

TSAR AND PRETENDER: SAMOZVANCHESTVO OR ROYAL IMPOSTURE IN RUSSIA AS A CULTURAL- HISTORICAL PHENOMENON

B. A. Uspenskij

1. Although *samozvanchestvo*, or royal imposture, is not an exclusively Russian phenomenon, in no other country has it been so frequent, or played such a significant role in the history of people and state.¹ To write the history of Russia and avoid the question of royal imposture is impossible: in the words of Kliuchevskii, “royal imposture in Russia, ever since the first False Dmitrii* made his appearance, became a chronic malady of the state from that moment on; almost until the end of the eighteenth century, hardly a single reign passed without a pretender.”² From the beginning of the seventeenth century and even up to the middle of the nineteenth, it would be hard to point to more than two or three decades in which a pretender did not put himself forward, and indeed, in some periods, pretenders can be counted by the dozen.³

The root-causes of this phenomenon have not yet been fully explained. For the most part scholars have attempted to solve the question of royal imposture by reference to either a social or a political perspective: on the social level it is seen as a specific and persistent form of anti-feudalism, and on the political level as a struggle for power. Neither of these approaches, however, elucidates the *specific* nature of royal imposture as a cultural phenomenon: as we shall see below, royal imposture in the broader sense of the term is by no means invariably linked to social movements, nor does it necessarily involve a struggle for political power. If we are to grasp the essence of royal imposture, we clearly have to uncover those cultural mechanisms which precondition the phenomenon, i.e., to examine in a historical light the ideological

* Claiming to be Dmitrii, the youngest son of Ivan the Terrible, who had in fact been murdered in 1591, the False Dmitrii marched on Moscow in 1605 and held the throne for less than a year.

conceptions of Russian society. An important step in this direction was taken by K. V. Chistov, who has convincingly demonstrated the connection between royal imposture and the utopian legend of the Tsar-Deliverer; indeed, Chistov sees royal imposture as a realization of this legend.⁴ While wholly accepting Chistov's conclusions, we should point out, however, that his explanation is not exhaustive. This approach, in fact, explains not so much the appearance of pretenders, as the social reaction to it, i.e. the response and support which they enjoyed among the populace; in addition, it highlights an important aspect of the phenomenon, namely *belief* in the pretender. Moreover, the question of royal imposture cannot be explained without delving further into the psychology of the pretenders themselves, i.e. into the whole complex of notions which directly motivated their actions. In this paper we shall attempt to show that it was *religious* notions which lay at the root of this psychology; in other words, we shall examine the religious aspect of royal imposture as a phenomenon of Russian culture.

2. It is quite clear that the psychology of royal imposture is directly connected with the question of attitude to the Tsar, i.e. the special way in which royal power was understood. Pretenders made their appearance in Russia only after there were Tsars, i.e. after the establishment and stabilization of royal power (no instances of pretenders claiming a *princely* throne are known). Moreover, the special nature of the attitude to the Tsar is determined by the understanding of royal power as being sacred, having a divine nature. It might even be suggested that royal imposture, as a typically Russian phenomenon, is connected precisely with the process of sacralization of the monarchy (which in turn is connected with the Byzantinization of monarchic power). Furthermore, the appearance of pretenders may actually be evidence of the start of the process of the sacralization of the monarch;⁵ it is perhaps no accident that the first pretender appeared in Russia soon after the rite of anointing was added to the accession ceremony (along with that of crowning). Anointing confers, as it were, a special charismatic status on the Tsar: as the anointed one, the Tsar is likened to Christ (Greek: *christos*, "the anointed one") and consequently, from the beginning of the eighteenth century, could even be called "Christ."⁶

We should remember that the word "tsar" in early Russia was regarded as a sacred word and has the same feature of non-conventionality in relation to the linguistic sign that all sacred lexis has in general; by the same token, the act of calling oneself Tsar can in no way be viewed as a purely arbitrary act of will.⁷ Captain Margeret writes in his notes in 1607:

Now, concerning the title which they take, they think that there is none more solemn than the one they have, "Tzar." They call the Roman Emperor "*Tsisar*," deriving it from Caesar; other sovereigns they call "*kroll*," following the example of the Poles; the Persian suzerain they call "*Kisel Bacha*" and the Turkish, "*Veliqui Ospodartursk*," i.e. the Great Lord of Turkey . . . According to them, the word Tzar is to be found in the Holy Scriptures. For wherever mention is made of David, or Solomon, or other kings, they are called "Zar David" and "Zar Solomon" . . . For this reason they maintain that the name of Tzar which it once pleased God to confer on David, Solomon and other rulers of Judah and Israel is the most authentic, and that the words "Tsisar" or "Kroll" are merely a human invention and acquired by feats of arms.⁸

In this way the name Tsar is acknowledged to be a creation not of man, but of God; consequently the title of Tsar is seen as distinct from all other titles in as much as it is of divine nature. Even more important is the fact that this word is applied to God Himself: in liturgical texts God is often called "Tsar," and hence the characteristic parallelism, bequeathed to Christian religious consciousness, as it were from the earliest times, between Tsar and God,⁹ a parallelism which finds expression in such paired phrases as *Nebesnyi* Tsar (King of Heaven—referring to God) and *zemnoi* Tsar (Earthly Tsar—referring to the Tsar); *Netlennyi* Tsar (Incorruptible Tsar, i.e. God) and *tlennyi* Tsar (Corruptible Tsar, i.e. the Tsar).¹⁰ Cf. also the naming of the Tsar as *zemnoi bog* (Earthly God), which is attested to in Russian from the sixteenth century onwards.¹¹

In such conditions as these the very fact of calling oneself Tsar—irrespective of the fact of wielding actual power or not—has an undeniably religious aspect to it, and either way betokens a claim to possess sacred qualities. It is typical that the False Dmitrii was called, like Christ, "*pravednoe solntse*" (sun of righteousness);¹² the Barkulabovskii chronicle speaks of him thus: "for he is assuredly the true Tsar of the East, Dmitrii Ivanovich, the sun of righteousness."¹³ This is, as far as we know, the first case of such a title being applied to a Tsar.¹⁴ In this sense, arbitrarily to proclaim oneself Tsar may be compared with proclaiming oneself saint, a custom found, for example, among the Russian sects of the *khlysty* (the flagellants) and the *skoptsy* (the castrates). Indeed, in certain cases these two tendencies coincide: the well-known Kondratii Selivanov, whom the *skoptsy* saw as the incarnation of Christ, was at the same time believed to be the Emperor Peter III.^{15*} According to the teaching of the *skoptsy*, "in the beginning was the Lord Sabaoth, then Jesus

* Peter III (Petr Fedorovich) reigned from 1761-1762. He was overthrown and succeeded by his wife Catherine the Great.

Christ, and now the Lord and Father, Petr Feodorovich, God of Gods and Tsar of Tsars.”¹⁶ Similarly Akulina Ivanovna, “mother of God” to the *skoptsy*, was acknowledged to be both Mother of God and the Empress Elizabeth Petrovna,* and accordingly the mother of Kondratii Selivanov, since he was Tsar and God¹⁷; another “mother of God” to the *skoptsy*, Anna Sofonovna, considered herself to be the Grand Duchess Anna Feodorovna, the wife of the heir to the throne, the Tsarevich Constantine Pavlovich.^{18**} In general, along with the pretenders who took the name of a Tsar, there were in Russia also pretenders who took the name of a saint, or who claimed to have special powers from on high; in a sense these are phenomena of the same order. Thus, for example, in the first half of the eighteenth century there appeared in Siberia a self-styled Prophet Elijah¹⁹ (we should, incidentally, note in this connection that Kondratii Selivanov, whom we discussed above, was also at times called the Prophet Elijah).²⁰ At the end of the seventeenth century, Kuz`ma Kosoi (El`chenin), who led one of the Old Believer movements in the Don country, proclaimed himself “pope”²¹ and maintained that he had to place Tsar Mikhail on the throne;²² what is more, he acknowledged Mikhail to be God Himself.²³ According to other sources, he considered himself to be Tsar Mikhail, i.e. both Tsar and God together.²⁴ Self-styled Tsar Mikhails, as well as people who thought it their mission to put a Tsar Mikhail on the throne, have turned up in Russia at later dates too, right up to our own times.

3. The notion that royal power is established by God accounts for the distinction made in those days, and in particular in the seventeenth century, between “righteous” (*pravednyi*) and unrighteous” (*nepravednyi*) Tsars: *pravednyi* signifies not “just” (*spravedlivyi*), but “the right one” (*pravil`nyi*). Thus Ivan Timofeev distinguishes in his *Chronicle* between Tsars who are genuine (“most true,” “most original,” Tsars “by nature”) and those who are Tsars in outward appearance only (“unreal,” who “make an assault” on tsardom “by means of pretence”).²⁵ Neither usurpation of the throne, nor even legitimate accession to the throne through the rite of coronation, is sufficient to make a man Tsar. It is not conduct, but *predestination* which marks the true Tsar; so a Tsar may be a tyrant (as, for example, Ivan the Terrible) yet this in no way means that he is not in his rightful place. A distinction is therefore drawn between Tsars by the grace of God and Tsars by act of will, only the former being acknowledged as

* The Empress Elizabeth, who reigned from 1741-1761, was the daughter of Peter the Great and aunt of Peter III.

** Brother of Alexander I. He renounced his claim to the throne.

true Tsars; in other words, a distinction is made between the non-conventional and the conventional senses of the word *tsar*. The False Dmitrii, then, in contrast to Ivan the Terrible, is not, from Ivan Timofeev's point of view, a Tsar at all: although he was legitimately enthroned, he is in fact only a *samotsar`*, a "self-styled Tsar."²⁶ Similarly Boris Godunov,* according to the same author, "imposed himself on us . . . by his own volition,"²⁷ and so Ivan Timofeev does not recognize him as Tsar; and he has the same attitude towards Vasilii Shuiskii.^{28**}

On the other hand, Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich,^{***} as Avraamii Palitsyn emphasizes in his *Tale*,^{****} "was chosen not by men, but in truth by God";²⁹ and moreover he does not understand this in the sense that God's will guided Mikhail Fedorovich's election in the Assembly of the Land, but rather that he was destined by God even before his birth and anointed from his mother's womb.³⁰ The Assembly of the Land simply divined, as it were, his predestination.³¹ (It should be noted, by the way, that the early Russian scribes provide no practical indications whatsoever on how to distinguish a true Tsar from a false one.)

Similarly in the *Epistle to the Ugra* by the Archbishop of Rostov, Vassian (Rylo), dated 1480 and addressed to Ivan III, the author sees the Tatar Khan (Akhmat) as a false Tsar. He calls him a pretender and usurper who "captured our land like a robber, and ruled over it *although he was neither a Tsar nor descended from Tsars,*" and contrasts him with Ivan, who is the true Tsar, "the sovereign-ruler confirmed by God":

And yet what prophet prophesied and what apostle or prelate taught this man, so unpleasing to God, this wicked man who *calls himself Tsar* to submit to you, the great Christian Tsar of all Russian lands?³²

It must be borne in mind that during the period of Tatar rule the Khan was called "Tsar" in Russia, yet now this Tsar is called a *pretender* (we shall return to this question later). Cf. also a similar formulation in the denunciatory epistle from the clergy, headed by Iona (the future Metropolitan), to Prince Dmitrii Shemiaka in 1447, appealing to him to submit to Prince Vasilii the Blind:

* Reigned 1598-1605.

** Vasilii IV, a boyar who held the throne from 1606-1610.

*** Tsar Mikhail, the first of the Romanov dynasty, was elected Tsar in 1613. The Assembly of the Land was abolished by Peter the Great.

**** Avraamii Palitsyn (1555-1627) completed his *Skazanie* in 1620.

Lord, we must dare to say this: will you be overcome by spiritual blindness through your infatuation with what is temporal and ephemeral, and the totally illusory honour and glory of being prince and ruler: that is, to hear yourself addressed by the title of Prince and yet not to have it bestowed by God?³³

In this case too, self-styled power (power by outward appearance only) is contrasted with God-given power (power by inner nature), and power conferred on oneself with power conferred by God; it is worth noting in this connection that it was precisely Vasilii the Blind who was the first of the early Russian princes more or less consistently to call himself “Tsar” and “autocrat” (*samoderzhets*).³⁴ Indeed, it is Metropolitan Iona³⁵ himself who calls him Tsar, and who is probably the author of the epistle of 1447 quoted above; thus, in this instance too, the point at issue is royal power by divine election.

If true Tsars receive power from God, then false Tsars receive it from the Devil.³⁶ Even the church rite of sacred coronation and anointing do not confer grace on a false Tsar, for these actions are no more than outward appearances; in reality the false Tsar is crowned and anointed by demons acting on the orders of the Devil himself.³⁷ It follows therefore that if the real Tsar may be likened to Christ (see above) and perceived as an image of God, a living icon,³⁸ then a pretender may be regarded as a false icon, i.e. an *idol*. Ivan Timofeev in his *Chronicle* writes of the False Dmitrii:

All obey this man who dwells beyond the borders of the Russian land; all willingly submit to him *though he is an idol, and pay homage to him as to a Tsar*.³⁹

Thus the Tsar as icon is seen in opposition to the pretender as idol.

4. The idea of a true Tsar’s being divinely preordained, of his being marked by divine election, is clearly apparent in the exceptionally persistent notion of special “royal signs,” usually the cross, the eagle (i.e. the Tsar’s coat of arms) or the sun-signs which are supposed to be found on the Tsar’s body and which attest to his elective status. This belief has played an important part in the mythology of royal imposture: according to numerous historical and folklore sources it was precisely by virtue of these “royal signs” that the most diverse pretenders—for example, the False Dmitrii, Timofei Ankudinov,* Emel’ian Pugachev** and others—demonstrated their royal descent and their right to

* Claiming to be the son of Vasilii Shuiskii (Vasilii IV), he was executed in 1653.

** Emel’ian Pugachev (1726-1775) was the leader of the most widespread and serious popular revolt under Catherine the Great.

the throne; and it was especially the marks on their bodies that made others believe in them and support them.⁴⁰ Thus, for example, a beggar who turned up in 1732 in the Tambov province proclaimed:

I am no peasant and no son of a peasant; I am an eagle, the son of eagles, and my destiny is to be an eagle. I am the Tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich . . . I have a cross on my back and a birthmark in the form of a sword on my thigh . . .⁴¹

Compare the evidence of the Pugachev investigation:

He had been at Eremina Kuritsa's [the name of a Cossack] for two days, when the latter called Emel'ka [Pugachev] to the bathhouse and Emel'ka said to him: "I have no shirt." Eremina Kuritsa replied: "I'll give you mine." Then the two of them went alone to the baths. When they arrived and Emel'ka undressed, Eremina Kuritsa saw the scars of a disease on Emel'ka's chest, just under the nipples, and asked him: "What's that you have there, Pugachev, on your chest?" And Emel'ka replied to Eremina Kuritsa: "Those are the marks of a sovereign." Hearing this, Eremina said: "That is good, if it is so."

Further on in the same deposition we read:

When we had sat down, Karavaev said to Emel'ka: "You call yourself a sovereign, yet sovereigns have the royal signs on their bodies," whereupon Emel'ka stood up and, ripping open the collar of his shirt, said: "There! If you do not believe that I am the sovereign, just look—here is the royal sign." First of all he showed the scars under his nipples left by an illness, and then the same kind of mark on his left temple. The Cossacks—Shigaev, Karavaev, Zarubin, Miasnikov—looked at the signs and said: "Well, now we believe you and recognize you as sovereign."⁴²

In 1822 a certain townsman by the name of Startsev wrote to Alexander I about a man who maintained that he was Paul I:

I know that he bears upon his body, on his back between the shoulder-blades, a cross the like of which none of your subjects can have except those of supreme power; for this reason it must be supposed that he has a similar sign also on his chest. Now since he is vouchsafed such a cross on his body he cannot be a man of simple birth, neither can he be a nobleman: he must almost certainly be the father of Your Imperial Majesty . . .⁴³

In 1844 a peasant by the name of Kliukin stated that he had been in the baths with a man who called himself the Tsarevich Constantine Pavlovich, and "I saw the hair on his chest formed in the shape of a cross, which no man has,

save one of royal blood.”⁴⁴ Such examples are very common and it would be easy to adduce many more. There is no reason in such cases to suspect a conscious attempt at mystification: for there is no doubt that the pretenders themselves were convinced that the presence of such a mark on their bodies specifically attested to their having been singled out.

The notion of divine election, of the belief that the Tsar is mystically preordained, most likely explains not only the specific conception of royal power in early Russia, which we discussed above, but also the psychology of the pretender. In the absence of any clear-cut criteria on how to distinguish between a true and a false Tsar, the pretender could evidently to some degree believe in his predestination, in his election. It is significant that the most striking pretenders—the False Dmitrii and Pugachev—crop up precisely at those moments when the natural (i.e. hereditary) order of succession has been broken and when the actual occupier of the throne could in fact be regarded as a pretender. Boris Godunov who, in Ivan Timofeev’s words, acceded to the throne “by an act of his own will” (see above) could be regarded in this way, as, of course, could Catherine the Great, who had no right to the Russian throne at all. The presence of one pretender (a pretender on the throne) provokes the appearance of others; and there is a kind of competition between pretenders, each of whom claims to be marked (elect). At the basis of this psychology, however paradoxical it may seem, there lurks the conviction that it is not man, but God who must judge who is the real Tsar.⁴⁵ It follows, therefore, that royal imposture is a quite predictable and logically justified consequence of the conception of royal power which we have been discussing.

However, the specific psychology of royal imposture is based to a considerable degree on a *mythological act of identification*.⁴⁶ It is indicative in this connection that Pugachev, who called himself Petr Fedorovich,* should have called his closest associate, I. N. Zarubin, Chika, “Count Chernyshev.”^{47**} In addition, the other self-styled Peter III—the *skopets* Kondratii Selivanov, discussed above—had his own “Count Chernyshev” (this was another leader of the *skoptsy*, A. I. Silov⁴⁸). The case of the “mother of God” to the *skoptsy*, Akulina Ivanovna, who, as mentioned above, called herself “Empress Elizabeth” (at the end of the eighteenth century, i.e. after Elizabeth Petrovna’s death) is exactly analogous. She had a close associate who called herself E. R. Dashkova;⁴⁹

* I.e. Peter III, husband of Catherine the Great.

** Count Z. G. Chernyshev (d. 1784) and his brother Ivan held high positions under Catherine.

the fact that the real, not self-styled E. R. Dashkova* was an associate not of Elizabeth, but of Catherine, only serves to underline the purely functional role of such an appellation. In these cases the *name* has become, as it were, a function of the *position*. No less remarkable in this context is the portrait of Pugachev in the Moscow Historical Museum, where Pugachev is painted over the portrait of Catherine:⁵⁰ if a portrait is a pictorial parallel to a person's name, then the repainting of a portrait is equivalent to an act of renaming.⁵¹

5. Thus the very concept of royal power in early Russia presupposed an opposition between true, genuine Tsars and Tsars in outward appearance only, i.e. pretenders. In this sense the behavior of a pretender is viewed as carnival behavior: in other words, pretenders are seen as mummers (*riazhenye*).

Furthermore, royal imposture is obviously connected with the "game of Tsar" which was played in Muscovy in the seventeenth century; people would play at being the Tsar, i.e. would *dress up* as Tsars and act out the attendant ceremonies. Thus in the record book of the Muscovite court for February 2, 1634 we read:

The same day, Prince Matvei, Prince Ofonasei and the Princes Ivan and Ondrei Shakhovskie were brought before the Tsar, where the following was said to them: In the year 7128 [i.e. 1620] Ondrei Golubovskoi laid a charge against you to the Sovereign Tsar and Grand Prince Mikhailo Fedorovich of all Russia** that one evening you went to Ileika Bochkin's house and that you, Prince Ofonasei, Prince Ondrei, Prince Ivan and Ileika Bochkin did in a rascally and cunning [i.e. playful] way call you, Prince Matvei, Tsar, and that you, Prince Matvei, did call the prince and his comrades your boyars; indeed, you yourselves confessed to such rascality. The boyars' verdict was that you should be condemned to death for that misdeed. And then his Majesty the Tsar and Grand Prince Mikhailo Fedorovich of all Russia, at the entreaty of His Majesty's father, the Great Sovereign and Most Holy Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, Filaret Nikitich, was merciful to you and spared your lives. His Majesty commanded that you be sent for your great crimes to separate prisons in the towns downriver [from Moscow]. But now His Majesty the Tsar and Grand Prince Mikhailo Fedorovich of all Russia, in blessed memory of his father, the Great Sovereign and Most Holy Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, Filaret Nikitich, has taken pity on you and ordered you to be reprieved from disfavor and brought back from Moscow to appear before the Sovereign. Henceforth you, Prince Matvei, and your comrades are to redeem your great crimes through service.⁵²

* Princess E. R. Dashkova was one of the outstanding women of her time.

** I.e. Mikhail Romanov.

Another such case has been preserved in the archive of the Ministry of Justice. On the Wednesday of the first week of Lent in 1666, a landowner from Tver` by the name of Nikita Borisovich Pushkin made a petition in Moscow, in which he called down on his peasants “the Sovereign’s word and deed”:

It seems the peasants from my villages around Tver`, to wit from the villages of Vasil`evskoe and Mikhailovskoe, have got up to some kind of unholy mischief: they chose one of their number—I do not know whom—as their leader, and *having given him a high-ranking title*, went with him this Shrovetide Saturday and made an uproar with flags and drums and rifles.

The evidence for the case revealed that the peasants “called one of their number a man of high rank—the Tsar;” moreover, they paraded their elected Tsar, Mit`ka Demidov, “through the village on a litter with a funnel placed on his head,”

and carried before him *varenets* [boiled soured milk, the ritual repast of Shrovetide]; they also tied a sheaf of straw to a pole [cf. the carrying and burning of sheaves of straw or a scarecrow stuffed with straw in ritual processions at Shrovetide], and the customary basket [sic], and tied a garment instead of a standard to another pole and carried with them instead of a rifle, roofing-timbers.

Next the peasants chose as their Tsar, instead of Mit`ka Demidov, Pershka Iakovlev, who unleashed a royal punishment upon his subjects:

In the village of Mikhailovskoe, at Pershka’s command, his brother peasants beat a certain peasant—I forget his name—with sticks, and the peasant pleaded with them, saying: “Sire, have mercy”; and Pershka was wearing a green caftan at the time with a shoulder-belt and a maiden’s fox-fur hat upon his head. And for a flag they tied a woman’s veil to a pole.⁵³

Both of these peasant “Tsars” had two fingers of their right hands cut off. Both they and their accomplices were whipped “mercilessly” and exiled together with their families to Siberia.⁵⁴ It is highly significant that all these events should have taken place at Shrovetide and be characterized by the typical attributes of Shrovetide festivities (the sheaf of straw, the *varenets*, etc.). Dressing up as Tsar similarly emerges as one of the aspects of Shrovetide mummers.⁵⁵ Unfortunately we do not know at what season of the year the Shakhovskie princes “played at tsar,” but we have every reason to suspect that it happened at Yuletide or at Shrovetide.

“Playing at Tsar” is reflected not only in historical but also in folklore and ethnographical documents. We find a characteristic description of the game in a fairy-tale recorded in the Perm` province:

The boy grew not year by year, but hour by hour. He started playing with his friends. They began to *play at Tsar*. The blacksmith's son said to his friends: "Shout to the river to flow backwards! The one who succeeds will be Tsar!" They all shouted and shouted, but nothing happened; then he gave a shout, and the river began to flow backwards. They played the same game again: "Shout to the forest to bow down to the damp earth!" The others shouted and shouted, but nothing happened; he gave a shout, and the forest bowed down. "So, I am Tsar a second time!" They played a third time: "Shout to the animals in the forest to be silent!" [Omission in the text.] "So, lads, I'm Tsar for the third time! I can kill whoever I like since no court can try me," he said. So they agreed to this.⁵⁶

Here we have a very clear reflection of the sacred properties of the Tsar: "playing at Tsar" in this context is seen as playing at being a sacred, omnipotent being.

The "game of Tsar" is essentially a variant of royal imposture, though one completely divested of any kind of political pretensions whatsoever: it is royal imposture in its purest form, so to say. It was no accident that the "game of Tsar" was ruthlessly punished in the seventeenth century, and the fact that despite persecution the game was still played and even left its mark in folklore is extremely significant.⁵⁷

6. The extent to which the "game of Tsar" was found in early Russia is demonstrated by the fact that it could be played not only by pretenders, but also by real Tsars, who forced *another* man to be the false, inauthentic Tsar—a Tsar in outward appearance only. Thus Ivan the Terrible in 1567 forced his equerry, the boyar Ivan Petrovich Fedorov (Cheliadnin), who was suspected of conspiracy, to be dressed up in the Tsar's clothes, given the sceptre and other insignia of royalty and be seated on the throne; after which, having bowed down to the ground before him and paid him all the honors befitting a Tsar, Ivan killed the travesty Tsar with his own hand. This is how Slichting describes the incident:

When he [I. P. Fedorov] arrived at the palace, the tyrant caught sight of him and immediately commanded that he be given the raiment which he [Ivan] was wearing himself and that he should be arrayed therein, that he be given the sceptre which sovereigns are wont to hold, and then ordered him to mount the royal throne and take his seat in the place where the Grand Prince himself always sat. As soon as Ioann [I. P. Fedorov] had done this, albeit with vain protestation (there is after all no sense in trying to justify oneself before a tyrant), and had seated himself on the royal throne in the princely raiment, the tyrant himself rose, stood before him and, baring his head and bowing, knelt before him, saying: "Now you have what you sought, what you aspired to—to be Grand Prince of Muscovy and to occupy my place. So now you are

the Grand Prince; rejoice now and enjoy the power after which you thirsted." Then after a short pause he began again, thus: "However, as it lies in my power to seat you upon this throne, so does it also lie in my power to unseat you." Thereupon, seizing a knife he thrust it into his chest several times and made all the soldiers there at the time stab him with their daggers.⁵⁸

This scene is full of the most profound symbolism: Ivan accuses Fedorov of unlawfully claiming the Tsar's throne and yet makes him Tsar, but Tsar in outward appearance only—a *pretender-Tsar*. Such behavior is fairly typical of Ivan in general and—as we shall see below—is not by any means necessarily linked with the desire to rid himself of an unworthy man or quench his thirst for revenge; rather it is connected with the masquerading and dressing up so typical of Ivan and his entourage,⁵⁹ in fact, with the game which outwardly might remind one of playing the holy fool, but which is in reality radically different from it.⁶⁰

Even more indicative is the incident when in 1575 Ivan crowned Simeon Bekbulatovich Tsar, handed over to him all his royal ceremonial and all the royal insignia, himself assuming the name of Ivan of Moscow and playing the role of a simple boyar; in the words of the chronicler:

Ivan Vasil'evich was pleased to make Simeon Bekbulatovich Tsar of Moscow . . . and crowned him Tsar, and himself assumed the name of Ivan of Moscow, left town and went to live in Petrovka; he handed over all his royal ceremonial to Simeon, while he himself travelled simply, like a boyar, in a cart and when he came into Simeon's presence he would seat himself far away from the royal throne, together with the boyars.⁶¹

According to some sources, Simeon Bekbulatovich even underwent the sacred rite of coronation,⁶² but even this could not make of him a genuine, authentic Tsar.⁶³ The enthronement of Simeon Bekbulatovich was directly bound up with the institution (or to be more precise, with the reinstatement) of the *oprichnina*, which also had many features of the masquerade to a marked degree; while Ivan entrusted the *zemshchina* to Simeon Bekbulatovich, he himself controlled the *oprichnina*:⁶⁴ the term *zemshchina* (from *zemlia* = land, earth) is correlated with the original land, while the word *oprichnina* signifies that which is separate, unconnected, on the outside.⁶⁵ We should point out that I. P. Fedorov too was the head of the *zemshchina* government,⁶⁶ so that in both cases the person at the head of the *zemshchina* plays the part of the travesty Tsar; and this, of course, is no mere coincidence.

It is highly significant, moreover, that Simeon Bekbulatovich should have been a direct descendant of the Khans of the Golden Horde, i.e. of those who in their time wielded the real power over the territory of Russia and who *called themselves Tsar* (we have already mentioned that the Tatar Khans were called

precisely this);⁶⁷ the Tsarevich Bekbulat, father of Simeon Bekbulatovich, was the grandson of Akhmat, the last Khan of the Golden Horde—the very man of whom Vassian Rylo wrote in his *Epistle to the Ugra* in 1480 that he was a false Tsar, a pretender (see above)—and was, in addition, one of the strongest claimants to the Khanate of the fragmented Tatar Horde.⁶⁸ So it was that Ivan placed the Tatar Khan on the throne of Russia. *The role of travesty, pretender-Tsar is played by one who would formerly have possessed the right to call himself Tsar and to rule over the Russian state*; such a Tsar is now revealed to be a false Tsar, a Tsar in outward appearance only—and by the same token, the previous Tatar Khans are also seen as false Tsars, not true ones.⁶⁹ What we have before us is as it were the last stage in the struggle with Tatar rule, a semiotic stage. In his time, having overcome the Khan (Tsar), the Russian Grand Prince became Tsar, i.e. began to take the name used by the Khans; and now it was the Khan who became the *pretender-Tsar*.⁷⁰ It was quite in character that Ivan the Terrible should have behaved like this; for he was the first Russian Tsar officially crowned Tsar, i.e. the first monarch to enjoy the *formal* right to assume the title of Tsar of Russia.

It could be said that in each case, both in that of I. P. Fedorov and in that of Simeon Bekbulatovich, the “game of Tsar” had a symbolic character for Ivan the Terrible and served the function of a *political “unmasking”*: in the first case an actual person (I. P. Fedorov, accused of laying claim to royal power) was unmasked, and in the second, a state principle (the rule of the Tatar Khans). In both cases it was the *head of the zemshchina* who was subjected to being unmasked.

We know of another Tsar who indulged in this game: Peter the Great. In much the same way as Ivan designated Simeon Bekbulatovich Tsar while he himself became a subject, so Peter designated F. Iu. Romodanovskii “Prince-Caesar” [*kniaz`-kesar`*], calling him *korol`* (*konich* [sic], king) and “His Majesty,” while he called himself the latter’s “serf and lowliest slave,” and was awarded various ranks and promotions by him.⁷¹ Setting out in 1697 on his journey abroad, Peter entrusted the government of Moscow to Prince-Caesar Romodanovskii, and in his letters from abroad addressed him as monarch, emphasizing his own subject status.⁷² All the highest ranks—those of Colonel (1706), Lieutenant-General and *shoutbenakht*, i.e. Rear-Admiral (1709)—were awarded to Peter by the Prince-Caesar.⁷³ Nobody dared drive into Romodanovskii’s courtyard—the sovereign himself used to leave his carriage at the gates⁷⁴—and in their mock ceremonies Peter would kiss Romodanovskii’s hand.⁷⁵

This “game” also had its point of symbolic unmasking. It is characteristic, for example, that at the wedding of the Tsar’s jester, Shanskii, in 1702,

Romodanovskii should have been dressed in the robes of a seventeenth century Tsar of Russia, while Nikita Zotov was dressed as the patriarch:⁷⁶ this parody of the Russian Tsar as it were anticipates Peter's assumption of the title of Emperor.⁷⁷ After F. Iu. Romodanovskii's death (in September 1717), the title of "Prince-Caesar" was inherited by his son, I. F. Romodanovskii (from April 1718); at the wedding of the "Prince-Pope," P. I. Buturlin, in 1721—that is, just before Peter was proclaimed Emperor!—I. F. Romodanovskii again appeared in the costume of Tsar of Russia, his wife was dressed as Tsarina and the crowd of servants wore traditional Russian costume.⁷⁸ In this connection we should remember that both Romodanovskii were known as adherents of traditional Russian customs and in their private lives kept up the traditional boyar ways.⁷⁹ Broadly speaking, the Prince-Caesar may be considered an equivalent of the Prince-Pope: the Prince-Caesar being a parody of the Tsar, and the Prince-Pope a parody of the Patriarch; just as the parody of the image of the Tsar preceded the assumption of the title of Emperor, so the parody of the image of the Patriarch preceded the abolition of the Patriarchate [1721]. At the same time we have here a parody of the very principle (ultimately derived from Byzantium) of the coexistence of the priesthood and monarchy, i.e. the division of power into ecclesiastical and secular, a division which was in opposition to the one-man power of Peter.⁸⁰ Finally, we should not forget that the Romodanovskii family, unlike the Romanovs, traced their descent from Riurik. Thus, in this case too—as in that of Simeon Bekbulatovich—the role of the monarch is played by one who could previously have laid claim to the title.

Moreover, for both Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great, this masquerade is intimately bound up with the notion of royal imposture, and can be seen as simply another aspect of the same phenomenon. Its basis is the opposition between genuine and apparent Tsars (pretenders) mentioned above: in all these cases the true, real Tsar, by shedding the *external* signs of his status as Tsar and forcing another to play what is to all intents and purposes the role of pretender, is in fact emphasizing as it were his own *authentic* right to the royal throne, independent of any formal attributes of kingship. Ivan and Peter clearly shared the conception of royal power which we discussed above, and indeed their behavior derives from that conception. It is indicative that Ivan should have renounced the throne several times in the course of his reign (in 1564 in connection with the institution of the *oprichnina*, and in 1575 in connection with its reinstatement and the installation of Simeon Bekbulatovich as Tsar), as if in the full certainty that, come what might, he still remained the true and genuine Tsar: a Tsar by nature, "by the will of God, and not by the unruly whim

of mankind,” as he puts it himself in his letter to Stephen Batory.⁸¹ In just the same way Ivan could, in a critical situation, ostentatiously abandon Moscow, leaving his throne behind him (in 1564 he left Moscow for Aleksandrovskaja Sloboda) and nonetheless still remain Tsar.⁸²

It is also significant that both Ivan and Peter should have named another man not only *Tsar*, but *saint*; their contemporaries—not without justification—saw overt blasphemy in this.⁸³ Bearing in mind the sacred nature of the title of Tsar, we can say that we have essentially the same type of behavior in both cases.

7. It should be borne in mind that any kind of masquerade or dressing up was inevitably thought of in early Russia as *anti-behavior*; i.e. a sinister, black-magic significance was attributed to it in principle. This is quite plain from the example of the mummers of Yuletide, Shrovetide, St. John’s Night and other festivals, who, it was assumed (by participants in the masquerade as well as spectators!), depicted devils or unclean spirits; correspondingly, the dressing up was accompanied by extremes of disorderly behavior, often of an overtly blasphemous character.⁸⁴

This is how imposture too, and, evidently, “the game of Tsar,” was perceived in early Russia. Dressing up in the Tsar’s clothes should be seen in this context as a typical case of anti-behavior, to which, on the level of content, there corresponds the blasphemous attempt to procure sacred attributes through outer simulation. It is no accident that Ivan and Peter took part in this masquerade, for they were both Tsars of whom anti-behavior was on the whole typical, whether expressed by dressing up or by the blasphemous imitation of church rituals—cf. in this connection Ivan’s “*oprichnyi* monastery”⁸⁵ and Peter’s “All-Jesting Council.”⁸⁶ In this sense the link between the installation of Simeon Bekbulatovich as Tsar and the institution of the *oprichnina* [or *oprichina*], mentioned above is highly typical: the word *oprichnina* means both “separate, unconnected,” and at the same time “on the outside” [*kromeshnoe*]; it is, therefore, by the same token connected with the *other world*, the travesty element of demons. Thus the *oprichniki* were seen as *kromeshniki* [people on the outside] (cf. *t`ma kromeshnaia* [outer darkness] as a term for purgatory), i.e. as special kinds of mummers, who assumed diabolical appearance and diabolical behavior.⁸⁷ And indeed the manner in which the *oprichniki* acted recalls the behavior of mummers at Yuletide or other festivals; thus, Ivan’s *oprichnyi* monastery in Aleksandrovskaja Sloboda—in which the *oprichniki* dressed up in monks’ habits and the Tsar called himself the Abbot of this carnival monastery—would seem in all probability to have arisen under the influence

of those Yuletide games of which the icon-painter of Viaz'ma, the *starets* Grigorii, wrote in 1651, in his petition to Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. In Viaz'ma, he wrote,

there are various vile games from Christmas Day to the vigils of epiphany, during which the participants designate some of their number as saints, invent their own monasteries and name for them an archimandrite, a cellarer and startsy.⁸⁸

In exactly the same way the blasphemous entertainments indulged in by Peter, exemplified above all by the ceremonies of the All-Jesting Council, were originally intended primarily for Yuletide and Shrovetide (they soon, however, extended to the whole period from Christmas to Lent), and correspondingly contained elements of Yuletide and Shrovetide ritualism.⁸⁹ It should be noted in addition that by forcing his people to wear "German," i.e. European, clothes, Peter had in the eyes of his contemporaries transformed his entourage into mummers (just as Ivan's *oprichniki* had appeared in their time as mummers too): it was said that Peter had "dressed people up as devils."⁹⁰ Indeed, European dress in pre-Petrine times was perceived as a "mockery," a masquerade, and in icons devils could be depicted in German or Polish dress.⁹¹

By the same token, royal imposture as a specific type of behavior falls wholly into the traditional Russian situation which presupposes, along with correct, normative behavior, some form or other of anti-behavior⁹²; in other words royal imposture is part of the tradition of anti-behavior in Russia.

8. Royal imposture, then, is perceived in early Russia as anti-behavior. The fact that the False Dmitrii was regarded as a sorcerer ("a heretic"), i.e. that features characteristic of the behavior of sorcerers were ascribed to him in the popular consciousness, is indicative of this. Indeed, it is precisely this kind of view which is reflected in historical songs about the False Dmitrii, for example:

*The unfrocked Grishka, son of Otrep`ev, stands
Before his crystal mirror
And in his hands he holds a book of magic
And casts spells, this unfrocked Grishka, son of Otrep`ev;*⁹³

And:

*He distributes Lenten food to the people,
While he himself eats non-Lenten food [on a Friday!];*

*He makes his bed on the icons there are around him
And tramples underfoot the miracle-working crosses.*⁹⁴

Similar views were seemingly held even during the False Dmitrii's lifetime: an anonymous account of 1605 states that after the False Dmitrii's appearance in the political arena Boris Godunov sent emissaries to the Polish Sejm and "they spread the rumor that Dmitrii is the son of a priest and is a widely-known sorcerer." Later on, the same rumor was put about by Boris in Moscow, too; from the same account we learn that on his way to Moscow the False Dmitrii captured Grishka Otrep'ev, "the great and widely known magician, of whom the tyrant Boris spread the rumour that he was the real Dmitrii."⁹⁵ In any case the evidence provided by folklore sources is thoroughly corroborated by the tales about the Time of Troubles,* in which, for example, we find the "heretical book" (i.e. book of magic or sorcery) which the False Dmitrii was said to be constantly reading;⁹⁶ it is stated that he began "to eat veal and other unclean foods on Wednesdays and Fridays."⁹⁷ No less characteristic are the rumours that a *skomorokh's* mask hung instead of icons on the False Dmitrii's wall, and that icons lay about under his bed;⁹⁸ *skomorokhi* and sorcerers were identified with each other in early Russia, and it was believed that, during the act of sorcery icons were placed on the ground, icons or the cross were trodden on, and so on.⁹⁹

Historical songs about the False Dmitrii tell of how he sets off to the bathhouse at the time when people are going to church; this is also a characteristic behavior of sorcerers, inasmuch as in early Russia the bathhouse was thought of as an "unclean place," a kind of antipode to the church—and hence sorcerers could be recognized by the fact that they went to the bathhouse instead of going to church.¹⁰⁰ See, for example:

*The time had come for the Great Day,
For the Great Day, for Christ's Day,
And in Ivan-the-Great's bell-tower
The biggest bell of all was rung.
All the boyar-princes went to the liturgy,
To Christ's midnight Easter service,
But that thief Grishka the Unfrocked went to the bathhouse
With his sweetheart Marinushka Iur'evna.
All the boyar-princes are praying to God;*

* The period between the death of Fedor (eldest son of Ivan the Terrible) in 1598 and the accession of Mikhail Romanov in 1613.

*That thief Grishka the Unfroked is washing in the bathhouse
 And fornicating with his sweetheart Marinushka.
 The boyar-princes come back from the service;
 That thief Grishka the Unfroked comes from the bathhouse
 With his sweetheart Marinushka Iur`evna.¹⁰¹*

Cf.:

*All the people went to Christian mass,
 But Grishka the Unfroked and his Tsarina Marishka,
 Marina Ivanovna, daughter of the Prince of Lithuania—
 They didn't go to Christian mass;
 They went to the steam-baths,
 To the clean wash-tub,
 And steamed themselves in the steam-bath.
 They washed themselves in the wash-tub
 During Christ's midnight Easter service.
 The people come away from Christian mass,
 But Grishka the Unfroked comes from the steam-bath
 With his Tsarina Marina Ivanovna.¹⁰²*

The description of the model intended to represent hell, which the False Dmitrii is supposed to have erected for his amusement, is particularly interesting in this connection. In the *Tale of the Reign of Tsar Fedor Ioannovich*: we read:

And so that accursed heretic, ever thirsty for power in this brief life and in the one to come, built for himself the image of his eternal dwelling, the like of which has never been in the realm of Russia since the beginning of the world; what he desired, that did he inherit. He made a great pit right opposite his palace on the other side of the Moscow river and placed a great cauldron of pitch there, prefiguring his own future place, and placed above it three great and awesome bronze heads; their teeth were made of iron and inside there was noise and clanging, and by some cunning contrivance the jaws were made to yawn open like the jaws of hell, and the teeth were pointed and the claws were like sharp sickles ready to clutch at you. When they began to yawn it was as if a flame spurted out of the gullet; sparks were continually shooting out of the nostrils and smoke was ceaselessly issuing from the ears. From inside each head could be heard a great noise and clanging, and people looking at it were terrified. And out of the mouth hung down a great tongue, at the end of which was an asp's head, which looked as if it wanted to swallow you up. The accursed one, foretelling his eternal dwelling-place with his father the Devil and Satan, was very fond of that hellish place and was always looking at it out of his palace windows, so as to achieve his heart's

desire, the outer darkness of hell; and what he coveted, that did he inherit. And that accursed heretic ordered those Orthodox Christians who denounced his accursed heresy to be thrown into it to their death.¹⁰³

This description corresponds fairly closely to the iconographic representation of hell as a fire-breathing serpent (see such depictions on Russian icons of the Last Judgement, for example).

The False Dmitrii was accordingly given a sorcerer's burial: whereas his accomplice, Basmanov, who was killed together with him, was buried near a church, the False Dmitrii was buried in a "God's house" [*ubogii dom*] or *skudel'nitsa* (i.e. where suicides were buried).¹⁰⁴ Subsequently, however, the corpse was exhumed and burnt.¹⁰⁵ The reason for the exhumation was doubtless the idea that the earth would not accept the body of a sorcerer, i.e. the earth's anger was feared.¹⁰⁶ Compare also the statement that when the False Dmitrii's body was exhibited "for shame," before being interred,

the earth itself did abhor it, and the beasts and the birds abhorred such a foul body and would not come to eat of it . . . the earth disdained to carry upon it the accursed and vile corpse, and the air was poisoned and would not send rain from the heavens; where the accursed corpse lay, the earth brought forth no fruit and the sun would not shine because of the foul stench, and the stench covered all the fruits and they dried up; and the Lord took away from the earth both wheat and grapes until the corpse had disappeared.¹⁰⁷

Foreigners' accounts of the vilification of the False Dmitrii's body are also significant:

for further ridicule they threw a hideous and shameless *mask* on the belly of the dead sovereign . . . , and stuffed a reed-pipe into his mouth . . . with which to bribe the door-keeper of Hell.¹⁰⁸

The mask and the pipe were seen as the attributes of the inverted world of the sorcerer and were intended to demonstrate the False Dmitrii's adherence to that world; at the same time we see here an exchange between top and bottom, which is characteristic of mummers who aim to resemble unclean spirits.¹⁰⁹ Compare also the characteristic rumours of devils playing like *skomorokhi* over the False Dmitrii's body:

And as his body lay in the field many people in the middle of the night, even until cockcrow, heard much dancing and playing of bells and pipes, and other devilish games being enacted over his accursed body; for Satan himself was rejoicing at his coming . . . ¹¹⁰

It is characteristic that even the False Dmitrii, recognizing Boris Godunov as a false Tsar, i.e. a pretender (he ordered his body to be transferred from the Arkhangel'skii Cathedral and interred outside the Kremlin, in the Church of St. Ambrose), should see a sorcerer in him and "fearing spells and magic, gave orders to demolish . . . to its foundations" Boris's palace.¹¹¹

Pretenders, then, are perceived as sorcerers, and elements of anti-behavior are attributed to them. And conversely Peter the Great, whose conduct seemed to his contemporaries nothing more nor less than anti-behavior,¹¹² is perceived essentially as a pretender: popular rumour, even during Peter's lifetime, proclaimed him to be not a genuine ("natural") Tsar, but rather a *substitute Tsar* who had no right to the throne. Here, for example, is one of the many testimonies which express just such a view: in 1722

the *staritsa* Platonida said of his Imperial Majesty: *he is a Swede put in the place of the Tsar*, for just fancy—he does what is displeasing to God; christenings and weddings are celebrated 'against the sun';¹¹³ and images are painted of Swedish people,¹¹⁴ and he does not abstain during Lent,¹¹⁵ and he has taken a liking to Swedish dress,¹¹⁶ and he eats and drinks with Swedes and will not leave their kingdom . . .¹¹⁷ and the Grand Prince Peter Alekseevich was born already with teeth of a Swedish woman, he is the Antichrist.¹¹⁸

Rumors to the effect that a substitute had been exchanged for the real Tsar (either while he was abroad or else in infancy) and that another man sat upon the throne in his stead—i.e. a pretender, a Tsar in outward appearance only—were widespread in Peter's reign and were extraordinarily persistent.¹¹⁷ These rumors stimulated the appearance of a whole succession of pretenders who played the role of the legitimate heir of the authentic, real Peter; for the most part they were False Alekseis, giving themselves the name of the Tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich.¹²⁰ It is remarkable that the first False Aleksei appeared even during the lifetime of Aleksei Petrovich (in 1712, i.e. six years before his execution).¹²¹ This seemingly testifies to the fact that viewing Peter as a "substituted" Tsar could be transferred to his son: in as much as Peter is seen as a false Tsar, his son may be seen as the false heir; it was presumed that the real Peter had a real heir who was called Aleksei Petrovich.¹²² The absence of pretenders playing the role of Peter himself is entirely understandable if we bear in mind the widespread opinion that Peter had been *killed* when he was "substituted"; this opinion is one component of the legend of the "substitute" Tsar.¹²³

Thus, along with the myth of the return of the Tsar-Deliverer (which has been analysed in connection with the question of royal imposture by

K. V. Chistov), there existed the fairly persistent myth of the *pretender on the throne*, which was based on a specifically Russian concept of royal power, i.e. on the distinction between true and false Tsars. The coexistence of these myths considerably assisted the spread of royal imposture in early Russia.

Translated by David Budgen

NOTES

- ¹ K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial'no-utopicheskie legendy* (Moscow, 1967) 29.
- ² V. O. Kliuchevskii, *Sochineniia* (Moscow, 1956-1959), vol. III, 27.
- ³ K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial'no-utopicheskie legendy*, 32, 179-180.
- ⁴ Ibid.
- ⁵ On the history of the process of sacralization of monarchic power in Russia, see B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, "Tsar and God," in this volume, 1-112.
- ⁶ Feofan Prokopovich specifically justifies the legitimacy of such a title in his *Discourse on the Tsar's Power and Honour* and subsequently in his *Inquiry upon the Pontifex* and *Discourse on the Coronation Day of Catherine the First*. See Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novograda i Velikikh Luk, Sviateishago Pravitel'stviuushchego Sinoda Vitse prezidenta, a potom pervenstvuiushchego Chlena Slova i rechi pouchitel'nyia, pokhval'nyia i pozdravitel'nyia* (St. Petersburg, 1760-1768), part I, 252; part II, 178-179; Idem, *Rozysk istoricheskii, koikh radi vin, i v iazykovom razume byli i naritsalis' imperatory rimstii, kak iazychestii, tak i khristianstii, pontifeksami ili arkhieiereiami mnogobozhnogo zakona* (St. Petersburg, 1721), 37. For the history of the naming of the Russian monarch as "Christ," see especially B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, "Tsar and God," in this volume, 25.
- ⁷ The religious connotation of the word "tsar" can be traced back also in sporadic instances of its use in the titles of the Russian princes before the title of Tsar was officially assumed. See Wladimir Vodoff, "Remarques sur la valeur du term 'tsar' applique aux princes Russes avant le milieu du XV siecle," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 11 (1978).
- ⁸ Quoted in N. Ustrialov, *Skazaniia sovremennikov o Dmitrii Samozvantse* (St. Petersburg, 1859), part I, 254—translation from the French; Margeret's spelling of titles has been preserved.
- ⁹ Archpriest Avvakum wrote in his exegesis of Psalm XLIV: "Christ . . . by command of the Father on high is anointed by the Holy Ghost and is filled with grace and truth. It is for this reason that he is called Christ, or the Anointed One, or Tsar." See *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, izdavaemaia Arkheograficheskoiu komissieiu* (St. Petersburg, Petrograd, Leningrad, 1872-1927), vol. XXXIX, 459.
- ¹⁰ The opposition between the "corruptible Tsar" and the "incorruptible" one (God) dates from a work by the sixth century Byzantine writer Agapetos, which was widely quoted in early Russian writing. The twenty-first chapter of this work, in which it is said that the Tsar is like men in his corruptible nature, but like God in his power, found its way into the early Russian *The Bee [Pchela]* (V. Semenov, *Drevniaia russkaia Pchela po*

- pergamennomu spisku* (St. Petersburg, 1893), 111-112). We find reflections of this opposition in the chronicle story of the murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii (*Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (St. Petersburg, Petrograd, Leningrad, Moscow, 1841-1989), vol. I, 370; vol. II, 592); in an extract from Iosif Volotskii's *Letter to the Grand Prince* (*Poslaniia Iosifa Volotskogo* (Moscow, Leningrad, 1959), 184); and in the sixteenth discourse of the same author's *Enlightener* [*Prosvetitel*] (Iosif Volotskii, *Prosvetitel* (Kazan, 1855), 602). In the latter the monarch is directly named "corruptible [mortal] tsar" (Ibid., 420). Aleksei Mikhailovich often called himself this, for example in his epistle to the Troitse-Sergievo Monastery of 1661 (*Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi imperii Arkheograficheskoi ekspeditsiei imp. Akademii nauk* (St. Petersburg, 1836), vol. IV, no. 127, 172).
- ¹¹ The practice of calling the Tsar "earthly God" is also Byzantine in origin (cf. the same appellation in the works of the eleventh century Byzantine writer Kekavmenos: *Sovety i rasskazy Kekavmena. Sochinenie vizantiiskogo polkovodtsa XI v.* (Moscow, 1972), 275). Foreigners were the first to report that the Russians considered their Tsar to be the "earthly God," e.g. Pastor Oderborn in his pamphlet on Ivan the Terrible in 1588 (*"Irrdliche Gott": see 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), d 3; in the Latin edition the word used for this quality is *divinitas*: see Paul Oderborn, *Ioannis Basilidis Magni Moscoviae Ducis Vita* (Wittenberg: heirs of Johann Crato, 1585), x 4); cf. Isaac Massa in his description of Siberia of 1612 (M. P. Alekseev, *Sibir' v izvestiiakh zapadnoevropeiskikh puteshestvennikov i pisatelei* (Irkutsk, 1932), 252); Iurii Krilsanich in his *Politika* of 1663-1666 (Iurii Krilsanich, *Politika* (Moscow, 1965), 206). In Russian sources the title of "earthly God" or "earthly divinity" as applied to the monarch is recorded later, from the mid-eighteenth century onwards (see B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, "Tsar and God," in this volume, 30-33).
- ¹² "Righteous sun" is a name often given to Christ in liturgical texts (see, for example, the Christmas troparion, the troparion for the feast of the Purification of the Mother of God, the fourth and fifth verses of the Easter canon, etc.). In the new edition of the liturgical texts established after Patriarch Nikon's reforms, the corresponding expression is "sun of righteousness" (cf. Malachi 4:2).
- ¹³ N. T. Voitovich, *Barkalabauska letapis* (Minsk, 1977), 198.
- ¹⁴ Cf. Simeon Polotskii's address to Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich of 1656: "We greet you, Orthodox Tsar, righteous sun" (I. Tatarskii, *Simeon Polotskii (ego zhizn' i deiatel'nost')*. *Opyt issledovaniia iz istorii prosveshcheniia i vnutrennei tserkovnoi zhizni vo vtoruuiu polovinu XVII veka* (Moscow, 1886), 49).
- ¹⁵ V. Kel'siev, *Sbornik pravitel'stvennykh svedenii o raskol'nikakh* (London, 1860-186), vyp. III, 62-98.
- ¹⁶ Ibid., 75, 81.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., 63, 81, 106-107. "The *skoptsy* believe that their Redeemer [Kondratii Selivanov] was incarnate of the Empress Elizabeth Petrovna, of blessed memory, who, according to their mythology, was like the real Mother of God, a pure virgin at the birth, before the birth and after the birth, since she conceived and bore the Redeemer, according to the Gospel, not from the will of the flesh, but from the Holy Ghost. The most widely held opinion among them is that the Empress Elizabeth was delivered of her burden in Holstein, and then, on her return to Russia, being predestined for a saintly and ascetic life, in fact ruled for only two years (although others maintain she did not

rule at all) and gave up her throne to one of her favorites who bore a perfect likeness to her in both her facial features and her spiritual virtues—while she herself retired to the province of Orel, where she settled in the house of a peasant *skopets* and lived out the remainder of her days under the name of a simple peasant woman, Akulina Ivanovna, in fasting, prayer and good works, and on her death was buried in the garden there, where her relics remain to this day. Other *skoptsy* relate that Elizabeth Petrovna's delivery took place in Russia, and that her son, Peter III, the Redeemer, was despatched the moment he was born to Holstein, where on reaching adolescence, he underwent castration." (Ibid., 63).

¹⁸ Ibid., 108.

¹⁹ See N. N. Pokrovskii, "Sibirskii Il'ia-prorok pered voennym sudom prosveshchennogo absoliutizma," *Izvestiia Sibirskogo otdeleniia AN SSSR. Ser. obshchestvennykh nauk* 6, vyp. 2 (1972).

²⁰ When in the 1790's Kondratii Selivanov was in hiding from the authorities among the Fedoseev Old Believers of the Moscow province, he was treated with great respect, since he led an ascetic life and kept silent. Subsequently, at the investigation, the Old Believer Ivan Gavrilov testified as follows: "We called him, in our local speech, Elijah the Prophet, or Enoch, or John the Divine" (P. I. Mel'nikov, "Materialy dlia istorii khlystovskoi i skopcheskoi eresi," *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* 3 (1872): 47). This could not possibly be simply a rhetorical trope, since such appellations would normally be totally inadmissible among the Old Believers (they consider it sinful, for example, to call people by the sobriquets of their patron saints: to address Nikita, say, as "Nikita Sokrovennyi [the Concealed]," if his nameday is the day of the Holy Nikita Sokrovennyi; see P. I. Mel'nikov (Andrei Pecherskii), *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* (St. Petersburg, 1897-1898), vol. IV, 251). It is characteristic in this context that Kondratii Selivanov should have proclaimed himself not only God and Tsar, but prophet too, stating that: "I am God of Gods, Tsar of Tsars and prophet of prophets" (V. Kel'siev, *Sbornik pravitel'stvennykh svedenii o raskol'nikakh*, vyp. III, 81; appendices, 12).

²¹ S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii* (Moscow, 1962-1966), vol. VII, 429.

²² V. G. Druzhinin, *Raskol na Donu v kontse XVII veka* (St. Petersburg, 1889), 97, 148, 267, 277.

²³ That is, Prince Michael, mentioned in the Old Testament; according to the prophecy of Daniel, he was called upon to destroy the unfaithful (Daniel 12, 1). Concerning the legend of Tsar Mikhail, see A. N. Veselovskii, "Opyty po istorii khristianskoi legendy," *Zhurnal Mimisterstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, April-May (1875); V. Istrin, *Otkrovenie Mefodiia Patarского i apokrificheskie videniia Daniila v vizantiiskoi i slaviano-russkoi literaturakh. Issledovaniia i teksty* (Moscow, 1897), 180 ff.; cf. the evidence of Kuz'ma Kosoi at the investigation in 1687: "He claims to be Grand Duke Mikhail and, on the evidence of the Holy Scripture and the testimony of various holy books, the Lord God Our Saviour Himself" (V. G. Druzhinin, *Raskol na Donu*, 277). In defence of his plenary powers Kuz'ma Kosoi stated that he had a book which was written in God's own hand before the making of the world and the creation of the universe, and showed a transcript from this book (Ibid., 97; cf. Supplement to *Akty istoricheskie, sobrannye i izdannye Arkheograficheskoiu komissiei* (St. Petersburg, 1841-1842), vol. XII, no. 17, 133).

²⁴ K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial'no-utopicheskie legendy*, 90; cf. Supplement to *Akty istoricheskie*, vol. XII, no. 17, 139. In addition, the biblical Prince Michael, mentioned in the Book of the Prophet Daniel, could be associated with the Archangel Michael

- and at the same time with the Tsar Mikhail Fedorovich, the founder of the Romanov dynasty. Thus a founder of the Old Believers, Father Lazař, compared Mikhail Fedorovich with the legendary Tsar (Prince) Michael (N. Subbotin, ed., *Materialy dlia istorii raskola za pervoe vremia ego sushchestvovaniia, izdavaemye bratstvom sv. Petra mitropolita* (Moscow, 1875-1890), vol. V, 225), while a certain Old Believer, Martyn son of Kuž'ma, stated under torture in 1682: "when Tsar Michail Fedorovich reigned, it was not he, but the Archangel Michael" (S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. VII, 428). As N. N. Pokrovskii points out, the legend of the Tsar Mikhail "unleashed on the reigning tsar (and sometimes the entire dynasty after Aleksei Mikhailovich) an enormous accumulation of eschatological views which had grown up over the centuries in popular consciousness" (Ia.N. Pokrovskii, "Predstavleniia krest'ian-staroobriadtsev Urala i Sibiri XVIII veka o svetskikh vlastiakh," in *Ezhegodnik po agrarnoi istorii Vostochnoi Evropy, 1971 g.* (Vilnius, 1974), 167).
- ²⁵ *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 300, 393.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, 351.
- ²⁷ *Ibid.*, 326, 336, 356.
- ²⁸ V. Val'denberg, *Drevnerusskie ucheniia o predelakh tsarskoi vlasti* (Petrograd, 1916), 362, 364, 365, 369, 372.
- ²⁹ *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 1237.
- ³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1247.
- ³¹ V. Val'denberg, *Drevnerusskie ucheniia*, 366.
- ³² *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. VI, 228; vol. VIII, 211.
- ³³ *Akty istoricheskie*, vol. I, no. 40, 79, 82. The "spiritual blindness" of Dmitrii Shemiaka is evidently contrasted here with the physical blindness of Vasilii the Blind (whom Shemiaka blinded in 1446).
- ³⁴ See especially the *Discourse Selected from the Holy Scriptures which is in Latin* [Slovo izbranno ot sviatykh pisanii ezhe na latyne] (1460-1461) in the edition of A. Popov, *Istoriiko-literaturnyi obzor drevnerusskikh polemicheskikh sochinenii protiv latinian (XI-XV v.)* (Moscow, 1875), 384, 394. (Prince Vasilii is called "Tsar" in this work twelve times in all). The title of "Tsar" applied to Vasilii the Blind is used also by Metropolitan Iona in his epistle to Pskov (*Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, no. 90, 673; though in the other copy of this epistle the words "of the Russian Tsar" as applied to Vasilij the Blind do not occur: see *Akty istoricheskie*, vol. I, no. 60, 107), and he is also called this in the chronicle for 1472 (*Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. XXV, 260; A. Popov, *Istoriiko-literaturnyi obzor*, 379). The history of Russian princes' being honored with the title of "Tsar" has been researched by Vodoff (see Wladimir Vodoff, "Remarques sur la valeur du term 'tsar' applique aux princes Russes avant le milieu du XV siecle"); for the term *samoderzhets* [autocrat] see V.Skol'skii, *Uchastie russkogo dukhovenstva i monashestva v razvitii edinoderzhaviia i samoderzhaviia v Moskovskom gosudarstve v kontse XV i pervoi polovine XVI v.* (Kiev, 1902), 68n3; Ostrogorsky, G. "Zum Stratordienst des Herrscher in der byzantinisch-slavischen Welt," *Seminarium Kondakovianum* 7 (1935): 168.
- ³⁵ See Iona's epistle to the Pskovians (*Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, no. 90, 673), supposedly dated 1461, but possibly earlier (on the question of the date see E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi* (Moscow, 1917), vol. II, 498n2).
- ³⁶ See VaI'denberg, *Drevnerusskie ucheniia*, 223-4.
- ³⁷ See Ivan Timofeev's *Chronicle (Vremennik)*, *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 373.

- ³⁸ Maxim the Greek wrote in his epistle (about 1545) to the young Ivan the Terrible that “the earthly Tsar was none other than the living and visible form (that is, the spirit embodied) of the Tsar of Heaven Himself” (Maksim Grek, *Sochineniia* (Kazan, 1859-1862), vol. II, 350; A. F. Ivanova *Slovar` gorovov Podmoskov`ia* (Moscow, 1969), no. 217); and Metropolitan Filipp Kolychev said to Ivan: “If, O Tsar, you are revered as the image of God, you were nevertheless created with the clay of the earth” (V. Skol’skii, *Uchastie russkogo dukhovenstva i monashestva v razvitii edinoderzhavii i samoderzhavii v Moskovskom gosudarstve v kontse XV i pervoi polovine XVI v.*, 198). No less significant is the fact that Patriarch Nikon protested specifically at the Tsar’s being called “God’s likeness” (Zyzykin, M. V. *Patriarkh Nikon: ego gosudarstvennye i kanonicheskie idei* (Warsaw, 1931-1939) vol. II, 14). The Patriarch of Jerusalem, Dosifei (Dositheus), also links the righteousness of the Tsar with his status as the image of God in his document [*gramota*] to Tsar Fedor Alekseevich dated 27 June 1679 (Kapterev, N. F. “Snosheniia Ierusalimskikh patriarkhov s russkim pravitel`stvom,” *Pravoslavnyi Palestinskii sbornik* 43 (1895): 239). This idea, generally, has its roots in Byzantium (see B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, “Tsar and God,” in this volume, 43-44).
- ³⁹ *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 367.
- ⁴⁰ K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial`no-utopicheskie legendy*, 44, 66, 67, 71, 86, 118, 126, 127, 148-9, 185, 210.
- ⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 126; G. V. Esipov, *Liudi starogo veka. Rasskazy iz del Preobrazhenskogo prikaza i Tainoi kantseliarii* (St. Petersburg, 1880), 434.
- ⁴² *Vosstanie Emel`iana Pugacheva. Sbornik dokumentov* (Leningrad, 1935), 123, 125126; K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial`no-utopicheskie legendy*, 148-149.
- ⁴³ *Ibid.*, 185; B. Kubalov, “Sibir` i samozvantsy. Iz istorii narodnykh volnenii v XIX v.,” *Sibirskie ogni* 3 (1924): 167.
- ⁴⁴ K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial`no-utopicheskie legendy*, 210. This motif of the “royal marks” turns up unexpectedly after the French Revolution, when a runaway French convict appeared in Russia exhibiting a royal lily (the mark with which capital offenders were branded in pre-Revolutionary France) and went around assuring Russian landowners that this was how the princes of the blood were distinguished; this fabrication was remarkably successful (Léonce Pingaud, *Les Français en Russie et les Russes en France; l’ancien régime, l’émigration, les invasions* (Paris, 1886), 89; Iu. M. Lotman, Roman A. S. Pushkina “*Evgenii Onegin.*” *Kommentarii* (Leningrad, 1980), 45). Ippolit Zavalishin (the brother of the Decembrist)—an adventurer who clearly believed in his own divine election—demanded upon his arrest that note be taken of special marks on his body: “that he had a birthmark in the form of a crown on his chest, and on his shoulders another in the form of a sceptre” (V. P. Kolesnikov, *Zapiski neschastnogo, sodержashchie puteshestvie v Sibir` po kanatu* (St. Petersburg, 1914), 22; see also Iu. M. Lotman, B. A. Uspenskii, *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, Ann Shukman, editor (Ann Arbor, 1984), 202-204). Clearly belief in the royal marks was not only widespread among the common folk but was shared by very different classes of Russian society.
- ⁴⁵ Ancient Rome provides us with a typologically similar picture: with the violation of the natural order of succession, the usurper or adopted son who gets the throne pretends to refuse power, i.e. does not consider himself Emperor, as it were, and in fact presents himself as a false monarch. He accepts power only when a sign from God (a victory over his rival, for example) or social opinion endorses his authority and his mystical power. It is precisely from the moment of this first manifestation of

- supreme power that the days of his rule are calculated; and by the same token, the day of his predecessor's death does not always coincide with the successor's *dies imperii*; see J. Beranger, *Recherches sur l'aspect ideologique du principal* (Basel, 1953) (this book was kindly brought to my notice by M. L. Gasparov).
- ⁴⁶ On mythological identification in general, see Iu.M. Lotman, B. A. Uspenskii, "K semioticheskoj tipologii russkoj kul'tury XVIII veka," in *Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura XVIII veka (Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii 1973 g.)* (Moscow, 1974), 285, 296, 299, 300, passim.
- ⁴⁷ *Dokumenty stavki E. I. Pugacheva, povstancheskikh vlastei i uchrezhdenii. 1773-1774* (Moscow, 1975), 55, 57, 127-39, 152, passim; no. 50, 54, 156-76, 198, passim. Moreover, Zarubin-Chika was called Ivan Nikiforovich Chernyshev, in contrast with the real Count Zakhar Grigořevich Chernyshev.
- ⁴⁸ See F. V. Livanov, *Raskol`niki i ostrozhniki. Oчерki i rasskazy* (St. Petersburg, 1868-1873), vol. I, 207-208; K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial'no-utopicheskie legendy*, 182.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*; F. V. Livanov, *Raskol`niki i ostrozhniki*, vol. I, 426.
- ⁵⁰ M. Babenchikov, "Portret Pugacheva v Istoricheskom muzee," *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 9-10 (1933).
- ⁵¹ The phenomenon of mythological identification is seen most graphically among the *skoptsy* and the *khlysty* who see in actual people the direct incarnation of the Lord of Sabaoth, of Christ or of the Mother of God, and give these people the corresponding names. In the same way the *Pavlikiane* ["Paulicians"] (who are in many ways similar to the *khlysty* and may well have a common origin) called themselves after the Apostle Paul and his disciples and fellow workers; they saw themselves as their incarnations (see Iu. Iavorskii, "Legenda o proiskhozhdenii pavlikian," in *Stat'i po slavianskoj filologii i russkoj slovesnosti (Sbornik statei v chest' akad. A. I. Sobolevskogo)* (Leningrad, 1928), 506).
- ⁵² *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. IX, 550-551, 529.
- ⁵³ See I. I. Polosin, "Igra v tsaria' (Otgoloski Smuty v moskovskom bytu XVII v.)," *Izvestiia Tverskogo pedagogicheskogo instituta I* (1926): 59-61.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 62.
- ⁵⁵ Compare, for example, the description of the Shrovetide processions in the reminiscences of A. K. Lelong: "At about two o'clock they would harness two or three sledges and on one of them would put a vat or barrel instead of a mattress, and on this would sit Vissarion Rodionovich: (a peasant) dressed up in a cloak made of matting and a hat, similarly adorned with bast feathers. He would ride on ahead, while other sleighs rode behind, full to bursting with our house servants, who would be singing and playing the accordion. This convoy would go round the whole village and be joined by other mummers from the village on their own sleighs; they would go round other villages, singing, and be joined by still more people on sleighs and in disguise. Under the leadership of our Vissarion. an enormous convoy would be formed" (A. K. Lelong, "Vospominaniia," *Russkii arkhiv* 6-7 (1913): 65). Just as characteristic was the custom of dressing up as a priest at the end of Shrovetide and imitating the church ritual of the burial service (see, for example, P. V. Shein, *Velikoruss v svoikh pesniakh, obriadakh, obychaiakh, verovaniiah, skazkakh, legendakh i t.p.* (St. Petersburg, 1898-1900), 333; M. I. Smirnov, "Kul't i krest'ianskoe khoziaistvo v Pereslavl'-Zalesskom uезде. Po etnograficheskim nabludeniiam," in *Trudy Pereslavl'-Zalesskogo istoriko khudozhestvennogo i kraevednogo muzeia* (Pereslavl'-Zalesskii, 1927), vyp. I, 22-23). The same kind of travesty can be observed in the Yuletide rituals as well (see V. E. Gusev,

“Ot obriada k narodnomu teatru (evoliutsiia sviatochnykh igr v pokoinika),” in *Fol’klor i etnografiia. Obriady i obriadovyi fol’klor* (Leningrad, 1974); cf. the petition of the *starets* Grigorii, quoted below, which tells us that at Yuletide “they designate some of their number as saints, invent their own monasteries and name for them an archimandrite, a cellarer and *startsy*”).

It is very significant that in the case of 1666 quoted above, there was a *maiden’s* cap on the head of the peasant “Tsar” Pershka Iakovlev: dressing up in the clothes of the opposite sex—and especially men dressing up as women—is characteristic of mummers at Shrovetide, Yuletide and other times.

⁵⁶ D. K. Zelenin, *Velikorusskie skazki Permskoi gubernii. Sprilozheniem dvenadtsati bashkirskikh skazok i odnoi meshcheriaskoi* (Petrograd, 1914), no. 40, 271.

⁵⁷ In connection with the “game of Tsar” Makarov’s reminiscences of a certain landowner from Chukhloma are interesting: 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. Unfortunately, the memoirist makes no mention as to the season in which the performance took place. In as much as the Tsar is seen as a living image of God (see above), the “game of Tsar” is indirectly linked with the likeness to the Divinity; whereas what we have here is a *direct* imitation of God. It is not impossible that the behavior of this landowner reflects memories of the ritual “ride on a donkey” performed by the Patriarch on Palm Sunday (a ritual which had lapsed since 1696), or of the triumphal reception of Peter in Moscow after the victory of Poltava (December 21, 1709), when he was met by children dressed in servants’ robes, waving palm branches and singing “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord”; in one instance Christ was represented by the Patriarch and in the other by the Tsar.

⁵⁸ A. I. Malein, trans. ed., *Novoe izvestie o Rossii vremeni Ivana Groznogo. “Skazanie” Al’berta Shlikhtinga* (Leningrad, 1934), 22. A similar account of I. P. Fedorov’s execution is given by Oderborn (P. Oderbornius, *Wunderbare, Erschreckliche, Unerhörte Geschichte, und warhaffte Historien*, f.v. M3, fo. R2-f.v. R2; Veronensis Alexander Gwagnmus, *Sarmatiae Europaeae decriptio, quae Regnum Poloniae, Lituaniam, Samogitiam, Russiam, Masoviam, Prussiam, Pomeraniam, Livoniam et Moschoviae, Tartariaeque partem complectitur...* ([Cracovia], 1578), f.v. 28f.v. 30). See also N. M. Karamzin *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo* (St. Petersburg, 1892), vol. IX, 113; for typological analogies see O. M. Freidenberg, “Proiskhozhdenie parodii,” *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* VI (1973): 492.

⁵⁹ In addition this disguise very often bears the character of a symbolic *unmasking*. Thus, for example, when in 1570 Ivan the Terrible flew into a rage with the Archbishop of Novgorod, Pimen the Black, he ordered him to be arrayed as a *skomorokh*. Cf. Shlikhting’s account: “. . . he ordered that his tiara be snatched from his head; he also divested him of his episcopal vestments as well as stripping him of his rank as a bishop, saying: ‘It is not fitting that you be a bishop, but rather a *skomorokh*. Therefore

I will give you a wife in marriage.' The tyrant ordered that a mare be brought forth, and turning to the bishop said: 'Receive from me this wife, mount her now, saddle her, set out for Muscovy and enter your name on the register of the *skomorokhi*.' Then, when the bishop had climbed on the mare Ivan ordered that his feet be tied to the animal's back; and having sent him out of town in this fashion, he commanded him to follow the Moscow road. When he had already gone some way, Ivan sent for him to appear before him again and gave him a musical instrument to hold, bagpipes and a stringed lyre. 'Practice in this art,' said the tyrant, 'for there is nothing more for you to do, especially now that you have taken a wife.' And so this bishop, who had no idea before this of how to play the lyre, rode off on the command of the tyrant in the direction of Moscow on the back of the mare, strumming on the lyre and blowing the pipes" (A. I. Malein, trans. ed., *Novoe izvestie o Rossii*, 29-30; cf. N. M. Karamzin *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, vol. IX, 172). According to other sources the Tsar threatened the Archbishop that he would make him lead a bear about, as the *skomorokhi* do (Veronensis Alexander Gwagnmus, *Sarmatiae Europae decriptio*, fol. 34-35; Adam Olearii, *Opisanie puteshestvii v Moskoviiu i cherez Moskoviiu v Persiiu i obratno* (St. Petersburg, 1906), 127-129). The priest-figure and the *skomorokh* are perceived as antipodes, and by dressing the archbishop up as a *skomorokh*, Ivan is, as it were, attaching him to the inverted world of anti-behavior: if the mummers during the Yuletide and Shrovetide rituals can dress up as priests (see above), then here we have a case of the opposite—of a priest becoming a mummer.

- ⁶⁰ For a discussion of the similarities and differences between Ivan's behavior and that of the Holy fool (*iurodivyi*), see Iu. M. Lotman, B. A. Uspenskii, *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, Part I, Chap. 2.
- ⁶¹ S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. III, 565; Ia.V. Lileev, *Simeon Bekbulatovich khan Kasimovskii, velikii kniaz' vseia Rusi, vposledstvii velikii kniaz' Tverskoi. 1567-1616 g. (Istoricheskii ocherk)* (Tver, 1891), 25-26; A. Nikolaev, "Simeon Bekbulatovich" in *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'* (St. Petersburg, 1904), 466-467. Cf. the petition handed to Simeon Bekbulatovich by Ivan the Terrible and his sons on October 30, 1575, which observes all the rules of epistolary etiquette laid down for addressing the monarch: "Unworthy Ivan Vasil'ev and his children, little Ivan and little Fedor, do petition thee, great Lord and Prince Semion [sic] Bekbulatovich of all Russia, that thou, O Lord, shouldst show them mercy . . ." The petition concludes in the manner proper in such cases with the words: "How, O Lord, dost thou decree? We petition thee, O Lord, for everything. O Lord, have mercy, take pity!" (*Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1951), 195-196).
- ⁶² Ia.V. Lileev, *Simeon Bekbulatovich*, 26, 36; cf. however A. Nikolaev, "Simeon Bekbulatovich," 467-468.
- ⁶³ The fact that Simeon Bekbulatovich was legitimately installed as Tsar is confirmed by the latest text of the oath of allegiance to Boris Godunov (in 1598) and to his son Fedor Borisovich (in 1605): those swearing allegiance undertook not to wish "the Tsar Simeon Bekbulatovich" to be ruler of Moscow (S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. IV, 353,421). It is also significant that the False Dmitrii ordered Simeon Bekbulatovich to take the tonsure, seeing in him a claimant to the throne (A. Nikolaev, "Simeon Bekbulatovich," 470).
- ⁶⁴ Cf. the evidence of the Chronicles: "And so Tsar Ivan Vasil'evich became an ally of those who do multiply the sins of Orthodox Christianity and was filled with anger and violence: he began maliciously and mercilessly to persecute the serfs in his power and to shed their blood; and the kingdom which was entrusted to him by God he divided

into two parts: one part he made over to himself, and the other he entrusted to Tsar Simeon of Kazan'. Then he went away from several small towns and went to one called Staritso, where he took up residence. He called his half the *oprichniki* and Tsar Simeon's part the *zemshchina*; and he ordered his half to assault, slaughter and plunder the other half . . ." (S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. III, 733n85; cf. K. Popov, "Chin sviashchennogo koronovaniia (istoricheskii ocherk obrazovaniia china)." *Bogoslovskii vestnik* II (1896): 284; Ia.V. Lileev, *Simeon Bekbulatovich*, 22-23). See also the commentary by Ia. S. Lur'e in *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo*, 634n2. Simeon Bekbulatovich ruled from October 1575 to July 1576.

⁶⁵ The term *oprichnina* was not invented by Ivan the Terrible: it is met earlier in business documents, signifying a separate territory (see Ia.I. Sreznevskii, *Materialy dlia slovaria drevnerusskogo iazyka po pis'mennym pamiatnikam* (St. Petersburg, 1893-1912), vol. II, 694; A. Diuvernua, *Materialy dlia slovaria drevnerusskogo iazyka* (Moscow, 1894), 122; S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. II, 484). However, in Ivan's time—and possibly even earlier—the word had a second meaning associated with the "outer [darkness]" [*khromeshnyi*], i.e. the inverted, demonic principle; this will be discussed in more detail below.

⁶⁶ See S. B. Veselovskii, *Issledovaniia po istorii klassa sluzhilykh zemlevladel'tsev* (Moscow, 1969), 93-94.

⁶⁷ The naming of the Tatar Khan as "Tsar" was reflected in the title of the Russian monarch. Thus, Ivan the Terrible and the Russian monarchs following him were called "Tsar of Kazan'" and "Tsar of Astrakhan'" (after the capture of Kazan' in 1552 and of Astrakhan' in 1557): the Khanate (or kingdom) of Kazan' split away from the Golden Horde in 1445 and that of Astrakhan' came into being after the collapse of the Golden Horde in 1480, i.e. both Khanates were in one way or another connected with the Golden Horde.

⁶⁸ Ia.V. Lileev, *Simeon Bekbulatovich*, 3; A. Nikolaev, "Simeon Bekbulatovich," 466.

⁶⁹ In his capacity of Khan of Kasimov, Simeon Bekbulatovich was related by direct line of succession to the Khans of the Golden Horde and was called Tsar even before he was installed on the Russian throne (see V. V. Vel'iaminov-Zernov, *Issledovanie o kasimovskikh tsariakh i tsarevichakh* (St. Petersburg, 1863-1866), vol. II, 1, 13-14, 15-16, 20-21, 25). Ivan the Terrible made him Tsar or Khan of Kasimov in 1567; prior to this he was called, like his father, Tsarevich: evidently in his capacity as descendant of the Khans (or Tsars) of the Golden Horde. The rulers of the kingdom of Kasimov in general held the title of Tsarevich, except for those who were already Khans before their installation as ruler of Kasimov; these retained the title of Tsar (Khan). Simeon Bekbulatovich (even before he was converted to Orthodoxy and while he still bore the name Sain-bulat) was the first ruler of Kasimov personally to receive the title of Tsar (Khan). See *Ibid.*, 25-26.

The kingdom of Kasimov was created by Vasilii the Blind in 1452 as a reaction to the recently formed kingdom (or Khanate) of Kazan', and the rulers of Kasimov were appointed by the ruler of Moscow: power was not hereditary and was conferred on the person who was considered most useful to Moscow. Kasimov (the former town of Gorodets) was so named in the same year, 1452, after the prince of the Golden Horde, Kasim, the son of the Khan Udu-Mukhammed, who went over to Vasilii the Blind in 1446, for protection against his brother Mukhmutek, the Khan of Kazan' (immediately after the latter had formed the kingdom of Kazan' in the autumn of 1445:

see V. V. Vel`iaminov-Zernov, *Issledovanie o kasimovskikh tsariakh*, vol. I, 3-4). In 1449 Kasim defeated the troops of the Khan of the Golden Horde, Seid-Akhmat, and in 1467 led an unsuccessful campaign against Kazan`. Thus the kingdom of Kasimov may be seen as a kind of Muscovite model of the Golden Horde.

⁷⁰ The assumption by the Russian Grand Prince of the title of Tsar is connected with the fall of the Byzantine Empire, an event which led to the idea of Moscow as the new Constantinople, or the Third Rome (see Iu. M. Lotman, B. A. Uspenskii, *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, Part I, Chap. 1).

Moreover, in its time, the title of Tsar united the Emperor (*basileus*) of Byzantium, to whom Russia was culturally subject (the Russian church lay under the jurisdiction of Constantinople), and the Khan of the Golden Horde, to whom the Russian lands were politically subject; both of these rulers were called "Tsar" in early Russia. During Tatar rule the Russian church prayed for the Tatar "Tsar," i.e. he was named in the liturgy (see G. M. Prokhorov, *Povest` o Mitiaie. Rus` i Vizantiia v epokhu Kulikovskoi bitvy* (Leningrad, 1978), 53, 84); we may assume that before the Tatar-Mongol conquest the prayer for the Tatar "Tsar" had been preceded by prayer for the Greek "Tsar," i.e. the Emperor of Byzantium. After the collapse of the Byzantine Empire and of the Golden Horde (with the subsequent conquest of the Tatar lands), the Grand Prince of Moscow emerges as the successor not only of the Tsar (Emperor) of Byzantium, but also of the Tsar (Khan) of the Golden Horde. On the one hand, with the fall of Byzantium the Grand Prince was the only Orthodox ruler left (with the exception of the ruler of Georgia, which was distant and peripheral), i.e. the only independent ruler of the Orthodox *oikoumene* [inhabited, i.e. civilized, world]; it was generally assumed that there was only one Tsar in the Orthodox world (see *Ruskaia istoricheckaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, supplement, no. 40, 274 ff.; cf. M. A. D'iakonov, *Vlast` moskovskikh gosudarei. Ocherki iz istorii politicheskikh idei drevnei Rusi do kontsa XVI v.* (St. Petersburg, 1889), 25-26; V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevsi. K voprosu o vliianii Vizantii na obrazovanie idei tsarskoi vlasti moskovskikh gosudarei* (Kharkov, 1901), 200 ff.), and this position, formerly occupied by the Emperor of Byzantium, was now occupied by the Prince of Russia. On the other hand, the territory which had formerly belonged to the Golden Horde now belonged to the Grand Prince. Thus the Russian Tsar now united in his own person both the Tsar (Khan) of the Golden Horde and the Tsar (Emperor) of Byzantium: if in a territorial sense he was successor to the Tatar Khan, then in a semiotic sense he was successor to the Greek Emperor.

⁷¹ M. I. Semevskii, *Slovo i delo. 1700-1725* (St. Petersburg, 1885), 283; A. Petrov "Romodanovskii, kniaz` Fedor Iuëvich," in *Russkii biograficheskii slovar`* (Petrograd, 1918), vol. "Romanova-Riasovskii," 132. Peter's first letter to Romodanovskii addressing him as "king" is dated May 19, 1695. It begins with the words "*Min Her Kenich* [My Lord King]. The letter written by Your Illustrious Majesty, my most merciful sovereign, in the capital town of Preshpurkh [Presburg] on the 14th day of May, was handed to me on the 18th day, for which sovereign mercy of yours we are bounden to shed our blood, even to the last drop . . ." The letter is signed "The eternal slave of your most Illustrious Majesty bombardier *Piter*" (*Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo* (St. Petersburg-Moscow, 1887-1977), vol. I, no. 37, 29-30). Later on, similar letters frequently occur.

In his *History of Tsar Peter Alekseevich and of Those Persons Close to Him*, Kurakin recounts that already in 1689, at the time of the military exercises, Peter had proclaimed F.Iu. Romodanovskii to be Tsar of Presburg, with his residence in

Preobrazhenskoe, in the small town Presburg (Plezpurkh) on the river Iauza, and I. I. Buturlin to be Tsar of Semenovskoe with his residence in Sokolyni court on Semenovskoe meadow (*Arkhiv kniazia F. A. Kurakina* (St. Petersburg-Saratov-Moscow-Astrakhan, 1890-1902), kn. I, 65). Subsequently, in the mock battles of Kozhukhovo in 1694 Buturlin was referred to as “the Polish King” (*Zapiski Zheliabuzshkogo s 1682 po 2 Iulia 1709* (St. Petersburg, 1840), 32-33; M. M. Bogoslovskii, *Petr I. Materialy dlia biografii* (Moscow, 1940-1946), vol. I, 195); he suffered a defeat by Romodanovskii, who by this act emerged, as it were, as the Russian potentate (they were both, however, referred to as “generalissimus” as well). It is highly significant that in these mock battles (at Semenovskoe in 1691 and Kozhukhovo in 1694) Peter took part on Romodanovskii’s side, acting as his subordinate, and so consequently Romodanovskii’s victory over Buturlin was in fact predetermined (see *Ibid.*, 125-128, 196-206). In addition, in these contexts Buturlin had under his command a concentration of the old Muscovite troops (*streletsy*), whereas Romodanovskii had new-style soldiers (*soldaty*); the former played a passive, and the latter an active, role, i.e. Buturlin’s forces were doomed to defeat beforehand (see *Ibid.*, 195, 197, 199, 206). According to Zheliabuzhskii, it was precisely after his victory in the Kozhukhovo mock battle of October 1694 that Romodanovskii received his “new appellation” and began to be called “*gosudarich*” [“son of the sovereign” or “little lord”: *gosudar* could mean either “sovereign” or “lord”] (*Zapiski Zheliabuzshkogo*, 39). In his speech to the troops after this victory, Romodanovskii is mentioned as “Our Most Elevated Generalissimus, Prince Fedor Iurevich of Presburg and Paris and conqueror of All the Iauza” (M. M. Bogoslovskii, *Petr I*, vol. I, 201). Wittram supposes that Romodanovskii had the title of “*gosudar*” in May 1692 (R Wittram, *Peter I, Czar und Kaiser. Zur Geschichte Peters des Grossen in seiner Zeit* (Göttingen, 1964), vol. I, 110), basing his supposition on the letter from the shipwrights of Pereaslavl’ which states that Peter was building a ship on the orders of “his Lord [*gosudar*], Generalissimus Prince Fedor Iurevich” (see M. M. Bogoslovskii, *Petr I*, vol. I, 143); this context is not, however, very significant, in as much as the word “*gosudar*” could in this case refer to the title of “generalissimus.”

⁷² M. M. Shcherbatov writes of Romodanovskii: “Some time before his departure for foreign parts, he (Peter) gave the title of ‘Prince-Caesar’ to this man [Romodanovskii], while he himself pretended to be his subject, and in so doing set an example of obedience. Having accepted from him various ranks and, supposedly, instructions, he left him ruler of Russia when he himself went to foreign parts in 1697; and when he returned he continued both the title and his ostensible respect to him: he would call him ‘Lord’ [*gosudar*] both verbally and in writing, and he used his [Romodanovskii’s] sternness and severity to repress the arrogance of the bojars and to track down and punish crimes even unto his death” (M. M. Shcherbatov, *Tetrati zapisnyia vsiakim pis'mam i delam, komu chto prikazano i v kotorom chisle ot E. I.V. Petra Velikago 1704, 1705 i 1706 godov s prilozheniem primechanii o sluzhbakh tekh liudei, k kotorym sei gosudar' pisyval* (St. Petersburg, 1774), 15). Golikov tells us that, on going abroad in 1697, Peter “founded a new government”: “The Great Lord entrusted the government of the state to his most faithful bojars, Prince Romodanovskoi and Tikhon Nikitich Streshnev, and gave them as assistants the most loyal of his boyars, namely Lev Kirilovich Naryshkin and the Princes Golitsyn and Prozorovskii. And so that the Chief Ruler, Prince Romodanovskii, should be the more respected, he gave him the title of Prince-Caesar and Majesty, and himself pretended to be subject to him” (I. I. Golikov, *Deianiia Petra Velikago* (Moscow, 1788), part I, 290).

After the victory of Poltava Peter considered it his duty to congratulate Romodanovskii, in as much as it meant that thenceforth Petersburg would become the residence of “His Majesty”: “We congratulate Your Majesty on this victory which is unprecedented in the entire world. And now beyond any doubt the desire of Your Majesty to take up residence in Petersburg has been attained through this final downfall of the enemy” (*Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo*, vol. IX, no. 3281, 246).

⁷³ A. Petrov “Romodanovskii, kniaz' Fedor Iuřevich,” 135; P. V. Verkhovskoi, *Uchrezhdenie Dukhovnoi Kollegii i Dukhovnyi Reglament* (Rostov-na-Donu, 1916), vol. I, 92.

⁷⁴ A. Petrov “Romodanovskii, kniaz' Fedor Iuřevich,” 138.

⁷⁵ *Zapiski Iusta Iulia, datskogo poslannika pri Petre Velikom* (Moscow, 1900), 297.

⁷⁶ I. I. Golikov, *Deianiia Petra Velikogo*, part I, 76; M. I. Semevskii, *Slovo i delo*, 286-287.

⁷⁷ It is essential to bear in mind that Peter could have been called Emperor long before he officially assumed the imperial title in 1721. Feofan Prokopovich specifically remarks on this in his encomium on Peter, dated 1725, when he recalls how “with our entreaties we persuaded him to assume the title of ‘Great’ and ‘Emperor’”; Feofan adds: “which is what he was already, and was called by everyone” (Feofan Prokopovich, *Arkhiepiskopa Velikogo Novagrada i Velikikh Luk*, part II, 163). Indeed, Peter is addressed as “Emperor” and “Father of the Fatherland” as early as 1708 in a speech delivered to him on behalf of all the clergy (K. V. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'* (Kazan', 1914), 462n 4, with a reference to the Archive of the Typographical Library, no. 100, fol. 20). From that time on this title is frequently used to refer to Peter. Some examples follow. In 1709, on the occasion of the victory of Poltava, a publication appeared under the title of *The Wonderful Public Apotheosis of the most Praiseworthy Valour of the Hercules of All the Russias . . . of our Great Sovereign, Tsar and Grand Prince Peter Alekseevich, Emperor and Autocrat of All the Russias, Great, Small and White* (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom* (St. Petersburg, 1862), vol. II, no. 160; T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniia grazhdanskoi pečati 1708—ianvar' 1725 g.* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1955), no. 26). In 1713 in the title of the *Book of Mars [Kniga Marsovaia]* it is stated that it was printed “by order of the Emperor, Peter the First, Autocrat of All the Russias,” and on the frontispiece of this volume there appears a portrait of Peter done by Aleksei Zubov in 1712 with this inscription: “Peter the First, Most August [*prisnopribavitel'*] Emperor, Tsar and Autocrat of All the Russias” (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. II, no. 233, 291; T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniia grazhdanskoi pečati*, no. 68; *Portret Petrovskogo vremeni. Katalog vystavki* (Gos. Treťiakovskaia galereia; Gos. Russkii muzei) (Leningrad, 1973), 206. The word *prisnopribavitel'* [literally: “Eternally increasing”) means “most august,” cf. *augustus* from Latin *augeo*, “I increase, add”). Peter is referred to as “Emperor” (but not as “Tsar”) in Serban Kantemir's *Panegyric Burnt Offering [Panegiricheskoe vsesozhzhenie]* of 1714 (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. II, no. 249; T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniia grazhdanskoi pečati*, no. 85); it is noteworthy that in the manuscript of this work, preserved in the Library of the Academy of Sciences, the word “Autocrat” (*samoderzhets*) is used instead of “Emperor” (T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, R. I. Kozintseva, *Opisanie izdaniia, napechatannykh pri Petre I. Svodnyi katalog. Dopolneniia i prilozheniia* (Leningrad, 1972), no. 20): apparently the word “Emperor” was inserted during the process of publication. The title of the book *The Laurea or Crown of Immortal Glory [Liavrea ili Venets bezsmertnyia slavy]* (1714) uses the words “His Imperial Majesty” (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura*

v Rossii pri Petre Velikom, vol. II, no. 266; T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniĭ grazhdanskoi pečhati*, no. 112); in just the same way Peter is called “Emperor” in both editions of the *Book of Command or of Maritime Rights in the Navy* [*Kniga ordena ili vo flote morskikh prav*], which came out in the same year, 1714 (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. II, no. 247, 249; T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniĭ grazhdanskoi pečhati*, no. 75, 79). See also *Ibid.*, no. 243, 310, 320 (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. II, no. 394), 366, 606 (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. II, no. 478); T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniĭ, napechatannykh kirillitseĭ 1689—ianvar’ 1725 g.* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1958), no. 126, 128, 130, 131, 136, 138 (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. II, no. 453), 149 (P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. II, no. 478); *Ibid.*, no. 380, 450, 483. 1718 saw the publication of the *True Document of His Caesarine Roman Majesty . . . on whom the aforementioned Caesar in this his Document conferred the title of Caesar [Tsezar’] of all the Russias*; this document was referred to on the occasion of Peter’s being presented with the imperial title (*Ibid.*, no. 388; T. A. Bykova, M. M. Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniĭ grazhdanskoi pečhati*, no. 298). We should also mention the portrait of Peter in the collection of the State Russian Museum, presumably dated 1697, which bears the inscription: *Petrus Alexandrowitz Moscovitarum Imperator cum magna legatione huc regio montem venit media May. Anno M: DCXCVII*; i.e. “Peter Aleksandrovich, Emperor of Muscovy, came here to the region of mountains together with the Great Embassy in the middle of May 1697” (*Portret Petrovskogo vremeni*, 119). Even earlier, in 1696, on the occasion of the victory of Azov, a medal was struck with a portrait of Peter and bearing the inscription: *Petrus Alexi; fil. Russor. Mag. Caes.* (G. Baier, *Kratkoe opisanie vsekh sluchaev, kasaiushchikhsia do Azova* (St. Petersburg, 1738), 267), where the word *Caes[ar]* signifies “Emperor”. In 1709 the Viennese court expressed its disapproval of the Tsar’s assumption of the title of “Emperor”; in 1710 the Austrian ambassador to Russia, General Velchek (Weltschek) notified Vienna to acknowledge the title of “*Majestät Kayser*”, i.e. the imperial title (A. V. Florovskii, “Stranitsa istorii russko-avstriiskikh diplomaticheskikh otnoshenii XVIII v.,” in *Feodal’naia Rossiia vo vsemirno-istoricheskom protsesse. Sbornik statei, posviashchennyi L. V. Cherepninu* (Moscow, 1972), 390).

⁷⁸ *Dnevnik kamer-iunkera F. V. Berkhgol’tsa, 1721-1725* (Moscow, 1902-1903), part I, 115-117; A. Petrov “Romodanovskii, kniaz’ Fedor Iur’evich,” 121. The wedding of the Prince-Pope took place on September 10, 1721, and Peter became Emperor on October 20 of the same year.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 138, 123-124.

⁸⁰ It should be emphasized that “*kesar*” stands in the same relation to “tsar” as “pope” [*papa*] to “patriarch”. Indeed, if *pope* signifies the supreme pontiff of Rome, then *kesar* in Church Slavonic signifies the Roman Emperor. Thus *Prince-kesar*, like Prince-Pope, would on the face of it appear to be Rome-orientated; however, just as the Prince-Pope in fact represents the Russian patriarch, so the *Prince-kesar* represents the Russian Tsar.

⁸¹ *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo*, 213.

⁸² It is indicative that in 1682, at the time of the Revolt of the *strel’tsy* and the disputes with the Old Believers, the Tsarevna Sophia Alekseevna broke off the discussions and threatened to leave Moscow with the two young Tsars (Ivan and Peter) [i.e., Ivan V and his half-brother Peter I (the Great); Sophia, their elder sister, was Regent until 1689]

(S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. VII, 288); this threat had the desired effect. Cf. in this connection Peter's own departure in 1689 for the Troitse-Sergievo Monastery.

When, however, Patriarch Nikon did the same thing (in 1658 Nikon, having quarrelled with Aleksei Mikhailovich, ostentatiously left the patriarchal throne and retreated to the Monastery of the Resurrection), he ceased to be considered Patriarch. The difference in attitude to secular and ecclesiastical power is thrown into particular relief here: in a certain sense the Tsar emerges as a more sacred figure than the Patriarch, in as much as he is Tsar by nature and not by virtue of his having been installed upon the throne.

⁸³ Similarly. Ivan the Terrible mockingly called Nikita Kazarinov Golokhvastov an "angel" (see the testimony of Kurbskii in his *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow, Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXI, 308; cf. N. M. Karamzin *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, vol. IX, 186). In an exactly comparable way Peter the Great later named one of the participants in his fools' performances (Vasilii Sokovnin) "a prophet," and this directly corresponds to the blasphemous tendency of Peter's merrymaking (cf. Kurakin's testimony in his *History of Tsar Peter Alekseevich and of Those Persons Close to Him in Arkhiv kniazia F. A. Kurakina*, vol. I, 73). In conditions where the non-conventionality of the sign is prevalent this kind of linguistic behavior is highly significant.

⁸⁴ Cf., for example, the eloquent description of Yuletide mummers in the Petition of 1636 from the priests of Nizhnii Novgorod, apparently drawn up by Ioann Neronov: "On their faces they place shaggy and beast-like masks and the like in clothing too, and on their behinds they fix tails, like demons made visible, and they wear shameful members on their faces, and goat-like bleat all manner of devilish things and display their shameful members, and others beat tabors and clap and dance and perform other improper deeds" (N. V. Rozhdestvenskii, "K istorii bořby s tserkovnymi besporiadkami, otgoloskami iazychestva i porokami v russkom bytu XVII v. (Chelobitnaia nizhegorodskikh sviashchennikov 1636 goda v sviazi s pervonachal'noi deiatel'nost'iu Ivana Neronova)," *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh* 2 (1902): 24-26); the features described here correspond exactly to the iconographic image of the demon, which is also characterized by the tail, the shagginess and the interchange between top and bottom (the face and the sexual organs). In just the same way the behavior of the mummers in the picture represented here corresponds to the idea of devilish behavior. The description of Yuletide games which appears in the Life of Ioann Neronov is no less characteristic: "In those days the ignorant used to assemble for games of devilry . . . putting on their faces various frightening masks in the guise of demons' faces" (N. Subbotin, ed., *Materialy dlia istorii raskola za pervoe vremia ego sushchestvovaniia, izdavaemye bratstvom sv. Petra mitropolita* (Moscow, 1875-1890), vol. I, 247). Numerous ethnographic descriptions testify that the mummers themselves called their masks "the mask of the Devil," "the devil's mug," "the devil's grimace" and so on, and by the same token considered that donning them constituted a terrible sin which would require future atonement. Very often, therefore, any kind of Yuletide mask at all, whatever it represented, was seen as a devil's mask (see. for example, P. S. Efimenko, "Materialy po etnografii russkogo naseleniia Arkhangel'skoi gubernii. Chasti I-II," *Izvestiia imp. Obshchestva liubitelei estestvoznaniia, antropologii i etnografii pri Moskovskom universitete* XXX (1877-1878): 138; S. Maksimov, *Sobranie sochinenii* (St. Petersburg, 1908-1913), vol. XVII, 39-40). In early Russia a particular form of penance was laid on those who donned a mask.

It is no accident, therefore, that the *oprichniki* of Ivan the Terrible, whose form of behavior was to a significant degree based on the principles of anti-behavior (see below), should have danced in masks: it is well-known that Prince Mikhailo Repnin preferred death to the donning of the sinful “*mashkara*” (*Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXI, 279; S. M. Solov’ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. III, 541). Kurbskii testifies that the Tsar ordered that Repnin be killed in church, near the altar, during the reading of the Gospel; this is, of course, highly significant: the wearing of a mask was shown in this case to be the antipode to the church ritual.

⁸⁵ See A. I. Malein, trans. ed., *Novoe izvestie o Rossii*, 27; I. I. Polosin, *Sotsial’no-politicheskaia istoriia Rossii XVI—nachala XVII v. Sbornik statei* (Moscow, 1963), 154; N. M. Karamzin *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, vol. IX, pp. 98-99; R. G. Skrynnikov, *Ivan Groznyi* (Moscow, 1975), 123. Metropolitan Filipp (Kolychev) viewed the wearing of monastic cowls by the *oprichniki* as sacrilege. See N. M. Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, vol. IX, 98, 118-119.

⁸⁶ See M. I. Semevskii, *Slovo i delo*, 282-336; R. Wittram, *Peter I, Czar und Kaiser*, vol. I, 106-110.

⁸⁷ Kurbskii, for example, often calls the *oprichniki* “*kromeshniki*” (see especially *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXI, 155, 273, 306, 307, 323) and puts into the mouth of Metropolitan Filipp Kolychev the following words addressed to the Tsar: “If thou wilt promise to repent of thy sins and dismiss from thy presence that Satanic regiment which thou hast assembled to the great detriment of Christianity, that is to say, those *kromeshniki*, though they are called *aprishnitsy* [*oprichniki*], I will bless thee and forgive thee, and will return . . . to my throne” (Ibid., 316). On this subject S. B. Veselovskii wrote: “The words *oprich*’ and *krome* are synonymous. In those days the idea of the after-life, of ‘the kingdom of God,’ was a realm of eternal light beyond the confines of which (outside [*oprich*] which, without [*krome*] which) was the kingdom of eternal gloom, ‘the kingdom of Satan’ . . . The expressions *kromeshnyi* and *kromeshnik*, formed by analogy with the words *oprich*’, *oprichnyi* and *oprichnik*, were not merely a play on words, but at the same time branded the *oprichniki* as the progeny of hell, as servants of Satan. Kurbskii, too, on many occasions in his writings, calls the adherents and servants of Tsar Ivan, and in particular his *oprichniki*, ‘the Satanic regiment,’ from which it followed, or was implied, that Tsar Ivan was like Satan” (S. B. Veselovskii, *Issledovaniia po istorii oprichniny* (Moscow, 1963), 14; cf. also N. M. Karamzin *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, vol. IX, 95). In exactly the same way Ivan Timofeev also recounts in his *Chronicle* (*Vremennik*) that the Tsar laid “dark,” i.e. infernal, signs on his *oprichniki*: “He separated his favorites, who were as wolves, from those he hated, who were as sheep, and laid on the chosen warriors dark signs: he clothed them all in black from head to foot, and ordered that they also have their own horses, identical in color to their clothing; he made all his men in every way like demonic servants” (*Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 272). That it is possible to put such an interpretation on the word *oprichnik* seems to be inherent in the word itself: *oprichnik* seems to be etymologically connected with the Ukrainian *oprishok* (“robber”), and this corresponds to the connection between robbers and the world of outer darkness [*kromeshnyi*] and of sorcery (cf. the widespread association of robbers with sorcerers). In this context the name introduced by Ivan is highly significant: it is surely this that also explains the prohibition in 1575 of the name *oprichnina* (see S. M. Solov’ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. III, 565; I. I. Polosin, *Sotsial’no-politicheskaia istoriia Rossii*, 183; G. Shtaden, *O Moskve Ivana*

Groznogo. *Zapiski nemtsa oprichnika* (Moscow, 1925), 110; R. G. Skrynnikov, *Ivan Groznyi*, 190).

⁸⁸ N. F. Kapterev, *Patriarkh Nikon i ego protivniki v dele spravleniia tserkovnykh obriadov* (Sergiev Posad, 1913), 181. The custom of dressing up as a monk at Yuletide was partially kept up even into the twentieth century (see G. K. Zavoiko, "Verovaniia i obychai velikorossov Vladimirskoi gubernii," *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie* 3-4 (1914): 138; V. I. Chicherov, *Zimnii period russkogo zemledel'cheskogo kalendaria XVI-XIX vekov* (*Ocherki po istorii narodnykh verovanii*) (Moscow, 1957), 210, and also the description of the "monk game" in, for example, M. I. Smirnov, *Etnograficheskie materialy po Pereslavl'-Zalesskomu uezdu Vladimirskoi gubernii. Svadebnye obriady i pesni, pesni krugovye i prokhodnye, igry. Legendy i skazki* (Moscow, 1922), 58). The information given by the chronicler of Piskarev (in the beginning of the seventeenth century) about the entertainments indulged in by the young Ivan the Terrible in 1545-1546 is very interesting in this connection: "And he also amused himself in this way: he would do the spring ploughing and sow buckwheat with his boyars, and his other amusements were walking on stilts and *dressing up in a shroud*" (see *Materialy po istorii SSSR*, II (Moscow, 1955-9, 73-4). This should be compared with those ethnographical accounts which testify that Yuletide mummers sometimes dressed up in "the clothes of the deceased" and pretended to be corpses (see, e.g. F. Zobnin, S. Patkanov, "Spisok Tobol'skikh slov i vyrazhenii," *Zhivaia starina* 4 (1899): 517); cf. also the Yuletide game of "dead-man", in which one of the participants also imitated a dead person (see V. E. Gusev, "Ob obriada k narodnomu teatru (evoliutsiia sviatochnykh igr v pokoinika)," in *Fol'klor i etnografiia. Obriady i obriadovyi fol'klor* (Leningrad, 1974), 50 ff.; S. Maksimov, *Sobranie sochinenii* (St. Petersburg, 1908-1913), vol. XVII, 14ff.; K. Zavoiko, "V kostromskikh lesakh po Vetluge reke (Etnograficheskie materialy, zapisannye v Kostromskoi gubernii v 1914-1916 gg.," in *Etnograficheskii sbornik* (Kostroma, 1917), 24). Both corpses and representatives of the Devil belong to the "other world" and can be directly associated with each other; thus in a broad sense mummers depict all dwellers of the "other world."

Thus the *oprichniki* should evidently be associated with mummers and in this sense identify with the "other world" of outer darkness [*khromeshnyi*]. It is, moreover, characteristic that the *oprichniki* should, in their turn, perceive the representatives of the *zemshchina* as belonging to another, alien world: for which very reason it was as if in their eyes they did not even exist. Cf. Shtaden's testimony: "The *oprichniki* did indescribably terrible things to the *zemskie* [members of the *zemshchina*] so as to extort from them money and goods. Even the field of battle [i.e. God's judgement—whichever side won in a battle to settle a dispute was taken to have been granted success by God's judgement] had no force in this case: all those who fought on the side of the *zemskie* acknowledged themselves to be defeated; though they were alive they were thought of as if they were dead . . ." (G. Shtaden, *O Moskve Ivana Groznogo*, 86). Thus the *oprichniki* consider the *zemskie* to be no better than *corpses*: the *oprichnina* and the *zemshchina* belong to different worlds, which are opposed to each other in the same way as the "other world" and this world are.

The *oprichniki* were supposed to avoid associating with the *zemskie* (see *Ibid.*, 93), and this forcibly reminds one of those restrictions on association which were common in the case of denominational disagreements (cf. the Old Believers' later refusal to have contact with the Nikonites for eating, drinking and praying); it was most likely this that Ivan Timofeev had in mind when he wrote in his *Chronicle* that Ivan the Terrible,

in founding the *oprichnina*, “in his anger, by division and splitting into two, divided a united people and as it were created two faiths” (*Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 271). The *oprichniki* moreover cut themselves off from their parents and in so doing automatically became outcasts, standing in opposition to the rest of the world. The punishment for contact between an *oprichnik* and a member of the *zemshchina* was death for both, so association with a representative of the opposite party was just as dangerous as contact with a representative of the “other world”.

- ⁸⁹ Kurakin, in his *History of Tsar Peter Alekseevich*, describes Peter’s jesting entertainments as “Yuletide pranks,” remarking, however, that the Patriarch of All the Fools “prolonged his celebration from Christmas throughout the entire winter until Shrovetide, visiting all the noble households of Moscow and the suburb and the houses of the best-known merchants, and chanting the way they usually do in church” (*Arkhiv kniazia F. A. Kurakina*, kn. I, 72 ff.); the behavior of the travesty “Patriarch” is, moreover, extremely reminiscent of the behavior of Yuletide carol-singers. Information on this jesting celebration at Yuletide can also be found in *Zapiski Zheliabuzskogo*, 59, 225, 279; *Zapiski o Rossii pri Petre Velikom, izvlechennye iz bumag grafa Bassevicha* (Moscow, 1866), 119-120; *Zapiski Iusta Iulia*, 128-129; Johann Georg Korb, *Dnevnik puteshestviia v Moskoviiu (1698 i 1699 g.)* (St. Petersburg, 1906), 109 ff.; and *Dnevnik kamer-iunkera F. V. Berkhgol'tsa*, vol. II, 10-11; vol. III, 186. Golikov, following Strahlenberg, enumerates all that Peter was accused of and mentions in particular “His Majesty’s celebration at Yuletide” (I. I. Golikov, *Deianiia Petra Velikogo*, part I, 3; cf. Ph.J. von Strahlenberg, *Das Nord- und Ostliche Theil von Europa und Asia, In so weit solches Das gantze Rußische Reich mit Sibirien und der grossen Tatarey in sich begreiffet, In einer Historisch-Geographischen Beschreibung der alten und neuern Zeiten, und vielen andern unbekanntten Nachrichten vorgestellt* (Stockholm, 1730), 231-232); it is quite clear that the “All-Jesting Council” could indeed be seen as a Yuletide performance. According to Berkhgol’ts, Yuletide celebrations in 1724 were signaled by all the senators and members of the Imperial Colleges being dressed up in disguise and being obliged to wear masks and the appropriate costumes even in their audience chambers (*Dnevnik kamer-iunkera F. V. Berkhgol'tsa*, vol. IV, 16-17).

Even later in the eighteenth century jesting performances were often associated with either Yuletide or Shrovetide and included features of the corresponding rituals. So, for example, the public masquerade “Minerva Triumphant” which took place in Moscow in 1763 after Catherine the Great’s accession was arranged to coincide with Shrovetide. Poroshin describes the Yuletide games which Catherine organized in Petersburg, in which men dressed up in women’s clothing (S. A. Poroshin, *Zapiski, sluzhashchie k istorii ego imperatorskogo vysochestva Pavla Petrovicha* (St. Petersburg, 1881), 560), in a similar way to that of Yuletide mummers. Dressing up in the clothes of the opposite sex was in general characteristic of court masquerades in the eighteenth century (see for example *Zapiski imperatritsy Ekateriny II* (St. Petersburg, 1906), 100-1; S. A. Poroshin, *Zapiski*, 555, A. V. Khrapovitskii, *Dnevnik s 18 ianvaria 1782 po 17 sentiabria 1793 goda* (Moscow, 1901), 205).

- ⁹⁰ Ia.V. Lileev, *Simeon Bekbulatovich*, 208; T. S. Rozhdestvenskii, “Pamiatniki staroobriadcheskoi poezii,” *Zapiski Moskovskogo arkheologicheskogo instituta VI* (1910), xxxiv.

- ⁹¹ See B. A. Uspenskii, “Historia sub specie semioticae” in *Kul'turnoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi. Istoki, stanovlenie, traditsiia* (Moscow, 1976), 290. In exactly the same way the prominent Old Believer Ivan Smirnov testified in the 1720’s that Peter was making “the male sex female, to the extent that he orders the male sex to let their hair grow

- long and to shave their beards" (P. S. Smirnov, *Iz istorii rashkola pervoi poloviny XVIII veka po neizdannym pamiatnikam* (St. Petersburg, 1908), 160); as already pointed out, assuming the attributes of the opposite sex is typical in general of mummers: men disguising themselves in women's clothing, imitating women and so on. Such an opinion as the one quoted above must have been reinforced by the behavior of Peter himself, who was prone to all kinds of disguises and to the assumption of other names or titles which corresponded to them ("Sergeant Peter Mikhailov", "bombardier" or "captain Piter", and so on).
- ⁹² See Iu. M. Lotman, B. A. Uspenskii, *The Semiotics of Russian Culture*, part I, chapters 1 and 2.
- ⁹³ V. F. Miller, *Istoricheskie pesni russkogo naroda XVI-XVII vv.* (Petrograd, 1915), 590.
- ⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 621.
- ⁹⁵ *Istoricheskoe i pravdivoe povestvovanie o tom, kak moskovskii kniaz` Dimitrii Ioannovich dostig ottsovskogo prestola.* With introduction and trans. from Czech by V. A. Franzev (Prague, 1908), reprinted in *Starina i novizna* 15 (St. Petersburg, 1911).
- ⁹⁶ *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 827.
- ⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 56. Apart from the prescriptions laid down for fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays, the Russians and the other Eastern Slavs placed a special prohibition on veal (see D. Zeienin, *Russische (Ostslavische) volkskunde* (Berlin-Leipzig, 1927), 116). According to Shlikhting, who records that Muscovites ate no veal at all, Ivan the Terrible ordered that people who sampled veal out of hunger should be burnt at the stake (A. I. Malein, trans. ed., *Novoe izvestie o Rossii*, 39): thus it is quite clear that a doctrinal significance was seen in this prohibition.
- ⁹⁸ See N. Ustrialov, *Skazaniia sovremennikov o Dmitrii Samozvantse* (St. Petersburg, 1859), vol. II, 196, 238.
- ⁹⁹ See, e.g., S. Maksimov, *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. XVIII, 128, 146; vol. X, 184; Ia.A. Nikitina, "K voprosu o russkikh koldunakh," *Sbornik muzeia antropologii i etnografii AN SSSR VII* (1928): 309-310; D. Zeienin, *Russische (Ostslavische) volkskunde*, 45; P. S. Efimenko, "Materialy po etnografii," 221.
- ¹⁰⁰ Ia.A. Nikitina, "K voprosu o russkikh koldunakh," 311-312.
- ¹⁰¹ V. F. Miller, *Istoricheskie pesni*, 585.
- ¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 591; cf. also 587, 588, 589, 593, 595, 597, 601, 602, 620, 62.
- ¹⁰³ *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 818-820. Cf. also in *Another Story* [Inoe skazanie]: "And he created for himself in this transient life an entertainment which was also a token of his eternal dwelling-place in future ages, the like of which no-one in the state of Russia or in any other state, save in the infernal kingdom, has ever before seen on earth: an exceedingly vast hell, having three heads. And he made both its jaws of bronze which jangled greatly; and when it opened wide its jaws, the onlookers saw what seemed like a flame spurt from inside them and a great jangling noise issued from its gullet; its teeth were jagged and its claws seemed ready to grab, and out of its ears flames seemed to be bursting forth; and the accursed one placed it right on his Moskva river as a reminder of his sins, so that from the highest vantage points in his residence he could gaze upon it always and be ready to settle in it for endless ages with other like-minded associates" (*Ibid.*, 55-56).
- ¹⁰⁴ Samuil Kollinz, *Nyneshnee sostoianie Rossii, izlozhennoe v pis'me k drugu, zhivushchemu v Londone* (Moscow, 1846), 22, describes these burial places as follows: "[the corpses] are sent to the *Bosky* or *Boghzi Dome* (i.e. God's House) which is a great pit in the fields

arched over, wherein they put an hundred or two hundred and let them rest till Midsummer, and then the popes go and bury them, and cover them with earth.”

¹⁰⁵ S. M. Solov`ev, *Istotiia Rossii*, vol. IV, 455; Adam Olearii, *Opisanie puteshestviia v Moskoviiu i cherez Moskoviiu v Persiiu i obratno* (St. Petersburg, 1906), 238.

¹⁰⁶ For customs associated with the burial of “unclean” bodies in general, see D. K. Zelenin, *Ocherki russkoi mifologii* (Petrograd, 1916).

¹⁰⁷ *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 831, 59.

¹⁰⁸ N. Ustrialov, *Skazaniia sovremennikov o Dmitrii Samozvantse*, vol. I, 347; cf. S. M. Solov`ev, *Istoriia Rossii*, vol. IV, 455.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. the description of the Yuletide mummers in the Petition of 1636 from the priests of Nizhnii Novgorod quoted above, note 84.

The reed-pipe stuck into the False Dmitrii’s mouth “for payment to the gatekeeper at the entrance to hell” seems to be a travesty substitute for the money which was ordinarily placed with the deceased so that he would be received into the next world; moreover, the money was sometimes placed in the deceased’s *mouth* (see Samuil Kollinz, *Nyneshnee sostoianie Rossii*, 21; *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. I, 178; cf. also A. Fischer, *Zwyczaje pogrzebowe ludu polskiego* (Lwow, 1921), 173 ff.; L. Niederle, *Slovanske starozitnosti. Oddil kulturni. Zivot starych Slovanu* (Prague, 1911-1921), vol. I, 266-268). In addition, the whistle could also have corresponded functionally to the so-called “permit,” which, it was supposed, was destined for the gate-keeper of Paradise, who was usually thought to be either St. Nicholas or St. Peter.

¹¹⁰ *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XIII, 831, 59.

¹¹¹ *Istoricheskoe i pravdivoe povestvovanie*, 25, 31. For our purposes here it is sufficient to note that pretenders were *perceived* as sorcerers, in as much as they were seen as self-appointed, travesty Tsars. The question arises as to how far anti-behavior was inherent in these pretenders and how far it was attributed to them by public opinion. It must be supposed that this was a question of the degree of self-awareness of the pretender, which varied in each actual case. As we have already said, many pretenders undoubtedly believed that they were genuine Tsars, yet among them there were also some adventurers who were perfectly well aware of the unlawfulness of their claims. *A priori* it must be assumed that anti-behavior was in the main characteristic of the pretenders in the second category, i.e. those who perceived themselves as mummers.

¹¹² See especially on this B. A. Uspenskii, “Historia sub specie semioticae.”

¹¹³ What is meant here is walking around the lectern against the sun (in other words, counter-clockwise) in the course of the celebration of a christening or a wedding; this practice was introduced by Patriarch Nikon, whereas previously the accepted form of this ritual movement was in the opposite direction, ‘sun-wise.’ The opponents of Nikon’s reforms considered this change a blasphemous violation of the ritual, imparting to it the nature of a demonic action.

¹¹⁴ This refers more particularly to the spread of the art of secular portraiture. Formerly only icon-painting was allowed in Muscovite Russia, i.e. it was permitted to depict only the saints, not ordinary people.

¹¹⁵ What is presumably meant here is the violation of fasts, a common feature of life in Petrine Russia, and the exemption of soldiers from fasting, which was introduced into Russia on Peter’s insistence.

¹¹⁶ That is, the enforced introduction of foreign dress under Peter.

- ¹¹⁷ Formerly it was forbidden to eat, drink or pray with persons of another faith (foreigners); this prohibition survived among the Old Believers. .
- ¹¹⁸ G. V. Esipov, *Raskol' nich`i dela XVIII veka* (St. Petersburg, 1861-1863), vol. II, 41.
- ¹¹⁹ See K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial`no-utopicheskie legendy*, 91-112; N. B. Golikova, *Politicheskie protsessy pri Petre I po materialam Preobrazhenskogo prikaza* (Moscow, 1957), 122-161, 168-176, 172-219, 266-275.
- ¹²⁰ See K. V. Chistov, *Russkie narodnye sotsial`no-utopicheskie legendy*, 114-130.
- ¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 118-119.
- ¹²² Such a duality, as we have seen, is quite characteristic for the ideology of imposture: just as the pretender Peter III (Pugachev) had his own "Count Chernyshev" (see above), so the "pretender" Peter the Great was assumed to have a pretender heir, Aleksei Petrovich.
- ¹²³ Chistov (*Ibid.*, 113-114), who thinks that the historical image of Peter did not correspond to the utopian image of the Tsar-Deliverer, explains this phenomenon differently—and in our opinion unconvincingly. Inasmuch as Peter was perceived as a Tsar by "indirect" line of succession, and as a "substitute" Tsar, his historical image bears no relation at all to the problem: the real Peter who existed in the consciousness of his contemporaries has nothing whatsoever to do with the person who *should have been* occupying his place.