

ENTHRONEMENT IN THE RUSSIAN AND BYZANTINE TRADITIONS

B. A. Uspenskij

After the fall of Byzantium, the Muscovite state attempted to enact a restoration of the Byzantine Empire. Thus originated the kingdom of Muscovy, which subsequently became the Russian Empire. This kingdom was modeled as a theocratic one, with Moscow conceived as the New Constantinople and the Third Rome. In conformity with this conception, there appeared in Moscow, as in a New Constantinople, a tsar, that is, a βασιλεύς (basileus), or emperor. Notably, the Byzantine emperor had been called “tsar” in Russia, so that Peter I’s assumption of the title of emperor in 1721 designated a change of cultural orientation and not an elevation in rank. As a result of its new orientation towards Byzantium, Russia acquired both a tsar and a patriarch. However, by this time Byzantium had been long gone; and, what is more, long after Byzantium fell, contacts between Moscow and Constantinople had remained severed. Thus the Russians modeled themselves not on a tradition that actually existed, but on a certain notion of a theocratic state, in which ideology played a far greater role than real facts.

I

The tradition of enthronement (*postavlenie na tsarstvo*) began in Rus’ on January 16, 1547, when Ivan IV was crowned tsar. Ivan IV’s ceremony of enthronement, composed by Metropolitan Makarii, had nothing in common with the Byzantine emperors’ (tsars’) rite of enthronement, but rather derived from Dmitrii Ivanovich’s rite of enthronement as Grand Prince that had taken place on February 4, 1498 (Dmitrii Ivanovich was the grandson of, and co-ruler with, Grand Prince Ivan III).¹

There exist two basic textual versions of Ivan IV's order of enthronement as tsar, the Formulary Edition² and the Chronicle Edition; sometimes distinguished in the latter is the Nikonian version, as presented in the Nikonian and L'vov Chronicles; in the Chronicle of the beginning of the reign; in the Piskarevsk Chronicle³; and in the Illuminated (*Litsevaia*) version, presented in the "Royal Book" (*Tsarstvennaia kniga*);⁴ a special variant of the Formulary Edition is contained in the order of services published by N. I. Novikov.⁵ The oldest copies of the Chronicle Edition (within the Nikonian and L'vov Chronicles) are dated to the second half of the 1550s, the oldest copies of the Formulary Edition—to the beginning of the 1560s.

The Formulary Edition has a more general character, and was undoubtedly compiled after Ivan IV's enthronement. Thus allowance is made here for the presence of the tsar's father, who was no longer alive ("if there is a father . . .," "if there is no father . . ."), and Tsaritsa Anastasia and the tsar's children are mentioned (although Ivan had only married one month after his enthronement and couldn't yet have had children), as is the patriarch ("the holy patriarch or right reverend metropolitan, your father, summons you . . .").⁶ As we see, various possibilities are allowed for here—participation in the ceremony of enthronement by the Grand Prince alone or together with his father; and the involvement of either a metropolitan or a patriarch—and this is clearly connected to the formulary character of the given document, which was to serve as the norm for the future enthronement of tsars. Thus we may discern two levels in the text of the Formulary edition: the narrative connected with the real ceremony of enthronement that took place in 1547, and the formulary proper, that provides for other potential situations.

We can date the composition of the Formulary Edition more or less precisely. There is every reason to believe that it was composed no earlier than 1547 and no later than 1560. The *terminus post quem* is the date of Ivan IV's enthronement as tsar (1547); the *terminus ante quem* is the death of Tsaritsa Anastasia (1560), who is mentioned in the metropolitan's greeting. At the same time it is possible to define the date more exactly on the basis of some general considerations. The Formulary Edition came into existence at the moment when the demand arose that the international community recognize the tsar's title, that is, no earlier than the mid-1550s.⁷ We may assume that this version was composed before the trip by Archimandrite Feodorit (missionary to the Lapps, known by the name of Feodorit Kol'skii) to Constantinople in 1557 to have Ivan IV's enthronement as tsar blessed.⁸ Thus the composition of the Formulary Edition of Ivan IV's elevation to the kingdom may with a large degree of certainty be dated to the mid-1550s.

In 1561 Ioasaph, metropolitan of Evripos, brought to Moscow the decree of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Ioasaph, of December 1560, that confirmed Ivan IV's title as tsar.⁹ Acknowledging Ivan IV's rank, the patriarch nevertheless pointed out that only the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople were entitled to enthrone somebody, and proposed that Ivan have the metropolitan of Evripos repeat the ceremony as the patriarch's exarch.¹⁰ The metropolitan also brought to Moscow *The Order and Charter of Coronation and Enthronement as Emperor*, a book which described the Byzantine emperors' ceremony of enthronement, which significantly differed from the way Ivan IV had been crowned.¹¹ However, Ivan IV did not accept this proposal; subsequent ceremonies of enthronement for Russian tsars were based on the Formulary Edition of Ivan IV's enthronement.¹²

We are thus forced to admit that familiarity with Byzantine imperial practice had no substantive influence on Russian tsars' own rite of enthronement. It was only for Boris Godunov's enthronement as tsar on July 21, 1605, that the description of the Byzantine enthronement ceremony received from Patriarch Ioasaph was used to some degree, but only in particular aspects.¹³ We may add to this that in Metropolitan Makarii's Great Reading Menalogion (compiled c. 1529-1554) under August 31 there is a description of the enthronement of Manuel II Paleologus as emperor in 1392.¹⁴ The author of this description is Ignatii Smolianin, who was present at the event.¹⁵ Thus the Byzantine order of enthronement as emperor was to some extent known in Russia; nonetheless it was not reflected in Ivan IV's order of enthronement as tsar¹⁶ or on later Russian tsars' ceremonies of enthronement.

II

The basic difference between the Formulary Edition of Ivan IV's elevation to the tsardom and the Chronicle Edition concerns the anointing of the tsar. Only the Formulary version contains a description of the anointing, which is presented as a separate article ("Order and rule how a tsar or grand prince should be anointed with chrism"), but mention of anointment is also made in the general order of service. It is significant that it is precisely in this context that the patriarch is also mentioned: "You are summoned by the holy patriarch or right reverend metropolitan, your father, together with the entire holy community, to the anointment with holy and great chrism and for communion in the holy and life-giving divine sacraments of Christ"; before this only the metropolitan had been mentioned. Apparently, the introduction of this rite into the elevation

to the tsardom's order of service presumed the participation of the patriarch in principle, and therefore also presumed the establishment of a patriarchate.

One may thus suppose that Ivan IV's elevation to the tsardom in 1547 occurred in conformity with the order of service described in the Chronicle Edition, which very closely corresponds to the service order for Dmitrii Ivanovich's elevation to Grand Prince in 1498; in the Chronicle Edition anointing of the tsar is not mentioned.¹⁷ However, subsequent elevations to the kingdom took place in accord with the order of service presented in the Formulary Edition. The first Russian tsar consecrated with sacred unction was Fedor Ivanovich, enthroned on May 31, 1589,¹⁸ in conformity with the Formulary version of the order of enthronement of his father, Ivan IV. All subsequent Russian tsars were likewise anointed with chrism during the ceremony of enthronement.

III

Anointment with chrism during accession to the throne was practiced in Byzantium as well as in the West.¹⁹ It is not important for us that this custom appeared in Byzantium under Western influence;²⁰ those who composed the Russian order of elevation to the kingdom (Metropolitan Makarii and his collaborators) undoubtedly took the already existing Byzantine tradition as their point of departure.²¹

Neither in Byzantium nor the West was anointing with chrism during enthronement identified with the sacrament of Chrismation, which in the Orthodox Church is, as a rule, is performed directly after Baptism.²² However, in Russia, the two were identified.²³ Here it is necessary to emphasize that mere anointment with chrism by no means signifies the sacrament of Chrismation. Thus, for example, we may piously wash our faces with water from the baptismal font, but this will not mean a second baptism; similarly, traditional bathing in the "Jordan" (that is, a baptismal ice hole), arranged for Epiphany, is not the same as Baptism, even though it was an accepted practice to baptize adults who were converting to Orthodoxy in it.²⁴ In precisely the same way, during Baptism in the Catholic Church the priest daubs the one being baptized with chrism, although this is not considered a special sacrament; subsequently, however, during confirmation, when a bishop anoints a person with it, this is perceived as a sacrament.²⁵

Accordingly, in Constantinople as well as in the West, anointment during the ceremony of enthronement was clearly distinguished from the rite of

Chrismation, while in Moscow both rites turned out to be absolutely identical: we can speak here about one and the same ritual, that is, the performance of the same sacrament. Most likely, the Russian hierarchs knew that in Byzantium anointment took place during the enthronement of emperors, but at the same time they did not possess a description of exactly how the given ritual was performed in Constantinople; therefore, they introduced the rite they were familiar with into the order of service for elevation to the tsardom.²⁶

Thus, in particular, if the Constantinopolitan patriarch proclaimed “Holy, Holy, Holy”²⁷ when anointing the emperor, the Muscovite metropolitan or later the patriarch pronounced “The seal and the gift of the Holy Spirit” when anointing the tsar (in a later version: “The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit”),²⁸ that is, precisely the words that were said in performing Chrismation. In Constantinople they anointed (crosswise) only the head of the monarch being crowned,²⁹ while in Moscow they anointed the brow, ears, breast, shoulders, and both sides of each hand, each time repeating the words “The seal and the gift of the Holy Spirit,” as is done during Chrismation.³⁰ In a similar way as after Baptism and Chrismation, it was accepted practice not to remove one’s white baptismal clothes and not to wash for seven days, so as not to remove any of the chrism;³¹ after anointment the tsar could only wash and change clothes on the eighth day.³²

Notably, the proclamation “Holy, Holy, Holy” referred to Old Testament tradition,³³ and in particular, to the Old Testament tradition of anointing a king,³⁴ while the words “The seal and the gift of the Holy Spirit” obviously refer to the New Testament. The proclamation “Holy, Holy, Holy” indicates that the one becoming tsar has been divinely chosen (as is the case with Old Testament kings), while the declaration of the sacramental words during Chrismation likens the tsar to Christ, whom “God anointed . . . with the Holy Spirit.”³⁵ Thus both in Byzantium and the West when a monarch was anointed he was likened to the kings of Israel, while in Russia the tsar was equated to Christ Himself. Hence in the West unjust rulers were compared to impious Biblical kings, whereas in Russia they were juxtaposed to the Antichrist.³⁶

IV

And so, consecrating a tsar in Russia—in distinction from consecrations in Byzantium—did not in principle differ from Chrismation, which was performed over every Orthodox Christian after his or her Baptism. Accordingly, if in both the West and in Byzantium the anointing of the monarch preceded the

crowning, in Russia it occurred after.³⁷ At the same time, the crowning itself was likened in an obvious way to Baptism; Chrismation in this case was performed after crowning because in usual practice it was performed after Baptism.

Together with this, anointing the tsar was directly part of the liturgical action. Indeed, anointment took place during the liturgy after the chanting of “Holy to the holies” (*Sviataia sviatym*), and directly after the anointing the metropolitan (or later the patriarch) addressed the tsar with the words: “Come, tsar, as you are worthy, anointed, to take communion”—after which communion would take place.³⁸ Thus the tsar communes with the Holy Sacraments precisely in his capacity as the anointed and is likened to Christ by the very act of anointment. It is worth noting here that the ritual of crowning, which precedes anointment, is structured like an abbreviated morning service (*utrenia*).³⁹ Thus the crowning is correlated with Matins and anointment with the liturgy. Accordingly, anointing as tsar is the culminating point of the entire ceremony of enthronement.⁴⁰

At the same time, the “tsar’s place” in the middle of the church, where the crowning takes place, correlates with the “tsar’s doors” that lead to the altar and before which the anointment is performed; it is worth noting that during this period the label “tsar’s doors” (as opposed to the earlier period) relates to Christ as Tsar of Glory.⁴¹ The two tsars—heavenly and earthly—are thus juxtaposed within the space of the temple, in other words, they are located in a spatially defined order. It is not accidental that since the time of Ivan IV the “tsar’s place” in the Moscow Cathedral of the Dormition was called “the throne”⁴²—the throne of the earthly tsar, situated amid the cathedral, was again clearly juxtaposed to the throne of the heavenly Tsar, located at the altar.⁴³

Characteristically, when the tsar was invited for anointment, he was called “holy.”⁴⁴ Generally speaking, the epithet “holy” was part of the Byzantine emperor’s title,⁴⁵ although in this context it turns out to be directly connected to the exclamation (*vozglas*, Gr. ecphonesis) “Holy to the holies” that usually precedes communion, but in this case preceded anointing and communion.⁴⁶ Thus the connection between anointment and communion was emphasized in the liturgical action.

Anointment to the kingdom defines the special liturgical status of the tsar as manifested in the nature of his taking the Holy Sacraments. After the introduction of anointing with chrism to the rite of elevation to the tsardom the manner in which tsars took communion began to be distinguished from that of laymen, to some degree likening it to the communion of clergymen. Later, from the mid-seventeenth century, the tsar began to take communion exactly the same way as clergy did.⁴⁷

Having been placed in the liturgical context, anointing the tsar gave him a specific sacral status, a special charisma.⁴⁸ Hereafter the tsar's special charisma—the charisma of power, conferred precisely through anointment with chrism—was particularly emphasized by the Russian Church. According to Russian specialists in modern canonical law, anointment with chrism “summons a special grace of the Holy Spirit onto the anointed sovereign. Our church teaches that those who do not recognize this grace are subject to anathema and exclusion. On the feast of the Triumph of Orthodoxy that takes place on the first Sunday of Lent, in the Order of Service that is established for this occasion, among other things it is proclaimed: ‘To those who think that Orthodox sovereigns are not raised to the throne by God’s special will, and that at anointment the gifts of the Holy Spirit are not poured into them for carrying out their great calling; and also to those who dare to raise revolt against them or commit treason—anathema!’”⁴⁹

V

As we know, the sacrament of Chrismation is in principle unrepeatable, just like the sacrament of Baptism that is connected with it. The sacrament of Baptism is only repeated in cases when the earlier baptism is declared invalid or if the very fact of its having taken place is in doubt. Similarly, the repetition of Chrismation, generally speaking, suggests that the previous ritual is being recognized as invalid. However, in the given case the ritual that had been performed over the future tsar after his baptism would not have been put in doubt; the repetition of Chrismation indicated that after crowning the tsar took on a qualitatively new status, different from that of all other people. Chrismation is performed on the same person, but he has taken on a new quality, defined by the ritual of crowning.

In this sense later clarifications by Russian theologians are characteristic:

The anointing of tsars with holy chrism upon their ascension to the throne was established by God Himself. God, having blessed the regal power for the people of Israel, ordered those selected for kingship to be anointed at the moment they were chosen. Saul, David and other kings of the Jewish people were thus anointed (1 Kings 10:1, 16:2, etc.). On this divinely established basis, and with this same understanding, the Christian Orthodox Church performs the sacrament of Chrismation over Orthodox sovereigns when they are crowned to the tsardom. This is not a special sacrament just because it has

the same basis as Chrismation and the same form; in any case, the Orthodox Church unchangingly recognizes only seven sacraments. This is not the repetition of the same sacrament, because it has an exclusive significance and use; the church recognizes the general sacrament [that is, Chrismation] as unrepeatable. It is only a special variant of the sacrament of Chrismation, or, so to speak, its highest degree, since through it the particular, highest gifts of grace are communicated, corresponding to its supreme mission in the world and in Christ's Church . . . ⁵⁰

And also:

Finally, one must not forget to mention in particular, brethren, the strength and grandeur of the sacrament of Chrismation in its use for the crowned head of the Christian people. Who does not know that our devout sovereigns, in ascending the throne, accept holy Chrismation for their great service on the same day as they accept the crown and other marks of greatness? This is not a repetition [of the sacrament] of Chrismation, no, the sacrament is not repeated, just as Baptism, or spiritual birth [cannot be performed twice]; this is another, supreme degree of communicating the gifts of the Holy Spirit that is required for another exalted state and service! Neither is the sacrament of Ordination repeated, but has degrees of elevation; the laying on of hands crowns servitors of the faith for the highest service again and again. Thus we say that holy anointment of tsars is another, supreme degree of a sacrament, when a special Spirit descends onto the head of peoples. "You are my Son, I today gave birth to you" (Psalms 2:7), says the Lord to the tsar on that day when He Himself creates him anew as an exalted person, adorned with all of the gifts of His grace. To this new-born person is added another gift of the Holy Spirit through holy anointment for the Lord's select.⁵¹

As for the holy action when the Orthodox Church anoints devout Sovereigns with holy chrism upon their elevation to the tsardom . . . this is not a repetition of the sacrament of Chrismation, through which all believers commune with the powers of grace, which are essential for spiritual life itself. No, this is another, supreme level of communion of the gifts of the Holy Spirit that is required for the special, extraordinarily important service of the tsar, specified by God Himself (Daniel 4:22, 29) . . . As is known, the sacrament of Ordination is also not repeated; however, it has its gradations, and the repeated laying on of hands crowns servitors of the faith for the highest service. Thus we say that holy anointment of tsars is but a special, supreme degree of the sacrament, an extraordinary Spirit that descends onto the head of God's anointed ones.⁵²

This holy action is indispensable for Orthodox sovereigns, as tsars over a people that has received grace (see 1 Peter 2:9), and for whose governance a ruler is needed who has also received grace in the highest degree. In the

tsar's anointment by the Holy Church a special grace of the Holy Spirit is passed on which gives wisdom and strength to divinely-crowned sovereigns for the holy task of tsar's service that faces them. In this way this anointment is not a separate sacrament or a repetition of the sacrament that is performed over every Orthodox Christian after Baptism . . . but merely a special type or supreme degree of the sacrament of Chrismation in which—in view of the special mission of the Orthodox Sovereign in the world—special supreme gifts of grace, of royal wisdom and strength, are communicated to him.⁵³

Repetition of Chrismation of one and the same person cannot occur, for reason of the nature of this sacramental action. . . . The Church has never allowed repetition of this sacrament for the same person: "This mystery is not revealed twice"—it says of Chrismation in the Orthodox confession of faith. Only in two cases has the Church permitted its repetition: when crowning a tsar and when someone converts to Orthodoxy from a serious heresy. . . . In the first case the Church has clear Divine command as basis for its behavior. God, in establishing the royal power over his chosen people, ordered the anointing of those chosen for this high merit. . . . For this reason the Christian Church also, in anointing tsars, has as its aim to communicate to them more than the gift of the Holy Spirit that is common to all Christians but a special power of the Holy Spirit which will strengthen them in carrying out their royal responsibilities that are beyond the capability of ordinary people.⁵⁴

Arguing against this kind of assertion, the well-known historian of church law Professor N. S. Suvorov asserted that, on the contrary, the anointment of tsars is a special—eighth!—sacrament, noting that Russian theologians were hesitant to call it so exclusively "from fear of destroying the symmetry of seven sacraments, established at the start by scholastics in the West."⁵⁵ This sacrament, in his opinion, was destined to communicate the special gift of ruling the state as well as the Church to tsars:

Russian sovereigns are not dedicated by the church hierarchy but instead receive Holy Chrismation that is performed at coronation. . . . We in Russia have no doubt about its sacramental character, that holy action by which the tsar, by means of Church prayer together with the anointment with chrism, receives power and holy wisdom from above to rule and to judge. Theologians who interpret this act merely as a sacramental descent of the gifts of the Holy Spirit onto the sovereign forget that there is no other person over whom the sacrament may be performed, and that the grace of the Holy Spirit that is necessary for ruling the whole Russian Church is invoked. In contrast, bishops are ordained [by church authority] to rule only an individual diocese . . . but in order to rule the Russian state as a whole and not in parts the beneficent gifts of the Holy Spirit are communicated. Otherwise a theologian would find it difficult to explain why the grace-giving gifts of the Holy Spirit are granted

[during the consecration as tsar] for governing the Russian state, while no grace-giving gifts of the Holy Spirit are required for governing the whole Russian Church, not its parts, and consequently for exercising the central Church power.⁵⁶

And further:

In the sacrament of Chrismation the Russian Orthodox tsar receives beneficent gifts for ruling not only the Russian state but also the Church which constitutes the Russian people from itself . . . The tsar is not consecrated into the religious hierarchy, as was the case with the Byzantine emperor, and does not claim the power to perform and teach in church, but receives strength and high wisdom in order to carry out the highest administrative power in both state and Church.⁵⁷

It is curious to juxtapose these statements by Russian scholars of the liturgy with the following evaluation of a Western church historian:

The rite of anointing the tsar [in Russia] has the clear character of a special sacrament, like Chrismation, which is applied to the already anointed tsar in order to emphasize the sacred character of his person and power and to suggest the special grace of his being. At the same time, the crowning and anointment communicate to the tsar the quality of a Christian leader, although they do not give him the authority to carry out this or that liturgical action; accordingly, the tsar takes communion from the hands of a metropolitan like a layman. In this sacred character the [Russian] tsar is completely different from the Byzantine emperor. The tsar, crowned and anointed, occupies a totally unique position among the members of the Church, always remaining only a layman.⁵⁸

In this way, Russian theologians describing the Synodal period unanimously recognize anointing the tsar as a sacrament; at the same time, some have considered this a unique sacrament, different from ordinary Chrismation, and others as a special type of Chrismation sacrament, its supreme degree. In essence, the understanding of the tsar's anointment as a sacrament was defined by the rules of anathematization, cited above. The notion of various (higher and lower) degrees of the same sacrament seems uncanonical. If one understands anointment of the tsar as a special sacrament, different from Chrismation, then one must evidently speak of a special ritual that communicates special charismatic qualities to the anointed tsar. In this case we would have a unique situation in which two rituals that are absolutely identical in every detail would be recognized as different. It would be hard to accept this as anything but canonical nonsense.

It only remains to note that the non-canonical repetition of Chrismation could come into conflict with a person's confessional conscience. Thus, Bishop Andrei (Prince Ukhtomskii) wrote in 1926:

Everyone knows that during their coronation Russian tsars were anointed with chrism. From a canonical and dogmatic point of view this was [merely] anointment with chrism and in no way the sacrament of Chrismation. I myself personally considered this a sacrament even as a fifth-year gymnasium student, but when I began to make sense of ecclesiastical directives, I began to become critical of puerile textbooks.⁵⁹

But, had Bishop Andrei thought this way, for this he would have been subject to anathema . . .

Translated by Marcus C. Levitt

NOTES

- 1 See Dmitrii Ivanovich's ritual of elevation in: A. I. Pliguzov, G. V. Semenchenko et al., eds., *Russkii feodal'nyi arkhiv XIV-pervoi treti XVI veka* (Moscow, 1986-1992), vyp. 3, prilozhenie, 604-625, no. 16-18; E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki sviashchennogo venchaniia tsarei na tsarstvo v sviazi s grecheskimi ikh originalami. S istoricheskim ocherkom chinov tsarskogo venchaniia v sviazi s razvitiem idei tsaria na Rusi* (Moscow, 1883), kn. 1, xxvii-xxviii, 32-38; P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, eds., *L'idea di Roma a Mosca (secoli XV-XVI). Fonti per la storia del pensiero sociale russo* (Rome, 1993), 67-77; Sigizmund Gerbershtein, *Zapiski o Moskovii* (Moscow, 1988), 79-82.
- 2 E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, 42-90; P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, *L'idea di Roma*, 78-95; *Dopolnenie k Aktam istoricheskim, sobrannym i izdannym Arkheograficheskoiu kommissieiu* (St. Petersburg, 1846-1875), vol. 1, no. 39, 41-53.
- 3 *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* (St. Petersburg, Petrograd, Leningrad, Moscow, 1841-1989), vol. XIII/1, 150-151; vol. XX/2, 468-469; vol. XXIX, 49-50; vol. XXXIV, 180-181; *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, khraniashchikhsia v gosudarstvennoi kollegii inostrannykh del* (Moscow, 1813-1894), part. II, no. 33, 41-53.
- 4 *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. XIII/2, 452-453; Ia.N. Shchapov, "K izucheniiu 'China venchaniia na tsarstvo' Ivana IV" in *Rimsko-konstantinopol'skoe nasledie na Rusi. Ideia vlasti i politicheskaia praktika. IX Mezhdunarodnyi Seminar istoricheskikh issledovani* "Ot Rima k Tre'temu Rimu." *Moskva*, 29-31 maia 1989 g. (Moscow, 1995), 214f.
- 5 *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika* (Moscow, 1788-1791; The Hague, Paris, 1970), part 7, 4-35; see M. V. Shakhmatov, "Gosudarstvenno-natsional'nye idei 'chinovnykh knig' venchaniia na tsarstvo moskovskikh gosudarei," *Zapiski Russkogo nauchnogo instituta v Belgrade* 1 (1930): 249-252.
- 6 In the order of service published by N. I. Novikov (*Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika*, ch. 7, 4f) the name of Tsaritsa Anastasia is not mentioned (and neither is Ivan's; in general, the exposition here is consistently impersonal). Mention of the patriarch is also absent.
- 7 I. A. Tikhoniuk, "O vizantiiskom obratse tsarskoi koronatsii Ivana Groznogo," at press.

- ⁸ See *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, izdavaemaia Arkheograficheskoiu komissieiu* (St Petersburg, Petrograd, Leningrad, 1872-1927), vol. XXXI, 340; V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevtsy. K voprosu o vliianii Vizantii na obrazovanie idei tsarskoi vlasti moskovskikh gosudarei* (Kharkov, 1901), 150; W. Regel, ed., *Analecta byzantine-russica* (St. Petersburg, 1891), lif.
- ⁹ For the text of the document, see *Ibid.*, 75-85; P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, eds., *L'idea di Roma*, 96-104; B. L. Fonkich, "Grecheskie gramoty sovetskikh khranilishch" in *Problemy paleografii i kodikologii v SSSR* (Moscow, 1974), 247-252; B. L. Fonkich, comp., *Grechesko-russkie sviazi serediny XVI—nachala XVIII veka. Grecheskie dokumenty moskovskikh khranilishch, Katalog vystavki* (Moscow, 1991), 8-9, no. 1-3.
- ¹⁰ See V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevtsy*, 150-151.
- ¹¹ This book has come down to us in a collection from the 1640s: *Chin i ustav o venchanii i o postavlennii tsarskom. Perevodil na Moskve mitropolit Egrivskoi Iasaf s patriarsha Potrebniaka tsaregradskago leta 7070 mesiatza dekabria 13 den`*, RGADA, f. 177, d. 30, ll.26-42. See also I. A. Tikhoniuk, "O vizantiiskom obraztse." In the description (*opis`*) of the tsar's archive it mentions the "book of the tsar's elevation" that was received together with Patriarch Ioasaph's blessing. See *Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi imperii Arkheograficheskoi ekspeditsieiu imp. Akademii nauk* (St. Petersburg, 1836), vol. I, 349, no. 289. Another copy of the same text was preserved at the Kirillov Monastery; see P. M. Stroev, "Bibliologicheskii slovar` i chernovye k nemu materialy," *Sbornik Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Akademii nauk* 19/4 (1882): 141; Andrei Kurbskii mentions it in his *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow* (*Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. XXXI, 340), as does the Moscow Chronicle of 1552-1562 ("Letopisets russkii [Moskovskaia letopis` 1552-1562] po rukopisi, prinadlezhashchei A. N. Lebedevu, soobshchil Andrei Lebedev," *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri imp. Moskovskom universitete*, kn. 3, otd. 1 (1895): 149).
- ¹² Something similar occurred in 1589 when the first Russian patriarch Job was ordained. Before the elevation of Job the Russians thought it necessary to question the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah II, about how the patriarch of Constantinople was put into office. However, they were dissatisfied with the Greek ceremonial order and ultimately turned to the Russian tradition for elevating a metropolitan (which involved a second consecration [*chirotony*]). See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh. Kharizma vlasti v Rossii (Vizantiiskaia model` i ee russkoe pereosmyslenie)* (Moscow, 1998), 85-87.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, 136-139.
- ¹⁴ See Arkhimandrit Iosif, *Podrobnoe oglavlenie Velikikh Chetkikh Minei vserossiiskago mitropolita Makariia, khraniashchikhhsia v Moskovskoi patriarshei (nyne sinodal`noi) biblioteke* (Moscow, 1892), 499.
- ¹⁵ See A. I. Pliguzov, G. V. Semenchenko et al., eds., *Russkii feodal`nyi arkhiv*, vyp. 2, 273-275, no. 86; G. P. Majeska, "Russian Travelers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," *Dumbarton Oaks Studies* 19 (1984): 104-113.
- ¹⁶ On several of the Greek sources used in compiling the Formulary Edition, see Kh. Loparev, "O chine venchanii russkikh tsarei," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* 252 (1887): 312-319.
- ¹⁷ In one of the chronicles ("The Royal Book") there is an editor's note that mention of anointment was required; the note was made after Ivan IV's elevation to the tsardom in 1547 and has no historical significance; see B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 21-22, 21-22n17. The same goes for the description of Ivan IV's elevation to the tsardom in

a manuscript from the Pogodin collection (RNB, Pogod. 1567), in which it says that Ivan “was most gloriously elevated to the tsardom of all Rus` . . . according to the law of a tsar’s flawless elevation and most holy Anointment [sic] to the throne of the ancient paternal heritage . . . with the blessing and consecration of the primate, Metropolitan of all Rus` Makarii . . . which was in the year 7055, January 20 [sic].” This description also mentions the “Tsar’s place,” that is, the tsar’s throne in the Cathedral of the Dormition, set up in 1551, and so indicates that this was composed after the fact. See I. Zabelin, “Arkhaeologicheskaiia nakhodka: Reshenie voprosa o Tsarskom meste, ili tak nazyvaemom Monomakhovom trone (po rukopisi Pogodinskogo drevlekhranilishcha),” *Moskvitianin* no. 11, kn. 1, otd. 3 (1850): 55. See also a description of Ivan IV’s enthronement in the “Kazan History”: “and he ascended the throne and was elevated to the tsardom with a great royal elevation. . . . And he was consecrated with sacred unction and decorated with the neck-yoke and the crown of Monomakh, according to the ancient royal law, just as Roman, and Greek, and other Orthodox tsars had been elevated” (T. F. Volkova, “Kazanskaia istoriia,” in *Pamiatniki literatury Drevnei Rusi: Seredina XVI veka* (Moscow, 1985), 360). The photograph of the “Kazan History” is dated to 1564-1565, that is, when the Formulary Edition of Ivan IV’s elevation to the tsardom already existed; at the same time, the surviving manuscript copies contain traces of editing from the late sixteenth century, during the rule of Fedor Ivanovich, who as we know was not consecrated as tsar with sacred chrism. Thus the document reflects later notions about the procedure of enthronement.

Equally unreliable historically is the report in the Vologda Chronicle concerning the fact that in 1547 Ivan IV “got anointed as tsar for the sake of tsardom” in *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. XXXVII, 173. The Vologda Chronicle was compiled in the late seventeenth to early eighteenth century, and correspondingly reflects the ideas of that time about enthronement. Mention of Ivan IV’s anointment in the “Chronicle of Novgorod’s Divine Churches” (*Novgorodskie letopisi (tak nazyvaemye Novorodskaia vtoraiia i Novgorodskaia tret’ia letopisi)*) (St. Petersburg: Izd. Arkheograficheskaiia komissiia, 1879), 329), as well as in one of the copies of the “Book of Degrees” (see N. M. Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva rosiiskogo* (St. Petersburg, 1842-1843), vol. 8, 24n161) can be explained exactly the same way. In the *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, Andrei Kurbskii calls Ivan “the divinely appointed” and speaks of the “the dignity of the tsar’s anointing” (*Ruskaia istoricheskaiia biblioteka*, vol. XXXI, 261, 239); similarly, in an epistle to the elder Vas’ian Kurbskii says that “tsars and princes in the Orthodox faith from ancient generations until today are anointed by God to do justice and to protect [us] from the enemy” (Ibid., 394). These words should not be taken literally: anointing appears here as a necessary attribute of the tsar’s rank, deriving from the biblical archetype.

¹⁸ See the order of service in: P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, eds., *L’idea di Roma*, 117-118; *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, ch. II, 83, no. 51; A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov’ v ikh vzaimnykh otnosheniakh v Moskovskom gosudarstve. Tsarstvovanie Fedora Ioanovicha. Uchrezhdenie patriarshestva v Rossii* (Odessa, 1912), prilozhenie 2, 120-122; *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. XXXIV, 232.

¹⁹ See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar’ i imperator: Pomazanie na tsarstvo i semantika monarshikh titulov* (Moscow, 2000), 5-26.

²⁰ It was adopted between the mid-ninth and mid-tenth century. See Ibid., 26.

²¹ Metropolitan Makarii’s words addressed to Ivan IV describing elevation to the tsardom are characteristic. In accord with the Formulary Edition of the order of service,

- the metropolitan said: "Your father Grand Prince Vasiliï Ivanovich, autocrat of all Russia . . . ordered you, his son Ivan, to become Grand Prince and to be anointed and to be crowned with the divinely-crowned tsar's crown, according to the ancient tsar's rite" (E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, 49, 74; P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, eds., *L'idea di Roma*, 82). The statement about anointment "according to the ancient tsar's rite" cannot, of course, refer to the Russian tradition of enthronement, but most likely to the Byzantine tradition (and, indirectly, to the Biblical tradition). See also note 17 above.
- ²² In his description of the Byzantine coronation rite Simeon of Thessalonica nowhere gives the emperor's anointment the significance of a sacrament and in no way relates it to Chrismation. See: J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca* (Paris, 1857-1864), vol. CLV, 351-358; M. Arranz, "L'aspect rituel de l'onction des empereurs de Constantinople et de Moscou," in *Roma, Constantinopoli, Mosca* (Naples, 1983), 413; Idem, "Les Sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain, X: La consecration de saint Myron," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 2 (1989): 319n3; A. Kniazeff, "Les rites d'intronisation royale et imperial," in A. M. Triacca, A. Pistoia eds., *Les benedictions et les sacramentaux dans Liturgie: Conférences Saint-Serge, XXXIVe semaine d'études liturgique. Paris, 23-26 Juin 1987* (Rome, 1988), 155. Likewise, anointing the monarch during his enthronement was not perceived as a sacrament in the West. See E. H. Kantorowicz, "Deus per naturam, Deus per gratiam: A Note on Medieval Political Theology," *The Harvard Theological Review* 45 (1952): 253-277.
- ²³ See: M. Arranz, "Évolution des rites d'incorporation et de readmission dans l'Eglise selon l'Euchologe byzantine," in *Gestes et paroles dans les diverses familles liturgiques. Conférences Saint-Serge, XXIVe semaine d'études liturgique. Paris, 28 Juin-1er Juillet 1977* (Rome, 1978), 66; Idem, "L'aspect rituel de l'onction," 413, 415; Idem, "Les Sacrements," 319n3; Idem, "Couronnement royal et autres promotions de cour: Les Sacrements de l'institution de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain, III/1," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 1 (1990): 86n5.
- ²⁴ In this context, Olearius' mistake is characteristic; he assumed that it was accepted practice to baptize "Chaldeans" (that is, mummies) who took part in the "Fiery Furnace Play" (*Peshchnoe deïstvo*) a second time in an ice hole (A. Olearii, *Opisanie puteshestviia v Moskoviiu i cherez Moskoviiu v Persiiu i obratno* (St. Petersburg, 1906), 301-303); actually they only bathed in the ice hole, which was called "the Jordan [River]." We may also mention in this connection the ancient practice in the Orthodox Church of sprinkling with water blessed on Epiphany; see A. Neselovskii, *Chiny khitrotesii i khirononii. Opyt istoriko-arkheologicheskogo issledovaniia* (Kamenets-Podol'sk, 1906), 87.
- ²⁵ See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i imperator*, 7-11. Bishop Andrei (Prince Ukhtomskii) wrote in this connection: "Many priests, the most pious ones, after anointment with chrism of newly-baptized children, instead of wiping off the brush with some rag, anointed their own forehead or head with what was left over . . . Well then, may this behavior by devout priests be seen as the sacrament of Chrismation?" See A. Znatov, ed., "Ep. Andrei (Ukhtomskii), 'Istoriia moego starobriadchestva (1926),' *Nash sovremennik*, 1 (2007): 212.
- ²⁶ It is not impossible that the Russians based their practice on the epistle of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Antony IV to Grand Prince Vasiliï (Basil) I of 1393, in which it was emphasized that the Byzantine emperor was the head of all Christians and that he had been anointed with chrism: "He is anointed with the great chrism and elevated to tsar and autocrat of all Romans, that is, all Christians." See *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, prilozhenie no. 40, 271-272; Fr. Miklosich, I. Müller,

eds., *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, 1315-1402* (Darmstadt, 1860-1868), vol. 2, 190, no. 447. This epistle might have been a source of misunderstanding, as anointment with chrism (*pomazanie mirom*) could have been taken to mean Chrismation (*miropomazanie*). True, this epistle was only known in the Greek original; at least, manuscripts with a Russian translation have not been preserved. On the history of the epistle, see D. Obolensky, "A Late Fourteenth-Century Byzantine Diplomat. Michael, Archbishop of Bethlehem," in *Byzance et les Slaves: Études de civilisation: Mélanges Ivan Dujcev* (Paris, 1979), 305-306.

- ²⁷ For example, in: Jean Verpeaux, ed., *Pseudo-Kodinos: Traité des offices* (Paris, 1966), 258; L. Schopen, ed., *Ioannes Cantacuzenos (Ioannis Cantacuzeni historiae libri IV)* (Bonn, 1828-1832), vol. 1, 197; or in Simeon of Thessalonica in J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. CLV, 353-354. See also the anonymous description of the anointment of Emperor Manuel II in 1392 in Jean Verpeaux, ed., *Pseudo-Kodinos*, supplement VI, 354-355.

According to the Byzantine order of enthronement of the emperor from the Medici library the words "Holy, Holy, Holy" were pronounced by the patriarch (and then repeated by the archdeacon and other clergy) directly before the anointment rather than at the moment of anointment. See Kh. Loparev, "K chinu tsarskogo koronavaniia v Vizantii" in *Sbornik statei v chest' Dmitriia Fomicha Kobeko: ot sosluzhivtsev po Imperatorskoi publichnoi biblioteke* (St. Petersburg, 1913), 3, 8. This differs from what other authors report.

- ²⁸ This formula was prescribed by the seventh rule of the I Constantinopolitan (II Ecumenical) Council (of 381). For the history of the text of the formula in the Russian liturgical rite, see: *Russkaia istoricheskaia biboioteka*, vol. VI, 93, no. 6; V. N. Beshenevich, *Drevne-slavianskaia kormchaia. XIV titulov bez tolkovanii* (St. Petersburg, Sofia, 1906-1987), vol. 2, 182, no. 32; A. Almazov, *Istoriia chinoposledovaniia kreshcheniia i miropomazaniia* (Kazan, 1884), 417-418, 422; prilozhenie, 48, 51, 62, 65; E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi* (Moscow, 1917), vol. 2/2, 518; M. Arrants, "Chin oglasheniia i kreshcheniia v Drevnei Rusi," *Simvol* 19 (1988): 89-90; I. Rumiantsev, *Nikita Konstantinov Dobrynin ("Pustosviat")*. *Istoriko-kriticheskii ocherk* (Sergiev Posad, 1916), prilozhenie, 257.

As far as we know, in only one case was anointing as tsar accompanied by other words, and thus formally differing from Chrismation, and that was at the coronation of Catherine I (May 7, 1724), when instead of "The seal and the gift of the Holy Spirit" were pronounced the words: "In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." See *Opisanie koronatsii Ee velichestva imperatritsy, Ekateriny Aleksievny, torzhestvenno otpravlennoi v tsarstvuiushchem grade Moskve 7 maiia 1724 godu* (St. Petersburg, 1724), 14. This may be explained by the fact that Catherine was crowned as the emperor's spouse rather than as ruling empress (which was an unprecedented phenomenon in Russia, and which may be explained by Peter I's western cultural orientation). At the same time, after Peter's death Catherine's coronation was the formal basis for her ascension to the throne on January 28, 1725, which took place without any special rituals. Thus Catherine I's coronation represents an exception, when during a monarch's anointing the rite of Chrismation was not repeated. See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 162-164; Idem, "Liturgicheskii status tsaria v russkoi tserkvi. Priobshchenie k tainam" in B. A. Uspenskii, *Etiudy o russkoi istorii* (St. Petersburg, 2002), 229-278, esp. 238-241.

- ²⁹ St. Simeon of Thessalonica explains that the head alone is anointed because the emperor of Byzantium is the head of all Christians. See J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae*

cursus completis. Series graeca, vol. CLV, 353-354; D. M. Nicol, "Kaisersalbung: The Unction of Emperors in Late Byzantine Coronation Ritual," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 2 (1976): 48-49. Thus here there is a play on the two meanings of "head" (κεφαλή)—the concrete and the abstract. This interpretation is the result of a later reconsideration: historically the anointing of the head during elevation to the kingdom apparently derives from the western Baptismal rite. See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i imperator*, 12.

- ³⁰ E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, xxviii, 8, 63, 87; M. Arranz, "L'aspect ritual de l'onction," 413. In modern times it is also usual to anoint the feet during the sacrament of Chrismation (see K. Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava bogosluzheniia pravoslavnoi tserkvi* (St. Petersburg, 1874), 67), although they did not do this earlier in Russia. See A. Almazov, *Istoriia chinoposledovaniia*, 412-413, 415-416, 418, 420, 423; *prilozhenie*, 48, 51, 62, 65; E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 1/2, 432; vol. 2/1, 73; vol. 2/2, 518; N. Odintsov, *Poriadok obshchestvennogo i chastnogo bogosluzheniia v drevnei Rossii do XVI veka: Tserkovno-istoricheskoe issledovanie* (St. Petersburg, 1881), 76-77, 260-261; "Posledovanie tainstv v tserkvi russkoi v XVI stoletii, po rukopisiam Novgorodskoi-Sofiiskoi i Moskovskoi-Sinodal'noi biblioteki," *Strannik* (1880): 565; Ieromon. Filaret, *Opyt slicheniia tserkovnykh chinoposledovaniia po izlozheniiu tserkovno-bogoslyzhebnykh knig moskovskoi pechati, izdannykh pervymi piat'iu rossiiskimi patriarkhami, s ukazaniem predstavliaemykh simi knigami vazhneishkikh razlichii i nesoglasii v izlozhenii tserkovnykh chinov* (Moscow, 1875), 29-30; *Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka*, vol. VI, 33, 55, no. 2; 93-94 no. 6; V. N. Beshenevich, *Drevne-slavianskaia kormchaia*, vol. 2, 182, no. 32; M. Arranz, "Les Sacrements de l'ancien Euchologe constantinopolitain, VI-IX: L'Illumination de la nuit de pâques," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 1 (1987): 88-89; M. Arrants, "Chin oglasheniia," 89-90. Cf. however: "Chast' 1: Sluzhby kruga sedmichnogo i godichnogo i chinoposledovaniia tainstv. Istoriko-arkheologicheskoe issledovanie," in A. Dmitrievskii, *Bogosluzhenie v russkoi tserkvi v XVI veke* (Kazan, 1884), 294. See also the Old Believers' protest against the anointing of feet in N. Subbotin, ed., *Materialy dlia istorii raskola za pervoe vremia ego sushchestvovaniia, izdavaemye bratstvom sv. Petra mitropolita* (Moscow, 1875-1890), vol. 6, 286, 323; vol. 7, 349; P. S. Smirnov, *Iz istorii raskola pervoi poloviny XVIII veka po neizdannym pamiatnikam* (St. Petersburg, 1908), 201. Still, generally speaking anointing feet is a very ancient tradition. See, in particular, F. C. Conybeare, ed., *Rituale Armenorum* (Oxford, 1905), 98. In general, the ritual of anointing was not stable (see M. Arrants, *Kreshchenie i miropomazanie: Tainstva Vizantiiskogo Evkhologiiia* (Rome, 1998), 153-154), and this could affect the ritual of anointing as tsar.

In this connection, we note that when Aleksei was enthroned as tsar (on September 28, 1645), the patriarch also anointed his beard and under his beard with holy chrism. See: *Drevniaia Rossiiskaia Vivliofika*, part 7, 290; Arhimandrit Leonid (Kavelin), ed., "Chin postavleniia na tsarstvo tsaria i velikogo kniazia Alekseia Mikhailovicha," *Obshchestvo ljubitelei drevnei pis'mennosti, Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti* 7 (1882): 32; E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, xxxi-xxxii; N. Pokrovskii, "Chin koronovaniia gosudarei v ego istorii," *Tserkovnyi vestnik* 19 (1896): 607; E. Karnovich, "Koronovanie gosudarei," *Russkii arkhiv: Russkii istoricheskii zhurnal* 1 (1990): 50. This was conditioned by the special attitude toward beards, which were generally accorded sacred status. See B. A. Uspenskii, *Filologicheskie razyskaniia v oblasti slavianskikh drevnostei (Relikty iazychestva v vostochnoslavianskom ku'te Nikolaia Mirlikiiskogo)* (Moscow, 1982), 173-175. A case is known of daubing boys' chins with chrism when performing Chrismation.

See Kh. Ia. Nikiforovskii, *Prostonarodnye primety i pover`ia, suevernye obriady i obychai, legendarnye skazaniia o litsah i mestakh v Vitebskoi Belorussii* (Vitebsk, 1897), 21, no. 136; this practice might possibly have influenced the rite of the tsar's enthronement. The special attitude toward the beard might have been supported in this case by the words of the Psalter about the myrrh that streamed from Aaron's head onto his beard (Psalm 132: 2 [133:2]). See also St. Augustine's commentary on this passage: "In capite ipsius unguentum, quia totus Christus cum Ecclesia: sed a capite venit unguentum. Caput nostrum Christus est: crucifixum et sepultum resuscitatum ascendit in coelum; et venit Spiritus Sanctus a capite. Quo? Ad barbam. Barba significat fortes; barba significat iuvenes strenuos, imprigros, alacres" (J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series latina*, vol. XXXVII, 1733), and also a thirteenth century lyric: "Unguentum in capite quod descendit in barbam, barbam Aaron, quod descendit in oram vestimenti eius, mandavit dominus benedictionem in seculum" (E. Lodi, "Enchiridion euchologicum fontium liturgicorum," *Bibliotheca "Ephemerides liturgicae"* 15 (1979): 1678, no. 3349b).

³¹ See A. Almazov, *Istoriia chinoposledovaniia*, 470f; K. Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava*, 676; N. Odintsov, "Posledovanie tainstv," 571; Idem, *Poriadok obshchestvennogo i chastnogo bogoslužheniia*, 83, 152; A. Dmitrievskii, *Bogoslužhenie v russkoi tserkvi*, 307. On an analogous custom among the Greeks, see, in particular, Simeon of Thessalonica in J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. CLV, 235-236. As Amalarius of Metz testifies, the same thing took place in the Western church at one time. See: I. M. Hanssens, ed., "Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia," *Studi e testi* 2 (1949): 186; J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series latina*, vol. CV, 1070; N. Odintsov, *Poriadok obshchestvennogo i chastnogo bogoslužheniia*, 79-80.

³² See: E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, 63, 87-88, 96; P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, eds., *L'idea di Roma*, 92, 118; *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofka*, part VII, 31, 291-292, 360, 465; *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii. Sobranie pervoe* (St. Petersburg, 1830), vol. 2, 64, no. 648; 435, no. 931; *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, part II, 83-84, no. 51; part 3, 85, no. 16; Arhimandrit Leonid (Kavelin), ed., "Chin postavlennii na tsarstvo," 32-33; A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov`*, prilozhenie 2, 122; RNB, Dukh. akad., d. 27, l. 64.

M. Arranz suggests that these special features of the Russian ritual of anointing as tsar were determined by the fact that Metropolitan Makarii did not consider himself comparable to the patriarch of Constantinople, who alone was invested with the appropriate divine authority. See M. Arranz, "L'aspect rituel de l'onction," 415; Idem, *Istoriicheskie zametki o chinoposledovaniiaikh tainstv po rukopisiam Grecheskogo Evkhologiiia. Leningradskaia dukhovnaia Akademiia, 3-i kurs* (Rome, 1979), 67. We find a different explanation in A. Kniazeff, who is inclined to think that here the tendency was felt to repeat especially important rituals, something which the author feels was characteristic of Russians. (See A. Kniazeff, "Les rites d'intronisation," 157.) It is impossible to agree with either explanation; see our discussion of the question of a special cheirotonia (*khirotoniia*, placing of hands) by Russian metropolitans and patriarchs which Kniazeff mentions in B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 30-107.

³³ Isaiah 6:3.

³⁴ In the prayer which the patriarch of Constantinople pronounced during the emperor's enthronement (which begins with the words "Lord, Our God! To the Tsar ruling and

the Lord reigning" [*Tsariu tsarstvuiushchim i Gospod` gospodstvuiushchim*] in the Slavonic translation), King David's anointment is mentioned ("Lord, our God . . . for Samuel the prophet chose his slave David and anointed him king [*tsar`*] over his people Israel . . ."), and so David thus turns out to be prototype of the crowned emperor. See M. Arranz, "Couronnement royal," 127. As Simeon of Thessalonica and several other sources attest, it was precisely after this prayer that anointment took place in Byzantium. See: J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. CLV, 353-354; Kh. Loparev, "K chinu tsarskogo koronavaniia," 3, 8; M. Arranz, "L'aspect rituel de l'onction," 413; A. Kniazeff, "Les rites d'intronisation," 155. For the Greek text of this prayer, see E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, 27-28. Cf. in this context the perception of the monarch as "new David" which was typical for both Byzantium and for the Medieval West. See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i imperator*, 4, 60n41. This prayer also became part of the Muscovite order of service for elevation to the throne, although there it preceded the actual ceremony of enthronement and was not directly connected to the anointment. See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 137; in particular, we find it in the offices of enthronement of Dmitrii Ivanovich in 1498 (see *Russkii feodal`nyi arhiv*, vyp. 3, 610, 616, 622, no. 6-18; *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. XII, 247), and then of Ivan IV in 1547 (see *Ibid.*, vol. XIII/1, 150; vol. XIII/2, 451-452), although neither was anointed as tsar or Grand Prince.

³⁵ Acts 10:38. According to St. Simeon of Thessalonica's interpretation, in Byzantium anointment was administered on behalf of Christ: a cross was made on the emperor's head using chrism because "Christ himself anoints the basileus, protecting him with his cross from failures, giving him power and making him the head." See J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. CLV, 353-354; and the Slavonic translation by Evfimii of Chudov in RNB, Dukh. akad., d. 27, l. 28 verso; BAN, f. 32.5.12, l. 20; f. 32.4.19, l. 69 verso; also see in this connection M. Arranz, "Couronnement royal," 125. Hence the idea of anointment turns out to be significantly different in Byzantium and Russia; if in Byzantium Christ anoints the tsar (basileus), in Russia the tsar resembles Christ as a result of his anointment.

In this connection, the polemic between Patriarch Nikon and the Metropolitan of Gaza Paisios Ligarides in 1664 is curious. Ligarides taught that the tsar is anointed by God, according to the Greek tradition, but Nikon countered: "If you say that the tsar went to the altar because he is anointed by God, you are lying. He is anointed through the hierarch [i.e. patriarch] as tsar." See V. A. Tumins, G. Vernadsky, eds., *Patriarch Nikon on Church and State: Nikon's "Refutation"* [*Vozrazhenie ili razorenie smirennago Nikona, Bozhieiu milostiiu patriarkha, protivno voprosov boiarina Simeona Streshneva, ezhe napisa Gazskomu mitropolitu Paisiiu Likaridiusu i na otvety Paisiovy, 1664 g.*] (Berlin; New York: Mouton, 1982), 621-622; V. K-v, "Vzgliad Nikona na znachenie patriarshei vlasti," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia* 212 (1880): 243n2. On this polemic, see B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 158-159; B. A. Uspenskii, "Liturgicheskii status tsaria v russkoi tserkvi. Priobshchenie sv. tainam," *Uchenye zapiski. Rossiiskii pravoslavnyi universitet ap. Ioanna Bogoslova* 2 (1996): 235-236.

³⁶ This observation belongs to S. Averintsev (oral communication). On the perception of unjust tsars in Russia, see: B. A. Uspenskii, "Historia sub specie semioticae" in *Kul`turnoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: Istoki, stanovlenie, traditsii* (Moscow, 1976), 286-292 (on Peter I); Idem, "Tsar and Pretender: *Samozvanchestvo* or Royal Imposture in Russia as a Cultural-Historical Phenomenon" in this volume, 115 (on the False Dmitrii);

- A. M. Panchenko, B. A. Uspenskii, "Ivan Groznyi i Petr Velikii: kontseptsii pervogo monarkha," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* XXXVII (1983): 54-78 (on Ivan IV).
- ³⁷ See in this connection B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 136-143. In Russia the so-called cap of Monomakh served as the tsar's crown; see B. A. Uspenskii, "Vospriiatie istorii v Drevnei Rusi i doktrina 'Moskva—tretii Rim'" in *Russkoe podvizhnichestvo. Sbornik statei k 90-letiiu D. S. Likhacheva* (Moscow, 1996), 468-469, 480-483, notes 11-24.
- ³⁸ E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, 63, 87; P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, eds., *L'idea di Roma*, 92, 118; *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, part II, 83, no. 51; part III, 85, no. 16; Arhimandrit Leonid (Kavelin), ed., "Chin postavleniia na tsarstvo," 32-33; A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov'*, prilozhenie, 122.
- ³⁹ See A. Kniazeff, "Les rites d'intronisation," 159.
- ⁴⁰ In the "Royal Book," which contains the Chronicle Edition of the order of service for Ivan IV's elevation to the kingdom, there is an editor's note written in *skoropis`* script that indicates the necessity of making reference to anointment. Here we read: "In the liturgy after the Cherubims' song anointment with oil, after 'She is worthy,' anointment with chrism, and just then write Eucharist" (*Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, vol. XIII/2, i452n1). Hence anointing with chrism, according to this source, is performed not immediately before communion (as it is prescribed in the Formulary Edition and as it was subsequently practiced) but right after the presentation of the Gifts. This note obviously reflects the process of working out the future order of enthronement as tsar; it is posited that the editorial corrections to the chronicle belong to the 1570's. See Ia.N. Shchapov, "K izucheniiu 'China venchaniia na tsarstvo,'" 215. It is curious that according to this source anointment is performed at the time when it was customary to ordain deacons (see K. Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava bogoslužheniia*, 433-436, 706), which generally speaking correlates to the understanding of the liturgical status of the Byzantine emperor. See in this connection B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 156; B. A. Uspenskii, "Liturgicheskii status tsaria," 233. Nonetheless, this order of service was not adopted, which is also quite indicative.
- ⁴¹ See B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 144-150.
- ⁴² In the description of Ivan IV's enthronement as tsar, composed after the fact (i.e., after he had already become tsar), we read: "This very Tsar's place, which is the throne, was built in the year 7060 [1552], on the first day of September, in the fifth year of his power, kingdom, and governance." See I. Zabelin, "Arkheologicheskaiia nakhodka," 55. The fact that the tsar's throne in the Cathedral of the Dormition was established on the first day of the new year may be significant.
- ⁴³ The equation of these two thrones was manifested very eloquently in Emel'ian Pugachev's behavior. After seizing a city he went to the cathedral, went into the altar through the tsar's gates, and sat on the throne. See B. A. Uspenskii, "Liturgicheskii status tsaria," 274n44. At the same time this kind of association may also be traced in more well-educated circles, for example, that of Bishop Innokentii Borisov: "Why do our most devout sovereigns ascend the throne? . . . For the peoples too there must be a continuous Tabor on which the will of the heavenly lawgiver can be discerned, where the light of God's glory is reflected on the face of the crowned representatives of the people. This Sinai, this Tabor—is the tsar's throne." See B. A. Uspenskii, V. M. Zhivov, "Tsar` and God. Semiotic Aspects of the Sacralization of the Monarch in Russia" in this volume, 77. The word "throne" (*prestol*) goes back to the Slavonic Bible; see on King Solomon: "And the king created a throne [*prestol*] . . ." (1 Kings 10:18).

- ⁴⁴ See the address to the tsar in the Formulary Edition of the order of service for the enthronement of Ivan IV (which, as already noted, had been composed after Ivan had already become tsar, and which defined the order for all later enthronements): “Lord Holy Divinely-Crowned Tsar, the holy patriarch summons you, or the most holy metropolitan, your father, with the entire holy council, to anointing with holy and great chrism, and to communing with the holy and life-giving, divine sacraments of Christ.” See E. V. Barsov, *Drevnerusskie pamiatniki*, 62, 86; P. Catalano, V. T. Pašuto, eds., *L’idea di Roma*, 91. The same salutation of the tsar as “holy” is also met in the order of service for the enthronement of Fedor Ivanovich (Ibid., 118; *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, part 2, 83, no. 51; A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov’*, prilozhenie 2, 121), as well as in that of Mikhail Fedorovich (*Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov*, part 3, 84, no.16) and of Aleksei Mikhailovich (*Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofka*, part VII, 288, 291, 31). However, this address is absent in the order of service for Boris Godunov’s elevation to the kingdom (*Dopolneniia k Aktam istoricheskim*, vol. 1, 247, no.145), as well in that of Fedor Alekseevich (*Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofka*, part VII, 357; *Polnoe sobranie zakonov*, vol. II, 63, no. 648) and that of Ivan Alekseevich and Peter Alekseevich (*Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofka*, part VII 7, 462; *Polnoe sobranie zakonov*, vol. II, 434, no. 931). See also: V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevsy*, 151n3, 153; B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, “Tsar and God,” in this volume, 14.

The form of address “lord” (*gospodi*) is also noteworthy in relation to the tsar, as apparently juxtaposed in the given context to the form “*gospodine*,” which was usual in addressing simple mortals. While “*gospdine*” represented the vocative form of “*gospodin*,” “*gospodi*” was the vocative of “*gospod*.” In the order of service for Boris Godunov’s enthronement we find the form “*gosudar*.” See *Dopolneniia k Aktam istoricheskim*, vol. 1, 247, no. 145. The same form of address is used in Patriarch Nikon’s epistle to the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Dionisios in 1665. See E. Matthes-Hohlfeld, “Der Brief des Moskauer Patriarchen Nikon an Dionysios, Patriarch von Konstantinopel (1665). Textausgabe und sprachliche Beschreibung von zwei bisher nicht veröffentlichten Handschriften,” *Bibliotheca Slavonica* 3 (1970): 285.

- ⁴⁵ Theophanes Continuatus (III, 10) relates how Emperor Michael II (820-829) ordered that he not be called “holy,” insofar as “he took it into his head that this word could only apply to God”; the writer found this incorrect. See I. Bekker, ed., *Theophanes Continuatus, Ioannes Cameniata, Symeon Magister, Georgius Monachus* (Bonn, 1838), 99; Ia. N. Liubarskii, ed., *Prodolzhatel’ Feofana. Zhizneopisaniia vizantiiskih tsarei*, (St. Petersburg, 1992), 46.

- ⁴⁶ See: B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, “Tsar and God,” in this volume, 23-24. A. Ia. Shpakov, *Gosudarstvo i tserkov’*, prilozhenie 2, 120-121. After the introduction of anointment into the Byzantine enthronement rite the epithet “holy” as applied to the emperor was associated with the exclamation “Holy, holy, holy,” that was pronounced during the royal anointment in Byzantium; in any case, the epithet was connected with the special status of the emperor as the anointed one. In the words of Simeon of Thessalonica, “the pious emperor is holy through anointment, and the high priest is holy through the laying on of hands” (J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. CLV, 431-432); in another place Simeon says that the exclamation “*agios*” while anointing as emperor signifies that the emperor “is made holy by the Holy Spirit and dedicated by Christ as the emperor of the sanctified” (Ibid., 353-354). At the same time, Makarios of Ancyra, an author of the fourteenth-fifteenth century, asserts that “the emperor, the Lord’s anointed, is holy through anointment and belongs to the

clergy . . . [He] is a hierarch, priest and teacher of the faith" (*Leonis Allatii de ecclesiae occidentalis atque orientalis perpetua consensione, libri tres* (Cologne, 1648), 219, s.1., 1970; V. Savva, *Moskovskie tsari i vizantiiskie vasilevsky*, 65). In Balsamon's opinion it was precisely the anointment of emperors that made them equal to clergymen, giving them the right to approach the altar, use the thurible, burn incense like priests, bless with the triple-branched candlestick like hierarchs, and, finally, to teach the faith (See *Ibid.*, 73-74; J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completis. Series graeca*, vol. CXXXVII, 751-754; vol. CXIX, 1165-1166). Pachymeres cites a characteristic episode when Patriarch Joseph I (1267-1275) composed his testament; he didn't call Emperor Michael Paleologus ἅγιος, as it was accepted for emperors who had been anointed with chrism. It turned out that this word had actually been in the original text of the testament but was later left out by monastic copyists who considered it blasphemous in reference to the emperor, whom they considered a heretic. See: I. Bekker, ed., *Georgii Pachymeris de Michaele et Andronico Paleologis libri tredecim* (Bonn, 1835), vol. 1, 507; A. Failler, ed., "Georges Pachymères. Relation historique," *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae* 24/2 (1984): 639-639; Georgii Pakhimer, *Istoriia o Mihaile i Andronike Paleologakh* (St. Petersburg, 1862), vol. 1, 468; D. M. Nicol, "Kaisersalbung," 46-47; I. E. Troitskii, *Arsenii, patriarkh Nikeiskii i Konstantinopol'skii, i arsenity. K istorii vostochnoi tserkvi v XIII veke* (St. Petersburg, 1873), 190.

Thus both in Byzantium and in Russia the epithet "holy" in relation to the tsar (emperor) was associated with anointing, although in Byzantium it was associated with the exclamation "Holy, holy, holy," while in Russia it was understood through its connection to the exclamation "Holy to the holies."

⁴⁷ See: B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar` i patriarkh*, 151f; *Idem.*, *Tsar` i imperator*, 232f.

⁴⁸ B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, "Tsar and God," in this volume, 10-11.

⁴⁹ P. Vozdvizhenskii, *Sviashchennoe koronovanie i venchanie na tsarstvo russkikh gosudarei s drevneishikh vremen i do nashikh dnei* (St. Petersburg, Moscow, 1896), 3; K. Nikol'skii, *Anafematstvovanie (otluchenie ot tserkvi), sovershaemoe v pervuiu nedeliu Velikogo posta: Istoricheskoe issledovanie o chine Pravoslavii* (St. Petersburg, 1879), 263. This order of service was compiled in 1766 (*Ibid.*, 49-50); the corresponding exclamation was repealed by decision of the All-Russian Orthodox Council (*Pomestnyi Sobor*) of 1917-1918 (A. G. Kravetskii, "Diskussii o tserkovnoslavianskom iazyke (1917-1943)," *Slavianovedenie*, 5 (1993): 124). On the eighteenth-century sacralization of the monarch in general, see B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, "Tsar and God," in this volume, 1-112.

⁵⁰ "Obzor tserkovnykh postanovlenii o Kreshchenii i Miropomazanii," *Pravoslavnyi sobesednik*, February (1859): 179-180.

⁵¹ Archbishop Ignatii (Semenov), *O tainstvakh edinoin, sviatoi, sobornoii i apostol'skoi Tserkvi: Opyt arkhelogicheskii* (St. Petersburg, 1849), 143.

⁵² Mitr. Makarii (Bulgakov), *Pravoslavno-dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie* (St. Petersburg, 1895-1905), vol. 2, 360-361; see also K. Nikol'skii, *Posobie k izucheniiu ustava bogoslužheniia*, 686; *Sviashchennoe miropomazanie russkikh Gosudarei i ego znachenie* (Moscow, 1896), 2-3.

⁵³ S. V. Bulgakov, *Nastol'naiia kniga dlia sviashchenno-tserkovno-sluzhitelei: Sbornik svedenii, kasaiushchikhsia preimushchestvenno prakticheskoi deiatel'nosti otechestvennogo dukhovenstva* (Moscow, 1913; 1993), 995n1; P. Lebedev, *Nauka o bogoslužhenii Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi* (Moscow, 1890), part 2, 138.

⁵⁴ S. Pospelov, *Rassuzhdenie o tainstve Miropomazaniia* (Moscow, 1840), 58-59.

⁵⁵ N. Suvorov, *Kurs tserkovnogo prava* (Iaroslavl', 1890), vol. 2, 27.

- ⁵⁶ Ibid., 26. The author accompanies this argument with the following remarkable comment: “Meanwhile, every bishop, at the very moment of his consecration, is clear about the existence of the supreme power that determines his juridical limits and communicates legal authority. The consecrated hears the royal decree announcing that the sovereign *orders* and the Holy Synod blesses him to be a bishop, that is, to exercise those spiritual gifts that are created by his dedication as bishop, within particular juridical bounds, while the consecrated person ‘thanks, accepts, and does not demur.’ And the members of the Holy Synod (which title is also granted to them at the will of the sovereign) upon their entry into this supreme central ruling establishment *swear an oath* to recognize ‘the monarch of all Russia, our all-gracious sovereign, as the ultimate judge of the spiritual college’” (Ibid.). From Suworov’s point of view, the Synodal administration embodies the essence of the Orthodox tradition. See in this connection, B. A. Uspenskij, V. M. Zhivov, “Tsar and God,” in this volume, 22.
- ⁵⁷ N. Suworov, *Kurs tserkovnogo prava*, vol. 2, 28. A. M. Loviagin literally says the same thing: “According to the teaching of Orthodox theologians, anointment, which accompanies coronation, is a special sacrament: the tsar is not consecrated into the religious hierarchy as it was with the Byzantine emperor, and does not take on the power to perform and teach in church, but receives strength and high wisdom in order to carry out the highest administrative power in both state and Church” (A. M. Loviagin, “Koronatsiia ili koronovanie” in F. A. Brokgauz, I. A. Efron, eds., *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar`* (St. Petersburg, 1895), vol. 16, 320-321). Compare with this the accusation against the Russian Church by representatives of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Church: “The Muscovite hierarchy established a number of imperial (tsarist) holidays and ‘services’ and punished those priests who didn’t carry out the emperor’s cult by defrocking them. It [the Muscovite hierarchy] even introduced a completely new sacrament of ‘Chrismation’ to the tsardom that went against the Christian faith” (V. Chekhovskii, *Za tserkvu, Khristovu gromadu, proti tsarstva ĭ mi* (Frankfurt on Main, 1947), 8). The author says approximately the same thing as N. S. Suworov and A. M. Loviagin: that the anointment of the monarch has the character of a special sacrament in the Russian Church, even though they give the given idea completely opposite evaluations.
- ⁵⁸ G. Olšr, “La Chiesa e lo Stato nel cerimoniale d’incoronazione degli ultimi sovrani Rurikidi,” *Orientalia christiana periodica*, 3-4 (1950): 296. The author is not fully accurate in the description of the tsar’s communion. On this see: B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar ` i patriarkh*, 151-186; Idem., “Liturgicheskii status tsaria,” 229-278.
- ⁵⁹ A. Znatov. ed., “Ep. Andrei (Ukhtomskii),” 213.