are quite meaningful, and it is characteristic that they were all marked by Nicholas I as inadmissible in reference to depicting Peter. See T. Zenger, "Nikolai I—redaktor Pushkina," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 16-18 (1934), 522. In the framework of the civil cult a special religious attitude also formed toward Falconet's statue of Peter. See on this V. M. Zhivov, B. A. Uspenskii, "Metamorfozy antichnogo iazychestva," 228-230. A. F. Merzliakov's inscription "To the Monument of Peter the Great in Petersburg" was polemically directed at this issue:

*He is flying on a blazing steed, like some god;*  
*His gaze embraces everything, he commands with a gesture.*  
*The snake of enmity, perfidy, dies, trampled,*  
*The soulless cliff takes on shape and life,*  
*And Russians would have been brought to perfection right then,*  
*at the start of the new age,*  
*Had death not said to Peter: "Stop! You are not god—no further!"*

See A. F. Merzliakov, *Stikhotvoreniia* (Leningrad, 1958), 259-260.

<sup>408</sup> G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. I, 563-569. We encounter similar justifications in the poetry of Petrov and Nikolev analyzed above. Thus in Petrov's letter "To the High Title of Great Catherine, Accorded Her Majesty, Most Wise Mother of the Fatherland, in 1767," he wrote:

*But what saith She? God alone is most wise,  
Is it for me to assume God's name and honor?  
Let Him make me wise, and act through me.*

See V. Petrov, *Sochineniia*, part III, 13-14. Nikolev wrote of the very same Catherine:

*Not God . . . but a human on the throne,  
A human—in the most holy sense,  
Born to defend her near ones,  
Born to make the age happy  
. . . .  
Not God, but in Her we see the Creator.*

See N. P. Nikolev, *Tvoreniia*, part II, 29.

In reference to such epigones, however, the question arises whether these justifications represent evidence of a conscious attitude toward the issue of sacralization or if they were merely a continuation of the tradition of similar justifications established by Lomonosov and Sumarokov, and thus merely one of the more refined methods of praising the monarch.

<sup>409</sup> Notably, this theory derives in many ways from interpretations of Psalm 81 (82) and to a great extent recalls old Russian teaching about power. Derzhavin evidently assimilated the idea of juxtaposing righteous and unjust tsars from ancient Russian writings as well as the notion of limiting power by means of moral laws and of fair judgement as the necessary basis for correct rule. See G. R. Derzhavin, *Sochineniia*, vol. VII, 630; vol. VI, 415; vol. II, 220-222; vol. III, 58, 663. However, Derzhavin combines these ideas with his own. He does not reject the sacralization of the monarch, so characteristic for post-Petrine Russia, but makes it a consequence of the tsar's righteousness; sacralization would be unforgivable if it were applied to a ruler without discrimination. It is justified, however, when addressed to a tsar who rules according to the law and the commandments, and when the tsar is in God's image. Derzhavin evidently resolved the conflict between the deification of the monarch and Christian religious consciousness—so characteristic for all eighteenth-century Russian culture—within this framework.

<sup>410</sup> See V. M. Zhivov, B. A. Uspenskii, "Metamorfozy antichnogo iazychestva," 230-234.

<sup>411</sup> True, in the nineteenth century there were also attempts to limit Baroque influence in sermons. Voices were heard in favor of making sermons less eloquent and more instructive. See the example of Archimandrite Innokentii Smirnov in V. Zhmakin, *Innokentii, episkop penzenskii i saratovskii. Biogr. ocherk* (St. Petersburg, 1885), 67. To a significant extent ancient mythology disappeared from sermons, and was considered inappropriate for religious literature. See, for example, *Pis'ma mitr. Moskovskogo Filareta*, vol. III, 62-63, 109; *Filaret, Pis'ma Moskovskogo metropolitan Filareta k pokoinomu arkhiepiskopu tverskomu Alekseiiu, 1843-1867* (1883), 110. There were also other manifestations of this tendency, which nevertheless only limited the continuing vitality of the Baroque tradition.

<sup>412</sup> *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. IV, 332-333; V. M. Zhivov, B. A. Uspenskii, "Metamorfozy antichnogo iazychestva," 229-230.

<sup>413</sup> *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. IV, 75.

<sup>414</sup> A. Kotovich, *Dukhovnaia tsenzura*, 466.

- 415 Ibid., 84, 441, 442, 465.
- 416 *Pis'ma mitr. Moskovskogo Filareta*, vol. III, 392.
- 417 *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. III, 311.
- 418 I. Smolitsch, *Geschichte der russischen Kirche*, 164.
- 419 R. L. Nicholas, "Filaret," in *Modern Encyclopedia of Soviet and Russian History* (New York, 1979), vol. II, 123. This forced the heir to refrain from attending meetings of the body.
- 420 *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. V, 163-164; dopoln. tom, 517-581.
- 421 Ibid., 444-450; vol. IV, 339-340.
- 422 Ibid., vol. III, 311.
- 423 Ibid., vol. IV, 28-29; A. Kotovich, *Dukhovnaia tsenzura*, 289, 353.
- 424 *Mneniia, otzyvy i pis'ma Filareta, mitr. Moskovskogo i Kolomenskogo, po raznym voprosam* (Moscow, 1905), 22-24.
- 425 *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. IV, 297-301, 469; vol. III, 107-108, 512.
- 426 Characteristically, when the Rumanian Gospodar Alexander Cusa carried out a reform of church administration similar to that which Peter I had put into place in his era, it led to a rift between the Rumanian Church and the patriarch of Constantinople, and Metropolitan Filaret, like the entire Russian Synod, while condemning the Rumanians, was at the same time forced to justify the canonicity of the Russian church administration and to distinguish it from that of the Rumanian Church. See F. Kurganov, *Nabroski i ocherki iz noveishei istorii Rumynskoi tserkvi* (Kazan, 1899), 170-171, 216-223, 336-346. Moreover, the Rumanian Gospodar directly cited Peter I's example and the juridicial status of the contemporary Russian Synod (see Ibid., 451, 475-458), and the response by members of the Synod, including Filaret's, seemed like sophistic self-defense, an attempt to hide from themselves, and from society, the conflict between Christian consciousness and the growing sacralization of the monarch, involving the increasing subordination of church to state. See Ibid., 493-496, 496-506; *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. V, 807-808, 834-839. Curiously, for all of the attempts to present the Russian situation as consonant with church norms, acknowledgement of the noncanonical establishment of this institution slipped into the Russian Synod's response. See F. Kurganov, *Nabroski i ocherki*, 459. Just as characteristic of the Russians' sophistry was Filaret's statement that the spiritual college "which Peter took from the Protestant . . . divine providence and the spirit of the church turned into the Most Holy Synod." See *Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta*, vol. IV, 145; by "the Protestant" Filaret meant G. F. Leibniz, who had proposed extending the collegial system to administer ecclesiastical matters.
- 427 Feofan offered a special defense of it in his "Treatise on Oaths and Pledges" (*Rassuzhdenie o prisiage i kliatve*). See Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, part IV, 243-265.
- 428 See Markell Rodyshevskii's protest against this kind of oath in P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. II, 91 (second pagination).
- 429 See *Mneniia, otzyvy i pis'ma Filareta*, 190.
- 430 P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii*, vol. I, 643.
- 431 See this overt protest against the sacralization of the monarch in Aleksei Tolstoi's "Song on Potok the Warrior":

*Preserve us, Lord, from the earthly god!  
Writ sternly commands us  
To recognize only the heavenly God!*

A. K. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. I, 299. True, Tolstoi is writing here about Muscovite Rus' and he characteristically attributes sacralization of the tsar to Tatar influence.

<sup>432</sup> Innokentii, "Slovo, proiznesennoe v Odesskom kafedral`nom sobore... po vozvrashchenii iz Moskvy posle prisutstviia tam pri sviashcheneishem koronovanii ikh Imp. Velichestv," *Khristianskoe chtenie* (1856), 450; ellipsis in the original. The expression "last day" hints at Innokentii's book "The Last Days of Jesus Christ's Earthly Life," i.e., it specifically denotes Golgotha.

<sup>433</sup> N. I. Barsukov, *Zhizn' i trudy M. P. Pogodina* (St. Petersburg, 1888-1910), kn. XV, 132.

<sup>434</sup> *Pis'ma raznykh lits znamenitomu arkhiepiskopu Innokentiiu Borisovu* (Moscow, 1885), 17. Pogodin's letter was also published with some insignificant differences from the cited text by Barsukov (see N. I. Barsukov, *Zhizn' i trudy*, kn. XV, 134-135); Barsukov's publication seems less correct. The words Pogodin cites by Krylov on Glinka should be juxtaposed to the analogous statement by Pushkin in his letter to Pletnev of January 7, 1831:

Poor Glinka works like a hired hand, but nothing worthwhile comes of it. It seems to me that he has gone off his head, mad from grief. Whom did he take the notion to ask to be godparent of his child! Just imagine into what kind of a position he will put the priest and the deacon, the godmother, the midwife, and the godfather himself, whom they will make renounce the devil, spit, blow, unite to Christ, and do other such stuff. Nashchokin assures us that everybody was spoiled by the late tsar, who stood godfather to everybody's children. Even now I can't get over Glinka's audacity.

A. S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. XIV, 141; translation adapted from J. T. Shaw, trans., *The Letters of Alexander Pushkin* (Bloomington, 1967), 452. Pushkin has in mind F. N. Glinka's poem "Poverty and Consolation," in which there occur the lines: "Will God give children? . . . —Well, so what—Let him be our *godfather!*" See F. N. Glinka, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Leningrad, 1957), 408. This incident indirectly reveals the association between God and monarch; it was the fact that Emperor Alexander baptized children that, as P. V. Nashchokin suggested, made it possible to conceive of God in the corresponding role.