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ABSTRACT

The Transfigured Kingdom:
Sacred Parody and Charismatic Authority
at the Court of Peter the Great, 1682-1725

Ernest Alexander Zitser
Advisor: Professor Richard S. Wortman

This dissertation explores the connection between religion, spectacle, and institution-building at the court of Peter I “The Great” (1682-1725). It seeks to explain why the monarch who has been credited with single-handedly creating modern Russia routinely took part in carnivalesque ceremonies parodying the rituals of both Church and State. Analyzing previously unpublished archival materials, I demonstrate that the tsar and his close political advisors used Muscovite royal amusements in order to create a counter-cultural play-world centered first in the suburban royal estate of New Transfiguration and subsequently in the new imperial capital of St. Petersburg. The monarchical rites associated with this imaginary, and ever-expanding Transfigured Kingdom, elevated the tsar’s persona above internal court factions and clan politics, guaranteed his prerogatives over ecclesiastical affairs, and bound his “company” into an ecumenical community of believers in his divine gift of grace. By implicating this “royal priesthood” (1 Peter 2: 9) in taboo-breaking, libertine ceremonies, the tsar and his advisors thus inducted select members of the Muscovite elite into a new order of distinctions between nobility and baseness, sacrality and profanity, tradition and modernity, challenging them to confront, internalize, and implement the new charismatic scenario of power. In this view, the modernization of the army, state, and ecclesiastical administration derived its rationale and purpose from the attempt to
transfigure the realm in accordance with the ideal image of the Kingdom of God and the contemporary example of “well-ordered” Christian monarchies.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**INTRODUCTION**

The Keys to the Kingdom: Sacral Kingship and "Sacred Parody" at the Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Court 1

**PART I: THE TRANSFIGURED KINGDOM**

**CHAPTER ONE**

*Kinsmen:*
Royal Charisma and Family Honor During the Naryshkin Restoration 55

**CHAPTER TWO**

*Cavaliers:*
War Games, Word Games and the Origins of the Transfigured Kingdom 111

**CHAPTER THREE**

*Apostles:*
Unholy Knights, Holy Orders and the Apotheosis of the "Great Skipper" 177

**PART II: THE KINGDOM TRANSFIGURED**

**CHAPTER FOUR**

*Jesters:*
Matrimonial Parodies and the Petrine Civilizing Process 233

**CHAPTER FIVE**

*Sons:*
Orthodox Imperial Reform and the Legacy of the Transfigured Kingdom 296

**CONCLUSION**

"And the Last Shall Be First": The 'Fledglings of Peter's Nest' and the Persistence of Royal Charisma 361
BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX
# List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AN</td>
<td>Academy of Sciences (<em>Akademija nauk</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch.</td>
<td>Archival section (<em>chast’</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed. khr.</td>
<td>Archival storage unit (<em>edinitsa khraneniiia</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Archival fond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol.</td>
<td>Manuscript folio(s) (<em>listy</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infra</td>
<td>Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRLI</td>
<td>Institut russkoi literature (<em>Pushkinskii Dom</em>) Rossiiskoi AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koll.</td>
<td>Archival collection (<em>kollektiiia</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Leningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS(S)</td>
<td>Manuscript(s) (<em>[sbornaia] rukopis’</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Novosibirsk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Archival book number (<em>kniga</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otd.</td>
<td>Archival division (<em>otdelenie</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op.</td>
<td>Archival description (<em>opis’</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGADA</td>
<td>Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGAVMF</td>
<td>Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv voenno-morskogo flota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGIA</td>
<td>Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGVIA</td>
<td>Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi voenno-istoricheskii arkhiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO BAN</td>
<td>Biblioteka Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk, Rukopisnyi otdel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO RNB</td>
<td>Rossiiskaia nacional’naia biblioteka, Rukopisnyi otdel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPb.</td>
<td>Saint-Petersburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPb. F IRI RAN</td>
<td>Sankt-Peterburgskii filial Instituta russkoi istorii Rossiiskoi AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supra</td>
<td>Above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledging everyone who contributed to the writing of this dissertation is the most pleasant academic requirement of my entire graduate career. It is also the most daunting. There are so many people to thank, and so many debts to repay, that despite all my best efforts, this brief note of recognition cannot truly do justice to all of them. Nevertheless, I must single out a few individuals and organizations, without whom my work would not have been possible. My year-long research trip to Moscow and St. Petersburg was quite literally made possible through the generous support of the Individual Advanced Research Opportunities in Eurasia (IARO) Program of the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX). Financial support during the write-up stage was provided by the Eurasia Program Dissertation Fellowship of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), the Josephine De Kármán Foundation Fellowship, and the Junior Fellowship of the Harriman Institute at Columbia University.

It also gives me great pleasure to thank my academic advisor, Richard S. Wortman, and the other members of my orals, proposal, and dissertation defense committees: Leopold Haimson, Mark Von Hagen, J. W. Smit, Irina Reyfman, and Robert Crummey. From the very beginning of my graduate career at Columbia University, Professors Haimson and Von Hagen have been enthusiastic supporters of my research project and have freely shared their excitement for the study of all things Russian. As both teachers and scholars, they have created the perfect forum in which I could pursue my academic interests, wherever they may lead. In the best traditions of
the Columbia history and Slavic literature departments, Professors Smit and Reyfman have continuously challenged me to be more comparative and to think broader, and I thank them for their careful reading and incisive critique of my work. Professor Crummey's seminar first sparked my interest in pre-Petrine Russia and his encouragement remains an important source of intellectual combustion. But perhaps my greatest debt is to Professor Wortman, who has never questioned the need for yet another book on Peter the Great, and who has been a constant source of inspiration, instruction, and guidance.

During the course of this project, I have also had the great honor to make the acquaintance of several individuals, whose comments, tips, and suggestions have shaped the direction of my research. In particular, I must single out the input of Marc Raeff, who has generously shared both his time and his immense erudition from the very beginning of my foray into Petrine history. I would also like to thank Professors Eve Levin, James Cracraft, Lindsey Hughes, and Dr. Paul Hollingsworth, all of whom graciously offered useful advice, shared evidence, and exchanged valuable information, and who left an indelible imprint on the final product.

This thesis would have never seen the light of day without the moral (and emotional) support of my friends and colleagues: Bob Crews, Margaret Sena, Rebecca Balmas-Neary, Maia Rigas, Nigel Raab, Chuck Steinwedel, Mark Miller, Avi Matalon, Fred Stern, Galina and Anna Temkina, Cynthia Hooper, Nancy Sinkoff, and Brian Weiser. Their good humor and sober common sense put to rest the myth of the solitary dissertation-writer. Together with my family, Alex and Lora Zitser, Leo, Mark and Diane Goldenberg, and my in-laws, Greg, Tanya, and Paul Litvak, they gave me the
confidence to accomplish whatever I wanted, the courage to try, and the freedom to succeed.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Olga, who knows how hard the road has been and who has made it so fun to travel.
INTRODUCTION

The Keys to the Kingdom:
Sacral Kingship and "Sacred Parody"
at the Seventeenth-Century Muscovite Court

Long before he was executed for treason by the Roman imperial authorities, Jesus of Nazareth, the charismatic leader of a small, millenarian, Jewish sect, entrusted the task of propagating his subversive political message – namely, that he himself was the long-awaited Messiah (Heb. "anointed one"; Gr. *christos*) of the House of David, who had come to liberate his people and to institute the Kingdom of God on earth – to a fisherman named Simon son of Jonah.¹ Despite the fact that many of the other disciples had about as much right to the position as Simon, Jesus imperiously overrode all claims based on precedence or genealogy – a fact that he brought home by ignoring the candidacy of Simon’s own brother, Andrew, who had been the first to accept the message of the Nazarene teacher (John 1:40-42).² In order to signal the important new role that he was to play within Jesus’ entourage, and, by extension, in the world to


² On St. Andrew “The First-Called” (*pervozvannyi*) as the patron saint of Russia, see *infra*, Chapter Three.
come. Simon son of Jonah ceremoniously adopted a new name, very soon after his own conversion. The nickname by which he was now to be addressed by the rest of the apostles — “The Rock” (Aram. Cephus; Gr. Petros) — evoked his position as the cornerstone of the brotherhood of believers in Jesus’ divine gift of “grace” (Gr. charisma). During a memorable meeting of his followers, Jesus confirmed this new position by questioning, and then blessing, Simon-Peter as his most faithful disciple. Punning on Simon’s “Christian” name, Jesus publicly proclaimed that “on this rock (Aram. kepha; Gr. petra), I will build my church, and the gates of Hades will not prevail against it.” After promising to give Peter “the keys of the kingdom of heaven” (Matthew 16: 19-20), Jesus concluded this private political rally by “sternly” enjoining his followers to secrecy, hard work, and self-abnegation, for the sake of their common goal — the transfiguration of the world as they knew it.3

The secret ceremony during which Peter was proclaimed leader of “The Twelve,” as Jesus’ new council of church elders came to be called (Luke 9:1-3), prepared the disciples to experience a manifestation of the sacred (Gr. hierophany) and to witness a physical demonstration of their teacher’s divinity.

Six days later, Jesus took with him Peter and James and his brother [John] and led them up a high mountain, by themselves [to pray]. And [while Jesus was praying] he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his clothes became dazzling white. Suddenly, there appeared to them Moses

---

3 Acutely aware of the rhetorical power of paradoxical assertions, Jesus concluded by arguing that “those who want to save their life will lose it, and those who lose their life for my sake will save it [...] Those who are ashamed of me and of my words, of them the Son of Man will be ashamed when he comes in his glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels.” Jesus ended this pep-talk by warning his followers about the imminent realization of the kingdom of God on earth and stipulated that anyone who wanted to follow him “had to deny [himself] and take up [his] cross daily [...]” (Luke 9:23-27).
and [the Prophet] Elijah, talking with him [about the radical "departure," which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem]. Then Peter said to Jesus, "Master, it is good for us to be here; if you wish, we will make three dwellings [or tents] here, one for you, one for Moses, and one for Elijah." While he was still speaking, suddenly a bright cloud overshadowed them, and from the cloud a voice said, "This is my Son, the Beloved; and with him I am well pleased; listen to him!" When the disciples heard this [divine command], they fell to the ground and were overcome with fear. But Jesus came and touched them, saying, "Get up and do not be afraid." And when they looked up, they saw no one except Jesus himself alone (Matthew 17: 1-8; cf. Mark 9:2-8; Luke 9:28-36).

As they were coming down from the mountain, Jesus offered his own interpretation of the disciples' ecstatic religious experience (Matthew 16:9-13).⁴ According to this exegesis, Peter, James, and John were among a select group of people, who had come to realize that the Mosaic law, which had bound the scriptural community of the Israelites ever since the covenant at Mt. Sinai, had finally been superceded by a new dispensation. This dispensation had been heralded by the prophecies of John the Baptist, who appeared, like a new Elijah, to trumpet the "good news" (Gr. euangelos) about Jesus and the coming kingdom of God. By their induction into the mystery of the Transfiguration, therefore, the disciples demonstrated first, that they were the only ones among the present, corrupt generation, to understand the divine pedigree of their humble teacher; and second, that this secret knowledge formed the basis of their self-

---

⁴ On the mystical significance of the ascent to the top of a mountain, the paradigmatic site of personal communion with the divine since Moses' encounter with God on Mt. Sinai, see Vladimir Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church, trans. by the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius (London, 1957), 27-28, 34-36, 41.
conception as an “antinomian” spiritual elite,\(^5\) empowered by God Himself to perform miracles and to commit redemptive “strange acts.”\(^6\)

Almost seventeen hundred years later, on the other side of the globe, a group of religious reformers around another Peter, embarked upon the path marked out by the apostles’ radical critique of the corrupt, hypocritical, and unregenerate world of their fathers.\(^7\) Unlike his Near Eastern namesake, however, the leader of this reform movement was not the disciple of a self-proclaimed Jewish messiah but the youngest

---

\(^5\) Here, as throughout the dissertation, I employ the term “antinomianism” to designate the behavior (and self-understanding) of those actors, who believe that their special, religious qualities allow them to transgress “against” (Gr. ant) the established moral, political, or religious “law” (Gr. nomos) of the community in which they live. For a sociological definition of religious “antinomianism,” see Stephen Sharot, “The Sacredness of Sin: Antinomianism and Models of Man,” *Religion* 13 (1983), 37-54. On religious antinomianism in early modern Europe, see the classic, historical studies of Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages*, rev. and exp. ed. (Oxford and London, 1970); and Gershon Scholem, *Sabbatai Sevi: The Mystical Messiah*, trans. by R. J. Zwi Werblinsky (Princeton, 1973). Although no comparable studies exist for early modern Russia, see the historical literature about Orthodox “fools-in-Christ” (Rus. iuridivye), who transgress the communal boundaries between the sacred and the profane, in order “to awaken the indifferent to eternal truths” by the “shock value” of their “performance, which is essentially a reenactment of Christ’s walk with the cross,” see Lossky, *op. cit.*, 19-20; George P. Fedotov, “The Holy Fools,” in *The Russian Religious Mind, II: The Middle Ages. The 13th to the 15th Centuries* [The Collected Works of George P. Fedotov, vol. 4] (Belmont, MA., 1975), ch. 12; and A. M. Panchenko; “Smekh kak zrelisheche,” in D. S. Likhachev *et. al.*, *Smekh v drevnet Rasi* [Hereafter. Likhachev. Smekh,] (L., 1984), 72-153; and Richard W. F. Pope, “Fools and Folly in Old Russia,” *Slavic Review* 39:3 (1980), 476-481, esp. 479.


\(^7\) The fact that the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich was christened Peter – even though he was not born on the name-day of SS. Peter and Paul (June 29), but of St. Isaac of Dalmatia (30 May) – demonstrates that the tsar and his new (Naryshkin) in-laws hoped that this young royal heir would serve as the “bed-rock” on which the future imperial glory of the Romanov dynasty would rest. See the poem on the birth of tsar Peter Alekseevich by Simeon of Polotsk, in *Izbrannye sochineniya*, ed. by I. P. Eremin (M., 1953), 7-8. 15. excerpted and trans. by Serge A. Zenkovsky, *Medieval Russia’s Epics, Chronicles, and Tales* (NY, 1974), 517-518. On naming practices at the seventeenth-century Muscovite court, see Elizabeth Kristovich Zelensky, “‘Sophia the Wisdom of God’ as a Rhetorical Device During the Regency of Sof'ia Alekseevna, 1682-1689” (Ph.D. thesis, Georgetown University, 1992), 203-205; and E. F. Shmurlo, “V chest’ kakogo sviatogo Petr Velikii poluchil svoe imia,” *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshchenia* 330 (July 1900), 209-222, esp. 211-212.
son of the Orthodox Christian “tsar of All the Russias”; and his retinue was composed not of simple fishermen, but of royal kinsmen, foreign mercenaries, and Muscovite courtiers. Most shockingly of all, this antinomian fellowship of believers appeared to be guided not by Jesus, the Spirit of God made Flesh, but by Bacchus, the spirits of alcohol made divine. At least this is how the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich Romanov (1672-1725), better known to posterity as Emperor (imperator) Peter I, “The Great,” appeared to Jochann Georg Korb (ca. 1670-1741), the secretary of the 1698-1699 Habsburg mission to Muscovy.⁸

In his “Diary” – a detailed, and very unfavorable account of Korb’s brief stay in the Russian capital⁹ -- the German Catholic diplomat left a vivid description of the

---


⁹ Although Korb’s “Diary” was written as if it was just another in a long line of exotic travelogues about Muscovy, it actually constituted an ingenious attempt to explain to educated world opinion why Habsburg diplomats had concluded a separate peace with the Ottoman Porte, and thereby to justify the reason why they had left their Muscovite allies in the lurch. Aware that the best defense is a good offense, Korb placed the blame for the collapse of the Vatican-sponsored “Holy Alliance” almost entirely on the inconstancy and crudeness of the young Russian monarch and his entourage. The description of the tsar’s Yuletide amusement was only one of a number of telling episodes meant to illustrate this theme. The publication of Korb’s “Diary” elicited an angry reaction from the tsar and the Russian diplomatic establishment, which tried (successfully) to have the book banned by the Holy Roman Emperor. For a discussion of the diplomatic repercussions of this incident, see Nikolaev, *op. cit.*, here 46-47.
burlesque ceremonials accompanying one of the first public appearances of tsar Peter's
blasphemous "mock church"10:

February 21 [11 February 1699 OS]. A sham patriarch and a complete set of
scenic clergy dedicated to Bacchus, with solemn festivities, the palace which
was built at the Czar's expense, and which it has pleased him now to call
Lefort's.11 A procession thither set out from Colonel Lima's house.12 He that
bore the assumed honours of the Patriarch was conspicuous in the vestments
proper to a bishop. Bacchus was decked with a mitre, and went stark naked, to
betoken lasciviousness to the lookers on. Cupid and Venus were the insignia on
his crozier, lest there should be any mistake about what flock he was a pastor
of. The remaining rout of Bacchanalians came after him, some carrying great
bowls full of wine, others mead, others again beer and brandy, that last joy of
the heated Bacchus. And as the wintry cold hindered their binding their brows
with laurel, they carried great dishes of tobacco leaves, which then, when

10 In order to capture the flavor of the rhetorical flourishes of the original Latin version (which
is, unfortunately, unavailable to me), I cite from the nineteenth-century English translation of
MacDonnell, op. cit., I: 255-256. For the notion of a "mock church," see Paul Hollingsworth, "The
'All-Drunken, All-Joking Synod': Carnival and Rulership in the Reign of Peter the Great," Paper
presented at the University of California, Berkeley seminar on "The Image of Peter the Great in Russian
History and Thought" (Berkeley, CA, 1982), 2.

11 Franz (F. Ia.) Lefort (1656-1699) was a Swiss mercenary who had joined Muscovite service
in 1675, at the end of the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. By the end of the 1690s, Lefort had
become the leading foreign favorite at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich. As the tsar's closest boon-
companion, Lefort received a promotion to the rank of "General" during peace-time, accepted an
appointment as the first "Admiral" of the non-existent imperial Russian navy, and took command of the
1698-99 "Great Embassy" to Europe. For Lefort's spectacular career at the Muscovite court, see M.
Posselt, "Admiral russkogo fлота Frants Iakovlevich Lefort, ili nachalo russkogo fлота," Morskoi sbornik
3 (1863); idem, Der General und Admiral Franz Lefort, sein Leben und seine Zeit (Frankfurt am Main,
1866), 2 vols.; André Babkine, "Les Premières lettres de Russie du Général Lefort," Canadian-
American Slavic Studies 16:3 (Autumn 1974), 380-385; and the index entries in M. M. Bogoslovskei,
Petr I. Materialy dla biografii (M.-L., 1940-1946), I: 406; II: 596; III: 474; and Lindsey Hughes,
Russia in the Age of Peter the Great (New Haven and London, 1998), 594.

12 Iurii Stepanovich Lim (lt. Lima) was a Venetian soldier-of-fortune who had joined Muscovite
service sometime during the reign of tsar Fedor Alekseevich. In 1682, he served as a lieutenant-colonel
under Patrick Gordon, the Scottish Catholic who would become a member of the royal entourage of tsar
Peter Alekseevich. In 1694, during the war-games known as the "Kozhukhov campaign," Colonel Lima
(and another of his relatives, possibly his father) served in the regiment of Franz Lefort. During the
second Azov campaign (1696), the army colonel served as "Vice Admiral" of the Russian royal
"flotilla," immediately under the command of "Admiral" Lefort. In 1702-1704, Lima served as a
colonel in the newly-renamed Lefort regiment. For Lima's career, see Pokhodyni zurnal 1696 goda
(Spb., 1853), 14-15; "Kozhukhovskii pokhod. 1694. (Sovremennoe opisanie)," ed. by M. I. Semevskii,
Voennyi sbornik 11:1 (1860), 62-63; and, Bogoslovskei, op. cit., I: 280, 305, 317-318, 406; III: 226,
474. On General Gordon, see infra, Chapter Two.
ignited, they went to the remotest corners of the palace, exhaling those most
delectable odours and most pleasant incense to Bacchus from their smutty jaws.
Two of those pipes, through which being set crosswise, served the scenic
bishop to confirm the rite of consecration. Now, who would believe that the
sign of the cross – that most precious pledge of our redemption – was held up to
mockery?

Who indeed? Certainly not the Viennese court, which had, just a few months before,
toasted the young Orthodox tsar as a valuable partner in the Catholic “Holy League”
against the Islamic Ottoman Porte.\(^{13}\) And certainly not those Russian Orthodox
moralists, who boldly proclaimed their disaffection with the “childish amusements”
of the young Muscovite tsar\(^ {14}\) and his dissolute royal favorites.\(^ {15}\) In fact, when confronted

\(^{13}\) Peter Alekseevich visited Vienna in 1698, as part of his famous, year-long trip to northern and
central Europe, the first foreign sojourn by an Orthodox Russian tsar. While Peter made a big
impression on his hosts, the diplomatic side of his “Great Embassy” was a grand failure because he
failed to prevent Habsburg diplomats from signing a separate peace with the Ottoman Porte, leaving
Muscovy alone with their sworn enemy. For an account of Peter’s trip to Vienna and of his reception at
the court of Leopold I, see Bogoslovskii, \emph{op. cit.}, II: 513-520.

\(^{14}\) In January 1697, abbot Avramii, of the Andreevskii monastery, the Orthodox monk wrote an
“epistle” (\emph{poslanie}) urging tsar Peter Alekseevich to grow up, take seriously the high calling of his royal
office, and abandon his “useless amusements (\emph{potecki nepotrebnye}),” with their “laughter-inducing talk
(\emph{slova smehkhotvorne}) and jokes (\emph{shuuki})” and actions displeasing to God (\emph{dela Bogoneugodnye}).”
However, Avramii refrained from describing these unseemly and childish royal amusements, because, he
claimed, “my ears [do not want] to hear, my nostrils [do not want] to smell, and my mouth [does not want
to] speak” about such abominable things. For his pains, abbot Avramii was promptly arrested and
interrogated under torture in the Preobrazhenskii chancellery, the increasingly busy office of Peter’s
political police, founded in the village of his boyhood games and headed by his mock double, “Prince
Caesar” F. Iu. Romodanovskii. For Avramii’s “notes” (\emph{tetradi}) see N. A. Baklanova, “Tetradi startsa
Avraamiia,” \emph{Istoricheskii arkhiv} 6 (1951), esp. 145, 148; for his interrogation, see “Delo o podannikh
tsariu tetradikh stroitelia Andreievskogo monastyrja Avraamiia [1697]. Doprozy Avraamiia,
See also N. B. Golikova, \emph{Policheskke protsesyi pri Petre I} (M., 1957), 79-81; James Cracraft, \emph{The
Church Reform of Peter the Great} (London and Basingstoke, 1971), 19-20; and M. Ia. Volkov, “Monakh

\(^{15}\) For the link between the tsar’s supposed religious, political, and sexual deviance, see the
testimony of G. R. Nikitin, a wealthy merchant (\emph{gost}) with close connections to the late Muscovite
court. According to the records of the Preobrazhenskoe chancellery, Nikitin had supposedly condemned
tsar Peter Alekseevich for taking one of his low-born favorites (A. D. Menshikov) to bed, “as his wife”
(\emph{chto zhonka}). Although there is nothing to either prove or disprove this hearsay evidence, it confirms
that some prominent Muscovites linked the institution of favoritism and royal amusements on the one
with the tsar’s “apostasy-like activities” (oststupnicheskie ego dela), most contemporary Russian commentators echoed Korb’s astonished bewilderment at the fact that a self-described Christian monarch would choose to display his royal authority by means of spectacles which parodied the sacraments established by “our God, Christ Himself.”

Yet, for more than three decades, that is precisely what the tsar did. Indeed, from the very beginning of his independent reign until (almost) the day of his death, Peter Alekseevich and his courtiers repeatedly (and quite deliberately) engaged in what many, God-fearing Christians regarded as offensive and dissolute behavior more

hand, with political despotism and moral depravity on the other. For the case against Nikitin, see RGADA: f. 6, op. 1, No. 10; for the accusation of homosexuality, see fol. 2; for a critique of royal amusements and personal despotism, see fols. 2-3. For a brief biography of Nikitin, see S. V. Bakhruhin, “Torgi gostia Nikitina v Sibiri i Kitae,” in Nauchnye trudy S. V. Bakhrushina (M., 1955), 3:226-251.

16 “Otryvak oblicheinia na vseshuteishii sobor. Ok. 1705 g.” in Materialy dlja russkoj istorii, ed. by S. A Belokurov (M., 1888), 539-540, here 539. Despite Belokurov’s tentative date, the internal evidence suggests that this anonymous denunciation must have been written sometime between 1692 and 1700. This suggestion is confirmed by Golikova, op. cit., 132, who has located the original document in RGADA, f. Sekretnyi del. No. 2, pis‘mo 12 “n.”

17 The first mock patriarch was elected at Yuletide 1691/1692, when the tsar was nineteen years-old. See infra, Chapter Two.

18 The fifty-two year old Russian monarch died shortly after participating in the “election” of the fourth (and final) “Prince Pope,” a “commissariat officer” named “Stroev.” Judging by the fact that a chancellery scribe made a copy of a thirteenth-century “ceremonial order of election” (chon izbiraniia) on 19 December 1724, preparations for this carnivalesque royal amusement were underway before Yuletide 1724/1725. See RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fols. 5-7, here fol. 7v. For an eyewitness account of this, the last “burlesque ceremony of the Conclave” (cérémonie burlesque de Conclave), see the description attributed to Peter’s adjutant. [Franz] Villebois (?-1760), in Mémoires secrets pour servir a l’histoire de la cour de Russie, sous les règnes de Pierre le Grand et de Catherine I”, ed. M. Théophile Hallez (Brussels, 1853), ch. 2; trans. by G. F. Zvereva in A. A. Nikiforov, “[N. P.] Vil‘bua. Rasskazy o russkom dvore,” Voprosy istorii 12 (1991), 192-206, esp. 195-199. For other references to the January 1725 ceremony, see F. A. Ternovskii, “Imperator Petr I v ego otmosheniiakh k katolicheskv i protestantstvu,” Trudy Kievscoi Dukhovnoi Akademii (1869), 1: 373-403, here 377-378; Eugene Schuyler, Peter the Great (NY, 1884), II: 507; and Hollingsworth, op. cit., 4. 59 n. 13. If one counts from the date of the election of the first mock patriarch (Yuletide 1691/92) to the election of the last (Yuletide 1724/1725), then the Muscovite court played along with the tsar’s “childhood amusement” for over three decades.
appropriate to a gang of "rogues" (pluty) than to the entourage of a pious Orthodox tsar. Adopting the indecent language, dress, and games of traditional Yuletide mummers, for two or three weeks after the Nativity of Christ, the tsar and the entire "devilish host" (so vsem sonmom besovskim) would ride around the houses of "all the royal counselors" (ezdia po boiarskim domam vsem), as well as the members of the "Holy Council" (osviashchennyi sobor) of the Russian Orthodox patriarch, in the guise of mock ecclesiastics. Singing Christmas carols and extorting gifts from their hosts, this "unholy council" would carouse at the expense of the very people whom they mocked. And it is precisely in this polemical confrontation between the Muscovite politico-religious "establishment" and the tsar's retinue that the contemporary descriptions of the "sacred parodies" (Lat. parodia sacra) staged at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich link back to the biblical narratives about the religious

19 The author of the anonymous denunciation of Peter's Yuletide amusements describes the annual caroling processions as the work of Nikita Zotov, a low-born "rogue" (platy), who encourages the tsar and his courtiers to "carry on like devils (besiatstya)" and to curse God under the guise of "singing praises to Christ" (slavit'). See "Ortyvok," in Beloukov, op. cit., 539-540. On literary "rogues" in late-seventeenth Russian literature, and their connection to Yuletide amusements, see E. V. Dushechkina, Russkii sviatochnyi rasskaz: stanovlenie zhanka (SPb., 1995), 56-64.

20 For an analysis of Yuletide celebrations in seventeenth-century Muscovy, see N. V. Ponyrko, "Russkie sviatki XVII veka," Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury 32 (1977), 84-99; ibid., "Sviatochnyi smekh," in Likhachev, Smekh, 154-174; and Dushechkina, op. cit., 48-56. For the culture of Yuletide mummerly in Russia, see L. M. Ivleva, Riazhen'e v russkoi traditsionnoi kul'ture (SPb., 1994).

21 On the "Most Holy Council," see I. M. Likhnitskii, Osviashchennyi sobor v Moskve v XVI-XVII vekakh (SPb., 1906); and Bogoslovskii, op. cit., I: 427, 430.

22 A pun on the title of the Muscovite Holy Council, formed by the addition of the negative prefix, "unt-" (ne-) to the word for "holy" (sviashchennyi).

23 "And they [the mock patriarch and royal carolers] visit the houses of the [real Russian Orthodox] patriarch and the metropolitans (khodiak k patriarkhu i k mitropolitom), as well as all kinds of other households (i vo sviatkie domy); while [the properly ordained ecclesiastical officials not only] (oni zhe) do nothing to forbid him [the tsar] (nichto emu ne vozbraniakh) [from carrying on in this way, but
antinomianism of Simon-Peter and "The Twelve." For, as I will argue in this
dissertation, a self-conscious parallelism between the millenarian "kingdom" heralded
by Jesus and his disciples and the imaginary "Transfigured Kingdom" evoked during
the tsar's Yuletide "amusements" (potekhi) provides one of the most important keys to
understanding the paradoxical way in which the tsar and his intimates asserted their
commitment to Orthodox "imperial reform" - the actual subject of this historical study
of Muscovite court culture.\(^{24}\)

**Entering the Transfigured Kingdom**

On the most general level, my dissertation is intended as a contribution to the
history of early modern European court culture, and, in particular, to the growing
research into the ideological (and specifically, religious) foundations of Russian
"absolutism."\(^{25}\) More specifically, it seeks to explain why a self-professed Christian


\(^{25}\) By "absolutism," I mean a specific form of early modern monarchical rule, in which the political elite of a territory organizes itself around an acknowledged representative of a ruling dynasty, whose claims to absolute sovereignty are circumscribed by the infrastructural weakness of his administrative apparatus. On the current state of the "absolutism debate," see Der Absolutismus - ein Mythen? Strukturwandel monarchischer Herrschaft in West- und Mitteleuropa (ca. 1550-1700), ed. by Ronald G. Asch and Heinz Duchscheit (Cologne, Weimar and Vienna, 1996) [ = Münstersche historische Forschungen, 9]. For a neo-Weberian analysis of the infrastructural weakness of the early modern state, see Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power* (Cambridge, 1986 and 1993), 2 vols. On the "absolutism debate" in Russian historiography, see Hans Bagger, *Reformy Petra Velikogo: Obzor issledovanii*, trans. by V. E. Vozgin (M., 1985), 93-102, 40-42 n. 40-44. For a critique of contemporary attempts to depict Muscovite "autocracy" as a uniquely successful "absolutist" regime, see
monarch routinely took part in grotesque, and often obscene, ceremonies parodying the rites of both the Russian Orthodox and the Roman Catholic churches (Rus. *sviaschennaia parodia*; Lat. *parodia sacra*).\(^{26}\) The focus of my dissertation is on one particular aspect of Peter’s court – a play-world created on the fields of the suburban royal estate of New Transfiguration (Rus. *Novo-Preobrazhenskoe*), in order to model the radical transformation envisaged by the tsar and his intimate advisors for the rest of

---


the Muscovite realm, and, ultimately, for Russia’s position in the world. Over the course of Peter’s reign, this allegorical “Transfigured Kingdom,” with its mock kings, knights, and clerics, its extravagant ceremonies of solidarity, and its imaginary and ever-expanding topography, served as an important reference point for every member of the tsar’s inner circle. Simultaneously a geographical, and a rhetorical “common place” (Gr. topos), the notion of the “Transfigured Kingdom” delineated the boundaries between those courtiers who belonged to Peter’s select “company” (Rus. kompaniia) and those who did not. Continuously invoked, presented, and re-

---

27 The various male-bonding rituals associated with the tsar’s “Transfigured Kingdom” cannot be reduced to the “activities” of the so-called “Most Comical and Most Drunken Council” (Rus. vesheusteshii i vsep lanteshii sobor). Indeed, the “conclaves” of this “mock church” constituted just one of the many extravagant ceremonies, by which the tsar and his entourage mobilized belief in Peter’s personal charisma. In addition to the court’s infamous drinking parties, these ceremonies included the enactment of war-games (Chapter Two), the conferring of mock orders of chivalry (Chapter Three), and the staging carnivalesque jester-weddings (Chapter Four). As I intend to demonstrate, only by placing the tsar’s “mock church” into the context of these other royal “amusements” (potekhi) can we ever hope to understand the political significance of the ceremonies of “election” and “ordination” of the “Prince Pope” (Chapters Two and Five).


presented by the organizers of Petrine court spectacles, both in public ceremonies and in private correspondence, this "political allegory" marked off those who had come to believe in Peter Alekseevich's personal gift of grace (Gr. charisma) from those who remained unconvinced or hostile to the tsar's leadership style and his vision of imperial reform. As a royalist "scenario of power," the "Transfigured Kingdom" thus helped the tsar and his advisors to reconstitute the Muscovite court into a millenarian "community of belief," whose members simultaneously defined themselves as both the apostles of the Orthodox Russian Emperor and as the chivalrous members of a cosmopolitan, Christian, and pan-European polite society.

Through an extended treatment of the symbolism employed by the retinue of tsar Peter Alekseevich in ritual, visual, and epistolary texts, I will argue that the tsar's childhood "amusements" (potekhi) were intimately tied to the informal elaboration, legitimation, and institutionalization of royal charisma at the Muscovite court. Locating the antinomian activities of the tsar's "company" within the context of Muscovite

---

30 For the notion of "political allegory," see Paul Kléber Monod, The Power of Kings: Monarchy and Religion in Europe, 1589-1715 (New Haven and London, 1999), 54-57, 340 n. 74. For a "Bacchanalian" political allegory, see ibid., 363 n. 192; and Steven N. Orso, Veldsquez, "Los Borrachos," and Painting at the Court of Philip IV (Cambridge, 1993).


33 My "textual" evidence, broadly defined, will consist of two types of primary sources: [1] narrative sources (both published and unpublished), written by foreign and native eyewitnesses to the burlesque spectacles staged at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich; and [2] visual sources illustrating the ceremonies and participants involved in enacting the "Transfigured Kingdom."
conceptions about sacred monarchy and royal play, as well as contemporary political developments, I hope to demonstrate that the religious burlesques staged at the court of Peter the Great served as a type of political sacrament, a rite of passage which elevated the tsar’s person above normal men, guaranteed his prerogative over church affairs, and bound the participants into an ecumenical community of believers in his God-given authority. To be a member of this “royal priesthood” (1 Peter 2:9) one did not have to profess Russian Orthodoxy or even to be a native Muscovite; and, as with the apostles at the moment of Jesus’ transfiguration on Mount Tabor, it was not enough simply to bask in the radiance of the deified King.34 Instead, contemplation of the personal “sacrifices” of Russia’s “anointed one” (Gr. christos)35 necessitated active political involvement, a striving towards the “deification” (Gr. theosis) of the world, through the fulfillment of one’s true calling.36 In this view, much of the “company’s” sense of

34 On the self-conscious use of the homology between the earthly and heavenly “King” (Church Slavonic, tsar), see the comments of Horace G. Lunt, in Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology, ed. by Marc Raeff (NY, 1966), 15 n. 1.

35 Playing on the comparison between the divine “suffering servant” and Russia’s warrior-tsar, Feofan (Prokopovich), the chief panegyrist of Peter’s reign, publicly preached a sermon in which he argued that “By your [i.e. Peter’s] labors we rest, by your campaigns we stand unshakable, by your (yes. this is what I mean to say) many deaths, we live.” Feofan (Prokopovich), “Slovo v nedeliu osmuinadesiat’ [...] [23 October 1717],” in Sochineniia, ed. I. P. Eremin (M.-L., 1961), 67. See also Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, The Image of Peter the Great in Russian History and Thought (NY and Oxford, 1985), 12-13. For Feofan’s explicit defense of the idea that earthly tsars deserve to be referred to as “gods (bozi) and christs (christy) [the anointed ones],” see Eremin, op. cit., 84-85; and infra, Chapter Five.

mission and their commitment to imperial expansion, administrative reorganization, and 
moral renewal, derived from their belief in Peter’s personal “election” for the task of 
transfiguring the Muscovite realm in accordance with the light of faith and the example 
of other “regular,” Christian kingdoms. Indeed, as I hope to demonstrate, the tsar and 
his advisors spent such an enormous amount of time devising and participating in the 
quasi-religious, male-bonding rituals of the “Transfigured Kingdom” precisely because 
these royal spectacles constituted an integral part of the “company’s” attempt to 
articulate, institute, and maintain its members’ vision of Orthodox imperial reform. 
The origins of the “well-ordered police state”37 were thus inextricably linked to the 
assertion of personal, extra-legal, and God-given authority; in fact, at least in this case, 
the flamboyant flaunting of royal “charisma”38 helped to promote, not to undermine, 
the ideals of modern “bureaucracy.”39

37 For the notion of “regular,” or “well-ordered police state,” see B. I. Syromiatnikov, 
“Reguliarne gosudarstvo” Petra I i ego ideologiya (M.-L., 1943); Marc Raeff, “The Well-Ordered 
Police State and the Development of Modernity in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Europe: An 
Attempt at a Comparative Approach,” American Historical Review 80:5 (December 1975). 1221-1243; 
idem., The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change Through Law in the 
Germanies and Russia, 1600-1800 (New Haven and London, 1983). On the connection between “police” 
and “politeness,” see Jean Starobinski, “The Word Civilization,” in his Blessings in Disguise, or On the 
Morality of Evil, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, 1993), 1-35, esp. 8-12; and Peter France, 

38 Max Weber’s sociological analysis of “charisma” was indebted to St. Paul’s definition (I 
Corinthians 12:4-7; cf. Romans 12: 6-8; and Mt 25:15) of the workings of divine “grace” (Gr. χάρις). 
For Weber’s discussion of charismatic authority, see From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, trans. 
and ed. by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (NY, 1946), 245-252; and Max Weber on Charisma and
By emphasizing that the tsar and his entourage relied on allegorical court spectacles in order to assert the sacrality of royal authority, my study not only provides a needed corrective to the secular bias of the scholarly literature about the reforms of Peter the Great, but also offers a paradigm for the study of the role of symbolism and ritual in the creation, maintenance, and development of a political order in early modern Europe. My approach to the relationship between absolutism and parody at the court of Peter the Great challenges both of the standard, historiographical treatments of this phenomenon. Some historians dismiss the tsar’s religious burlesques as the coarse “humor” characteristic of the primitive stage in the development of Russian society, a native, childish crudeness which is bound to disappear with the influx of cosmopolitan secular culture of the civilized west. Others subsume the parodic spectacles under the myth of Peter’s idiosyncratic “greatness,” attributing them to the policies of a “reforming tsar” (tsar’ preobrazovatel’), who drags medieval Muscovy into the modern world by mocking all superstitious manifestations of traditional

---

*Institution Building: Selected Papers*, ed. by S. N. Eisenstadt (Chicago and London, 1968). In this dissertation, I attempt to historicize Weber’s sociological definition of “charisma,” by trying to figure out how tsar Peter Alekseevich and his royal retinue understood (and applied) the notion of God’s grace. For an explicit discussion of this theological category, see *infra*, Chapters Five.

39 For Weber’s discussion of “bureaucratic” authority, see Gerth and Mills, *op. cit.* 196-244; for an insightful application of the Weberian paradigm to Russian administrative history, see Raeff, *op. cit.*

authority.\textsuperscript{41} While there is some merit to these interpretations, particularly the latter, they tend to apply their own (often anachronistic) notions of the division between politics and play, the sacred and the profane, as well as between high and low cultures, to the parodic spectacles organized at Peter’s court, thereby missing the serious consequences which such “amusements” had for contemporaries who witnessed, participated, or objected to the staging of Russian absolutism. So, while almost every account of Peter’s reign mentions (if only in passing) the adolescent amusements of the “great” Russian tsar who closed a door on Muscovy and opened a “window into Europe,”\textsuperscript{42} no scholar has ever taken the tsar’s religious burlesques seriously enough to devote a whole monograph to them.\textsuperscript{43}

There are at least two major reasons for the relative neglect of this topic: the first is a problem of sources; the second, of interpretation. On the one hand, until the late nineteenth century, a basic lack of published, primary sources made it nearly impossible to write a history of Petrine royal amusements from the perspective of their organizers.\textsuperscript{44} On the other hand, the mock ecclesiastical council of Peter the Great has


\textsuperscript{43} Even the most sophisticated works on Petrine court spectacles relegate the tsar’s religious burlesques to the realm of the “carnivalesque,” and, hence, the subject of a separate study. See the comments of O. G. Ageeva, “Obshchestvennaia i kul’turnaia zhizn’ Peterburga pervoi chetverti XVIII v.,” (Diss. kand. ist. nauk, Institute of History, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1990), 28, 81-83, 139. As I will argue, however, this separation between the serious and the carnivalesque is as artificial as the other bipolar conceptions mentioned above.
continued to pose an implicit challenge to the existing historiography. Russian historians have traditionally privileged the modern, rational, and self-avowedly innovative political ideals of Peter's reform project while relegating his "sacred parodies" (parodia sacra) to the psychologically irrational, traditional, and non-political realms. By positing a division between the personality of the ruler and the instrumentality of rule, however, they have not seriously considered the possibility that such burlesque royal "amusements" (potekhi) could, in and of themselves, constitute an important part of the "mechanics of power" at the early modern Muscovite court.\textsuperscript{45}

Nor have they taken up the suggestion of Reinhard Wittram, who has argued that, far from signaling Peter's modern, "secular" views, the presence of sacred parody only demonstrates the centrality of religion at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich.\textsuperscript{46}

Part of the reason for this secularist bias is that, until recently, Russian historians have posited the "modern West" as a monolithic cultural model of "rationality," an deal-type whose "influence" is passively absorbed into the Russian body politic.\textsuperscript{47} Awed by the towering figure of the "great" Peter, scholars have

\textsuperscript{44} For example, despite the fact that the project to publish Peter's papers was begun in the 1880s, it has still not progressed beyond the year 1714. See E. P. Pod'iapolskaja, "Ob istorii i nauchnom znachnenii izdania 'Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra velikogo,'" in Arkheograficheskiy ezhegodnik za 1972 god (M., 1974), 56-70. For a discussion of the sources on Peter's "mock church," see Hollingsworth, "The 'All-Drunken, All-Joking Synod,'" op. cit., 24-25.

\textsuperscript{45} On the "mechanics of power," see Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power," in Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977, ed. by Colin Gordon (NY, 1980), 109-133, esp. 115-116, where the author seeks to define "the way power [has been] exercised - concretely and in detail - with its specificity, its techniques and tactics [...]."

consistently failed to specify the agents of transmission or to distinguish between all of the "Wests" – Catholic, Protestant, and especially Eastern Orthodox48 – that were tapped in the creation of the new Russian Imperial court culture.49 In an attempt to re-introduce human agency into a narrative of cultural development that has, all too often, privileged explanations based on modern teleology, my project will thus seek to analyze the way that the organizers of the court spectacles staged on the suburban royal estate of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe articulated (and, later, implemented) their own, idiosyncratic version of Orthodox imperial reform. Instead of positing the existence of a historical imperative to "modernize," or chronicling the ineluctable imposition of the high, elite culture of the so-called early Enlightenment (Ger. Frühafklärung) upon the low, native culture of a backward Muscovy, my examination of Peter’s "Transfigured Kingdom" will thus seek to shed light on the practices by which a specific social group in a particular historical and institutional context – in this case, the royal entourage of tsar

47 For a thought-provoking critique of this traditional, historiographic position, see L. Jay Oliva, Russia in the Era of Peter the Great (Englewood Cliffs, 1969), 28-29; B. I. Krasnobaev, "Russkaia kul’tura vtoroi poloviny XVII-nachala XIX v. v kontekste obshchevrepeiskoi kul’tury (K postanovke voprosa)," in Slavianskie kul’tury i mirovoi kul’turnyi protsess, Materialy mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii InNESKO (Minsk, 1985), 157-162; and Isabel de Madariaga, "Sisters under the Skin," Slavic Review 41: 4 (Winter 1982), 624-628. The "Westernization" paradigm has been re-conceptualized, but not entirely abandoned, by Marc Raeff, "Seventeenth-Century Europe in Eighteenth-Century Russia? (Pour prendre congé du dix-huitième siècle russe)," ibid., 611-619; and "Muscovy Looks West," in Russia and Europe, ed. Paul Dukes (London, 1991), 59-68.


49 A notable exception is James Cracraft’s projected trilogy on the “Petrine revolution” in Russian culture. For the first two volumes, see James Cracraft, The Petrine Revolution in Russian Architecture (Chicago and London, 1988); The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery (Chicago and London, 1997).
Peter Alekseevich – appropriated, reinterpreted, and subverted various aspects of these "Wests" (as well as of local, Muscovite traditions) to suit their needs and aspirations.\(^{50}\)

As I suggest in the rest of this introduction, the war-games, processions, and carnivalesque inversions of the political order staged at Peter's court represented a "scenario of power" the uniqueness of which must be understood in the context of the "Baroque" court culture of late seventeenth-century Europe in general,\(^1\) and the "Moscow Baroque" in particular.\(^{52}\) Using the institutions of the monarch's personal household in order to surround himself with a new group of people, chosen according


to his own inclinations and to the contemporary ideas of spectacle, the tsar and his personal entourage re-organized the amusements (*potekhi*) of a seventeenth century Russian tsar – hunting, court theater, dwarves and jesters – and transformed them into institutions capable of mobilizing support for royal policies, keeping courtiers in line by means of informal sanctions, and policing, and if necessary, punishing those in disfavor. By presenting the controversial political acts of the tsar as the creative, “strange acts” of an antinomian brotherhood of “the elect,” these so-called royal amusements highlighted the need for, and justified the fundamental reorganization of Muscovite political and military administration along the lines of the cameralist “well-ordered police state.” As such, the religious burlesques of Peter the Great, like the court spectacles of his European contemporaries, and the “amusements” of his Russian predecessors, were neither frivolous diversions nor enlightenment propaganda, but, rather, the very stuff of rule.

The proposition that the political travesties staged by the tsar and his advisors served to discipline the bodies of courtiers as much as to enlighten potential opposition about the values and methods of his regime is only one part of my narrative, however. In addition to this argument, I also intend to address the fundamental question of why Peter, who could choose to emphasize different aspects of contemporary cultural repertoires within the boundaries of monarchical power and patronage, chose to preside over a “carnival court.”

53 For the notion of “carnival” and the “carnivalesque,” see Bakhtin, *op. cit.*; Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca, 1986), 6-20, 54-57, 64, 103-104;
mobilization of royal charisma at the court of Peter the Great is indebted to the work of those scholars who study the "poetics," as well as the "mechanics" of power.\textsuperscript{54} I am particularly inspired by the work of Russian semioticians, like Iu. M. Lotman, B. A. Uspenskii, and V. M. Zhivov, who have offered by far the most important contribution to the "thick description" of Petrine court culture.\textsuperscript{55} Building upon their insights into the rhetorical nature of the religious burlesques that so outraged Peter's contemporaries,\textsuperscript{56} I intend to treat the "Most Comical and Most Drunken Council" not

\begin{flushright}
and Morson and Emerson, eds., \textit{op. cit.}, 5. 15. 39. 51. 99-100. 102. 106. 192. 268-269 n. 44. 219 n. 7. 313. Working independently of each other, both Paul Hollingsworth and myself have seen Bakhtin's notion of the "carnivalesque" as a useful heuristic device for describing Peter's style of rule. Cf. Hollingsworth, \textit{op. cit.}; and Ernest Alexander Zitser, "Carnival and Coercion: The 'All-Fools' and All-Drunkards' Synd' and the Pre-History of Petrine Cultural Reforms" (M.A. thesis, Columbia University, 1994).
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{56} Basing his study on some of the original, archival sources, Victor Zhivov has recently emphasized the extent to which the "Most Drunken Council" is of special symbolic (and historical)
as a formal, parodic organization, but as (just one) example of a broader political
discourse about the taboos surrounding access to the "sacred" person of the Russian
tsar, whose special status derives from a conception that he is the last Orthodox ruler
in the entire world, and hence, the only hope of temporal redemption for Greek and
Slavic Christians. Indeed, in my interpretation, the mock ecclesiastical council of
Peter the Great appears as the most shocking, and, therefore, the most memorable
element of the elaborate political allegory that I have dubbed the "Transfigured
Kingdom" – a dystopic foil against which Peter and his courtiers defined themselves
and their project of Orthodox imperial reform. In other words, this dissertation

_________________________

importance for an understanding of the tsar’s cultural reforms. See V. M. Zhivov, "Kul’turnye reformy

57 On the political significance of the rituals and the personnel responsible for regulating access
to the monarch, as well as on the different managerial styles of "distant" versus "participatory"
monarchs, see David Starkey, "Representation Through Intimacy: A study in the symbolism of monarchy
Symbolism, ed. by I. Lewis (London, 1977), 187-224; and idem, "Introduction: Court history in
perspective," in The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War, ed. by David Starkey
(London and NY, 1987), 1-24, esp. 7-10. The limitations of the "mock court" model may explain why
at a recent meeting of the "Court Studies Society," David Starkey remarked that "Peter's court was
unlike any other of his acquaintance." See Hughes, op. cit., 515 n. 1.

58 This theosophical conception of world history is generally referred to as the "doctrine" of
"Moscow, the Third Rome." However, as recent literature suggests, this "doctrine" was much more
complex and contradictory than previous scholars have previously imagined. For a good review of the
literature on "Moscow, the Third Rome," see Dimitrii Sremoukoff, "Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine," in The Structure of Russian History: Interpretive Essays, ed. by Michael
Cherniaevsky (NY, 1970), 108-125. For more specialized studies, see A. L. Gol'dberg, "Tri 'poslaniia
Filofeia,' Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury 29 (1974), 68-97; idem, "Idea 'Moskva – Tretii Rim' v
tsikle sochinenii pervoi poloviny XVI v.,” ibid., 37 (1983), 139-149; Marie-Karina Schaub, "Les
couronnements des tsars en Russie du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle: essai d'historiographie," in La royauté
sacrée dans le monde chrétien (Colloque de Royaumont, mars 1989), eds. Alain Bourreau and C. S.
Ingerflom (Paris, 1992), 137-148; Daniel Rowland, "Moscow – The Third Rome or the New Israel,"
Russian Review 55: 4 (1996), 591-614; Plukhanova, op. cit., 14-21; Marshall Poe, "Moscow, the Third
Rome": The Origins and Transformations of a Pivotal Moment (Washington, D.C., 1997); and N. V.

59 For a methodologically similar attempt to use a cultural inversion in order to elucidate the
positive, political agenda of a religiously-motivated community, see Peter Lake, "Anti-popery: the
suggests that the key to the "sacred parodies" of Peter the Great is to be sought not in Peter's psychology or Russia's backwardness, but in the rhetorical practices, political ambitions, and moral convictions of the tsar and his retinue. In turn, the uniqueness of these factors can only be fully appreciated against the background of the "political theologies" of Peter's royal predecessors, as well as of his foreign contemporaries.60

Orthodox Imperial Reform and the "Moscow Baroque"

Both politically and ideologically, the attempt on the part of Peter Alekseevich and his courtiers to articulate their own interpretation of the relationship between personal piety and sacred monarchy was indebted to the program of spiritual renovation inaugurated at the end of the sixteenth-century and revived during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich Romanov (1645-1676).61 In a (relative successful) attempt to


60 "Political theology" – a concept invented by Carl Schmitt, Politische Theologie (Münich, 1922) and adopted by Ernst H. Kantorowicz, The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology (Princeton, 1957) – refers to the generic and stylistic interpenetration of juridico-political and theological concepts which lies at the root of the ideological system created by the devotees of medieval and early modern "mysteries of state." For two, different approaches to medieval political discourse, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, "Mysteries of State: An Absolutist Concept and Its Late Mediaeval Origins." Harvard Theological Review 48:1 (January 1955), 65-91; and Marc Bloch, Les rois thaumaturges (Strasbourg, 1924). For an insightful analysis of the difference between these two classical approaches to "political theology," see Wilentz, op. cit., Cannadine, op. cit.; and Jacques Revel, "La royauté sacrée: éléments pour un débat," in Boureau and Ingerlom, eds. op. cit., 7-17. For a pioneering attempt to analyze Muscovite "political theology," see Michael Cherniavsky, Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths (New Haven and London, 1961); and Wortman, op. cit.

61 As we will see in Chapter One, Peter came to power on a platform which harkened back to the reformist project of his father. On the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, see J. T. Fuhrmann, Tsar Alexis: His Reign and His Russia (Gulf Breeze, 1981); Philip Longworth, Alexis, Tsar of All the Russians...
restore the power and grandeur of his troubled realm, as well as to insure the stability of his dynastic line.¹² Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich oversaw the creation of the fateful alliance between the Russian monarchy and a reformist movement within the contemporary Orthodox church.¹³ Seeking to control, if not to respond to the increasingly strident appeals of his own subjects, who longed for the spiritual purification of what they imagined as the last Eastern Orthodox empire in the world, Aleksei encouraged the immigration of those foreign clerics, who had overseen the Orthodox revival in the Balkans, the Ukraine, and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The tsar’s patronage of clerics committed to the restoration of Orthodox purity implicated the political and ecclesiastical establishments of both

---

¹² At the turn of the seventeenth century, after the dynasty which had ruled Russia for over six hundred years died out, Muscovy experienced a period of civil war and foreign occupation, known as the “Time of Troubles” (1598-1613). The election of Aleksei’s father, Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov, to the throne of Muscovy, signaled the beginning of the “restorationist” project which would be pursued by Russian political elites until the well into the reign of Peter Alekseevich. For a succinct summary of these developments, see Oliva, op. cit., ch. 1; S. F. Platonov, The Time of Troubles: A Historical Study of the Internal Crisis and Social Struggle in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Muscovy, trans. by John T. Alexander (Lawrence, 1970); and R. G. Skrynnikov, Rossiia v nachale XVII v. “Smuta” (M., 1988).

¹³ Although Aleksei’s wager on the so-called “zealots of piety” (revnitieli blagoestichia) has only quite recently been seen in the light of the comparative, historical literature on “confessionalization” and “social disciplining” in other parts of early modern Christendom, the “reformist” program of patriarch Nikon has been the subject of an extensive (and growing) historical literature. For an analysis of the “reformation” during the patriarchate of Nikon, Aleksei’s religious protégé, see Paul Bushkovitch, Religion and Society in Russia: The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century (NY and Oxford, 1992); B. A. Uspenskii, “The Schism and Cultural Conflict in the Seventeenth Century,” trans. by Stephen K. Batalden, in Seeking God: The Recovery of Religious Identity in Orthodox Russia, Ukraine and Georgia (DeKalb, Ill., 1993), 106-143; and Georg Michels, At War with the Church: Religious Dissent in Seventeenth-Century Russia (Stanford, 1999). For a succinct summary of the German-language literature on “confessionalization” and “social disciplining,” see R. Po-Chia Hsia, Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe, 1550-1750 (London and NY, 1989); for an application of these notions to seventeenth-century Muscovy, see Zelensky, op. cit., 40-43; and Cathy Jean Potter, “The Russian Church and the Politics of Reform in the Second Half of the Seventeenth-Century” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1993).
Muscovy and the metropolitane of Ukraine in the parallel project of justifying the “absolutist” policies of this northern Orthodox monarch.64 Thus, just as immediately before the collapse of the Rurikid dynasty, important segments of the political and ecclesiastical elites of “Orthodox Slavdom” (Lat. *Slavia orthodoca*)65 had turned to the unifying figure of the Muscovite tsar in the name of imperial reform.66

64 Until the mid-1680s, the metropolitane of Ukraine was still formally under the formal jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople. See Potter, *op. cit.* 466-469.


66 In the middle of the sixteenth century, as part of a diplomatic move that was intended to counter the imperial and confessional pretensions of the “Holy Roman Emperor of the German Nation,” the “awe-inspiring” (gronyi) Ivan Vasil’evich “The Terrible” (1533-1584) became the first Grand Prince of Moscow to be crowned as “tsar,” on the model of the Christian “caesars” (Gr. basileos) of the eastern Roman empire. During the reign of his son, the last representative of the Rurikid royal line, the defenders of Muscovite imperial ambitions even managed to ordain a metropolitan as the patriarch of the autocephalous Russian church (1589), thereby symbolically re-creating on Russian soil the “symphonic” diarchy between the Byzantine emperor and the patriarch of Constantinople. See Marc Szeftel, “The Title of the Muscovite Monarch up to the End of the Seventeenth Century,” *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 13:1-2 (1979), 59-81; Uspenskii, *Tsar i patriarkh, op. cit.*, 13, 99, 204 n. 9, 257, 327-328 n. 111, 429-430, 496-500, 505: N. V. Simitsyna, “Avtokefalntia russkoi tserkvi i uchrezhdienie moskovskogo patriarkhata,” in *Tserkov’, obshchestvo i gosudarstvo v feodal’noi Rossii* (M., 1990), 126-151; and Borys A. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitane, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest* (Cambridge, 1998), ch. 11.

However, the fact that Ivan was crowned “tsar” immediately before his campaign against the Islamic khanates (“tsardoms”) of Kazan’ and Astrakhan’ only underscores the fact that the Orthodox ruler of the Muscovites, like his “imperial Roman predecessors,” derived his legitimacy through conquest and victory over pagan “barbarians,” as much as through ritual consecration and spiritual renovation of the church. See A. M. Ranchin, “Printsip ‘traslatio imperii’ i Kievskaa Rus’ v istoriosofskoi konseptssii ‘Moskva – tretii Rim,’” in *Slaviane i ikh sosedii. Imperskaia ideia v stranakh tseresn’ noyi. vostochnoi i iugo-vostochnoi Evropy. Tesisy XIV konferentsii*, ed. by B. N. Floria [hereafter, *Tesisy XIV*] (M., 1995), 63-66, esp. 65; Jaroslav Pelenski, “Muscovite Imperial Claims to the Kazan Khanate,” *Slavic Review* 26:4 (1967), 559-576; Omeljan Prissak, “Moscow, the Golden Horde, and the Kazan Khanate from a Polycultural Point of View,” *ibid.*, 577-583; Ihor Sevcenko, “Muscovy’s Conquest of Kazan: Two Views Reconciled,” *ibid.*, 541-547; Edward Keenan, “Royal Russian Behavior, Style, and Self-Image,”
The court’s unwavering support for a policy of “confessionalization” of the laity\textsuperscript{67} insured that from the mid-seventeenth century on, classically-trained Orthodox clerics from both the Balkans and the recently-conquered south-western regions of the expanding Muscovite empire\textsuperscript{68} would join Russian Orthodox reformers in applying the moralistic and rhetorical conventions of medieval scholasticism and Renaissance humanism to the Christian story of salvation supposedly embodied by the Muscovite tsar and his realm.\textsuperscript{69} In the process of extolling the Romanov dynasty’s commitment to religious “enlightenment” (prosveshchenie), these Orthodox clerics helped to create a truly “baroque” court culture, characterized by a unique combination of classical


\textsuperscript{67} The tsar signaled his court’s commitment to the program of “confessionalization” by convoking the Moscow Church Council of 1666-1667, which codified the schism (raskol) within the Russian Orthodox church, between the royalist party of self-styled religious “enlighteners” and the opposition groups associated with the millenarian movement of “Old Believers.” On the importance of the Church Council of 1666-1667 in codifying the split between the court-sponsored religious reformers and the “Old Believers,” see Potter, \textit{op. cit.}, ch. 4.

\textsuperscript{68} During the first half of the seventeenth century, the Romanov dynasty launched several military campaigns against the Polish Republic and the Swedish monarchy, in order to recapture the territories which it was forced to surrender during the “Time of Troubles.” Despite years of inconclusive warfare, however, Muscovy’s most notable geopolitical success literally fell into its lap. In 1648, a segment of the Orthodox Cossack host revolted against the Polish magnates of eastern Ukraine, declared its independence from the weak, Polish crown, and sought protection from the Great Russian “autocrat.” In return for a pledge of military, financial, and religious support, the Muscovites took nominal possession of the entire left-bank Ukraine, including the city of Kiev. Although the Polish Republic refused to ratify this seismic shift in the balance of power until the so-called “Eternal Peace” of 1686, from the mid-seventeenth century, possession of the “Mother of Russian Cities” gave the Russian tsars an opportunity to make claims about the “Kievan inheritance,” which was depicted as the Riurikid, and, hence, Romanov “patrimony.” In recognition of their new “imperial” position, from the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, Romanov rulers began to style themselves as the tsars of “Little, White, and Great Russia.” See Longworth, \textit{op. cit.}; and Jeremy Black, “Russia’s Rise as a European Power, 1650-1750,” in Dukes, \textit{op. cit.}, 69-83.

\textsuperscript{69} On “scholasticism” and “Latin humanism” in late Muscovy, see A. S. Lappo-Danilevskii, \textit{Istoriiia russkoi obshchestvennoi mysli i kul’tury, XVII-XVIII vv.} (M., 1990); and Max J. Okenfuss, \textit{The
Roman, Latin humanist, and Eastern Orthodox elements.\textsuperscript{70} The notion of “imperial renovation” (Lat. \textit{renovatio}) and “translation of empire” (Lat. \textit{translatio imperii}) formed an integral part of this new court culture and served as an important corollary to the confessional program of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and his reform-minded Orthodox supporters.\textsuperscript{71}

Like the humanist scholars and artists at the magnificent courts of other contemporary Christian princes,\textsuperscript{72} the Orthodox panegyrists at the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich invented a unique royalist discourse by ostensibly following hallowed traditions.\textsuperscript{73} However, unlike their foreign counterparts, the organizers of Alekseevan court spectacles transformed the public “theater of royal virtue” into something


\textsuperscript{71} On the “imperial idea” in the lands of south- and east-central Europe, including seventeenth-century Muscovy, see the collection of articles edited by B. N. Floria, \textit{Tezisy XIV, op. cit.}; and Slaviane i ikh sosedii. \textit{Protishozhdenie i ranniaia istoriia slavian v obshhestvennom soznani pozdnego srednevekov’ia i rannego Novogo vremeni. Tezisy XV konferentsii} (M., 1996).

\textsuperscript{72} On the fateful alliance between “art and power,” see Strong, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{73} For example, Russian imperial ideologists traced the genealogy of the Orthodox tsar back to the first Christian ruler of the Roman Empire, Constantine I “The Great,” by way of a native Slavic counterpart – grand prince Vladimir of Kiev, the tenth-century leader of the Varangian socio-military elite, who renounced his pagan beliefs, converted his Slavic subjects to Orthodox Christianity, and thereby earned the title of a saint who was “equal [in rank] to the apostles” (ravnoapostol’skii). St. Vladimir became the Slavic Orthodox embodiment of the Constantinian imperial myth of the wise and pious ruler, and the neo-Platonic imagery used to describe his conversion from the “darkness” of paganism to the “light” of Christianity became one of the main sources for the rhetorical convention linking monarchy and religious enlightenment at the Muscovite court. On the importance for Alekseevan court culture of Christian neo-Platonism, and particularly of the works of the mystical theologian known
resembling a Spanish *auto sacramental* than a French *ballet de cour*. That is, under the watchful eyes of the guardians of royal purity, the public life of the Muscovite court increasingly took on the ascetic fervor of the pious "baroque" monarch, whose severe regimen of devotional duties appeared to leave no room for light-hearted royal play. In effect, by organizing rituals which emphasized the tsar's role as the divine intermediary between Muscovy and the Kingdom of God. Aleksei Mikhailovich and his religious advisors oversaw the transformation of nearly every aspect of the ceremonial life of the court into a sacramental act, extending the doctrine about the

to contemporaries as "Dionysius the Areopagite," see Zelensky, *op. cit.*, 49-55, 59, 74-75; on St. Vladimir, see *ibid.*, 46-47.

74 For an insightful comparison between the cultures of Muscovy and Imperial Spain, see James H. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretative History of Russian Culture* (NY, 1966), 69-70, 653-654; and Jack Weiner, "The Spanish Golden Age Theater in Tsarist Russia (1672-1917)" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana, 1968). On the "baroque" religious rituals at the Spanish court, see Monod, *op. cit.*, 129-141. The Holy Thursday ritual mentioned by Monod (*ibid.*, 135-136, 362 n. 190), was also practiced at the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. See the travel-diary of Paul of Aleppo, a Near Eastern, Orthodox cleric who left a record of his visit (1654-1655) to the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. See A. Golosov, *Tserkovnaiia zhizn' na Rusi v polovine XVII veka v izobrazhenii eia v zapisakh Pavla Aleppskogo. Chast' I: Zapiski arkhidiakona Pavla, kak tserkovno-istoricheskii dokument* (Zhitomir, 1916).

75 For an assessment of the "nightmarish religiosity" of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, see Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People, op. cit.*, 63.


last, truly Orthodox, Christian world empire well beyond what was customary even at the court of Ivan the Terrible.\footnote{Cherniavsky, \textit{op. cit.}, ch. 2; A. L. Dvorkin, “Ivan the Terrible as a Religious Type: A Study of the Background. Genesis and Development of the Theocratic Idea of the First Russian Tsar, and his Attempts to Establish ‘Free Autocracy’ in Russia” (Ph. D. thesis, Fordham University, 1988). The fact that Aleksei modeled himself on this “awe-inspiring” (грозный) predecessor was not merely an attempt to underline the Romanov link to the previous, Rurikid dynasty. It was also a deliberate attempt to appropriate the image of that powerful Orthodox “sovereign” (Gr. \textit{autokrator}; Rus. \textit{samodertzhes}), for a monarch (Aleksei), who was just as interested in presenting an image of confessional Orthodoxy and domestic stability as of imperial conquest. For Aleksei’s interest in all things having to do with Ivan the Terrible, see N. A. Eremina, “Vliianie idei sozdaniia velikoi Greko-rossiiskoi imperii na formirovanie teorii vlasti i religioznuiu politiku moskovskogo gosudarstva (XVI-XVII vvs.),” in \textit{TesiY XIV}, 66-69, esp. 68, where the author refers to the files of Aleksei’s “Privy Chancellery” (\textit{RGADA}, Priorat tainykh del. Zотовскиа opis’).}

The Muscovite court’s fastidiousness about the purity of the tsar’s “two bodies” – the sinful, natural body of the man, and the mystical body of the Orthodox Christian emperor – extended even to that monarch’s “amusements” (Rus. \textit{potekhi}). Whether he was making a pilgrimage to a local monastery or hawking on the grounds of his favorite, suburban estates, the tsar and his hand-picked royal entourage took advantage of their absence from the political and ideological constraints of Moscow to enact more intimate, and personally-meaningful, demonstrations of royal absolutism. Samuel Collins (1619-1670), an Englishman who was privy to some of these ceremonies due to his role as the tsar’s personal physician,\footnote{Samuel Collins, \textit{The Present State of Russia […]} (London, 1671). In the introduction, the anonymous editor of this book (identified by the initials \textit{N. D.}) explained that it constituted the posthumous publication of the research materials which Collins had gathered during his nine-year stint (1660-1669) as the personal physician to the tsar. See “To the Reader,” \textit{ibid.}, A3-A4v. Significantly, in terms of the historical cult of Ivan the Terrible at Aleksei’s court, Collins had originally intended this book to be a biography of that sixteenth-century Russian monarch, \textit{The Life of Ivan Vasiloidg} [sic]. See \textit{ibid.}, A3v.} described the décor of one particularly memorable spot on Aleksei Mikhailovich’s annual pilgrimage circuit.
Every year towards the latter end of May the Czar goes three miles out of Moscow, to an house of pleasure call’d Obrasausky [sic.]: In English Transfiguration, being dedicated to the Transfiguration in the Mount. And according to that, Master 'tis good for us to be here, let us make three Tabernacles; So the Emperour [i.e. tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich] has most magnificent Tents [...]. His and Czartsa's, with those of his eleven children and five Sisters, stand in a circle with the Church-Tent in the middle, the most glorious show in its kind that ever I saw. There are Rails and Guards set Musquet [sic.] shoot from them, beyond which no man may pass without order: For the Czar will have none of the vulgar people to be eye-witnesses of his pastimes. 80

Although he was aware of the biblical proof texts on which this scene of royal deification was obviously modeled, Collins did not draw out the political implications of his observations. Nor was that his job. As the tsar's physician, he was hired to tend to the health of Aleksei's natural body. The task of extolling the tsar's "mystical body" (Lat. corpus mysticum) and of ministering to the tsar's spiritual needs was in the hands of the official court preacher, Simeon of Polotsk (1629-1680). 81 Not coincidentally, this classically-trained, Orthodox monk offered the best explanation of the way in which the allegorical spectacles staged on Aleksei Mikhailovich's suburban estates modeled the "transfiguration" of the tsar's body politic.

---

80 Collins, op. cit., 113-114. Italics in the original.

81 Like Dr. Collins, Fr. Simeon (Samuil Emel'ianovich Petrovskii-Sitnianovich), was a recent émigré to Muscovy. Unlike the Enlightman, however, Simeon never went back to his native Belarus'. having linked his professional career to the geopolitical and confessional success of the Romanov dynasty. For his biography, see Bushkovitch, op. cit., 163-172; Potter, 214 n. 56. For an analysis of his works, and his place in Muscovite court culture, see Robinson, op. cit; Sazonova, op. cit.; Okenfuss, op. cit.; Bychkov, op. cit.
In a cycle of poems written to celebrate the dedication of the royal estate at Kolomenskoe, Simeon of Polotsk attempted to situate this suburban architectural embodiment of the tsar’s piety and political ambitions within Muscovite imperial-eschatological traditions. By linking the figurative conventions of the Muscovite court with imagery from the Old and New Testaments, Simeon depicted Aleksei Mikhailovich’s pleasure palace, and by metaphoric extension, his entire “royal house,” as a magnificent architectural reflection of metaphysical wisdom, celestial order, and heavenly light. Although Simeon’s poetic evocation of Kolomenskoe is based on its explicit comparison to the royal palace of the biblical King Solomon, it also includes stylized descriptions of the actual architectural and iconographic “wonders” of Aleksei Mikhailovich’s suburban estate, all of which served to underline the wisdom and taste.

---


83 The “ceremonial greeting” in honor of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich was originally included in Simeon’s manuscript collection of poems, entitled Rfmlolog. It has been published in two recent collections: Simeon Polotskii. Izbrannye sochinenii, ed. by I. P. Eremin (M.-L., 1953): 103-108 and in Russkaia slobodcheskaia poezhia XVII-XVIII vekov, ed. by V. P. Adrianova-Perets, annot. and comm. by A. M. Panchenko (L., 1970): 108-111. For the text of the “ceremonial greetings” composed in honor of the other members of the royal family, as well as an insightful analysis of the cycle as a whole, see O. R. Khromov, “‘Tsarskii dom’ v iskone Simeona Polotskogo na novosel’e,” Germanetika drevnerusskoi literatury 2 (1989): 217-243.

84 So, for example, the roaring mechanical lions at the gates of Kolomenskoe remind the poet of the lions decorating the throne of King Solomon himself. See Khromov, “‘Tsarskii dom,’” op. cit. 219-222.
of Simeon's royal patron. Using the common rhetorical convention of comparing the garden with heaven – a tradition dating back to King Solomon's "Song of Songs" and popular in seventeenth-century moralistic, didactic, and religious works – Simeon thus sought to depict the tsar's exclusive suburban estate as a special, paradisiacal spot and, thereby, to effect a merger between the tsar's two bodies.

Simeon's poetic evocation of Kolomenskoe did as much to "emplace" the sacrality of the House of Romanov as the architectural construction and ceremonial dedication of the tsar's pleasure palace. Alluding to the New Testament parable recounted in the Gospels (Mk 12: 41-44; Lk 21: 1-4), Simeon expressed the hope that his poetic contribution to the house-warming celebrations would be accepted by Aleksei Mikhailovich, just as Christ the King (Rus. tsar) not only deigned to accept the small donation of the poor widow but also taught his disciples that her selfless act of charity meant more than all the gold cast in by the rich. Similarly, Simeon of Polotsk not only urged his royal patron to reward his poetic efforts with generosity, but also to recognize

\[85\] On the sources and use of the motif of the heavenly "enclosed garden" (hortus conclusus) in the moral-didactic poetry of Simeon (Petrovskii-Sitmanovich), see Sazonova, op. cit., ch. 5. On the medieval Latin exegesis of the Song of Songs, an important source for all later interpretations, see E. Ann Matter, The Voice of My Beloved: The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity (Philadelphia, 1990).

\[86\] So, for example, the carved and painted flowers of the mansion's colorful interior and the sparkling pieces of mica in the windows evoke, respectively, the blooming plants of the Edenic garden and the shining stars in the celestial vault of "heaven's house," man's Paradise before and after the Fall. See Khromov, "'Tsarskii dom'," op. cit.

\[87\] On the merging of the tsar's two bodies in seventeenth-century Muscovite royal panegyrics, see Cherniavsky, op. cit., ch. 2.

the evangelical meaning contained in his poem (Rus. slovo, lit. “word”). After wishing long-life to the new home-owner, Simeon spelled out the implicit comparison between the earthly and the heavenly “tsar”: “In this new house, with the New Man / invested, live till the end of [your] days. / The New Man is Christ, the Tsar of Glory, /He is also the crown on your head.” As Simeon’s “word” is fleshed out during the recitation of this “ceremonial greeting,” the royal suburban estate where Aleksei Mikhailovich was poetically invested and crowned with Christ became the site of the tsar’s deification. Indeed, the monk’s poem was intended to perform the same kind of mystery as the priest officiating at mass; for in the presence of believers, both public rituals transform the “host” into God.\textsuperscript{89} And just as the tsar becomes equated with Christ, so the estate at Kolomenskoe takes on the eschatological overtones of Mt. Tabor, the site of Christ’s transfiguration.\textsuperscript{90} By arguing that the royal estate of Kolomenskoe was imbued with the celestial light of the Transfiguration, which passed from God-like monarch to his radiant wife and children, illuminating the entire “royal house” and endowing his realm with an eschatological meaning, Simeon thus greatly expanded the iconographic boundaries of Muscovite political discourse.

The introduction of allegorical designs and baroque decorative elements during the construction of Aleksei Mikhailovich’s suburban estates, whether in the mansion at

\textsuperscript{89} Similarly, Simeon’s reference to the inevitable passing of Aleksei Mikhailovich, which was meant to remind his listeners of the vanity of all earthly glory (in the baroque tradition of memento mori and vanitas), also emphasized the liminal position of the tsar’s two bodies, located on the boundaries between the earthly and heavenly realms. On the popularity of the sentiment behind these baroque topoi, see Peter N. Skrine, The Baroque: Literature and Culture in Seventeenth-Century Europe (London, 1978), ch. 8.

\textsuperscript{90} Khromov, “‘Tsarkii dom.’” op. cit., 223.
Kolomenskoe, the gardens of Izmailovo,\textsuperscript{91} or the court theater at Preobrazhenskoe,\textsuperscript{92} was meant to impress foreign ambassadors with the wealth and magnificence of the tsar and to assure his allies that Muscovy was a credible diplomatic partner, fluent in the language of European absolutism.\textsuperscript{93} The hybrid stylistic extravagance of royal suburban estates was, therefore, not a sign that Muscovite craftsmen were ignorant, or incapable of learning new architectural techniques,\textsuperscript{94} but rather a reflection of the renewed emphasis that their patrons put on the need to reconcile the confessional and the military strands of Muscovy's "Roman" imperial heritage.\textsuperscript{95} The court's new geopolitical orientation towards the Holy Roman Empire, whose representatives brokered the peace treaty with the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, accepted

---

\textsuperscript{91} On the cultivation of royal gardens during the Russian "baroque," see D. S. Likhachev, \textit{Poeziia sadov. K semantike sadovo-parkovykh stilei: sad kak teest}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. (SPb., 1991), 110-126; on the garden of Izmailovo, which housed a "labyrinth" (vavilon) and a "zoo" (zverinets), see ibid., 120-124.

\textsuperscript{92} On Preobrazhenskoe, and its court theater, see infra, Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{93} However, the unusual combination of "baroque" ornaments with traditional Muscovite planning and wooden architecture only served to confirm the ambassadors' professional and religious biases about the relative obscurity of this upstart dynasty and the exoticism of its "Oriental" confessional practices. Nevertheless, the ambassadors' disdainful attitude and polemical evaluations of these Muscovite pleasure palaces are themselves a clear sign of the importance that these architectural and iconographic innovations had in the court's new political discourse. Khromov, "Podmoskovnoye votchiny," \textit{op. cit.}, 291-292.

\textsuperscript{94} For a demonstration of Muscovite knowledge of the new, "western" style, see Cracraft, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{95} Khromov, "Podmoskovnoye votchiny," \textit{op cit.}, 294-295. In this regard, it is very significant that in describing the official royal titulature of the Muscovite tsars, Collins offered the following fanciful gloss on the name of his royal patron: "The present Emperours name is Alexie Michalowig Romanove. viz. Alexis the Son of Michael the Roman." He went on to repeat the assertions of Muscovite diplomats regarding the fact that the "the word Czar [...] has so near relation to Cesar [...] that it may well be granted to signifie [sic] Emperor. The Russians would have it to be an higher Title than King, and yet they call [the biblical King] David Czar, and our Kings Kirrois, probably from Carolus Quintus, whose history they have among them." The invocation of Emperor Charles V may explain why, according to
Muscovy into the “Holy Union,” and pushed the Romanovs into a series of (quite unsuccessful) wars against the Ottoman Empire and their Tatar vassal states (1676-1700), also encouraged the supporters of the Muscovite dynasty to match, if not outdo, the imperial pedigree of their new allies, while, at the same time, differentiating themselves from both the Catholic and the Islamic powers.

Despite the fact that Polish and Imperial diplomats usually took the glaring cultural differences between the kinds of political legitimations that were deemed appropriate in Moscow versus those that were used at their own countries as a sign of Orthodox “barbarism,” knowledgeable foreigners, like Samuel Collins, recognized the fact that there was a basic similarity between the court of Aleksei Mikhailovich and those of some of his royal contemporaries. Indeed, at the very beginning of the Muscovite “baroque,” the tsar’s personal physician offered an analysis of the relationship between Alekseevan court spectacles and the self-conscious cultivation of sacred kingship in terms which would have been easily understood by his English compatriots, who had just emerged from a civil war against the “personal rule” of an equally inaccessible “baroque” monarch. Collins noted that the Muscovite tsar “never appears to the people but in magnificence [sic.], and on festivals with wonderful

__________________________

Collins, tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich “puts in many Titles into his broad Seal as the Spanyards [sic] do.” See Collins, op. cit., 54-55. Italics in the original.

96 For a summary of the literature about the issues confronting Muscovite diplomats in the second half of the seventeenth century, see Lindsey Hughes, Sophia, Regent of Russia (1657-1704): ‘Ambitious and Daring Above Her Sex’ (New Haven and London, 1990), ch. 8.

97 Charles I Stuart’s attempt to rule his body politic like his body natural sparked off a civil war against the Catholic dynasty on the part of the Protestant “political nation.” On the “personal rule” of Charles I, a reign that has been characterized as a period of restricted access, see Kevin Sharpe, “The
splendor of Jewels and Attendants. [...] His Centinels [sic.] and Guards placed round about his Court, stand like silent and immovable Statues. No noise is heard in his Pallace [sic.], no more than if uninhabited. None but his Domesticks [sic.] are suffer'd to approach the inward Court, except the Lords that are in Office. He never dines publickly [sic.] but on Festivals, and then his Nobility dine in his presence.”

The similarities between the court of Aleksei Mikhailovich and that of Charles I moved Collins (or, rather, the editor of his posthumous publication) to offer a brief digression about the way that a policy of restricting access to the charismatic person of the monarch has historically worked to increase the power which the “Prince” exercises over the minds of his subjects:

“Indeed the too near approaches of the common Rabble make discovery of Princes’ infirmities, not to say vanities. Majesty is jealous of Gazers. This made Montezume [sic.] King of Mexico keep his Subjects at such a distance that they aurst [sic.] not behold him, familiarity breeds contempt, when Princes expose themselves too much unto publick [sic.] view, they grow cheap, and are little regarded. Therefore in a Theatre, the State is rail’d in, that the Spectators may not crowd upon the Scenes, which show best at a distance. And so it fares with Princes, the more they are reserv’d the more they are observ’d, the more implor’d the more ador’d; otherwise they run a great hazard of being condemn’d, and reckon’d no better than their Subjects, seeing an equal morality and frailty of flesh attends all men.”

---


*98 Collins, *ibid.*, 110-111.

*99 Collins, *ibid.*, 114-115. The original text is in italics, which may have something to do with the fact that the question of access to the monarch was of particular political importance during the Stuart “Restoration.” On the politics of royal access, see Brian Weiser, “Reconstructing the Monarchy: The Matter of Access in the Reign of Charles II” (Ph.D. diss., Washington University, 1999).*
Although the historical digression of this royalist sympathizer was more a commentary about *raison d'état* in "Restoration" England than about Muscovite Russia (much less Aztec Mexico), it does point to a certain commonality between the ruling styles of King Charles I and tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. For, like his British counterpart, the Russian tsar sponsored the construction of a private court theater for the ritual demonstration of his undisputed authority in temporal and religious affairs; and like the Catholic king, the Orthodox monarch thereby sought to ward-off the confessional strife that threatened to engulf his body politic.\(^{100}\) If Aleksei turned out to be more lucky than his ill-fated brother-sovereign, than it was less a result of the overwhelming power of the Muscovite "State" – the "rail'd" stage keeping his "Spectator"-subjects at a safe distance\(^{101}\) -- than of the "Scenes" of royal piety enacted in front of the most influential subjects of the crown. Indeed, the fact that Orthodox hierarchs and Muscovite aristocrats publicly


\(^{101}\) For an insightful social analysis of Muscovite royal spectacles, see Robert O. Crummey, "Court Spectacles in Seventeenth-Century Russia: Illusion and Reality," in *Essays in Honor of A. A. Zimin* (Columbus, 1985), 130-146. For Aleksei's close encounter with the rioting populace of Moscow, see Henry Calvin Lodge, "The Urban Crowd During the Reign of Aleksi Mikhailovich" (Ph.D. diss., Rutgers University, 1970); and Valerie Kivelson, "The Devil Stole His Mind: The Tsar and the 1648 Moscow Uprising," *American Historical Review* 98: 3 (June 1993), 733-756.
affirmed the conflation of the tsar’s two bodies (at the Church Council of 1666-1667), while the English Puritans supervised the beheading of both the king and his realm. Only emphasizes how differently the baroque “theater of royal virtue” – and the coterminous policy of restricted access to the monarch – worked in Muscovy and in Britain.

*The Libertine Origins of the “Well-Ordered Police State”*

The military defeats, social unrest, and political struggles that followed immediately upon the sudden illness and untimely death of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich exposed the fragility of early modern Russian “absolutism” and revealed the thin line which separated the culture of the “Moscow Baroque” from the violence endemic to the program of Orthodox imperial reform. From the third quarter of the seventeenth-century, the resurgence of the Ottoman threat, the increasing radicalization of the millenarian Old Believers, and the growing factionalism within the Muscovite political

---

102 Charles I Stuart played out the last act of his theatrical monarchy in 1648, on the make-shift “stage” of the scaffold. Defending the mystical body of the realm from the natural body of the king, Puritan revolutionaries had closed down both the public and the private (court) theaters before executing Charles himself. For an analysis of the cultural significance of regicide in early modern Europe in general, and Stuart England in particular, see Monod, *op. cit.*, 184-191, esp. 185.

103 For a comparative-historical analysis of the baroque “theater of royal virtue” which attempts to account for such radically-different political outcomes, see Monod, *op. cit.*, ch. 4.

104 Contrary to what one would expect from Norbert Elias’ developmental model, the creation of a stable, and highly-ramified court culture did not maintain the momentum of the Orthodox “civilizing process” spearheaded under the first two Romanov tsars. For a sustained critique of Elias’ teleology, see Jeroen Duindam, *Myths of Power: Nobert Elias and the Early Modern European Court* (Amsterdam, 1994).
elite.105 confronted Aleksei’s heirs with a series of very difficult questions: What should one do when the “theater of royal virtue” fails to produce the expected results? And how should a recently-installed and socially-insecure royal family, like the House of Romanov, deal with an overburdened and discontented urban population, an enserfed and restless peasantry, and a divided church, when all signs appeared to suggest that the fault lay in the basic premises of its progenitors’ imperial project? Was it even possible to renounce the ambitious plans of spiritual regeneration and military re-conquest in an increasingly interdependent, violent, and competitive system of dynastic, territorial states? And if it was possible, on what basis could the members of the Muscovite “ruling class” maintain their sense of solidarity vis-à-vis their social inferiors and confessional rivals?106 These were just some of the issues behind the crisis of confidence which gripped the Muscovite political and religious elites in the second half of the seventeenth century.107

103 At least some of the blame for the rise of factionalism at the court of Aleksei’s successors must be attributed to that tsar’s desperate attempts to insure his dynastic succession. By marrying two different times, Aleksei created two rival branches within the Romanov royal house. See Martin, op. cit. As John LeDonne has suggested, this dynastic configuration would last well into the next century. See his “Russian Ruling Families,” op. cit.

104 For an attempt to apply a non-Marxist definition of “ruling class” to Imperial Russian history, see John P. LeDonne, Absolutism and Ruling Class: The Formation of the Russian Political Order, 1700-1825 (NY and Oxford, 1991).

This apparent loss of faith in the project of imperial renovation and spiritual renewal was not unique to Orthodox Russia. In one form or another, all the Christian rulers after the Peace of Westphalia (1648) confronted the same basic problems as their Muscovite counterparts. Bled dry by more than three decades of almost continuous warfare, bankrupt or economically weakened by extraordinary (and sometimes illegal) economic extractions, and disillusioned by both the inquisitorial methods of the reforming churches (Catholic and Protestant) and the conspicuous consumption of baroque courts, political elites throughout the length and breadth of the European continent began to reconsider the relationship between confessional ideals and "reasons of state." Without abandoning their self-aggrandizing projects, many secular and religious princes began to heed the advice of post-war projectors, who counseled a return to the classical science of frugal household management (Gr. oikonomia); a more ascetic and self-denying morality; and a practical, this-worldly.

---

108 For what is still the most accessible, general introduction to the pan-European "crisis of conscience" (crise de la conscience européenne), see Paul Hazard, The European Mind, 1680-1715, trans. by J. Lewis May (Cleveland and NY, 1963). For a revision of Hazard's treatment, see Monod, op. cit., ch. 6, esp. 276, 280.


and (in principle) more tolerant religious faith.\footnote{As with the notion of the "Russian Baroque," for the sake of historical accuracy, I will differentiate between the philosophical movement (Neostoicism) associated with the Dutch jurist Justus Lipsius from the "Stoic"-like parallels in Muscovite political thought. On the importance (and pan-European significance) of the "Netherlands movement" for the origins of the absolutist state, see Oestreich, op. cit. On the reception of this, and other strands of the new political philosophy, focusing primarily on "natural law" ideas at the late Muscovite court, see Lappo-Danilevskii, op. cit., 122-248; and idem, "Idea gosudarstva i glavneishie momenty eia razvitiiia v Rossii so vremenii smuty i do epokhi preobrazovании." Golus minuvshago 12 (1914), 5-38; Douglas Joseph Bennett, Jr., "The Idea of Kingship in Seventeenth-Century Russia," (Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1967); Merguerian, op. cit., chs. 2-3, 5; Sumner Benson, "The Role of Western Political Thought in Petrine Russia." Canadian-American Slavic Studies 8:2 (Summer 1974), 254-273; A. M. Panchenko, "Nachalo petrovskoj reformy: ideinaia podopleka.," XVIII vek 16 (1989), 5-16; and Raeff, op. cit.; and idem, "La noblesse et le discours politique sous le règne de Pierre le Grand.," Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique 34: 1-2 (1993), 33-46.} What this amounted to was an assault on the neo-Platonic world view of those confessionally-minded and politically-inaccessible monarchs, who placed their hopes in the "civilizing" power of confessionalization and in the mystical correspondences between the microcosm of the court and the macrocosm of the realm. In re-mapping the boundaries of Europe, therefore, the post-Westphalian, neo-Stoic reaction against the baroque "theater of royal virtue" could not but affect contemporary conceptions about the duties and functions of sacred monarchy.

The neo-Stoic re-configuration of the mystical body politic took many different forms, depending upon the particularities of the reigning political discourse. But for all their variety, by the turn of the eighteenth century, the political elites of most of the dynasties of northern and central Europe had adopted the ideal of the frugal, manly, warrior-king. Wherever one looked, whether at William of Orange (later King William III of England), Elector Friedrich III (later King Friedrich I in Prussia), or the much more flamboyant Elector August I of Saxony (later King of Poland), royal thrones and even the property of entire ruling houses seemed at the mercy of these northern princes. For a monarch who espoused an activist, "Promethean" faith; a neo-Stoic conception of martial virtue; and a cameralist conception of "police," the new, eighteenth century seemed to offer unlimited opportunities for pursuing his divinely-appointed "calling" and for reaping the fruits of God's bounty. Economic growth and worldly glory, military victories and domestic reforms, now constituted the legitimating signs of divine favor and acted as a spur to further activity for the chosen few, who were lucky enough to join the cosmopolitan, chivalrous community of the post-war generation of princes. Thus, in the optimistic, exciting, and dangerous new world heralded by the coming of the eighteenth century, the most successful monarch appeared to be the one who had made a deliberate decision to abandon the stage-sets of the baroque "theater of royal virtue" in favor of another scenario of power, one that


114 This was most clearly the case with the War of the Spanish Succession (1700-1714). See Krieger, *op. cit.*, ch. 2.
allowed him effectively to mobilize the personal beliefs of his subjects and to project the combined military and economic might of the royal body upon the stage of world politics. 115

In this, as well as in several other important respects, Muscovy did appear to lag behind the times. While other courts were slowly abandoning the neo-Platonic hierarchies which had formed the (outmoded) ideological supports of baroque kingship,116 political factionalism, a succession of weak and underage tsars, and the long incumbency of a politically-savvy and exceptionally-well connected Russian patriarch, resulted in the intensification of church-sponsored efforts at the confessionalization of the tsar’s body politic. 117 Despite the self-conscious stress on Orthodox “tradition,” however, this period also witnessed the rise of a more active.

115 Whether one calls it “State Pietism” or the rise of the “rational state,” the recent literature on early modern state-building has attempted to depict this change as a religiously-based “cultural revolution.” On “State Pietism,” see Gavthorp, op. cit., 232-234, 244-246, 279-280; on the “rational state,” see Monod, op. cit., chs. 1, 5-6; on state-building as “cultural revolution,” see Philip Corrigan and Derek Sayer, The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution (Oxford and NY, 1985), 1-13; and Gavthorp, op. cit., xii, 12-13, 280. For an explicit statement regarding the connection between Peter’s reforms and “cultural revolution,” see Cracraft, op. cit.; and Georges Florovsky, “The St. Petersburg Revolution,” in Ways of Russian Theology, part I, trans. Robert L. Nichols [ = Collected Works of Georges Florovsky, 5] (Belmont, 1979), ch. 4.

116 Until as late as 1715, “baroque” notions of hierarchy, exclusivity, and royal purity dominated the court of Versailles, which was the most important contemporary model of European absolutism. See Elias, The Court Society, op. cit.; and Emmanuel Leroy Ladurie, “The court surrounds the King: Louis XIV, the Palatine Princess, and Saint-Simon,” trans. by Roger Just, in Honor and Grace in Anthropology, ed. J. G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers (Cambridge, 1992), 51-78. In this light, the new (and often scandalous) forms of royal access adopted by the regent and his entourage, immediately following the death of Louis XIV, can be seen as a “libertine” reaction against the old scenario of power. On “libertinism” during the regency of Philippe d’Orléans and his “rakes” (Fr. roués) (1715-1723), see Michel Feher, “Libertinisms,” in The Libertine Reader: Eroticism and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century France, ed. by Michel Feher (NY, 1997), 10-47, here 13-14.

117 On the immense political role of patriarch Ioakim (Savelov), see Potter, op. cit., chs. 5-9; and infra, Chapter One.
inner piety, among a new generation within the court-based, Muscovite service elite—the heralds of a cultural and demographic change, which would sweep out the old, Alekseevan scenario of power in favor of one that was much more in step with contemporary developments in other, “well-ordered,” Christian realms. Although this change in the way the Muscovite political elite defined the tsar’s relationship vis-à-vis both his subjects and his non-Orthodox “brother-sovereigns” was already well under way before the independent reign of Peter Alekseevich, it would not be fully realized until the entourage of the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich re-organized itself around the “rock” of the “Transfigured Kingdom.”

As I intend to demonstrate in this dissertation, the leaders of the Muscovite movement for “neo-Stoic,” Orthodox imperial reform, like their contemporary counterparts at several other European courts, instituted a new scenario of power by first offering a “libertine” critique of the ostensibly corrupt and pharisaical elite, which prevented the anointed monarch from living up to the full potential of his dual natures. The “Restoration” court of the “Merry Monarch,” Charles II Stuart, is the locus classicus for this type of polemical confrontation between rakish “Cavaliers” and

118 For an attempt to define “enlightened Orthodoxy” as a “conscious Christianity,” that “revolve[s] around moral problems, not monasticism and miracles,” see Freeze, op. cit., 102-103, 104; and Bushkovitch, op. cit. 178.

119 The changing composition of the Muscovite political elite demonstrates that this generational change was more than just a figure of speech. For evidence that supports the contention that the Petrine reforms corresponded with a generational change, see the prosopographical studies of O. E. Kosheleva, “Boiarstvo v nachal’nyi period zarozhdenia absolutizma v Rossii (1645-1682)” (Avtoreferat diss. kand. ist. nauk, M. V. Lomonosov State University, 1987), 14; and Airapetian, op. cit.; ch. 1.

120 According to Paul Bushkovitch, Orthodox religious reformers had already laid the spiritual “basis” for Peter’s “secularization” of Russian culture by 1680. See Bushkovitch, op. cit., 178-179.
hypocritical "Puritans." Likewise, in the light of their courts' emphases on martial virtues and a monarch-centered "State Pietism," it is not too far-fetched to suggest that the so-called *Tabakscollegium* of Friedrich Wilhelm I of Prussia and the "Transfigured Kingdom" of Peter Alekseevich of Russia constitute two, phenomenologically-similar examples of the new, "chivalrous" sociability. Indeed, it is precisely because the blasphemous "amusements" (*potekhi*) of the Russian tsar were directed at creating both

---


“cavaliers” and “disciples” – the twin sides of the charismatic authority structure at the court of Peter Alekseevich – that an accredited representatives of Friedrich Wilhelm’s military Brüderschaft could find a welcome home in the “conclaves” of the tsar’s mock ecclesiastical council.

In all these cases, the organizers of libertine royal rituals mocked what they imagined as the values of an old, inefficient, and distinctly feminized political elite – a generation that appeared to be more concerned with praying for salvation, than with fighting to realize it in this world. By unmasking their rivals, the (British, Prussian, and Russian) representatives of royal “wit” offered a more positive political vision of the king’s natural body and asserted a new, much more “statist” and “secular”

---

“O nyneshnem sostoianii v Moskovii v 1710 godu.” Chитиia v Обществе истории и древностей Rossiiskih 89: 2 (1874), 1-21, here 3.

123 For a reference to the participation of Georg Johann, Freiherr von Kayserling (d. 1711), the Prussian envoy to Muscovy, in the “conclaves” of the “Unholy Council,” see the undated (ca. September 1710) “collective epistle” written by “Prince Pope” (N. M. Zotov). RGADA. f. 9, otd. II, o. 3, ch. 1 (1710 g.), ed. khr. 11, fols. 189, 190v., 190, 190v.; and RO RNB, f. 824, op. 2, No. 200, fols. 20-20v., 26. On the personal, warm, and amicable relations between Peter Alekseevich and Friedrich Wilhelm I, a sign of the Brüderschaft among the new generation of northern warrior-princes, see Kathe, op. cit., 109: and G. V. Kretinin, Prusskie marshruty Petra Pervogo (Kalinigrad, 1996), passim. On Kayserling’s role as personal envoy intermediary between the two monarchs, see Frey, op. cit., 230. For a discussion of his love-affair with, and secret marriage to the tsar’s former mistress, Anna Mons, see M. I. Semevskii. Tsaritsa Katerina Alekseevna, Anna i Viliim Mons”, 1692-1724, 2nd rev. ed. (SPb., 1884), 32-55; Kayserling’s own account of the events can be found in his 1706 letter to Berlin, trans. by E. B. Zubova, in Russkaiia starina 5 (1872), 803-844.

124 Nor is it a pure coincidence that the British, Dutch, and German merchants who worked with Peter’s court organized themselves into a mock “monastery,” in obvious imitation of the “Most Drunken Council” of the “Prince Pope.” Platonov, op. cit., passim; Alekseev, op. cit., 74-76; and A. G. Cross, “The Bung College or British Monastery in Petrine Russia,” Newsletter of the Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia 12 (1984), 14-24.

definition of royal authority.\textsuperscript{126} Although this new “royal language” continued to be based on “upon older notions of personal sacrality,” it could now also point, however hesitatingly, “towards a power based on universal human reason.”\textsuperscript{127} Indeed, by the beginning of the eighteenth century, the most vocal proponents of this new discourse of power had come to eschew “the luxuriant, multivalent [rhetorical] constructions that had been so vital to Renaissance [and Baroque] monarchy.” They tried “to disengage the king from the ups and downs of politics and to place him in an immutable domain of permanent authority, the domain of the rational state.”\textsuperscript{128} In Muscovy, as I hope to demonstrate, this was the domain of the St. Petersburg-based “Kingdom Transfigured” – of baroque excess turned into a parody of excess; of extravagant holiness, religious passion, and mystical personal devotion “miraculously” transformed by reason, order, and obedience to formal bureaucratic procedure.\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{126} For a discussion of Peter’s “royal wit” (monarshe ostroynie), see Feofan (Prokopovich), “Slovo o sostoiavshемся mezhdu imperiей Rossii i koronoi Shvedskoiu mire 1721 года, avgusta v 30 den’ [...] propovedannoe [...] v tsarstviuichchem grade Moskve, v tserkvi sobornoi Uspeniiia presviatyla bogoroditsya, 1722 gođa, genvaria 28,” in Eremin, ed., op. cit., 112-126, 470-472, here 115; and Hughes, op. cit., 91.

\textsuperscript{127} For a succinct characterization of the new “royal language,” see Monod, op. cit., chs. 5-6, here 212. For the ideas of the chief exponent of the new “royal language” in Muscovy, see the works of Feofan (Prokopovich), in Eremin, ed., op. cit., passim; and the discussion infra, Chapter Five.

\textsuperscript{128} Monod, op. cit., 212.

\textsuperscript{129} As in some of the other Christian realms, the chief ideologist of this “absolutist” kingdom was an articulate, reform-minded (yet avowedly orthodox) clergyman. On “Pietism” and “Erastianism” as the religious bases of the “well-ordered police state,” see Gawthorp, op. cit., chs. 9-11; Raeff, “Modernization and Transfiguration,” op. cit. For one of the few (and still very problematic) discussions of the Russian Orthodox variant of these “Protestant” doctrines, regarding the prince’s domination over the church, see Florovsky, op. cit., ch. 4.
Keeping in mind such cross-cultural comparisons, this dissertation will seek to trace the relationship between the "Bacchic Christianity"\textsuperscript{130} of Peter's "company" and their attempt to re-conceptualize and to implement a new program of imperial renovation. The organization of my argument mirrors the conviction that there is an intimate connection between the play-kingdom staged on the grounds of the royal suburban estate of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe and the much more official "Kingdom Transfigured," founded on the shores of the Neva River. Seeking to bridge the conventional division between the Moscow (1672-1698) and the St. Petersburg (1698-1721) periods of Peter's reign – and, by implication, between the "medieval" and "modern" periods of Russian history – my narrative attempts to defend the proposition that the ideals which would later be enshrined in the "well-ordered" institutions and ideology of the Peter "The Great," the first Russian Emperor (imperator), were originally articulated during the "childhood amusements" (potekhi) of Peter Alekseevich, the last Muscovite tsar.\textsuperscript{131} In this interpretation, it is the self-conscious

\textsuperscript{130} This phrase comes from Florence Weinberg's classic study of the religion of Rabelais. See Florence W. Weinberg, The Wine and the Will: Rabelais' Bacchic Christianity (Detroit, 1972). On the connection between "Dionysian intoxication" and the "exuberant fellowship and companionship" of true believers, see André Winandy, "Rabelais' Barrel," Yale French Studies 50 (1974), 8-25; and infra, Chapter Two. M. M. Bakhtin, perhaps the most famous Russian student of Rabelais, may have had something similar in mind, when he wrote that "the new way of life in Russia made its appearance in masquerade attire, since Peter's reforms were interwoven with elements of travesty (the enforced shaving off of beards, European dress, western polite manners)." See Bakhtin, op. cit., 271.

mobilization (and rhetorical subversion) of Muscovite political theology – not “Western influence” or the exigencies of war per se – that provides the causal explanation for the paradoxical form in which the tsar and his “company” expressed their vision of Orthodox imperial reform.\footnote{Peter’s “Great Embassy” (1697-1698) to the “West,” and the cultural, “spin-off effects” of the Northern War (1700-1721) frequently constitute the key variables in traditional explanations of the ideological origins of Petrine reforms. Bagger, op. cit., chs. 1, 4. While not denying the importance of these external “causes,” my study seeks to shift the narrative focus onto the immanent factors in the elaboration of Petrine “political theology.”}

In an attempt to redirect the narrative focus from the personality of Peter Alekseevich and unto the discursive practices which created and maintained the “charismatic structure of domination” at his court,\footnote{For a sociological analysis of the “charismatic structure of domination,” see Weber, op. cit.} each of the following chapters will concentrate on the interactions between the tsar and the members of his “company” – the informal “cadre group,” which not only formed the nucleus of the “Transfigured Kingdom,” but also ran the entire government.\footnote{For the notion of “cadre groups,” and an explanation of the way in which they are able to lead, unify, and give coherence to an otherwise fragmented bureaucratic institution, see the classic study by Edward E. Shils and Morris Janowitz, “Cohesion and Disintegration in the Wehrmacht in World War II,” in his Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology (Chicago and London, 1975), 345-383; and idem, “Primary Groups in the American Army,” ibid., 384-402.} Indeed, the fact that some of the most important political figures of the reign – F. lu. Romodanovskii (head of the political police),\footnote{See infra, Chapters Two and Four; Appendix.} N. M. Zotov (de facto royal treasurer),\footnote{See infra, Chapters One, Three, and Four; Appendix.} F. A. Golovin (head of the foreign policy establishment),\footnote{See infra, Chapter Three; Appendix.} G. I. Golovkin (Golovin’s replacement as head of
the foreign affairs chancellery), T. N. Streshnev (head of the various military ministries), F. M. Apraksin (head of the naval ministry), and I. A. Musin-Pushkin (de facto administrator of the Russian Orthodox Church) – also held “ranks” in the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Transfigured Kingdom,” only supports the contention that Peter’s “company” formed the basis of, and gave an appearance of stability to the fragile construct that was the “well-ordered police state.” The Petrine scenario of power could therefore not have been formulated, much less enforced, without the active collaboration of those courtiers, who kept up the illusion – a word, which literally means “in play” – of royal “absolutism,” which the tsar and his retinue were trying to institutionalize.

This study of early modern political rituals thus seeks to describe the way in which the creation and continual evocation of a baroque political allegory, which I have dubbed the “Transfigured Kingdom,” both mirrored and helped to shape the imperial

---

138 See infra, Chapters Three and Five; Appendix.

139 See infra, Chapters One, Three, and Five; Appendix.

140 See infra, Chapter Three; Appendix.

141 See infra, Chapters One and Three; Appendix.

142 Although I have not been able to find references to the “ecclesiastical” pseudonym of A. D. Menshikov, this illiterate, low-born, royal favorite certainly helped to organize and to take part in the “conclaves” of Peter’s mock church. The collective petition of (ca. 1710) cited above, was, in fact, drafted by “Prince Pope” Zotov, during a festive “conclave” at Menshikov’s St. Petersburg mansion.

143 J. Huizinga, Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture (Boston, 1970), 11. M. Bakhtin’s comments about the Petrine reforms echo Huizinga’s assertion that “civilization arises and unfolds in and as play.” For an extended treatment of this parallel, see Zitser, op. cit., esp. 3-4. For an insightful discussion of the cultural importance of play, see Jacques Ehrmann, “Homo Ludens Revisited,” trans. by Cathy and Phil Lewis, Yale French Studies 41 (1968), 31-57; Eugen Fink, “The
project of tsar Peter Alekseevich and his libertine “company.” Assuming the “baroque personae,” which I have tried to evoke by the one-word chapter titles, this group of men sought to implement the ideals first articulated in the last decade of the seventeenth century, in the play-kingdom of the “Prince Caesar” and his religious counterpart, “His Most Foolish and Most Drunken Highness,” the “Prince Pope” of “Pressburg and Kokui.” And, as this alternative universe expanded to include the entire Russian political elite, it was this same group of men, that oversaw the transformation of “sacred parody” (Lat. *parodia sacra*) into playful solemnity – or “serious play” (Lat. *serio ludere*) – and, ultimately, into the annual celebrations of the St. Petersburg-based, “well-ordered police state.”

Over the course of the reign, as the core group became dispersed to all the corners of the empire, Peter’s mock church expanded its membership base and

---


145 For an explanation of these mock titles, see Appendix II (Zotov).

146 On the oxymoron *serio ludere*, a “hermetic device to communicate a hidden message to a few happy initiates,” see Weinberg, op. cit. 9, 28, 65, 71, 79, 128, 149, 155 n. 10. According to Weinberg, this was a relatively common Renaissance trope, particularly favored by Rabelais, who used it to suggest “an equivalence” between drunken “merriment and [divine] wisdom.” Ibid., 9, 149. For more on this “Bacchic” association between drunkenness and religious enlightenment, see infra, Chapter Two. On the notion “jest and earnest” (Lat. *ludicra- seria*) as a “collocation of contraries,” but one which was not merely “a piece of rhetorical elegance” or “a poetic conceit,” but also a classical “ideal of [a dignified] life,” see Curtius, op. cit., 418 n. 2, 419, and esp. 422-424, on the use of this witty, and urbane ideal as a “panegyrical trope” in the eulogy of secular rulers.

147 Based on a qualitative analysis of the (admittedly fragmentary evidence), it is clear, for example, that the number of “arch-hierarchs” [ = the higher levels of the hierarchy, composed of bishops, archbishops, metropolitans, abbots, abbeses, and archimandrites] who attended the St. Petersburg masquerade of 1723 was much higher than the number mentioned in Peter’s 1698 letter to
spawned its own imitators. Both trends were encouraged by the fact that, after the founding of St. Petersburg, the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope” became an important part of Petrine public celebrations. However, these same trends also subverted the original purpose of the mock church, so that by the third decade of Peter’s reign, the travesties associated with the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope” became no more important than the other carnivalesque elements of the masquerades celebrating the “Kingdom Transfigured.” In this way, therefore, even before the tsar’s untimely death at the age of fifty-three, the “Unholy Council” had become merely another, colorful element within the court’s new, St. Petersburg-based.

Viniius. During the 1723 masquerade in St. Petersburg, there were eight “metropolitans,” all with obscene pseudonymous names and titles; they were attended by “archdeacon” Strovev and “sacristan” Protas’ev. See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. No. 186, fol. 30v. There was also an unspecified number of mock clerics known as the “Sleepless Cloister” (neusypaenaia obitel’), which was headed by a mock “archimandrite,” and included, among other “servants” (sluzhashchikh obitel’ia), the families of guards officers (fendrik) Afonasii Tatishchev and “Iaroslav Prince” and fendrik Vasii Neliubokhtin. RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. No. 186, fol. 27v. Compare this number to the figure calculated from Peter to A. A. Viniius (9 July 1698), PIB, I: 265, 741. Even if one includes “Ianiik,” the Patriarch of Pressburg” and “Andrei, the Patriarch of Palestine,” alongside “the three metropolitans” mentioned in this letter, it is clear that by the end of Peter’s reign, the top echelons of the mock ecclesiastical hierarchy increased dramatically. This increase corresponds to the inevitable explosion in the number of lower-ranked servitors listed among the “servants (sluzhiteli) of the Arch-Prince Pope (arshii kniaz-papy)” (before 1722); and in P. I. Buturlin to Vice-Governor Voeikov (23 April 1723). Both documents were published by M. I. Semenovskii, “Petr Velikii kak iumorist [1690-1725],” in Ocherki i razskazy iz russkoi istorii XVIII v.: Slovo i delo! 1700-1725, 2nd ed. (SPb., 1884), 278-334, here 312-313, 313-314. For a prosopographical analysis of the latter document, see Ernest Alexander Ziser, “Towards a Prosopography of Peter I’s ‘Unholy Council,’” Paper presented at the 24th Annual Mid-Atlantic Slavic Conference, Princeton University, 25 March 2000; for a discussion of Semenovskii’s (highly questionable) editorial principles, see infra, Chapter Five.

148 Three “institutions” of note are [1] what may be described as a sort of “Ladies’ Auxiliary,” based around the St. Petersburg court of the new royal consort, tsaritsa Catherine Alekseevna and her ladies-in-waiting; [2] the “Great British monastery,” a foreign “affiliate” of the mock ecclesiastical council, composed of those British, German, and Dutch men and women who were, in one way or another, connected to serving the needs of the Russian court; originally based in Moscow, the “Great British Monastery” re-organized itself into a St. Petersburg-based “Bung College,” in preparation for the 1721 wedding of “Prince Pope” P. I. Buturlin; and, finally, [3] the parody of Peter’s mock church, centered around the court of tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich.

149 Ageeva, op. cit., passim.
social calendar – "an institutionalized artifact of Peter’s youth,"¹⁵⁰ when his position at the Muscovite court, and Muscovy's position within the concert of Christian sovereigns was still in flux.¹⁵¹ Indeed, as both the mobilizing agents and the languages of mobilization become more didactic, under the supervision of Peter’s new ecclesiastical protégé, the public appearances of the “Most Unholy Council” of the “Prince Pope” slowly came to be confined primarily to the Shrovetide masquerades timed to coincide with the celebrations of the peace of Nystadt, which ended the “Great Northern War” (1700-1721) and marked the formal inauguration of the “All-Russian Empire” (Vserossiiskaia imperiia).


¹⁵¹ However, the fact that, on the eve of his death, the tsar was planning to organize the “election” of yet another “Prince Pope” demonstrates that more than thirty years into his reign, Peter was not as secure as he wanted to be. Indeed, the fact that this “election” coincided with the beginning of another wave of repression against the St. Petersburg-based political elite, suggests that the two events may have been connected. See infra, Conclusion.
CHAPTER ONE

Kinsmen:  
Royal Charisma and Family Honor  
During the Naryshkin Restoration

It is a bitter irony that the children of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich Romanov – the seventeenth-century monarch who devoted his entire life to curbing domestic violence, instilling a sense of religious decorum among his subjects, and restoring order to the Russian royal line – came to power by means of two bloody, court coups.¹ Indeed, following the brief reign (1676-1682) and untimely death of Aleksei’s eldest son (and hand-picked successor), the political elite of Muscovy once again confronted the possibility of a prolonged period of dynastic crisis, divisive government, and civil war, such as had followed the decline and fall of the House of Riurik (1598-1613).² Indeed, as we will see in this chapter, the historical example of the “Time of Troubles” (Rus. smuta) that followed the extinction of the first Russian royal house – and its positive corollary, the miraculous “restoration” of royal rule, through the divinely-inspired “election” of the second (Romanov) dynasty – informed the actions of nearly all of the

¹ Although the Russian eighteenth-century has been traditionally designated the “period of court coups,” the political and ideological preconditions for the institutionalization of violence at the imperial Russian court can be traced back to the post-Alekseevan succession. For a characterization of the period of court coups, see V. O. Kliuchevskii, Sochineniiia v deviatii tomakh (M., 1989), 4: 279-281; and M. A. Bol’sov, “…Kii strashnyi glas,” in Dvortsovye perevorocy v Rossii, 1725-1825 (Rostov-on-the-Don, 1998), 3-20. On the post-Alekseevan dynastic situation, see Russell Edward Martin, “Dynastic Marriage in Muscovy, 1500-1729” (Ph.D. diss, Harvard University, 1996), ch. 5. For the argument that all “baroque” politics is the politics of the coup d’état, see Louis Maria, “Pour une théorie baroque de l’action politique. Lecture des Considerations politiques sur les coups d’État, de Gabriel Naudé,” in Gabriel Naudé, Considerations politiques sur les coups d’État (Paris, 1888), 5-65.

leading political actors at the end of the seventeenth century. Even the conspirators who organized the coups of 1682 and 1689, and who had less reason than anyone else to see their opportunistic political tactics as unconscious echoes of past events, sought to take advantage of the historical paradigm, according to which violence served as divine retribution for the sins of unruly subjects, wicked counselors, and heretical pretenders to the throne – the scapegoats of an original, holy community of Orthodox Christians.³ All sides of the political spectrum in early modern Russia thus claimed to see the workings of Providence in their actions, despite the fact that these actions sometimes pointed at radically different visions of the Orthodox body politic, of monarchical government in general, and of Romanov rule in particular.

A providentialist interpretation of politics was particularly favored by those members of the Muscovite political and clerical elite, who saw themselves (and were generally recognized) as the guardians of the program of Orthodox imperial reform and religious enlightenment launched during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich.⁴ Primary among these self-professed defenders of the Alekseevan heritage were the hierarchs of the post-Nikonian Russian Orthodox church: men like Ioakim (Savelov)


⁴ For the notion of Orthodox "imperial reform," see supra, Introduction.
(1620-1690), the powerful patriarch, whose career spanned the reigns of four consecutive Romanov tsars, from Aleksei to his three sons;\textsuperscript{5} or the patriarch’s personal secretary and chief ideologue, the monk Evfimii (c. 1620-1705) of the Miracles Monastery (Chudov) in Moscow.\textsuperscript{6} Supported by a hand-picked team of erudite churchmen, Ioakim’s court served as an important locus of power and patronage, and represented itself as a source of stability in what was seen as an increasingly unstable political environment. In the absence of a strong, adult, male monarch, even the most prominent members of the noble families who actually supervised the imperial administration, led the royal troops, and dominated the life of the court could not challenge with impunity the power of the Russian Orthodox patriarch.\textsuperscript{7} It was these great noble clans, however, who ultimately decided the outcome of the succession struggle between Aleksei’s last two surviving sons.\textsuperscript{8} Like their “reformed” clerical counterparts, many of the statesman-like leaders of the “aristocratic” service families


\textsuperscript{6} On Fr. Evfimii, see Olga B. Strakhov, “The Reception of Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Culture and Literature in Muscovite Rus’: The Case of Evfimii Chudozkii (1620s-1705)” (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1996).

\textsuperscript{7} Thus, patriarch Ioakim’s political base in the patriarchal see allowed him to wield power that was disproportionate to the status of his clan, a relatively minor, provincial family of hereditary military servitors. See Savelov, \textit{op. cit.}, 12, 15.

\textsuperscript{8} Indeed, in retrospect, the decade following the death of tsar Fedor Alekseevich could be characterized as the “Silver Age” of the Muscovite royal council (Rus. \textit{boiar skaia duma}), the informal, ad hoc, consultative commission(s), which made most of the policy decisions for the empire. See A. S. Lavrov, \textit{Regentsstvo tsarevny Sof’i Alekseevny: Sluzhitoe obschestvo i bor’ba za vlast’ v verkhakh Russkogo gosudarstva v 1682-1689 gg.} (M., 1999), 99-100, 191.
saw a fundamental similarity between the periods of "boyar rule," which stood at the opposite extremes of the turbulent century (Rus. *buntashnyi vek*) between the reign of Ivan Vasil'evich "The Terrible" and that of the "Most Gentle" Romanov tsar.⁹ The moral of the stories which the clerical and the political elites of Muscovy told themselves about their own past thus seemed to suggest that heresy, civil war, and foreign invasion, not Orthodox imperial reform, accompanied the reigns of weak or under-aged monarchs. And in both cases, the only responsible conclusion to be drawn from the experience of previous generations was the need for a "restoration" of an unquestioned, divinely-ordained, royal authority in the present one.

However, even before Muscovite statesmen (both secular and religious) could turn their attention to the glaring discrepancy between the "absolutist" pretensions of the Romanov dynasty and the monarch's actual (and much more limited) abilities to organize and enlighten his subjects, they had to resolve the problems within the ruling house itself. For many contemporaries, the fact that the Russian ruling house could not solve the question of the post-Alekseevan succession appeared as the clearest sign of Muscovy's moral decline and political debility. Every one of the consecutive regimes at the seventeenth-century Russian court was, of course, able to solve the problem of the royal succession; but not without resorting to historical falsification, political

⁹ This epithet (*tsaarkhishii*) - a translation of the term (Gr. *Galenoctos*; Lat. *Serenissimus*) by which Orthodox churchmen referred to the Emperor of the Christian East - was introduced into the royal titulature during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich as part of his strategy of emphasizing the link between the "second" (Constantinople) and "third" Rome (Moscow), while differentiating himself from the "first." For a discussion of this Byzantine borrowing, see Michael Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths* (New Haven and London, 1961), 61-63, esp. 62 n. 62; and Strakhov, *op. cit.*., 20.
corruption, and extra-judicial coercion.\textsuperscript{10} And this (apparently unavoidable) resort to seemingly inappropriate means deprived the dynasty of its legitimacy – which, ever since tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, was based on a dignified aloofness from the nitty-gritty of Muscovite clan politics.\textsuperscript{11}

It is with this contemporary perception of the link between the problem of royal succession and imperial decline that I wish to begin my analysis of the origins of Petrine political theology in general, and the “Transfigured Kingdom” in particular. As I hope to demonstrate in this (and the following) chapter, the question of who would inherit the throne of Moscow was much more than a family quarrel between the distaff branches of the Russian royal house.\textsuperscript{12} Or, rather, the dispute between the Miloslavskiis and the Naryshkins re-played, and serve to symbolize, the much larger, generational, political, and religious conflicts taking place within the Muscovite elite as a whole.\textsuperscript{13} As I will demonstrate in this chapter, both sides of the succession struggle


\textsuperscript{11} On the deliberately “inaccessible” ruling style of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, see supra, Introduction.

\textsuperscript{12} Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich was married twice: first to M. I. Miloslavskaiia; and second, to N. K. Naryshkina. As we will see, the children from these two marriages eventually became the “candidates” of two different political factions and the pawns of a complicated system of clan politics. See Martin, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{13} Nancy Shields Kollmann, \textit{By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia} (Ithaca and London, 1999), chs. 4-6, epilogue.
understood that the resolution of the family quarrel involved taking a particular stance vis-à-vis the reformist legacy of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. Whether this legacy was understood literally (as the real estate bequeathed by Russia’s royal father) or figuratively (as the grace bestowed by the divine Father), the post-Alekseevan succession involved a re-conceptualization of the social and ideological bases of Romanov rule. And this re-conceptualization implied nothing less than a thoroughgoing re-vision of the relationship between the tsar’s two bodies – the body natural of the man, and the body politic of the ruler. More concretely, I will argue that the coalition which put tsar Peter Alekseevich on the throne of Moscow owed at least some of its success to the fact that they were able to convince a significant portion of the Muscovite ruling class that, despite the apparent proliferation of charismatic claimants to the throne, the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich was the only candidate for the role of Russia’s savior (Gr. christos). Focusing on the various means – both legal and illegal, secular and religious – by which Peter’s kinsmen sought to advance the interests of their candidate, this chapter will thus offer an explanation of the link between royal charisma and family honor during the period which I have dubbed the “Naryshkin Restoration.”

The Compromise of 1682
In April 1682, immediately after the unexpected death of the twenty-year-old tsar Fedor Alekseevich Romanov, a cabal of conspirators, led by the maternal relatives of tsarevich Peter Alekseevich, attempted to put the youngest son of the late tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich on the throne of Muscovy, ahead of his elder step-brother, Ivan Alekseevich. On 27 April, patriarch Ioakim and the Naryshkins presented the nine-year-and-eleven-month old Peter Alekseevich as the next, Orthodox tsar in front of a hastily-convoked and largely ceremonial “assembly of the land” (zemskaia sobor), consisting of royal courtiers, chancellery clerks, and Moscow merchants. However, this half-hearted attempt to revive the waning tradition of “popular acclamations” could not stifle the growing unrest among the rank-and-file members of the plebeian police.

---


15 The Naryshkins, one of the two distaff sides of the Russian royal family at the time of the 1682 uprising, representing the children of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich’s second marriage to N. K. Naryshkina (m. 1671, d. 1694). Tsar Peter Alekseevich was thus the Naryshkin candidate. For a genealogical tree of the House of Romanov, see Lindsey Hughes, Sophia, Regent of Russia, 1657-1704: “Ambition and Daring Above Her Sex” (New Haven and London, 1990), xiv.

16 The Miloslavskiis, the other of the two, distaff sides of the Russian royal family at the time of the 1682 uprising, representing the children of Aleksei’s first marriage to M. I. Miloslavskaiia (m. 1648: d. 1669) Tsar Ivan Alekseevich was thus the Miloslavskii candidate. See Hughes, ibid.

17 After the revolutionary “assembly” of 1613, which elected the first Romanov tsar in accordance with the principle of vox populi, vox Dei, these ad hoc convocations fell into gradual disuse. Reforms by successive governments undercut the utility, if not the emotional appeal of these “assemblies,” so that by the end of the century, they were convoked only pro forma. For a summary of the extensive literature on “assemblies of the land,” see M. N Tikhomirov, “Sosovno-predstavitel’nye uchrezhdения (zemskie sobory) v Rossii XVI veka,” in Rossiiskoie gosudarstvo XV-XVII vekov (M., 1973), 42-69.

18 Hughes, op. cit., 52-53.
units, which were garrisoned in and around Moscow, nor quell the increasingly persistent rumors that the elder (and hence, more legitimately) “true” tsar, had been murdered by a Naryshkin “usurper.” Indeed, despite its apparent pragmatism, the concerted effort to bypass the unwritten laws of Muscovite royal succession turned out to be a miserable failure. For many of the Naryshkin conspirators, and their supporters, it also turned out to be a fatal mistake.

The timing of the urban uprising sparked by the machinations of patriarch Ioakim and the Naryshkins demonstrates the degree to which the privileged, military units of Moscow musketeers (Rus. strel’tsy, lit. “shooters”) shared in the founding myths of the Romanov dynasty. Shrewdly exploiting the factional divisions within the ruling elite in order to press their claims against the previous Russian government – which was pursuing a highly unpopular program of military re-organization – several regiments of musketeers rose up against their noble commanders. Encouraged by the

---

19 Popular rumors accused I. K. Naryshkin of trying on the royal regalia, insulting the Russian royal family, and plotting against the life of the Miloslavskii tsarevich, Ivan Alekseevich. See Hughes, op. cit., 59-60, 285 n. 43. Rumors thus equated Ivan Naryshkin with Boris Godunov, the “usurper,” who was reputed to have murdered Grand Prince Dmitrii of Uglich (the last Riurikid heir), and of sparking the original “Time of Troubles.” See Platonov, op. cit., 57-58.

20 According to knowledgeable foreign sources, the well-known physical and mental handicaps of the elder tsar encouraged the patriarch, and several members of the Muscovite political elite, to suggest and (finally) to implement the possibility of bypassing the elder tsar in favor of the younger one. See Hughes, op. cit., 52.

21 The uprising began on May 15, the very same day as the murder of tsarevich Dmitrii of Uglich. See Hughes, op. cit., 62. One of the official, contemporary accounts of the events of May 1682, compiled in the Crown Appointments Department (Razriad), was even entitled “Time of Troubles” (snizbnoe vremia). See “Zapisnaia kniga razriadnogo prikaza za 15 maia-konets dek. 1682,” cited in Hughes, ibid., 285 n. 64.

22 On the causes of the musketeers mutiny, see Hughes, op. cit., 54-55; and P. V. Sedov, “Sotsial’no-politicheskaya bor’ba v Rossii v 70kh-80kh gg. XVII v. i otmena mestnichestva” (Avtoreferat diss. kand. ist. nauk, A. A. Zhdanov State University, 1985).
supporters of the (very much alive) elder tsarevich, the mutinous troops invaded the inner sanctum of the Muscovite Kremlin, dispatched their hated governors, and, finally, after three days of terrible bloodshed, called for Ivan’s coronation alongside his young half-brother. In this way, the lower-class rebels sought to sanction through religious ceremony what they had accomplished through force of arms. Usurping the “electoral” power so jealously guarded by the defenders of Russian royal “absolutism,” for whom the principle of the “People’s Voice is the Voice of God” (Lat. vox populi, vox Dei) had played itself out in 1613, the rebels thus sought to re-enact the original, founding moment of the covenant between the Romanov dynasty and its Orthodox subjects.

Frightened into submission, the Naryshkin side of the Russian royal family acceded to the demands of their political rivals, the Miloslavskiis, and the latter’s (temporary) lower-class allies. In exchange for sparing their lives, the few, surviving members of the Naryshkin clan were forced to retire from the arena of Muscovite politics;\(^\text{23}\) while the patriarch was forced to perform a second coronation in as many months. The unprecedented coronation of both half-brothers represented a pragmatic political expedient, which attempted to double the chances that at least one of the two young Romanov tsars would be able to live into adulthood to father a viable heir to the throne. Reason of state (raison d’état), however, was not a legitimate justification for

\(^{23}\) Three male members of the Naryshkin clan were killed during the 1682 musketeer mutiny. The physical destruction of the Naryshkins, who had literally been pulled out of their hiding places and hacked to death in the public square outside of the royal palace, was followed by their political emasculation. Indeed, after the maternal grandfather of tsar Peter Alekseevich was forcibly tonsured and exiled to a monastery in the far north, the clan lost its last representative in the Muscovite royal council. See Lavrov, \textit{op. cit.}, 125-126.
the religious ceremony that was intended to invoke God's grace upon the mortal body of His earthly representative - the man officially empowered "to rule alone" (Gr. *monos archein*, monarchy).\(^{24}\) Nor could this expedient, political solution quell the self-righteous anger of the mutinous soldiers and rioters, many of whom pushed for a much more radical reconfiguration of the Russian body politic - a re-vision which drew at least some of its inspiration from the millenarian ideals of social justice advocated by the proponents of "Old Belief." And it is precisely because of the threat that popular insurrection posed to both the natural and the political bodies of the two young tsars that the entire court left Moscow in charge of a royal commission headed by I. A. Khovanskii\(^{25}\) and fled the turbulent politics of the Russian capital. Eventually, the court repaired behind the fortified walls of the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery, from which it issued a decree calling-up all the hereditary provincial servitors of Muscovy, to come and save the two royal brothers from the "seditious" and "schismatic" politics of their own subjects.

The choice to retire behind the fortified walls of the Trinity Monastery complex was neither as arbitrary, nor as purely pragmatic as it may seem at first sight.\(^{26}\) As the

\(^{24}\) From the perspective of Orthodox purists, the patriarch could be said to have been coerced into using his position to justify the Miloslavskii's crude grab for power. This is precisely what the patriarch and the Naryshkins would go on to argue vis-à-vis tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna. On the sanctity of Russian royal coronations, see Marie-Karine Schaub, "Les couronnements des tsars en Russie du XVI\(^{\text{e}}\) au XVIII\(^{\text{e}}\) siècle: essai d'historiographie." In Boureau and Ingerflom, eds., *op. cit.*, 137-148; and B. A. Uspenskii, *Tsar' i patriarkh: kharizma vlasti v Rossii (Vizantiiskaia model' i ee russkoe pereomsmylenie)* (M., 1998).

\(^{25}\) As the head of the Musketeer Chancellery (*Strelets'kii prizak*), Prince Khovanskii was (at least nominally) in charge of the Moscow garrison. For an insightful analysis of the motives for his (seemingly duplicitous) relations with both the Moscow rioters and the court-in-exile, see the discussion of the Khovanskii "boiar commission," in Lavrov, *op. cit.*, ch. 1.
final resting place of a “national” saint, this monastery had long been seen as the main line of defense against those “infidels” and “heretics,” who would subvert the confessional purity of the Russian Orthodox realm and overthrow its divinely-appointed rulers. In 1380, for example, St Sergius, the legendary founder of the Trinity Monastery, was reputed to have personally blessed the troops of Grand Prince Dmitrii Ivanovich “of the Don” (Rus. Донской) – the medieval Muscovite grand prince (and vassal of the Golden Horde), who went on to defeat his Islamic overlords at the battle of Kulikovo. 27 Most recently, the monastery had quite literally served as the bastion of resistance against the Catholic armies of the First False Dmitrii, the Polish-backed pretender to the Muscovite throne, who had succeeded in crowning himself as the tsar of Russia during the infamous “Time of Troubles.” Indeed, the Trinity monastery was one of the best-known historical sites in the Muscovite political imagination, a symbol of confessional purity and military might, which could serve as a powerful focus for mobilizing public opinion in favor of anyone who sought refuge behind its walls. By making an unscheduled “pilgrimage to the Trinity Monastery” (Rus. Троитский покой), the court of Moscow had thus won an important ideological battle against the mutineers and the Old Believers who had driven it from the capital, during the new “Time of

26 On the importance of the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery in the political, economic, and spiritual life of medieval Russia, see Pierre Gonneau, La Maison de la Sainte Trinité: un grand monastère russe au Moyen Âge tardif (1345-1533) (Paris, 1993); idem, “Monachisme et pouvoir politique à l’époque de la construction de l’État moscovite (XIVe-XVIIe siècles),” in Moines et monastères dans les sociétés de rite grec et latin ( = Haute études médiévales et modernes, 76) (Geneva, 1996), 435-458.

Troubles.” In this interpretation, the fact that the court’s orders were in fact obeyed by the provincial military servitors, who were called to restore the Romanovs to their rightful place, derived, at least in part, from the aura of sanctity reputedly possessed by the inhabitants of the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery.

The Royal Trinity

Despite such familiar historical parallels, however, the “restoration” of Romanov rule following the 1682 uprising was anything but traditional. The court’s return to Moscow did not mean a return to the same kind of monarchical rule as had prevailed before the new “Time of Troubles.” If anything, it signaled the dispersal of royal charisma, rather than its concentration in the hands of a single ruler. As a result of the political compromise hammered out during the course of the uprising, the Miloslavskii candidate had acceded to the throne alongside his half-brother, while the Miloslavskis and their supporters among the Muscovite political elite assumed control of what was, in essence, an informal regency council. In fact, officially, for more than seven years (1682-1689), one of Aleksei Mikhailovich’s daughters, tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna Miloslavskaiia, ruled in the name of the two tsars, neither of whom was deemed fit to rule by himself.28 Tsarevna Sof’ia assumed the responsibility for her

---

28 Female regents were not unprecedented in Muscovite political practice. “As in the clan, so in the state: there were certain times when it was entirely appropriate for a woman to assume a masculine role (such as in 1598, when there was no clearly mandated heir, but there was a widowed tsaritsa).” Usually, however, as in the minority of Ivan the Terrible, the mother of the young heir was chosen to head the regency council during his nonage. See Abby Finnoogh Smith, “Prince V. V. Golitsyn: The Life
deceased mother, tsaritsa Maria Il'inichna Miloslavskaiia, tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's first wife; this, despite the fact that Aleksei's second wife (and the mother of the youngest co-tsar), tsaritsa Natalia Kirilovna Naryshkina, was still very much alive. This controversial role reflected the actual balance of power between the distaff sides of the royal house. It also demonstrated that even after his coronation, the youngest Romanov tsar remained a secondary figure in an inherently unstable political compromise brokered by the Russian Orthodox patriarch.  

The unprecedented situation which prevailed after the 1682 Moscow uprising prompted Muscovite, Ukrainian, and Ruthenian (Belorussian) panegyrist to create an innovative theology of rule based on their (often conflicting) interpretations of the Alekseevian heritage of Orthodox imperial reform. For example, one of the earliest and most outspoken Muscovite advocates of the 1682 compromise, the monk Silvester (Simeon Agafonnikovich Medvedev), utilized the theological associations of the female regent's Christian name, Sof'ia, to popularize the mystical trope of "Holy Wisdom" (Hagia Sophia), the Divine Omniscience of the three hypostases of the Trinity, as one

---

29 As the youngest male heir of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, and the issue of his second marriage, tsar Peter was expected to give way before his older half-brother by his father's first marriage. Though lame and mentally-retarded, tsar Ivan showed all signs that he could carry on his dynastic and ceremonial obligations. And as long as he was able to live up to his responsibilities as pious tsar and dutiful husband, the Miloslavskii branch of the royal family and their supporters in the royal council could be sure that their control over the government would be prolonged indefinitely. Thus, judging solely by the standards of Muscovite inheritance laws and the succession practices within the Romanov dynasty, Peter's chances of ever ruling on his own were very slim indeed. See Smith, op. cit., 151-153.
of the most important allegorical images of the entire regency. Like his more famous predecessor, Fr. Silvester sought to use the Constantinian cult of the “wise” ruler of an expanding Christian empire to draw an analogy between the microcosm of the Muscovite realm with the macrocosm of the Kingdom of God. However, applying such imagery to the complicated political situation of the regency was a much more controversial enterprise, if for no other reason than that tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna was not a crowned head of state, and, according to Muscovite customary law, she could never assume the crown in her own right. Nevertheless, this did not deter Fr. Silvester from addressing his new royal patron in the same allegorical style that he had once used to describe the projected imperial renovation in the reign of her brother, tsar Fedor Alekseevich. Following the abbot of the Savior (Rus. Zaikonospasskii) Monastery, several other Muscovite panegyrists, as well as some of the leading Orthodox hierarchs of the metropolicy of Ukraine, began to apply Wisdom imagery to tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna. Indeed, after the regency government committed Muscovite forces


31 Fr. Silvester was a pupil of Simeon of Polotsk, the leading seventeenth-century exponent of Muscovite imperial renovation and religious enlightenment. On Simeon’s contribution to the formulation of the new, “absolutist” court culture, see supra, Introduction.

32 Among the Muscovite panegyrists was Medvedev’s brother-in-law, the court poet, educator, and monk, Karion (Istomin). For Karion’s literary panegyrics, see A. P. Bogdanov, Pamiatniki obshchestvenno-politicheskoi mysli v Rossii kontsa XVII veka. Literaturnye panegiriki (M., 1983), 2 vols.

33 The Ukrainian panegyrist were lead by such important Orthodox hierarchs as Lazar’ (Baranovich), head of the eparchy of Chernigov and Novgorod-Seversk, and the former rector of the Kiev Mohyla College. See A. P. Bogdanov, “Politicheskaia graviura v Rossii periodo regenstva Sof’ii Alekseevny,” Istochnikovedenie otechestvenoi istorii. Sbornik statei za 1981 g., ed. by V. I. Buganov (M., 1982), 225-246, here 225, 229.
to the defense of the Orthodox population of the south-western borderlands from the incursions of the Crimean vassals of the Ottoman Porte.  This trope became the cornerstone of all the literary and visual panegyrics concerning the personal virtues of the regent and the policies of her government, both in Muscovy and in the Ukraine.  Paradoxically, the person who owed her sudden appearance on the political stage to the divisive succession struggle between the distaff branches of the Russian royal house was thus invoked by clerical panegyrists as the symbol for the unity of the Orthodox "Third Rome."

In this politically-tense period, factions that sought to counterbalance the influence of the Russian Orthodox patriarch, appealed more and more often to the "divine wisdom" of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna.  For example, exploiting the dynastic instability of the Muscovite imperial government in order to defend the independent status of the Kievan metropolis against the centralizing policies of the Russian

---

34 This new commitment was a consequence of the regency's controversial diplomatic alliance with the Catholic powers of the Holy Alliance, organized by the Vatican. For a discussion of the geopolitical implications of the regency's diplomatic efforts vis-à-vis the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, see Z. Wójcik, "From the Peace of Oliwa to the Truce of Bakhchisarai: International Relations in Eastern Europe, 1660-1681," Acta Poloniae Historica 34 (1976), 255-280; J. K. Babushkina, "Mezhdunarodnoe znachenie Krymskikh pokhodov 1687 i 1689 gg.,” Istoriicheskie zapiski 33 (1950), 159-161; and Hughes, op. cit., ch. 8.


36 A. P. Bogdanov, "Literaturnye panegiriki kak istochnik izucheniia sootnosheniia sil v pravitel'stve Rossi v periodo regenstva Sof'i (1682-1689 gg.)," Materialy XVII Vsesoiuznoi nauchnoi studencheskoi konferentsii "Student i nauchno-tekhnicheskii progress." Istorii (N., 1979), 71-79.
Orthodox church, Ukrainian and Ruthenian hierarchs sought to offer their own version of Muscovite imperial renewal. The Russian Orthodox patriarch claimed to have a monopoly on the power to authorize changes in the Orthodox canon and the religious imagery which legitimated Muscovite imperial rule. But Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchs took advantage of their reputation for erudition and their access to the most modern printing technology, in an effort to promote their own interpretation of Muscovite political theology. Over the course of the regency, literary and visual panegyrics, such as the books and posters printed in the typography of Lazar' (Baranovich), the archbishop of Chernigov and Novgorod-Seversk, increasingly depicted the Muscovite regent as the most important figure in the imperial Orthodox realm.

Just a year after the political compromise which created the regency, archbishop Lazar' wrote a treatise on *Grace and Truth*, an exegetical apologia for dual rule.37 The title of the book evoked the virtues of the young tsars’ heavenly namesakes, the apostles John and Peter; but, as the accompanying engraving implied, it was the counsel of Sophia – The Wisdom of God, the namesake of tsarevna Sof'ia, that would guide the new government to act in the interests of religious enlightenment and imperial renovation. The archbishop appealed to the royal triumvirate of Ivan, Peter and Sof'ia, as the rightful protectors of the Kievan religious enlightenment, urging the regency government to send troops to protect the newly-incorporated south-western territories.

---

37 Baranovich’s *Blagodat’ i istina* (Chernigov, 1683), exists in several copies: *RO RNB*, No. 1508; *RGADA*, Tserkovnaia pechat', *inv.* No. 1054; *RO BAN* 36.11.17 and 8.1.5 (*inv.* Nos. 487 and 488), as cited by Bogdanov, “Politicheskaia graviura,” *op. cit.*, 231.
but to refrain from subordinating the Ukrainian religious establishment to its Muscovite counterpart.

At the end of his learned treatise, Lazar' (Baranovich) appended a large engraving,\(^{38}\) which was meant to visually summarize the arguments and "conclusions" of the book.\(^ {39}\) The so-called "Shchirskii engraving" attempted to illustrate the argument that only a sovereignty based on adherence to the "true science of government – Divine Wisdom – and one ultimately based on the source of all wisdom – the Trinity," could assure victory against the Islamic "infidels" and protect the Ukraine.\(^ {40}\) Like other panegyrical productions during the regency, the engraving relied on the iconographic convention of depicting Sophia – The Wisdom of God reigning over the world, in order to make a point about the political organization of the Muscovite realm. The Ukrainian artist depicted the unstable political compromise of 1682 as part of the divine order, on a chain of perfection stretching from the Holy Trinity, to the three patron saints of the rulers, and finally, to the rulers' earthly intercessors, the metropolitan of Kiev and the patriarch of Moscow. In this view, the new Muscovite government would act most wisely if it followed its divine prototype, the divine wisdom of the Holy Trinity.

As long as the 1682 compromise held, even those ecclesiastics allied with the Russian patriarch and the factions opposed to the regency government invoked the

\(^{38}\) For a reproduction of this engraving, see Hughes, op. cit., 141 (Illustration 8).

\(^{39}\) On the genre of conclusio, which was very popular in the Orthodox brotherhood schools of the Ukraine and Ruthenia, see M. A. Alekseeva, "Zhant konkluizii v russkom iskusstve kontsa XVII-nachalo XVIII veka," in Russkoe iskusstvo barokko. Materialy i issledovaniia (M., 1977), 7-29.

\(^{40}\) My discussion of Baranovich's Grace and Truth is indebted to Zelensky, op. cit., 307-312.
rhetorical trope of Sophia – The Wisdom of God to describe the political situation of the newly-“restored” Romanov dynasty. The power of this courtly convention explains why, for example, Ioannikios and Sofronios Leichudes – the two Greek monks who were called to Moscow by patriarch Ioakim in order to undermine the educational and religious pretensions of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna’s protégé, Silvester (Medvedev) – invoked the Wisdom of God, in a laudatory oration to the regent, on the occasion of her birthday. Unlikely abbot Silvester and the Ukrainian hierarchs, however, the Leichudes brothers did not use the trope of Sophia – The Wisdom of God to make tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna the leading person in the political and mystical perfection supposedly embodied by the Muscovite “royal trinity.” Although they did refer to the tsarevna as “empress” (Lat. imperatrix) the regent’s claim to the Byzantine imperial heritage was expressed in a very attenuated way. Relying on the Greek Orthodox iconographic image of the Holy Virgin as the Wall (Gr. Oranta), the two Greek monks drew attention to the intercessory role performed by the regent in the Muscovite campaign against the Crimean khanate. The Leichudes limited her role to praying to the Mother of God for the success and the welfare of the “virile” troops of Muscovy. In their presentation, the “royal trinity” appeared as a divinely-appointed but essentially passive figurehead for the manly exploits of Russian troops against the “infidel Turk.” The humiliating failure of these troops during the Crimean campaigns of 1687-1688 would

---

41 The Russian translation of the Latin oration delivered by “Ioannic et Sophronius Sacromonaci et Doctores Lycudii” on 17 September (c. 1686), entitled “Laus serenissimae ac Potentissimae Reginae Moschoviae et Imperatricis Sophiae Alexievae die natalitiorum suorum,” was published by E. L. Lermontova, *Pokhval’noe slovo Likhudov tsarevne Sof’e Alekseevne* (M., 1910).
occasion the collapse of the broad coalition behind the 1682 compromise and lead to a drastic re-vision of the place of the three persons of the Muscovite "royal trinity."42

*The Naryshkin Manifesto*

It was very characteristic of the covert methods by which the political coalition that put the future Peter the Great on the throne conducted its business, that the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich Romanov played no more than a symbolic role in the second palace coup staged in his favor.43 Following the ideological conventions and the informal rules of engagement elaborated during the two previous "Times of Troubles," Peter's kinsmen did not shirk from using falsification, coercion, and political manipulation, in order to press the claims of their candidate. As in 1682, the court of a Romanov tsar made an unexpected "pilgrimage" to the Trinity Monastery; as during the previous "Time of Troubles," the appeals issued from behind the safety of the Trinity Monastery called for the "restoration" of legitimate royal authority; and, finally, just as before, this move was an ingenious way of branding one's political opponents as rebels, usurpers, and heretics. However, whereas in 1613 (and, to a lesser extent, in 1682), the self-proclaimed royalists really did seek to quell

---

42 For an insightful discussion of the domestic and geopolitical determinants of the 1689 coup, see Lavrov, *op. cit.*, 15-16, 92, 96; Smith, *op. cit.*, ch. 5; and Hughes, *op. cit.*, ch. 9.

43 For a prosopographical analysis of Peter's supporters during the 1689 coup, see Lavrov, *op. cit.*, ch. 3, esp. 162-163, 184-185, 250 n. 38.

According to Bogdanov, "Literaturnye panegiriki," *op. cit.*, 72, the original presentation copy is located in *RGADA*, f. 375, op. 1, d. 22.
an armed, popular insurgency, the coup organized by the Naryshkins can more accurately be described as a pre-emptive strike. For, shortly after "seeking refuge" behind the fortified walls of the Trinity Monastery, the seventeen-year-old tsar and his armed retinue informed the elder tsar and his courtiers about several *faits accompli*: the execution of Moscow's police chief, F. L. Shaklovityi, for allegedly conspiring against the Naryshkin line of the royal family;\(^{44}\) the removal of the name of the regent, tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna, from the official royal title used in diplomatic and intra-governmental correspondence;\(^{45}\) and, finally, the sacking of chancellery personnel loyal to the Miloslavskii-led regency and their replacement by officials loyal to the new Naryshkin regime.\(^{46}\)

The organizers of the 1689 palace coup which finally overthrew the regency government of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna attempted to depict their illegal actions as the rightful restoration of the diarchy of the sons of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, and, by implication, as a repudiation of female rule. This tactic was clearly revealed in the letter, supposedly written by tsar Peter Alekseevich to his "brother" and "co-ruler," tsar Ivan Alekseevich, on 12 September 1689.\(^{47}\) Even though the letter was made to

\(^{44}\) F. L. Shaklovityi was brought to the Naryshkin camp at the Trinity-St. Sergii Monastery and tortured on 7 September 1689. On 8 September, his former post as the head of the Musketeer Chancellery was given to Prince I. B. Troekurov. See Lavrov, *op. cit.*, 168.

\(^{45}\) The decree about expunging the name of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna from the official diplomatic and government correspondence was issued on 7 September 1689. See M. M. Bogoslovskii, *Petr I: Materialy dlja biografii* (M., 1940), I: 86; Lavrov, *op. cit.*, 167.

\(^{46}\) Lavrov, *op. cit.* 182-190.

\(^{47}\) *Pis'ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo* (SPb., 1887) [hereafter, *PiB*], I:13-14.
appear as if it had come from the pen of the younger co-tsar, this important document was neither composed nor signed by Peter Alekseevich himself. In fact, it is unknown what role, if any, the younger co-tsar had in drafting what was, in essence, an unofficial proclamation about the de facto beginning of his independent reign. While there is no doubt that this letter was a Naryshkin manifesto, it still remains to be explored why the tsar’s kinsmen decided to present their political demands in a forged epistle, under literary mask of “tsar Peter” (tsar Пётр).

His familiarity with the secret transcripts of the official criminal proceedings against F. L. Shaklovityi suggests that the anonymous author of the 1689 letter to tsar Ivan Alekseevich was himself a member of the royal commission charged with conducting the investigation into the alleged plot which had sparked the Naryshkin coup. Even a brief look at the social composition of the commission entrusted with the sensitive job of making the case against the former head of the Moscow police force, and implicitly, against the regency government and tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna

---

48 PiB. 1: 488; Lavrov, op. cit., 167, 244 n. 50.

49 PiB. 1:14.

50 The Naryshkin case against the alleged “coup plotters” was only published at the end of the nineteenth century; see Rozysnye dela o Fedore Shaklovitom i ego soobshchnikakh, 4 vols. (SPb., 1884-1893).

51 Since such investigative commissions were usually composed of several high-ranking members of the Muscovite royal council, as well as a small number of chancellery clerks (d’iaki) and scribes (pod’iachie), it is impossible to determine who actually wrote the letter to tsar Ivan Alekseevich without a further investigation into the composition of the Trinity royal commission. For the regular composition of political investigative commissions, see N. B. Golikova, “Organy politicheskogo syska i ikh razvitie v XVII-XVIII vv.,” in Absolutizm v Rossii XVII-XVIII vv. Sb. statei k 70-letiiu B. B. Kafengauza (M., 1964), 243-280, here 248. For the composition of the Trinity investigative commission, see Lavrov, op. cit., 168-169, 245 n. 70.
herself, reveals that it was made up of some of Peter’s closest advisors. In fact, the three men appointed to head the Trinity investigative commission – Prince I. B. Troekurov, Prince B. A. Golitsyn (1654-1714), and T. N. Streshnev (1649-1719) – were not only members of Peter Alekseevich’s personal entourage, but were also either related to the Romanov dynasty, to the Naryshkin clan, or to the young tsar himself.

---

52 Prince I. B. Troekurov, father of one of Peter’s closest intimates, served as boyar from 1682 until his death in 1703. In January 1689, he was one of the official witnesses at tsar Peter’s first wedding. For his court rank, see I. Lu. Airapetian, “Feodal’naia aristokratia v period stanovleniia absolutizma v Rossii” (Diss. kand. ist. nauk, M. V. Lomonosov State University, 1987), 319; on his service career, see Robert O. Crumney, “Peter and the Boyar Aristocracy, 1689-1700.” Canadian-American Slavic Studies 8:2 (Summer 1974), 274-287, here 284. On Troekurov’s role in Peter’s wedding, see the official relation, published by N. I. Novikov, ed., “O sochetanii brakom tsarja i velikogo kniazia Petra Alekseevicha s tsaritsieiu Evdokieiu Feodorovnoiu,” Drevnyaia Rossiiskais Vitliofika, 2nd ed. (1789), 11:194-196, here 196. For his other service ranks and appointments, see PiB, I: 538. His son, Fedor, one of Peter’s privy chamberlains (konnanyi stol’nik), died in 1695, after being fatally wounded during one of the tsar’s war-games. See Peter to F. Lu. Romodanovskii (8 September 1695), ibid., 49. As a member of Peter’s “company,” F. I. Troekurov was buried “like the Savior [himself]” (pokhoronili iako spassia). See Prince B. A. Golitsyn to Peter (November 1695), ibid., 538-539. On his role in Peter’s “company,” see ibid., 26, 32, 503.

53 For a brief biography of Prince B. A. Golitsyn, one of the master-minds behind the 1689 coup d’etat, see Evgenii Serchevskii, Zapiski o rode kniaze Golitsynkh (SPb., 1853), 54-59; and Hughes, op. cit., 419-420. From 1682 to the Naryshkin coup, Prince Golitsyn served as official drink attendant (kravchiil) and privy chamberlain (konmannyi stol’nik) to tsar Peter Alekseevich. From 1690, until his retirement in 1714, he served as royal counselor (boyar), as well as the head of the entire Volga-Kama region. See Airapetian, op. cit., 70-71, 90-91, 329, 316. Although I have not been able to find out his “clerical” pseudonym, there is every reason to believe that this highly-educated and rabidly anti-Catholic royal intimate was one of the moving forces behind the organization of the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope.” For his religious views, see the comments of Christoph Ignaz von Guariint, head of the 1698-1699 Imperial embassy to Muscovy: Guariint characterized Golitsyn as “Catholicis infensissimus” and as “je ein grösserer eyferrer der Russischen religion jederzeit gehalten, und keine andere Gloire hefftiger gesucht, als wan ein Catholischer durch ihn von dem wahren Glauben zu dem Russischen Schisma verführt worden, wie er dan in Moscovitiuscher sprach ein wahrer Nachfolger Joannis Baptistae durchgehends genannt wird.” Guariint’s letter to Vienna (12 August 1698) is cited by Paul Bushkovitch, “Aристocratic Faction and the Opposition to Peter the Great: The 1690s,” Forschungen zur Osteuropäischen Geschichte 50 (1995), 80-120, here 102-103 n. 54.

54 T. N. Streshnev, who was related (by marriage) to both the Golitsyn clan and the Russian royal family, was generally acknowledged as one of leading figures of the “Naryshkin group.” In addition to his role as boyar (from 1688) and privy counselor (konmannyi stol’nik), since 1679 Streshnev was also one of the legally-appointed adult male guardians (ditad’kt) of tsar Peter Alekseevich. From the Naryshkin coup until his death, Streshnev also controlled most of the military chancelleries of the empire. In 1711, he became one of the founding members of the Russian Imperial Senate. See Lavrov, ibid, 168-169; Airapetian, 99, 154-155, 335; Hughes, op. cit., 418; John P. LeDonne, “Ruling Families
Like some of their lower-born, professionally-trained, administrative assistants *(tovarishchi)* – most notably, the chancellery clerk *(d’iak)* N. M. Zotov (1643/4-1718), the future “Prince Pope” of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council\(^{56}\) – they would go on to form the core group of the “Transfigured Kingdom.”

The fact that the members of the Trinity investigative commission decided to forge a letter from “tsar Peter” to his “brother sovereign” *(bratets gosudar’)* suggests that their use of a folksy, familial address represented an epistolary attempt to maintain the fiction of a diarchy between the sons of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, while shifting the actual control of the regency government from one distaff side of the royal house to another.\(^{57}\) The issue of the co-tsars’ sexual maturity, as well as their ability to take up

---

\(^{55}\) By his marriage to A. F. Lopukhina, the sister of the tsar’s new bride, Troekurov managed to ally himself with both the Lopukhin and the Naryshkin clans, who formed the main contingent of the courtiers at the Trinity Monastery. See Lavrov, *ibid.*, 169.

\(^{56}\) Thanks to his appointment as personal tutor to tsar Peter Alekseevich, this low-born chancellery clerk *(dumyi d’iak)* became an intimate member of the Naryshkin party. For the genealogy of the Zotov clan, see S. Lihumov, *Opyst istoricheskikh rodoslovi*:*i: Gundorovyi, Zhitzhenskie, Nesvitskie, Sibirskie, Zotovy i Ostermany* (Petrograd, 1915), 80-90; “Grafy Zotovy,” *Gerhoved*, ed. S. N. Troitskii (September 1914), 131-135; and Airapetian, *op. cit.*, 121, 366-367. On N. M. Zotov’s career in the Muscovite civil service prior to the 1689 coup, see Bogeslovskii, *op. cit.*, 34-37, 55-56; *idem*, “Detsvto Petra Velikogo,” *Russkaja starina* 1 (1917), 27-29; and V. Korsakov, “Zotov, gr. Nikita Moiseevich,” in *Russkii biograficheskii slovar’* (NY, 1962), 7: 476-481, here 476-477. For Zotov’s participation in the case against Shaklovityi, see his signature on two important documents, “Stateinoi spisok po izvetnomi po royskmomu delu” and “Prigovor po stateinomu spisku,” in *Rozysknye dela*, *op. cit.*, 1: 209-270, here 263-264, 270. For his career after the 1689 coup, see *infra*, Chapter Four. For his role in Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council, see *infra*, Chapter Four; and Appendix.

\(^{57}\) Even the seemingly innocuous epistolary salutation opening the letter to Ivan Alekseevich, actually contained a veiled reference to the most emotional and the most divisive political issue between the rival courts of the sons of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich: the question of the royal succession. Writing from the point of view of the younger co-tsar, the anonymous member of Peter’s retinue commended the health of tsar Ivan Alekseevich, his new young bride, tsariitsa Praskov’ia Fedorovna (*neé* Saltykova), and
the mantle of royal rule, to which the anonymous author of the letter to tsar Ivan Alekseevich hinted in the salutation,58 formed the main theme of the Naryshkin manifesto. The author of the 1689 letter struggled to depict the palace coup staged by the maternal relatives and supporters of tsar Peter Alekseevich as the restoration of the piety and justice associated with the reign of the co-tsars’ late father. Putting the religious and allegorical language favored at the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich into the mouth of his youngest son and heir, the author of this document had the epistolary “tsar Peter” stress, in very traditional Muscovite fashion, that the royal brothers had been chosen by God to fulfill the obligations of earthly sovereigns: “The scepter by which the two of us govern the Russian tsardom of our ancestors has been entrusted to us by the grace of God, as is evidenced by the [7]190 [1682] decision of the ecclesiastical council of our Mother, the Eastern [Orthodox] Church, as well as by [the tacit consent of] our [royal] brotherhood, [composed of] the neighboring sovereigns.” By invoking the “scepter of governance” (skipet pravlenia), a synecdoche first used

---

58 The issue of the sex of Ivan’s child was an important political problem from the moment that the Naryshkins found a bride for their royal candidate, thereby ceremonially declaring that Peter Alekseevich had officially come of age. Despite their confidence in Peter’s youth and virility, as well as the fertility of tsaritsa Evdokiia Fedorovna (née Lopukhina), the tsar’s virgin bride, his courtiers could not help but be anxious about the possibility that the elder tsar could still father a male heir (and successor) before Peter. Should this happen, they would almost certainly be condemned to a life-sentence of service in the royal retinue of the junior tsar. See Lavrov, op. cit., 89-90. For an insightful analysis of the politics behind the strikingly different weddings of Ivan and Peter, see Martin, op. cit., 239-246.
by Simeon of Polotsk to justify his royal patron's program of religious enlightenment. The author of the 1689 letter asserted that the sons of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich had become the legal and spiritual guardians of the largest community of Orthodox Slavs on the eastern European plain. Before their dual coronation in 1682, the accession of Aleksei's sons to this divinely-ordained duty was confirmed by the actions of their spiritual "mother," the Eastern Orthodox Church assembled in council; it was also tacitly acknowledged by their spiritual brothers, the divinely-ordained "fraternity" (bratiia) of neighboring sovereign princes, who signaled their agreement to offer diplomatic recognition to the unstable political compromise of 1682 by addressing the Muscovite tsars with their full royal title.

The problem with this definition of what constituted a legitimate claim to the Muscovite throne was that according to these criteria, all three official Muscovite heads of state at the end of the 1680s could claim to have fulfilled these requirements. Both the tsars and the female regent were the children of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich; their right to rule had been affirmed by the "mother" church; and their legitimacy had been recognized by their "brother" sovereigns, most notably, during the "Eternal Peace" between Muscovy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, negotiated during the

---

59 The "scepter of governance" echoes the title of Simeon's polemical religious treatise, *The Staff of Governance*, written in order to defend the irreconcilable position taken by the church council of 1666-1667 against the "schismatic" Old Believers. On Simeon's *Zhezhl pravleniia* (M., 1667), see Bushkovich, *op. cit.*, 166. This treatise remained "a model for official Church polemics against the schismatics through the end of the century [...]," even for those clerical officials, who later repudiated the author's "Latinizing" tendencies. See Potter, *op. cit.*, 217 n. 66.
regency of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna. As a result, the anonymous author of the 1689 letter had to come up with another explanation of why the "scepter of rule" belonged only to the royal brothers. In an attempt to exclude the regent, and by implication, the Miloslavskii clan as a whole, from the royal succession, he implicitly appealed to the Muscovite political elite's traditional conceptions about patrilineal inheritance. According to customary law, the "scepter of rule" within the family and over the estate could only be handed down from father to son. This was especially true within the Romanov royal house, which had devised the practice of keeping its female members as secluded and celibate as nuns. This policy was an expedient way of elevating the Romanov clan above its former equals, the other clans of hereditary military servitors who constituted the political and social elite of Muscovy. By keeping their sisters and nieces out of the marriage market, seventeenth-century Romanov tsars could avoid the messy and potentially destabilizing problems associated with integrating

---


61 Although the elder daughters of hereditary military servitors were entitled to a share of the patrimony in the form of a dowry, and could even act as guardians during the minority of their brothers, they were excluded from assuming the entire inheritance for themselves. For a discussion of female inheritance practices among the Muscovite hereditary military elite, see Sandra Levy, "Women and the Control of Property in Sixteenth-Century Muscovy," *Russian History* 10: 2 (1983), 210-212; Ann Kleimola, "'In accordance with the canons of the Apostles': Muscovite Dowries and Women's Property Rights," *Russian Review* 51 (1992), 204-229; N. L. Pushkareva, *Women in Russian History: From the Tenth to the Twentieth Century*, trans. and ed. by Eve Levin (Armonk, 1997), 44-49, 106-112; and Michelle Lamarche Marrese, "The Enigma of Married Women's Control of Property in Eighteenth-Century Russia," *Russian Review* 58:3 (1999), 380-395.
new royal in-laws into the matrimonial alliances that shaped the politics within the
Muscovite elite.\textsuperscript{62}

In the brief preamble to the 1689 Naryshkin manifesto, the anonymous author
implicitly argued that the regent had violated these common law notions about familial
obligations and “willfully” over-stepped her traditional gender role. According to this
interpretation, tsarevna Sof’ia unceremoniously usurped her brothers’ personal
responsibility for securing domestic tranquility, guaranteeing the fair administration of
justice, and defending the Orthodox faith, traditionally, the most important tasks of
Russian tsars, for which they were ultimately to be accountable before the Supreme
Judge Himself.\textsuperscript{63} By making a subtle distinction between “governance” (pravlenie), the
legitimate authority exercised by the sovereign (gosudar’) over his realm, and
“possession” (vladenie), the illegitimate rule of an usurper who illegally appropriates
the patrimony of the rightful property-owners, the author of the 1689 letter managed to
attack the legitimacy of the regency government of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna. as well
as the integrity of the regent herself: “There was never any mention [in the previously-
cited proofs of the legitimacy of] our sovereignty, of a third person having an equal
share with us in the governance [of the Muscovite realm]. But you already know about

\textsuperscript{62} See Martin, \textit{op. cit.}; and Nancy Shields Kollmann, “The Seclusion of Elite Muscovite

\textsuperscript{63} On the discourse about responsibilities of Muscovite tsars, see Douglas Joseph Bennett, “The
Idea of Kingship in 17\textsuperscript{th}-Century Russia” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1967); and Daniel Rowland,
“The Problem of Advice in Muscovite Tales About the Time of Troubles,” \textit{Russian History/Histoire
russe} 6:2 (1979), 259-283; on the use of this discourse in the 1689 letter to tsar Ivan Alekseevich, see
Barbara Joyce Merguerian, “Political Ideas in Russia During the Period of Peter the Great (1682-1730)”
(Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1970), 103.
what happened after our sister [...], began to rule our realm [simply by an act] of her own will, [and, consequently, how] her [illegitimate] rule was [directed] against our own [royal] persons, [how it put ever more] burdens on the people, and how we [were forced to] put up with it.”

By including her own name in the royal titulature alongside that of the anointed and crowned heads of Muscovy, the regent symbolically asserted that she was equally “entitled” to govern the Russian tsardom and thereby illegally took possession of her brothers’ patrimony.

By subverting the patrilineal principle and usurping the legal property-rights of her brothers, tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna had also appropriated the symbols of their sovereignty, as well as their masculinity. As a result of her “self-willed” act, the virgin tsarevna began to wield political authority, which, as we saw above, was represented in the Naryshkin manifesto by the brothers’ “scepter of rule” (skipet’ pravleniia). The regent’s usurpation of this symbol of public and ancestral trust infringed on the benevolent, paternal authority of God Himself. Indeed, employing the same underhanded techniques as the organizers of the 1682 counter-coup, the author of the 1689 letter insinuated that the co-tsars’ passivity in the face of (in this case, metaphorical) rough-handling of the royal regalia was explained by the suspicion that tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna had some kind of supernatural control over her brothers.

---

64 *PiB*, I: 13.

65 Cf. *uchela vladet’*, literally, took possession of, as in *vstupit’ vo vladenie imushchestvom*, to take possession of property.

66 In making this accusation, the author of the 1689 letter appears to have been guided by the same interpretive scheme as the Miloslavskis and their supporters, who had accused I. K. Naryshkin of trying on the royal regalia. See Hughes, *op. cit.*, 59, 285 n. 43.
Playing on the multiple meanings of the word “possession” (*vladenie*), the anonymous courtier from the retinue of tsar Peter Alekseevich implied that the regent was also some kind of a witch.\(^67\) If the male members of the diarchy did not seem to be performing their duties, if justice and domestic tranquility was being perverted, if, in other words, the rightful Muscovite tsars had lost the use (or possession) of their (phallic) royal scepters,\(^68\) then they must have been at the mercy of forces beyond their control\(^69\) -- forces which the author of the 1689 Naryshkin manifesto associated with the figure of the “self-willed,” female regent.\(^70\)

Inverting the traditional plot of a fairy-tale about the evil step-mother, the author of these scurrilous innuendoes went on to argue that the machinations of the regent resulted in a conspiracy against the life of her step-brother, tsar Peter Alekseevich and

\(^67\) Accusations of sorcery were not unusual at the courts of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich or his children, especially when this concerned the health and fertility of the ruler and his family. In fact, as the recorded cases of “words and deeds” (*slovo i delo gosudarevo*) against the majesty of the tsar demonstrate, such practices as putting the “evil eye,” casting magic spells (*zagovor*, lit. “conspiracy”), or invoking unclean spirits in order to send wasting diseases (*porcha*) on one’s political rivals, were quite regularly invoked in Muscovite political disputes. On the Miloslavski’s accusations against A. S. Matveev, see *supra*. For the Naryshkins’ accusations against those involved in the “case” of F. L. Shaklovityi, see A. N. Truvorov, “Volkhvy i vorozhei na Rusi, v kontse XVII veka,” *Istoricheski vestnik* 6 (1889), 710-715; and W. F. Ryan, *The Bathhouse at Midnight: An Historical Survey of Magic and Divination in Russia* (Universtiy Park, 1999), 77, 173, 415-416. On demonic possession in Russia, see Ryan, *ibid.*, 8, 41, 78; for the “political dimension” of witchcraft accusations, see *ibid.*, 38-39, 165, 375; and ch. 16.

\(^68\) Although this symbolism is merely implicit in the text, the earlier invocation of the co-tsar’s sexual potency (particularly, regarding Ivan’s apparent inability to father a male heir), suggests that virility was an important point in the program of the Naryshkin manifesto. For a discussion of the phallic symbolism associated with the Muscovite royal scepter, see *infra*, Chapter Five; and Conclusion.

\(^69\) Cf. *kem-to vladenit strasti*, to be at the mercy of one’s passions.

\(^70\) In this interpretation, tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna appeared as one of the most potent (and anxiety-producing) figures of all – the carnivalesque harridan, who inverted the traditional gender roles of the patriarchal political establishment. On this image, see Natalie Zeman Davis, “Woman on Top,” in her *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford, 1975); 124-151.
his mother, the young tsaritsa-dowager, N. K. Naryshkina. Only the quick thinking and bold actions of tsar Peter, and everyone who rallied to his cause, prevented the fairy-tale from turning into a tragedy. Foreshadowing the “happy ending” of the special report compiled by the Trinity investigative commission, the anonymous author of the 1689 letter argued that the time had finally come when the co-tsars could dispense with the regency government altogether.

And now, sovereign brother, the time has come for both of our [royal] persons to control for ourselves the tsardom entrusted to us by God, for we have come into the fullness of our age. We should not permit that extraneous [literally, “third”], reprehensible person, our sister ts. [arevna] S. [ophia] A. [lekseevna] to [appear] alongside our [two] masculine persons in the [official royal] titulature or in the administration of [government] affairs. And you too, my sovereign brother, should bend your will [to this purpose], because [as you are also aware, not only did] she begin to get involved in government affairs and to include her name in the official royal titulature without our permission, but, to add the ultimate insult to our injury, she wanted to be crowned with the royal wreath. [We have finally attained our] majority and at our age, sovereign, it is shameful, for this reprehensible person to control the kingdom in our stead.⁷¹

Urging his “brother-sovereign” to recognize their “shameful” (sramno) passivity, “tsar Peter” demanded that his elder half-brother demonstrate the fact that he could still “bend his will” to the exercise of his own legitimate royal authority. Provocatively employing an obscene double-entendre, “tsar Peter” challenged his co-ruler to prove that he was no longer subject to the feminine charms of his sister, tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna. Only if they were both able to break free of the spell cast over the diarchy by the female regent, that extraneous, “reprehensible,” and literally unmentionable

⁷¹ *PiB*, 1: 13.
person, who wielded their royal scepters for them, could the co-tsar's assert their God-given rights to rule as mature men. In what seems to be a veiled reference to the pregnancy of tsaritsa Evdokiia Fedorovna Lopukhina, Peter's young bride, the author of the 1689 letter hinted at the most visible sign of the fact that the regent's evil machinations had failed to prevent Peter Alekseevich from reaching the "fullness" of his age and from becoming a real man. And now that the Naryshkin coup had exorcised the influence of the regent Sof'ia Alekseevna, the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich had also come of age politically.

The fact that the term "reprehensible person" (zazornoje litso) was repeated twice in two consecutive sentences, underlines its ideological significance in the compositional structure of the Naryshkin manifesto about the restoration of legitimate, masculine royal authority. For this term referred to individuals, and particularly to unmarried women, with whom it was "blameworthy" (zazorno) for ecclesiastics to have relations. No matter how holy or celibate, the cleric who had to deal with a woman was necessarily subjected to moral reproof, because even the most innocent relations carried the danger of sexual temptation and ritual pollution. Indeed, in using this loaded adjectival phrase in the anachronistic sense which it had already acquired by the end of the seventeenth century,\(^2\) the author of the 1689 letter implied that tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna's untoward actions vis-à-vis her brothers - the rightful, divinely-

ordained tsars of Russia – had subverted the ideal of monastic purity which tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich had attempted to establish at court and within his royal house.\textsuperscript{73}

In order to parody the supposedly vain and unnatural ambitions of the Russian regent, the author of the 1689 letter resorted to familiar literary models, some of which could be traced back to the anti-Catholic polemical literature of the early seventeenth-century Ukraine, and beyond, to the medieval Latin tradition of “sacred parody” (\textit{parodia sacra}).\textsuperscript{74} By the end of the seventeenth-century, accusations of sexual impropriety on the part of monks and nuns, ecclesiastics who had taken a vow of chastity and had self-consciously adopted the “angelic form,” had become a stock example of hypocrisy in the polemical literature directed against the vices of the Russian Orthodox clergy. The number of humorous stories, poems, and parodies about licentious monks and nuns was matched only by literary examples of gluttony and intemperance.\textsuperscript{75} Such accusations constituted an integral part of the rhetoric of seventeenth-century Orthodox ecclesiastical reformers and lay-people, critical of those “ignorant” Russian clerics

\textsuperscript{73} On Aleksei’s “monastic” court, see \textit{supra}, Introduction.

\textsuperscript{74} For an attempt to understand why literary parodies of liturgical texts appeared in 17\textsuperscript{th}-century Muscovy, see L. A. Chernaia, “Parodiia na tserkovnye teksty v russkoi literature XVII veka.” \textit{Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Seriia 8. Istoriiia} 2 (1980), 53-63. On the linguistic reasons for 17th-century Muscovites’ receptivity for this literary genre, based upon a new-found interest in “translating” Church Slavonic, the sacred language of the Orthodox liturgy, into “simple Russian,” see B. A. Uspenskii, \textit{Kratkii ocherk istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka (XI-XIX vv.)} (M., 1994), 101-103. On Ruthenian models of \textit{parodia sacra}, see \textit{ibid.}, 74-75.

whose lust after worldly things overcame their self-proclaimed commitment to God.

This attack on the ignorance and hypocrisy of the “unreformed” clergy was part of a larger project to restore the purity of the one, true Orthodox faith, which had supposedly become corrupted by non-canonic, “pagan,” as well as foreign accretions.

The Naryshkins’ allegations about tsarevna Sof’ia’s improprieties vis-à-vis her brothers, as well as about her plans to get married, take on the crown of Russia, and unite with Rome,76 relied on this confessional critique, which effectively struck at the heart of the regent’s claim to be the best defender of the religious and political orthodoxy of the Romanov royal house. In reply, the author of the 1689 Naryshkin manifesto asserted that by overthrowing the regency government of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna, the retinue of tsar Peter Alekseevich was bent on restoring the religious, political, and sexual order confused during the “topsy turvy” rule of a woman.77 The epistolary “tsar Peter” thus concluded his epistle by calling upon his elder “brother sovereign” to help him return to the harmonious, patriarchal ideal elaborated during the reign of their father.78 What he described was another Romanov “restoration,” not a Naryshkin coup d’etat.

76 See the “amazing rumors” recorded by the Czech Jesuit, Irzhi (Georgius) David, “Brevis Relatio revolutionis in regno Moscovito,” in J. S. Gagarin, Peter Gagarins Neueste Studieen (Stuttgart, 1857), 163, cited by Hughes, op. cit., 263-264, 310 n. 6.

77 For the gendered nature of the carnivalesque imagery associated with the trope of the “world turned upside down,” see Davis, op. cit.; and Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, The Politics and Poetics of Transgression (Ithaca, 1986).

78 In fact, besides abolishing the regency, the author of this political manifesto was deliberately vague about the broader conceptions that underlay the Naryshkins’ vision of a realm restored to its former purity and glory. According to the author of the 1689 letter, the regency of tsaritsa Natalia Kirillovna would make sure that the realm was now governed in order to further the dynastic interests of
In reality, of course, the September 1689 letter, like the investigation and execution of the supposed plotters against the life of tsar Peter Alekseevich, was itself an important means of securing the acceptance and legitimating the palace coup in favor of the Naryshkins. The Naryshkin manifesto was hand-delivered by Prince P. I. Prozorovskii, a close member of the retinue of tsar Ivan Alekseevich, an old Muscovite courtier and a high-ranking member of the Muscovite royal council, who was one of the favorites of the co-tsars’ late father. As the person who had been entrusted by tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich with the sensitive matter of bringing up, and guarding the interests of the tsar’s sickly, mentally-retarded son by his first marriage, Prince Prozorovskii now faced the difficult task of trying to persuade his royal charge to agree to the limiting conditions outlined in his younger half-brother’s letter. The leaders of the Naryshkin party, who had just promoted Prozorovskii to head the prestigious Chancellery of the Great Exchequer for his role as intermediary between the courts of the two co-tsars, charged the old Muscovite courtier with sealing the conditions worked out in the Trinity Monastery by presenting this letter as if it had come from the pen of tsar Peter Alekseevich himself.79

---

79 Prince P. I. Prozorovskii, who was charged with delivering the rest of the message from the Naryshkin camp orally (slovesno), was appointed as the new head of the Chancellery of the Great Exchequer (prikaz Bol’shoi Kazi) on 12 September 1689, a position which carried the title of major-domo (dvoretskii). This letter instructed tsar Ivan and his courtiers to acknowledge in writing that they had received and had accepted the written demands and oral explanations of the Naryshkin camp as presented by “our loyal counselor.” See PiB, I: 14, 488.
As we saw above, however, even before Prozorovskii’s special delivery, the members of the Trinity investigative commission had opened an inquest into the “plot” against the life of the Naryshkin candidate. The investigators had no problem locating a scapegoat on whom to put the blame for the violence lurking just beneath the surface of the post-Alekseevan succession struggle. Seeking to underline the similarity between the 1689 coup and the last “Time of Troubles,” Peter’s kinsmen put all the blame on F. L. Shaklovityi, the relatively low-born, royal secretary (dumnyi d’iak), who was entrusted to run the Musketeer Chancellery during the regency of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna.\textsuperscript{80} As an important political figure at the regent’s court,\textsuperscript{81} Moscow new police chief was a perfect person to reprise the role of I. A. Khovanskii, the former head of the Musketeer Chancellery and the person whose name served as an eponym for the violence, which was perpetrated against the Naryshkin clan in 1682.\textsuperscript{82} Tortured into submission, F. L. Shaklovityi eventually confessed to knowing about, and yet concealing, the “evil intentions” of the musketeers, who had supposedly contemplated launching an armed attack on the royal regiments guarding Preobrazhenskoe, the suburban estate of tsar Peter Alekseevich and his mother.\textsuperscript{83} Shaklovityi also admitted


\textsuperscript{81} For an example of his political influence, see the correspondence between F. L. Shaklovityi and Prince V. V. Golitsyn, the head of the Foreign Affairs chancellery and the \textit{de facto} “Chancellor” of the regency. See Lavrov, \textit{op. cit.}, 138-156, esp. 142, 236 n. 301.

\textsuperscript{82} The events of 1682 were popularly referred to as the “Time of Khovanskii” (\textit{Khovanschina}), after the courtier, who headed the Musketeer Chancellery during the court’s self-imposed, voluntary exile from Moscow. See Hughes, \textit{Sophia}, ch. 3, esp. 80, 82-84.

\textsuperscript{83} Lavrov, \textit{op. cit.}, 268. On Preobrazhenskoe as the site of the Naryshkin clan’s “counter court,” see \textit{infra}, Chapter Two.
that he was aware of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna’s "plans" to have herself crowned and that he even expressed support for a plot to assassinate the regent’s step-mother and the Russian Orthodox patriarch. Finally, Shaklovityi confirmed the allegation that he had instructed the musketeers to set fire to the Naryshkins’ suburban estate, in order to capture and then to kill the young co-tsar, the tsaritsa-dowager, their relatives, high-ranking political supporters, and royal favorites.84 For all their sensationalism, however, the accusations against Shaklovityi served as a better guide to the fears entertained by the Naryshkins and their allies,85 than about any actual conspiracy on the part of the tsarevna Sof’ia and her low-born favorite (and reputed lover).86 Indeed, the quickly-organized execution of F. L. Shaklovityi (and his “co-conspirators”) was meant to allay fears and to end further speculations, not to open up other lines of inquiries into the meaning of the new “Time of Troubles.”87

51 In particular, Shaklovityi mentioned Prince B. A. Golitsyn, and the tsar’s maternal uncle, boyar L. K. Naryshkin (1664-1705). See the depositions taken from Shaklovityi on 7, 8 and 12 September 1689, in Rozsnyye dela, I: 165-178. Note that the last deposition supposedly took place on the day of his execution.

82 As the fear of an attack on Preobrazhenskoe implied, the Naryshkins suspected that their political foes would descend upon their private sanctuary and destroy them in one fell swoop. This fear was hardly irrational: the Naryshkin family had suffered tremendous personal losses during the 1682 mutiny of the Moscow musketeers and the political infighting that followed its repression. See Lavrov, op. cit.

83 On rumors of an illicit affair between the regent and her chief of police, see the memoir of tsar Peter’s brother-in-law, Prince B. I. Kurakin, “Gistoriia o tsare Pete Alekseeviche (1682-1694),” in Petr Velikiy. Vospominaniia. Dnevnikove zapisi. Anekdoty, ed. L. Nikolaeva (M., 1993), 53-84, here 66. As one of the first courtiers to have joined the Naryshkins at the Trinity Monastery in 1689, Kurakin was obviously very receptive to such scurrilous, anti-regency rumors. On Kurakin’s political affiliation and his marriage to K. F. Lopukhina, the sister of Peter’s first wife, see Lavrov, op. cit., 162. For more on Kurakin, see infra, Chapter Two.

87 Lavrov, op. cit., 178-181. 247 n. 98.
Although the members of the Trinity investigative commission ultimately failed to prove the connection between F. L. Shaklovityi and the Miloslavskiis, they did succeed in linking the former head of the Musketeer Chancellery with tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna’s ecclesiastical protégé, Silvester (Medvedev) – the monk branded as the main ideologue of the regency regime and (eventually) executed as the second leader of the conspiracy against the Naryshkin branch of the royal family. In fact, the Trinity investigative commission did not officially disband until it had succeeded in capturing and interrogating the monk who supposedly had direct proof that the Muscovite regent had planned to get herself crowned, and who was himself rumored to have had intentions on the patriarchal throne.\textsuperscript{88} The amount of time, energy, and manpower devoted to tracking down and returning the fugitive monk suggests that the Naryshkins and their supporters were determined to have Fr. Silvester share the burden in Shaklovityi’s “conspiracy.” Indeed, if we now turn to the commission’s case against Silvester (Medvedev), we will see the way in which Peter’s kinsmen used contemporary theological debates in order to garner support for, as well as to demonstrate the divine-election of the Naryshkin candidate.

The fact that, aside from some contradictory (and coerced) testimony, the only piece of concrete evidence against Silvester (Medvedev) were two panegyrical engravings that asserted tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna’s divine election, merely underscores the political significance of the allegorical language, in which the competing sides of the theological controversies at the late-seventeenth-century Muscovite court, conducted their debates. Indeed, as I will now demonstrate, the high-stakes show-down between the entourage of the Russian Orthodox patriarch, a coterie of independent-minded Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchs, and tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna’s ecclesiastical protégé over the moment of “transubstantiation of the Host” (Rus. presushchestvlenie sviatykh Darov) during the Eucharist echoed, and, in many ways, shaped the succession struggle between the distaff sides of the Muscovite royal family. During the course of this dispute, it became apparent, for example, that the Eucharistic controversy was as much about who had the power to interpret the signs of the tsars’ divine election, as it was about the correct theological interpretation of the sacramental liturgy. In other words, the transubstantiation debate was part of the attempt on the part of competing political factions to define a tsar by sacrament.

89 The fact that between 1686 and 1688, the monk who spearheaded the attack on abbot Silvester’s interpretation of the Eucharist also translated the works of archbishop Symeon of Thessalonika on the proper coronation of Byzantine emperors only underscores that the main participants in the Eucharist debate also saw it as part of a political struggle over which of the heirs of Aleksei would oversee his imperial legacy. Besides a compilation on the “Ritual Prayer for the Election of a Tsar,” Evfimii of the Miracles Monastery also translated archbishop Symeon’s explanation of the reason why Byzantine emperors took communion like priests during their coronation. See Strakhova, op. cit., 191-
The highly-charged, allegorical rhetoric in which the patriarch and other participants of the late-seventeenth-century religious and educational debates at the Muscovite court couched their arguments necessarily intertwined theology and politics. Indeed, in the decades after the fateful church council of 1666-1667, subjects throughout the far-flung Muscovite empire were forced to confront the uncomfortable fact that when almost every question was about the “true faith” of the only independent Orthodox realm in the world, there was ample room for charges of both heresy and treason. This was bound to be especially true for such politically-sensitive issues as the reform of the liturgy regarding the Eucharist, the central mystery of the Christian religion. Indeed, from the moment that the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich embarked upon an ambitious program of imperial expansion and moral renewal, the question about the proper and uniquely Orthodox way of conducting the mass became one of the most important, and highly controversial issues of Muscovite political theology.

This “politicization” of the Eucharist provoked a bitter rebuke from one-time supporters of Orthodox imperial reform, such as the arch-priest Avvakum.90 As part of his critique of the liturgical innovations introduced by patriarch Nikon and tsar Aleksei

---

200 (Nos. 32-33). On the importance of this point for the seventeenth-century Muscovite coronation ritual, see Uspenskii, Tsar’i patriarkh, op. cit., 154-156; 166-170.

90 For the notion of a “king by sacrament,” see Louis Marin, Portrait of the King, trans. by Martha M. Houle (Minneapolis, 1988), 121 ff.

91 Archpriest Avvakum, one of the original leaders of the Russian Orthodox “Zealots of Piety,” broke with the church after the introduction of the Nikonian reforms, and went on to became the founder of the millenarian movement of “Old Believers.” On Avvakum’s connection to the pro-monarchist
Mikhailovich, this former royalist-sympathizer criticized the solemn invocation of the "Most Serene" (Rus. tishaishii) tsar during the "Great Entrance" – one of the most important ritual moments of the Eucharist, when the clergy who carry the host appear before the congregation assembled to receive communion — as an "unholy profanation" of the prayer that Avvakum had been taught to perform during the Orthodox offertory procession. But he objected to the new Byzantine title not simply because it was a liturgical innovation; rather, he accused patriarch Nikon of "clouding the tsar's mind" and of currying royal favor by amending the sacraments to refer to the tsar as if he were "more holy than the saints of all ages." Avvakum objected to the politicization of the most sacred rite of the Christian mystery by inveighing against the tsar's gullibility and overweening pride, as well as the mercenary interests of a worldly, hypocritical patriarch. Indulging in some shrewd confessional polemics, the arch-priest accused Nikon of introducing the "heretical" dogmas of Catholic theologians, who used the concept of the corpus mysticum to equate the mortal body of the monarch with the immortal body of God in order to bolster royal absolutism. In response to such


92 For a description of the Orthodox liturgy, see Timothy Ware, The Orthodox Church (Middlesex, 1964), 286-288. On the difference between the Roman Catholic Introit and Offertory processions, and the Greek Orthodox Little and Great Entrances, see ibid., 288-289. For a general comparison between the western and eastern Eucharistic rite, see Hugh Wybrew, The Orthodox Liturgy: The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite (London, 1989), 1-11.


94 On the corpus mysticum and the "king's two bodies," see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, The King's Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology (Princeton, 1957); and the discussion of the "royal host" in Marin, op. cit., 9-10.
criticisms, as well as to the continuing reform of the Orthodox liturgy, the leaders of
the Russian church commissioned several important official statements on the
question. However, for most of the seventeenth century, the Russian Orthodox
church did not have a clearly defined theological position on the moment of
transubstantiation during the Eucharist. Only during the debate against Silvester
(Medvedev), under the pressure of the succession struggle for the Alekseevan heritage,
did the entourage around the Russian Orthodox patriarch come up with an “official
line” on this question.

The Eucharist debate played an important role in the elaboration of the conflict
between the defenders of the regent’s right to rule in the name of the two tsars, and
those who pressed for the independent rule of the two brothers. Even before the fatal
split within the broad coalition that supported the compromise of 1682, the retinue of
patriarch Ioakim and the supporters of the Naryshkin candidate for the Muscovite
throne had become embroiled in a theological debate against abbot Silvester and several
important Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchs, who were the leading apologists for the
controversial religious and foreign policies of the regency of tsarevna Sophia. In an
attempt to re-assert his authority over the program of imperial “enlightenment,” the
Russian Orthodox patriarch recruited Sofronios and Ioannikios Leichudes, two
classically-trained Greek monks from the University of Padua, to head the Epiphany
monastery school – the seat of abbot Silvester’s main competitor in the educational

---

55 This included both official translations of classic theological texts, such as the Skrzhal of
Arsenii the Greek, as well as original contributions by foreign Orthodox experts, such as Paisii Ligarides
debates at the Muscovite court. On 15 March 1685, just nine days after the new contenders for the highest academic post in the empire arrived in the capital, the entourage around patriarch Ioakim and the court of tsaritsa Marfa Matveevna (née Apraksina), the widow of tsar Fedor Alekseevich, sponsored a ceremonial religious disputation about the moment of transubstantiation of the host during the Eucharist.°°

Like the 1666-67 church council's orchestrated condemnation of the "schismatic" Old Believers, the organizers of the informal religious disputation of 1685 intended to show off the erudition of the Leichudes brothers while impugning the orthodoxy and loyalty of their opponent. During this sham dispute, the Leichudes confronted Jan (A. Kh.) Belobodski, a Polish Catholic philosopher, who had come to Muscovy on his own initiative, in the hopes of securing an important educational post for himself.°°° By attacking Belobodski, Silvester's former opponent in the struggle for


°° Smoltskovskii, op. cit., 62-63; Prozorovskii, op. cit., 242-244. By the second half of the seventeenth century, it had become customary for different parties at the courts of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and his children to stage ceremonial religious disputations about key questions of the continuously-developing Orthodox canon. Indeed, ever since Aleksei's court committed itself to the program of imperial expansion and religious renovation, the tsar, the patriarch, as well as members of the royal family and leaders of powerful court factions, recruited reform-minded clerical protégés from neighboring Orthodox countries who sought support for their particular positions at the Muscovite court. For their part, patrons would sponsor clerics who could deliver a particularly emotional sermon on a topic of contemporary political relevance, recite a panegyrical ode on the occasion of some holiday, compose a literary encomium to the illustrious pedigree of the patron's clan, or denounce the heretical views of their political opponents. For a discussion of this client-patron relationship in the context of the "Moscow Baroque," see L. I. Sazonova, Poeziiia russkogo barokko (vtoraia polovina XVII-nachalo XVIII v.) (M., 1991); and Bogdanov, Pamiatniki, I: 11-48. On Medvedev as tsarevna Sofia Alekseevna's protégé, court preacher, and chief panegyrist, see Bogdanov, "Sil'vester Medvedev," op. cit., 87; and Zelensky, op. cit., ch. 4.

°°° Jan Belobodski came to Moscow in February 1681 [7I89], as part of the suite of archbishop Simeon of Smolensk; later that same year, on the urging of tsar Fedor Alekseevich, archbishop Simeon
the rectorship of the projected Moscow Academy, the Leichudes announced their intention to take on Medvedev himself, while, at the same time, accusing the regent’s ecclesiastical protege of “Latin heresy.” By implication, rather than by direct attack, the Leichudes brothers publicly thus declared that the regent’s choice for the position of rector was fundamentally flawed, and that the regency’s Polonophile foreign policy and its lenient treatment of foreign clerics were having a deleterious effect on Russian Orthodoxy.

Medvedev had already denounced Belobodski’s views in front of tsar Fedor Alekseevich and patriarch Ioakim, who had condemned the Polish nobleman’s critique of the validity of the doctrine of transubstantiation at the 1681 church council. At the time, the Russian Orthodox patriarch and the entire ecclesiastical council had agreed with the position paper submitted by abbot Silvester, who had persuasively argued that on this question, the positions of the Greek and Latin Catholic churches were identical: the bread and wine is transformed into the body and blood of the Savior during the moment in the liturgy when the officiating priest pronounces the Words of the Institution – “This is my body […] This is my Blood” (cf. Mat. 26:26-28). Now, barely four years later, Ioakim’s entourage had reversed themselves on the issue,

converted the Polish nobleman to Russian Orthodoxy, giving him the name Andrei. Despite his knowledge of languages, the new convert was unwilling to enroll formally as a translator for the Foreign Affairs chancellery. For Belobodskii’s biography, see A. Kh. Gorfunkel’, “Andrei Belobodskii – poe i filosof kontsa XVII-nachala XVIII veka,” Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury [hereafter, TODRL] 18 (1962), 188-213; and idem, “‘Pemateugum’ Andreia Belobodskogo (Iz istorii pol’sko-russkikh literaturnykh sviazei),” TODRL 21 (1965), 39-64, esp. 39-40. Based on the evidence provided by Gorfunkel’, it appears that until Belobodskii’s forcible recruitment into the 1686-1691 Chinese embassy of F. A. Golovin, the converted Pole still held out hopes of becoming the rector of the new Moscow academy. On F. A. Golovin (1650-1706), one of Peter’s most trusted political advisors and a member of
branding as idolatry the “Latin heresy” that they had formerly avowed as official Orthodox dogma. Relying on their own liturgical specialists, the patriarch’s party encouraged their Greek protégés to argue that all three sections of the Eucharistic prayer in the Orthodox liturgy formed an integral part of the one act of consecration of the sacramental bread and wine. In this view, the exact moment when this bread and wine is transformed into the actual body and blood of the Savior does not occur until the last “Amen” of the Invocation Prayer (Gr. epiklesis), that “calls down” the Spirit on the Holy Gifts: “Send down Thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts set forth: And make this bread the Precious Body of Thy Christ, And that which is in this cup, the Precious Blood of Thy Christ, Changing them by Thy Holy Spirit. Amen. Amen. Amen.”

To argue, as had Medvedev, that transubstantiation occurs when the priest repeats the words said by Christ during the Last Supper, is to commit the heresy of “artolatry” and to indulge in “bread worship,” the idolatrous reverence of the sacramental elements before their consecration.

the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope,” see supra. Introduction; infra. Chapter Three; and Appendix.


99 Besides the epiklesis, the Orthodox Eucharistic prayer includes a prayer of Thanksgiving, which culminates in the narrative of the Last Supper and the Words of Institution, as well as the anamnthesis, the act of “calling to mind” Christ’s death, burial, Resurrection, Ascension, and Second Coming, and of “offering” the Holy Gifts to God. See Ware, op. cit., 287-288.

100 Ware, ibid., 289-290. See also the discussion in Gabriele Scheidegger, Endzeit: Russland am Ende des 17. Jahrhunderts [ = Slavica Helvetica, 63] (Bern, 1999), 289-313.
The suspicion that this unofficial court spectacle was organized by factions hostile to the regency is supported by the list of the "prominent people" (znatnye liudi) and "royal counselors" (boiare) who had supposedly presided over the progress of the religious disputation of 1685. I say supposedly, because the only source for this list is the Leichudes brother's own, literary Cure for Belobodski's "harmful" doctrines, a polemical treatise whose arguments were later interpolated into the collections of Evfimii and archbishop Afanasii of Kholmogory. Silvester's main enemies during the Eucharist debates. In this self-serving version, written two years after their disputation with Belobodski, the Leichudes were careful to record the fact that they had the full support of the Russian Orthodox patriarch (Ioakim) and a powerful group of Muscovite courtiers around tsaritsa-dowager Mariia Matveevna. In particular, they singled out the tsaritsa's siblings – the Apraksin brothers – all three of whom would later go on to assume some of the most prominent positions at the court of Peter the Great, as well as in his mock ecclesiastical council; N. G. Milesco-Spafarios

101 The relevant excerpt from Akos, ili vrachevaniie [...] (Moscow Synodal Library, No. 440, fols. 36-37), was published in Tsvetaev, ed. op. cit., 240-242.

102 Like the Streshnevs, the Apraksins were a long-time boiar family, with marital links to the Russian royal house and with intimate access to the quarters of tsar Peter Alekseevich. All three Apraksin brothers served as Peter's privy counselors (komnatnye stol'niki). Two of them, Peter (1710) and Fedor Matveevich (1713), reached the rank of boiar, although by that time, it was largely a ceremonial appointment. See Airapetian, op. cit., 99, 329, 321, 316; and infra, Chapter Three.

103 Peter Matveevich (1659-1728), the eldest of the Apraksin brothers, was tutored in Latin by none other than Belobodskii himself. In 1711, the tsar appointed this boiar governor (gubernator) of Kazan' province. See Gorfunkel', "Andrei Belobodskii," op. cit., 191; and Hughes, op. cit., 115. For a biography of "General-Admiral" Fedor Matveevich (1661-1728), the (titular) head of the Russian imperial navy and the governor of Voronezh, see "Apraksin, Fedor Matveevich," in Russkii biograficheskii slovar' (Spb., 1900), 2:256-258; S. I. Dmitriev, General-Admiral graf F. M. Apraksin. Spovizhnik Petra Velikogo (Petrograd, 1914), 4, 6; and P. Belaventsev, General-Admiral graf Fedor Matveevich: kratkii biograficheskii ocherk (Revel', 1899), 5; Hughes, op. cit., 115, 418-419; and infra, Chapter Three.
(1636-1708), a prominent chancellery official, translator, and scholar,\textsuperscript{104} who was patronized by several important members of the Naryshkin faction,\textsuperscript{106} and, who administered the language exam taken by Jan Belobodskii;\textsuperscript{107} and, finally, boiar I. A. Musin-Pushkin (1661-1729), patriarch Ioakim’s nephew-in-law,\textsuperscript{108} Peter’s illegitimate half-brother,\textsuperscript{109} and the future head of Peter’s Monastery Chancellery.\textsuperscript{110} The unofficial

\textsuperscript{104} According to an inventory compiled in 1734, a portrait of A. M. Apraksin, dressed in the vestments of a “high priest” of the mock ecclesiastical council, hung on the wall of the Novo-Preobrazhensk picture gallery. On the portrait of “Andrew Furioso” (Rus. Andrei Bestitschchii), see N. M. Moleva, “‘Persony’ veshutesheego sobora,” Voprosy istorii 10 (October 1974), 206-211, here 209. For the Apraksins’ role in Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council, see infra, Appendix.


\textsuperscript{106} Spaftarios’ was patronized by members of the Matveev and Golitsyn clans. See I. N. Mikhailovskii, Vazhneishie trudy Nikolaia Spafaria (1672-1677) (Kiev, 1897), 29-30, cited by Belobrova, 15 n. 38.

\textsuperscript{107} According to a royal decree (16 October 1682), issued in the name of both co-tsars, N. M. Milescu-Spaftarios was one of the five translators from the Foreign Affairs chancellery who tested Belobodskii’s proficiency in Latin, Polish, and French. See RGADA, f. 138 (1682 g.), No. 20, fols. 358-362, cited by Gorfunkel, “‘Pentateugum.’” op. cit., 40.

\textsuperscript{108} I. A. Musin-Pushkin was married to Mavra Timofoevan Savelova, the niece of patriarch Ioakim (Savelov). See Savelov, op. cit., 32-33. For a genealogy of the Musin-Pushkins, see Istoriiia ro dov russkogo dvorianstva, ed. by P. N. Petrov (SPb., 1886), I: 293.

\textsuperscript{109} See the rumors reported by F. J. Strahlenberg, Zapiski kapitana Filippa Ioganna StraLENBERGA ob istorii i geografii Rossiiiskoi imperii Petra Velikogo, trans. and ed. by Lu. Bespiatikh et. al. (M.-L., 1985), I: 92. On the question of illegitimacy, see PiB, 2: 91; and Hughes, op. cit., 418, 533 n. 18.

\textsuperscript{110} In 1700, after Peter Alekseyevich decided to revive his father’s Monastery Chancellery and refused to appoint another candidate for the patriarchal throne, he gave Musin-Pushkin – a member of the tsar’s mock ecclesiastical council – de facto control over the property of the entire Russian Orthodox Church. For the service career of boiar I. A. Musin-Pushkin, see Airapetian, op. cit., 97, 317; Crummey, op. cit., 283 n. 18; D. N. Bantysh-Kamenskii, Slovar’ dostopamiatnykh liudei Russkoi zemli (M., 1836), 3: 385-387; and M. Gorshakov, Monastyrskaia prikaz (1649-1725) (SPb., 1868), 121-122. For his role in the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope,” see infra, Appendix. Musin-
nature of this religious disputation, as well as its contemporary political significance, is confirmed by the fact that even after the Leichudes had “defeated” their clerical opponent, and supposedly demonstrated their ability to take over the leadership of the Moscow Academy, the regency’s Foreign Affairs chancellery still demanded that the Greek brothers present proofs of their educational qualifications.\(^{111}\)

The theological dispute of 1685 became the opening salvo in a bitter and protracted controversy at the Muscovite court over the moment of transubstantiation of the host during the Eucharist.\(^{112}\) Silvester (Medvedev), who was not one to back down from a theological debate, especially when both his principles and his career were on the line, eagerly entered the fray. By-passing official ecclesiastical channels, he appealed directly to tsarevna Sof’ia’s “wisdom” as a way of seeking royal support for his theological positions, as well as for his candidacy as rector of the projected academy. Going beyond the customary invocation of the monarch’s role in the religious enlightenment of his realm – a trope first applied to a Romanov tsar by his teacher, Simeon of Polotsk – Silvester went on to identify the regent as the leading

---

\(^{111}\) Smen'kovskii, op. cit., 64.

\(^{112}\) Until the middle of 1686 or 1687, the Eucharistic controversy “remained confined within a small circle centered on the Pechatnyi dvor [Patriarchal Press in Moscow],” where both Silvester (Medvedev) and Evfimi of the Miracles Monastery worked, and the Miracles (Chudov) Monastery itself, “the residence of Evfimii and the center of the patriarchal administration.” See Potter, op. cit., 465.
member of the Russian royal family, the receptacle of grace, and the true inheritor of royal authority. According to Fr. Silvester, as the earthly representative of Divine Wisdom, the tsarevna did not need to be consecrated in order to have the right to oversee the imperial renovation of her realm, just as he did not need to be ordained as a priest in order to qualify for the position of rector of the Moscow Academy. This appeal to Divine Wisdom without the mediation of the church hierarchy questioned the power of the ordained authorities, undermining the patriarch's control over the official program of enlightenment, as well as her brothers' right to rule on their own.

Silvester's insistence on the centrality of the Words of the Institution during the Eucharist, as well as his attempts to equate tsarevna Sof'ia with Christ in His sophic aspect, was clearly intended to justify the regent's claims to royal rule, despite the fact that she was not anointed. Petitioning for the institution of the Academy, the abbot asserted that "It is not given to people perfectly to know, who among them has a soul with grace." Referring to the pentecostal imagery from the Acts of the Apostles and the Prayer of Invocation, Fr. Silvester argued that just as fire gives a sign of its presence, so "the Holy Spirit makes a sign" of its presence in a soul. "Then the soul [of the divinely-selected person] is filled by the activity of three graces," an indirect reference to Faith, Hope, and Charity, the daughters of St. Sophia, the regent's divine namesake.113 According to Silvester, the regent was filled with God's grace, which made its presence known not through consecration, but through Sof'ia's virtuous and

---

113 Tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna was born on 17 September, the name-day of the martyred St. Sophia and her daughters. See Zelensky, op. cit., 203-205.
wise actions, including her patronage of him. Only those people, like the abbot himself, who were able to correctly interpret the scriptures and to see in the regent’s acts signs of divine election, realized the fact that her’s was a soul graced by the Holy Spirit.

During the course of the Eucharistic debate, the abbot of the Zaikonospasskii monastery challenged the church’s control over grace and enlightenment, asserting his (and by implication, his patron’s) unmediated access to the divine. According to Silvester’s interpretation of the Eucharist, the power of the divine resided in the Word, specifically, the phrase pronounced by Christ during the Last Supper, “Take […] eat”: mere human words and actions, such as the ones performed by the clergy during the Eucharist, had no power to transform the bread and wine into the body and blood of the Savior. The clergy, through the church hierarchy, enjoyed no special relationship to the divine; they were simply men, empowered only to perform and maintain the cult. Consequently, grace and enlightenment did not require consecration.114 Similarly, the female regent did not need to be crowned or anointed by the Russian Orthodox patriarch in order to exercise royal authority. Her mandate to rule came from the fact that in her liminal position as the earthly counterpart of Divine Wisdom, she was above and beyond all established hierarchies, whether of gender, family, church, or state.115

114 Potter, op. cit., 443-44, 463, 458.

Responding to Silvester's challenge to the authority of the church hierarchy, the Leichudes brothers and Evfimii of the Miracles Monastery argued that God's grace could not be bestowed upon the Eucharistic elements, or, for that matter, on the tsar, without the mediation of the ordained members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Only the recitation of the Prayer of Invocation can transform the sacramental bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. Similarly, only the patriarch's invocation of the Holy Spirit – particularly during the ceremony in which the leading hierarch anoints a newly-crowned tsar – symbolically elevated the body of the earthly monarch to the level of the Heavenly King. Furthermore, they linked anointment, like communion during the coronation service, with the special, sacerdotal quality of Muscovite tsars. Invoking the authority of Greek theologians, such as archbishop Symeon of Thessalonika, Evfimii defended the practice of taking communion as a priest, behind the closed gates ("Royal Gates") that hid the altar ("The Throne of God") from the laity during the Eucharistic service – a practice which was explicitly modeled on the coronation of Byzantine emperors and seems to have been introduced during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich as a way of highlighting the tsar's divine election. Since a woman could neither receive communion in the altar nor be ordained as a priest, this practice also ensured and legitimated succession by primogeniture exclusively through the male line of the royal family. The patriarchalism of the Russian Orthodox Church on the issue of the royal succession thus fit in well with the customary laws regarding property.

116 This liturgical innovation was included in the coronation service of tsar Fedor Alekseevich, which, in turn, seems to have served as the model for the dual coronation of tsars Ivan and Peter Alekseevichi. See Uspenskii, Tsar' i patriarkh, op. cit., 174, 170, 164, 156, 185, 23 n. 20.
relations among the hereditary land-owning service elites. Taken together, both could be used to challenge the legitimacy of tsarevna Sofia’s rule. And, as we saw, above, that is precisely what the Trinity investigative commission attempted to accomplish.

The religious debate, like the succession struggle with which it was intimately intertwined, was settled by force of arms. After the coup of 1689, the patriarch personally authorized a search of abbot Silvester’s monastic cell for any damaging evidence about his participation in the “Shaklovity plot.” A search of the premises turned up the existence of two engravings that served as the visual apotheosis of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna’s claims to the leading position in the Muscovite “royal trinity.” In an engraving commissioned in 1688 by Shaklovityi for the glorification of his embattled patron, A. Tarasevich depicted an allegorical representation of the triumvirate in Moscow. This visual panegyric, which was modeled on the Shchirskii engraving of 1683, was to accompany Iakov Bogdanovskii’s book in honor of the regent, entitled The Gifts of the Holy Spirit. In the engraving, which illustrated the main proposition of the book, Tarasevich portrayed “the descent of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit [...] above that of her great sovereign majesty”; meanwhile, “above the figures of the [two co-] tsars” he pointedly excluded anything but their

117 Rozysknoe delo, op. cit., I: 829-830.

118 On A. Tarasevich and his engraving, see M. A. Alekseeva, Graviura petrovskogo vremeni (L., 1990), 8, 12.

119 Unlike I. Bogdanovskii’s Dary dukha sviatogo (Chernigov, 1688), the Tarasevich engraving has not been preserved. See Bogdanov, “Politicheskaia graviura,” op. cit., 241 n. 70.
"patronymics."\textsuperscript{120} In the words of abbot Silvester, who was shown a copy of this engraving, "all the glory and praise went to the great sovereign lady [tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna] alone."\textsuperscript{121} By emphasizing that the gifts of the Holy Spirit descended upon the tsarevna, and only upon her, the engraver followed the author in designating the regent as more than first among equals. Referring to a biblical verse (Isaiah 11:2) often used in the regent’s panegyrics, the author of this visual composition underlined the connotations of God-chosen charismatic rulership, standing above and beyond the natural laws of inheritance or gender.\textsuperscript{122} Just as the Holy Spirit descended upon the "holy gifts" of the Eucharistic bread and the wine, miraculously transforming them into the body and blood of Christ, so the descent of the "gifts of the Holy Spirit" transformed a woman, traditionally excluded from political rule, into the earthly embodiment of God-given sovereignty.

Silvester’s personal participation in the creation of the second engraving discovered during the search of his premises demonstrated his continued reliance on the gifts of the Holy Spirit as the main distinguishing sign of the regent’s divine election. In this print, tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna is pictured with scepter, orb, and crown (but without the pectoral cross) of the Romanov tsars, as they were portrayed in the official Book of Royal Titles (Rus. Tituliarnik), whose oval shaped portraits seemed to have been the prototype for this engraving. The regent’s title as full-fledged sovereign, as

\textsuperscript{120} Rozysknoe delo, op. cit., I: 660.

\textsuperscript{121} Rozysknoe delo, op. cit., I: 595-596.

\textsuperscript{122} See the analysis in Zelensky, op. cit., 315-316.
well as a panegyrical by Fr. Silvester, is located in a cartouche at the bottom of the page. In these verses, Silvester (Medvedev) enumerates the personal qualities which demonstrate that Sof’ia has been blessed with the divine grace and power of Sophia – The Wisdom of God.\textsuperscript{123} The oval portrait appeared on the chest of the two-headed eagle of the Muscovite grand princely seal, surrounded by medallions depicting the allegorical representations of the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit (Wisdom, Piety, Virginity, Mercy, Justice, Fortitude and Meekness) mentioned in the abbot’s panegyric to his patron. In the words of Shaklovityi, who had commissioned this engraving, the whole layout was supposed to echo the seal of the Holy Roman Emperor (also a two-headed eagle), with the seven medallions representing the seven imperial electors.\textsuperscript{124} But although he thereby suggested that this engraving may simply have been part of the regency’s efforts to prop up its declining international prestige after the failed Crimean campaign of 1686/7,\textsuperscript{125} the investigators from the Trinity commission clearly saw this as part of an abortive attempt to crown the tsarevna alongside her brothers.\textsuperscript{126}

To the maternal relatives of tsar Peter Alekseevich and the retinue of the Russian Orthodox patriarch, Silvester’s participation in the creation of these engravings served as direct evidence of the abbot’s crimes against the majesty of the tsar, the piety

\textsuperscript{123} The text of this panegyrical poem is cited and translated by Zelensky, \textit{op. cit.}, 317-318.

\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Rozysnye dela}, \textit{op. cit.}, I: 596.

\textsuperscript{125} This may have been the reason why Shaklovityi commissioned a similar engraving in Amsterdam. For a discussion of the origins and symbolism of the so-called “Bloteling engraving,” see Zelensky, \textit{op. cit.}, 318-322.

\textsuperscript{126} Even now, this engraving is often referred to as a “coronation portrait.” See Bogdanov, “Politicheskaia graviura,” \textit{op. cit.}, 242.
of the faithful, and the stability of the Russian Orthodox church. As such, they called for the harshest possible penalties from both the secular and spiritual authorities. A massive manhunt launched by the Trinity investigative commission resulted in Silvester’s capture in a monastery near Smolensk, on the border between Muscovy and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. The fleeing abbot was quickly returned to Moscow and incarcerated in the Trinity-St. Sergius monastery, where, just a few weeks before. Shaklovityi and the other “co-conspirators” met their bloody end. At the same time, patriarch Joachim quickly organized a rump church council, which was intended to reassert his authority over the program of religious enlightenment and to signal the defeat of what came to be branded as the “Latin” party within the Russian and Ukrainian Orthodox churches.127 By defrocking Fr. Silvester and forcing him to renounce his views about the Eucharist, the patriarch and his entourage not only succeeded in cowing the Ukrainian prelates into accepting what eventually became the official Russian Orthodox dogma on the moment of transubstantiation,128 but also in diverting the blame for the violent outcome of the succession struggle within the royal family unto another scapegoat.

Polemical pamphlets and manuscripts produced in the wake of the church council of 1690, such as The Dagger of Fr. Evfimii and The Shield of Faith of

---

127 On the church council of 1690, see Prozorovskii, op. cit., 370-376; Potter, op. cit., 504-505. The partisan terms (“Latinophile” and “Grecophile”) for the different sides of the educational and theological debates in the second half of the seventeenth century, appear to have been applied consistently only after this council, i.e. long after the conclusion of the debates that supposedly gave rise to them. See Strakhov, op. cit., 55; Potter, op. cit., 453.

128 Potter, op. cit., 468-469.
archbishop Afanasii of Kholmogory, depicted Silvester (Medvedev) as another in a long line of heretical priests and rabble-rousers, whose nefarious activities and crypto-Catholic views shook the foundations of Muscovy. The (as yet unidentified) author of one of these manuscripts compared the abbot’s flight to the Biziukov monastery with the actions of the so-called “False Dmitrii,” the early-seventeenth-century, Polish-backed pretender to the Muscovite throne, who claimed to be the last representative of the extinct Riurikid dynasty.\textsuperscript{129} Having betrayed his Orthodox faith and committed treason against the tsar, “like the former false and defrocked monk Grishka Otrep’ev,” abbot Silvester had fled to Poland in order “to create more trouble [smushchenie], to evoke the scorn of the Catholic church for our eastern Orthodox faith, and to cause harm to our most pious Russian tsardom.”\textsuperscript{130} In this view, “Sen’ka Medvedev” was yet another “Grishka Otrep’ev,” a defrocked priest, who had made a pact with the Catholic Poles, in order to stir up a new “Time of Trouble” (smuta). However, just as the unanimous election of the Romanov dynasty put an end to the period of wars and foreign invasions heralded by the collapse of the Riurikid dynasty, so the restoration of the diarchy and the imposition of unanimity within the church signaled the providential resolution of the new dynastic crisis. In this typological reading of Muscovite history, the formative moment of the reigning Romanov dynasty foreshadowed and clarified the outcome of the succession struggle three generations later. Thus, according to the


\textsuperscript{130} Cited in Prozorovskii, \textit{op. cit.}, 330.
politically-motivated and self-serving interpretations offered by the apologists of the 1689 coup, divine intervention, not religious repression and political violence, insured the success of the Naryshkins’ “restoration” of Romanov rule.

The signet-ring worn by tsar Peter Alekseevich in the 1680s only emphasized these historical continuities between Peter and his predecessors. That ring depicted the young Romanov tsar enthroned in full Muscovite royal regalia and holding the scepter and orb of his patrimony. The traditional royal titulature, “Tsar and Grand Prince Peter Alekseevich of all the Russias [...]” (*Tsar’ i velikii kniaz’ Petr Alekseevich vseia Rusi*) appeared on the perimeter of the seal. Indeed, this ring seems to have been an exact replica of a ring belonging to his father, tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, and “in its symbolism, introduced no innovations.”131 And that is precisely the point. To the men who strove to guarantee that the Naryshkin candidate accede to the throne ahead of his half-siblings, dynastic continuity, patrilineal descent, and the rituals of the Orthodox church, not modernist “innovations,” were the main points demonstrating tsar Peter Alekseevich’s claim to be the true inheritor of God’s grace. And while they would later invoke other moral philosophies, and other images of rule, the political theology elaborated during the struggle against the regency of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna would continue to inform the way in which Peter’s kinsmen enacted his charismatic authority long after the “Naryshkin Restoration.”

---

CHAPTER TWO

Cavaliers:
War Games, Word Games and the
Origins of the Transfigured Kingdom

On 16 September 1689, the Sunday immediately following the execution of F. L. Shaklovityi and his "co-conspirators," the armed retinue of tsar Peter Alekseevich finally felt safe enough to depart from the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery – the fortified complex, which sheltered them during the final show-down against the regency government of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna. However, instead of organizing a triumphal entry into the newly-pacified Russian capital, as they would later insist on doing, the leaders of the new, revolutionary regime undertook yet another, politically-significant pilgrimage; this one, to a nunnery near Aleksandrovskaja sloboda, a suburban royal estate located some thirteen miles (20 versts) outside of Moscow. The decision to visit this particular estate, so soon after successfully carrying off the palace coup in favor of the Naryshkin line of the Russian royal house, was significant in several respects. First, the trip guaranteed that the young tsar would be away from the capital on September 17, the name day of his half-sister, the deposed regent. While tsar Ivan Alekseevich commemorated this day by dutifully going through the routine of

---

1 On the execution of F. L. Shaklovityi, the judicial act which signaled the triumph of the Naryshkin coup-plotters, see supra, Chapter One.

2 The tradition of Roman imperial triumphs would be instituted only in 1696, after Peter's successful prosecution of the Azov campaign. See infra, Chapter Three.

3 Unlike hastily-organized "pilgrimage to the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery" (Troitskii pokhod), which, as we saw in Chapter One, amounted to the Muscovite equivalent of a court coup, the trip to Aleksandrovskaja sloboda was much better thought out, if no less politically expedient.
toasting the health of his sister, his step-brother and co-ruler was off in the country, demonstratively inspecting “a Monastery of Nunnes [sic.],” which, in the words of General Patrick Gordon of Auchleuchries (1635-1699), was reputed for keeping “a very strict Lyfe [sic.], and [for] admitt[ing] no sort of male persons” into their company. Judging by the rumors about Sof’ia Alekseevna’s reputed loose morals, secret liaisons, and marriage plans, as well as by the Naryshkins’ later decision to confine the former regent to the New Maidens (Novodevich’i) Convent, this visit was a prelude to the forcible tonsuring of the “willful” tsarevna.

Second, and just as important for understanding the political significance of the tsar’s unscheduled pilgrimage to Aleksandrovskaja sloboda, was its historical value as the site of the infamous counter-court (oprichnina) of tsar Ivan Vasil’evich “The

---

4 Dvortsovye razriady (SPb, 1855), 4: 486. Although the mentally-retarded elder tsar was oblivious to the changed political circumstances, the fact that Ivan’s keepers insisted on the performance of his religious and familial duties suggests that the deposed regent had retained at least some supporters among the Muscovite political elite.

5 “Zhurnal ili dnevnaja zapiska (na Angliiskom iazyke) byvshago v Rossiiskoi službe Generala Gordona, im samim napisannyi” [hereafter cited as Gordon, “Diary”], Rossiiskii Gosudarstvennyi Voennno-Istoricheskii Arkhiv, f. 846, op. 15, No. 4, fol. 260: 16 September 1689. As commander of the “First Moscow Select Regiment,” this Scottish Catholic had sided with the Naryshkins during the 1689 palace coup by dutifully bringing his troops to the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery – an action, to which he (rather immodestly) attributed decisive significance in the final showdown between the Naryshkins and the regency government of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna. The most important source for Gordon’s career in Muscovite service is his “Diary”; in addition, see M. O. Bender, “Patrick Gordon i ego dnevnik.” RGVIA, f. 846, op. 15, No. 8, fol. 1-53; and G. Herd, “General Patrick Gordon of Auchleuchries – a Scot in Seventeenth-Century Russian Service” Ph.D. thesis, Aberdeen University (Aberdeen, 1994).

6 See supra, Chapter One.

7 The Naryshkins tonsured tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna in 1689; however, she was not forced to take the veil until the musketeer uprising of 1698. See Lindsey Hughes, Sophia, Regent of Russia, 1657-1704: “Ambitious and Daring Above Her Sex” (New Haven and London, 1990), 133, 255, 310 n. 41.
Terrible.”\textsuperscript{8} From this suburban estate the sixteenth-century grand prince had launched his violent campaign of intimidation against the “traitors” within the established political elite, in an attempt to realize in real life the “autocratic” (Gr. \textit{autokrates}, absolute ruler) ideal embodied in his earlier adoption of that Byzantine imperial title (1547).\textsuperscript{9} As the alternative site to the old Muscovite capital, Aleksandrovskaja sloboda represented the center of monastic purity from which the tsar and his closest advisors would sweep away the corruption of the “new Jerusalem” and the “Third Rome.”\textsuperscript{10} By implicitly invoking the image of Ivan Vasil’evich’s terrible wrath against those members of the elite who had supposedly “plotted” against him during his minority, the organizers of the 1689 coup thus made a pointed historical reference,\textsuperscript{11} with


\textsuperscript{11} This image was quite familiar to seventeenth-century Muscovites from various sources, including contemporary chronicles, the polemical correspondence between Ivan “The Terrible” and Andrei Kurbskii, and historical accounts of the “Time of Troubles.” On the popularity of the epistolary exchange between the “autocrat” and the “boyar,” see \textit{Perepika Ivana Groznogo s Andreen Kurbskin}, eds. Ia. S. Lur’e and Iu. D. Rykov (L., 1979), 248.
menacing contemporary overtones for any potential political opposition to the newly-installed relatives of tsar Peter Alekseevich.\textsuperscript{12}

However, the fact that the Naryshkins enacted this threat some thirteen miles outside of Moscow, and in the obscure form of a “field-ballet military,”\textsuperscript{13} suggests that the military maneuvers which took place during Peter’s stay at Aleksandrovskaia sloboda were intended as much for the members of the new regime, as for their Muscovite rivals. Indeed, as this chapter shall attempt to demonstrate, the Transfigured Kingdom of Peter the Great owed its origins both to the \textit{esprit de corps} fostered by such “playful” (\textit{poteshnye}) war-games and to the highly-stylized allegorical language in which seventeenth-century Muscovite courtiers had come to express their commitment to the divinely-ordained person of the Russian Orthodox tsar. In fact, as I

\textsuperscript{12} For an illuminating example of how one contemporary Muscovite service family adapted Ivan the Terrible apocrypha for its own purposes, see V. N. Avtorkratov, “'Rech' Ivana Groznogo 1550 goda' kak polemicheskii pamflet kontsa XVII v.,” \textit{Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury} 11 (1955), 255-279; Marshall Poe, “The Imaginary World of Semen Kolovskii: Genealogical anxiety and falsification in late seventeenth-century Russia,” \textit{Cahiers du Monde russe} 39: 3 (July-September 1998), 375-388; and V. P. Kozlov, \textit{Tainy fal’sifikatsii: Analiz poddelok istoricheskikh istochnikov XVIII-XIX vekov}, 2nd ed. (M., 1996), ch. 1. During the Naryshkin coup of 1689, rank-and-file chamberlain (riadovoi stol’nik) S. S. Kolovskii (c. 1626-1692), the reputed author of this historical falsification, was a relatively lowly Muscovite courtier. In 1691, already in his mid-sixties, he was “unexpectedly” promoted to the Muscovite royal council (Boiar Duma), with the respected rank of okol’niichii. On 18 October 1691, after refusing to participate in Peter’s war-games, he was demoted to provincial nobleman (\textit{napisan s gorodom} [...] \textit{v deti boiarokie}). In January 1692, just before his death, he was pardoned and reinstated to his new Duma rank. Thus, the “unexpected” career of the elderly Kolovskii was clearly related to Peter’s first, spectacular assertions of his royal charisma – particularly, the so-called “Semenovskoe campaign,” as well as the foundation of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council (of which Kolovskii may have been an original member). For the service career of S. S. Kolovskii, see Avtorkratov, \textit{op. cit.}, 274-278; and I. Iu. Airapetian, “Feodal’naia aristokratiiia v period stanovleniia absoliutizma v Rossii” (Diss. kand. ist. nauk, M. V. Lomonosov State University, 1987), 114-115, 322. On the first “Semenovskoe campaign,” and the blasphemous “election” and “ordination” of “Patriarch Dearie” and his “Unholy Council,” see infra.

\textsuperscript{13} This is General Gordon’s term for the military maneuvers which he would help to organize for the tsar and his court in October 1691. See Gordon, “Diary” (14 October 1691), \textit{RGVIAt}, f. 846, op. 15, No.5, fol. 101. I use it here as a general designation for the foreign-inspired, martial spectacles,
will argue, the Petrine court’s antinomian stance towards the Muscovite “establishment” merely served to emphasize the fact that the young Naryshkin candidate was the only person to possess the authority necessary to transfigure his realm based on principles derived solely in accordance with the wishes of his father (both mortal and divine). In turn, the tsar’s active, personal participation in these suburban court spectacles demonstrated that, at first, Peter’s new, charismatic, scenario of power could only be understood (and enacted) in the intimate “company” (Rus. kompaniia) of like-minded, rakish cavaliers.\(^{14}\)

One of the moral, conscientious men, who would go on to regret having made a political wager on the young Naryshkin candidate, was the same Scottish general who organized the military maneuvers at Aleksandrovskaja sloboda. According to his “Diary,” General Patrick Gordon, the most senior foreign officer in imperial Russian service and the head of the Catholic community of Moscow, was ordered to appear at Aleksandrovskaja sloboda on 16 September 1689. There, an unidentified member of

which were staged (often with the input of foreign military advisors like Gordon) at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich. On other martial spectacles, see infra.

\(^{14}\) By using this loaded term, I do not mean to imply that all of Peter’s courtiers were men who “lead a wild, dissolute life” – although, in the case of some people, that is not far from the truth. I simply hope to evoke the negative, moralistic evaluations of the court’s numerous disapproving contemporaries, such as the author of the anonymous denunciation quoted supra, Introduction; and, more famously, Prince B. I. Kurakin’s sardonic character-sketches of those courtiers, who had made their wager on the former Naryshkin candidate and who had come into royal favor after the 1689 coup. See B. I. Kurakin, “Gistoriia o tsare Pete Alekseeviche,” in Petr Velikii. Vospominaniia. Dnevnikovy zapisi. Anekdoty, ed. L. Nikolaeva (M., 1993), 53-84. However, instead of taking such evaluations for granted, I hope to explain the reasons why the tsar and his intimates decided to present themselves as free-wheeling, libertine, “cavaliers,” as well as why Peter’s contemporaries found such self-presentations so shocking. For an attempt to define the cultural parameters of eighteenth-century “libertinism,” see Barry Ivker, “Towards a Definition of Libertinism in Eighteenth-Century French Fiction,” Studies on Voltaire and the Eighteenth Century 83 (1970), 221-239; James G. Tumer, “The Properties of
Peter's entourage pointed out the significance of the location where Gordon was to be personally introduced to the young Naryshkin candidate. In addition to the nearby "Monastery of Nunnes," Gordon's attention was drawn to the fact that "here the Tzaar [sic.] Ivan Vasiliovits (commonly called by strangers the tyrant) did usually reside, taking great delight in this solitary place, he had a large palace here, built of stone or brick rather environed with a thick and high earthen wall, the small River on the South syde [sic.] thereof, giveing [sic.] good convenience for ponds and meadows [...]."\textsuperscript{15}

Utilizing his knowledge of Muscovite court culture and his expertise as a military engineer,\textsuperscript{16} the savvy old mercenary noted the favorable location for a civil construction project like a "palace," surrounded by landscape architecture composed of man-made "ponds" and "meadows." In his view, this was something that a monarch out for peace and quiet at a lovely spot in the countryside could indeed "take great delight in."

Judging by the growing importance of suburban pleasure palaces in the life of the Muscovite elite,\textsuperscript{17} Gordon was not far off the mark in his recommendations. But he

\textsuperscript{15} Gordon, "Diary," \textit{op. cit.}, fol. 260. Unlike other, less knowledgeable foreigners, who were "strangers" to Muscovy, Gordon would not dismiss Ivan Vasil'evich "The Terrible" as a "tyrant." Sensitive to the changing political winds and eager to recommend himself to the new political powers. Gordon wisely chose not to commit himself to that kind of partisan historical assessment.

\textsuperscript{16} For an example of Gordon's reference books on "military art," see the following entry in his "Diary" (10 August 1693), \textit{op. cit.}, fol. 312: "[...] Desired Mr. Munter to cause to bring the following books from Reval, Coll. Worthmuller his Commandants spiegell, his Apologiai Forticatoriam, the touch-stone of the Ingenieur."

\textsuperscript{17} A. F. Smith, "Prince V. V. Golitsyn: The Life of an Aristocrat in Muscovite Russia" (Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1987), ch. 6; and Lu. A. Tikhonov, "Podmoskovnye imeniia russkoi aristokratiia vo vtoroi polovine XVII-nachale XVIII v.," in \textit{Dvorianstvo i krepostnoi stroiRossii XVI-
was a generation too late. For while tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich was indeed fond of building elaborate parks and gardens on the grounds of his suburban estates, the entourage of his son and heir, Peter Alekseevich, was not interested in such bucolic pleasures. Instead, the young tsar took advantage of the Scottish general’s expertise in drilling regular troops to stage several days’ worth of military maneuvers on the grounds of this historically-significant spot, outside the Muscovite capital.18 The war-games which took place at Aleksandrovskaja sloboda, immediately after the 1689 palace coup, thus became the first in a series of “field-ballets military” organized by Gordon for the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich. But they were by no means the first martial spectacles staged on the grounds of suburban royal estates by the political supporters of the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. Indeed, if we are to understand the uniqueness of this new scenario of power, and the way in which such private, royal spectacles could be used to assert Peter’s personal charisma, we must first analyze the serious role which these “childhood amusements” (potekhi) assumed at the court of the Naryshkin candidate.

---

18 See Gordon, “Diary,” fols. 260-261: “[Tuesday] September 17: [...] I was called to his Ma[jes]tie [sic., Peter Alekseevich], and exercised 8 files of sojourns [sic., soldiers]. Before his Ma[jes]tie [sic.] had much discourse. Was graced with damask and atlas to two coats [above and beyond his usual allowance of 6 dishes, 3 loads of hay, and a “tunne” [sic.] of oats a day, which he also received this day]. September 18: I was called to come out on horseback and did with many others exercize and fire by way of pickeering [...]. [Friday] September 19: Wee [sic.] were again [sic.] in the Fields with his Ma[jes]tie and had all sorts of exercize to horse [...]. September 21: Wee [sic.] were in the Fields and exercized very late [...].”
During the decade-long succession struggle at the end of the seventeenth-century, the Naryshkin clan and its allies mobilized the resources and symbolic practices associated with the "discursive domain" of the royal suburban estate as part of their attempt to put the young Peter Alekseevich on the throne.\textsuperscript{19} Appealing to a tradition according to which royal estates could serve as the potential locus of political transformation and moral renewal, the tsar's maternal relatives sought to "de-center" the power of the regency government of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna and to institutionalize their own opposition-court. Although they were politically out-maneuvered in 1682, the Naryshkins made a show of preparing for what seemed like an inevitable clash between the regent and her step-brother. Indeed, for the duration of the regency (1682-1689), the entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich oversaw the militarization of the service staff responsible for administrating the junior tsar's amusements on his suburban estates. Under the direction of the courtiers around the dowager-tsaritsa Natalia Kirillovna (née Naryshkina, the second wife of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich), royal falconers, grooms, and gunners joined foreign military specialists in staging salutes and firework displays on important family dates to symbolize the (frequently exaggerated) might of the Naryshkin faction.

\textsuperscript{19} On the formation of "discursive domains," see Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, The Politics and Poetics of Transgression (Ithaca, 1986), 60-61. For a discussion of the succession struggle, see supra, Chapter One.
As early as 30 May 1683, on their candidate’s eleventh birthday, the Naryshkins recruited a foreign mercenary named Simon Sommer to aid a team of master artisans and journeymen from the Moscow Artillery Chancellery in organizing a “fire-arms salute for the amusement” of tsar Peter Alekseevich (ognestrel’nuye poteshnye strel’by) on the suburban estate of Vorob’evo. A year later, in June 1684, Captain Sommer organized a similar display on the grounds of Preobrazhenskoe, in anticipation of the young tsar’s name day, which fell at the end of the month. These demonstrations of advanced military fire-power were a far cry from the wooden military toys traditionally assembled for the nursery of a young seventeenth-century Muscovite tsar, conveying the serious import that these royal amusements assumed on the estates outside of the Miloslavskii-controlled capital. The military themes of the court spectacles staged by

20 Simon Sommer was a recently-hired professional soldier from Brandenburg, then serving as a captain in General Gordon’s “First Select Moscow Regiment.” See Sbornik vypisok iz arkhivnykh byunag o Pete Velikom, ed. by G. V. Esipov, 2 vols. (M., 1872), I: 39.


the Naryshkins presented their candidate as the rightful successor to the war-like, imperial heritage of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. The young tsar’s “passion” for fireworks and military “amusements” was thus supposed to reflect the reassertion of his role as the future commander-in-chief, a position to which neither of his Miloslavskii siblings could aspire, whether because of their health (as in the case of tsar Ivan Alekseevich) or their gender (as in that of tsarevna Sof’ia Alekseevna).

The construction of a small “play city” (poteshnyi gorodok) just across from tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich’s old Preobrazhenskoe palace was itself a significant step in the organization of the Naryshkins’ counter-court and in the elaboration of its activist, political theology. Early in February 1685, when the retinue of tsar Peter Alekseevich first visited the site of the new suburban construction project, the “play city” consisted of nothing more than two small huts.24 From such inauspicious beginnings, however, the “play city” went on to become the center of a bustling settlement of military units established for the tsar’s “amusement” (poteshnye polki). Over the next decade, as part of the show of force favored by the entourage around tsar Peter Alekseevich, this “play city” was transformed into the nucleus of a play kingdom, serious in all but its name. At its center, on a man-made island in the middle of the Lazuza River, stood a fortress, which was connected by floating bridges to the suburb of lower-class military servitors on one side, and tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich’s old royal palace on the other. The fort

was defended by a “mock” (poteshnye) army staffed by royal grooms from the old Preobrazhenskoe stables, the falconers from nearby Semenovskoe, and the children of the Muscovite noble elite, who served as Peter Alekseevich’s royal chamberlains (stol’niki). By 1687, court records indicate the appearance of “toy boats” (poteshnye korabli), such as those found in the garden ponds of the Kremlin and Izmailovo, which could also be used to navigate the river itself. In the following years other buildings were erected within the city walls, including a stone church, living quarters for leading dignitaries and royal intimates, as well as barns, stables, granaries, and storehouses for munitions. In sum, by the end of the 1680s, the Naryshkin faction had transformed the bucolic site of the tsar Peter Alekseevich’s childhood “amusements” (potekhi) into an alternative capital and the locus of a “New Transfiguration (Novo-Preobrazhenskoe).

24 February 1685 is the date when records for the new construction project begin to be kept. See Esipov, op. cit., I: 345, 55-56. On the royal visit. see Dvortsovye Razriady, op. cit., 327-329; and Astrov, op. cit., 92-93, 213, 215-216.


28 Bogoslovskii, op. cit., I: 58-60, 63-64.

29 The deliberate addition of the adjective “new” (novo), demonstrates that the entourage of the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich intended to tap into the allegorical justifications invoked to celebrate the construction of “old” Preobrazhenskoe – the suburban site of Aleksei’s royal epiphany. On the way in which Aleksei’s suburban royal estates could be used to “emplace” his personal sanctity, see supra, Introduction.
An icon commissioned soon after the entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich first visited the site of the “Naryshkin capital” in February 1685 hinted at the meaning of the construction project undertaken on the grounds of the Preobrazhenskoe estate. On one side of the icon, the artists from the Moscow Armory depicted the Annunciation of the Holy Virgin (Presviatoi Bogoroditsy Znamenie), while on the reverse, they showed the apostle Peter and the martyr Natalia, the celestial patrons of the children of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and N. K. Naryshkina. Emphasizing the defensive element of their political strategy, Peter’s kinsmen entrusted the children of the tsaritsa-dowager to the protection of their respective heavenly patrons and the intercession (pokrov) of the Mother of God. However, the well-known ecclesiastical anthem (troparion) for the Feast of the Annunciation suggested that the courtiers, who sponsored the construction of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe, hoped that the Mother of God do more than just protect the denizens of her “City.” Indeed, it appears that by building Peter’s “play city,” the Naryshkins prayed that she help them “defeat the enemy forces,” who assailed (if, as yet, only metaphorically), the “unconquerable walls” associated with the Virgin (Gr. Oranta). The icon thus served as the banner under which the maternal relatives of

---

30 Muscovite court records reveal that the icon was ordered by T. N. Streshnev on 2 March 1685, a little over a month after the tsar and a large entourage first visited Novo-Preobrazhenskoe. See Esipov, op. cit., 1: 55-56. On T. N. Streshnev’s role in Peter’s “company,” see supra, Chapter One; on Streshnev’s role as mock “metropolitan of Novgorod,” see infra, Chapter Four.

31 For an insightful discussion of the connection between this Novgorodian icon and the cult of the Protective Veil of the Mother of God (Pokrov Bogoroditsy), see M. B. Pliukhanova, Sviyuzni i simvoly Moskovskogo tsarsstva (SPh., 1995), 31-37.

32 The troparion is cited by Astrov, op. cit., 3: 8 (1875), 93 n. 5.
tsar Peter Alekseevich symbolically proclaimed the beginning of their political and religious offensive against the Miloslavskii side of the Russian royal family.

Indeed, judging by the fact that at about the same time as the creation of this icon, the courtiers of tsaritsa Marfa Matveevna (née Apraksina) staged the first debate in the Eucharistic controversy, it would appear that this commission was part of a concerted effort to undermine the authority of the regency government. From what we now know about the highly-developed allegorical court culture of the late seventeenth century, it is not surprising that the Naryshkin offensive relied on the device of using celestial patron-saints as stand-ins for the members of the Russian royal family. Both the panegyrists and the detractors of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna's claims to represent the diarchy of the co-tsars had relied precisely on such correspondences between the macrocosm and the microcosm to make their case about the stability of the "royal trinity" which governed Muscovy after the compromise of 1682.\(^{33}\) What appears as more surprising, is that echoes of this court struggle over religious legitimation reverberated in the "childhood amusements" staged on the grounds of the suburban royal estate of Preobrazhenskoe. However, as even a brief survey of the prominent place of suburban royal estates in Muscovite court culture will demonstrate, at least from the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, these alternative sites in the cultural geography of the capital played an important role in the court's attempt to ground its

\(^{33}\) In fact, the Leichudes brothers even applied the same iconographic image – the Virgin as the Wall (Gr. Oranta) – to tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna. See supra, Chapter One.
authority in the realm of the “sacred.”

Indeed, if we are to understand the full significance of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe in Petrine political theology, we must examine the way in which his father used suburban royal estates as political statements.

*Autocracy in the Suburbs*

Article Six of Aleksei Mikhailovich’s Law Code of 1649, the first substantive legal definition of the Muscovite royal court as an institution, built a ceremonial fence of “honor” (*chest*) around the place wherever his majesty happened to be in the course of the customary pilgrimage through his Orthodox realm. To infringe upon this exclusive, if peregrinating, sacred spot was tantamount to encroaching on another sacred ritual space – the house of God. Equating ceremonial order, religious orthodoxy, and public tranquility, the compilers of the Law Code of 1649 did not hesitate to stipulate similarly severe punishments for blasphemers, schismatics, and other disturbers of the peace and decorum in church and at court.

---


environments, the correct performance of ceremonies insured that divine majesty and regal splendor radiated outward from the "Royal Throne," whether it happened to be the Orthodox altar or the tsar's ceremonial seat of power.\textsuperscript{37} Hierarchically-arranged and legally-enforced, proximity to either spot determined one's access to the powers of the divine.

The Muscovite court's withdrawal behind the guarded fences of exclusive, elaborately-organized suburban estates thus represented more than a flight from the often turbulent politics of Moscow. Like pilgrimages and royal processions,\textsuperscript{38} the trips to the pleasure palaces outside the capital were also intended as the extension of a celestial order and harmony associated with the consecrated, immortal body of the tsar to the rest of his realm.\textsuperscript{39} Whereas Aleksei Mikhailovich had to share the capital's ritual environment with the rest of the Muscovite political elite, his suburban estates gave him the opportunity to create his own personal space, one that embodied his tastes, ambitions, and personal vision of rule. From the mid-1660s, when the tsar began to refurbish existing royal estates and acquired several new ones around the

\textsuperscript{37} On the symbolic equivalence between the altar and the throne, see the discussion about the "royal portals" in Uspenskii, \textit{Tsar i Patriarkh, op. cit.}, 144-150.


\textsuperscript{39} The belief in the civilizing power of the court's example motivated other contemporary European monarchs to escape what were seen as the intrigues and vices of city life and to retire to an idyllic and idealized countryside, a landscape often deliberately remodeled to reflect the virtues of classic pastorals. This trend was inaugurated by Louis XIV, who moved his court from central Paris, the site of recent political opposition, to the erstwhile hunting lodge of Versailles. See Orest Ranum, "The Court and Capital of Louis XIV: Some Definitions and Reflections," in \textit{Louis XIV and the Craft of Kingship}, ed. by John C. Rule (Columbus, 1969), 265-285.
capital, many of them favorite sites of Aleksei Mikhailovich’s hunting expeditions, royal suburban estates began to be ranked in terms of the royal favor bestowed upon them and decorated to illustrate the appropriate image that the tsar wished to project.40 Just as a courtier’s honor was determined by a complicated system of precedence-ranking (mestnichestvo), which combined pedigree and service,41 so the amount of attention, resources, and time lavished on one place usually depended on both its function and its location in the royal hierarchy of status and prestige. In this way, royal suburban estates not only reflected the tsar’s position as head of state, private individual, and leader of Muscovite court society, but also doubled for Aleksei Mikhailovich himself.42 They thus served both of the tsar’s two bodies, satisfying the personal needs of the mortal man and the dynastic and religious requirements of his body-politic.43

40 So, for example, whereas the estate of Izmailovo served as a model farmstead, Kolomenskoe doubled as the tsar’s second capital. See Likhachev, op. cit., 110-126; Khromov, op. cit., 293; and Introduction, supra.

41 For the connection between precedence-suits and elite notions of family honor, see Nancy Shields Kollmann, By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia (Ithaca and London, 1999), ch. 4.

42 For a suggestion of the kind of different roles which the monarch could assume on his suburban estates, see Samuel J. Klingensmith, The Utility of Splendor: Ceremony, Social Life, and Architecture at the Court of Bavaria, 1600-1800 (Chicago and London, 1993), 7.

43 On the notion of the “king’s two bodies” and the application of religious imagery to the monarch, see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval Political Theology (Princeton, 1957); and Michael Cherniavsky, Tsar and People: Studies in Russian Myths (New Haven and London, 1961).
Aleksei’s suburban estates, therefore, presented the perfect arena for the tsar to enact his vision of Orthodox imperial reform and moral renewal. Extolling the harmony, orderliness, and beauty of hierarchy, the tsar’s regulations, relating to the most minute points of etiquette governing life in Moscow and on the estates, proclaimed the universal applicability of the aesthetics of the new, “Baroque” court culture. For example, in re-organizing the rites and ceremonies associated with the traditional royal pastime (potekha) of falconry, Aleksei Mikhailovich brought this sport of kings and emperors in line with his new aesthetic, moral, and political ideals. In 1656, the tsar dictated *The Rules of Falconry: New Regulations and Organization for Falconry Steerage*, an elaborate ceremonial outlining in minute detail the structure, deportment, and clothing of the hunters and their birds, particularly during the election of top falconers from within the rank-and-file members of his court entourage. These rules, drawn up according to the tsar’s vision of “good order,” invested royal play with

---

44 For a discussion of Aleksei’s program of Orthodox “imperial reform,” see supra, Introduction.


46 Tsar Aleksei’s concern with the beauty of regulation and discipline echoed the political vision of *De arte venandi cum avibus* (Lat. Concerning the Art of Hunting with Birds), an imperial Falcon book composed during the reign of Frederick II Hohenstaufen. Like the seventeenth-century Russian tsar, emperor Frederick was himself the object of eschatological expectations, which depicted him as the chastiser of the Church in the Last Days. See Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Frederick the Second, 1194-1250* (London, 1931), 359-363, 685-689; and Norman Cohn, *The Pursuit of the Millennium: Revolutionary Millenarians and Mystical Anarchists of the Middle Ages* (NY, 1970), ch. 6.

a higher meaning, modeling the social relations on the microcosm of the estate for a
realm that rarely lived up to the harmonious and hierarchical ideal.48

But it was Preobrazhenskoe, the estate which actually bore the name of Christ’s
Transfiguration,49 that eventually came to play the most significant role in modeling the
projected deification of the ruler, and, therefore, by metaphoric extension, of his entire
realm. Throughout the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich, and even beyond, the position
occupied by this royal estate in the courtly hierarchy of prestige evolved to reflect the
changing political circumstances within the Muscovite royal house. Initially,
Preobrazhenskoe was merely a convenient rest-stop on the road to Izmailovo and the
Trinity-St. Sergius monastery; it also served as a home-base for those times when the
tsar’s hunting trips in the fields and groves around Elk Forest took him across the
Iauza, a tributary of the Moscow River, to the small royal estate of Semenovskoe, the
settlement of the royal falconers and the training-ground for Aleksei Mikhailovich’s
extensive collection of hunting birds.50 However, by the end of the 1660s, after the
tsar ordered the construction of a small wooden church dedicated to the Ascension
(presumably to commemorate the death of his first wife and to accommodate more of

48 André Berelowitch, “Chasse et rituel en Russie au XVIIe siècle: Le Règlement de la
Fauconnerie d’Alexis Mixajlovic,” in Russes, Slaves et Soviétiques. Pages d’histoire offertes à Roger

49 This royal estate was named for the church of the Transfiguration of the Savior (Rus. Spasa
Preobrazheniie), which was consecrated sometime in the 1660s. On Preobrazhenskoe, see Zabelin,
“Istorii,” op. cit.; idem. Preobrazhenskoe ili Preobrazhensk: Moskovskaia stolitsa dostoslavnykh
preobrazovani pervogo imperatora Petra Velikogo (M., 1883); P. V. Sinitsyn, Preobrazhenskoe i
okruzhaushchie ego mesta: ikh prashloe i nastoashchee (M., 1895); A. Bugrov, “Staro-Preobrazhenskii
dvorets,” Moskovskii arkhiv. Istoriko-kraevedcheski al’manakh, 1 (1996), 42-58, esp. 46; and supra,
Introduction.
his retinue), the estate became a much more frequent stop on the court’s annual itinerary.51

Preobrazhenskoe was extensively remodeled after Aleksei Mikhailovich’s second marriage (1671) and the birth of another male heir, the future Peter the Great. These dynastic developments, which sowed the seeds of the political rivalry between the supporters of the two distaff sides of the Russian royal family, were also linked to the timing of the first theatrical productions ever staged at the Muscovite court.52

Indeed, the veiled allusions to contemporary events of this and other court dramas (Rus. komedii)53 explains why in the last years of the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich the court spent so much time in the relatively poor and undeveloped region around Preobrazhenskoe, as opposed to the more luxurious accommodations of some of the

50 Zabelin, Preobrazhensk, op. cit., 9-10. 15.


52 This unprecedented royal “amusement” (potekha) took place in a special playhouse constructed on the premises of the Preobrazhenskoe estate. The first play, based on the Biblical story of Esther, was performed on 17 October 1672, just a few months after the birth of Peter Alekseevich, and represented the new in-laws’ bid for power, as well as Aleksei Mikhailovich’s attempt to insure an orderly succession. For the text of the play, see Pervye p’esy russkogo teatra, eds. A. N. Robinson, et. al. (M., 1972). On the first Russian court theater, see, S. K. Bogoievenskii, Moskovskii teatr pri tsariakh Aleksee i Petre (M., 1914); V. N. Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, Russkii teatr: ot istokov do serediny XVIII v. (M., 1957), ch. 5; B. N. Aseev, Russkii dramaticheskii teatr XVII-XVIII vekov (M., 1958), 33-42; A. S. Demin, “Russkie p’esy 1670-kh godov i pridvornaia kul’tura,” Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury 27 (1972), 273-283; Jack Weiner, “The Spanish Golden Age Theater in Tsarist Russia (1672-1917)” (Ph.D. diss., Indiana, 1968); Simon Karlinskii, Russian Drama from Its Beginnings to the Age of Pushkin (Berkeley, 1985); and O. A. Derzhavina, “Russko-evropeiskie literaturnye sviaz i v oblasti dramaturgii na rubele XVII-XVIII vekov (Istoriia Esfirii na shkol’noi stene zapadno-evropeiskogo i russkogo teatra),” in Slavianskie literatury. VII mezhdunarodnyi s”ezd slavistov. Varshava, avgust 1973 g. Doklady sovetskoi delegatsii, ed. M. P. Alekseev, et. al. (M., 1973), 282-294.

other royal estates. For in the relative privacy of this secluded pleasure palace, Aleksei Mikhailovich could dramatically stress his mediating leadership role as host to Muscovite court society and enact his own vision of personal rule in front of a captive audience, who, if need be, could be forced to attend the new court spectacle. By the end of the reign, Preobrazhenskoe was the only other suburban estate where Aleksei Mikhailovich celebrated important religious holidays and occasionally received foreign embassies, and, therefore, the only site which rivaled Kolomenskoe as the “second capital” of his personal, Transfigured Kingdom.

Despite tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich’s best efforts, however, the familial peace and social harmony symbolically enacted on the stage of his royal estate failed to materialize in the political life of the court following his death. Indeed, after the untimely death of his young heir, Fedor Alekseevich, the political infighting between the distaff branches of the Russian royal house escalated into a fierce succession struggle over the Alekseevan legacy. As we saw in the previous chapter, in the course of this struggle, each party put forth a candidate whom they claimed as the embodiment of the Alekseevan vision of order, and, therefore, the true heir to the throne. Unlike the Miloslavskiis, whose patronage strategies emphasized the exemplary, “Baroque”

---

54 Zabelin, Preobrazhensk, op. cit., 17-18.

55 Karlinskii, op. cit., 43-44.

56 Khromov, op. cit., 293.
piety of tsar Ivan Alekseevich and his sister, the regent Sof'ia Alekseevna.\(^{57}\) the
Naryshkins capitalized on the advice given in the introduction to tsar Aleksei
Mikhailovich's *Rules of Falconry* (1656): "These maxims are for your souls and
bodies; but never forget truth and justice, and benevolent love and martial exercise; one
must have enough time for work, and some hours of frolic (*potekha*)."\(^{58}\) Just as
Aleksei Mikhailovich had "playfully" used his royal falconers to stage his personal
vision of the reformed Orthodox realm on his favorite suburban estates, so the
Naryshkins used Novo-Preobrazhenskoe to stage politically-significant court spectacles
for the "amusement" of their candidate. From this perspective, the military maneuvers
organized by general Patrick Gordon outside of Aleksandrovskiaia sloboda in September
1689 culminated the tradition of Alekseevan suburban court spectacles, while pointing
forward to the kind of changes which this tradition would undergo at the militarized
"counter-court" of the young, Naryshkin candidate.

That all sides of the post-Alekseevna succession struggle were aware of the
special significance of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe is demonstrated by the fact that the coup
of 1689 was started by a rumor that the Moscow musketeers were about to descend

\(^{57}\) For a discussion of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna's patronage of the New Maidens
(Novodevich'i) Convent - the architectural embodiment of the Sophia-Wisdom of God ideogram - which emphasized the regent's mediating presence between heavenly order and political stability, see Hughes, *op. cit.*, 124, 133, 15-154, 225, 243, 258-259; and E. K. Zelensky, "‘Sophia the Wisdom of God’ as a Rhetorical Device during the Regency of Sof'ia Alekseevna, 1682-1689,” (Ph.D. thesis, Georgetown University, 1992), 323-331.

\(^{58}\) Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's addendum to the introduction of his *New Regulations and Organization for Falconry Steerage*, in Zenkovsky, ed., *op. cit.*, 522. The last line of the invocation echoed a popular Russian proverb: "*Delu vremia, potekhi chas,*" which may have been an adaptation of Ecclesiastes 3: 1-8. See Berelowitch, *op. cit.*, 92 n. 3.
upon, and set fire to this suburban capital of the Naryshkin faction.\footnote{For an analysis of these politically-expedient rumors, see the “testimony” of F. L. Shaklovityi, cited supra, Chapter One.} Indeed, it is hardly a coincidence that the tsar’s unscheduled “pilgrimage to the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery” (Troitskii pokhod) took place on the night of 7-8 August 1689, just one day after tsar Peter Alekseevich and his kinsmen celebrated the Feast of Transfiguration (6 August), and not on 25 September – the name-day of St. Sergius and, therefore, the usual time for the court’s annual pilgrimage to that monastic shrine.\footnote{On the timing of the Muscovite court’s annual pilgrimages to the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery, see E. F. Shmurlo. “Kriticheskie zametki po istorii Petra Velikogo, X: Preobrazhenskoe i Kremli’v zhizni tsarevicha Petra (do 1682 г.),” Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia 330 (July-August 1900), 223-234, here 225. For the timing of Peter’s unscheduled “pilgrimage,” see A. S. Lavrov, Regenstvo tsarevny Sofi’ Alekseevny: Sluchiloe obschestvo i bor’ba za vlast’ v verkhakh Russkogo gosudarstva v 1682-1689 gg. (M., 1999), 157-158.} In a sense, the light of the Transfiguration could be said to have “sparked” the coup of 1689. For surely, if such knowledgeable foreigners as General Gordon could recognize the fact that this church feast was “a great holiday at Preobrasinsky [sic.],”\footnote{Gordon, “Diary” (6 August 1690), op. cit., fol. 22.} so could the warring factions at the late seventeenth-century Muscovite court. In fact, as I will now attempt to demonstrate, tsar Peter Alekseevich would use these very same tropes in order to distance himself from the broad, and necessarily temporary, political coalition that had supported his candidacy during the “Naryshkin-Restoration.”

\textit{The Bellicose Kingdom of Peace}
Far from demonstrating the triumph of the Naryshkin clan, the war-games organized immediately after the 1689 coup signaled the elaboration of a new policy of royal access and evidenced the formation of the tsar’s own retinue of intimates, mentors, and boon-companions. Indeed, the patronage extended to the foreign (and confessionally-heterodox) military advisors – such as general Patrick Gordon, who helped to stage these military maneuvers in the first place – underlined the changed basis of belonging to the tsar’s inner circle. Adopting a radically different, and unprecedented imagery, in order to represent the authority of the young Russian Orthodox tsar, Peter Alekseevich and his personal entourage went on to stage a series of elaborate and realistic military maneuvers just outside of the estate named after the Transfiguration (Novo-Preobrazhenskoe), implementing their idiosyncratic interpretation of the fundamental transformation and renewal promised by that church holiday. The special significance which the feast of the Transfiguration held for Peter Alekseevich and his courtiers demonstrated that these spectacles also emphasized the tsar’s Christ-like willingness to abandon the external attributes of his divinely-appointed

---


63 For example, on 6 August 1690, general Gordon recorded that this day “being the transfiguration, a great holiday at Preobrasinsky, after noon the Court foot [infantry] fought against the first Regiment of Streltzes [Rus. streltsy, i.e. Muscovite musketeers] called the Stremeny [Rus. stremianny, i.e. the elite “Stirrup” regiment] and beat them out of the fields.” See Gordon, “Diary” (6 August 1690), op. cit., fol. 22.
role and to don the coarse clothes of a soldier for the benefit of the whole realm. Thus, despite the fact that the tsar skirmished alongside his courtiers as just another "subject" of his sham lord and liege – the chivalrous king of the New Transfigured Kingdom – no one could ever truly forget that these public demonstrations of Peter Alekseevich's masculine virtues only served to underline his divine calling.

Tsar Peter Alekseevich's adoption of a military rank in the army of the mock king of the Transfigured Kingdom coincided with the re-organization of the entourage responsible for staging his childhood amusements. At the end of 1690, the tsar instructed general Gordon to re-organize the "play regiments" along the lines of the foreign-trained, "new-style" regiments of professional soldiers. This military re-organization was not completed until the end of 1692. By 1693, the year of the first surviving list of commanding officers (nachal'nye liudi) for the Preobrazhensk regiment, Moscow had four regular regiments: two old ones – known as the First and

\[64\] In the eastern Orthodox tradition, the feast of the Transfiguration emphasizes the humanity of Christ, as evidenced by the liturgical hymn for this feast, which expresses "two aspects of Christ's humanity – His natural state and His state of voluntary submission to conditions of fallen humanity." See Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, trans. by the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius (London, 1957), 148-149. On Christ's "kenosis" as the voluntary assumption of His "slave's form," see *ibid.*, 144 ff., 148; and George Fedotov, "Russian Kenoticism," in *The Russian Religious Mind: The Collected Works of George P. Fedotov* (Belmont, Mass., 1975), 3: 94-131.


Second Select – and two new ones – the “Preobrazhensk” and the “Semenovsk,” which were still occasionally referred to as the “play regiments.” The members of the tsar’s entourage took all the leading command positions in the newly-created regiments, while the court personnel who staffed the tsar’s “play regiments” went on to form the core group of low-level cadres (sergeants, corporals, and bombardiers) of the Preobrazhensk regiment and the grenadier units. The tsar himself became the official royal patron of the Preobrazhensk regiment, receiving a newly-designed “sergeant’s kaftan” (serzhantskii kaftan) from the Court Workshop at the beginning of 1691.

The elaborate war-games accompanying this military re-organization of the court were integral not only to the transformation of the tsar’s entourage, but also in the elaboration of its new self-conception. Although the former “play regiments” were named and divided on a strictly topographical basis, according to their place of quartering, this practical division soon acquired an added dimension of meaning as the competing realms of two mock kings, who acted as the main characters in the “Field ballets military” organized by General Gordon in 1690 and 1691. The mock-solemn

---


68 Opisanie vysochaisikh poveleii po pridvornomu vedomstvu, 1701-1740 gg. (SPb., 1888), iv-v; and Bobrovskii, op. cit., 7.

69 Bobrovskii, op. cit., 13. Semenovskoe and Preobrazhenskoe are two adjacent royal estates, which were simply separated from one another by a branch of the Iauza River, known as the Kapilovsk stream. In the official “relation” of the so-called “Kozhukhov campaign” (1694), this topographical division acquired the status of a “border” between two play kingdoms. See “Kozhukhovskii pokhod. 1694. (Sovremennoe opisanie),” Voennyi sbornik 11:1 (1860), 49-106, here 54.

70 Gordon was less interested in the meaning of the “great pompé [sic.]” and “formalities” accompanying these military maneuvers, than in the logistical details of the engagement. For Gordon’s description of the second “Semenovskoe campaign,” which he characterized as a “Field ballet military,” see his “Diary” (14 October 1691), op. cit., fols. 99-101, esp. fol. 101.
tone of these war-games, facetiously called the first and second "Semenovskoe campaigns," is clearly expressed in a contemporary "Description of the Great and Terrible Battle in which His Highness, Generalissimo Friedrich Romodanovskii took part on the 6th, 7th, and 9th of October in the present 200th year [1691]."\textsuperscript{71} This anonymous "Description," written from the point of view of a soldier in the army of "Generalissimo Friedrich," offers one of the first documented glimpses into the imagery and practices shaping the personal entourage of the young tsar, as well as an insight into the structure of the imaginary Transfigured Kingdom enacted on the grounds outside of the Muscovite capital.

The "armies" that took part in the choreographed war-games of 1691 were actually commanded by the two courtiers who headed the chancelleries responsible for administering the lands and supervising the personnel on the royal estates of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe and Semenovskoe. Judging by the title of the "Description," the leading role in the mock campaign was played by Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii (1640-1717), a fifty-one-year-old privy chamberlain (komnatnyi stol'nik) who belonged to a clan that proudly traced its lineage back to the Riurikid dynasty.\textsuperscript{72} During the regency

\textsuperscript{71} "Opisanie velikogo i strashnogo boiu, kotoryi byl v nyneshnem 200 godu oktjabria 6 i v 7, i v 9 chislekh u ego presvetleishego generalissimusa Fridriha Romodanovskogo," \textit{RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, kn. 93}; published in N. G. Ustrialov, \textit{Istoritsa tsarstvovaniia Petra Velikogo} (SPb., 1858), 2: 486-490; see the discussion in Bogoslovskii, \textit{op. cit.}, I: 125-130.

\textsuperscript{72} For the genealogy of the Romodanovskii clan, see \textit{Istoritsa rodov russkogo dvorianstva}, ed. P. N. Petrov (SPb., 1886), I: 139-141; and P. Dolgorukov, \textit{Rossiiskaia rodoslovnaiia kniga} (SPb., 1855), 51-52. For a brief biography of Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii, see Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 78, 96, 149-150. 334; LeDonne, \textit{op. cit.}, 243; Robert O. Crumney, "Peter and the Boiar Aristocracy, 1689-1700," \textit{Canadian-American Slavic Studies} 8:2 (Summer 1974), 274-287, here 278; and Lindsey Hughes, \textit{Russia in the Age of Peter the Great} (New Haven and London, 1998) [hereafter, \textit{Peter}], 423-424. For other biographical information, see Hughes, \textit{ibid.}, 16, 42, 52, 73, 98-100, 101, 103, 106, 115, 141, 174, 198,
of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna, Romodanovskii had led the chancellery which administered the Naryshkin-controlled Transfiguration royal estate and its service staff, especially the staff responsible for the royal amusements. During the military re-organization of the early 1690s, this estate chancellery (*Poteshnaia izba*) assumed responsibilities for administering the Preobrazhensk regiment and for staging the tsar’s war games, as well as for handling all cases of *lèse-majesté* (Rus. *slovo i delo gosudarevo*). Partly as a result of this new appointment, Romodanovskii became a virtual stand-in for Peter Alekseevich, not only during court entertainments, but also within the political leadership, during the young tsar’s increasingly frequent absences from Moscow. Indeed, despite the fact that he was never promoted to the Muscovite royal council (Rus. *Boiarskaia duma*), Romodanovskii remained undoubtedly one of the most powerful men at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich.

---


75 Airapetian, *op. cit.*, 78, 149-150.
Romodanovskii's "arch-rival" was I. I. "The Elder" (bol'shoi) Buturlin (d. 1710),76 "tsar and sovereign of Semenovsk."77 A minor courtier (komnatnyi stol'nik) from a large and wealthy Russian noble family,78 Buturlin seems to have been given a prominent role in this royal amusement thanks largely to his official capacity as the head of the chancellery responsible for administering the land and the personnel at Semenovskoe, the old falconry yard of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich.79 In what may have been a tribute to the favorite pastime of the late tsar, for the duration of the campaign Buturlin was referred to by the sobriquet "Vatupich," a nickname probably derived from the designation for a type of pigeon (vatutin, vetiutin).80 To anyone familiar with the political significance of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich's allegorical "amusements," it was apparent that during the choreographed military maneuvers staged by the entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich, the army of the "King of Semenovsk" would inevitably fall prey to the superior skills of his rival. However, the skills of "Generalissimo

76 On 4 August 1710, the roof of Prince Iakov Kol'tsov-Mosal'skii's house collapsed upon I. I. Buturlin the Elder, crushing him to death. See Airapetian, op. cit., 77.

77 Although the "Description" does not mention the name of the rival "Generalissimo," he is identified by Kurakin, op. cit., 75.

78 From 1682 until his accidental death in 1710, I. I. Buturlin the Elder served as "privy chamberlain" (komnatnyi stol'nik) to tsar Peter Alekseevich. At the same time, fourteen other Buturlins served as rank-and-file chamberlains (triadovye stol'nikii). See Airapetian, 329, 98, 347. For the genealogy of the Buturlin clan, see "Rodoslovaia rospis' Buturlinykh [6 April 1682]. Zaverennaia kopia 1798g.," SPB FIFI RAN, koll. 238, op. 2, karton 264, No. 4. 347.

79 Kurakin, op. cit., 75; Golikova, op. cit., 10. For his role as Peter's intimate, see Crummey, op. cit., 278.

80 Kurakin, ibid., 75; Charles E. Gribble, A Short Dictionary of 18-Century Russian, (Columbus, 1987), 15.
Friedrich" and his "regular" troops owed less to the injunctions of *The Rules of Falconry* than to the laws of military art and the tenets of religious chivalry.\textsuperscript{81}

Judging by the fact that for the duration of this royal amusement, the little fort across from the old Transfiguration palace received the name "Pressburg" (*Preshpur*),\textsuperscript{82} the capital of the Kingdom of Hungary, the model of these martial virtues seems to have been the "Holy Roman Emperor of the German Nation." Leopold I. The two symbolic acts which signaled the extension of Habsburg royal absolutism into Hungary after its devastation by the Ottoman Turks and a protracted civil war – the Magyar magnates' grudging acceptance of restrictions to their constitution and the unprecedented election of the Emperor's heir as king of Hungary in 1687 – both took place in Pressburg.\textsuperscript{83} This absolutist project was devised with the input of some of the leading theorists of "cameralism" at the late seventeenth-century

\textsuperscript{81} For the virtues ascribed by the seventeenth-century "Roman Stoic tradition" to the "military commander," see Gerhard Oestreich, *Neosticism and the Early Modern State* (Cambridge, 1982), 55. Seeking to revive the classical Roman tradition, and to apply it to such practical purposes as the reorganization of the army, authors like Justus Lipsius noted that an "ideal commander [...] should carry the lance at the head of his men and share in all their tribulations. He should set an example and not simply issue orders. [He] is tireless in making his dispositions, controlled in danger, wise and swift in execution, blameless and irreproachable, moderate in all things, of proven loyalty and faith, favored by fortune, and amiable towards everyone." *Ibid.* As we shall see, the war-games enacted by Peter's courtiers on the fields outside of Moscow, captured the spirit, if not the letter of this formulation of military "virtue."

\textsuperscript{82} For the reference to Pressburg as the "capital city" of "His Highness" Romodanovskii, see "Opisanie," in Ustrialov, *op. cit.*, 490.

\textsuperscript{83} John P. Spielman, *Leopold I of Austria* (New Brunswick, 1977), 134, 136. A Russian translation of the 1690 coronation ceremonial (*vypiska iz tseremonii koronatsii*) for "Joseph, King of the Romans" (*rimskogo korolja izosta*) is located in *RGADA*, *f.* 156, No. 104. The daily entries of General Gordon, who has only recently been recognized as an important diplomat in his own right, reveal that at least some members of the tsar's entourage were aware of these developments, if only by means of news digests ("gazettes"). See, e.g., Gordon, "Diary" (12-14 January 1690, 6 December 1692), *op. cit.*, *op. cit.*, fol. 2, 204. On Gordon-the Jacobite diplomat, see Herd, *op. cit.*, ch. 4.
Habsburg court,\textsuperscript{84} the very same economic advisors, whose policies helped to finance the royal building-boom in 1690s around Vienna – patronage that was seen by some contemporaries as a re-assertion of imperial ambitions on the part of the Holy Roman Emperor.\textsuperscript{85} With the help of the Vatican, Leopold I had organized a new crusade against the Muslim “infidels”; and, during the regency of tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna, he arbitrated the “Eternal Peace” that paved the way for Muscovy’s inclusion into the “Holy Alliance” against the Ottoman Porte. After the 1689 coup, Imperial diplomats repeatedly sought to induce the new Naryshkin regime to live up to its diplomatic responsibilities by launching a new campaign against the Crimean Tatars, the vassals of the Porte; but in the early 1690s, the recently-installed government continued to shy away from resuming the unsuccessful campaigns that had brought down the regency. The appearance of a “King of Pressburg” during the military maneuvers of 1691 thus may have had a geopolitical resonance for contemporaries. By pointing to the Habsburg Emperor’s difficulties in pacifying his own realm, the establishment of “Pressburg” appears to have been intended to deflate the claims of one of the Muscovite leadership’s main geopolitical and confessional rivals, while, simultaneously, signaling the tsar’s refusal to be bullied into any rash acts.

\textsuperscript{84} Cameralist policies entailed the centralization of power and more efficient administration of royal lands to promote growth of commerce and industry of the kingdom as a whole, and hence the independent income and power of the monarch. Leonard Krieger, \textit{Kings and Philosophers, 1689-1789}. (NY, 1970), 64; and Marc Raeff, “The Well-Ordered Police State and the Development of Modernity in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Europe: An Attempt at a Comparative Approach,” \textit{American Historical Review} 80:5 (1975), 1221-1243.

\textsuperscript{85} Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, \textit{Court, Cloister and City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe, 1450-1800} (Chicago, 1995), 290-300.
More important, the example of Leopold I’s policies in Hungary appears to have served as a political allegory for the “restoration” of royal authority in Muscovy. During the war-games of the early 1690s, the divisive political struggle between the Naryshkin and Miloslavskii clans of the Muscovite royal house was symbolically replayed on a battlefield which was purposely tilted against the reputed supporters of the recently-deposed regent. Romodanovskii’s troops, composed of the “regular” cavalry and infantry regiments, including the two new royal life-guard regiments, faced off against the Muscovite musketeers, whose involvement in, and support of, the Miloslavskii candidate in 1682 resulted in a popular uprising reminiscent of the Muscovite “Time of Troubles,” if not of the Hungarian civil war. The inevitability of the choreographed victory of the head of the chancellery responsible for investigating and punishing all cases of “rebellion” against the tsar hinted at the form the reassertion of Muscovite “absolutism” was to take. By assigning the playful role of “King of Pressburg” to a trusted old courtier, who wielded extraordinary judicial power over the entire political elite and expected to be treated with the respect due to his office as the head of the secret police and “Generalissimus” of the royal life-guard regiments, tsar Peter Alekseevich demonstrated that he took the “cameralist” and “neo-Stoic” ideals of subordination to the embodiment of centralized, absolute power


87 For an argument about the place of the earlier “Time of Troubles” in the political imagination of the courtiers, who were involved in the post-Alekseevian succession struggle, see supra, Chapter One.

88 On Kurakin’s appraisal of Romodanovskii’s power and influence, see op. cit., 83-84.
very seriously. "Generalissimo Friedrich's" defense of his own "Pressburg" thus came
to express a serious political message in the entertaining-didactic form of contemporary
court amusements.

For the tsar and his entourage, however, demonstrating the new rules of the
game was perhaps even more important than replaying the battles which accompanied
the recent succession struggle. The German pseudonym of the "King of Pressburg,"
like the foreign name of his mock capital, hinted at the broader vision of the
Transfigured Kingdom imagined by the tsar and his entourage. Romodanovskii's new
Christian name, "Friedrich," bore no direct relation to his real first name; however,
this fact pointed to something more significant than the fact that the tsar habitually
showed off his knowledge of Dutch or German by sprinkling his speech with foreign
loan-words. Referring to the mock king by the German word for "peaceful," the tsar
seems to have been designating the role that his old Russian favorite was to play during
the war-games, as well as the way in which he was to play it. The German name of
the "King of Pressburg" recalled the biblical prototype of King Solomon, the "Prince
of Peace," whose very name evoked messianic expectations and whose image was so
important in the allegorical court culture of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. As we in the
Introduction, Simeon of Polotsk had compared the "wonders" of Aleksei's estate at
Kolomenskoe to those of King Solomon's palace in an effort to extol the "wisdom" of
his royal patron; in the poem of the court preacher, the ancient king of Israel, who built
the Temple and presided over the reign of peace and plenty from his capital in
Jerusalem, served as the model for the seventeenth-century Muscovite tsar. Simeon’s panegyric partook of the exegetical tradition according to which Solomon was a type of Christ, the King who established peace not by the sword, but by the Word of God.⁹⁹ Similarly, the anonymous author of the “Description” seems to have had the example of the “Peaceful Prince” in mind when he chose to emphasize that the mock king of “Pressburg” was spurred to take up arms only in response to the aggressive intentions of the enemy “Generalissimo.” ⁹⁰ Indeed, it appears that in the war-games staged by tsar Peter Alekseevich on the grounds of his father’s royal estates, the wise and chivalrous character of “Generalissimo Friedrich” embodied the millenarian vision associated with the founding of a new Transfigured Kingdom. ⁹¹

---

⁹⁹ This was, for example, the interpretation offered by Martin Luther, in his sixteenth-century pamphlet “On Governmental Authority.” Justifying the “temporal sword, or law” used by secular princes to compel obedience in matters unrelated to religious beliefs, Luther argued that “Although He [Christ] sanctions the sword, He did not make use of it, for it serves no purpose in His kingdom, in which there are none but the upright. Hence, [King] David of old was not permitted to build the temple [2 Sam. 7:4-13], because he had wielded the sword and had shed much blood. Not that he had done wrong thereby, but because he could not be a type of Christ, who without the sword was to have a kingdom of peace. It had to be built instead by Solomon, whose name in German means ‘Friedrich’ or ‘peaceful.’” See Martin Luther, “On Governmental Authority,” The Protestant Reformation, ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (NY, 1968), 49. On Peter’s knowledge of Luther, see Zakonodatel’nye akti Petra I, ed. N. A. Voskresenskii (M.-L., 1945), 38; and James Cracraft, The Church Reform of Peter the Great: (London and Basingstoke, 1971), 25.

⁹⁰ “Opisanie,” in Ustrialov, op. cit., 486. Compare this stress on wisdom and chivalry to the image of the ideal “general” in the seventeenth-century military manual analyzed by Oestreich, op. cit., 76-85, esp. 82-83.

While the courtier entrusted with defending the royal dignity took on the title of the mock king, the actual tsar freed himself to play other roles, more in keeping with his attempts to demonstrate his divine calling. Following the rules of the game which he himself had helped to establish, Peter Alekseevich assumed a new name and rank in the army of “Generalissimo Friedrich,” commanding a company of foreign-style cavalry (reirty) under the nom de guerre “captain (rotmistr) Peter Alekseev.” Derived from his patronymic, the tsar’s pseudonymous last name emphasized the lengths to which the “son of Aleksei” went to demonstrate his charismatic status as Muscovy’s rightful monarch. Despite the lowly rank of his adapted persona, the tsar actually “performed” the single most heroic act of personal bravery during the whole mock campaign. By intercepting the reckless charge of “Generalissimo” Buturlin against “His Highness” Romodanovskii, “cavalry captain Peter Alekseev” foiled the enemy’s attempt to kill “Generalissimo Friedrich” and thereby “to behead his troops.” The mock army, that miniature body politic that was the “Transfigured Kingdom” of the “King of Pressburg,” was thus saved from disorder, flight, and defeat by the actual head of the Muscovite realm. This prominent and public display of the tsar’s personal bravery conveyed the redemptive role of God’s anointed in the new rhetoric of religious chivalry, prefiguring the symbolic role that Peter’s tricorn, shot

92 Bogoslovskii, op. cit., I: 127. On the duties of the ideal “captain,” the most important “pillar of military authority” in the army reforms introduced during the seventeenth-century “Military Revolution,” see Oestreich, op. cit., 81-82.

93 “Opisanie,” in Ustralov, op. cit., 487.
through by an enemy bullet in the heat of battle, was later to play in the panegyrics produced during the Great Northern War.\textsuperscript{94}

In the imaginary world revealed by the insider’s account of the war-games, God decided the outcomes of military engagements on the basis of the competing sides’ adherence to the code of chivalry and martial valor. The duplicitous and cowardly behavior of “Generalissimo” Buturlin only served to emphasize the magnanimity of the tsar’s mock double, the chivalrous Christian sovereign of “Pressburg.” Taken prisoner, the enemy king was led into the camp of “Generalissimo” Romodanovskii, who received his rival with the honors befitting a worthy opponent. In a generous act of hospitality, which foreshadowed the treatment of the Swedish command staff captured after the decisive Russian victory at Poltava (1709), the “King of Pressburg” wined and dined his prisoner, while saluting the bravery of his own troops.

“Generalissimo” Romodanovskii further demonstrated his “nobility” (blagoutrobie) as a “Christian sovereign” (gosudar’ khrisianskii) by honoring Buturlin’s petition asking to be allowed to return to his troops, in exchange for a pledge of friendship, peace, and obedience.\textsuperscript{95} The very next day after his release, however, the “King of Semenovsk” forgot his “promises and the mercy shown to him,” and resumed his campaign against

\textsuperscript{94} The most famous interpretation of this episode was offered by Feofan (Prokopovich) in two separate panegyrical orations about the battle of Poltava. See “Slovo pokhval’noe nad voiskami Sveiskami pobede [...] v leto gospodne 1709 mesiatsa iunia dnia 27 bogom darovannoi” and “Slovo pokhval’noe o batalii Polavskoi [...] iunia v 27 den’ 1717,” in Feofan Prokopovich. Sochineniia, ed. I. P. Eremin (M.-L., 1961), 31-32; 56-57.

\textsuperscript{95} The honor of escorting his humbled and repentant rival was given to “the abovementioned cavalry captain, who had taken [Buturlin alive] during the battle.” In gratitude, the enemy “Generalissimo” presented “Peter Alekseev” with a sword. See “Opisanie,” in Ustrialov, 488.
the "King of Pressburg." In the words of the author of the "Description," the ensuing defeat of the enemy's cavalry demonstrated "God's mercy" and the "injustice" of their cause.96

This playful, religious rhetoric also extended to his account of the general battle, which took place on the last day of the "Semenovskoe campaign." The author of the "Description" equated this decisive engagement, a five hour military maneuver involving both infantry and cavalry, with the "Day of Judgement" (sudnyi den').97 But in the witty, tongue-in-cheek style of the "Description," the eschatological battle between the forces of good and evil assumed the form of a mock-epic, complete with a comic portrayal of the cowardly actions of the enemy "Generalissimo," who hid among the "corpses" of his own troops before he was located and brought to his knees, literally and figuratively, in front of "Generalissimo Friedrich." And while the victory of this "King of Peace" did not inaugurate the reign of the messiah, it did symbolize the triumph of the ideals of the Transfigured Kingdom imagined by the inner circle of tsar Peter Alekseevich. And these chivalrous, new ideals could not but have an impact on the way that the tsar and his entourage related to the conservative politicians, who

96 Whether or not this formulation can be taken to mean that the author of the "Description" was aware of the treatises of Hugo Grotius, it certainly does provide evidence of the court's early interest in contemporary theories about "just" and "unjust" wars. On Peter's later interest in the writings of the seventeenth-century Dutch jurists, see A. S. Lappo-Danilevskii, "Idea gosudarstva i glavneishie momenty eia razvitiia v Rossii so vremeni smuty i do epokhi preobrazovani," Golos minuvshago 12 (1914), 5-38; Sumner Benson, "The Role of Western Political Thought in Petrine Russia," Canadian-American Slavic Studies 8.2 (Summer 1974), 254-273; and M. A. Panchenko, "Nachalo petrovskoi reformy: ideinaia podopleka," Iz istorii russkoj kul'tury, ed. by A. D. Koshelev (M., 1996), 3: 503-518.

97 "Opisanie," in Ustrialov, 490.
had put the young Naryshkin candidate on the Muscovite throne. Indeed, just two months after the conclusion of the first "Semenovskoe campaign," the tsar went on to organize another, much more private court spectacle, which demonstrated how far Peter Alekseevich would go in order to assert his charismatic authority, and which left very little doubt about the radical, anti-nomian thrust of his new, and much more accessible style of rule.\textsuperscript{98}

\textit{The State of Sober Drunkenness}

In the winter of 1691-92, at Yuletide, a select group of Muscovite courtiers and foreign military advisors assembled at the suburban royal estate of New Transfiguration (\textit{Novo-Preobrazhenskoe}) to hear the proclamation of a new "Gospel According to Peter."\textsuperscript{99} In the course of an elaborate Bacchanalian parody of the sacrament of Holy Orders (Rus. \textit{Tainstvo sviashchesnstva}),\textsuperscript{100} the young tsar and his courtiers elected and

\textsuperscript{98} For a discussion of the difference between "participatory" versus "aloof" strategies of royal access, see supra, Introduction.

\textsuperscript{99} General Gordon, who personally witnessed the ceremony during which the "King of Pressburg" acquired his own mock spiritual counterpart, left very little evidence about his reaction to this private court spectacle. On Sunday, 27 December 1691, Gordon recorded in his "Diary" that he was present at a ceremony in the Muscovite royal palace [lit. "above," Gordon's translation of the traditional Muscovite term (\textit{verkhu}) for the royal apartments in the Kremlin], where an unnamed number of people, presumably making up the tsar's inner circle, "Choysed [sic.] a Patr: [...]" Five days later, on New Years day, Friday, 1 January 1692, Gordon noted that he was "[i]n Preobrasinsko [sic.], at the installling of the Patriarch [...]" See Gordon, "Diary" (27 December 1691 and 1 January 1692), op. cit., fols. 110 and 154. On the Kremlin royal quarters (\textit{verkhu}), see I. E. Zabelin, \textit{Domashnii byt russikh tsarei v XVI i XVII st.}, repr. of 4th ed. (M., 1990), 1: 59-60.

\textsuperscript{100} On the sacrament of Holy Orders, see Ware, Timothy. \textit{The Orthodox Church}. Middlesex, 1964; on seventeenth-century practice, see A. Golosov, \textit{Tserkovnaia zhizn' na Rusi v polovine XVII veka
installed a mock “Patriarch” to act as the spiritual leader of the tsar’s own faction – a “royal priesthood,”¹⁰¹ based on intimate access to the person of the young Romanov tsar, and committed to implementing in real life the religious and chivalric ideals enacted during the court’s war-games.¹⁰² In direct opposition to the patrimonial politics of the party which had put Peter Alekseevich on the Muscovite throne, the young tsar and his intimates raucously asserted that to be a member of this “holy nation,” one did not have to perform the ritual laws of Russian Orthodoxy or to be a royal relative, much less a native Muscovite; one simply had to believe in the divine gift of grace (Gr. charisma) possessed by Russia’s anointed one (Gr. christos) and, like the disciples at the moment of Jesus’ transfiguration on Mount Tabor, to bask in the marvelous light of his deified nature.¹⁰³ By assuming the titles of metropolitans, bishops, and deacons, the tsar’s inner circle thus arrogated to itself the functions traditionally entrusted by

---

¹⁰¹ See 1 Peter 2: 9: “But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God’s own people, in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light.”

¹⁰² In a letter written on the eve of Peter’s first, real, military campaign, the Russian tsar observed: “we fooled around (shutili) at Kozhukhov, now we’re off (edem) to try our luck [igrat’, lit. to play] at Azov.” See Peter to F. M. Apraksin (c. April 1695), Pis’ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo (SPb., 1887) [hereafter, PiB], I: 28.

¹⁰³ “Thou wast transfigured on the mountain, O Christ our Lord, and the glory has so caught the wonder of Thy disciples, that when they see Thee crucified they will understand that Thy Passion is voluntary, and they will proclaim to the world that Thou art truly the Splendor of the Father.” See the hymn for the Feast of the Transfiguration, from the Menologia (immovable feasts) and the Lenten Triodion, cited in Lossky, op. cit., 149.
Christ to Peter the Apostle and his ecclesiastical successors – whether the Roman Catholic pope or the Russian Orthodox patriarch.\textsuperscript{104}

The fact that General Patrick Gordon personally took part in the ceremony that sought to transform the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich into the "church" of Peter suggests that what mattered to the tsar and his inner entourage was not religious convictions but skill and a commonality of values and goals. This cosmopolitan (if not quite tolerant) attitude was demonstrated very clearly later, in a royal decree of 16 April 1702, which invited foreigner specialists to Muscovy by proclaiming that the Russian monarch had no power over people's consciences and simply sought to enlist knowledgeable people in his service.\textsuperscript{105} But already at the end of the seventeenth century, the tsar's entourage was filled with foreign advisors and confidants. So much so, in fact, that Prince B. I. Kurakin (1676-1727),\textsuperscript{106} the only other contemporary eyewitness to leave a record of these events, accused the tsar of consciously trying to undermine the power and closeness of the traditional Muscovite elite by favoring

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{104} On the image of St Peter in Orthodox Christianity, see John Meyendorff, "St. Peter in Byzantine Theology," in The Primacy of Peter. Essays in Ecclesiology and the Early Church, ed. by John Meyendorff (Crestwood, 1992), 67-90.


\textsuperscript{106} The biography of Prince B. I. Kurakin still remains to be written. For his autobiography, see "Zhizn' kniazia Borisa Ivanovicha Kurakina, im samim opisannaia," in \textit{Arkhiv kn. F. A. Kurakina}, ed. M. I. Semevskii (SPb., 1890), vol. I. For his diplomatic career, see A. A. Ludintseva, "Russkaia diplomatia v period Severnoi Voiny (Deiatel'nost' B. I. Kurakina)" (Avtoreferat kand. diss., State Party School of the CPSU[b], 1949); and Daria Borghese, \textit{Un ambasciatore di Pietro il Grande in incognito presso la Santa Sede} (Rome, 1961). For a discussion of selected aspects of his political and historical thought, see M. A. Alpatov, \textit{Russkaia istoricheskaia myst' i Zapadnaia Evropa: XVII-pervaia polovina XVIII veka} (M., 1976), 212-237.
\end{footnotesize}
foreigners and low-born Russians.\textsuperscript{107} Taken together, then, these two sources reveal the ecumenicism, the openness, and the heterogeneity of the tsar’s entourage, while emphasizing its traditional constituent base in the Muscovite elite. In their silences and emphases, they also shed light on the strange and yet compelling nature of the political sacrament enacted during the winter of 1691/1692.

General Gordon appeared to be as uncomfortable with recording all the details of these extraordinary events, as he was with revealing the identity of the person concealed behind the idiosyncratic abbreviation of “Patr:.” Indeed, to someone who was unaware that the Scottish general was describing the “ordination” of a mock patriarch, it might have seemed that Gordon was talking about the election of the real head of the Russian Orthodox church.\textsuperscript{108} In reality, however, the terseness of Gordon’s

\textsuperscript{107} However, as recent studies attest, and as his own presence in the entourage illustrates, Peter’s court was as filled with nobles as previous ones, and the Muscovite elite continued to play the leading role that it had played in previous reigns. See Airapetian, op. cit., ch. 1; Crummey, op. cit., 274-275; Brenda Meehan-Waters, “The Russian Aristocracy and the Reforms of Peter the Great,” ibid., 288-302; and her Autocracy and Aristocracy: The Russian Service Elite of 1730 (New Brunswick, 1982).

\textsuperscript{108} In some sense, that is precisely the tactic adopted by Reinhard Wittram, a modern-day biographer of Peter the Great; although fully aware of the difference between the “Prince Pope” and the Russian Orthodox patriarch Adrian, Wittram combined Gordon’s vituperative comments about the ecclesiastical politics surrounding the election of patriarch Adrian (1690) with his brief remark about the “installation” of the mock patriarch, and came up with an ingenious explanation for the origins of the mock ecclesiastical council. Wittram suggested that the defeat of Markell of Pskov, the candidate supposedly favored by the young tsar, embittered Peter against Adrian and formed the immediate background for the parodic ordination of his own, mock patriarch. See Wittram, op. cit. 266; and idem. Peter I, Czar and Kaiser: Zur Geschichte Peters des Grossen in seiner Zeit (Göttingen, 1964), 1: 106-111. But as James Cracraft has pointed out, there is no evidence that the tsar and his allies interpreted the rejection of Markell of Pskov as a political defeat. See James Cracraft, The Church Reform of Peter the Great (London and Basingstoke, 1971), 16-17. Indeed, as V. M. Zhivov has recently argued, immediately after the accession of patriarch Adrian, the tsar and his entourage had scored a victory against the intolerance and xenophobia expressed in Joachim’s “testament” by removing the article banning intercourse with heretics and marriages between Orthodox and other believers from the “hierarchical vow” that all the bishops had to swear upon their ordination. See V. M. Zhivov, “Church Reforms in the Reign of Peter the Great,” in Anthony Cross, ed., Russia in the Reign of Peter the Great: Old and New Perspectives (Cambridge, 1998), I: 66. Whatever the actual balance of power between the
entries about the ordination of the mock patriarch was more than just a sign of his apparent disdain for Russian Orthodoxy. In fact, it was also typical of his fastidiousness, especially in matters concerning his honor and his faith. And both of these core values seemed to have been troubled by what the aging Scottish Catholic experienced on those two occasions at the end of 1691. Although this was not the first time that he had “come home late” after a party thrown by one of the members of the tsar’s entourage. Gordon was never comfortable with the heavy drinking that would usually go on at these events. In fact, the same kind of embarrassed silence pervades his laconic diary entries about the ordination of the mock patriarch. But there was more to the silence than ex post facto regret that he probably drank more than he should have. For, as we will see when we investigate the symbolism of the ordination ceremony, Gordon witnessed a religious parody which could have been taken as an attack on the “papal” pretensions of the Russian Orthodox patriarch. And, as a devout Catholic, he could not but take offense at this affront to his religious sensibilities, even

patriarch and the new regime may have been, it is important to point out here that the brevity and ambiguity of Gordon’s diary entries about his participation in the ordination of the first mock patriarch shed less light on the tsar’s motivations than on Gordon’s own reaction to this monarchical rite of power.


110 Seeking to present himself as a cautious and temperate man, he would often note the terrible after-effects that these parties were having on his no-longer-young frame; indeed, he literally refused to spell out that he was inebriated, concealing his condition by the use of the abbreviation “dr:[unk]” or such euphemisms as “being merry.” See, e.g., Gordon, “Diary,” op. cit., fol. 297-298: “30 April [1693]: Heard devotion and went to Towne afterwards, and dined with his Maj[es]tie with all our Company by Mr. Termond: where excessive dr:[inking]. Monday [1 May]: Being very sick I gott leave to come home late and was very ill disposed the whole day […].”; ibid., fol. 318: “[2 October 1693]: […] His Maj[es]tie came to me in the afternoone and supped. Afterwards with Company by me and was very merry”; ibid., fol. 83: [17 June 1691, on the Thursday after the Feast of Corpus Christi]: “The [blank] dined by me with many others and were very soberly merry.” Note that Gordon seems to be aware both of the tsar’s “Company” and the mystical notion of “sober merriment [i.e. drunkenness].”
if it was in jest.\textsuperscript{111} Be that as it may, besides noting down the fact of his attendance, Gordon never elaborated on his reaction to the religious parody staged by the tsar and his intimate entourage. Judging by his actions, he preferred to play along with Peter Alekseevich, in return for staying in good favor at court.

Unlike General Gordon, who appears to have pursued a strategy of condemnation by silence, Prince Kurakin left a very detailed and highly-unfavorable description of the election of the first “Prince Pope” of the Transfigured Kingdom. Prince Kurakin was a disgruntled Russian courtier who, at the time, was not only a member of the inner circle of tsar Peter Alekseevich, but also his brother-in-law.\textsuperscript{112} Before his honorary exile as an ambassador to the courts of Europe, Kurakin was very well placed within the Naryshkin-Lopukhin clique, which controlled the Muscovite government after the coup of 1689. He was certainly present in the Trinity Monastery during the political stand-off between the distaff branches of the royal house.\textsuperscript{113} And he clearly took part in the war-games staged in the early 1690s by the tsar’s personal entourage; the fact that he served as an officer within the regular guards regiments

\textsuperscript{111} However, it should be pointed out that the very fact that general Gordon, the leading representative of the Catholic community in Moscow, was invited to attend and to witness, if not to personally participate in the performance of this political sacrament, casts doubt on the idea that this was an “anti-Papist” ceremony. Although there were derogatory references to Roman Catholic rites (e.g. the miter of the “patriarch” and his “bishops”), these elements were mixed with Orthodox vestments (e.g. the “panagia” worn around the neck of the archpriest) and Yuletide travesty (e.g. the “playing cards” sown into the patriarchal vestments) in an offensive, but pluralistic ritual of initiation into the tsar’s personal entourage. See Kurakin, \textit{op. cit.}, 79-80.

\textsuperscript{112} Kurakin was married to K. F. Lopukhina, the sister of tsar Peter Alekseevich’s first wife, tsaritsa Evdokiia Fedorovna (\textit{nee} Lopukhina). See Lavrov, \textit{op. cit.}, 162.
formed during these military maneuvers testifies to the fact that he was a trusted
member of the tsar’s inner circle. Indeed, in his unfinished exposé of the “court
intrigues” during the reign of Peter the Great, written a few years after the death of the
first Russian emperor, Kurakin even flaunted his status as a knowledgeable insider,
who was “brought up at court alongside [the tsar] and was always with him [...], even
until the battle of Poltava [1709].”\footnote{Lavrov, op. cit., 162-163. Prince Kurakin and his two brothers all served as privy
chamberlains (komnatnye stołniki) at the court of the young tsar Peter Alekseevich. See Airapetian, op. cit., 99-100.}

Prince Kurakin devoted an enormous amount of attention to the origins of the
tsar’s Yuletide amusements, and in particular, to the ordination of the first mock
patriarch. Recording his impressions nearly twenty-five years after the event, he
consciously conflated several similar ceremonies in order to produce a vivid (and
scathing) description of the “amusements” indulged in by the tsar’s entourage in the
early 1690s. Notwithstanding its late appearance and its polemical intent, his exposé
remains the most detailed eyewitness account of this political sacrament, and deserves
to be quoted in full:

Now I must not forget to describe the manner in which the mock patriarch
(poteshnyi patriarkh), metropolitans, and other ecclesiastical ranks (chiny
dukhovnye) were established (uchenì) from among the distinguished courtiers
(iz pridvornykh znatnykh person) who surrounded His Majesty, more toward the
destruction (bolee k unichtozheniiu) of those ranks [?]. Matvei Filimonovich
Naryshkin, a drunk and foolish old man [who held the second-highest
(okol’nichii) rank in the old, Muscovite royal council (Boiar duma)], was
designated [as the] patriarch. A few other boiars were given the [titles of]
members of the higher orders of clergy (arkhierii) [such as bishops, archbishops
or metropolitans] from different provinces (ot raznykh provintsii). The royal

\footnote{Kurakin, op. cit., 56.}
chamberlains (*iz spalnikov*) [served in the capacity of] deacons (*d’iakony*) and various other [clerical] ranks. The garb [of the mock patriarch] was made to be somewhat waggish (*nekotorym obrazom shutoshnoe*), and not exactly on the model [of the vestments] of the [real Russian Orthodox] patriarch. He had a tin miter, in the shape of the miters worn by Catholic bishops (*episkopy*), which was engraved with the figure of Bacchus [astride] a cask; playing cards (*partii igryshnye*) were sewed on to his attire; and in place of the pectoral crosses (*panagia*) [traditionally worn around the neck by Orthodox bishops], he wore earthenware flasks trimmed with little bells. Finally, a book, which contained several phials of vodka, was constructed in place of the Gospels. And all of this [religious paraphernalia] constituted [the accoutrements available] there [for the enactment of] the ceremonies [in honor of] the festival of Bacchus (*prazdhestvo Bakhusovo*).115

The spatial designation ("there") in the last sentence of Kurakin’s brief sketch referred to the little fortress which served as the royal residence of the mock “tsar and sovereign” of “Pressburg.” Over the course of the reign, the mock capital of “Generalissimo Friedrich” served as the site where “the ordination of these mock patriarchs and members of the higher orders of clergy usually took place.”116 Here, the tsar and his courtiers composed the entire mock ceremonial. According to Kurakin, it was couched “in such terms, that I dare not repeat them, beyond saying briefly, that it [enjoined the initiates] to drunkenness, to lechery, and to all kinds of debauches.”117

While Gordon found it more prudent to keep his evaluation of the situation to himself, the logic of the political exposé necessitated that Kurakin offer his intended readers an explanation for this strange ceremony. However, even during the short and

117 Kurakin, *ibid.*
relatively more liberal reign of Catherine I. Peter’s imperial consort and successor, Kurakin chose not to finish the thought. He noted, almost in passing, that distributing mock clerical ranks among the courtiers was an act which was aimed “more toward the destruction (unichtozheniiu) of those ranks” than, presumably, to their maintenance, support, and efflorescence. But his analysis, written several years after the official abolition of the patriarchate and the establishment of the Most Holy Governing Synod, is clearly more of a retrospective judgement than an assessment of the tsar’s actual motives. Furthermore, Kurakin’s use of the passive voice in describing the allocation of roles and the authorship of the mock ceremonial is striking for the heavy-handed way in which it seems to ignore the question of the role played by the tsar himself. This obvious omission was part of Kurakin’s literary strategy, according to which he avoided a direct attack on the person and memory of the recently deceased tsar by choosing to characterize Peter by the supposedly unsavory company which he kept.118

One of these unsavory characters was V. A. Sokovnin, the young royal chamberlain (spal’nik) whom Kurakin blamed for “introducing” (vneseny) and “inaugurating” (nachaty) these and other unseemly “Yuletide pastimes” (zabavy sviatoshnye) at the court of Peter Alekseevich.119 As the nephew of the infamous Old Believer sisters, boiarni F. P. Morozova and E. P. Usurova,120 Sokovnin’s Orthodoxy

118 For the hidden literary strategy of Kurakin’s political exposé, see the editor’s introduction to his “Gistoriia o tsare Petre Alekseeviche,” op. cit., 55.

119 V. A. Sokovnin served as privy chamberlain (konnotnyi stol’nik) to tsar Peter Alekseevich from 1683-1697. See Airapetian, op. cit., 334.

120 V. A. Sokovnin was the nephew of boiarni Fedos’ia Prokof’evna Morozova (nee Sokovnina) and Avdot’ia (Evdokiia) Prokof’evna Usurova (nee Sokovnina), who were executed for their
was already tainted in the eyes of Prince Kurakin, who, like most seventeenth-century Muscovite courtiers went along with the reforms of Orthodox liturgy introduced during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. The fact that Kurakin attributed Peter’s crude amusements to the “fanciful invention” (vymysel) of Sokovnin, therefore, put these games in the context of the heretical “fabrications” of the schismatic opposition movement directed against the Russian Orthodox church. Indeed, Kurakin made sure that a knowledgeable reader would put Sokovnin’s blasphemous “invention” in the same camp as the “devilish” amusements of the common rabble by underscoring the plebeian Muscovite origins of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council. Kurakin preceded an explanation of its origins with an ethnographic digression, which places the tsar’s Yuletide amusements squarely in the context of traditional Russian winter games:

The Russian people (narod rossiiskii) have an old custom (obychai), according to which, [immediately] before and [for some time] after the Nativity of Christ, they celebrate Christmas-tide (igraiut svitaki). That is, friends gather together in [someone’s] home at night and, among the common rabble (podlye liudi), themselves don masquerade dress (plat’e mashkarat), while more distinguished

“heretical” beliefs. After Sokovnin’s father, dumnyi dvorianin Aleksei Prokof’evich, was convicted and executed for allegedly plotting against the life of the tsar in 1697, Vasiliy and his brother, Fedor, were sent into exile. See Airapetian, op. cit., 62, 326, 105.; V. Korsakov, “Sokovniny,” Russkii biografcheski slovar’ (SPb., 1909), 19: 48-50. On A. P. Sokovnin’s alleged involvement in the so-called “Tsykler affair” of 1697, and its fatal repercussion upon the political careers of his sons, see N. I. Pavlenko, Petr Velikii (M., 1990), 62-63.

121 For the Muscovite elite’s public commitment to the court’s program of “imperial reform,” see supra, Introduction.

122 This is in direct contradistinction to those historians who argue that the “Most Drunken Council” was based on the example of the mock “abbey” and “kingdoms” traditionally created during Carnival or the Feast of Fools by clubs and fraternities of Europe. On the carnivalesque amusements staged by religious confraternities and clubs in early modern Europe, see Peter Burke, Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe, (NY, 1978), 184, 192; and Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, Carnival in Romans, (NY, 1979), ch. 11. The argument that Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council was indebted to these “western” models was made most recently by Russell Zguta, “Peter I’s ‘Most Drunken Synod of Fools and Jesters,” Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas 21 (1973): 18-28, esp. 25-28.
people (znatnye liudi) have their servants (liudi ikh) stage all manner of comical theatrical productions (igrat' gistorii smeshnye). And according to that habit (po tomu obyknoveniia), His Highness also celebrated Christmas-tide (takzhe igrati sviatki) with the chamberlains (komnatnye liudi) of his court. And one [of those chamberlains] [...] Vasiliy Sokovnin [...] an evil man who was full of all kinds of dirty tricks (muzh [...] zloi i vsiakh pakostei napolnen), was elected leader (izbrali za glavu) and inventor (ustanovitel') of that amusement (potekha) [and] nicknamed ‘The Prophet’ (prorok).

Sokovnin’s “fanciful invention” is indeed remarkably similar to the Yuletide amusements favored by Russian peasants and townsfolk, who, habitually “designate[d] some of their number saints, invent[ed] their own monasteries, and name[d] for them an archimandrite, a cellarer and elders [...].”

However, the prominence of Bacchus in Kurakin’s account of the tsar’s Yuletide amusements demonstrates that the religious parody attributed to Sokovnin owed as much to the didactic and allegorical culture of the seventeenth-century Muscovite court as to the supposedly “popular” customs of the Russian “folk.” This was not the first time that Bacchus had made an appearance at a Yuletide amusement staged for the Muscovite tsar on his suburban royal estate. The Roman god of wine and drink was one of the title characters in The Comedy of Bacchus and Venus, a

---


124 On the lack of clear-cut boundaries between “popular” and “elite” in Petrine literary culture, which reflected rhetorical, not “national,” styles, see S. I. Nikolaev, Literaturnaia kul'tura petrovskoi epokhi (SPb., 1996), 126-131; and V. D. Levin, “Petr I i russkii iazyk (K 300-letiui so dnia rozhdenia Petra I),” Izvestii AN SSSR. Seriia literatury i iazyka 31: 3 (1972), 217-227, here 217 n. 16.
“school drama” staged at the suburban court theater of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich at the end of the Christmas fast in 1675. Judging by the list of characters, costumes, and props, as well as the fact that the script (which has not survived) was written by Stepan Chizhinskii, a pupil of the Orthodox Kiev-Mohyla Academy, this comedy was most likely a morality play about the vices of drunkenness and lust. Ostensibly, Chizhinskii sought to preach about the possibility of leading a good Christian life in the world, as well as to broaden the cultural horizons of his Muscovite patrons, by linking

125 For a discussion of the “school drama” developed in the Orthodox academies of the Ukraine and Belarus, see L. A. Sofronova, Starinnyi ukrainskii teatr (M., 1996); on its influence on Russian court theater, Ramniala russkaia dramaturgiia (XVII-pervai polovina XVIII v.) ed. by A. N. Robinson, et. al. (M., 1972); and Russkaia dramaturgiia poslednei chetverti XVIII i nachala XVIII v., ed. O. A. Derzhavina, et. al. (M., 1972).

126 At the end of the Christmas fast in 1675, the tsar ordered a ballet and two “comedies,” one about David and Goliath and the other about Bacchus and Venus. The ballet, which included twenty dancers in officially-prohibited foreign clothing, was staged by Nikolai Lima, a foreign fortifications engineer, turned producer. See Bogoiaevskii, op. cit., XII, XV-XVI. It is unknown whether he was related to Lu. S. Lima, a foreign favorite at the court of Peter Alekseevich. See supra, Introduction.

127 Bogoiaevskii, op. cit., XIV. For a biography of Chizhinskii and his role in producing the “Comedy of Bacchus and Venus,” see Vsevolodskii-Gerngross, op. cit., 116-121. In October 1682, an “S. Chizhinskii” was among a group of translators, who administered the language exam to see if A. Kh. Belobodskii qualified for a job at the Foreign Affairs Chancellery. See A. Kh. Gorfunkel’, “‘Pentateugum’ Andreia Belobodskogo (Iz istorii pol’sko-russkikh literaturnykh sviazei),” Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury 21 (1965), 39-64, here 40. It is unknown whether this S. Chizhinskii was the same man as the one who staged the Comedy of Bacchus and Venus in front of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich.

128 In the sermons of another, and more famous, graduate of the Kiev Mohyla Academy, Dmitrii (Tuptalo), metropolitan of Rostov under Peter the Great, Bacchus and Venus appeared as the personifications of adultery and drunkenness, while Cupid represented “filthy carnal lust.” Excerpts from these sermons are cited by F. [A.] Ternovskii, “Russkoe propovednichestvo pri Petre I-m,” Rukovodstvo dla sel’skih pastyrej: Zhurnal izdavaemyi pri Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Seminarii 3: 37 (1870), 43-60, here 44-45; and P. Savluchinskii, “Russkaia dukhovnaia literatura pervoi poloviny XVIII veka i ee otnoshenie k sovremennosti (1700-1762),” Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii 5 (1878), 280-326, here 282.
the contemporary use of Bacchus in European art and literature to the cultural and religious traditions of the Russian Orthodox tsar and his court.\textsuperscript{129}

From the description offered in the list of props, Bacchus was depicted in much the same way as the satyr who appeared on the European stage. Bacchus' oversized head, made out of canvas and decorated with horse hair, was connected to a wine-skin inside the barrel upon which he was to be wheeled on-stage. However, his companions were anything but typical. Part of Bacchus' retinue consisted of the "father of drunks" (otets p'ianits) and thirteen "drunkards," three of whom stuffed their clothes with pillows in order to look like hunchbacks.\textsuperscript{130} Besides Bacchus' lavishly-dressed wife, Venus, their son Cupid, and his votary, the "brothel master," the rest of the characters - four people dressed like bears, two musicians, and a jester - were part of the Muscovite minstrel tradition.\textsuperscript{131} Such a scandalous combination of Biblical motifs, classical mythology, and buffoonery for the edification of the audience was typical of scholastic "interludes" and had become increasingly common in the later theatrical productions at the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. It certainly fit in well with the

\textsuperscript{129} On the image of Bacchus in Renaissance art and literature, see the two-volume study by Andreas Emmerling-Skala, "Bacchus in der Renaissance," \textit{Studien zur Kunstgeschichte} 83 (1994). On courtly appropriations of Bacchus, see the description of The Festivals of Bacchus, a ballet performed at the court of the twelve-year-old Louis XIV, in Charles Blitzer, \textit{Age of Kings} (NY, 1967), 129; on the connection between Bacchus, "the world-conquering God of the East," and the "imperial theme" in French royal propaganda, see Frances Yates, \textit{Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth-Century} (London, 1985), 140-146. On Bacchus as political allegory on Spanish imperial ambitions, see Steven N. Orso, \textit{Vellásquez, "Los Borrachos," and Painting at the Court of Philip IV} (Cambridge, 1993).

\textsuperscript{130} Bogoiaevskii, \textit{op. cit.} XIV-XV.

carnivalesque atmosphere of the twelve day period between Christmas and Epiphany, during which the play was staged.\textsuperscript{132}

The appearance of a “father of drunks” and his thirteen drunken disciples preceded by some two decades the “ordination” of a mock patriarch and his council at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich. Although there is little evidence of direct borrowing, the similarities between the religious parodies staged before tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and his son are a striking illustration of the way in which the entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich adapted the language and practices of the earlier reign to its own purposes. Both of these theatricalized court spectacles took place during Yuletide, on the grounds of the Preobrazhenskoe royal estate. Both of them made reference to mythological as well as stock characters. Both included parodies of religious rites: in the case of Chizhinskii’s \textit{Comedy}, the actors ostensibly enacted a parody of Christ and his disciples during the Last Supper, the historical model for the sacrament of Communion; similarly, during the “ordination” of the mock patriarch of “Pressburg,” the entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich parodied the sacrament of Holy Orders. Finally, in both cases, these \textit{parodia sacra} served as a dramatic rhetorical device in the pursuit of some higher, didactic or political goal.\textsuperscript{133} However, during the parodic


\textsuperscript{133} Using literary parodies of religious texts (Lat. \textit{parodia sacra}) in order to make fun of, and thereby to correct, common vices like drunkenness, was popular in the second half of the seventeenth century, when such sacred parodies (\textit{parodia sacra}) as \textit{The Tavern Liturgy}, or \textit{The Feast of Tavern}
ordination of the mock patriarch, the tsar and his courtiers personally participated in the organization, staging, and execution of a burlesque which had earlier been left to low-born actors. This change in the social make-up, as well as the relationship between actor and audience, entailed a concomitant change in the nature of the political relations underlying the theatrical experience at the court of Peter Alekseevich.

As we saw above, this theatrical innovation was noted by Prince Kurakin in his indignant account of Sokovnin’s “invention.” In order to understand how Kurakin could argue that these Yuletide amusements constituted an insidious assault against the honor of the Muscovite elite, one must pay careful attention to the way this titled prince differentiated between the Yuletide celebrations of the “distinguished people” and those of the “base rabble.” Foreign travelers to Russia had already noted that seventeenth-century Muscovite elites “consider it improper for an honest man to dance [...] ‘An honest man,’ they say, ‘ought to sit in his place and be amused only at the jester’s contortions, he should not himself be the jester for the amusement of others: that is wrong!’” But, in Kurakin’s polemical reading, that is precisely what the tsar’s Yuletide amusements succeed in doing: with the aid of “evil” and even “heretical” royal favorites, like Sokovnin, the tsar transformed the distinguished nobles who

---

Drunkards circulated in manuscript literature. For the text of this parody, see V. P. Adrianova-Perets, “‘Prazdnik kastsikh iaryzhok’: Parodia-satira vtoroi poloviny XVII veka,” Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury 1 (1934): 171-247; for other examples of the genre, see her Russkaiia demokraticheskaiia satira XVII veka, 2nd ed. (M., 1977).

134 Kurakin, op. cit., 81.

attended Peter Alekseevich into base "servants," who performed humiliating skits for the amusement of their lord and master. Kurakin's insight into the broad definition and the political significance of "jesters" at the court of Peter the Great will be explored more fully in Chapters Three and Four; for now, it is sufficient to point out that knowledgeable contemporaries perceived the serious political consequences of such "amateur theatricals." Keeping this in mind will help us to unravel the reasons why a courtier, whom Kurakin derisively characterized as a "drunk and foolish old man," was ordained the "Patriarch" of the Transfigured Kingdom.

The election of M. F. Naryshkin to the position of "Patriarch" during Yuletide of 1691/2 tapped into the royal entourage's knowledge of history and genealogy, as well as traditional Yuletide symbolism, in order to evoke the birth of the New Transfigured Kingdom from the death of the old. Boiar M. F. Naryshkin (d. 1692), also known by the coarse, yet affectionate nickname of "Patriarch Dearie" (Milak), was Peter Alekseevich's first cousin twice removed and the oldest living male of the tsar's maternal relatives. According to the Muscovite laws of family precedence,


137 For the various shades of meaning of the word "dear" (milii) and its derivatives, including the vulgar "milakha," see V. I. Dal', Tolkovyi slovar' zhyvogo velikorusskogo iazyka (M. -SPb., 1881). 2: 325-326.

138 In 1688, M. F. Naryshkin served alongside six of his relatives as privy chamberlains (komnatnye stol'nikii) at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich. That same year he received a promotion to the Muscovite royal council, where he served for four years, first as okol' nichii (1688-1690) and then as
this old courtier represented the generation of the “fathers,” a superior “place” vis-à-vis the one occupied by the young tsar within the Naryshkin clan. In the days before the abolition of precedence-ranking (mestnichestvo), this position would have given him significant authority over his younger relatives. Even now, the elevation of this old kinsman to the rank of spiritual “elder” may have signaled that he still wielded some kind of moral authority at the court of Peter Alekseevich, if only for the duration of the parodic ceremony staged during Yuletide 1691/2. If so, then during this spectacle, the “Naryshkin patriarch” would have served in the capacity of “spiritual father” to the young “Naryshkin candidate”; in turn, such a diarchy between this fictive “father” and “son” would have recapitulated the original Romanov diarchy – that of Patriarch

---


Filaret and his son, Mikhail Fedorovich, the first Romanov tsar, while poking fun at the current diarchy between tsar Peter and tsar Ivan.

However, in pointed contrast to the idealized “symphony” between the first Romanov tsar and patriarch, the unequal relationship between Peter Alekseevich and his old relative(s) embodied a critique of “patriarchal” authority, in both its ecclesiastical and genealogical senses. Seeking to distance themselves from the factions which had organized the coup in favor of the “Naryshkin candidate,” the tsar and his intimates attacked not only his maternal relatives, but also the court of tsar Ivan Alekseevich and the entourage of the Russian Orthodox patriarch. Indeed, the ordination of “Patriarch Dearie” seems to have been something of a declaration of independence from the paternalism of the political coalition that had put the young Peter Alekseevich on the throne in 1689. As a political commentary on the faction which dominated the formal organs of government since the “Naryshkin Restoration,” the “ordination” of M. F. Naryshkin emphasized the distinction between those men who, bound by familial ties and personal ambitions, had put the young tsar on the throne, and those who came to profess their belief in the tsar’s personal charisma and his reformist vision of a New Transfigured Kingdom. The fact that the tsar’s old kinsman could not translate familial into political power, despite his age and genealogical superiority, demonstrated the way the tsar’s entourage felt about the

---

141 This historical parallel is suggested by the fact that one of the courtiers who participated in the earliest Yuletide amusements adopted the title of “Patriarch of Palestine,” possibly in imitation of the hierarch who had ordained Filaret (Romanov) in 1619. For the ordination of Filaret (Romanov) by Patriarch Feofan III of Jerusalem, see Uspenskii, Tsar i Patriarkh, op. cit., 95. For the undated (ca.
“inflation of honors” which accompanied the succession struggle. Indeed, M. F. Naryshkin’s relatively recent promotion to the Boyar Duma only underlined the fact that, like this once-powerful advisory body, he had been reduced to the status of a living link between the past and the future. Increasingly, important political decisions were made in the tsar’s inner council, which gathered at the “General’s Yard” (general’nyi dvor) in Preobrazhenskoe, rather than in the royal palace in Moscow. Indeed, since the symbolic inauguration of the Transfigured Kingdom, participation in the suburban military maneuvers had became at least as important as Muscovite clan politics in determining access to the tsar. While this was still a far cry from the meritocratic thrust of the “Table of Ranks” (1722), the organization of the tsar’s entourage seemed to have shifted the emphasis away from pedigree to professional expertise. In this sense, the parodic ordination “Patriarch Dearie” reflected the existence of a definite, if still fluid, line of demarcation between Peter’s party and the officials of the Naryshkin regime.

1690s) letters of “Andrei, [the mock Patriarch] of Palestine (Andrei Palestinskii),” see RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 4, ch. I. No. 53, fols. 502-504.

Naryshkin’s promotion was part of the “inflation of honors,” described by Robert O. Crummey, Aristocrats and Servitors: The Boyar Elite in Russia, 1613-1689 (Princeton, 1983).


As Robert Crummey argues, during the post-1689 period, the lines distinguishing the circle of favorites and intimate advisors from “those officials who were associated with the court of Tsar Ivan and with the formal organs of government under the control of the Naryshkin faction,” were “far from clear.” The difficulty in assigning individuals to one category (“Peter’s partisans”) or the other (“leading officials of the Naryshkin regime”) explains why he chooses to study the “most powerful officials and best connected courtiers of the 1690s as a unit.” See Crummey, “Peter and the Boiar Aristocracy,” op. cit., 279.
As a critique of the policies of patriarch Joachim, the parodic ordination of a mock patriarch and his "Unholy Council" (*neosviashchenyi sobor*)¹⁴⁵ challenged the notion that the Muscovite tsar required the sanction of the church hierarchy in order to carry out his divine calling, the religious position with which the party of Peter Alekseevich came to power in 1689. By arrogating the right to perform the sacrament of Holy Orders, if only for the duration of the Yuletide of 1691/2, the royal entourage asserted that the tsar did not need the either the blessings or the approval of the Most Holy Council (*osviashchenyi sobor*) — the official ecclesiastical corporate body consisting of higher clergy and headed by the patriarch, traditionally represented at the "assemblies of the land," which, for most of the seventeenth-century, were theoretically responsible for confirming Romanov royal rule.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, this political sacrament even implied that as God's anointed, the tsar was personally responsible for organizing the ceremonies which bestowed grace, a theological position which went one step beyond the arguments voiced by the opponents of patriarch Joachim during the course of the Eucharist debate. As we recall from Chapter One, Silvester (Medvedev) had justified tsarevna Sof'ia Alekseevna's claims to be a receptacle of grace, above and beyond the power of the clergy, by citing the biblical Wisdom literature attributed to King Solomon. And, despite all appearances to the contrary, so too did the organizers

¹⁴⁵ This punning title was one of the many joking names by which the mock ecclesiastical council was referred to in the parodic literature produced at Peter's court. See M. I. Semevskii, "Petr I kak humorist," in *Ocherki i razskazy iz russkoi istorii XVIII v.: Slovo i delo! 1700-1725* (SPb., 1884), 279-317; and *infra*, Chapter Five.

of the seemingly blasphemous Yuletide "ceremonies [in honor] of the festival of Bacchus." Unlike Medvedev, however, the entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich relied upon a different, though no less extraordinary, interpretation of Divine Wisdom in order to challenge the power of the patriarch.

From the time of Philo of Alexandria onwards, biblical commentators had described the esoteric experience by which the soul comes to understand the divine mysteries as "sober drunkenness" (Rus. trezvoe piasstvo). The vision of the ideal transfigured realm was said to come upon the spiritual adept in a state of mystical ecstasy akin to the euphoria of intoxication. This flash of insight supposedly illuminated the taken-for-granted conventions of the human world, allowing the mystic to "step outside" (Gk. ekstasis) the boundaries of everyday reality. In turn, this radical relativizing experience allowed the adept to catch a glimpse of the world as it

---


148 For the phenomenology of "ecstatic states" and the experience of "liminality," see Peter Berger, The Heretical Imperative (Garden City, 1979), 39; and Victor Turner, Dramas, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society (Ithaca and London, 1974), chs. 1. 6-7. For an insightful discussion of the "liminal situation" (Grenzsituation) created by Peter's parodia sacra, see Wittram, op. cit. 268: "Der eigentlich sinnhaft-spasshafte Reiz der Parodien des Saufkonzils lag wohl in der rastlos erneuerten Grenzsituation: man spielt mit allen heiligen Dingen, Gebärden und Gefühlen und zweifelt doch keinen Augenblick an der Wirklichkeit und Gegenwart Gottes, an der Heilsbedürftigkeit des Menschen und am Heilsgelehren in der Kirche. Das gerade ist die unschöpfliche Komik [...]. Das ist keine harmlose Sache; wenn sie so ganz harmlos wäre, könnte sie kaum so komisch sein – der Einfall wäre rascher schal geworden."
really is, or should be organized, in order to conform to divine laws. Therein lay the explanation for his strange, sometimes blasphemous acts, as well as the source of his spiritual authority. Christian commentators argued that even the founders of the Church could be characterized by Philo’s oxymoron. As evidence for this assertion, they pointed to the New Testament account of the apostles’ mystical experience during Pentecost (Rus. Piatidesiatnitsa), an event that signaled the formation of the “historical” Church and that served as the biblical prototype for the sacrament of Holy Orders. References to the authoritative interpretation of Peter the Apostle, the “rock” on which Christ intended his Church to be built (Mat. 16:18), thus tended to support those exegetes, who sought to describe the apostles’ mystical experience at Pentecost by comparing it to Philo’s notion of “sober drunkenness.”

It possible that this exegesis of the Acts of the Apostles also informed the Bacchanalian ceremony staged in 1691/92 by the courtiers around the apostle’s earthly


150 Lewy, op. cit., 5 fn. 3, 153 fn. 1, 162 fn. 1.

151 In the account attributed to Peter the Apostle (Acts 2), the Holy Spirit descends upon Christ’s hand-picked disciples during a private holiday celebration. Illuminated by the grace of God, the followers of Christ begin to speak about “God’s deeds and power” in other than their native languages. To the assembled crowd, which does not understand the profound significance of the miracle at Pentecost, the babbling apostles appear as if they were literally drunk, “filled with new wine.” Appropriating the mockery of the unbelievers for his own allegorical explication (Acts 2:14-17), the Apostle Peter responds that although Christ’s disciples are not drunk in the base, physical sense, they are intoxicated with the Holy Spirit, “as was spoken through the prophet Joel: In the last days it will be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophecy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams [...].”
namesake, tsar Peter Alekseevich. Substituting the libations of Bacchus for the
overflowing of the Holy Spirit, a few select members of the royal entourage were
initiated into the mystery of the tsar's charismatic authority, becoming the founding
members of his "church." To the uninitiated, this rite may have appeared like a
"devilish" inversion of the sacrament which is supposed to bestow grace upon the
clerical successors of Peter the Apostle.152 However, to those courtiers who were
familiar with the trope of "sober drunkenness" and who were aware that this court
spectacle was yet another rakish demonstration of their libertine wit, the "Bacchanal"
accompanying the revelation of Peter Alekseevich's divine calling playfully re-enacted
the mystical experience of the apostles in the new allegorical language of late
seventeenth-century Muscovy.153 Illuminated by the light of faith, the participants and
eyewitnesses of this political sacrament were able to see the Transfigured Kingdom
presided over by the chivalrous "Prince of Peace" and to understand what they must do
in order to realize it. The laws by which the old world is governed were exposed for

152 For example, an anonymous denunciation (podmetnoe pis'mo) from the end of the
seventeenth century describes the mock ecclesiastical council as a "satanic assembly" (besovskoe
sonmisheche). See "Otryvok oblicheniiia na vseshhteishii sobor. Ok. 1705 g.," in Materialy dlja russkoj
istorii, ed. by S. A Belokurov (M., 1888), 539-540, here 539. For th dating of this document, see
supra, Introduction.

153 A. F. Zubov, the most important Russian engraver at the court of Peter I, earned his
promotion to master status after etching a picture of the apostles at Pentecost. Although Zubov copied
the illustration from Piskator's bible, the choice of subject matter suggests that he was aware of the
significance of this motif at the court of his royal patron. On Zubov's Descent of the Holy Ghost upon
the Apostles (1701), see James Cracraft, The Petrine Revolution in Russian Imagery (Chicago and
London, 1997), 177-184, esp. 179-181, and Figures 50-51. Similarly, in his discussion of the odes of
V. K. Trediakovskii (1703-1769), a graduate of the Slavonic-Latin-Greek Academy in Moscow, Victor
Zhivov has demonstrated the continuing relevance of the trope of "sober drunkenness" for eighteenth-
century Russian literary "classicism." See V. M. Zhivov,azyk i kul'tura v Rossii XVIII veka (M.,
the conventional, man-made creations that they really are, and the new world appeared to be just within reach of the adepts. Like the apostles, they were urged to follow through with the transvaluation of values revealed by their encounter with the divine. In their “ecstatic” state, they were to go out into the world to preach about their vision, enjoining other mortals to strive for the deification that was to accompany the imminent transfiguration of the realm heralded by V. A. Sokovnin, the young courtier- turned “Prophet” of the Transfigured Kingdom.154

The symbolism of the accoutrements available at Pressburg for the ordination of the mock patriarch and his ecclesiastical council tends to support the mystical interpretation of the political sacrament enacted during Yuletide 1691/92. According to Kurakin’s belated description and a few scattered archival references, it is known, for example, that Bacchus appeared on the “cover” of the casket made to look like the “Gospel.” This small wooden chest (30.3 cm X 107 cm X 60.5 cm) served as a portable provisions’ hamper for the “religious paraphernalia” of the mock patriarch. It contained compartments for five phials and for several smoking pipes.155 On the center

154 “During the winter [season] from the Nativity of Christ until Shrovetide, that same [mock] patriarch would continue [his] carolling visits [slavienie] [...] to all the distinguished houses in Moscow and in the [Foreigners’] Quarter, as well as to the [houses] of wealthy merchants, [all the while] singing traditional ecclesiastical hymns [: vospieniem obyknovennym tserkovnym].” Kurakin, op. cit., 80. For another contemporary reference to the “comical words (slova smekhatvormye) and jokes (shutki) and deeds displeasing to God (dela bogoneugodnye)” that accompanied the “missionary activity” (prorochevestva) of the “Prophet” Sokovnin, see the testimony (14 January 1697) of undersecretary I. Bubnov, in “1697. Delo o podamnykh tsarui tetradakh stroitel’ia Andreevskogo monastyr’ia Avraamiiai. Doprosy Avraamiiia, Pososhkova, i dr.,” in B. B. Kafengauz, I. T. Pososhkov: zhizn’ i deiatel’nost’ (M.-L., 1950), 173-181, here 177-178.

155 For an example of the use of this paraphernalia, see Johann Georg Korb’s account of the “sanctification” of the palace built for one of the tsar’s foreign favorites in 1699, quoted supra, Introduction.
of the lid, this "Good Book" depicted the infant Bacchus, sitting atop a barrel of
wine,\textsuperscript{156} presumably the "new wine" with which the apostles had been intoxicated
during Pentecost. A much larger travel chest, representing the Books of the Apostles
(Rus. \textit{Apostol}, Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles) themselves, depicted Bacchus on
the top of the lid and the twelve apostles on the back.\textsuperscript{157} The apostles appear to be
sitting around a table laden with drinks, an illustration which may represent the
Eucharistic meal before Pentecost. If so, then the visual emphasis on the goblets
containing the communal wine serves both as a sign of Christ's absent presence and as
a declaration of their readiness to receive the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Thus, by
juxtaposing the Bacchanalian feast with the table fellowship of the apostles, the tsar and
his inner circle transformed the mystical trope of "sober drunkenness" into a central
element of the celebrations inaugurating the New Transfigured Kingdom.

This interpretation of the origins of the tsar's mock ecclesiastical council seems
to be confirmed by a number of other contemporary references to the patristic trope of
"sober drunkenness," such as those found in the (undated) Pentecostal sermon by
metropolitan Stefan (Iavorskii) of Riazan and Murom, the temporary office-holder
\textit{(locum tenens)} of the patriarchal throne and the official preacher at the court of Peter

\textsuperscript{156} For a description of this "Gospel," which is currently housed in the museum of the Moscow
Kremlin (\textit{inv. No. DK-1806/1-6}), see \textit{Petr Velikii i Moskva: Katalog vystavki} (M., 1998), 52 (Nos. 85-
86).

\textsuperscript{157} For a description of this "Book of the Apostles," see I. E. Zabelin, "Istoria i drevnosti
Moskvy," \textit{Opyty izucheniiia russkih drevnostei i istorii}, 2 vols. (M., 1872), 2: 190-191, fn. 2; and the
photograph in Giancarlo Buzzi, \textit{The Life and Times of Peter the Great}, transl. Ben Johnson (Feltham,
1968), 59.
In this holiday sermon, delivered sometime after the death of patriarch Adrian (d. 1700), metropolitan Stefan offered an allegorical exegesis of the seven signs by which the Holy Spirit appears to the faithful, as well as why each specific symbol of divine grace was particularly "suited" to each "rank" of his listeners. Contrary to expectations, however, the metropolitan of Riazan reserved the image of "wine" from the Acts of the Apostles for the "princes, boiars, and the entire royal council (singkliit)," not for members of his own "spiritual rank." According to the court preacher, the miraculous properties of the "supernatural wine," which endowed the apostles' with the power to preach Christ's message and fortified them to withstand the persecutions of unbelievers with joy and courage, applied equally well to the royal entourage of Russia's "anointed one" (Rus. khrístos). Addressing the tsar's advisers as "lovers of Christ" (khristoliubtsy), Stefan urged them to drink the "divine wine" (Bozhestvennoe vino), which gladdens the heart and strengthens the resolve of loyal servitors to perform heroic feats. Like Stefan's discussion of the Pentecostal story, the explicit reference to "wine, which gladdens the heart of man" (Ps. 103:15), one of the most influential biblical proof-texts for the patristic trope of "sober

---


159 Ibid., 163. Metropolitan Stefan's explanation was taken, almost verbatim, from an earlier allegorical sermon on the same topic by the Ukrainian Orthodox preacher, Ioannkii (Galiatovskii). See Galiatovskii's Kliuch' razumenia (L'viv, 1665), fol. 201 ff., cited by Ternovskii, op. cit., 3: 36 (1870), 16.

160 "Slovo os'moe [...]," op. cit., 171, 179.
drunkenness,”^{161} underlines that the court preacher intended his sermon to tap into this
exegetical tradition. And the fact that he couched his appeal to the royal entourage in
these terms demonstrates that at least some of the tsar’s advisors were not only aware
of this interpretation, but also found it flattering.\textsuperscript{162}

In another sermon, this time delivered in front of the tsar and his court by
Feofan (Prokopovich) – rector of the Kiev Mohyla Academy – this future chief
panegyrist of Peter the Great urged the royal entourage to celebrate the Russian military
victory at Poltava (1709) in the fashion appropriate to those who have demonstrated
that God is on their side:\textsuperscript{163}

\begin{quote}
Drink up, for this wine of gladness was given to you from on high! Delight in
the nectar of universal merriment, dry off the sweat shed during the ferment of
battle (\textit{voennyi var}) with the victorious palm; display and rejoice in your
steadfast and manly army: for in it you see the great fruit of the chivalrous
training instituted by you. And you too, oh wise commanders and unbeatable
warriors, sparkle [like the] strong pillars and adamantine shields of our
fatherland and [our] orthodoxy. Thunderous Fame [that is, public glory],
announcing your bravery and that of your tsar, will fly everywhere under the
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{162} In typical “Baroque” fashion, this same sentiment could be expressed in the language of
classical symbolism. In the very first book of emblems to be published during the reign of Peter the
Great, \textit{Emblemata et symbola} (Amsterdam, 1705) the image of Ariadne receiving a cup from the hands of
Bacchus, referred to this same Psalm in order to express the notion that “wine banishes sorrow and
gladdens the heart.” See \textit{Emblemy i simvoli}, ed. A. E. Makhov (M., 1995), 252 (No. 726: Bacchus and
Ariadne).

\textsuperscript{163} The sermon entitled “Panegirikos, ili Slovo pokhval’noe o preslavnoi nad voiskami
Sveiskimi pobede [...]”, went to print at the typography of Kiev Pechera Monastery, as part of a
brochure which included a poem, in Latin, Russian and Polish, entitled “Epinikom, siest pesn’ pobednaia
of toezhde preslavnoi pobede.” The brochure was published shortly before Peter’s arrival in Kiev and
the sermon was read on 24 July 1709. The entire brochure was specially reprinted for the 21 December
1709 triumphal entry into Moscow. See Eremin, \textit{op. cit.}, 459-461.
sun, and foreign races will proclaim: “The tsar deserves such an army, and the army deserves such a tsar.”

“The ferment of battle,” the arresting image invoked by Prokopovich to describe the events at Poltava, hinted at the Muscovites’ favorite method of making merry, as well as the special significance of the trope of “sober drunkenness” at the court of Peter the Great. Prokopovich relied on the surprising analogy between the metaphorical notion of the heat produced during the process of waging war (Lat. aestus) and the heat generated by the chemical process of fermentation; specifically, his image referred to the brewing process initiated by the presence of a leavening agent made of hops (var’), used in the production of alcoholic beverages like beer. Whether or not Prokopovich was aware of it, the explicit call to partake of the “wine of gladness” given to the faithful army of Peter “from on high,” echoed metropolitan Stefan’s invocation of the “supernatural wine” upon the royal retinue. Like the metropolitan of Riazan, Feofan urged those who truly believed in the tsar’s enterprise to receive the symbol of the Holy Spirit and of Christ’s sacrifice and, once again, at least for the duration of this sermon, to experience the sense of communion which made this victory possible.

This imagery could not help striking a responsive chord among his listeners, many of whom had already imagined themselves as both chivalrous knights and as the apostles of the New Transfigured Kingdom. Indeed, the correspondence between the

---

164 “Panegirikos, ili Slovo pokhval’noe,” ibid.

tsar and his intimates abounds in references to the trope of “sober drunkenness.”
Although these references are usually filtered through the prism of classical
mythology, examples of the kind of imagery found in the sermons of Stefan
(lavorskii) and Feofan (Prokopovich) do exist. Perhaps the most original reference to
the trope of “sober drunkenness” can be found in a letter written in 1715 by general B.
P. Sheremet’ev, the first Field-Marshal of the Imperial Russian army, on the occasion
of the birth of tsarevich Peter Petrovich, the tsar’s new son and heir. In this
elaborate, if brief example of parodia sacra, Sheremet’ev compared the party thrown
after he and his officers received the news from the capital to the apostles’ celebration
of the Pentecost. Recounting his and his officers’ mock battle against “Johnny Hops”
(Rus. Ivashko Khmel’nitskii), the folksy personification of drunkenness, Sheremet’ev
substituted their gradual slide into a drunken stupor for the sudden illumination
accompanying the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles (Acts 2:2). Thus, even
a courtier who was not particularly close to the tsar’s inner entourage, nevertheless
knew that this was indeed the correct way of addressing the tsar, if he wanted to be

166 For example, in a missive dictated on 17 November 1706. A. D. Menshikov, the tsar’s royal
favorite, confessed that this was the third day that he and his companions were “celebrating,” a term,
that, like “making merry,” usually referred to the drinking bouts which accompanied all courtly
festivities and military victories. However, the conclusion of this sentence makes a veiled allusion to a
deeper, almost mystical meaning of these drinking fellowship, “in which I brought a generous offer in
wine to Bacchus, but with my soul I praised God.” See PiB, 4 (1): 438; cf. ibid., 6: 142, 168; and
Wittram, op. cit., 270.

167 P. B. Sheremet’ev to Peter I (27 November 1715), originally published in Pis’ma k
gosudarju imperatora Petra Velikomu, pisannye ot general-feldmarshala, tainogo sovetnika,
mal’tiskogo sv. apostola Andreia, Belogo Orla i Prusskogo Ordena kavalera grafa Boris’a Petrovicha
Sheremeteva, 4 parts (M., 1778-1779), 4: 120; and re-published in Russkii arkhiv 1:2 (1909), 173-174.
considered a member of his "company" – the "royal priesthood" of all believers in the charismatic authority of Peter Alekseevich.

---

168 For the complicated relationship between the tsar and his first General Fieldmarshal, see A. I. Zaozerskii, "Fel'dmarshal Sheremetev i pravitel'svennaia sreda petrovskogo vremenii," in Rossiia v period reform Petra I, ed. by N. I. Pavlenko (M., 1973), 172-198, esp. 182-183; and infra, Chapter Four. For a pioneering discussion of Peter's "company," as both a social and an epistolary phenomenon, see A. I. Zaozerskii, Fel'dmarshal B. P. Sheremetev (M., 1989), 200-206.
CHAPTER THREE

Apostles:
Unholy Knights, Holy Orders and the
Apotheosis of the “Great Skipper”

At first glance, the strange, discursive practices by means of which the royal entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich enacted its vision of Orthodox imperial reform appear to have very little to do with this monarch’s endeavor to transform Muscovy into a powerful member of the nascent “Concert of Europe.”1 After all, what can a pilgrimage to some obscure, unaccredited, and god-forsaken shrine – the subject of the first section of this chapter – tell us about the tsar’s desire to emulate the example of other, “regular,” Christian princes? What, if anything, does the foundation of a mock order of chivalry – the topic of the second section – reveal about the grandiose imperial ambitions of the tsar and his entourage? Finally, what do these two, seemingly unrelated events, have to do with the playful role (of the humble, “artisan tsar”), which the imperious young monarch adopted (and urged others to adopt) in the “company” of his most trusted advisors? Actually, quite a lot. In fact, as I will argue in this chapter, the tsar’s unexpected lay-over at the Pertominsk Monastery in 1693, like his decision to create the first, Russian knightly Order (c. 1699) and its mock counterpart (c. 1709), all stemmed from the same source: namely, the desire (on the part of tsar and his “company”) to mobilize the loyalties of a committed group of disciples, who could attest to the redemptive significance of Peter’s personal gift grace (Gr. charisma) and
who could help him to realize the ideals, which were first formulated on the grounds of
the suburban royal estate of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe, during the tsar’s "childhood
amusements." \(^2\)

Focusing on the ideological, social, and geographical "expansion" of the
Transfigured Kingdom, this chapter will thus seek to demonstrate that, immediately
after the Naryshkin candidate (informally) declared his independence from the political
coalition that had put him on the throne of Moscow,\(^3\) the rituals of inclusion and
exclusion into the entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich began to partake of both religious
and chivalrous tropes. This orientation towards the ideal of the *ecclesia militans*\(^4\)
explains why in the spectacles immediately preceding the inauguration of the Order of
St. Andrew, as much as in those accompanying the foundation of its mock chivalrous
counterpart, the "Order of Judas," the tsar's courtiers appeared as modern-day,
Orthodox "knights." Precisely by affiliating themselves with a knightly order like those
of other contemporary Christian monarchs, the tsar and his courtiers sought to prove
that they were linked by these very institutions and traditions to the broader, pan-
European court society. At the same time, in an effort to realize the Orthodox religious

---

\(^1\) On Russia's role in shaping the emerging pan-European balance of power between Christian
monarchs, see M. S. Anderson, *Peter the Great*, 2nd ed. (London and NY, 1995), 84; L. Jay Oliva,

\(^2\) For a discussion of the political significance of Muscovite royal amusements (*potekhi*), see
supra, Chapter Two.

\(^3\) On the importance of the election and ordination of the first mock patriarch in the elaboration
of Peter's own ruling style, see supra, Chapter Two.

\(^4\) For an argument that the values informing the "pillars" of the early modern state – "the
prince, the bureaucracy, and the army" – transformed them into an "*ecclesia militans*, a secular religious
imagery associated with these two orders of chivalry, Peter’s knights distinguished themselves from their European “brothers” by appearing as the apostles of the Russian tsar, in his capacity as the “anointed one” (Gr. christos). Indeed, as I will argue in this chapter, only after the idea of apostlehood came to be accepted by the tsar’s circle of intimates, could other Muscovite courtiers begin to conceive of Peter Alekseevich as the divinely-ordained, charismatic leader, who was personally responsible for transfiguring his realm and inaugurating the renovation of a reformed, Russian Orthodox empire.

*The Accidental Pilgrims*

Although some of Peter Alekseevich’s closest political advisors had toyed around with the idea of building a Russian navy as early as 1688, the Naryshkin candidate did not get a chance to implement this bold, new approach to the program of Orthodox imperial reform until well after the coup of 1689. Indeed, even after the

---

5 As early as 1688, nearly a year before the Naryshkin coup, the tsar and his advisors spent the summer in and around Lake Pereiaslav’. See the correspondence between Peter – who signed in Dutch (Piter) as well as Latin (Petru) – and his mother, tsaritsa Natalia Kirillovna, in *Pis’ma i bumagi imperatora Petra Velikogo* (SPb., 1887) [hereafter, *PIB*], 1: 10-12, 486. Also see Peter’s autobiographical introduction to the “Naval Statute” of 1720, “Predislovie k morskomu reglamentu,” in N. G. Ustrialov, *Istorii tsarstvovaniia Petra Velikogo*, 6 vols. (SPb., 1858), 2: 397-401, here 398-399.

6 Indeed, despite the informal program of military (and especially, naval) buildup, sponsored by the tsar and his advisors, Peter was not able to realize his plans until after the failure of the First Azov campaign (1695). Taking advantage of the “military emergency” of 1696, the tsar and his advisors succeeded in pushing an ambitious program of naval construction through the aging, and increasingly ineffectual Muscovite royal council (*boiar duma*). See M. M. Bogoslovskii, *Petr I: Materialy dlia*
“Naryshkin Restoration,” the ceremonial duties of his office (as co-tsar) and the familial (and political) obligations which he owed to his kinsmen (and their supporters), forced Peter Alekseevich to find ever more elaborate excuses for justifying his avid interest in the (unrealized) naval projects of his father. In order to get around these restrictions on his freedom of movement, the young tsar hit upon a ploy to which even his mother could not object: whenever he wanted to make a trip to the dock-yards of Iauza or the wharves of Pereiaslavl, Peter would offer to make a “pilgrimage” to

---


Like his father before him, Peter Alekseevich had contemplated building a merchant marine in the south of Russia, nearer to the trade routes with the Orient; however, as before, this point of entry into the world market was blocked by the Ottomans, who controlled the Crimea as well as the Caspian and the Black Seas. On the “mercantilistic” sea-building project of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, see Phillips, op. cit., ch. 1. On Peter’s knowledge of his father’s projects, see “Predislovie,” in Ustrialov, op. cit., 399. A book about the voyages of the first Russian ship, the Eagle of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, was translated from French into Russian in 1719, a year before Peter completed his forward to the “Naval Regulations.” See N. I. Novikov, ed., Drevniaia Russkaia Viviliofika, 2nd ed. (1788), part 3. According to Franz Lefort, as early as 1692, Peter expressed an interest in sailing down the Volga River to Kazan’ and Astrakhan’, the same towns visited by the Eagle, “in order to establish better trade with Persia.” See Lefort’s letters to his brother, dated 4 July and 13 September 1694, cited in D. M. Posselt, Admiral Russkago flota Frants Jakolevich Lefort, ili nachalo Russkago flota (SPb., 1863) 1 = Prilozhenie k Morskemu sborniku, 31, 94, 97.

Despite the fact that the “Naryshkin Restoration” had been directed against the rule of a female regent, after the 1689 coup, the government (officially) headed by Ivan and Peter Alekseevich continued to be run by an informal regency, which was dominated by the faction of one of the co-tsars. Indeed, until her death in 1694, the dowager-tsartseva Natal’ia Kirillovna (nee Naryshkina) was unofficially still referred to as the regent. See B. I. Kurakin, “Gistoriia o tsare Pete Alekseeviche (1682-1694),” in Petr Velikii. Vospominiia. Dnevnikovye zapis. Anekdoty, ed. L. Nikolaeva (M., 1993), 53-84; and supra, Chapter One.

Like the “toy ships” of Novo-Peobrazhenskoe, the “toy fleet” built and sailed on Lake Pereiaslavl’ between 1688-1692, offered the tsar and his entourage an opportunity to make spectacular statements about their ambitions in the relative safety and comfort of their own back yard. Testing the deeper, and more dangerous, waters of the Arctic Ocean was the next significant step in expanding the boundaries of the Transfigured Kingdom. On the (first-ever) joint maneuvers between Russian land and sea forces, staged at Pereiaslavl’ in 1691-1692, see I. V. Girs and B. P. Favorov, “Poteshnaia flotiliiia Petra,” Sudostroenie 6 (1972), 72-74; and Phillips, op. cit., 57-58.
some nearby monastery. This pious desire was perfectly in keeping with established Muscovite traditions, according to which Russian tsars had made their political presence known by appearing before their subjects during pilgrimages to the most important holy shrines of the realm.\textsuperscript{10} Visits to the hallowed relics of such shrines not only demonstrated the Muscovite rulers’ respect for the wonder-working saints of the Orthodox Church, but also made an important statement about their own role as intercessors between heaven and earth.\textsuperscript{11} And, as we saw in Chapters One and Two, when we described the Muscovite court’s trips to the Trinity-St. Sergius Monastery and the nunnery near Aleksandrov skaia sloboda, such pilgrimages could also serve less exalted, and more politically-expedient causes.

It is not surprising, therefore, that in a letter addressed to his elder half-brother and co-ruler,\textsuperscript{12} tsar Peter Alekseevich explained his desire to visit Arkhangelsk by referring to this very tradition. In June 1694, on the way back from his second trip to the White Sea,\textsuperscript{13} Peter notified Ivan Alekseevich of the fact that, this time, he had


\textsuperscript{12} Peter to tsar Ivan Alekseevich (14 June 1694), PiB, I:21-22. Like the “Naryshkin manifesto” of 1689, this letter maintained the fiction of a diarchy between the last two surviving sons of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, while acknowledging that actual power resided elsewhere. Unlike the 1689 missive, this epistle was actually signed by “tsar Peter.” See PiB, I: 495. For a discussion of the “Naryshkin manifesto” of 1689, see supra, Chapter One.

\textsuperscript{13} Peter Alekseevich and “his hundred-man retinue” first visited the port-city of Arkhangel’sk in 1693. See Phillips, op. cit., 58-59.
(finally) fulfilled his earlier promise to visit the famous, northern monastery complex of Solovetsk and to pray at the shrine of saints Zosima and Savvatii.\textsuperscript{14} However, the young tsar failed to mention the fact he and his entourage had also paid an unscheduled visit to the (as yet unaccredited) reliquary of saints Vassian and Iona of the Pertominsk monastery – a distant outpost (scete) of the Solovetsk Monastery. Nor did the junior co-tsar ever mention that this unplanned pilgrimage resulted from the fact that the boat in which Peter was travelling had nearly capsized in the stormy waters, directly off the coast of the church, which housed the relics of the two Arctic saints. As we will see below, the tsar’s silence about his unexpected detour was motivated by more than a supposed desire to prevent his relatives from worrying about him.\textsuperscript{15} Had the powers-that-be back in Moscow known about the meaning of the strange spectacle, which the tsar staged in order to commemorate his accidental “pilgrimage” to the shrine of saints Vassian and Iona, they would have seen that Peter’s pledges of brotherly obedience and paternal respect concealed bold assertions about his independent, personal rule.

Clearly, then, the unscheduled visit to the Transfiguration Church of the Pertominsk Monastery was meant for an entirely different audience.

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} \textit{PiB}, 1:21.
\item \textsuperscript{15} The hagiographic trope of worrying relatives appears both in Peter’s correspondence with his mother and in his autobiographical introduction to the “Naval Statute” of 1720. Lindsey Hughes has recognized the “implicit parallels” with the “Lives of the Saints” in “the fact that Peter’s mother twice tried to dissuade him from his endeavour, first from sailing on a lake [Pereslavl’], then from sailing on the White Sea [near Arkhangel’sk].” She goes on to suggest that Peter’s “first visit to the latter [Arctic sea-port], and later to the West, is presented as a new sort of pilgrimage, not to holy shrines, but to maritime ‘holy places’ – harbours, shipyards, and docks.” See Hughes, \textit{op. cit.}, 81. I will attempt to demonstrate that Peter’s “accidental pilgrimage” to the shrine of the Pertominsk monks fits into this interpretation.
\end{itemize}
The real reasons for Peter's two "pilgrimages" to Arkhangel'sk (in 1693 and 1694) - to make contacts with foreigners, to test out the latest technological advances in the field of "naval architecture," and to get his first real experience of sea-travel - prefigured his eighteen-month trip to northern and central Europe in 1697-1698 and hinted at the form which the tsar and his courtiers imagined his personal rule would take. During his first visit to Arkhangel'sk, in the summer of 1693, the tsar had an opportunity not only to see, but also to sail in the top-of-the-line vessels of the best sea powers in the world. At this time Peter Alekseevich first sailed on the St. Peter, a small, armed, patrol ship (Dutch, jacht), christened after his heavenly namesake. By mid-September 1693, the tsar had already started making plans for a return trip the following year. Foremost among his plans lay his interest in sailing beyond the White Sea and into the Arctic Ocean with a proposed, grandly-named, but as yet non-existent "White Sea Fleet," composed of the St. Peter and two new ships. The names of these ships - the St. Paul and the Holy Prophecy (Dutch, Santa Prooffeetie) - were clearly intended to play off of the "providential" name of the St. Peter, in order to emphasize

---

16 Since Holland and England, the two countries that also happened to be Muscovy's best trading partners, were currently engaged in a war against France, their ships were accompanied by men-of-war, in order to prevent trade being disrupted by enemy vessels. Posselt, op. cit., 18-19.


18 F. M. Apraksin, the new governor-general of the port region (and Peter's kinsman by marriage) was put in charge of building the St. Paul at the newly-constructed Solombala wharf in Arkhangel'sk; while Franz Lefort, one of the tsar's foreign favorites, was directed to purchase the second ship, Holy Prophecy (Santa Prooffeetie), in Holland. See Phillips, op. cit., 59. On F. M. Apraksin, see Phillips, ibid., 171; and supra, Introduction; Chapter One. On Franz Lefort, see supra, Introduction.

19 For a discussion of the allegorical significance of ships' names in Petrine court culture, see I. D. Chechot, "Korabl' i flot v portretakh Petra I. Ritoricheskaia kul'tura i osobennosti estetiki russkogo
the fact, that the young tsar was "predestined" for his imperial vocation. The trips to
the northern port city of Arkhangelsk thus not only offered Peter a chance to try out
the best military hardware in the world, but also served to highlight the prominent role
which the navy – and the political, ethical, and religious ideals associated with sea-
travel – was supposed to play in the "mercantilist" economic and foreign policies of
the tsar and his entourage.

None of these reasons appeared in the 1693 letter to tsar Ivan Alekseevich.
Instead, the anonymous author of the epistle explained Peter Alekseevich's visit to
Arkhangelsk by emphasizing the conventional political, religious, and familial

20 Note that in 1698-1700, the tsar had personally helped to build and to launch the sixty-gun
Divine Predestination (Rus. Bozhiye predvidenie; Dutch, Goto Predestinatsia) in Voronezh, in front of
the entire Russian court. At the same time, he commissioned Adrian Schoonebeck – the recently-hired,
official court artist – to immortalize Peter's "divinely"-inspired creation. The Dutch engraver produced
three views, including one that revealed the allegorical significance of the ship's other name, The Praying
Apostle Peter (Rus. molitvashchii apostol Petr, Dutch, Petrus Verschijning). On the poop-deck,
immediately above the tsar and F. A. Golovin, Schoonebeck included an allegorical device depicting a
praying apostle Peter, with the motto "On this rock [...]" (Mat. 16: 18-19). This unusual reference to
Peter's patron saint was clearly meant to demonstrate the ideals behind the court's new imperial policy –
ideals which were intimately connected to the cultivation of royal charisma. For a description of the
ceremony accompanying the launching of the war-ship Predestination, see Bogoslovskii, op. cit., 4: 341-
346. For an insightful analysis of Schoonebeck's triptych (1700-1701), see M. A. Alekseeva, Gravitura
petrovskogo vremen (L., 1990), 25-34 (Figures 27-29). On Schoonebeck, "one of the chief agents [...] of
Peter's revolution in Russian image-making," see James Cracraft, The Petrine Revolution in Russian
Imagery (Chicago and London, 1997), 136, 165-171, 177, quote on 120; and Alekseeva, op. cit., ch. 2.

21 On the neo-Stoic interpretation of the "ship of state," see Oestreich, op. cit. 42; on maritime
imagery in the "Baroque," see Peter N. Skrine, The Baroque: Literature and Culture in Seventeenth-
Century Europe (London, 1978), ch. 5, esp. 75-78. For the ideological significance of the navy – and
sea-travel in general – at the court of Peter the Great, see Evgenii Anisimov, The Reforms of Peter the

22 For a critical review of Soviet studies on the subject of Peter's "mercantilism," see Simone
Blanc, "The Economic Policy of Peter the Great," in Russian Economic Development from Peter the
Great to Stalin, ed. by William L. Blackwell (NY, 1974), 21-49. See also Anisimov, op. cit. 70-71.
obligations of a pious, seventeenth-century, Muscovite tsar. Even in this politically-expedient explanation, however, the letter-writer was not willing to discuss Peter’s unscheduled pilgrimage to the Pertominsk Monastery, despite the fact that this would only heighten the impression of the great lengths to which the junior tsar was willing to go in order to perform his official duties as a Muscovite head of state. For the unofficial saints of Pertominsk were the indirect beneficiaries of the patronage extended by the Russian royal house to the Solovetsk Monastery, and particularly to one of its most powerful abbots, St. Filipp – the sixteenth-century metropolitan of Moscow and the reputed teacher of Vassian and Iona. In fact, in 1652, tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and patriarch Nikon supervised the posthumous rehabilitation of metropolitan Filipp, who had been imprisoned and executed at the end of the sixteenth century for standing up to Ivan the Terrible. Patriarch Nikon even accompanied Filipp’s relics on their long trip from Arkhangel’sk to Moscow, where, during an elaborate ceremony, the tsar himself begged forgiveness from the saint for his “great-grandfather’s ire.” Aleksei’s ritual contrition, like his deliberate conflation of the Riurikid and Romanov lines of the Russian royal house, thus pointed to the poliitical significance of the transfer of St. Filipp’s relics, a calculated move on the part of the tsar and his spiritual advisors to sanctify the new royal-sponsored program of Orthodox imperial reform.²³

The historical example provided by Aleksei Mikhailovich’s posthumous rehabilitation of metropolitan Filipp helps to shed light on the active role played by the

---

tsar’s youngest son in the canonization of that saint’s disciples. From one point of view, Peter Alekseevich’s personal solicitude for the memory of saints Vassian and Iona, during the tsar’s unscheduled pilgrimage to the Pertominsk Monastery, was yet another reminder of the Romanovs’ continuing support for the reformist agenda of the Orthodox church. On the other hand, Peter’s visit to the Transfiguration Church of the Pertominsk Monastery was also clearly meant to emphasize the legitimacy of Aleksei’s youngest son, by underscoring the reciprocal relation between Peter Alekseevich and the unaccredited Arctic saints, each of whom refracted (and, therefore, “proved”) the other’s sacrality. For until the retinue of the junior co-tsar visited the Pertominsk Monastery, Vassian and Iona remained saints only in name. According to their vita, sometime in the sixteenth century, two dead bodies had washed up on shore near the Pertominsk Monastery – a shrine for the local inhabitants, who made their living by fishing the dangerous and icy waters of the Arctic Ocean. Monastic and local tradition immediately identified the bodies with St. Filipp’s disciples, the Solovetsk monks Vassian and Iona, drowned in 1561, in a storm which capsized their boat. The author of the vita described the vision of the fishermen who had found the bodies of the two drowned monks, and recorded the saints’ strict instructions about being buried on the spot where they had washed up. He also noted that later, a church, dedicated to the Transfiguration of the Savior, had been built to house the relics of Vassian and Iona.

For the vitae of SS. Vassian and Iona, see “Skazanie o proiavlenii i obretenii i o chudesekh prepodobnykh otet nachikh Vasiana i Iony, izhe na Primorii Studenago moria, Velikago Okiana, v Zatoce, vo Uniskikh, naritsaemykh Rogakh Pertominskikh chudotvorcev,” RO RNB, “Solovetskoe sobranie” 181/182 (Sbornik zhitiu russkich sviatykh), fols. 181-185. My thanks to Eve Levin for providing me with a copy of her notes on this manuscript.
whom the local population credited with performing miracles. In keeping with this established local tradition, the anonymous chronicler who recorded the details of tsar Peter Alekseevich’s "pilgrimage" to the shrine of Vassian and Iona, attributed the survival of the tsar and his entourage in a storm off the nearby inlet of Unskaiia Guba to the miraculous intercession of the miracle-working Pertominsk saints.

Relying on a biblical proof-text from the gospel of Matthew (14:24-33), the Pertominsk chronicler made an implicit comparison between the panic assailing the passengers and crew of the *St. Peter*, struggling against the storm which overtook the royal yacht on the Arctic Ocean, with the fear and doubt of the Apostle Peter, as he strode on the waves of the sea of Galilee. Just as the episode of Peter’s walk on water served the gospel author with an allegory of the apostles’ faith in the divinity of Jesus, so the Pertominsk chronicler used the story of the near-capsizing of the royal yacht in order to illustrate the power of Providence in human (as well as royal) affairs.

According to the chronicler’s account, even the administration of the sacraments of

---


26 In the so-called "Dvinsk Chronicle," a description of Peter’s visit to the Pertominsk monastery accompanies the vita of SS. Vassian and Iona. The relevant portion of the "Dvinsk Chronicle" was originally under the title of *O vsochaishikh prishestviakh velikogo gosudaria tsaria i velikogo kniazia Petra Alekseevicha [...] iz tsarsvuiushchego grada Moskvy na Dvinsk Arkhangel’skomu gorodu [...]*, ed. by N. I. Novikov (M., 1783), 43-47. Cf. "Dvinskii letopisets. Prostrannaiia redaktsiia," in *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* 33 (Spb.-M., 1846-). The "Dvinsk chronicle" also emphasizes the typological parallel between the naval program of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich (King David) and tsar Peter Alekseevich (King Solomon). See G. Stökl, "Der zweite Salomon. Einige Bemerkungen zur Herrschervorstellungen im alten Russland," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 13: 1-2 (1979), 23-31, here 30.
Penance and Holy Communion, did not succeed in calming either the crew and the passengers aboard the royal yacht or the waters of the Arctic Ocean. And although the Pertominsk chronicler recorded that a local pilot finally managed to steer the royal yacht into the bay, he made it clear that the tsar and everyone on board the *St. Peter* ultimately owed their salvation to God and the intercession of “the two drowned monks who in death still live.”

The tsar’s own actions after this unexpected safe-landing demonstrate that he accepted the Pertominsk monks’ interpretation of the events and credited his salvation from the storm to the miraculous intercession of the two Arctic saints. During the

---

27 The sacraments were administered by archbishop Afanasii of Kholmogory, who had accompanied the tsar on his three-week ocean-voyage. Peter and his advisors saw archbishop Afanasii of Kholmogory as one of the more “learned and cultivated clergymen,” someone who knew how to treat “the numerous and various foreigners [found at the seaport of Arkhangelsk]” in a way “that redounds to the honor and glory of the Russian realm.” See the comments of I. A. Musin-Pushkin to metropolitan Stefan (Iavorskii) (28 February 1707), cited in I. Chistovich, *Feofan Prokopovich i ego vremia* (SPb., 1868), 58 n. 2. In fact, despite his great age, the archbishop of Kholmogory was later even considered for the post of temporary office-holder of the patriarchal see, a position eventually assumed by the new metropolitan of Riazan’, Stefan (Iavorskii). For a brief biography of archbishop Afanasii of Kholmogory, see *Russkii biograficheskii slovar’* (SPb., 1897), 2: 371-372; for his role in 1689, see supra, Chapter One. On Peter’s favorable attitude towards the archbishop, see James Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (London and Basingstoke, 1971), 122-121.

28 “Skazanie,” *op. cit.*, 197, 197v., 198.

29 While it is not surprising that the monks of Pertominsk took advantage of the tsar’s unexpected visit to the shrine of Vassian and Iona to shortcut the path toward recognition of their saints, it remains to be explained why Peter Alekseevich decided to sponsor the canonization of these Arctic saints. As we will see, the tsar’s request casts doubt upon conventional explanations, which tend to over-emphasize Peter’s religious skepticism. It does not conflict, however, with the demands of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Orthodox religious reformers, who recognized the importance of relics, but wished merely to impose order upon the proliferation of unattested local shrines, which, they claimed, were administered by greedy monks who played on the ignorance of the population in order to line their own pockets, to the detriment of the royal treasury, the spiritual welfare of their flock, as well as the “general good” of the realm as a whole. Indeed, the tsar’s insistence on personally witnessing the physical proof of sanctity, as well as the political uses to which this process was put, demonstrate that Peter was already well on the way to formulating the kind of attitudes enshrined in the *Spiritual Regulation* of archbishop Feofan (Prokopovich), the architect of Peter’s ecclesiastical policy in the second half of his reign. On the new, Orthodox piety and its connection to Peter’s religious policies, see L. R. Lewitter, “Peter the Great’s Attitude Towards Religion: From Traditional Piety to Rational
course of his four day lay-over at the Pertominsk monastery in June 1694, tsar Peter Alekseevich ordered that the relics of Vassian and Iona be exhumed and examined in the presence of archbishop Afanasii of Kholmogory - a reform-minded Orthodox cleric who, at least according to the chronicler, had not been well disposed towards the monastery or the two saints and even questioned their credentials. To the great joy of the Pertominsk monks, the tsar asked the archbishop to perform an ad hoc ecclesiastical investigation into the status of their (as yet) unattested local miracle cult.\textsuperscript{30} Despite the fact that only one body was found, Afanasii of Kholmogory succumbed to royal pressure and agreed to recognize the holiness of the relics, which were laid to rest in the chapel of the monastery. A service of thanksgiving was held and was followed by a solemn liturgy at which the tsar himself sang in the choir and read from the Books of the Apostles (Rus. Apostle). In a final step of the traditional canonization process, the tsar made a gift of money, supplies, land and fishing rights to the monastery, as well as provision for the extension of its buildings.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30} According to the Spiritual Regulation of Feofan (Prokopovich), archbishops were responsible for investigating all local cases of unattested “saints” and their alleged miracles; they were to forward regular reports about these incidents to the tsar’s Holy Synod, which had final say in the matter. See The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great, ed. and trans. Alexander V. Muller (Seattle and London, 1972); 15, 19-20, 30; on the implementation of this decree in the later eighteenth century, see Levin, “False Miracles,” \textit{op. cit.}, 25-40.

\textsuperscript{31} On the attestation of the Pertominsk saints, see “Skazanie,” 198v-200v; and Levin; “False Miracles,” \textit{op. cit.}, 6-8.
The fact that Peter Alekseevich sponsored the immediate investigation into the sanctity of the reputed remains of Vassian and Iona testifies to the political significance which the tsar attached to the personal miracle ostensibly performed for him by these two new saints. Indeed, it appears that the process which resulted, finally, in the recognition of the saintly status of the Pertominsk relics, was also meant to affirm his own gift of grace (Gr. charisma). In a move which echoed the vita of saints Vassian and Iona, in their insistence on being buried where their bodies had been washed ashore, the tsar chose to consecrate the spot where he and his party landed. Using the language and the persona of the “Great Skipper” (Rus. bol'shoi ship’/ger or shiper) – the address used by the tsar’s intimates in their correspondence with him during the trip to Arkhangel’sk\(^\text{32}\) -- the tsar commemorated his miraculous rescue by carving a ten-and-a-half feet (one-and-a-half sazhen’) high, four-limbed, pinewood cross, on whose cross-beam Peter inscribed the following sentence, in Dutch: “This cross was made by Captain Peter in the year of our Lord 1694” (Dat kruys. maken kaptein Piter. van. a. Cht. 1694).\(^\text{33}\)

\(^{32}\) Posselt, op. cit., 37; George von Mengden, I. T. Inekhov, and Adam Weide to Peter I (after 14 June 1694); collective letter from soldiers of the Preobrazhensk life-guards regiment to Peter I (after June 27 1694), both in PiB, I: 495-496; and Peter to A. A. Vinius (21 July 1694), PiB, I: 23-24. The tsar even rebuked those courtiers, like F. M. Apraksin, who refused to play according to the rules of his “company” (kompania) and insisted on addressing their letters using the official royal titulature. See Peter to F. M. Apraksin (11 December 1696), PiB, I: 113; cf. ibid., 2: 97 (21 October 1702).

\(^{33}\) PiB, I: 21, 495. In 1805, Peter’s cross was transferred to the main Orthodox cathedral in Arkhangel’sk. See N. Golubtsov, “Krest Petra Velikogo, khramiashchiisia v Arkhangel’skom Kafedral’nom Sobore,” in Petr Veliki na Severe. Sbornik statei i ukazov, otnosiashchiisia k deiatel’nosti Petra I na Severe, ed. by A. F. Shidlovskii (Arkhangel’sk, 1909), 79-83; S. Ogorodnikov, “Vtoroe poseshchenie Petrom Velikim Arkhangel’ska v 1694 g.,” in ibid., 24-30, esp. 28; and Bogoslovskii. op. cit., I:176-193, esp. 181-182
To the monk who chronicled this episode, the unorthodox shape of the cross and its incomprehensible, “Roman” (rimiskaia) inscription, highlighted the strangeness of the tsar’s behavior on the last day of his visit to the Pertominsk Monastery. The tsar not only stooped to perform the manual work of an ordinary carpenter, but insisted on carrying the wooden cross on his own back, before erecting it on the sea-shore where he and his entourage had disembarked.34 In a re-enactment of Jesus’ procession through Jerusalem on the way to Golgotha, the tsar appeared literally bowed under the weight of the cross which he had fashioned and willingly took upon himself. Unlike Jesus, however, Peter Alekseevich had not been abandoned by his apostles; the tsar’s “company” solemnly escorted Peter and helped him to carry his burden from the Transfiguration Church of the Pertominsk monastery down to the shore. Indeed, the conspicuous involvement of some of the leading “churchmen” of Peter’s mock Transfigured Kingdom shows that this ceremony had less to do with recreating the Way of Sorrows than with celebrating the fact that the royal entourage had survived a test of their faith in the charisma of the tsar.35 By accompanying the tsar on his “pilgrimage” to another holy shrine named after the Transfiguration of the Savior, the members of

34 “Skazanie,” op. cit., 200v.-201.

35 According to the anonymous chronicler, the royal suite which visited the Pertominsk monastery included at least two well-known “members” of the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince-Pope” – dumi, d’iak N. M. Zotov, the “successor” to “Patriarch Dearie”; and boiar T. N. Streshnev, also known as the mock “metropolitan of Novgorod” – and several members of Peter’s “company”; boiar F. A. Golovin, Prince Ia. F. Lobanov-Rostovskii, F. I. Troekurov, stolniki V. F. Naryshkin, F. F. Pleshcheev, I. V. Voronin “and quite a few other clerical and military ranks” (ot dukhovnogo i voinskogo chin ne malo). See “Skazanie,” op. cit., fol. 196. On “Patriarch Dearie” (M. F. Naryshkin), the original patriarch of the tsar’s mock ecclesiastical council, who died in 1692, shortly after his “installation,” see supra, Chapter Two. On Zotov and Streshnev, see supra, Introduction; Chapter One; and infra, Appendix. For Prince F. I. Troekurov, see supra, Chapter One.
the mock ecclesiastical council playfully "sanctified" the tsar's undertaking, conveying in jest the serious political message that would have been taken as a joke had it been uttered with all the pomp of a royal proclamation.\textsuperscript{36}

Taking advantage of their accidental pilgrimage to the shrine of the Pertominsk saints, Peter Alekseevich and his entourage thus improvised a unique royal spectacle, which was intended for everyone in the group, including the creators of the ceremony itself. The fact that this ceremony was new, \textit{ad hoc}, unexpected, is not insignificant either. Indeed, it is a clear illustration of the sociological argument that there must constantly be demonstrations of the charismatic leader's special gift of grace, at unexpected and unusual times, for his followers to keep believing in his divine election.\textsuperscript{37} We have no evidence that Peter planned this ceremony in advance.

Certainly, the tsar and his entourage never intended to get caught in a storm, although it is not that surprising that a boat sailed by people new to the sea (and to this part of the realm) had nearly capsized. But if we look at what the tsar and his advisors actually did with this near-tragedy, we will see that this little-known episode in the tsar's second trip to Arkhangelsk is a good example of the unique way in which Petrine court spectacles created a sense of community among the followers of a self-proclaimed charismatic – though by no means infallible – young ruler, with weak dynastic claims.

\textsuperscript{36} "The language of a court coterie is always two-edged, by turns veiling and revealing. If the phrase of the worshipper is taken too seriously it immediately becomes a jest, but if it is treated merely as a courtly game it suddenly is fully and literally intended." See Ernst Kantorowicz, \textit{Frederick the Second, 1194-1250}, trans. by E. O. Lorimer (London, 1931), 522.

Such enigmatic assertions of royal charisma demonstrated that the tsar and his entourage sought to foster a particular kind of *esprit de corps* among those who witnessed and participated in the Pertominsk procession with the cross. Taking advantage of the fact that the entire royal retinue had personally experienced the near-capsizing of the *St. Peter*, the organizers of this spectacle attempted to transform the relief at their physical salvation (from a storm) into a re-affirmation of faith in the coming of the Kingdom Transfigured. Although shaken by an unexpected confrontation with their own mortality, the tsar’s “company” was urged to let go of the past, with all its fears and tribulations, and to commit themselves (ever more strongly) to the tasks set by their divinely-appointed leader. Whether or not they actually believed in the ultimate success of the tsar’s mission, all of his courtiers (*so vsem tsar’skim sigklitom*) had to participate in the procession with the cross, supporting Peter as he carried his burden (*na rame svoikh*) down to the sea.38 In this way, the ceremony improvised on the last day of the tsar’s visit to the Pertominsk Transfiguration Church enacted the scenario of power first articulated on the grounds of the royal suburban estate of New Transfiguration (Novo-Preobrazhenskoe).

The procession with the cross – like the fact that at the liturgy following the canonization of Vassian and Iona, the tsar chose to read from the Books of the Apostles – thus affirmed the analogy between the tsar’s entourage and Christ’s disciples. Just as the stormy voyage of the *St. Peter* suggested the biblical proof-text from the gospel of

---

38 “Skazanie,” *op. cit.*, 200v.-201.
Matthew to the monk who described the royal retinue’s miraculous rescue, so the inscription on the cross borne by “Captain Peter” invited his naval entourage to make an implicit comparison between themselves and the followers of Christ – the divine helmsman. The tsar bolstered that interpretation by carving a crucifix that looked more like a ship’s mast than an eight-limbed Orthodox cross. If one recalls that Jesus was also a carpenter, then Peter’s personal efforts on the docks of his ship-yards, a theme which is a recurrent motif in the tsar’s correspondence with his intimates back in Moscow, suggests that the image of the “artisan tsar” was initially based on an a deliberate analogy to Christ. In this case, working with wood, Peter transformed a poignant reminder of physical suffering and other-worldly redemption into a triumphal sign of earthly salvation for himself and his followers, and – through the building of a sea-worthy, imperial navy – of a political salvation for the realm as whole. The organizers of this impromptu ceremony thus affirmed that the tsar’s mission to make land-locked Muscovy into a major maritime power, the burden which he personally took upon his shoulders, was no less “miraculous” than the safe-landing of the St.

---

39 The patrician image of the Orthodox Church as the “ship of Jesus” (Rus. Isusov korabl’), buffeted by waves but solid as a rock (Rus. kamen’; Gr. petros), can be found in the Russian “Lives of the Saints” (Velikie Minei Chet’i), compiled by Metropolitan Macarius in the middle of the sixteenth century and revised by Dimitrii (Tuptalo), metropolitan of Rostov, in the reign of Peter the Great. For one of the most famous examples of this image, see the sermon of St. John Chrysostom, in “Zhitie Ioanna Zlatoustu,” Velikie Minei Chetii [November 13-15] (Spb., 1899), stlb. 1032; cited in M. B. Pliukhanova, “O natsional’nykh sredstvakh samopredeleniia lichnosti: samosakralizatsiia, samosozhzenie, plavanie na korable,” in Iz istorii russkoj kul’tury: XVII-nachalo XVIII veka, ed. by A. D. Koshelev (M., 1996), 3: 380-459, here 408.

40 On Peter’s labors as the redemptive work of a “new Adam,” see the exchange between the tsar and “arch-priest” T. N. Streshnev (6 and 12 March 1696), in PiB, 1: 54, 547-548. On the Christological connotations of Adamite imagery, see Lossky, The Mystical Theology of Eastern Orthodoxy, 136-137. On “Adam mysticism” and its connection to imperial reform, see Frances Yates, Astrea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century (London, 1985), 8, 12.
Peter. To those who had faith in Providence, the miracle-working Orthodox saints, and the divine gifts of the “Great Skipper,” the unsinkable royal yacht proved that, even on his first ocean-voyage, the tsar, like his saintly namesake, could also walk on water.41

The Fishermen’s Order

By commemorating the debt owed to the two fishermen’s saints of Pertominsk, the ceremonial procession staged by the tsar and his entourage recalled those other fishermen, who had abandoned their nets to follow a charismatic leader, who (they believed) was their “anointed one” (Gr. christos), on his mission to transfigure the world as they knew it. Indeed, in light of the playful interchangeability of names and attributes common to the rhetorical conventions of the “Moscow Baroque,”42 saints Vassian and Iona came to stand in for the pair of apostles who first followed Christ. To anyone familiar with the tropes and techniques of courtly panegyrics at the end of the seventeenth century, the implicit evocation of St. Peter in the ceremony honoring the two Pertominsk saints conjured up the image of that apostle’s “double” – his brother, the apostle Andrew. And while Andrew was also considered the patron saint of

41 An unsigned etching of Jesus walking on the waves before the boat of the apostles introduced a series of seascapes published by the master-engravers of the St. Petersburg Typograph on 14 September 1718. See Kunshy korabel’nye (SPb., 1718), 1. For a copy of the engraving, see RO BAN, inv. 267 gr.

travelers and sailors, he was not merely a convenient allegorical substitute for the miracle-working Pertominsk saints. In fact, St. Andrew was more familiar to Russian Orthodox Christians as the apostle who (according to tradition) had first introduced Christianity among the eastern Slavs, and therefore, as the patron saint of Russia itself. Reading the story of St. Andrew typologically,43 Peter Alekseevich and his entourage could, therefore, invoke this "national" saint, in order to justify the tsar's desire to sail through the whole of Russia and out into the cold waters of the Arctic Ocean.44

According to the story recorded in the Russian Primary Chronicle, St. Andrew had been preaching the gospel to the pagans living along the northern littoral of the Black Sea when he came to Chersonesus, a colony on the trade-route which connected the "Varangians with the Greeks." While proselytizing in that city, the apostle "observed that the mouth of the Dniepr [River] was nearby" and immediately "conceived a desire to go to Rome" by way of the extensive river-system of the Eurasian plain. Ascending the Dniepr, "by chance" he halted on the shore beneath the hills upon which Kiev was subsequently built. St. Andrew prophesied to his disciples that "the favor of God [shall] shine upon [these hills]" and that on this spot a great city


44 St. Andrew was, in fact, often invoked alongside the tsar's name-day saints (Peter and Paul) as his other heavenly patron. See G. V. Vilinbakhov, "Gosudarstvennaia gerald'ika Rossi" kontsa XVII-pervoi chetverti XVIII veka. (K voprosu formirovaniia ideologii absoliutizma v Rossi") (Avtoreferat diss. kand. ist. nauk, Leningrad State University, 1982), 14; and idem, "Otrazhenie idei absoliutizma v
with many churches shall arise. He then "drew near the hills, and having blessed them, he set up a cross." After offering a prayer to God, he descended from the hill and continued his northern journey up the Dniepr. For the retinue of Peter Alekseevich, as for the Russian chronicler who recorded this tale, the apostle's point of departure and his ultimate destination were less significant than the journey itself. In their typological reading, the trip of St. Andrew had, in some sense, prefigured the pilgrimage of tsar Peter Alekseevich and his entourage. Just like St. Andrew, the tsar had navigated the Russian river systems in an attempt to find a northern outlet to the sea; and just like the apostle, the tsar's chance stop-over resulted in the recognition of a neglected holy place, a recognition sanctified by the erection of a cross. However, whereas the ancient chronicler used the Andrew legend to highlight Kiev's role in fostering the religious unity of the Slavs who inhabited the plains along the trade-routes between the eastern and western halves of the Roman Empire, Peter's sailing trip was itself an assertion of his grandiose, all-Russian, imperial ambitions. Indeed, it is precisely by founding a chivalrous knightly order named after the apostle, St. Andrew, that the tsar's first attempted to institutionalize his vision of Orthodox imperial reform.

The tsar's decision to name the first Russian knightly order after St. Andrew highlights both the imperial aspirations and the polemical thrust of his court's political program. From at least the seventh century, the image of Andrew the Apostle had

---

45 The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian Text. Trans. and ed. by Samuel Hazzard Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, 1953), 53-54.
served as an important point in the debate over precedence between the imperial churches of Rome and Constantinople. The claims of Roman bishops to primacy in the Church were based on the fact that they were successors of St. Peter, to whom Christ had entrusted the care of his Church. To counter these assertions, Orthodox clerics located a tradition for the apostolic source of the see of Byzantium in the investiture of St. Andrew. Because Andrew was the first apostle to whom Jesus had addressed his invitation to become his disciple and because Andrew had introduced his brother to Christ (John 1:37-42), the defenders of Byzantine primacy asserted that they were entitled to regard their episcopal See as equal, if not superior, to that of Rome. By the time “Second Rome” finally fell to the Ottomans, the debate over the apostolic foundations of the see of Byzantium had become moot and both Orthodox and Catholic sides had come to accept the authenticity of the Andrew legend. But so long as Constantinople remained in the hands of the Islamic Ottoman Porte and the Habsburgs continued to claim to be the only Christian ruling house to embody the authority of ancient Rome, it appeared that there could be no renovatio of the eastern Roman empire or the See of St. Andrew. However, at least from the twelfth century, the Andrew legend had been transferred from Byzantium and adopted by Orthodox apologists for the rulers of Russia, who came increasingly to be identified as the founders of a new, or “Third Rome.” Indeed, the growing imperial pretensions of Muscovite rulers almost guaranteed that, in one form or another, the Andrew legend would re-appear in Russian

political rhetoric. The foundation of the Order of St. Andrew “The First-Called” (Rus. Pervozvannyi) at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich thus signaled the revival, in secular and chivalrous guise, of the ancient religious rivalry between the defenders of the Catholic and the Orthodox imperial ideas.\textsuperscript{47}

The earliest records of its (informal) institution\textsuperscript{48} indicate that the Order of St. Andrew was intended as an Eastern Orthodox counterpart to the Catholic knightly orders sponsored by the Holy Roman Emperor, and particularly to the crusading order of the sea-going Knights of Malta.\textsuperscript{49} In March 1699, F. A. Golovin (1650-1706), the boiar who headed Peter’s foreign policy establishment and who had recently led the tsar’s “Great Embassy” to Europe, boasted of his membership in the tsar’s new order

\textsuperscript{47} On the fate of the “imperial theme” in early modern Europe, see Yates, \textit{op. cit.}. On the significance of the imperial idea in late Muscovite Russia, see \textit{infra}, Introduction.

\textsuperscript{48} Although the Order of St. Andrew appeared at the end of the seventeenth century (c. 1698-1699), it did not become a “monarchical order” in the full sense until 1720, when it acquired its own set of statutes (monarchical constitution). In fact, until the second decade of the eighteenth century, the Order of St. Andrew can be classified as a “cliental pseudo-order,” which has been defined as a “princely order,” whose “members” were bound by an oath of clientship to the prince who bestowed [the order] in the form of a badge.” These “pseudo-orders” were “in effect glorified retinues, distinguished from other such groupings only by the misleading title ‘order’ applied to them by the prince who distributed the badge.” For a useful discussion of the distinction between various types of chivalrous orders, see D’Arcy Jonathan Dacre Boulton, \textit{The Knights of the Crown: The Monarchical Orders of Knighthood in Later Medieval Europe, 1325-1520} (Woodbridge, 1987), xvii-xx. For the text of the statutes of 1720, see \textit{Palnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii} [hereafter, \textit{PSZ}], vol. 24 (No. 17908), reprinted by E. E. Zamyslovskii and I. I. Petrov, \textit{Istoricheskii ocherk rossiiskikh ordenov i sbornik osnovnykh ordenskih statutov} (Spb., 1892), I (2), 101; and the discussion in A. V. Viskovatov, “Ob uchrezhdenii ordena sv. Apostola Andreia Pervozvannogo i po pozhalovanii sim ordenom v 1700 g. Multianskogo Gospodarica Brankovana, v kvalerskikh spiskakh nigde ne pokazannogo,” \textit{RGAVMF}, f. 315, op. 1, ed. khr. 47; and G. V. Vilenbachov, “K istorii uchrezhdenii ordena Andreia Pervozvannogo i evoliutsii ego znaka,” in \textit{Kultura i iskusstvo petrovskogo vremeni: Publikatsii i issledovaniia} (L., 1977), 153-155.

\textsuperscript{49} On the Knights of Malta, also known as the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, see Boulton, \textit{op. cit.}, 17, 17 n. 25.
to Johann Georg Korb, the secretary of the Habsburg ambassador to Moscow.⁵⁰ In his "Diary," the Austrian diplomat claimed that the tsar founded this Order to reward those servitors, who had distinguished themselves in battle against the Turks, during the 1695-1696 Azov campaigns, when Orthodox Muscovy was part of the Catholic Holy Alliance consisting of the Holy Roman Empire, Venice, the Polish Republic, and the Knights of Malta.⁵¹ Korb assumed that the turn to chivalry reflected the tsar’s desire to imitate the trappings of other European Christian princes, and particularly of Korb’s own sovereign, Emperor Leopold I of Austria. As evidence of this desire, the Habsburg diplomat pointed to the special favor shown by the tsar to General-Fieldmarshal B. P. Sheremet’ev, the Russian courtier who had returned from abroad as an honorary member of the Knights of Malta, the crusading Catholic order patronized by the Pope and the Holy Roman Emperor.⁵² In fact, the motto of the first Russian order ("For Faith and Fidelity") did resemble the one used by the Maltese knights (Pour la foi).⁵³ Even the name of the tsar’s new Order appeared to have been borrowed from that of two earlier Catholic brotherhoods dedicated to St. Andrew: one was an old

---


⁵³ Viskovatov, *op. cit.*, 3v.-5v.
Scottish order, also known as the Order of the Thistle; while the other was the Habsburg Order of the Golden Fleece, which was originally dedicated to the Mother of God and Andrew the Apostle.

Despite its similarity to these Catholic brotherhoods, however, the insignia of the Russian order were actually modeled after the first and most ancient European knightly order, reputedly founded by the Byzantine emperor Constantine I "The Great." The fact that Peter chose to emulate this particular emperor was not in itself that innovative; even before the collapse of the "Second Rome," the comparison to Constantine the Great had become a mainstay of the claim that the tsars of Russia inherited the imperial and religious authority of Byzantium. However, it was not the traditional image of the pious ruler who legalized Christianity, but that of the divinely-ordained, chivalrous warrior-king, which found favor at the court of Peter Alekseevich. In this, as in so many other innovations in Muscovite court culture, the son followed the lead of his father.

---

54 The Scottish Order of St. Andrew, or of the Thistle, was reputedly founded by James III Stewart, King of Scots, in or shortly after 1470. Ever since James VII of Scotland (who, as James II of England, was the Sovereign of the English Order of the Garter) decided to revive this order in 1687 (with true monarchical constitutions), it has been considered as the principal order of Scotland. See Boulton, op. cit., xx, 399, 399 n. 8, and 499-500. As Boulton points out (ibid., 500), "James' action seems to have set off a whole new wave of similar foundations," of which the Russian Order of St. Andrew (founded 1698, statues 1720) was only one example.

55 Vilinbakhov, op. cit., 152. For an extensive discussion of the Order of the Golden Fleece (Toison d'or), see Boulton, op. cit., ch. 13. St. Andrew was chosen as the celestial patron of this monarchical order because he had long been regarded as the particular protector of the Dukes of Burgundy, who had founded this Order. However, after the first ten years of its existence, the Order would give little other recognition to St. Andrew. See Boulton. ibid., 370-371.

56 Vilinbakhov, op. cit., 153-155.
During his long and controversial reign, tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich had repeatedly invoked the martial imagery associated with the first Christian emperor, particularly the legendary Cross of Constantine – a familiar emblem in medieval European heraldry, representing the cross that had appeared in the sky above the armies of Constantine as a sign that he would defeat the usurper Maxentius. Aleksei Mikhailovich even went so far as to order that the “relics” of the Cross of Constantine, supposedly housed in an Orthodox monastery on Mt. Athos, be transferred to Moscow.\(^{58}\) The cult of the Cross of Constantine, associated with divine protection and victory, was picked up by Aleksei’s successors, including by his youngest son, who also continued his aggressive policies against the Muslim overlords of Constantinople, as well as his dreams about making Moscow the center of a reformed, Orthodox empire. For example, in 1696, during Peter Alekseevich’s second attempt to wrest the fortress of Azov from the hands of the Crimean Tatars, the Cross of Constantine decorated the standards of a newly-organized “Naval Regiment.”\(^{59}\) After the initial failure to take the fortress by land, the tsar and his military advisors realized the importance of a naval blockade and had formed this new regiment in the hopes of actualizing the motto on its standard: “By this sign shall you win” (Lat. *In hoc signo vinces*). Indeed, the ideological origins of the insignia for the Russian first order of

\(^{57}\) On the Constantinian cult of the wise ruler, and its connection (via St. Vladimir the “Equal of the Apostles”) to the Christianization of Russia, see *supra*, Introduction and Chapter One.

\(^{58}\) On the “Cross of Constantine” and its veneration at the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, see Vilinakhkov, “Gosudarstvennaia geral’dika,” *op. cit.*, 16-18. On the importance of the “Cross of Constantine” in Muscovite political theology, see M. B. Pliukhanova, *Sluzhety i simvolы Moskovskogo tsarstva* (SPb., 1995), ch. 3.
chivalry can be traced back to the tsar's 1696 triumphal entry into Moscow, during which the royal "Captain" walked in the ranks of his Naval Regiment, behind Admiral Lefort's carriage, through an arch whose banners hailed "The victorious return of tsar Constantine" and "Tsar Constantine's victory over the profane tsar Maxentius of Rome." Although both Constantine and Maxentius were called "tsars" (Lat. caesar), the designers of the banners for the first ever Russian imperial "triumph" clearly distinguished the Orthodox Byzantine emperor, the spiritual forefather of the Russian tsar, from his profane Latin counterpart, who represented the Austrian kaiser. The decisive role of the tsar's new flotilla in his first major military victory thus provided the impetus for the foundation of an Orthodox order of sea-going knights, whose "well-ordered" military organization and Christian valor could rout the "barbarous" hordes of Muslim infidels while, at the same time, rivaling the Catholic brotherhood sponsored by the Holy Roman Emperor.

By founding Russia's first order of chivalry – a symbolic act, which was the institutional equivalent of the 1694 Pertominsk ceremony – the royal "Captain" thus transformed the Cross of Constantine into the Cruz Decussata of St. Andrew, invoking

---

59 Vilinbakhov, "Gosudarstvennaia gerald' dika." 18.

the protection of the patron saint of sailors for the nascent Russian navy and his own imperial ambitions. As during the procession outside of the Pertominsk monastery, the tsar did not carry this weight solely upon his own shoulders. The first cavaliers of the Order of St. Andrew included the tsar’s most trusted geopolitical allies, particularly those who were involved in the secret diplomacy at the end of the seventeenth century, when Russia was building its coalition against Sweden, while ostensibly still part of the Holy Alliance and its crusade against the Ottoman Empire. Besides the Muscovite foreign minister (F. A. Golovin), the first two members of the Order included I. S. Mazepa, the hetman (Cossack leader) of Left-Bank Ukraine, and Constantine Brancovan, the Orthodox hospodar (prince) of Wallachia, the nominal vassal of the Turkish sultan who was covertly involved in recruiting sailors for the imperial Russian navy. Both the honor and the burden of the tsar’s personal trust in these men was embodied in the Order’s medal, a representation of the crucified figure of St. Andrew in the form of the characteristic diagonal cross, worn around the neck on a sash or chain. By accepting the cross of St. Andrew, the men empowered to act as Peter’s personal representatives on the stage of world politics took on the responsibility of fulfilling the words of the Order’s motto, “For Faith and Fidelity.” Thus, like the

---

61 Viskovatov, op. cit., passim. According to V. A. Durov, “Russkie boevye nagrady za Polavskoe srazhenie,” Numizmatika i sfрагистика 5 (1974), 58, the August 1700 decree to the royal armory about the minting of a cavalier’s cross of the Wallachian hospodar is now located in RGADA, f. 396, No. 34 (668), fols. 1-2

62 For a depiction of the St. Andrew medal, see Vilinbakhov, “K istorii uchrezhdeniia,” op. cit., 148 (Figure 6), reprinted from J. A. Rudolpi, Heraldica Curiosa (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1718).

63 The sentiment behind this device echoed the motto of one seventeenth-century military manual, which concluded with the words “fides et honor, C'est à dire Chrestien et Soldat.”
courtiers who helped the tsar erect a cross in honor of the Pertominsk saints, the knights of the Order of St. Andrew were urged to become the disciples of their royal patron and his heavenly intercessors.

*The Uses of Apostasy*

The impromptu ceremonies, which demonstrated Peter’s personal gift of grace (Gr. *charisma*) – and of which the periodic “conclaves” of the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope” formed an important (but heretofore neglected) subset – were not confined to the early days of his reign. Indeed, as I will now demonstrate, the providential interpretation of Peter’s imperial mission, as elaborated during the inauguration of the Transfigured Kingdom in 1691/92, and as re-affirmed during the accidental pilgrimage of 1694, went on to inform the way the tsar and his courtiers handled what was perhaps the most embarrassing episode of the entire “Northern War” (1700-1721): the unexpected defection of Ivan Mazepa, the second cavalier of the Order of St. Andrew, to the side of King Charles XII of Sweden, in the fall of 1708. The relative success with which the tsar and his entourage transformed this potentially-disastrous, foreign policy debacle into the most important turning point of the entire conflict between Russia and Sweden once again serves to underline how easily the tsar and his “company” could integrate even this flagrant violation of Peter’s new scenario of power into the royalist myth of Russia’s “anointed one” (Gr. *christos*). Playing on

Paraphrasing this motto, Gerhard Oestreich argued that the virtues of “*Stoïcien et Soldat*” underlay the
the religious and political connotations associated with membership in the tsar’s self-styled, chivalrous fellowship of believers, Peter and his apostles would go on to compare Mazepa’s defection to the apostasy of Judas Iscariot, the disciple who betrayed his Anointed One for thirty pieces of silver. In fact, this analogy would become one of the most prominent motifs in the shaming rituals staged by Peter and his advisors, strengthening the impression that the court of Peter Alekseevich had re-organized itself according to the ideals of a chivalrous religious order so as to demonstrate the charismatic authority of the divinely-anointed Russian monarch.64

Although they have been obscured by centuries of confessional (and, later, nationalist) polemics, the reasons for the hetman’s breach of faith are not hard to fathom.65 Over the course of the long and costly conflict between Russia, Sweden, and Poland, Ivan Mazepa had become increasingly worried about the effects of Muscovite war-time exactions upon the military organization and morale of the Ukrainian political elite, as well as upon the security of his own position as hetman of the Cossack Host. Doubting that the tsar, who was beleaguered by the demands of war, would be able to protect the Ukraine from the previously unbeaten (and seemingly invincible) armies of


65 My interpretation of Mazepa’s motives during 1708-1709 is indebted to the revisionist studies of Anisimov, op. cit., 112-116; and Orest Subtelny, “Mazepa, Peter I, and the Question of Treason,” Harvard Ukrainian Studies, 2:2 (June 1978), 158-183.
Charles XII and his Polish protégé (king Stanislaw Leszczynski), Mazepa stunned the tsar and his court by switching sides, just a few months before the fateful battle of Poltava. No one at the court of Peter Alekseevich expected that kind of behavior from the faithful septuagenarian, who had successfully managed to serve both the interests of the Russian crown and those of the Ukrainian socio-military elite ever since his election as Cossack hetman in 1687. This shock was compounded by the fact that the hetman’s defection came at a crucial point in the war between Russia and Sweden, on the eve of what promised to be the final show-down between the armies of Peter and Charles. Mazepa’s “betrayal” caused a terrible panic among the Russian leadership, which now had to face the full force of the Swedish invasion without any allies.

News of Mazepa’s defection spread very quickly and for months it appeared that this major diplomatic embarrassment would have catastrophic strategic and political consequences, not only for Russia’s war effort, but also for the Russian court’s whole program of Orthodox imperial reform. Mazepa had seriously challenged the tsar’s authority in the Ukraine and had gone unpunished. Worse still (at least from the

---

66 Stanislaw Leszczynski was installed on the Polish throne by the Swedes after the forced abdication of Peter’s ally, the elector of Saxony, August II “The Strong,” in 1705. See N. N. Molchanov, Diplomatia Petra Pervego (M., 1986), 188, 195.

67 For example, in one of the first letters written after Peter learned of Mazepa’s defection, the Russian tsar confided to his friend and close political advisor, Admiral-General F. M. Apraksin, that he greeted this news with “great surprise,” especially since the hetman had “turned traitor and betrayer of his people [...] after nearly twenty-one years of loyalty to me and with one foot already in the grave.” See Peter to F. M. Apraksin (30 October 1708), PiB, 8 (1): 253. Peter repeated this confessionally-tinged accusation in another letter, this one to metropolitan Stefan (Iavorskii), an old acquaintance of the Ukrainian hetman and now the temporary office-holder of the vacant throne of the Russian patriarch. On 31 October 1708, metropolitan Stefan was ordered “publicly to issue, in the [Moscow Assumption] Cathedral church, an anathema against [...] this second Judas.” See PiB, 8 (1): 261; and Opisanie
Russian point of view), he continued to argue his case in numerous proclamations and manifestoes, which were disseminated throughout the Ukraine after October 1708. Clearly, the Muscovite tsar could not let Mazepa and his claims go unanswered. In November 1708, the tsar's diplomatic corps mounted an intense campaign to counter the literature produced in the camp of Mazepa and Charles XII. The conclusions which the Cossack elite and the urban inhabitants of the Ukraine were to draw from these broadsheets were dramatized during two remarkable ceremonies, in which the fugitive Cossack hetman and erstwhile cavalier of the Order of St. Andrew figured prominently.

On 6 November 1709, A. D. Menshikov (1673-1729), the commander of the Russian forces responsible for the punitive expedition against Baturyn, the Ukrainian hetman’s capital, and G. I. Golovkin (1660-1734), the vice-president of the Foreign Affairs chancellery, hastily gathered the remaining loyal members of the Cossack elite in the town of Glukhov (Ukr. Hlukhiv). In the midst of the proceedings to elect a new

---

68 This “propaganda war” was treated by B. Kentrschynskij, “Propagandakriget i Ukraina, 1708-1709,” Karolinska Förbundets Årskok (Stockholm, 1958), 81-124; cf. the English-language summary in the Ukrainian Quarterly 15 (1959), 241-259; and Subtelny, op. cit., 172 n. 31.

69 For a biography of Peter’s royal favorite, see N. I. Pavlenko, Poluderzhavnyi vlastelin: Istoricheskaiia khronika o zhizni spodvizhnika Petra Pervogo A. D. Menshikova (M., 1991). On his role in Peter’s “company,” see Hughes, op. cit., 432-441, 595; and supra. Introduction.

70 For a brief biography of G. I. Golovkin, who also happened to be related to the tsar and the Naryshkins, see D. O. Serov, Stroiteli imperii: Ocherki gosudarstvennoi i kriminal’noi deiatel’nosti spodvizhnikov Petra I (N., 1996), 33-34, 51 n. 33, 227; and Hughes, op. cit., 420-421, 591. On the genealogy and service career of his clan, see N. P. Likhachev, “Rodoproiskhizhdenie dvorian Golovkinykh,” Izvestia Russkogo Genealogicheskogo obshchestva 2 (1903), 103-139; and I. Lu. Airapetian, “Feodal’naia aristokratiiia v period stanovleniia absoliutizma v Rossii” (Diss. kand. ist. nauk, M. V. Lomonosov State University, 1987), 71-72, 330.
hetman, the Russian military authorities built a large platform and a gallows in the center of town. Accompanied by the sound of rolling drums, a life-size effigy of the treasonous Ukrainian hetman, adorned with the cavalier's medal and the blue sash of the Order of St. Andrew, was brought out into the public square. Menshikov and Golovkin waited while the dummy was carried up the steps of the central platform. When the effigy of Mazepa was brought before them, these two cavaliers of the Order of St. Andrew proceeded to tear up the official certificate that attested to Mazepa's membership in the tsar's knightly Order; immediately afterwards, the effigy was stripped of its chivalrous insignia. Then, after a public reading of the charges against the ex-hetman, the naked dummy was tossed into the hands of the executioner. The dummy was bound with ropes and dragged through the streets, unto the gallows set up for the occasion. The executioner tore up the Mazepa family seal, broke the sword that still hung at the dummy's side, and finally, without further ado, hung it from the gallows.\textsuperscript{71}

A few days later, on 12 November 1709, in an act timed to coincide with the installation of Ivan Skoropads'kyi, the new Cossack hetman, the Russian tsar and his entourage personally witnessed the official ceremony during which the metropolitan of Kiev thrice anathematized the name of Mazepa. Less than a week later, in Moscow, Mazepa's anathematization in absentia was repeated by metropolitan Stefan (lavorskii).

\textsuperscript{71} For a first-hand account of Mazepa's shaming ceremony, see G. I. Golovkin to P. A. Tolstoi, \textit{Pib}, 8 (2), 910-912, esp. 910. See also \textit{Zhurnal ili Poddennaia zapiska Petra Velikogo s 1698 g. dazhe do zakliuchenia Neishkadskogo mira}, ed. by M. M. Shcherbatov (SPb., 1770), I: 180; S. M. Solov'ev, \textit{Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen} (M., 1993), 15: 240, 305; and Subtelny, \textit{op. cit.}, 172-173.
the caretaker of the vacant throne of the Russian patriarch, in front of the heir-apparent, tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich, and all the leading political figures of the Russian capital. 72 Like the defamation of Mazepa, this ceremony was undoubtedly part of the diplomatic maneuvering following Mazepa’s defection; it too was designed to portray the hetman’s actions as, first and foremost, a betrayal of the common Orthodox faith. But apparently for Peter and his entourage it was not enough to exclude Mazepa from the fold of the Russian Orthodox Church and to condemn him to eternal damnation. The humiliating ceremony in which Mazepa’s effigy was stripped of his cavalier’s sash and literally dragged through the mud emphasized the ex-hetman’s betrayal of the common interest represented by membership in the tsar’s knightly order. Peter’s charge that had Mazepa betrayed the interests of “his [own] people” 73 thus referred not only to the Ukrainian Cossack elite or to the Orthodox Slavs, but also to his fellow cavaliers of the Order of St. Andrew. 74

On 27 June 1709 Mazepa was with Charles XII during the clash in which the Swedish army, under the command of the young king himself, was routed by the Muscovite forces near the Ukrainian town of Poltava. While most of the Swedish army was captured, Charles XII, Mazepa and a small, but loyal retinue, barely managed to

72 For the text of the anathema pronounced by metropolitan Stefan, see Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii [hereafter PSZ] (SPb., 1830), 4: 431-432; cited by Cracraft, op. cit., 128.

73 Peter to F. M. Aprkasin (30 October 1708), PiB, 8 (1): 253.

74 After the Swedes were routed at Poltava, Mazepa made his way to the capital of the Crimean khan, where he was rumored to have denounced the Wallachian hospodar, Brancovan, for his secret dealings with the Russians. See Viskovatov, op. cit., 17v.-18.
escape from the field of battle. Throughout all of July 1709 the Russian tsar and his military advisors hoped to capture Charles XII and Mazepa before they managed to make their way to the court of the Ottoman sultan, and certainly before the Swedish king and the Ukrainian hetman had succeeded in persuading Ahmed III to enter into the fray on their side. In order to forestall the possibility of a two-front war, on 1 and 2 July Peter sent out two regiments of mounted cavalry, under the commands of brigadier Kropotkin and major-general Prince G. S. Volkonskoi, in pursuit of the "remnants of Poltava" (poltavskie nedobiti). Prince Volkonskoi received detailed written instructions, signed by Prince Menshikov and composed by the tsar himself, about the manner in which Charles XII and Mazepa were to be transported back to Russia in the event of their capture.\(^75\) In the meantime, Peter and G. I. Golovkin began an intensive diplomatic correspondence with the rulers of adjacent territories, encouraging them "diligently to seek out, capture, and put under guard the traitor Mazepa," and implicitly warning them against abetting the fugitives.\(^76\) It is clear that in the beginning of July, the Russian tsar and his closest advisors believed that in one way or another, the Swedish king and the Ukrainian hetman, would soon be brought to justice.

\(^75\) For Peter's instructions to Major-General Prince G. S. Volkonskoi, see I. I. Golikov, Deiatel'nosti Petra Velikogo [...] (M., 1789), 13: 29-30; and Trudy Imperatorskogo Russkogo voennootcherzheskogo obschestva (SPb., 1909), 3: 302, 304.

\(^76\) PiB, 9 (1): 242. Besides the sultan of the Ottoman Porte, Peter and Golovkin contacted the seraskir of Silistra, the pasha of Ochakov, the khan of Crimea, the hospodar of Moldavia, and the Holy Roman Emperor of the German Nation. In their desperation, they even contacted the fugitive Swedish king, Charles XII himself, as part of their plan to exchange Count Karl Gustav Pipper, the captured Swedish royal minister, for Mazepa. See PiB, 9 (2): 1013; and G. V. Zashchuk, ""Orden Iudy,"" Voprosy istorii 6: 6 (June 1971), 212-215, here 214.
The attempt to bring the "remnants of Poltava" to justice, however, necessitated more than a flurry of diplomatic activity on the part of the Russian court. Indeed, as I will now demonstrate, this man-hunt also led to the creation of the "Order of Judas" — a mock counterpart to the first Russian order of chivalry. During the course of the month-long chase across the steppe, A. Ia. Shchukin (c. 1669-1720), the Russian official in charge of the Ingermanland Chancellery,77 the department responsible (among other things) for administrating the future site of Russia’s new northern capital,78 received three letters, each more urgent than the last, about the minting of a special silver commemorative medal (Rus. moneta). The first letter, written just two weeks after the battle of Poltava, was sent by diplomatic pouch on 11 July 1709. Bearing the seal and signature of the Russian royal favorite, the head of the Ingermanland Chancellery, Prince Menshikov himself, the letter contained the following order:

Mr. President.
Upon receipt of this [dispatch] immediately make a silver medal weighing ten pounds and have engraved upon it [a picture of] Judas hanging on an aspen tree, above thirty pieces of silver lying next to a sack; on the reverse [the medal is to have] the following inscription: "The thrice-cursed [i.e. anathematized] fatal son, Judas, hanging [literally, choking] because of his lust for money." After a two-pound chain is made for that medal, have it sent to us immediately by special courier [...].79

---

77 For a brief biography of A. Ia. Shchukin, see Serov, op. cit., 26 n. 29 and 255.

78 For the institutional history of the Ingermanland Chancellery, which was based originally in Moscow, on the royal estate of Semenovsk, see N. B. Golikova and L. G. Kisliagina, "Sistema gosudarstvennogo upravleniia," in Ocherki russkoi kul’tury XVIII veka, ed. by A. D. Gorskii et. al. (M., 1987), 2: 50-51; E. V. Anisimov, Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka (SPb., 1997), 48, 90-91; and Serov, op. cit., 123 n. 16.

79 This decree was found in a late-18th-century manuscript, which was originally published in Trudy Riazanskoii Uchenoi Arkhivnoi Komissii 1 (1894), 69; the text of the decree was re-published by
Menshikov repeated his injunction to hurry in two other missives to Shchukin. The last letter, dated 9 August 1709, was written just a week after the retinue of Charles XII had managed to cross into the Crimea and thereby to evade capture. However, although the sultan refused to hand the Swedish king over to their mutual enemy, diplomats like Count P. A. Tolstoi (1653-1729), the Russian ambassador at the court of Ahmed III, continued to hold out the hope that, as the subject of the tsar, the Ukrainian hetman would be extradited to answer the charge of treason. Clearly, Peter and his royal favorite believed, even at this late date, that they could still get their hands on the fugitive Cossack hetman. And the heavy silver chain and medallion of Judas commissioned by Menshikov seemed to have figured prominently in their plans to avenge Mazepa’s treachery.

According to the instructions later appended to the original decree, upon receipt of Menshikov’s commission, the staff of the Moscow-based Ingermanland

---


80 On Count P. A. Tolstoi, see infra, Chapter Five.

81 Tolstoi was particularly worried that in his hopeless position the ex-hetman would be cornered into “becoming a Mahomeddan” [obasuranitsia], that is, abandoning his Orthodox faith, converting to Islam, and joining the service of the Ottoman sultan; in which case, the Turks would never, under any pretext, “give up anyone who espoused their Law.” See Tolstoy’s unpublished letters to Golovkin, RGADA, f. 89, d. 1, fols. 450, 454-455, cited by N. I. Pavlenko, Petr Velikii (M., 1990), 320.

82 See the instructions appended to the 18th-century copy of Menshikov’s decree, published in Trudy Riazanskoi Uchenoi Arkhivnoi Komissii (1894), 69 and reproduced by Platonov, op. cit., 194.
chancellery contacted a silversmith named Matvei Alekseev,\textsuperscript{83} who was charged with transforming the twelve-and-a-half pounds of silver coin counted out by Semen Bazhenov (the clerk in charge of keeping the chancellery expense books) into the medal described in the letter of the royal favorite.\textsuperscript{84} However, it appears that in the eleven days between the time that the Judas medal was first commissioned by the royal favorite and the time that Menshikov's letter was rewritten in the form of a royal decree,\textsuperscript{85} the reference to the "Thrice-Cursed Fatal Son" was replaced by a quote from the gospel of Matthew (Mat. 27:9). In the later version of the medal commissioned by the Russian royal favorite, the original emphasis on the person of Mazepa, the "Thrice-Cursed Fatal Son, Judas," was therefore replaced with an inscription that emphasizes the geopolitical results of his betrayal.

\textsuperscript{83} It is unclear whether this silversmith was related to Fedor Alekseev, the master of the Admiralty Mint and the Russian medalist responsible for producing the first commemorative campaign medal of the Northern War. On Fedor Alekseev, see E. S. Shchukina, \textit{Medal'erne iskusstvo v Rossii XVIII veka} (L., 1962), 13ff.

\textsuperscript{84} The recent discovery of a crude sketch offers an idea of what this heavy silver commemorative medal may have looked like. I say "may have" because, although we know that the Judas medal was minted in 1709 (see Platonov, \textit{op. cit.}, 195), the actual silver medallion has never been located and is presumed to be lost. However, a previously unpublished document from the Sreznevskii collection (of the Library of the Academy of Sciences), was accompanied by a crude drawing of the medal, which may or may not have been sketched by Sreznevskii himself. In any case, the illustration portrays Judas Iscariot, hanging on a tree, above a sack-full of Polish coins (Pol. \textit{złoty}), scattered on the ground below his feet. See RO BAN, \textit{Sbornaia rukopis' 24.5.38}, fol. 75v. For a description of the manuscripts from the personal collection of I. I. Sreznevskii, see \textit{Opisanie rukopisnogo otdela Biblioteki AN SSSR}, ed. by A. P. Konosov and V. F. Pokrovskaya (M.-L., 1951), 4: 263.

\textsuperscript{85} I. I. Sreznevskii and S. F. Platonov discovered two different versions of the decree which ordered this medal to be made, one dated 11 July 1709, and the other one, dated eleven days later (22 July 1709). Cf. Platonov, \textit{op. cit.}, 194 and RO BAN, \textit{Sbornaia rukopis' 24.5.38}, fol. 75v. Note that although the illustration from the Sreznevskii collection seems to be a relatively faithful realization of the original commission, the inscription does not match the one specified in Menshikov's letter.
The biblical proof-text – “And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of the one on whom a price had been set, on whom some of the people of Israel had set a price […]” – comes from Matthew’s description of what the chief priests decided to do with the “blood money” inherited after Judas’ death. So as not to sully the temple coffers with ill-gotten gains, the elders decided to use the thirty pieces of silver, which Judas received for betraying Christ, in order to buy “Potter’s Field” – a profane place on the outskirts of the Holy City – as a place to bury foreigners. Adapting this biblical story to contemporary events, the new inscription offered a warning to all of Russia’s enemies,\(^{86}\) that if they dare to engage in battle against the army of Russia’s divinely-anointed monarch, then they too shall inherit “Potter’s Field.” In this reading, the Judas medal was intended to offer a prediction: just as Poltava had become a place for burying the Swedes, so any future engagement would end in the defeat of Russia’s enemies. Judging by the actions Menshikov, whose forces had recently razed the capital of the Ukrainian hetman, and who was now ordered to invade the territories of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in order to drive Leszczynski from the Polish throne, this was no idle threat.\(^{87}\)

The new inscription on the Judas medal also played up the parallel between Christ, “the one on whom a price had been set,” and the divinely-anointed founder of

\(^{86}\) If the sack of złoty (in the drawing from the Sreznevskii collection) is any indication, the warning was particularly aimed at those factions in Poland, whose “blood money” had supposedly bought Mazepa’s betrayal.

\(^{87}\) On 15 July 1709, just four days after Menshikov first wrote to Shchukin about the silver medal of Judas, the cavalry divisions of the royal favorite embarked upon a new campaign against the remnants of the combined Swedish-Polish forces. See Pavlenko, Poluderszhavnyi vlastelin, op. cit., 153; and idem, Petr Velikii, op. cit., 322-323.
the Order of St. Andrew, a parallel which was fundamental to the chivalrous-religious
organization of the Transfigured Kingdom. Like Jesus, Peter Alekseevich had been
betrayed by one of his own “chosen people,” a disciple who belonged to the “royal
priesthood” of believers in his divine gift of grace (Gr. charisma). As a result of this
fundamental breach of faith, the traitor had become like one of those “people of Israel
[who] had set a price” on their “anointed one” (Gr. christos). Indeed, by betraying the
chivalrous brotherhood committed to the cause of the Russian Orthodox tsar, Mazepa
had also betrayed St. Andrew, and by metaphorical extension, Christ himself. In
retaliation, the Russian royal favorite and the rest of the tsar’s disciples, some of whom
(like Chancellor Golovkin himself)89 also served as the “high priests” of the mock
ecclesiastical council and its chivalrous counterpart, the Order of St. Andrew, had
enrolled the traitor into a diabolical counter-order, representing the enemies of Christ –
an “Order of Judas.”

Judging by the external and internal evidence contained in the original
commission, it is not too far-fetched to suggest, therefore, that the heavy silver medal
and chain were intended as a humiliating replacement for the cross and sash of the
Order of St. Andrew, of which Mazepa was stripped, if only in absentia. In this light,
the Judas medal would have served as a mock decoration for Mazepa, in his new role
as the “Cavalier of the Order of Judas.” Indeed, to the extent that the silver medal of
Judas was intended as commemoration and commentary on an important aspect of the
Russian military victory – Mazepa’s betrayal – it served as a satirical counterpart to the
campaign decorations for the battle of Poltava. In an ironic extension of the practice of awarding all the participants of a successful military campaign, the tsar and his advisors thus made sure that even the traitorous cavalier of the Order of St. Andrew was to be recognized for his providential "contribution," not only to the victory at Poltava, but also to the apotheosis of Russia's "anointed one."

The Cavalier of the Order of Judas

If the primary purpose of the Judas medal was punitive, then the tsar and his advisors failed to reach their objective. Indeed, despite all of their efforts, Mazepa escaped from Russian grasp – permanently. Having contracted some kind of illness during his flight across the border, the old Cossack hetman died, just a few months after finding asylum in the Crimea. With him went all hope of stripping the real Poltava traitor, and not just his dummy, of the insignia of the Order of St. Andrew, and of hanging the twelve pound silver medal and chain of the "Order of Judas" around his

---

88 For Golovkin's role in Peter's mock ecclesiastical council, see infra, Appendix.

89 On the Muscovite practice of awarding campaign medals, see see Durov, op. cit., 63-64; and Shchukina, op. cit., 11-12. Like the mints of Russia's political rivals, during the reign of Peter the Great Moscow's two mechanized mints regularly issued commemorative medals which asserted the government's views on the campaigns of the Northern War, at once extolling Russian victories and mocking the enemy. See Medali i monety Petrovskogo vremeni // Medals and Coins in the Age of Peter the Great, ed. by I. G. Spasskii and E. S. Shchukina (L., 1974), 12.

90 The silver commemorative campaign medals awarded to non-commissioned officers and the rank-and-file soldiers for the battle of Poltava are reproduced in Spasskii and Shchukina, eds., op. cit., Plates 32 and 33: the main difference between them is the weight of the silver and the battle scene on the reverse of the medal: officers' medals depicted mounted cavalry, while soldiers' medals emphasized the role of infantry. On the blue ribbon worn with these decorations as a self-conscious echo of the blue sash of the Order of St. Andrew, see Durov, op. cit., 65.
neck. However, the mock order did not die with the Ukrainian hetman. Indeed, the fate of the Judas medal after the death of Mazepa only confirms the enduring connection between the idea of a knightly order, the tsar’s geopolitical ambitions, and the exercise of charismatic authority at the court of Peter Alekseevich. Far from losing its entire raison d’être, the imaginary mock order represented by the silver medallion became, if only for a very short time, as much a part of the discourse employed at the early eighteenth-century Russian court as the annual commemoration of the victory at Poltava.

As early as the winter of 1709, just a few months after it was commissioned, the medal originally intended for Mazepa appeared in an impromptu skit staged by the tsar in front of Joost Jules, the newly-appointed Danish extraordinary envoy to the court of Muscovy, who was sent to negotiate a new alliance between Denmark and Russia. During his first meeting with the Russian tsar, which took place in the recently re-conquered city of Narva, Jules saw the Judas medal around the neck of a “Prince Jacobskoy,” one of the titled “court jesters” whom the tsar kept in his personal retinue and whom he jokingly referred to as “patriarchs.” In his diary, the Danish diplomat recorded a story, which he claims to have heard from the tsar himself, about the origins of this mock chivalric order:

---

91 Joost Juel, *En Rejse til Rusland under Tsar Peter*, ed. by G. L. Grove (Copenhagen, 1893); translated into Russian and edited by Yu. N. Shcherbachev, “Zapiski lusta Iulia, datskogo poslannika pri Petre Velikom (1709-1711),” *Cheiki Moskovskogo Obshchestva Istorii i Drevnostei Rossiskikh* [hereafter: Juel], 189:2 (1899), here, 91, 93. Besides “Prince Jakobskoy,” Juel mentioned “old man [N. M.] Zotov,” who had once served as the tsar’s tutor and was now known as “patriarch, even though in reality he is not at all an ecclesiastic.” See Juel, *op. cit.*, 82.
The tsar told me that this jester is one of the wisest men in Russia, but despite that fact, he is seized with a spirit of rebellion. Once, when the tsar began a conversation with him about how the traitor, Judas, betrayed the Savior for thirty pieces of silver, Jacobskoy objected that the price was too low and that Judas should have asked for more. Then, in order to poke fun at Jacobskoy, as well as to punish him -- for it seemed from his words that had the Savior been alive today, he would not have been averse to betraying Him either, only for a bigger price -- the tsar immediately commanded that the above-mentioned Order of Judas be made, with a depiction of the latter preparing to hang himself.\(^{92}\)

As will immediately become apparent to anyone familiar with the actual circumstances surrounding the origins of the Judas medal, the anecdote recorded by the Danish envoy was more of an allegorical commentary about Mazepa’s treachery than an explanation of how this particular royal jester wound up wearing the commemorative silver medallion.

The jester’s joke, as retold by the tsar himself, at an informal diplomatic meeting at which the battle of Poltava was the main topic of conversation,\(^{94}\) had a contemporary political resonance. The anecdote re-called the deeds of the former cavalier of the Order of St. Andrew, whose betrayal had almost resulted in the death of Russia’s “savior” and the loss of his crown. By hinting at the exorbitant price which he had nearly paid for his misplaced trust, the tsar made an implicit comparison between

\(^{92}\) According to Juel, Peter spoke conversational Dutch “so clearly (na stol’ko otchetlivо)” that the Danish diplomat and the Russian tsar were able to understand each other “without an official interpreter (tolnach)” from the Muscovite Chancellery for Foreign Affairs. See Juel, op. cit., 91.

\(^{93}\) Juel, op. cit., 92-93.

\(^{94}\) Besides the battle of Poltava, during the course of their first meeting on 30 November 1709, the tsar regaled the Danish diplomat with stories about the conditions of his current allies, the kings of Poland and Prussia, and the contents of a letter from king Frederick IV of Denmark, congratulating Peter on the Poltava victory. Juel, op. cit., 91.
the inconstancy of the former Cossack hetman and that of Russia’s potential new ally, the Danish king. The very fact that the “Order of Judas” was first shown to the Danish ambassador in Narva, the site of the disastrous defeat which followed immediately after Denmark capitulated to Charles XII in 1700, emphasized the “treasonous” actions of Frederick IV, who had already once, at the very beginning of the Northern War, betrayed the confidence of the Russian leadership by withdrawing from the secret alliance against Sweden and leaving Russia to face the army of Charles XII all by itself. By their insistence that the first meeting between the Danish diplomat and the Russian tsar should take place at Narva, after the tsar had returned from reaping the diplomatic fruit of the victory of Poltava, the tsar and his advisors meant to instill the belief that the Muscovites had overcome their initial problems, and were capable of handling Sweden by themselves. If the Danes wanted to join in the dismemberment of the Swedish Empire, they had to act on the terms set by the Russian tsar and his diplomatic corps, or else remain on the sidelines, in the camp of the enemy and of the traitors.

What Juel actually recorded in his diary was, therefore, a subtle dig at the honor of his king, orchestrated, at the expense of the Danish diplomat, by the Russian tsar and his court jester. However, whether the Danish envoy misunderstood the political significance of the tsar’s practical joke, or simply decided not to record its real import in his diplomatic diary, it seems clear that he was not the primary intended audience for this impromptu little skit about faith, honor, and betrayal. In fact, if we analyze who “Prince Jacobskoy” was and why the tsar chose this particular Russian courtier to succeed Mazepa as the first “Cavalier of the Order of Judas,” we will see that the full significance of this skit could only be understood by Muscovite insiders. Those
courtiers who were able to re-call the history of the complicated relationship between the Russian royal family and the Shakhovskoi princely clan and who understood the role of jesters at the early modern Muscovite court would surely have grasped that the "spirit of rebellion" which had supposedly characterized the new "Cavalier of the Order of Judas" referred as much to events in his family's past as to the treachery of the former Cossack hetman or to the inconstancy of the Danish king.

The Shakhovskoi clan was a titled, princely family from Smolensk - which, for most of the seventeenth century, was a disputed border region between Orthodox Russia and the Catholic Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Consonant with the Smolensk nobility's reputation for political and confessional non-conformity, the Shakhovskoi clan had a family history of rebellion against the House of Romanov. One incident, in particular, seems to have left a lasting impression in the collective memory of the Muscovite political elite: In the summer of 1620, several members of the Shakhovskoi family staged a parody of the "election" of Mikhail Fedorovich, the first Romanov tsar.⑤ During a private gathering at the Moscow residence of a family acquaintance, Prince Matvei Fedorovich Shakhovskoi, the great-uncle of the future "cavalier of the Order of Judas," was named "tsar" and invested with royal authority in what Muscovite officials later described as an "intricate and rebellious manner" (zateinym vorovskim obychaem);⑥ meanwhile, his brothers and cousins, styled

themselves as "boiars," or top-ranking members of the mock tsar's royal council (Boiar duma). 97

This political burlesque, which re-called the installation of Mikhail Fedorovich by the 1613 "Council of all the Land" (zenskii sobor), underlined the fact that the lowly Romanovs were not God-ordained, but men-made rulers, and hence could be replaced, especially by a titled family like the Shakhovskois. This was no idle threat, since another Prince Shakhovskoi, Grigori Petrovich, was actively involved in organizing the Bolotnikov uprising during the "Time of Troubles" immediately preceding the installation of the Romanov dynasty on the Russian throne. 98 After an official investigation, one of the first of its kind, into the Shakhovskoi princes' "words and deeds against the sovereign" (slovo i delo gosudarevo), the mock tsar and his company were found guilty of treason and demonstratively condemned to death by the royal council of Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov; however, at the request of patriarch Filaret (F. N. lur'ev-Romanov), Mikhail's father and chief political advisor, the Shakhovskois' death sentence was commuted to exile and imprisonment in the towns of

---

97 Princes Matvei, Ivan and Andrei, "the sons of Prince Fedor," are explicitly mentioned as having been exiled for this skit, RIB, 9: 529. Prince Iurii's grandfather, Ivan Fedorovich the Yonger [men'shoi], was probably too young to have taken part in this ceremony; however, the rest of his brothers (including another Ivan Fedorovich, the Elder [bol'shoi], as well as the "mock-tsar," Matvei Fedorovich) and his cousins (Prince Ivan Ivanovich, a Prince Afanasii), i.e. Prince Iurii's great-uncles and cousins-twice-removed, seem to have been the organizers of this political parody. For a genealogy of the first branch of the eldest line of the Shakhovskoi clan, see A. A. Dolgorukov, Rassiiskata rodoslavnata kniga (SPb., 1854), I: 168-169; and P. N. Petrov, "Kniaz'ia Shakhovskie," Istoriia rodov russkogo dvorianstva (SPb. 1886), 1: 73ff.

98 See the brief biography of Grigori Petrovich Shakhovskoi by E. Likhach, "Shakhovskie," Russkii biograficheskii slovar' (SPb., 1905), 571. 578-579.
the Lower Volga (*ponizovye goroda*) and Siberia. The Shakhovskois were finally allowed to return into Muscovite court society fourteen years later, and then only after Prince Matvei Shakhovskoi and his mock royal council solemnly promised to "pay off their great faults with [loyal] service" to the real tsar, the God-ordained representative of the Romanov dynasty.

His family was still working its way back into prominence by means of faithful service to the Romanov dynasty when Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi (c. 1671-1713) received the Judas medal from tsar Mikhail's grandson, Peter Alekseevich. With this "promotion" to the imaginary "Order of Judas," Prince Shakhovskoi acquired more than yet another in a long series of mock titles by which he was jokingly referred to at the court of Peter Alekseevich. Indeed, if we now turn to Shakhovskoi's service career, we will see that despite the opinions of hostile, contemporary witnesses, he was much more than a "court jester." The prince spent his entire political career at the Muscovite court, where he was an intimate member of the tsar's entourage. He began

---

99 Other members of the Shakhovskoi clan, even those who were nowhere near the vicinity of Moscow, also fell into disfavor. Among these was perhaps the most famous representative of the Shakhovskoi clan in the seventeenth century, Prince Semen Ivanovich, known as "the Masquer" (*kharta*, lit. a mummer's mask) for his difficult personality and flamboyant literary style. Although this member of the impoverished third branch of Smolensk princes was in Tula at the time of the affair of 1620, he was thrown into the dock and exiled along with the rest of his Moscow relatives. For a biography of Prince Semen Ivanovich, see S. F. Platonov, *Drevnerusskie skazaniia i povesti o Snuutnom vremeni XVII veka kak istoricheskii istochnik* (SPb., 1888), 231-240. Prince Semen's connection to the affair of 1620 was pointed out by Edward L. Keenan, *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocalypse: The Seventeenth-Century Genesis of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Prince A. M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV* (Cambridge, 1971), 34. On his literary activities, see the commentary to S. I. Shakhovskoi's "Letopisnaia kniga," by E. I. Dergacheva-Skop, in *Pamiatniki literaturny drevnej Rusi: Konets XVI-nachalo XVII vv.*, ed. by D. S. Likhachev, *et. al.* (M., 1987), 9: 588-590; and E. P. Semenova, "Russkaia obshchestvennaia mys' pervoi poloviny XVII veka* (*Tvorchestvo S. I. Shakhovskogo i I. A. Khvorostinina*), Zhdanov State University, Avtoreferat diss. kand. ist. nauk, (L., 1982).

100 *RIB*, 9: 551.
his career as an ordinary, rank-and-file courtier (riadovoi stol'nik) in the retinues of various members of the Muscovite royal family. In 1687, Prince Iurii and his younger brother, Prince Afanasii Fedorovich, were transferred from the entourage of tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna (née Saltykova, the wife of tsar Ivan Alekseevich), to that of the tsars Ivan and Peter Alekseevichi themselves.\footnote{Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 432. M. G. Spiridov, \textit{Sokrashchennoe opisanie sluzheb blagorodnykh Rossiiskikh dvorian [...] Sobrannoe iz stateinykh, razriadnykh, stepennykh, letopisnykh, sluzhebnykh i nekotorykh drugikh rodoslavnykh knig} (M., 1810), I: 252. If his brief stint at the court of tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna (1686) was Prince Iurii's first service appointment, then he must have been born around 1671. This would make him about the same age as tsar Peter Alekseevich.}

In 1696, following the successful second campaign to capture the fortress of Azov, he was appointed to the position of privy chamberlain (komnatnyi stol'nik) at the court of tsar Peter Alekseevich.\footnote{Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 336. In 1703, Prince Iurii Fedorovich was listed as number 55 among all the privy chamberlains at the Muscovite court; his younger brother was number 159 in the list of courtiers assigned to military officers (stol'nik v nachal'nykh liudiakh). See Spiridov, \textit{op. cit.}, 252-253.}

However, even before this promotion, Prince Iurii Fedorovich was already part of the inner circle of the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich. Sometime after the formation of the mock ecclesiastical council of the Transfigured Kingdom, Prince Iurii Fedorovich adopted the title “archdeacon Gideon,” the pseudonym by which he was known among the tsar’s personal entourage, many of whose members also assumed mock ecclesiastical titles in their intimate correspondence with the tsar. In this new “ecclesiastical” capacity, Prince Shakhovskoi was the courtier responsible for drawing up the lists of participants in the tsar’s Yuletide caroling processions.\footnote{B. I. Kurakin, “Gistoriia o tsare Petre Alekseeviche,” in \textit{Petr Veliki. Vospominaniiia. Dnevnikovye zapisi. Anekdoty}, ed. L. Nikolaeva (Paris, Moscow, New York, 1993), 81. Kurakin claimed that Shakhovskoi was in a position to use his rank (chini) and power (vlast') as “archdeacon”}
may have also accompanied the tsar on his “pilgrimage” to the Pertominsk monastery in 1694. ¹⁰⁴

Judging by the admittedly fragmentary evidence from the period of the Northern War, Shakhovskoi also seems to have served as a personal liaison between the tsar and two of his closest political advisors, A. D. Menshikov and I. A. Musin-Pushkin. ¹⁰⁵ Besides heading up a department in Menshikov’s Ingermanland chancellery, ¹⁰⁶ the office responsible for minting the silver commemorative medal of Judas, Prince Shakhovskoi also acted as a personal intermediary between the tsar and Musin-Pushkin, the courtier who headed the Moscow-based Monastery Chancellery. ¹⁰⁷ In fact, Shakhovskoi seems to have spent the entire Northern War en route between the old capital and the new, and his constant travels, whether as part of the tsar’s personal retinue or as Peter’s personal emissary, may explain why so few of his own letters have come to light. Be that as it may, privy chamberlain (komnatnyi stol’nik) Shakhovskoi continued to serve in this capacity until 1710, when Peter bestowed upon him the

(arkhidiakon) to receive enormous bribes from those courtiers, merchants, chancellery officials, and people of “sundry ranks,” whom the tsar wanted to see in his annual Yuletide processions.

¹⁰⁴ Unless “His Holiness (preosviashchennyi), Gideon of Kiev and Galicia” was the pseudonym of another courtier entirely, the man who signed the collective epistle sent by the tsar to F. M. Apraksin (29 August 1694) was none other than Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi. See PiB I:25-26, 503.

¹⁰⁵ See the letters from Prince Shakhovskoi to A. D. Menshikov and I. A. Musin-Pushkin, published in Opisanie dokumentov i bumag, khraniaishchikhsia v Arkhive Ministerstva iustitsii (M., 1888), 8: 169-173.

¹⁰⁶ According to an unpublished document dated 16 August 1710 (Menshikovskii arkhiv, BAN, 13-i karton, No. 211), blizhnii boiarin Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi is listed as serving at the Ingermanland chancellery. See Platonov, op. cit., 196.

¹⁰⁷ On I. A. Musin-Pushkin, see supra, Introduction, Chapter One; and infra, Appendix.
highest (boiar) rank in the Muscovite royal council.\textsuperscript{108} Despite its prestige value, it was clear that this appointment was more an honorary promotion than an actual advance in service rank.\textsuperscript{109} In fact, this was one of the last few promotions to the Muscovite royal council, whose aging membership was undergoing a natural decline and whose political authority was being usurped by new, foreign-sounding institutions, such as the “Senate” and the Preobrazhenskoe “consilium” presided by “Prince Caesar” F. Iu. Romodanovskii.\textsuperscript{110} Shakhovskoi was appointed boiar alongside P. M. Apraksin, the older brother of the famous “General-Admiral” and himself one of the closest members of the tsar’s retinue.\textsuperscript{111} In April 1711, Shakhovskoi and Apraksin were joined by a new boiar, P. I. Buturlin, better known to Peter’s entourage as “Peter-Prick [Petrokhui], Metropolitan of St. Petersburg.”\textsuperscript{112} Like Shakhovskoi’s two subordinates in the

\textsuperscript{108} Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 319. Only one other privy chamberlain (komnatnyi stol’nik) was ever promoted directly to Peter’s Boiar Duma. That man was the powerful intimate Prince Ia. F. Dolgorukii, the future head of the Russian imperial government, who received the rank of boiar in July 1697. See Airapetian, \textit{ibid.}, 77, 96, 317. On Prince Ia. F. Dolgorukii, see \textit{infra}, Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{109} Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 110.

\textsuperscript{110} On Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii, see \textit{supra}, Chapter Two; and \textit{infra}, Chapters Four, Five, and Appendix.

\textsuperscript{111} On the joint promotion of Shakhovskoi and P. M. Apraksin, see Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 110, 316, 319. On P. M. Apraksin, see \textit{supra}, Chapter One.

\textsuperscript{112} Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 98, 110, 316. On P. I. Buturlin, see \textit{infra}, Chapters Four and Five; Appendix. In 1712, some of their relatives were also given positions in the obsolescent royal council: P. M. Apraksin’s younger brother, the famous “General-Admiral” of the Russian imperial navy, was made a boiar; while Prince Shakhovskoi’s cousin (Prince M. F. Shakhovskoi), and Buturlin’s cousin (P. V. Buturlin), received the second most important (okol’nichii) rank. See Airapetian, \textit{op. cit.}, 110, who apparently confuses Prince M. F. Shakhovskoi, the elder brother of Prince Iuri’s namesake, the ordinary rank-and-file courtier from the third branch of the eldest line of laroslavl’ princes, for Prince Iuri Fedorovich’s “brother.” On the genealogy of the Shakhovskoi clan, see \textit{supra}.
Ingermanland Chancellery,\textsuperscript{113} his new fellow counselors were either related to, or themselves actually members of the tsar's inner circle, on the most intimate terms with the tsar himself. In sum, all of them held important ranks in the mock ecclesiastical council of the Transfigured Kingdom, the festive gathering of the royal retinue.

Prince B. I. Kurakin, a contemporary eyewitness who penned a scathing portrait of the "mediocrities" who composed the royal entourage of tsar Peter Alekseevich at the end of the seventeenth-century,\textsuperscript{114} characterized Prince Shakhovskoi as the ultimate political creature, a man who was totally dependent on the good graces of, and willing to do anything for his royal patron. According to Kurakin, Prince Shakhovskoi was "a high-born court fool," (pridvornyi durak [...] iz znamykh person),\textsuperscript{115} who allegedly earned his daily bread by spying on, denouncing, and humiliating the respectable members of the Muscovite elite during court festivities. Unlike some other jesters in Peter's royal retinue, however, Prince Shakhovskoi was not weak-minded. In fact, according to Kurakin, Prince Shakhovskoi possessed "not a small intellect" and was "an [avid] reader of books" (byl uma nemalogo, i chitatel' knig). Coming from a cosmopolitan polyglot like Prince Kurakin, this was indeed high, if back-handed, praise.

\textsuperscript{113} According to an unpublished document dated 16 August 1710 (Menshikovskii arkhiv, BAN, 13-i karton, No. 211), blizhnii boiarin Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi was assisted (imel v tovarishchakh) by okol' nichii Prince Iu. F. Scherbatov and durnyi dvorianin P. V. Buturlin. See Platonov, op. cit., 196.


\textsuperscript{115} Kurakin, op. cit., 80.
Nevertheless, Kurakin immediately went on to qualify this already ambivalent characterization by describing Shakhovskoi as one of the “most drunken and malicious vessels” (samyi zloi sosud i p’ianyi)\textsuperscript{116} in the tsar’s entourage, a man “who acted villainously towards everyone, from the lowest person [at court] to the highest” (vsem zlodeistvo delal, s pervogo do poslednego).\textsuperscript{117} As the unofficial eyes and ears of the tsar, Shakhovskoi was the “channel” through which Peter was able “to know everything.” In fact, Kurakin dubbed him “Prince-Sticking Plaster” (Rus. lepen’-prilipalo),\textsuperscript{118} presumably because Shakhovskoi would spy on important government officials, bring up their misdeeds during dinner, and reproach them in front of the tsar in the same way as a sticking-plaster draws out all the filth in a boil unto the surface of the skin.\textsuperscript{119} By this disgusting metaphor, Kurakin alluded to Shakhovskoi’s idiosyncratic role in implementing the anti-corruption thrust of Petrine legislation. Like the fiskaly, the institution created by Peter to check up on government officials,

\textsuperscript{116} Kurakin’s use of the word “vessel” (sosud) to describe Prince Shakhovskoi may have been intended to evoke the biblical image of the “clay vessel” (in Church-Slavonic, sosud skudel’nyi), the symbol of mortality and decay. See I. I. Sreznevskii, Materialy dlja slovaria drevne-russkago iazyka (SPb., 1895), 3: 396-397; and Charles E. Gribble, A Short Dictionary of 18-Century Russian (Columbus, 1987), 84. Like the reference to “Potter’s Field” (Sel’ Skudel’nichi) on the only existing sketch of the commemorative medal of Judas, Prince Kurakin’s evocation of the “clay vessel” (sosud skudel’nyi) invoked the story of Judas’ suicide (Mat. 27) in order to make a direct connection between betrayal and an ignominious death. Indeed, Kurakin’s invocation of the image of the clay vessel in his description of the royal jester at the end of the seventeenth-century may have been an attempt to read back Prince Shakhovskoi’s eventual role as the “cavalier of the Order of Judas” into the 1690s.

\textsuperscript{117} Kurakin, op. cit., 80-81.

\textsuperscript{118} Kurakin, op. cit., 81.

\textsuperscript{119} Lepen’-prilipalo literally means “sticky-leaf” or “sticking plaster.” See SRfla XI-XVII vv. (M., 1994), 19: 198-199: (prilep, pripleplenie, prilipati); ibid., 8: 207-208: (lep*, lepiti, lepkii); and Sreznevskii, op. cit., 2: 18 (lepen’), 1422-1423 (prilipati).
Shakhovskoi, in his unofficial capacity as the tsar’s spy, made sure that courtiers were really loyal, doing their business, not embezzling, slacking off, or worse, plotting behind the tsar’s back.  

Knowing his family’s history, as well as his work in the capacity of the tsar’s personal “independent counsel,” I would argue that Prince Shakhovskoi was given the “Order of Judas” in order to expiate his family’s sins against the Romanovs. By serving to ferret out traitors, Judases against the Lord’s anointed, Shakhovskoi not only made up for his family’s checkered past, but also made sure that other courtiers would never take the tsar’s name in vain. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that in 1711, two years after he received the Judas medal, Peter appointed Prince Shakhovskoi to the newly-created post of “General Gevaldiger,” or head of the military police. As the Chief Hangman of the Russian expeditionary army during the famous Prut campaign against the Ottoman Empire, this “Cavalier of the Order of Judas” – who wore a medal showing Judas hanging on a tree – was put in charge of the division

---

120 Later legislation eventually replaced these sporadic raids by the tsar’s trusted courtiers with the institution of government inspectors (fiskaly) and the office of the Procurator-General (general-prokurator), the formal guardians of probity in administrative matters. Unlike the earlier unofficial investigators, the Procurator-General was officially referred to as the “sovereign’s eye” (oko gosudarevo). On the Procuracy and the State Fiscals, see Zakonodatel’stvo Petra I, ed. by A. A. Preobrazhenskii and T. E. Novitskaia (M., 1997), 131-135, esp. 133-135.

121 On 2 June 1711, the “high-born Prince, Privy Counselor and General-Gevaldiger” Shakhovskoi received a copy of the seven “articles” (stat’i) according to which he was to exercise his new function. On 29 June 1711, the day of the tsar’s thirty-ninth birthday, all the regiments of the army of General-Fieldmarshal B. P. Sheremet’ev were informed of Prince Shakhovskoi’s new commission. The very next day, 30 June 1711, this commission was confirmed by a royal decree, which was sent to all the field commanders of the Russian army. A copy of this royal decree, dated 30 June 1711, can be found among the papers of the personal chancellery of General A. A. Veide, a German officer who headed an army division under the General-Fieldmarshal. See SPb. F IRI RAN, f. 83, op. 3, ed. khr. 3: “Chernovye zhurnaly relatsii i pisem kasaisuchchhia kak do voennykh deistv, tak i do ministerskikh negotsiatsii, 1711-go g. – Zhurnal iskhodiashchikh dokumentov [iz kantseliarii generala] A. A. Veide,” fols. 3-3v, 5-5v.
responsible for executing deserters by hanging them on the gallows, in front of the troops, to teach future deserters a lesson.\textsuperscript{122} Obviously, this was no longer merely playful parody. Shakhovskoi's new, responsible position was deadly serious. And this, in turn, suggests that the role played by jesters at Peter's court should be re-defined. Indeed, the example of Prince Shakhovskoi, the "Cavalier of the Order of Judas," demonstrates that "jesters" were used as more than just a typical royal amusement (potekha). Or rather, these so-called amusements were, in fact, part of the very spectacle of power – a way of demonstrating and enacting the charismatic authority of tsar Peter Alekseevich.

Prince Shakhovskoi played out the last years of his political career as a living representative of the "Order of Judas," an institution which existed only symbolically, in the discourse employed at the court of Peter Alekseevich, as a parodic counterpart to the Order of St. Andrew. As the courtier actually entrusted with the task of locating and executing traitors to the Russian cause, this mock "Cavalier" enforced obedience to the ideals of faith and fidelity, associated with the tsar's knightly order. Even on the day of

\textsuperscript{122} Prince Shakhovskoi was responsible for all the military policemen (Rus. profosy) and executioners in every division of every regiment of the Russian army, as well as the instruments of their trade, such as the gallows, shackles, and armed mounted escorts. However, his most important duties consisted in judging, sentencing and, if necessary, organizing the execution of traitors, deserters, and anyone who caused disorder in the ranks during this important military campaign. In particular, Shakhovskoi was charged with carrying out investigations into breaches of discipline during the planned military marches through the Balkans and with the responsibility for "hanging, without any show of mercy" (veshat' bez vstakogo mifilofepejdiia), anyone who "willfully" (dobrovol'no) deserted from the Russian ranks in the face of the enemy. This phrase, referring to the death sentence, recurs several times in the "Articles to the General-Gevaldiger." In particular, see Article 3, in SPb F IRI RAN, f. 83. op. 3. ed. khr. 3, fol. 5v. On the duties of the "General Gevaldiger (or Rumor Meister)," as specified in Chapter 41 of the Military Statute (Ustav voinskii) of 1716, see Preobrazhenskii and Novitskaia, eds., op. cit., 155-231, here 185-186. On the position of the "General-Gevaldiger," and the Petrine military police in general, in keeping order within the ranks, see John L. H. Keep, \textit{Soldiers of the Tsar: Army and Society in Russia, 1462-1874} (Oxford, 1988), 108.
his funeral, this “royal jester” was charged with performing the leading role, if only for one last time, in a ceremony which affirmed the chivalrous fellowship of believers in the tsar’s charisma. The “Cavalier of the Order of Judas” was buried in St. Petersburg, on 30 December 1713, with all the pomp and circumstance worthy of his rank in the mock ecclesiastical council of the Transfigured Kingdom. The coffin of “Archdeacon Gideon” was escorted by the “entire [mock] Holy Council (osviašchennyi sobor),” which reconvened to honor the memory of one of its founding members. This Yuletide funeral procession was led by the “Prince-Pope” (Kniaž’-Papa) Zotov, the mock arch-priest of the Transfigured Kingdom. He was followed by the “Anti-Caesar” (Antiisesar’, i.e. Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii) “and other spiritual dignitaries” (dukhovnye osoby). The advent of the “Anti-Caesar” and the “Prince-Pope,” who represented, presumably, the patrons of the mock “Order of Judas,”

123 The silver commemorative medallion, which served as the insignia of his “order” may have been buried along with the second, and last “Cavalier of the Order of Judas.” However, the memory of Shakhovskoi’s role at Peter’s court appears to have been passed on to future generations by means of the oral family traditions of the Russian political elite. As late as the nineteenth century, A.S. Pushkin and the other members of the “Arzamas” literary society could make fun of their rivals at the Academy of Arts by scapegoating the dramatist Prince A. A. Shakhovskoi, whom they dubbed “Prince Jester (Kniaž’ Shutovskoi). Adapting some of the same rhetorical conventions as Peter’s courtiers, the “Arzamas brothers” thus appear to have seen Shakhovskoi’s attack on the poetry of their fellowship’s “divinely-inspired” founder, G. R. Derzhavin, in terms of the same ecstatic, apostolic model that had once been used to affirm the charismatic authority of Peter the Great. On the literary legacy of the “Arzamas brotherhood,” see the two-volume collection, “Arzamas”: Shornik v dvukh knigakh, ed. by V. E. Vatsuro and A. L. Ospovata (M., 1994); on the cultural significance of their religious parodies, see V. M. Zhivov, “Koshchunstvennaiia poeziia v sisteme russkoi kul’tury kontsa XVIII-nachala XIX veka,” in Iz istorii russkoi kul’tury, ed. A. D. Koshelev (M., 1996), 4: 701-753 and Iu. M. Lotman, “Neskol’ko slov o stat’i V. M. Zhivova,” ibid., 4: 755-762. On the phenomenologically-similar use of “Bacchic verse” in Pushkin’s correspondence with members of the secret “Society of the Green Lantern” (Zelennaiia lampa), see E. A. Tudorovskaiia, Poeitka liricheskikh stikhov vorenii A. S. Pushkina (Phb., 1996), 48-58.

124 See the entry for 30 December 1713 in Pokhodnyi zurnal 1713 goda (SPh., 1854), 53.
recalled the fact that the Order of St. Andrew was intended as an Orthodox counterpart to the chivalrous brotherhoods sponsored by the Holy Roman Emperor and the Pope. In this way, the organizers of the grotesque funeral procession which escorted the coffin of Prince Shakhovskoi employed the corpse of the "Cavalier of the Order of Judas" in much the same way as the tsar had once utilized the relics of the Pertominsk saints, or as he would eventually use the bones of St. Alexander Nevskii— to restate the imperial pretensions and the polemical thrust behind the chivalrous religious organization of the Russian court.

---

CHAPTER FOUR

Jesters:
Matrimonial Parodies and the
Petrine Civilizing Process

The travesties of wedding ritual staged at the court of Peter Alekseevich demonstrate the importance which the tsar and his “gang” (kompaniia) attached to the sacrament of Holy Matrimony for the transfiguration of the Muscovite realm. Indeed, the numerous “jester-weddings” (shutovskie svad’by) – like the war-games (potekhi) and military triumphal processions (triumfy), of which they were often the conclusion, and the conclaves of the “Unholy Council” (neosviashchennyi sobor), with which they had much in common – attest to the fact that these bacchanalian, matrimonial spectacles constituted an integral part of the court’s innovative program of Orthodox imperial renewal. In order to explain why Peter Alekseevich and his entourage believed that such “sacred parodies” (parodia sacra) could help to inaugurate the Kingdom

1 On the iconographic connection between the “wedding banquet” (zvannyi brachnyi pir) and the “Kingdom of Heaven” (Tsarstvie nebesnoe) at the Muscovite court, see Domashnii byt russkogo naroda v XVI i XVII stoletiiakh. V trekh knigakh. Kniga pervaya. Gosudarev dvor, ili dvorets, ed. by A. N. Sakharov (M., 1990), I: 161. This trope derives from Jesus’ parables, as recounted in the gospel of Matthew (Mat. 22:2-14), which ends with the message: “For many are called, but few are chosen” (Mat. 22:14; cf. 20:16, 19:30).

2 The political significance of the “jester-weddings” staged at the court of Peter the Great has long been recognized by scholars interested in analyzing the familial structures “underpinning” Muscovite court culture. See Edward L. Keenan, “Muscovite Political Folkways,” Russian Review 45 (1986), 115-181, here 160; and Russell Edward Martin, “Dynastic Marriage in Muscovy, 1500-1729” (Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1996), 272-278. Combining Martin’s prosopographical approach with a semiotic analysis of ritual, I seek to understand the way in which these court ceremonies fit into what A. M. Panchenko has dubbed Peter’s “reform of merriment” (reforma veselia). See A. M. Panchenko, “Russkaia kul’tura v kanun petrovskikh reform,” in Iz istorii russkoi kul’tury, ed. by A. D. Koshelev (M., 1996), 3: 11-261, esp. 138-167.

3 As “parodies” (i.e. imitations) of the seventh sacrament, as well as of the rites and customs traditionally associated with the Muscovite wedding ceremony, the “jester-weddings” organized by the
Transfigured, this chapter will discuss the symbolism and the politics behind the weddings of several members of the royal “company” – Ia. F. Turgenev (1694), F. P. Shanskii (1702), P. I. Buturlin, Prince Ia. F. Dologorukii, P. B. Sheremet’ev (1712), and N. M. Zotov (1715) – as well as the second, “carnivalesque” wedding of the tsar himself (1712). By tracing the “company’s” attempt to institute a new, chivalrous code of conduct, first among the “subjects” of the mock kingdom centered on the royal suburban estate of New Transfiguration (Rus. Novo-Preobrazhenskoe), and then, among the “citizens” of the newly-founded imperial capital and port-city of St. Petersburg (Rus. Sankt-Piterburkha), I hope to demonstrate the continuing relevance of Peter’s charismatic scenario, during a new, and much more deliberate, era of imperial re-structuring.²

The matrimonial spectacles organized by (and, sometimes, at the expense of) the members of Peter’s “company,” sought to sharpen the contrast between the idea that


³ This new, much more focused, period of reform, has traditionally been dated from Russia’s victory at the battle of Poltava (1709) to Peter’s death (1725). On the importance of Poltava for Peter’s charismatic “scenario of power,” see supra, Chapter Three.
the Muscovite court was a microcosm of outmoded clan politics and the (ostensibly) novel political conception of the relationship between tsar and courtier being predicated on the idea of personal service. The exaggeration of this contrast was a matter of Petrine political rhetoric, self-consciously enacted in carnivalesque ceremonies in which the “subjects” of the Transfigured Kingdom itself were the leading actors. Assigning the role of “jester”-groom to some particular member of his entourage, tsar Peter Alekseevich and his courtiers would periodically take part in theatricalized pageants modeled upon traditional Russian wedding banquets. Like the wise-cracking, picaresque, “harlequins” (gaery) of contemporary, comical “interludes,” ⁶ Peter’s “jester”-grooms would become both the instigators and the butts of the court’s laughter – a position, which was captured most clearly in the case of the “most-ferociously-witty” (ostrounnoliutneishii) F. P. Shanskii, who appeared as both “a buffoon and a laughing-stock” (shut i smekhotvorets) in the engraving, officially commissioned to commemorate his wedding.⁷ Poking fun at the conventional morality of an older generation of Muscovite courtiers, Peter, his “jester”-grooms, and their guests enacted the ideals of a new, masculine fellowship – one based upon a sense of belonging to the

⁶ For the text of three different Petrine interludes, see “Skazanie o garee garlikine Rossiiskom,” in “starinnye deistva i komedii Petrovskogo vremeni, izvlechennyia iz rukopisei i prigotovlennyia k pechatii I. A. Shliapkinym,” Shomnik Odoneliiia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Rossiiskoi Akademii Nauk, 97:1 (1921), 200-212; “Intermedia,” in N. S. Tikhonrovov, ed., Russkiiia dramaticheskiiia proizvedenia, 1672-1725 gg. (SPb., 1874), II: 485-498; and “Shutovskaia komediiia,” Pamiatniki russkoi dranny epokhi Petra Velikogo, ed. V. N. Peretts (SPb., 1903), 493-558. The latter skit includes a scene in which a comical “Pastor” marries the “Jester” and his bride, “Kasenka,” in a drunken parody of the traditional marriage ceremony. Ibid., 527.

⁷ See the “key” to the series of engravings produced by Adrian Schoonebeck, in M. A. Alekseeva, Graviura petrovskogo vremenii (L., 1990), 31-32, here 31.
chivalrous community of believers in Providence and in the charismatic authority of the divinely-ordained, warrior tsar.⁸

Both the audience for these performances, and the language in which they were addressed, changed dramatically over the course of Peter’s reign. Indeed, the evolution of Petrine matrimonial spectacles offers a perfect example of the ideological, demographic, and geographic “expansion” of the Transfigured Kingdom, which was only hinted at in the previous chapters of the dissertation. Whereas the first “jester”-grooms played to small, intimate gatherings of Peter’s most loyal supporters, by the second half of the tsar’s reign, the comical bridegrooms frequently performed in front of the entire Russian political elite (and even segments of the larger community, including elite Russian merchants and foreign diplomats). Similarly, whereas, the grooms’ impromptu skits were originally confined to the peripheries of Moscow – particularly the environs of the Foreigners’ Suburb (Rus. Nemetskaia sloboda) and the

⁸ One of the most interesting definitions of the jester’s role during the matrimonial spectacles staged at the court of Peter Alekseevich at the turn of the eighteenth-century appeared in the Trilingual Lexicon of F. P. Polikarpov, the Muscovite printer whose own publishing activities were instrumental in defining and popularizing the new, “secular” ideals enacted by the royal entourage. According to Polikarpov, a “jester” (shut or koshchun) was synonymous with a “mocking joker” (Lat. ioculator, Rus. glumitel’ or glumnik), someone who could actually learn to be virtuous just by mocking something (glumiusia znachit i pouchausia vo blago). As an example of this paradoxical notion. Polikarpov offered the following quote from the Psalms: “As [king] David says, ‘I exult [lit. play, exercise] in your miracles’ (Az zhe poglumiliusia v chudesekh tvoikh) instead of saying ‘I learn from [them]’ (vmesto reshchi pouchusia).” See F. Polikarpov, Leksikon treiazychyhi, sirech rechenii slovenskih, ellinogreceskih i latinskih sokrovishche. Iz razlichnykh drevnikh i novykh knig sobrannoe i po slavenskomu alfavitu v chin raspolozenoe (M., 1704), og/verso. Whether or not Polikarpov’s definition of the didactic role of mockery had anything to do with his observations of the travesties staged at the court of Peter Alekseevich, or, which is more likely, whether such didactic ideas were part of his rhetorical training as a pupil of Moscow’s Slavonic-Greco-Latin Academy, we would do well to remember this reference to king David, the “humble Psalmist,” when we analyze the typological symbolism invoked at the 1715 wedding of the “Prince Pope.” On Fedor Polikarpov, see P. P. Pekarskii, Nauka i literatura pri Petre Velikom, 2 vols. (SPb., 1862) and V. M. Zhivov, Iazyk i kul’tura v Rossii XVIII veka (M., 1996).
royal estate of New Transfiguration (Rus. *Novo-Preobrazhenskoe*) – by the end of Peter’s reign the “jester weddings” became a regular part of the lavish court spectacles, that would take place in the streets of both Russian capitals.⁹

In response to this “expansion” of the Transfigured Kingdom, the tsar and his company began to modify the way that they mobilized belief in the charisma of Russia’s “anointed one.” Over time, the esoteric language employed by Peter and his intimates became much more didactic; the parodies, much more satiric; the imagery, more “reasonable” than ever before. This transformation was reflected in two simultaneous processes: first, the “Catholicization” of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council;¹⁰ and second, in the “bureaucratization” of its procedures.¹¹ Both of these processes would culminate in the organization of one of the biggest matrimonial travesties ever staged at the court of Peter the Great – the 1715 wedding of “Prince Pope” Zotov. As my analysis of this royal *charivari* will seek to demonstrate, by the time the tsar and his

---

⁹ V. M. Zhivov, “Kul’turnye reformny v sisteme preobrazovanii Petra I,” in *Iz istorii russkoi kul’tury*, ed. by A. D. Koshelev (M., 1996) 3: 528-583, here 552; Paul Hollingsworth, “The ‘All-Drunken, All-Joking Synod’: Carnival and Rulership in the Reign of Peter the Great.” Paper presented at the University of California, Berkeley seminar on “The Image of Peter the Great in Russian History and Thought” (Berkeley, 10 June 1982), fols. 3-4, 8-9, 50-51, 57; and idem, “Carnival and Rulership in the Reign of Peter the Great.” Paper presented at the National Convention of the American Historical Association, December 1985, fols. 1-2, 4, 13. I would like to express my gratitude to Paul Hollingsworth, who generously sent me a copy of both papers.

¹⁰ By the term “Catholicization,” I mean to describe the slight, but noticeable shift in the way contemporaries referred to the mock ecclesiastical council of Peter the Great; specifically, this means that references to the “Unholy Council” (*sobor*) of the mock “patriarch” decreased relative to the invocations of the “conclave” of the “Prince Pope.” So, although both terms continued to coexist, the parody of “Catholic” ritual appeared to predominate over the “Orthodox.” See Zhivov, “Kul’turnye reformny,” *op. cit.*, 563-566, 563-564 n. 20; Hollingsworth, “The ‘All-Drunken, All-Joking Synod,’” *op. cit.*, fols. 10-11; L. N. Semenova, *Ocherki istorii byta i kul’turnoi zhizni Rossii, pervaja polovina XVIII v.* (L., 1982). 174-199, esp. 185-186, 192-193.
entourage decided to re-locate the capital of the Kingdom Transfigured to the shores of the Neva River, the idea of Orthodox imperial reform had become inextricably linked with the court's attempt to create a "policed" (Fr. policé) and "polite" (Fr. poli) ruling class. In this way, the aggressive self-assertions of the retinue of a young, libertine, warrior-tsar had become the basis for the didactic celebrations of the cavaliers of the Kingdom Transfigured.

Muscovite Travesties

Already in the old capital, tsar Peter Alekseevich had set a precedent for using the marriage ceremony as a way of travestyng Muscovite clan politics in the name of the ideals of his Transfigured Kingdom. In January of 1694, Peter organized the wedding of Ia. F. Turgenew – a low-ranking courtier and member of the tsar’s "play regiments" as a way of mocking elite Muscovite conventions of "honor" (Rus.

11 On the "bureaucratization" of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council, see Zhivotov, op. cit. 551-552, 562.


13 There is very little biographical information on Ia. F. Turgenew, besides the fact that he was a member of the service family of relatively lowly, rank-and-file courtiers (riadovye stol’niky), which appeared in the official list of Muscovite servitors (boiarstkie spiski) of 1682-1713. On the Turgenews, see I. Iu. Airapeti’ian, “Feodal’naia aristokratiiia v period stanovleniiia absoliutizma v Rossii” (Diss. kand. ist. nauk, M. V. Lomonosov State University, 1987), 421, 67, 328. Like the Zotovs, members of the Turgenew clan owed their rise into the ranks of dummy dvorianin thanks to promotions through service, not through wealth or birth. See Airapetti’an, op. cit., 121, 122, 117. For a summary of the available information of Ia. F. Turgenew, see Semenova, op. cit., 180-181. The conventional belief that Turgenew died immediately after his carnavlesque wedding was based upon a misreading of I. A. Zheliabuzhskii’s diary on the part of one of its nineteenth-century editors. See Paul Bushkovitch,
chest').\textsuperscript{14} Staged as the denouement of the martial exercises organized by General Patrick Gordon immediately after the tsar’s return from Arkhangelsk,\textsuperscript{15} the winter wedding had all the qualities of a Yuletide mummers’ skit.\textsuperscript{16} Like the carolers and entertainers making their rounds of Christmas visits, the Muscovite courtiers who followed in Turgenev’s wedding train wore “comical dress: bast sacks, bark hats, multi-colored kaftans, lined with cat fur […] in shoes made out of straw, with mouse-lined mitts.” They rode bulls, goats, pigs, and dogs – barnyard animals who were often anthropomorphized in the lewd ditties (koliadki) traditionally sung by Yuletide mummers. I. A. Zheliabuzhskii (1638-1709?), the old Muscovite courtier (okol’nichii) who left a record of this carnivalesque matrimonial spectacle in his daily log, dismissed Turgenev as a “jester” (shut), intimating that the ceremony had only an incidental

“Aristocratic Faction and the Opposition to Peter the Great: The 1690s,” Forschungen zur Osteuropäischen Geschichte 50 (1995), 97 n. 45. In fact, as late as 1700, the “jester” (shut) Iakov Turgenev was listed in the personnel records (v dvorsovom shtate) of Peter’s court as receiving a salary of fifty rubles. See I. E. Zabelin, Domashnii byt russkih tsarei v XVI i XVII st. 2 vols. Posthumous ed. (M., 1915), I (1): 267.

\textsuperscript{14} On elite Muscovite conceptions of clan honor, see Nancy Shields Kolmenn, By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia (Ithaca and London, 1999), ch. 4. For a discussion of Peter’s attempt to “inculcate a sense of personal honor on a European model, honor that was ‘highly individualized,’ based on a person’s cultivated self, rather than on heritage and clan,” see ibid., 234-241, here 236.

\textsuperscript{15} For an insightful discussion of the serious purpose behind this mock military campaign, see Richard H. Warner, “The Kozuchovo Campaign of 1694 or The Conquest of Moscow by Preobrazhenskoe,” Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas 13 (1965), 487-496. A contemporary “relation” which captured the mock-epic tone of these elaborate military maneuvers, was published by M. I. Semenovskii, “Kozlukhovskii pokhod, 1694. (Sovremennoe opisanie),” Voennyi sbornik 11:1 (1860), 49-106; “Iakov Turgenev” is mentioned on 62, 73. On General Gordon’s role in organizing Petrine war-games, see supra, Chapter Two. On the tsar’s 1694 “pilgrimage” to Arkhangel’sk, see supra, Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{16} On traditional Yuletide processions, see Larisa Ivleva, Riazhen’e v russkoi traditsionnoi kultupe (SPb., 1994). On the seventeenth century, see N. V. Poryanko, “Russkie sviatki XVII v.,” Trudy otdela Drevnerusskoj literatury [hereafter TODRL] 32 (1977), 84-99; and ibid., “Sviatochny i
comic effect. At the same time, however, Zheliabuzhskii understood that the Turgenev wedding procession effectively turned existing distinctions in rank on their head:

Turgenev and his undistinguished bride—"a chancellery clerk's wife" (d’iach’ia zhena)—rode "in the sovereign’s own best velvet-lined carriage," while the members of the most venerable clans of "Trubetskoi, Sheremet’ev, Golitsyn, and Gagin," rode behind him, just ahead of the wedding procession. The topsy-turvy world of this carnivalesque wedding procession thus enacted the reformist thrust of the tsar's political agenda by means of an ironic commentary on the pretensions of the "famed old warrior and Kievan commander," Turgenev's facetious title during the so-called "Kozhukhov campaign."18

In a similar way, the parodic origins of Turgenev's portrait—one of the first in a series of pictures to adorn the walls of the tsar’s newly-constructed palace in Novo-Preobrazhenskoe19 accounted for its innovative realism.20 The tsar commemorated


18 Turgenev led-off the military procession of "Generalissimo Prince Fedor Iur’evich [Romodanovskii]," riding under the banner of a nanny goat, representing Turgenev’s "old-fashioned noble seal" (starobytnyi ego shliakhovetskii herb: koza). Note that the anonymous author of the contemporary "relation" about the "Kozhukhov campaign" described Turgenev’s mock seal by the standard Muscovy term for the Polish nobility (Pol. szlachta). See Semevskii, "Kozhukhovskii pokhod," op. cit., 62; Warner, op. cit., 491.

19 For a discussion of the importance of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe in Petrine political discourse, see supra, Introduction; and Chapter Two.
Turgenev's role in the spectacles of the Transfigured Kingdom by commissioning a portrait that repudiated the genre-painting (parsuna) much-favored at the court of the regent Sof'ia Alekseevna in favor of what may be described as a civic icon. The anonymous artist who painted Turgenev's portrait dispensed with the allegorical background and titulature which traditionally accompanied stylized depictions of Polonophile Muscovite courtiers and depicted Turgenev, warts and all, armed with the colonel's mace and dressed simply in the uniform of the regiment that he led during the mock "Kozhukhov campaign." Thus, the portrait commemorated not a low-born courtier with pretensions to parsuna greatness, but a royal servitor defined exclusively by the instruments of his function in the Transfigured Kingdom. Turgenev's wedding, likewise, demonstrated the role assigned to traditional ceremonies as a way of dramatizing the inversion of the old order, while solidifying the cultural and political foundations of the new. In January 1702, the nuptials of another royal "jester," Feofilakt (or Filat) Pimenovich Shanskii, became the first royal-sponsored wedding celebration self-consciously to pit the patriarchal standard of precedence-ranking

---


22 Feofilakt (or Filat) Pimenovich Shanskii served as "equerry" (stripachii) in 1692 (7200) and as a rank-and-file "chamberlain" (stol'nik) in 1694/5 to 1699 (7207). See Airapet'ian, op. cit., 431; and P. P. Ivanov, Alfavitnyi ukazatel' familii i lits, upominaemykh v boiarskikh knigakh (M., 1853), 464.
(mestnichestvo) against the ideal of the court as a religious order of knights devoted to the charismatic person of the tsar.

The unequal marriage between the lowly Shanskii and his titled bride – a Princess Shakhovskaia – played out the transformation of roles at court by challenging elite Muscovite notions of rank and family honor. Like during the Turgenev wedding, every aspect of this three day celebration was choreographed by Peter and his "company." Cornelius de Bruyn, a Dutch artist who, along with several other foreigners, received an invitation to take part in the celebration of the nuptials of the tsar’s favorite "jester," noted that during the first two days of this royal spectacle, "all of the invited guests were commanded to appear at the wedding in the ancient attire" of Muscovy. Indeed, for the duration of the wedding, the tsar seemed to have lifted the formal injunction against wearing the old, Muscovite garments, which had been officially proscribed just two years before the staging of this matrimonial travesty. As if to underline the "traditional" nature of this event, the newlyweds were seated in

---

23 Shanskii’s bride was the sister of another royal intimate, Prince lu. F. Shakhovskoi, also known as “Archdeacon Gideon.” See Pokhodnyi zurnal 1713 goda (SPb., 1854), 53, fn. (c). On Shakhovskoi’s career as the mock “Cavalier of the Order of Judas.” see supra, Chapter Three.


25 Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii [hereafter, PSZ] (SPb., 1830), vol. 4, Nos. 1741 (4 January 1700), 1887 (20 August 1700); and “Peter’s Decree on Wearing German Clothes, 1701,” in Major Problems in the History of Imperial Russia, ed. by James Cracraft (Lexington and Toronto, 1994), 110-11. The tsar himself donned a long, Muscovite robe, "intermixed with many figures and of several colors," as well as a "great red fur cap," for the first half of the wedding celebration. See Cornelius de Bruyn, Travels into Muscovy, Persia, and Part of the East Indies; Containing an Accurate Description of
different rooms of the Lefort palace, chaperoned by the members of their own sex.

As befits the temporary elevation of status assumed by the bride and groom at a Muscovite wedding, both Shanskii and his betrothed sat in the company of "royalty." The two mock tsars and the mock patriarch of the Transfigured Kingdom presided over the male half, while the "royal" wives occupied a parallel position over the female half. This travesty of royal and ecclesiastical authority subverted the hallowness of tradition – as reflected in the seating arrangement and the emphasis on Muscovite dress – while simultaneously accentuating the "sanctity" of those royal intimates.

what is most Remarkable in those Countries (London, 1737), I: 26, cited in Lindsey Hughes, Russia in the Age of Peter the Great (New Haven and London, 1998), 362.

26 For the layout and history of the this palace, which was built for Franz Lefort with funds from the royal treasury, see R. Podol'skii, "Petrovskii dvorets na lavze," Arkhitekturnoe nasledstvo 1 (1951), 14-55. For a contemporary description of the blasphemous "sanctification" ceremony, which accompanied the dedication of this palace, see supra, Introduction.

27 During a traditional wedding ceremony, the bride and groom are referred to as "Prince" and "Princess," or, alternatively, as "Boiar" and "Boiarynia" – ornate expressions for those entitled to wear the wedding crown (venets), which in Russian gives the name to the whole nuptial ceremony [i.e. venchanie]. See R. O. Jacobson, "While Reading Fastner's Dictionary," in Selected Writings (The Hague, 1971), 2: 131. On the nomenclature and semiotics of the "wedding ranks" (svadebnyi chin) temporarily assumed by the newlyweds, their families, and their guests, see P. S. Bogoslovskii, "K nomenklature i topografi svadebnykh chinov" (Po dannym etnograficheskoi literatury i rukopisnym materialam Geograficheskogo Obshchestva), Permskii kraevedcheski sbornik (Perm, 1927), 1-64; and A. K. Baiburin and G. A. Levinton, "'Kniaz' i 'kniaginia' v russkom svadebnom velichanii (k semantike obridiyovkh terminov)," Russkaiia filologiiia 4 (1975), 58-76, esp. 58, 62-63. On the "choreography of kinship" at Muscovite royal weddings, see Martin, op. cit., ch. 4.

28 For a depiction of the separate men's and women's side on the first two days of the Shanskii wedding, see the contemporary engravings by Adrian Schoonebeek, reproduced in Alekseeva, op. cit., 31-32. According to the "key" attached to the first engraving, the three mock dignitaries occupied "table number one," which was located on a dais, near the entrance to the main banquet hall (bol'shaia stolovaia polata) of the Lefort palace, Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii and I. I. Buturlin were "dressed like monarchs" (v oblachenii, podobno monarsheiskogo), while N. M. Zотов appeared in "the guise of a patriarch" (v vide patriarkha). Alekseeva, ibid., 31; Podol'skii, op. cit., 27.

29 According to the key attached to the second engraving of the Shanskii wedding, the wife of Ivan Ivanovich Buturlin, the so-called "King of Semenovsk," presided over the women's side "in the dress of a [Muscovite] tsaritsa (vo oblachenii podobnai tsaritsa)." See Alekseeva, op. cit., 32.
who, like the groom himself, belonged to the mock ecclesiastical council of the "Prince Pope."³¹

On the third and final day of the festivities surrounding the Shanskii wedding, it became apparent that the organizers of the event considered Muscovite "habits" – both clothes and customs – to be the rag-tag equivalent of those Yuletide mummers, who had followed in Turgenev's wedding train; for on that day, the guests were required to appear dressed in the latest foreign fashions. The mandate to change their old clothes for the new "German dress" officially prescribed by the tsar, went hand in hand with a new code of courtly etiquette.³² For the first time ever, the segregation of male and female guests was abandoned.³³ Now, as Bruyn recorded, the wedding party, both the men and the women, "sat at table together, as the custom is with us; and there was dancing and skipping about, after the entertainment, to the great satisfaction of the Czar

³¹ "There were several Tables spread in a very large Hall, according to the Degrees and Ranks of the Guests, and at the upper end there was one Table placed upon a Throne, about 3 foot higher than the rest, at which sat the Mock Czar with a Mock Patriarch, to whom the Company advanced by gradual Steps, and bowed their Heads to the Ground at several proper Distances as they advanced, being call'd by Name, to kiss, first the Mock Czar, and then the Patriarch's Hands, upon which a Dram of Brandy was presented to every Man, both from the Czar and the Patriarch, and then they went backwards from the Throne to about 20 Foot distance, and all the way made their Bows as they went back." Perry, op. cit. 239-240. Compare this description with the detailed, historical reconstruction of a "traditional." royal banquet (tsarstvi sto), in Zabelin, op. cit., ch. 6.

³² A symbol of this new, chivalrous, courtly ethos was the comical bridegroom's heraldic "family seal," which included a jester's staff and a wooden cudgel, as well as a pendant cross of the Order of St. Andrew. See Alekseeva, op. cit., 31-32. For a discussion of the Order of St. Andrew, see supra, Chapter Three.

³³ O. G. Ageeva, "Obshchestvennaia i kul'turnaia zhizn' Peterburga I chetverti XVIII v.," Diss. kand. ist. nauk, Institut istorii AN SSSR (M., 1990), 135-145, esp. 138-139.
himself, as all his guests." The appearance of Russian women, during the wedding of the "most-ferociously-witty jester" of Peter the Great, thus broke with the seventeenth-century tradition of keeping elite Muscovite women confined to their quarters (terem) and presaged by almost fifteen years the royal decree codifying such behavior as the height of decorum at unofficial social gatherings (Fr. assemblé). However, the fact that it took nearly a decade and a half for these new, courtly conceptions to become official royal policy demonstrates that the "carnivalesque" wedding of Peter's comical bridegroom, like carnival itself, could only suspend the conventions of everyday court life; it could not abolish it. Only when the retinue of Peter Alekseevich felt strong enough to enforce such changes, could these temporary liberties be transformed into permanent laws.

The Petrine Round-Table

Like the suburban royal amusements (potekhi) discussed in Chapters Two and Three, therefore, the "jester weddings" of 1694 and 1702 turned the clannish politics of the old capital upside down in order to juxtapose the social relations in Moscow with

---

34 Bruyn, Puteshestvie, 53; and Hughes, op. cit., 261.


36 Ageeva, op. cit., ch. 2.

37 On the temporary suspension of social conventions during carnival time, see Peter Burke, Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe (NY, 1978), ch. 7.
those supposedly institutionalized in the chivalrous-religious organization of Peter’s peregrinating court. The nomadic lifestyle of the libertine, young bachelor who led a series of military campaigns against the Tatars and the Swedes, traveled to Europe, and repeatedly crisscrossed his extensive realm, only bolstered the importance of carnivalesque matrimonial spectacles as unifying events for his “company.” Indeed, Peter’s “divorce” and the de facto relocation of the Russian capital to St. Petersburg, on the shores of the Neva River, served to open up a new realm of possibilities for the realization of the Kingdom Transfigured. Unencumbered by the institutional and political constraints placed upon the royal person by life in Moscow, the intimate circle of believers in the tsar’s charisma gave free play to their imaginations. And marriage – especially Peter’s own, second wedding – would be one of the most important ways of bringing these dreams to fruition.

The matrimonial spectacles staged by Peter and his “company” in St. Petersburg, the tsar’s new imperial capital and Residenzstadt, were crucial to the elaboration of a new system of politics and a new dynastic scenario. Seeking to loosen

---

38 Immediately upon his return from the 1697-1698 “Great Embassy” to northern and central Europe, the tsar succeeded in confining his first wife, tsaritsa Evdokia Fedorovna (née Lopukhina), to a convent in distant Suzdal’ province. For a detailed account of the extensive negotiations (and violence) involved in this major political shake-up, see S. V. Efimov, “Evdokiia Lopukhina – posledniaia russkaia tsaritsa XVII veka,” in Srednevekovaja Rus': Sbornik nauchnykh statei k 65-letiiu [...] R. G. Skrynnikova, ed. by S. V. Lobachev and A. S. Lavrov (SPb., 1995), 136-165; and Paul Bushkovich, “Aristocratic Faction and the Opposition to Peter the Great: The 1690s,” Forschungen zur Osteuropäischen Geschichte 50 (1995): 80-120.

39 Although the fortress of St. Petersburg was founded in 1702, it did not become the Residenzstadt of tsar Peter Alekseevich until well after the victory at Poltava (1709). Peter never issued an official decree proclaiming St. Petersburg as the capital of the Russian Empire. However, the relocation of the Senate to the town on the Neva River, in late 1713, is conventionally taken to mark the translatio capitalii. See Hughes, op. cit.; 215; N. I. Pavlenko, Petr Velikii (M., 1990), 525.
the hold of a "dynastic marriage system" which relied on endogamy to bind the elite to the crown, the tsar and his intimates sought to transform Muscovite royal weddings into tools of geopolitics, not simply of domestic factionalism. Taking advantage of the opportunities presented after the victory at Poltava, Peter began to challenge the conventions of the Muscovite system of dynastic marriage and to elevate the royal house above the fray of traditional matrimonial politics by marrying off members of his family to foreign royalty. This step was not totally unprecedented, for both Kievan princes and the Riurikids grand dukes had married outside of native elites in order to secure foreign allies. After one disastrous attempt at the beginning of the seventeenth century, however, the Romanovs gave up trying to make such "equal marriages."

Instead, the new Russian ruling house and the rest of the Muscovite oligarchy elaborated a complicated selection process in which potential royal brides were chosen mainly from military clans of middling rank. This practice insured the integration of new families into the elite, without upsetting the existing balance of power between the tsar and the most influential political clans at court. Peter's intention to marry members of his family to foreign royalty, therefore, flew in the face of the "traditional" structures of political authority, which were maintained by controlling the marital

40 In the aftermath of the fifteenth-century internecine struggle for the throne of Riurik, warring Russian factions settled their dispute by agreeing to confine their potentially destructive conflicts to the sphere of marriage alliances. From then on, the stakes of politics was not over who should possess the crown, but how closely a Muscovite clan was related to the tsar through marriage. See Keenan, op. cit.; Martin, op. cit.; and Nancy Shields Koliman, Kinship and Politics: The Making of the Muscovite Political System, 1345-1547 (Stanford, 1987).
choices of the new (and still relatively insecure) Russian royal house. By re-instituting the practice of equal marriage between heads of state, the tsar was able to establish tactical diplomatic alliances for his ambitions in the Baltic and, at the same time, to demonstrate the power of the Romanov dynasty over the boiar clans, which had brought it (and, later, Peter Alekseevich himself) to the Russian throne.42

Peter’s elevation of a Livonian peasant woman to the status of royal consort reflected the same political and dynastic concerns as those which urged him to favor intermarriage with European royalty for his blood relations. After confining his first wife to a convent at the end of the seventeenth century, Peter spent nearly a decade as a bachelor – a very unusual status for an adult Muscovite tsar. The tsar had chosen bachelorhood in order to maintain his independence from the parties that had arranged his first marriage to tsaritsa Evdokiiia Fedorovna (née Lopukhina). Once freed from his royal in-laws and their political allies, Peter attempted to mold the only surviving child from this marriage, tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich (1690-1718), into a suitable heir to his vision of a reformed Russian empire. However, as the relationship between the tsar and his son grew strained,43 Peter began to construct an alternative dynastic scenario, in which he could legitimize any possible future male heirs without abandoning his hard-fought, political independence. Marriage to Marta Skavronskaiia, his long-time mistress

---

41 After 1709, when the Romanovs once again became suitable partners for intermarriage with other European dynasties, Peter successfully plied the suit of his nieces and his own son with members of minor German royal houses. See Hughes, op. cit., 411-415; Martin, op. cit., 123-125; 248-250.

42 For a discussion of the “Naryshkin Restoration,” see supra, Chapters One and Two.

43 On Peter’s conflict with tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich, see Hughes, op. cit., 402-411; and infra, Chapter Five.
and the mother of his numerous illegitimate children, presented an opportunity to bypass the presumptive heir and to ensure that Peter’s successors – i.e. those who were not tainted by their association with the Lopukhin line of the House of Romanov – would continue his policies. A foreign bride who did not bring any domestic or diplomatic entanglements and who was wholly dependent on the favor of her royal husband thus appeared to be the best candidate for the achievement of this goal.

Prince A. D. Menshikov, the low-born royal favorite, who personally benefited from Marta’s increasing importance to the dynastic politics of the court, carefully stage-managed the transformation of Peter’s relationship to his mistress. In anticipation of her new status, Marta Skavronskaia was received into the Orthodox faith. During this ceremony, her future step-son, tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich, was forced to act as her god-father. Although it was typical for a member of the royal family to preside over such sacraments as the baptism of a child from the royal house, this was hardly a typical Romanov event and Marta was hardly a child. Even more shocking was the fact that the tsar compelled his son to participate in the attempt to displace Aleksei’s own mother, and, implicitly, to challenge the tsarevich’s claim to the throne. Marta’s new given name demonstrated that her incorporation into the Romanov dynastic line was

---

44 By the time Peter married his mistress, they had already had five children together. See the dispatches of Charles Whitworth, the British ambassador to St. Petersburg, in Shornik Imperatorskogo russkogo istoricheskogo obschestva [hereafter, SIRIO], 61 (1888), here 146. For a biography of Marta/Catherine see M. I. Semievskii, Tsarisa Katerina Alekseevna, Anna i Villim Mons", 1692-1724, 2nd rev. ed. (SPb., 1884); and Hughes, op. cit., 394-398.

45 Menshikov’s sisters, with whom Marta first stayed, allowed him to monopolize this new channel of access to the tsar. On Marta’s warm relations with Menshikov, his wife (D. M. Arsen’eva),
over-determined. Following traditional Orthodox practice, the newly-baptized

“Catherine Alekseevna” took the name of the saint commemorated on the same day as
her conversion (St. Catherine), and the Christian name of the god-father as her own
patronymic (Aleksei). By name she became the “spiritual child” of her step-son, as
well as his step-mother. And since she and tsar Peter Alekseevich shared a
patronymic, Catherine in effect also became one of the children of tsar Aleksei
Mikhailovich, and her husband’s own sister. At around the same time, in her informal
correspondence, Catherine also adopted Peter’s pseudonymous last name

“Mikhailov,” which was used by the tsar to distinguish his service in the ranks from
his dynastic role as the grandson of tsar Mikhail Fedorovich. By this pseudonym, the
tsar’s foreign, low-born bride metaphorically underscored her connection to the founder
of the House of Romanov while underlining her own role as the wife of the chivalrous
warrior-tsar who was intent on restoring the territories lost to the Swedes during his

\[\text{and his sisters, see Hughes, \textit{op. cit.} 395, 436; and \textit{Pisma russkih gosudarei i drugikh osob tsarskogo}
\textit{semeistva} (M., 1861), esp. 1-8.}\]

\textit{trans. by Daneil P. Lucid (Baltimore and London, 1977), 107-116, here 108-109; and Hughes, \textit{op. cit.},}
397, 450-451, 560 n. 40.}\]


\[\text{48 For example, on 2 September 1698, during his stay in Konigsburg, Prussia, “cavalier Piter}
Michailoff” received a letter of patent, testifying to his training as a “bombardier.” See “Patent dannoi}
Ego Imperatorskonu Velichestvu v obuchenni bombardirskogo dela, i pri tom s onago perevod, 1698 g.,”
\textit{RGADA}, f. 9, otd. 1, op. 2, ch. 1, ed. khr. No. 37, fols. 1-3. Similarly, in 1701, “His Highness” (\textit{velikiy}
gosudar’) [F. lu. Romodanovskii] authorized the payment of 366 rubles to shipwright (\textit{bas}) “Piter
Michailof.” See “Rospiska v poluchenii zhalovan’ia (29 January 1701),” in \textit{PIB}, 1: 424; Hughes, \textit{op.}
cit., 98, 488 n. 45. For other references to this pseudonym, see \textit{PIB}, 1: 455, 765, 847, 859; \textit{ibid.}, 3: 31-
32. For an argument which stresses the fact that the activities of “cavalier” Peter Mikhailov were merely
a particular case of the reformism of tsar Peter Alekseevich, see N. I. Pavlenko, “Petr I (K izuchenii}
sotsial’no-politicaleskikh vzgliadov),” in \textit{Rossiia v period reform Petra I} (M., 1973), 40-102, here 44-46,
56-60.}\]
grandfather’s reign. In the hands of Peter and his intimates, the sacrament of baptism thus served as a potent sign of the changing dynamics at court, and by implication, of the reform and “Christianization” of the realm as a whole.\footnote{In this respect, Peter could be compared to Vladimir, the Varangian prince who “Christianized” Russia (980). On the importance of the image of St. Vladimir “The Equal to the Apostles” (ravnopostol’skii) to the Muscovite program of religious enlightenment (prosveshchenie), see supra, Introduction; and Chapter One. For what may be the most famous comparison between Peter I and St. Vladimir, see Feofan (Prokopovich), “Vladimir [...]” in Sochinenija, ed. by I. P. Eremin (M.-L., 1961), 149-206.}

The public celebrations of Peter’s second wedding – the only other sacrament, besides his bride’s second baptism, which was intimately connected to the tsar’s dynastic policies – constituted a pivotal moment in the integration of a new service elite into the project of Orthodox imperial reform.\footnote{For an analysis of the symbolism and politics behind Peter’s second wedding, see Hughes, \textit{op. cit.}, 261-262; and Martin, \textit{op. cit.}, 254-259.} The tsar’s insistence that the public ceremony be an “old wedding,”\footnote{Peter to Gavrilo Menshikov (20 February 1712), \textit{PiB}, 12 (1): 86. The English ambassador to Russia noted that the courtiers sent about “to invite the company to His Majesty’s wedding,” were ordered to use the terms “old wedding.” See Whitworth, \textit{op. cit.}, 144.} a reference to the fact that the nuptials had already been solemnized in secret, before Peter had left for the front in March 1711,\footnote{The disapproval of the clergy, led by metropolitan Stefan (lavorskii), the \textit{locus tenans} of the patriarchate, had forced the tsar to keep his intentions regarding his mistress a secret. A few days before he left for the front, the tsar revealed to his sister, tsarevna Natalia Alekseevna, that he had wed Catherine, ostensibly in order to insure that his new wife and their children would be provided for in the event of his death in the Prut campaign. Menshikov, Catherine’s sponsor, was the only courtier who was aware of the tsar’s plan to marry her. For a discussion of the way in which Peter avoided a confrontation with the Orthodox hierarchy over the issue of his re-marriage, see L. N. Semenova, \textit{Ocherki istorii byta i kul’turnoi zhizni Rossii. Pervaja polovina XVIII veka} (L., 1982), 68, 70; for an analysis of the secret ceremony itself, see Hughes, \textit{op. cit.}, 396; and G. A. Mikhailov, “Graviura A. Zubova ‘Svad’ba Petra I’: real’nost’ i vymysel,” \textit{Panorama iskusstv} 11 (1988), 20-55, here 42-43.} reflected ironically on the non-traditional, “secular,” character of the celebrations, particularly their location in the new port-city of St. Petersburg. The city most closely associated
with Peter’s new navy and his involvement in European diplomacy served as the stage on which the tsar dramatized the link between his dynastic policy and the inauguration of the Kingdom Transfigured. The tsar attended his wedding, which took place in 10 February 1712, in the guise of a “rear-admiral” (Rus., shaunbeinakht, Dutch, schout-bij-nacht). Peter self-consciously masked his royal persona by assuming a rank which he awarded himself, through the offices of the royal mock double, “Prince-Caesar” F. Iu. Romodanovskii, for the Russian victory in the battle of Poltava (1709). 53 This masquerade advanced the chivalric ethos, according to which feats of skill and valor in battle would be rewarded by royal recognition and matched by the social affirmation of one’s masculinity. Acting out a new standard of gentlemanly conquest, both sexual and military, the tsar could be said to have challenged, confronted, and defeated those who scorned his intention to marry outside of the Muscovite clan network.

The organization of Peter’s second wedding (1712) reflected a new style of public ceremony, which had originated in the “jester weddings” staged by the tsar at the end of the seventeenth-century and which had first been demonstrated in St. Petersburg, in 1710, during the nuptials of his niece to the Duke of Courland. 54 As in the earlier ceremonies, during his own wedding the tsar dispensed with the traditional functionaries, ceremonies, and fertility rituals associated with Muscovite matrimonial

---

53 For the correspondence related to Peter’s 1709 “promotions,” see PiB, 9 (1): 242-243, 342; and the discussion in Pavlenko, “Petr I,” op. cit., 44-45.

54 For a description of tsarevna Anna Ioannovna’s marriage to the Duke of Courland, as well as an insightful analysis of this “new” style wedding ceremony, see Ageeva, op. cit., 141-142; and idem, “Novye iavlenia v obshchestvennoi zhizni i bytu Peterburga pervoi chetverti XVIII veka: na primere
celebrations. Instead, Peter personally composed the list of participants, assigning the most important ceremonial posts, often with new, foreign-sounding titles such as "Marshal," "Schaffer," and "Vorschinder," to his trusted advisors and companions, most of whom served in the tsar's cherished navy. As in Muscovite royal weddings, the bride and groom were chaperoned by their proxy mothers and fathers. However, whereas these honorific posts were traditionally occupied by blood relatives of the Russian royal house, at Peter's wedding three of the four proxy parents were foreigners – Count de Buss, rear-admiral in command of Peter's galley fleet; Cornelius Cruys, vice-admiral in command of the Baltic fleet; and Cruys' wife – while the fourth, tsaritsa Praskov'ia Fedorovna, widow of Peter's half-brother (tsar Ivan Alekseevich), was a Romanov only by marriage. The proxy brothers were F. M. Skliaev, one of Peter's long-time childhood companions and an energetic shipbuilder, and I. M. Golovin (1672-1737), nicknamed "the Shipwright" (Bas), a courtier who was the nominal head of Peter's ship-building industry. Thus, the leading actors in this

---

55 Martin, op. cit., 250.


57 For the official list of weddings guests, see Pokhodnyi zhurnal 1712 g. [hereafter, PZh] (SPh., 1854), 1-7.

58 Martin, op. cit., 256.

59 On Skliaev, see Hughes, op. cit., 85, 99, 370.

60 For an extended discussion of I. M. Golovin's place in Peter's "company," see Hughes, op. cit., 364-365; idem, "For the Health of the Sons of Ivan Mikhailovich": I. M. Golovin and Peter the
carnivalesque matrimonial spectacle complemented Peter’s fictional identity as a “rear-admiral” and sustained the drama of transformation that was being enacted at court and in the new imperial city.

The arrangement of guests in the banquet hall of Prince Menshikov’s newly-constructed Petersburg palace likewise contributed to the sense of a new community, both spiritual fellowship and knightly order, affirmed through the celebration of the tsar’s second wedding. According to the engraving created by A. F. Zubov, the Russian artist commissioned to immortalize the wedding of Peter and Catherine, the most important guests at the banquet sat at a large ring-shaped table with an open space in the center and a passage through which guests seated on the inside edge of the table could reach their seats. A smaller, square table was placed in the middle of the open space formed by the circumference of the round one. Seated at this center table, in full view of the wedding guests, were three “spiritual personages” (dukhovnye persony): “Prince-Pope” (kniaz’ papa) N. M. Zотов, “Arch-Hierarch” (arkhierarkh) P. I. Buturlin, and “Archdeacon” (arkhidiakon) Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi. The

---

Great’s Mock Court.” Paper delivered at International Conference of Study Group of Eighteenth-Century Russia, Leiden, July 1999; and infra, Appendix.

61 For a description of the seating arrangements at Peter’s second wedding, see the meticulous reconstruction by Mikhailov, op. cit., 25-38.


63 P. I. Buturlin served as a rank-and-file courtier (riadovoi stol’ni) from 1682 until his unexpected promotion to the top rank of the obsolescent Boiar Duma in April 1711. See Airapetian, op. cit., 98, 110, 347, 316. On P. I. Buturlin, see M. I. Semevskii, “Petr Velikii kak iumorist” [1690-
prominent presence of the “Prince-Pope” and the leading members of his mock
conclave at the wedding of Peter and Catherine, like the placing of civil servants and
foreigners in posts formerly occupied by royal relatives of blood and marriage – as well
as the conspicuous absence of the heir-apparent\textsuperscript{65} -- signaled the tsar’s intention to
celebrate his wedding in the “company” of his own creation, independent of the
traditional demands placed by family and faith. Instead the “cavaliers” and “ladies"
sitting around the Petrine “Round-Table” enacted a new, chivalrous code of conduct –
one that bound them to the Russian monarch (and his new bride) by a commitment to
common goals, the obligations of service, and a belief in Peter’s charismatic
authority.\textsuperscript{66}

\textit{Knights and Bishops}

1725]," in \textit{Ocherki i razskazy iz russkoj istorii XVIII v.: Slovo i delo! 1700-1725}, second, rev. ed. (SPb.,
1884), 278-334, esp. 286-287; \textit{supra}, Chapter Three; and \textit{infra}, Appendix.

\textsuperscript{64} \textit{Pokhodnyi zhurnal 1712 goda}, 5-6. On Prince Ju. F. Shakhovskoi, (a.k.a. the “Cavalier of
the Order of Judas,”), see \textit{supra}, Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{65} During his father’s wedding, tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich was (conveniently) abroad. See
Mikhailov, \textit{op. cit.}, 39, 55 n. 29.

\textsuperscript{66} Note that Zubov depicted only the third (and final) day of the festivities associated with
Peter’s “new style” wedding, thereby eschewing Adrian Schoonebeck’s attempt to depict (sequentially)
the “carnivalesque” transformation of Muscovite “habits.” According to Zubov’s (much more static)
rendition of this same process, the element of the “carnivalesque” – symbolized by the three mock clerics
– is located at the very center of the Petrine “Round Table.” In Zubov’s interpretation, therefore,
antinomian royal play appears as an important manifestation of the tsar’s chivalry and wit. For a
different analysis of these two engravings, see Alekseeva, \textit{op. cit.}, and Mikhailov, \textit{op. cit.} For a
discussion of Peter’s “wit” (Russ. \textit{ostrosmie}) see Feofan (Prokopovich), “Slovo o sostoiavshemsia
mezhdu imperiieiu Rossiiiskoju i koronoiu Shvedskoiu mire 1721 goda, avgusta v 30 den’ [...]”,
propovedannoe [...] v tsarstvuiushchem grade Moskve, v tserkvi sobornoi Uspeniia presviatyla
As we saw in the previous section, more than a decade after Peter's "jester"-grooms first asserted his court's commitment to the ideals of Orthodox Christian chivalry, the tsar finally made a personal contribution to the matrimonial apotheosis of the Kingdom Transfigured. However, no matter how much royal panegyrists asserted the "iconic" role of the Muscovite tsar, Peter Alekseevich would not rely solely on the rhetorical power of his own example. In order to emphasize that the chivalrous code of conduct displayed during his wedding applied to the entire Russian political elite, the tsar helped to organize the weddings of the two leading representatives of his new imperial government: General-Field Marshal B. P. Sheremet'ev (1652-1719), the official head of Russia's military forces; and "First Senator and Minister" Prince Ia. F. Dolgorukov (1639/1650-1720), the head of the civil administration. These old courtiers came from two of the most prominent Muscovite clans and in their separate jurisdictions they commanded the respect of the nobility who served under them. The tsar hoped that their acquiescence to the new code of conduct would serve as a good


67 For the notion of the tsar as a "political icon," see Stephen Lessing Bahr, The Paradise Myth in Eighteenth-Century Russia: Utopian Patterns in Early Secular Russian Literature and Culture (Stanford, 1991), 16-18, 191 n. 18.

68 For a biography of boiar B. P. Sheremet'ev, see A. I. Zaozerskii, Fel'dmarshal B. P. Sheremetev (M., 1989); and N. I. Pavlenko, Ptentsy gneda Petra (M., 1984), 12-108. On his complicated relationship to the tsar's "company," see Zaozerskii, "Fel'dmarshal Sheremetev i pravitel'svennaia sreda petrovskogo vremeni," in Rossiia v period reform Petra I, ed. by N. I. Pavlenko (M., 1973), 172-198; and supra, Chapter Two.

69 For a biography of Prince Ia. F. Dolgorukov, one of the oldest, and most powerful supporters of the former Naryshkin candidate, see Airapetian, op. cit., 77, 96, 330, 317; and D. O. Serov, Stroitel imperii: Ocherki gosudarstvenoi i kriminal'noi deiatel'nosti spovednikov Petra I (N., 1996), 231; and supra, Chapter Three. He first appears with the title of "first senator and minister" during Peter's wedding to Catherine. See PZh 1712 g., 3, 14.
example to the lesser ranks. Sheremet’ev, to take the best-documented case, had successfully played this role for more than a decade, ever since he had returned from abroad as a Malta Knight to take up a post as the head of the Russian army. However, after more than a decade of service, he came to resent the obligations imposed by the tsar’s incessant demands upon his time and his health. By the spring of 1712, the General-Field Marshal even contemplated trading-in his hard-earned military decorations for the quiet life of a monk, the traditional and respected form of retirement for a Muscovite courtier.\textsuperscript{70} But Peter would not stand to see the career of his top military man, and the first Muscovite officer to belong to a foreign chivalric order, end in such an inglorious way. Calling Sheremet’ev to St. Petersburg, the tsar organized a triumphal entry to greet the returning general in a manner which emphasized the “honor” (Rus. gonor) that attended the successful performance of his secular obligations.\textsuperscript{71}

One month later (8 May 1712), in order to forestall any future thoughts of retirement once and for all, the tsar decided to marry off the sixty-year-old widower. Since vows of marriage and those of the monastic life were mutually incompatible, this arranged marriage guaranteed that Sheremet’ev would have to remain in royal service. The general’s new bride was A. P. Naryshkina (née Saltykova), the twenty-six-year old

\textsuperscript{70} Pavlenko, Ptentsy, op. cit., 90; Zaozerskii, op. cit., 127.

\textsuperscript{71} For a description of this “triumphal entry,” see P. B. Sheremet’ev to A. D. Menshikov (14 April 1712); cited in Zaozerskii, Fel’dmarshał, op. cit., 129.
widow of Peter’s maternal uncle, L. K. Naryshkin.72 The tsar organized a wedding celebration that befitted a cavalier who had (indirectly) married into the royal family. The sumptuous feast took place in the same palace where the tsar had celebrated his own wedding. The heads of the Foreign Affairs chancellery and the naval ministry served as the groom’s proxy fathers, the new tsaritsa, Catherine Alekseevna, was one of the proxy mothers, and the tsar himself served as the master of ceremonies.73 With this expression of the tsar’s favor, a sizeable dowry, and a marital connection with the royal family – the strategic goal of many Muscovite clans – Sheremet’ev reconciled himself to seven more years of service. But even upon his death, the old soldier could not realize his desire of retiring to the Kiev Monastery of the Caves. Violating the terms of his courtier’s last will and testament, the tsar ordered that the Russian general and cavalier be buried with full military honors in the Aleksandr Nevskii Monastery in St. Petersburg, in order to increase the prestige of the new capital and its patron saint, the Russian warrior-prince, St. Aleksandr Nevskii.74 Thus, in death, as in life, the tsar used the General-Field Marshal to illustrate the transformation of the old Muscovite elite into a European chivalric order of knights.75

However, it was the carnivalesque festivities surrounding the marriage (brak) of another “jester”-groom (and member of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council) – “Arch-

72 Zaozerskii, op. cit., 128-129, 228-229; 281; Pavlenko, op. cit., 90-91.

73 PZh 1712 g., 12-13, 56.

74 Zaozerskii, op. cit., 231, 293-294.

75 On chivalry and Petrine burial processions, see S. I. Nikolaev, Literaturnaja kul’tura petrovskoj epokhi (SPb., 1996), 38-45.
hierarch” (arkhierei) P. I. Buturlin (d. 1723), 76 -- that best captured the transvaluation of values enacted by many of the elite weddings that immediately followed Peter’s second marriage. Taking advantage of the northern location of his new port city, the tsar and his advisors staged a spectacle intended to parallel on an emotional and aesthetic level the extraordinary effect produced by the famous, St. Petersburg “White Nights” (belye nochi). 77 Presiding over this topsy-turvy world of black and white contrasts was the groom, in his capacity as the mock “Arch-Hierarch of St. Petersburg.” 78 As in the “jester-weddings” organized nearly a decade earlier on the outskirts of Moscow, travesty was the order of the day. On 3 June 1712, immediately following the conclusion of the “new-style” festivities surrounding the nuptials of “Senator” Prince Ia. F. Dolgorukov, 79 the tsar “appointed a wedding to be kept after the old fashion” – a deliberately polemical attempt to juxtapose the old and the new.

76 PZh 1712 g., 6. 14. 56; Whitworth, op. cit., 215-216. Buturlin’s wife [name unknown] died on 30 May 1720. See PZh 1720 g., 48. Buturlin himself died on 22 August and was buried on 28 August 1723, just two years after his marriage to A. E. Pashkova, “Prince Pope” Zotov’s widow. See PZh 1723 g., 21, 36-37; and N. F. Samarín, “Buturliny i lishkovy. Zamečki iz bumag seminogo arkhiva N. F. Samarina,” Russkaia starina 6 (1872), 559-563, here 560.

77 According to the log kept by the tsar’s personal secretary, Buturlin’s wedding train was led off by the royal family (vnačale Tsarskaia familia), which was followed (potom) by “the Admiral [F. M. Aprkasin], the Generals, the Senators, the foreign Ambassadors and Residents, as well as the leading figures of St. Petersburg and their wives (zhiteli Peterburskie znatnie s zhenami).” See PZh 1712 g., 14.

78 PZh 1712 g., 14. Buturlin was also known as “His Holiness, Peter-Prick Ewer-Pot (preosviashchennyi Petrakhui korchaga).” See [P. I.] Buturlin to Peter (15 February 1708), quoted in Semevskii, “Petr Velikii kak iumorist,” op. cit., 289.

79 Dolgorukov’s wedding took place in St. Petersburg on 1 June 1712, just a year after he escaped from Swedish captivity (1700-1712). According to the British ambassador, Prince Dolgorukov “was married to a sister of Prince Cercasky [sic. Cherkasskiil]” on 1-2 June 1712. “The Czar officiated as marshal, and the ceremony lasted two days [...]”. On the very next day after Dolgorukov’s new-style wedding, “the tsar appointed a wedding to be kept after the old fashion.” See Whitworth’s dispatch to
Everyone invited to this event, “from the royal family and even to the footmen,” were obliged to come in the long-skirted Muscovite smocks which the British ambassador, who participated in the day’s events, described as both “very extraordinary” and “inconvenient.” While the tsar sent out the appropriate “habits” to the resident foreigners, members of the Russian elite and their wives donned the clothes that “they or their ancestors had worn about thirty years ago.” Furthermore, “so that all might be of a piece,” the tsar had sent for “his father’s old musicians from Moscow.” The staging of these festivities thus evoked the fashions at the court of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich in order to symbolize the generational and cultural transformation underway at the court of his son. Dressed in these period-pieces, the wedding party escorted the bride and groom to the church in which they were to be married in the traditional Orthodox fashion (venchanie). After they had been to church “in this masquerade,”

the whole company embarked on-board a sort of hoy [sic.] or old Russian vessel, very heavy and clumsy, which could sail before the wind, and that being contrary, was towed by a half-galley to Petershoff [sic.], a pretty country house His Majesty has built midway between this place [St. Petersburg] and Cronschloss [sic.], where they arrived about eleven in the evening (for here is no night now) and found a very handsome entertainment ready. The Czar all the way took a particular delight in exposing the old methods of the country, but it was very plain that several others acted their part with regret, and wished themselves in their former condition.

---


* The old Russian vessel (sudno) was called the “Raft of Novgorod” (Novgorodskaja luka). See PZh 1712 g., 14. On the meaning of the local, regional term (*tuma*) for a string of wooden rafts (*drovianata, plotovaia koshma, tsep' plotov*), see V. Dal’, *Tolkovy slovar' zhivago velikoruskago iazyka*, 2nd ed. (SPb.-M., 1882), 4: 667.
Both the ancient Muscovite dress and the poorly-maneuverable, old Russian vessel which carried the wedding party represented the "old methods of the country," which the tsar took such delight in exposing. According to the tsar and the organizers of these festivities, neither had a place in the new commercial, administrative, and maritime center on the shores of the Neva. Their appearance during the carnivalesque wedding of the mock "metropolitan of St. Petersburg" brilliantly captures the highly-charged polemical nature of the travesties which transformed the "old habits" of Muscovite courtiers into disguises for newly-fashioned royal servitors.

The "masquerade"-wedding of the mock "Metropolitan of St. Petersburg" was, therefore, only the most unusual in a series of matrimonial spectacles arranged by Peter for both members of the royal family and for his intimates during the construction of the new capital. Like the "new style" wedding which immediately preceded it, this raucous celebration of "unholy matrimony" symbolized a movement away from wedlock as a tool of clan politics and towards marriage as a way of integrating the Russian elite into the broader European court society. As such, it tends to support the thesis that Petrine matrimonial spectacles constituted one of the chief symbolic acts which established Muscovy's parity abroad while institutionalizing the tsar's charisma at home. Indeed, as I will now try to argue, this proposition can just as easily be demonstrated with regards to the 1715 wedding of "Prince Pope" N. M. Zotov – the best-organized, the most outrageous, and until the celebrations of the Peace of Nystadt (1721), the most public example of "sacred parody" (*parodia sacra*) ever staged at the
court of Peter the Great. Once we realize the polemical thrust behind these spectacles, we will be in a better position to understand why Peter Alekseevich sought to combine the annual Yuletide processions of the “Unholy Council” with the (less frequent, but no less significant) appearances of “jester”-grooms.

_A Marriage of Convenience_

In order to grasp the political significance of the St. Petersburg masquerade of 1715, we must first distinguish between the two separate components that went into the making of this royal spectacle, namely: (a) the forced marriage (_zhenit'ba_) of N. M. Zотов; and (b) the public celebration of that wedding (_svad'ba_), which took the form of a raucous shaming ceremony known (in French) as a _charivari_. In addition, we need to account for the fact that there was a two year gap between the time that Peter ordered the “Prince Pope” to get married (October 1713) and the actual celebration of this wedding (January 1715). That two-year delay gave the tsar and his entourage plenty of time to solve the logistical problems involved in organizing what, until that time, was the most elaborate “jester-wedding” ever staged at the court of Peter Alekseevich. The domestic (and geopolitical) reasons for the delay also help to elucidate the reasons why the organizers of this particular “sacred parody” (_parodia sacra_) transformed the wedding of the “Prince Pope” into a celebration of St. Petersburg and an apotheosis of the “Rear-Admiral Mikhailov” – tsar Peter Alekseevich himself.

The origins of this particular matrimonial spectacle go back to the end of the summer of 1713, when Peter began making plans for the winter festivities which would
follow the end of the first “Finnish campaign” – a combined land and sea invasion of the small northern kingdom, which was the southern “bread-basket” of Sweden’s Baltic empire.1 For an analysis of the Finnish campaigns of 1713-1714, during which Russian forces were involved in a hugely successful attempt to cut off the Swedish Empire from its southern bread-basket, see N. I. Pavlenko, Petr Velikii (M., 1990), 369-373; E. V. Tarle, Russkii flot i vneshniaia politika Petra I (SPb., 1994), 68-80; and Hughes, op. cit., 52.

2 For Zotov’s genealogy and career prior to the 1689 coup, see supra, Chapter One. For Zotov’s career after the 1689 coup, see V. Korsakov, “Zotov, gr. Nikita Moiseevich,” in Russkii biograficheskii slovar’ (NY, 1962), 7:476-481. On Zotov as head of the Moscow-based Privy Chancellery (Blizhniaia kantseliariia), which was the institutional predecessor of the “College of State Accounting” (Revizion-kollegia), see [N. Tokarev], “Blizhniaia kantseliariia pri Petre Velikom i eia dela,” Opisanie dokumentov i bumag khramiashchikhstva v Moskovskom arkhive Ministersva lustritsii (M., 1888), 5 (2): 43-75; N. P. Eroshkin, Istoriia gosudarstvennykh uchrezhdenii dorevoluiionnoi Rossii, 3rd ed. (M., 1983), 74; and E. V. Anisimov, Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka (SPb., 1997), 22-25. For Zotov’s official appointment as “State Fiscal” (gosudarstvennyi fiskal), the courtier responsible for supervising the proper functioning of the administrative apparatus, see the royal decree of 22 August 1711, in PiB, 11 (2): 100, 409. Although the position of “State Fiscal” was soon made redundant by the re-organization of the entire system of state control (fiskalitet), the expansion of Zotov’s responsibilities was a natural consequence of his job as “General-President of the Privy Chancellery,” the central financial auditor of the realm.

3 Peter to N. M. Zotov (30 August 1713), SPb. FIRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 149.

4 Peter to F. Iu. Romodanovskii (4 October 1713), SPb. FIRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, tols. 211, 212.
Prozorovskaiia), a member of the female half of the mock ecclesiastical council, the tsar intended to gather his entire “company” in St. Petersburg for the projected (and almost obligatory) triumphal entry of the victorious Russian tsar. But instead of taking up on Peter’s invitation, the septuagenarian broached the subject of his retirement.

The tsar responded as he had to Sheremet’ev’s attempt to unilaterally end his service career – by ordering Zotov to get married. Hoping to postpone the inevitable, Zotov wrote a letter suggesting that he did not plan on coming to St. Petersburg, expressing the hope that Peter would, instead, visit him in Moscow. Zotov’s letter drew a sharp response from the tsar; in a brief note, dated 4 October 1713, Peter dropped the comical tone, if not the mock titulature of the previous summons: “Having received your Most Joking Highness’ letter, I reply that I never wanted to visit Moscow and that I require your arrival around the 20th of November.”

---

85 Peter to Princess A. P. Golitsyna (4 October 1713), SPb. F IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 216. On Princess Golitsyna (née Prozorovskaiia), see infra, Chapter Five.

86 A recently discovered archival document suggests that Zotov may have been worried about more than his advanced age. On 4 October 1713, just a few weeks before Peter had sent out his “relation,” the tsar had stripped Zotov’s son, brigadier V. N. Zotov, of his rank and removed him from his post as ober-commandant of Reval, for precisely the kind of illegal operations that the elder Zotov – as the courtier officially responsible for maintaining probity in the realm’s administrative and financial affairs – was charged with preventing. See Peter to F. M. Apraksin (4 October 1713), SPb. F. IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 213; and Peter to the new ober-commandant of Reval (27 November 1714), ibid., No. 76, fol. 267; for a summary of the case against V. N. Zotov, and his request to be re-instated as a brigadier, see RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. II, kn. No. 25 (1715), fol. 473-474ob. In fact, Zotov’s request for retirement (like his reluctance to come to St. Petersburg) may have stemmed from his fears about those “malicious people in Petersburg,” whose machinations had presumably sought to bring down his son.

87 Zotov’s assumption may have been based on the fact that in Peter’s letter to Romodanovskii, written at the start of the 1713 campaign season, the tsar considered dropping in on “His Highness” in Moscow, “if there is time.” See Peter to F. Iu. Romodanovskii (28 April 1713), SPb. F IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 72, fol. 174.

88 Peter to N. M. Zotov (4 October 1713), SPb. F IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 215.
Zotov received this sharply-worded reply, he hit upon another delaying tactic. In a letter to his “Most kind and gracious sovereign[,] tsar Peter Alekseevich,” dated 2 October 1713, the old Russian courtier acknowledged that he was as powerless to refuse the tsar’s wishes as he was capable of going against the will of God.

I report to your highness, like unto God himself:] From your sovereign lips I have received your will, along with a true affirmation that you do not wish to release me [from service and allow me] to enter a monastery and become a monk; instead, in order to take care of my house, you ordered me get married, having chosen a good, middle-aged woman, in order to cherish [me in] my old age. Now, according to your gracious sovereign charity, for tending my old age, I have been ordered to live in Moscow until the [roads are once again passable in] winter. But if, sovereign, one of these days there shall be found a wife fit for my marriage, allow me, our gracious sovereign, to be wed here in Moscow without any fanfare and concealed from the machinations of the malicious people in Petersburg. Later, sovereign, when we arrive in Petersburg, whatever public [festivities] you wish to arrange for your sovereign entertainment, I will happily be ready to amuse you. Marriage [is] probably the only thing capable of dragging an old woman away from Moscow: without it, no widow will want to [take a] ride with a groom on her frozen shame.

Couching his reluctance in the phrase “one of these days,” Zotov expressed his hopes that a marriage ceremony was only in the planning stages and that the tsar might still be persuaded to abandon it. This implicit refusal belied the eagerness with which the old courtier asserted his readiness to perform his role as the main character in the projected royal amusement. In this light, the weak pun with which he ended the letter was

---

89 N. M. Zotov to Peter (2 October 1713), RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, chast’ 1, d. 17, fols. 518-518/ob., 521 ob.; published by Semevskii, “Petr Velikii kak iumorist,” op. cit., 291-292. In a postscript to this same letter, Zotov asked the tsar to allow his youngest son, Konon, to return from his studies abroad, so that he could pay a visit to his brother, Ivan, “who is lying on his deathbed,” in Moscow. See RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, chast’ 1, d. 17, fols. 518-518/ob., 521 ob; Semevskii, op. cit., 292. The tsar denied this request: “It is impossible to release your son [Konon] from service; he is translating a naval statute for the spring […].” See Peter to N. M. Zotov (c. 21 October 1713), SPb. F. IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 256.
perhaps a better reflection of the courtier’s unwillingness to live up to his duties than an old man’s misogynous comment on the "frigidity" of his potential bride.

In this case, however, neither attestations of faith nor obscene jokes could dissuade Peter from his intentions. In his reply to Zотов’s letter, Peter pretended to take the old courtier’s hesitant acquiescence as an affirmation of the “Prince-Pope’s” zeal to get married:

We have received your Holiness’ letter, in which you express your desire to enter into legal matrimony. No one can be forbid that. But we cannot allow you surreptitiously [tatskii, lit. like a thief, or robber] to perform the seventh sacrament in the ancient barbaric custom (obrazom drevniago varvarskogo obychaia). For as the Apostle says, “if I build up again the very things that I once tore down, then I demonstrate that I am a transgressor.” Also, it is impossible in that matter to deprive us, and this place [St. Petersburg], of your [wedding] celebration [veselie, lit. merriment]. As for [the excuse] that she [the bride] does not have anyone to ride with from Moscow, tell my sister [tsarevna Natal’ia Alekseevna] to take her along (and show her this letter [to prove] that I ordered her to do it) and it will immediately be done. As for making your trip before the winter, I would like you [to come] before the 20th of next month, although I leave that up to you; just be here before Christmas […].

Seeking to forestall any more evasive tactics, the tsar branded Zотов’s request for a private wedding as tantamount to a criminal act – a characterization, which was based on an explicit invocation of the apostle Paul’s injunction against “transgressors” (Galatians 2: 18). Two questions come immediately to mind: Why would the tsar

---

90 Peter to N. M. Zотов (c. 21 October 1713), SPb. F. IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 256; published in Materialy dlia istorii Gangutskoi operatsii (Petrograd, 1914), 1 (1): 68. The last sentence, regarding news of Menshikov’s victories in Pomerania and other expected “pleasant things,” echoes the tsar’s letter to his sister, written on 21 October 1713, which allows us to date his letter to Zотов. See SPb. F. IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 240-241.

91 The reference to “transgression” may also have been a tacit reminder about the legal troubles of Zотов’s eldest son. See supra. Although the tsar did not mention the case against Vasily Nikitich in this letter, Zотов must surely have understood the personal rebuke behind the implication that his plans to
quote the scriptures to his old tutor? And why would he invoke this particular passage of Paul’s “Epistle to the Galatians”? An answer to this question helps to shed light on the reason why the tsar insisted that the “Prince Pope” celebrate his nuptials in the new, Orthodox, “city of St. Peter.”

When the tsar playfully chided his mock father-superior for attempting “to build up the very things” that Zotov himself had helped “to tear down,” he was making a statement that applied as much to his own “transgressions” as they did to those of the mock patriarch or his son. In fact, Peter’s comments about the “ancient barbaric customs” associated with the performance of the “seventh sacrament” in Moscow must be seen against the background of the innovative matrimonial spectacles staged by the tsar and his courtiers in the new imperial capital. The tsar’s polemical, if implicit, distinction between the old and the new echoed the apostle Paul’s discussion of the difference between a righteous life, lived in anticipation of Jesus’ return, and a hypocritical one, lived by paying lip-service to the tenets of the faith. In his epistle to the Galatians, Paul rebuked the apostle Peter — the disciple to whom Christ had left his Church — for continuing to espouse those “ancient” customs (such as circumcision), which would have made the transition to Christianity that much easier for the new Jewish converts to the faith. Denouncing Peter’s apparent inability to recognize the radical break heralded by Jesus’ death and resurrection, Paul insists that for those who

get married in secret amounted to the furtive actions of a “thief” — a serious accusation, in light on the tsar’s repeated, violent, anti-corruption campaigns. Since the tsar would not release Zotov’s youngest son, Konon Nikitich, from service, the “Prince Pope” had to deal with his son’s legal troubles in the same way that he did with the tsar’s insistence that he re-marry, namely, without the support of his familial and social networks.
have truly come to believe in justification through faith, there is no going back to the works of the law. To believe in the divine grace of the Anointed One is to be beyond the law – the nomos as defined under the old dispensation – and in the realm of the coming kingdom of God.

A secular version of this eschatologically-oriented antinomianism underlies Peter’s reference to the Pauline epistles in his letter to the “Prince Pope.” Addressing his own mock pontiff as the comical foil for St. Peter, the tsar invoked Paul’s rebuke in order to emphasize the radical and irreversible nature of the break heralded by the relocation of the Muscovite capital to the new imperial city on the shores of the Neva River. For the mock spiritual leader of his Transfigured Kingdom to get married in the “ancient barbaric customs” was as much of a transgression under the conditions of the new dispensation proclaimed in St. Petersburg as the Galatians’ reliance on the works of the law during the messianic age heralded by the death and resurrection of Christ. By specifying that he intended Zotov’s wedding to take place in St. Petersburg, the growing cosmopolitan port-city dedicated to Peter’s patron saint, the tsar sought to underline the imminent realization of his life-long attempt to institute, on earth, a “well-ordered” Orthodox empire. Peter’s letter reveals, therefore, that the spectacular St. Petersburg wedding of the “Prince Pope” formed an integral part of the attempt to capitalize on the millenarian moment heralded by the military success of Russian arms.

---

92 The Finnish campaigns had been so successful, that by the end of 1714, Russian troops were able to drive Swedish forces out of the kingdom and to occupy the entire Finnish coast. See Hughes, op. cit. 52.
and the geopolitical success of Russian diplomacy. For it is precisely at this time that geopolitical and military developments conspired to offer one of the best possibilities – at least since the Russian victory at Poltava (in 1709) – for a honorable end to the long Russo-Swedish conflict (1700-1721) and for the official diplomatic recognition of the tsar’s earthly “Paradise” (paradiz). But it is precisely at this point that all of the tsar’s preparations for Yuletide 1713 came to crashing halt.

The culprit for this unexpected change of plans was none other than A. E. Stremoukhova (née Pashkova) (1681?-1720), the woman whom the tsar had personally picked to be Zotov’s intended. As early as 8 November 1713, Peter had informed his friend and comrade-in-arms, general-lieutenant I. I. Buturlin (1661-1738), about the

---

93 Russian military successes during the Finnish campaign were capped off by the defeat of a small Swedish armada at the battle of Hangö (26 July 1714). The actual geopolitical significance of this naval victory a paled in comparison with the symbolic significance, which Russian diplomats attached to what amounted to the first major success of the newly-founded, Russian imperial navy. See Hughes, op. cit., 52-53.

94 After the supporters of the Bourbons forced their Habsburg counterparts to sign the Peace of Utrecht (11 April 1713), the European powers which had been involved in the “War of the Spanish Succession” once again turned their attention to the North. In particular, the diplomatic establishments of France and England, more worried about the Baltic trade than about the decline of the Swedish empire, attempted to mediate a peace between Russia and Sweden. See Tarle, op. cit., 81-84; N. N. Molchanov, Diplomatia Petra Pervogo (M., 1986), 324-325.

95 Peter to A. D. Menshikov (7 April 1706). PIB, 4: 209. For an insightful analysis of Peter’s epistolary references to “edenic” St. Petersburg, see Hughes, op. cit., 211-213. For a suggestive attempt to place this “utopian” theme in a broader context, see Baehr, op. cit., ix, 1. 31-33, 38-40, 65, 153, 184 n. 2.

96 Anna Eremeeyevna died on 30 May 1720 and was buried on 1 June in the Church of St. Samson, located on the Vyborg side of the Neva River. See PZ 1720 g., 22, 48; and Liubimov, op. cit., 83. According to the eyewitness account of the Hannoverian diplomat, at the time of the mock wedding (January 1715), Zotov’s “bride” was 34 years old. See F.-Ch. Weber, The Present State of Russia (London, 1723), 1: 89.

97 For a biography of I. I. Buturlin, a distant relative (dvоiurodnyi plemiannik) of P. I. Buturlin, the mock “Metropolitan of St. Petersburg, see “Buturlin, Ivan Ivanovich,” Russkii biograficheskii slovar’
"desire" of "the most-blessed father, the Prince Pope" to "be wed" (brachitsa). In this letter, the tsar first mentioned the name of Zotov’s potential bride, "a widow from the Pashkov clan (rodu Pashkoveych), previously been married to an officer of our regiment, Ivan Stremoukhov." In a matter of weeks, Peter’s intimate knowledge about the affairs of the Preobrazhenskoe life-guard regiment allowed him to locate someone who could not possibly object to going along with the tsar’s plans for another one of his Yuletide weddings. However, the widow of Ivan Stremoukhov was not as eager to make a spectacle of herself as the tsar had imagined. Although the tsar expected Zotov and Stremoukhova "here soon," when the "Prince Pope" did finally arrive in St. Petersburg, at the end of November 1713 (as the tsar had instructed), he came without his betrothed. So, although Zotov participated in the court’s winter festivities, the wedding of the mock pontiff of the Transfigured Kingdom had to be postponed.


98 Peter to I. I. Buturlin (8 November 1713), SPb. F. IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 302. He added, "I think this is no small piece of news (novina ne malaia)."

99 Ibid., fol. 302. Lieutenant-captain (kapitan-portuchik) Ivan Stremoukhov was killed on 23 September 1708, during the battle of Lesnaya. See Liubimov, op. cit., 83. This Ivan Stremoukhov may have been the same person as I. F. Stremoukhov, who served as a rank-and-file courtier (riadovoi stol’nik) between 1686 and 1700. See Airapetian, op. cit., 415.

100 Peter to I. I. Buturlin (8 November 1713), SPb. F. IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 73, fol. 302.

101 Zotov arrived in St. Petersburg on 21 November 1713, in time to participate in the traditional Yuletide caroling processions, as well in the carnivalesque funeral procession of "Archdeacon Gideon [Iu. F. Shakhovskoi]," the "Cavalier of the Order of Judas." See PZh 1713 g., 51-53. On the Shakhovskoi funeral, see supra, Chapter Three.

102 Despite this temporary set-back, however, Peter continued making the requisite preparations. Acting on his declared intention to put his own sister in charge of the arrangements for conveying the
After the start of the new campaign season in Finland, the tsar entrusted the task of organizing the “wedding of Privy State Counselor Nikita Moiseevich Zотов” to G. I. Golovkin (1660-1734), a close member of Peter’s “company” and the head of the Foreign Affairs Chancellery (Posolskii prikaz). 103 By handing the task of staging a “jester wedding” over to the Muscovite chancellery, traditionally responsible for organizing all official, Muscovite royal spectacles – particularly, royal weddings – Peter had, in effect, put the projected royal amusement on a “regular,” bureaucratic, footing. 104 Indeed, the involvement of the Foreign Affairs chancellery may go a long way towards explaining why the Zотов wedding offered such an accurate parody of the old, Muscovite wedding ritual. It may also help to elucidate why this particular “jester wedding” provided such an astute assessment of the contemporary diplomatic situation. In the months immediately preceding the masquerade-wedding of the “Prince Pope,” the clerical staff of Golovkin’s chancellery compiled muster rolls for all the people who were expected to take part in the celebrations, drafted the registers of the costumes that

reluctant bride to St. Petersburg, the tsar personally contacted tsarevna Natal’ia Alekseevna, who still lived in Moscow, in Novo-Preobrazhenskoe. In an addendum (v trydule) to a letter written two months after the projected wedding failed to materialize, Peter passed on a “request” from the mock spiritual leader of the Transfigured Kingdom to tsarevna Natal’ia: “The Prince Pope has asked that you take your bride along with you. Announce [this] to her. When she receives a letter from him [calling her to St. Petersburg], bring her along with you.” Peter to tsarevna Natal’ia Alekseevna (24 January 1714), SPb. F IRI, f. 270, No. 75, fol. 59. For an analysis of Natal’ia Alekseevna’s special role as cultural intermediary at the court of her brother, see Lindsey Hughes, “‘Between Two Worlds’: Tsarevna Natal’ia Alekseevna and the ‘Emancipation’ of Petrine Women,” in A Window on Russia: Papers from the Fifth International Conference of the Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia, Gargnano, 1994, ed. by M. di Salvo and L. Hughes (Rome, 1996), 29-36.

103 On G. I. Golovkin, see supra, Chapter Three. On his role in the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope,” see infra, Appendix.

104 Indeed, the enormous amount of paperwork involved in staging this mock wedding recalled the chancellery’s efforts in organizing the (already) old-fashioned Muscovite royal marriages. On the
each participant was supposed to wear, and even kept a record of the noise-makers that each member of the wedding train would carry. At the end of September 1714, the staff of the Foreign Affairs chancellery oversaw the implementation of a royal decree, which announced the call-up of the projected wedding guests, both men and women, all of whom were instructed to assemble at the appointed time and place in order to register for a mask, a costume, and an appropriate musical instrument. Closer to the date of the masquerade, Golovkin’s chancellery also oversaw a general dress rehearsal (smotr), for the duration of which, the participants were ordered to keep their outfits role of the Foreign Affairs chancellery in drawing up and storing the muster rolls for Muscovite royal weddings, see Martin, op. cit., 293-294., 318, 325, 339-240.

Most of these documents have been collected in an archival file entitled “Zapiski kasaushchiissia do shuoshnii svad`by kniz’ papy tainogo sovetnika Nikity Moiseevicha Zotova v Sant-Peterburge [1714’], Sent. po fevr: 1715’),” in RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129. This file also includes some information on the 1721 wedding of “Prince Pope” P. I. Buturlin, who was married in the same style, and even to the same woman, as his predecessor.

There, the maskers would have to confirm this royal assignment by appending their personal signatures next to their names (if they were literate), or to have a chancellery scribe note that they were notified (povementeho or ukaaz slyshan) about their place in the royal spectacle. Afterwards, the clerks from the Foreign Affairs chancellery would compile preliminary “registers” (restry), which would then be shown to the tsar and amended as required. See the royal decrees dated 21 September 1714, in RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 1-1v. (ministers, generals, and lieutenant colonels ordered to appear at the house of G. I. Golovkin); 2-2v., 3 (decree addressed to chancellery secretaries and scribes); 4 (decree addressed to secretaries not listed previously, as well as to Admiral F. M. Apraksin, Kikin and his wife, and Sava Raguzinskii, who commented: “I have had a Venetian costume ready for the last two months” [U menia venetsianskoe platno [sic] tomu 2 mesia`ta gotovo]). For the preliminary “register” (reestr) of the main courtiers, and their wives (reestr gospozham), organized according to their ranks, see RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 8-8v., 9-9v., 12.

In December 1714, the scribes reworked a letter from the royal favorite (A. D. Menshikov) into a royal decree, which ordered the maskers to don their costumes and to re-assemble at the “house of secretary Volkov on Vasile`evskii Island” for an official inspection (smotr). See Prince A. D. Menshikov to G. I. Golovkin (10 December 1714). RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 13-14. For the text of the royal decree (11 December 1714) based on this letter, and the names of the different individuals called for inspection, see ibid., fols. 15, 16-16v, 17-17v., 18-21v., 94-95. In the same letter, Menshikov also forwarded the tsar’s personal instructions about the special, ten-person floats to be used during this winter masquerade, as well as a list of the courtiers who were to be responsible for their construction. According to the “register of [wedding] sleighs” (reestr lineam) attached to this letter, there was originally supposed to be only thirteen floats: those of the “Groom” (zhenikhov), “[His] Royal
concealed by the long mantles of their cloaks, so as to maintain an element of surprise for the other "maskers."^{108}

The Foreign Affairs Chancellery was also responsible for supervising the foreign master-tailor (portnoi master) and seamstresses (masterity) hired to create the spectacular wedding clothes of the "Prince Pope" and his bride.^{109} Judging by the costumes commissioned on the orders of the Foreign Affairs chancellery, the organizers of the projected masquerade intended it to contain a message, which would be of interest to the entire Christian world. Indeed, if we analyze the reasons why the old groom appeared in the crimson cassock (rias) and red skull-cap (skufeika) of a

---

^{108} Those people who could not attend this inspection had to come up with a written explanation of why they could not come; legitimate excuses appeared to be sickness (bolen, or ob"lavila chto bol'na) or previous service obligations (v pokhode or po skase zheny ego [Pankratiy Sumorokov], chto i on poekhal v Myzu). See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 17. 17v., 64, 64v., 94.

^{109} The information (spravka) collected by the clerks of the "College of Foreign Affairs" (Gosudarstvennaya Kollegiya inosstrannykh del, instituted in 1718), in time for the 1721 wedding of Zотов's successor as Prince Pope revealed that "Bart Fan," the foreign master-tailor who had created the clothes worn by the bride and groom during the 1714 Zотов wedding, was already dead. See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 65-65v., 66.
“Roman [Catholic] cardinal” (kak nosiat rimskie kardinaly)\(^\text{110}\) and why his young bride wore a long black dress, “in the Spanish manner” (plat’e Gishpanskoiu manerioiu),\(^\text{111}\) we will see the wedding of the “Prince Pope” served as a scurrilous commentary on the losing side known as the “War of the Spanish Succession” (1700-1713).\(^\text{112}\)

\(^{110}\) During the 1714 wedding of N. M. Zotov, the groom was supposed to have worn a cherry-colored undergarment made of thick Chinese silk and brocade (kaftan haiberekovskoi kitaikskoi vishnevogo tsvetu), lined with two types of polar fox fur (dva mekha pestsovy i cherev’i), and fastened with several crimson buttons made out of foreign silk (pugovits shcholkovskikh nemetskikh malinovogo tsventa), described elsewhere as a long, multi-buttoned (pugovitsy [...] chastye), crimson “cassock” (ispodniaia riasa iz malinovoi materii), “with narrow sleeves, like [those worn by] Roman cardinals” (rukava uokie, kak nosiat rimskie kardinaly). This kaftan was to be worn under a short, buttoned mantle (poleupancha) of crimson or red cramoisy (karmazina), with an ermine collar (otlog) and a specially-made fastening cord (smur dita zaviatskii). There was also a velvet-lined outer cloak (verkhniaia epancha) of red cloth, with scarlet trim (s lopastmi lintovymy alym). In addition, the groom sported a squirrel-lined crimson cap, elsewhere referred to as a “skull-cap (skafetka), like [the ones worn by] Roman cardinals,” as well as a red, fur-trimmed, velvet hat (shaposhka), with fur ear flaps (lopastki kamordkovy), “like the ones worn by [Polish Catholic] priests” (kak nosiat ksenzy). See See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 93, 93v., 65, 65v. 66.

\(^{111}\) The bride, “Madam Stramoukhova [sic.],” wore a black dress “in the Spanish manner” (plat’e Gishpanskoiu manerioiu) of “seemly silk materials” (is priluchnykh materii shelkowykh), with gold and silver thread sewn into the lace sleeves and a high collar. She also wore a short, fur-lined brocade mantle (epanechka iz shtofa), which was fastened with wide scarlet ribbons (zaviatski lintovye alye). Finally, to top off her dress, the bride of the “Prince Pope” also sported a wig and hair-extensions (v volosy k pribavku k natural’nym). See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 93, 93v., 65, 65v. 66.

\(^{112}\) In the military conflict between the supporters of the Bourbon and the Habsburg contenders for the Spanish throne, Russia sided against Leopold I and his allies in the Vatican, who attempted to pass off the sordid political pretensions of the Holy Roman Emperor as the rightful, dynastic restoration of the universal Catholic monarchy of Charles V. To many contemporary commentators, especially those who had felt the devastating effects of the earlier wars of religion and had come away from that experience wary of the intentions of the Emperor and the Papacy, this plan seemed like another attempt to restore Catholic hegemony on the continent. In response to what they took to be a Papist provocation, the Protestant powers of northern and central Europe – many of whom served as Russia’s diplomatic and trading partners – formed an alliance with Louis XIV, the “Most Christian King of France,” Europe’s main bulwark against Habsburg domination. This coalition sought to forestall the plans of the Holy Roman Emperor and the Pope by force of arms. But because this was as much a war of words as a war of swords, the members of this anti-Habsburg coalition also published many political pamphlets, which lampooned their political and confessional opponents and which sought to discredit them in the eyes of European public opinion. Even the Russian government joined in on the “game,” commissioning the translation of a Polish broadside about the current political situation. See RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 4, ch. III, No. 95, fols. 378-379v., 380-381; ibid., No. 93, fols. 251-254v. For an insightful analysis of the
When viewed in the context of the anti-Catholic and anti-Habsburg propaganda produced during the “War of the Spanish Succession,” the masquerade costumes of the “Prince Pope” and his “Spanish” bride acquire a distinctively polemical coloration. In her long black dress, the widow Stremoukhova presented the spectacle of a “widowed” Spain, who, despite the recent death of her “husband,” King Carlos II, and her own properly mournful appearance, was, in reality, open to the “advances” of her many covetous neighbors. Similarly, the ecclesiastical vestments of her new beau, the “Prince Pope,” hinted at the “impure” political motives for the “courtship” between Spain and the Vatican. In sum, the Zotov-Stremoukhova wedding embodied a critique of the “unholy union” between the Papacy and the Spanish Habsburgs – a ruling house which had become synonymous with overweening imperial ambition and religious intolerance. As we will see, this “playful” commentary on the religious and political pretensions of the Holy Roman Emperor and the Roman Catholic Pope served as a counterpoint to the supposedly more tolerant, if no less warlike, imperial vision of the Russian Orthodox tsar.

A Royal Charivari

On 15 January 1715, on the eve of the wedding, the tsar issued a decree, detailing the order of ceremony for the long-awaited St. Petersburg masquerade. On the following morning, the participants were to listen for a three-gun salute, a signal to don their costumes and to go immediately to their muster places, making sure to hide their fancy dress under their mantles, “as during the [previous] inspection” (kak byli na smotre). The gentleman-maskers were reminded to take along the musical instruments assigned to them during the dress-rehearsal, while the women were commanded to bring “red piccolos” (dudochki krasnyia). The men were to gather at the house of Count Golovkin, while the women were to assemble at the house of D. G. Rzhevskaya (née Sokovnina), the “Abbess” of the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope.” The tsar, who had paid a personal visit to the houses of both of these courtiers at the start of the annual Yuletide caroling season, just a few weeks prior to the promulgation of this decree, had already assured himself of the fact that the

---

113 See the royal decree, dated 15 January 1715, in RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fols. 55, 55v., and 56 (rough draft, without list of names).

114 Dar’ia Gavrilova was the first cousin of Aleksei Prokof’evich Sokovnin, one of the Muscovite courtiers executed during the 1697 “plot” against the life of the tsar. Like other members of the Sokovnin family, including V. A. Sokovnin, the “Prophet” of Peter’s Transfigured Kingdom (see Chapter Two, note 98), she fell into disfavor after this affair. In the early eighteenth-century she appears to have become a lady-in-waiting in the entourage of tsaritsa Catherine Alekseevna, Peter’s second wife, who employed her as a female jester, as well as a spy. In 1714, the “Arch-Abbess” was assigned to supervise the tsar’s foreign daughter-in-law, Princess Charlotte of Wolfenbüttel, and charged with reporting on any “irregularities” in the household of the tsar’s heir-apparent, tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich. On D. G. Rzhevskaya, see Petr Dolgorukii, Rossiiskaia rodoslovnaiia kniga (SPb., 1857), 4: 31-35; P. F. Karabanov, “Stats-damy i freiliny russkogo dvora v XVIII stoletii [Part I],” Russkaia starina 2 (1870), 482; and Hughes, op. cit., 253; on her brief stint as a royal spy, see D. G. Rzhevskaya to Peter (8 July 1714), in N. G. Ustrialov, Istorija imperatora Petra Velikogo (SPb., 1859), 6: 322.

115 See the entries for 23-25 December 1714, in PZh 1714 g., 150-151. After paying a personal visit to Golovkin and the “Princess Abbess” on 23 December, the tsar returned with a group of Yuletide carollers on 24 and 25 December. They also “sang [the Lord’s] praises” (slavili) at the houses of other
prospective hosts were ready to receive their many guests. The banks of the Neva River in front of their houses had already turned to ice, so the specially-commissioned, ten-man floats (linei) and the “large sledges” (sani bol’shie) set aside “for the ladies” (v chem damam ezdit’), which were supposed to wait for the maskers, had no problem finding parking.\textsuperscript{116}

After dining at Golovkin’s, on 16 January 1715, Peter himself joined the “women and men [who had assembled] in their various costumes” (zhenshchiny i muzhchiny, v raznykh plat’iakh) in order to escort the “Prince Pope” and his bride to the St. Petersburg Trinity Cathedral, the city’s main church.\textsuperscript{117} The colorful account of F. C. Weber, one of the foreign ambassadors who took part in this masquerade, deserves to be quoted at length, if only to get a sense of the spectacle afforded by the carnivalesque wedding procession staged during Yuletide of 1714/1715:

Preparations having been made by the whole Court during three Months for a great Masquerade, the same was at length kept on the 27th and 28th of January [1715 (NS)/ 16-17 January 1715 (OS)]. I will relate the main Particulars, the World never having heard, for ought I know, of the like before. The occasion of this Masquerade was a Wedding. One Sotoff [sic.], who had been the Czar’s Writing-Master in his Majesty’s younger years, was in the 70th Year of his Age advanced to be his Jester, or merrymaking Privy-Counsellor [sic.], and afterwards Mock-Patriarch. Moreover, for Humor sake he was raised to the Dignity of a Prince and at length declared Pope. Invested with those imaginary Characters, and being now in the 84th Year of his Age, the Czar married him to a buxom Widow of thirty-four, and the Nuptials of this extraordinary Couple
courtiers, including, among others, “Prince Pope” Zotov, “Caesar (tsesar’)” Romodanovskii, and “Archhierarch” Buturlin.

\textsuperscript{116} RGADA, f. 156, op. I, ed. khr. 129, fol. 55.

\textsuperscript{117} PZh 1715 g., 47. The Trinity Cathedral, on the St. Petersburg side of the Neva River, was the city’s main church until well into the 1730s, when it was eclipsed by the stone cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul. As Hughes has rightly pointed out, its demolition (in 1927) has “distorted perceptions of the religious configuration of Peter’s city.” See Hughes, op. cit., 214 and 509, note 92.
were solemnized by the Court in Masks, or Mock-show. The Company consisted of about four hundred persons of both sexes. Every four Persons had their proper Dress and peculiar musical Instruments, so that they represented a hundred different sorts of Habits and Music, particularly of the Asiatic Nations. The four Persons appointed to invite the Guests, were the greatest Stammerers that could be found in all Russia. Old decrepit Men who were not able to walk or stand, had been picked out to serve for Bridesmen, // Stewards, and Waiters. There were four running Footmen, the most unwieldy Fellows, who had been troubled with the Gout most of their Life-time, and were so fat and bulky that they wanted others to lead them. The Mock-Tsar of Moscow, who represented King David in his Dress, instead of a Harp had a Lyre covered with a Bear-skin, to play upon. He being the Chief of the Company, was carried on a sort of Pageant placed on a Sled, to the four Corners of which were tied as many Bears, which being pricked with Goads by Fellows purposely appointed for it, made such a frightful roaring as well suited the confused and horrible Din raised by the disagreeing Instruments of the rest of the Company. The Czar himself was dressed like a Boor [Bauer, peasant] of Frizeland [sic.] and skilfully beat a Drum in Company with three Generals. In this manner, Bells ringing everywhere, the ill-matched Couple were attended by the Masks to the Altar of the great Church, where they were joined in Matrimony by a priest a hundred Years old, who had lost his Eyesight and Memory, to supply which Defect a pair of Spectacles were put on his Nose, two Candles held before his Eyes, and the Words sounded into his Ears, which he was to pronounce […].

After the blasphemous wedding ceremony (venchanie) staged at the Trinity Cathedral, the maskers conveyed Zotov and his bride to the spacious palace of the royal favorite, located on the other side of the frozen Neva River, on Vasil’evskii Island. Prince Menshikov, who had served as the master of ceremonies at the tsar’s own wedding, staged an elaborate wedding feast (stol) and provided the newlyweds

\[118\] Weber, op. cit., I: 89-90.

\[119\] The parodic performance of this part of the ceremony prompted one of the chancellery clerks who kept the tsar’s daily log to describe the entire affair as an “illegal marriage” (nezakonnyi brak). See PZh 1715 g., 33. The Zotov wedding appears to have been described by several different clerks from Peter’s “Privy Cabinet,” the chancellery responsible for keeping a daily log of the tsar’s activities. See the slightly different accounts in ibid., 9, 33, 39, and 47. On the tsar’s “Privy Cabinet,” see Hughes, op. cit., 112-113.
with a honeymoon suite (*postel*).\textsuperscript{120} In the morning, if one were to judge from the Cabinet secretary’s brief remark about the matrimonial *levée*, the wedding guests “roused the young Prince Pope” (*podymali molodogo Kniaz’ Papu*) in a scabrous parody of the customary display of a bride’s virginity;\textsuperscript{121} despite the fact that no one seriously expected that this particular bride and groom would ever pass such a test, “tradition” had to be obeyed. Afterwards, the newlyweds and “the entire wedding train” (*svad’ba so vsem poezdom*) mounted the floats and sleighs prepared for the wedding of the “Prince Pope” and, once again braving the frozen waters of the Neva River, crossed over to the St. Petersburg side. After a mid-day meal (*obed*) at the palace of the “Vice Admiral” – the tsar himself\textsuperscript{122} – the company of maskers spent the rest of the day (17 January 1715) being driven around the snow-packed streets of St. Petersburg (*vozili po ulitsam*).\textsuperscript{123} The next night (18 January 1715) the tsar sailed to Kronshlot, signaling the end of the masquerade, although not of the 1715 winter holiday season.\textsuperscript{124}

The symbolic significance of the contrasting colors worn by the “Prince Pope” and his bride – the red of a Roman Catholic cardinal and the black of a devout Spanish

\textsuperscript{120} *PZh* 1715 g., 9.


\textsuperscript{122} *PZh* 1715 g., 9, 33.

\textsuperscript{123} *Ibid.*
widow – as well as the “Many strange Adventures and comical Accidents” that
happened to them, not only during the carnivalesque matrimonial ceremonies but also
and during “their riding on Sleds throughout the Streets,” all served to emphasize the
fact that, from the perspective of the tsar and the other organizers of this event, the
second marriage of Zotov and Stremoukhova was, very self-consciously, intended to be
ill-matched. Indeed, whether one judged them in terms of age, social standing, and
religious affiliation, the union of a widowed young noblewoman and a seventy-year

124 Ibid., 9.

125 Weber, op. cit., I: 90.

126 Seeking to compensate for this difference (and to reward his obedient servant), Peter
instructed the imperial Senate to use the bride’s property in order to provide for Zotov’s old age. A
decree of 25 September 1714 specified that, in accordance with the recently proclaimed Law of Entail,
the landed property of the widow Stremoukhova, consisting of a widow’s allotment (prozhitchnoe
pomest’e) and a hereditary estate (votchina), was to be transferred to “her husband. His Royal Highness’
Private Counselor and General-President of the Privy Chancellery, the Great Count Tippler (graf Magnus
Naklevaniti) Nikita Moiseevich Zotov,” either “now or after the wedding (nyne ili posle zhen’by).” See
Korsakov, op. cit., 479. Pashkova’s property was added to Zotov’s own hereditary estates (votchiny),
which had been given to him from the church lands administered by I. A. Musin-Puskin’s Monastery
Chancellery (Monastyirskii prikaz), sometime before 1707. See “Knigi ‘zapisnye prigovoram’ byvshago
Votchinnago arkhiva,” Opisanie dokumentov i bumag, khraniashchikhsia v Moskovskom Arkhive
Ministerstva iustitsii (M., 1891), 8 (2): 33-34, 158. The 1715 decree also suggests that in addition to his
wife’s “dowry,” Zotov was also promised written confirmation of his promotion to the dignity of
“Count.” Zotov had not received any written confirmation of this honorary promotion since it was
personally conferred upon him by the tsar himself, in commemoration of the capture of the city of Riga
(1710). Although Zotov made sure to write down the exact circumstances of his promotion under the
hastily draw-up royal rescript of 8 July 1710, the old chancellery official knew that having the actual
letters patent (zhelovannaaia gramota) in his possession would help him to back up his claims for equal
treatment with other Petrine courtiers (not to mention his own wife). For the text of the royal patent
confering the title of “Count” on N. M. Zotov, see “Grafy Zotovy,” Gerboved. ed. by S. N. Troitskii
(1914), 131-135.

127 A. E. Stremoukhova (neé Pashkova) was the daughter of a Muscovite nobleman known for
his sympathetic treatment of arch-priest Avvakum, the famous leader of the “Old Believers.” According
to the autobiographical Life of Avvakum, Anna’s father, E. A. Pashkov – an assistant military governor
(tovarischh voevody) of a distant Muscovite outpost in eastern Siberia, where Avvakum had been exiled in
1656-1662 – became the archpriest’s “spiritual son.” Indeed, it appears that despite the fact that
Anna’s grandfather, A. F. Pashkov – the governor of Dauria – disapproved of his son’s religious
convictions (and never missed a chance to flog the heretical chaplain assigned to his troops), Avvakum
seems to have been secretly patronized by most of the governor’s family, including his own wife and
old chancellery clerk could only be described as an “unequal marriage” (neravnyi brak). As befits an unequal marriage, the wedding of this “young married couple” (molodozhennye) was to be accompanied by the “rough music” of its own charivari, the traditional carnivalesque shaming ceremony imposed by the self-appointed guardians of morality upon anyone who violated the prevailing social, sexual, or confessional order of early modern Europe. And within the bounds of the Kingdom Transfigured, these self-appointed guardians of “order” (and “rational” religion) were none other than the tsar and his closest political advisors, in their guise as the Preobrazhenskoe “Abbots of Misrule” and loyal “subjects” of the “Prince Caesar.”

In light of her family’s heterodox confessional allegiances, therefore, the tsar’s decision to unite A. E. Stremoukhova and the “Prince Pope” in the bonds of holy daughter-in-law. Avvakum even baptized (at least) one of Anna’s brothers. See “Life of Avvakum by Himself,” trans. Jane Harrison and Hope Mirrlees, in Medieval Russia’s Epics, Chronicles, and Tales, ed. by Serge A. Zenkovsky, 2nd ed. (NY, 1974), 399-448, here 412, 417, 421-422, 423-424. On the service career of A. F. and E. A. Pashkov, see the respective entries by N. Voronkov, in Russkii biograficheskii slovar’ (SPb., 1902), 12:444-445. For a brief genealogy of the Pashkov clan, see A. B. Lobanov-Rostovskii, Russkaiia rodoslovnaiia kniga, 2nd ed. (SPb., 1895), 2: 77-78.

128 For a late seventeenth-century comical dialogue directed against “unequal marriages,” see “Pritchka o starom muzhe,” in Pamiatiiki literaturny drevnej Russi. XVII vek. Kniga vtoroa (M., 1989), 234-236, 614. Compare the consequences described in this dialogue with Peter’s reported warning to Zotov not to consummate the marriage with the young widow for health reasons. See K. M. Zotov to Peter (27 June 1720), RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 4, ch. 1, No. 52, fols. 338-340, here 340: “You yourself, O most-wise Sovereign (premudruii gosudar’), deigned physically to tell (izvoli fizicheskii skazat’) my father, when he became ill shortly after his marriage, that for an old husband, sexual relations with a young wife is poison (sovokuplenie s chenoiu starogo muzha est’ emu otrava).”

129 On “rough music” and charivaris, see Natalie Zemon Davis, “The Reasons of Misrule” and “Women on Top,” in Society and Culture in Early Modern France (Stanford, 1975); 97-151; E. P. Thompson, “Rough Music,” in Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture (NY, 1993), 467-538; and Burke, op. cit., 198-199; who cites the following 17th-century English definition of a charivari: “an infamous (or infaming) ballad, sung, by an armed troop, under the window of an old dotard, married, the day before, unto a young wanton, in mockery of them both.”

130 On “Abbeys of Misrule,” see Davis, op. cit., 98ff.; and Burke, op. cit., 184.
matrimony, within the sacred walls of St. Petersburg’s Trinity Cathedral – most important shrine of the new northern capital – evinces a highly critical attitude towards the “old,” Muscovite “dispensation” on the part of the organizers of the masquerade-wedding. By conflating the “ancient barbaric customs” of the Greek Catholic Church with those of its Latin counterpart, and then measuring these against the “heretical” practices of the Old Belivers, the tsar and his advisors offered an ironic commentary on the long-standing conflict between the defenders of “religious enlightenment” (prosveshchenie) and their “schismatic” opponents, a conflict which, presumably, could not be resolved harmoniously before the capital of Peter’s Transfigured Kingdom was relocated to the “new Jerusalem” on the shores of the Neva River.

 Appropriately enough, the comical reconciliation of these two opposing strands of old Muscovite spirituality was to take place in the new imperial “residence” of “Friedrich”

131 On the polemical terms of the debate inaugurated during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich by the reform of Orthodox liturgy, see Cathy Jean Potter, “The Russian Church and the Politics of Reform in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century” (Ph. D. thesis, Yale University, 1993), esp. 4-5.

132 The fact that the pontiff of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council was forced to marry the daughter of an Old Believer may have been intended as a parody of the mystical union between the Church and her heavenly “Bridegroom” – an allegorical image derived from the Song of Songs, attributed to King Solomon himself. By insuring that the (presumably celibate) septuagenarian and his buxom young bride would be joined in the bonds of holy matrimony in a caricatured version of the Orthodox sacrament, the organizers of the unequal marriage between Zotov and Pashkova may have sought to transform the intense eroticism of the Song of Songs into a grotesque excoration of hypocrisy, senility, and concupiscence. On this mystical interpretation of the Song of Songs allegory, see Pierre Adnès, “Mariage et vie Chrétienne” and “Mariage spirituel,” in Dictionnaire de Spiritualité Ascétique et Mystique: Doctrine et Histoire (Paris, 1980), 10: 355-388, esp. 362, and 388-408. In a petition dated 14 January 1715, K. M. Zotov seems to have recognized that the symbolism of the projected masquerade-wedding was based on the “Wisdom of Solomon”; in fact, he invoked the same “wisdom literature” to argue against the tsar’s plans to force his father to re-marry. The tsar, however, would not be dissuaded, especially at this late date; on 24 January 1715 (already after the masquerade), Peter issued a detailed list of new instructions to Konon Zotov, the first point of which ordered him to return to France. For the
Romodanovskii, the Solomonic "Prince of Peace" who served as the tsar's mock double.\textsuperscript{133}

The prominent role which Weber attributed to Prince Romodanovskii, the "Mock Tsar of Moscow" and "Chief of the Company" during the St. Petersburg masquerade of 1715, demonstrates that knowledgeable eyewitnesses could sense that there was more to this court spectacle than the obscene and blasphemous amusements typical of charivaris and Yuletide matrimonial games.\textsuperscript{134} Although he preferred to downplay the contemporary political significance of the biblical allusion to the archetype of divine kingship,\textsuperscript{135} the Hanoverian diplomat correctly noted the incongruous detail that the tsar's double - the "secular" counterpart to the mock arch-priest of the Transfigured Kingdom - appeared in the role of the "humble Psalmist."

To get an insight into why "Prince Caesar" Romodanovskii dressed up as king David (\textit{tsare davydovskom}) during the royal charivari of 1715,\textsuperscript{136} we have to recall that Fedor

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item For a reference to St. Petersburg as the "residence" of "His Majesty," the "Prince Caesar" of the Transfigured Kingdom, see Peter to Prince F. Yu. Romodanovskii (8 July 1709), in \textit{PiB}, 9: 246. On "Prince Friedrich" Romodanovskii as a new "Solomon," see supra, Chapter Two.
\item On the eroticism of popular Yuletide rituals in Russia, see V. Ia. Propp, \textit{Russkie agrarnye prazdniki} (L., 1963), 116-120; and William H. Hopkins, "The Development of 'Pornographic' Literature in 18\textsuperscript{th}- and Early 19\textsuperscript{th}-Century Russia" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1977), 39-41.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Polikarpov’s model for a “jester” (glumnik) who learns to do good by engaging in mockery was none other than the harp-playing biblical monarch who composed the Psalms.¹³⁷ For their part, the Russian tsar and his courtiers were very well acquainted with the political and religious significance of an analogy between the biblical king and his contemporary imperial “successors.” For, in the words of a perceptive foreign observer who visited Muscovy at the beginning of the seventeenth century, according to the Russians, “the word for Tzar is to be found in the Holy Scriptures. For wherever mention is made of David, or Solomon, or other [biblical] 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 ‘Tsutar’ [Rus. tsesar’ = Holy Roman Emperor] or ‘Kroll’ [Rus. korol’ = king] are merely a human invention and acquired [only] by feats of arms.”¹³⁸

By assigning the leading role in the masquerade procession to “Prince Caesar” Romodanovskii, Peter and his advisors sought to make an implicit comparison between


¹³⁷ See supra, n. 8.

¹³⁸ See Estat de Russie et Grand Duché de Moscovie [...] à scavoir depuis l’an 1590 jusques en l’an 1606, en septembre par le Capitaine Jacques Margeret (Paris, 1607), quoted by N. G. Ustrialov, Skazaniia sovremennikov o Dimitrii Samozvantse, 3rd ed. (SPb., 1859), I: 254, and translated from the French by David Budgen, in B. A. Uspenskii, “Tsar and Pretender: Samozvanchesto or Royal Imposture in Russia as a Cultural-Historical Phenomenon,” The Semiotics of Russian Culture, ed. by Ann Shukman (Ann Arbor, 1984), 260-261. Compare Margeret’s comments to the observations of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich’s personal physician: “As for the word Czar, it has so near relation to Cesar […] that it may well be granted to signifie [sic.] Emperour [sic.]. The Russians would have it to be an higher Title than King, and yet, they call David Czar, and our Kings Kirrols [sic.] […]” Samuel Collins, The Present State of Russia […] (London, 1671), 54-55. On Dr. Collins, see supra, Chapter One.
the celebrations associated with the royal charivari in St. Petersburg and the jubilation of the Israelites at the ceremonial transfer of the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem. For example, the authors of I Chronicles and II Samuel describe how king David and the entire “house of Israel” conveyed the Ark of the Covenant up to the Temple in Jerusalem, “dancing (likovali) before the Lord with all their might, with songs and lyres and harps and tambourines and castanets and cymbals (s mnozhestvom kiparisnykh vetvei, s tsitrami, gusliami, timpanami, bubnami, i kimvalami)” (II Samuel 6:5; cf. I Chronicles 15:28).\footnote{For the Russian text of II Samuel, see Sviashennyia knigi vetkhago i novago zaveta (Vienna, 1878), 312-313.} The unstated analogy between the frenzied dancing of king David and the “rough music” which accompanied the Yuletide masquerade headed by the tsar’s mock double formed an important proof-text for the political and religious legitimation of St. Petersburg, the tsar’s new, Edenic city. In both cases, a raucous and blasphemous example of “royal play” signaled the bestowal of divine favor upon a newly-founded imperial capital, while underlining the ruling monarch’s personal gift of grace (charisma). The classical statement of this apparent paradox echoes in king David’s reply to the sardonic rebuke of his first wife (II Samuel 6:15-16, 20-23):

So David and all the house of Israel brought up the ark of the Lord with shouting (s radostnymi vosklitsaniami), and with the sound of trumpet (trubnymi zvukami). And as the ark of the Lord came into the city of David, Michal, Saul’s daughter, looked through a window, and saw king David leaping (skakal) and dancing before the Lord; and she despised him in her heart [...] And Michael the daughter of Saul came out to meet David, and said, “How glorious was the king of Israel today, who uncovered himself (vystaviv sebia na pokaz) today in the eyes of the handmaidens of his servants [pred rabyniami slug svoikh, i.e. the lowest of the low], as any vulgar fellow [pliasun, lit. prancer] might shamelessly uncover himself?” And David said unto Michal, “It was
before the Lord, who chose me in place of your father and all his household, to appoint me as prince over Israel, the people of the Lord, that I have danced [veselilsia, lit. made merry, or played] before the Lord. I will make myself yet more contemptible (umalius”) than this, and I will be abased (smirius”) in my own eyes; but by the maids of whom you have spoken, by them I shall be held in honor. And Michal the daughter of Saul had no child to the day of her death.

In this biblical parable, king David’s unseemly prancing only serves to underline his humility, as well as his direct link to God – the true source of his greatness as a ruler and warrior. Paradoxically, the more this mighty king abased himself before his Creator, the more he elevated himself in the eyes of the Lord and His chosen people.\(^{140}\)

The moral of the royal ceremony, in which the king makes a spectacle of himself, is clear: those Israelites who understand the sacred significance of this royal merriment (veselie) and chose to play along (likovat”) with their divinely-anointed monarch shall be fruitful, in accord with God’s promise to Adam and Eve in the Garden (Genesis 1:28); while those prudish unbelievers, like King David’s first wife, who prefer to sit on the sidelines and to criticize, shall remain barren and shall never experience the restoration of Paradise heralded by the transferral of the Ark of the Lord to “David’s city.” The parallel to the tsar’s treatment of his own first wife is striking, as is the implication that Peter’s city has usurped the prerogatives of Moscow – the “Second

Jerusalem” and the “Third Rome” – as the main spiritual center of the Russian empire.\(^{142}\)

While it is fruitless to speculate about how many participants of the royal charivari realized that they were helping the Russian tsar to enact an idiosyncratic version of Davidic kingship, we do know that both Peter and his mock pontiff were familiar with the proof-text from I1 Samuel. In fact, just four years before this biblical story came to inform the Davidic scenario of the masquerade which accompanied his own second wedding, Zotov had invoked this same imagery to celebrate the tsar’s military achievements against the Swedes. In a letter addressed to the “Most Holy Proto-Deacon, Sir Arch-Colonel P[eter]. A[lekseevich].”,\(^{143}\) the “Prince Pope” congratulated Peter on the “God-given victory” at the battle of Lesnaia (28 September 1708) and notified the tsar about the effect which this news had upon the morale of the Russian troops stationed in the Ukraine.\(^{144}\) Writing as if he were still under the influence of the large amount of alcohol which he claims to have consumed at the

\(^{141}\) On the interchangeability of these theosophical notions, see Daniel Rowland, “Moscow - The Third Rome or the New Israel,” Russian Review 55: 4 (1996), 591-614.


\(^{143}\) N. M. Zotov to Peter (6 October 1708), RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, No. 7 (1707), fols. 934, 934v.

\(^{144}\) The troops of General-Fieldmarshal Sheremetev were stationed in the Ukraine, awaiting orders to join in the general battle against the army of Charles XII of Sweden, when they received news about the battle of Lesnaia, a crucial engagement which the tsar dubbed the “mother of the Poltava victory.” See N. I. Pavlenko, Petr Velikii (M., 1990), 259; and idem, Ptentsy gnizda Petrova (M., 1984), 70-71. For B. P. Sheremetev’s congratulatory letter from Starodub, as well as the collective
obligatory celebration dinner, Zotov waxed eloquent about the soteriological implications of the tsar’s military success:

Having received the news […], from your courier, Mr. Ozerov, we began to rejoice, body and soul, in ineffable gladness. In everything (vse i vo vsem), every rank and all ages (vsiakogo chinh i vozrasta), have perceived as if a renewal in ourselves (iako by obnovlenie vospriial). Before your many God-given labors in that victory, our merry feet leap playfully (veselymi nogami skachuiuschchi igraem), like David in front of the ark (iako Davyd pred sennym kovchegom). We also pray that God mercifully bestow his munificence upon you, as he did to David over Goliath, by [allowing you] to defeat and overcome that second Goliath, the most haughty Swede.

In this tipsy paean of praise, Zotov makes an explicit comparison between the deeds of his royal patron and those of the biblical warrior-king in order to assert the Davidic descent of Russia’s divinely-anointed tsar. Appealing to an exegetical tradition according to which king David could serve as a “type” of Christ, Zotov implied that Peter’s “many God-given labors” are responsible for “renovating” both the “body and soul” of his believers, in much the same way as the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Christ.

epistle written from Pocheb by N. M. Zotov, G. I. Golovkin, P. P. Shafirov, and G. F. Dolgorukov, see PIb, 8 (2): 742, 748.

145 Zotov confessed that he was “treated quite well” (dovol’no ugostchen) at this private celebration dinner, and, that after raising several toasts in honor of the Russian tsar, his armed forces, as well as themselves, all the guests at the party were “pretty much satisfied” (udovol’stovalisza gorazdo) – a not too subtle reference to the drunken stupor which descended upon the revelers. N. M. Zotov to Peter (6 October 1708), op. cit., fol. 934-934v.

146 N. M. Zotov to Peter (6 October 1708), op. cit., fol. 934.

of Jesus is supposed to have done for the followers of this original, charismatic "son of David" (Mat. 1). Finding himself in a state of "ineffable gladness" – the ecstatic experience of "sober drunkenness"148 – the mock patriarch of the Transfigured Kingdom thus hinted at the true, transcendent genealogy of the tsar, who remained god’s anointed (Gr. christos) even as he assumed a humble role during the course of his royal "amusements."149

From this perspective, the Davidic attire of the mock tsar150 only served to emphasize the sublimity of Peter’s humble masquerade costume.151 For the duration of the 1715 royal charivari, Peter appeared in the same attire which he had worn at the

148 On the role of the mystical trope of "sober drunkenness" in Petrine political theology, see supra, Chapter Two.

149 For a stimulating discussion of the way in which Peter’s playful renunciation of the "external signs of his status as Tsar" in favor of a mock pretender actually serves to emphasize his "own authentic right to the royal throne, independent of any formal attributes of kingship," see B. A. Uspenskii, "Tsar and Pretender," op. cit., 271. Compare this argument to Lossky’s discussion of Christ’s kenosis as the "ineffable descent of the Son who is reduced to the ‘form of a slave’ without ceasing to be fully God." in Lossky, op. cit., 148.

150 According to the muster rolls compiled by the staff of the Foreign Affairs Chancellery, Romodanovskii’s costume consisted of a long, flowing caftan of red damask (is kamki), which was worn under a shorter, waist-length one, of unspecified "golden material" (materei zolotoi). Both of the "Prince Caesar’s" caftans, as well as the laps (or vorot u ozherelka) of the long, foreign-style mantle (epanka nemetskaia dlinnaiia) of coarse red cloth (is krasnogo sukna) worn over them, were trimmed with the best part of the ermine (gornostaem s litsa), the royal fur par excellence. On his head, Romodanovskii wore a red cloth cap (shapku krasnuiu sukonnuiu), which was crowned by a gold-plated tin wreath (ventsom zhestianym) and topped off by a royal orb (tabloko) See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fol. 93v. For a sense of what Romodanovskii’s “King David” costume may have looked like, see the engraving from the “Piskator” Bible (1650), reproduced in L. M. Starikova, “Russkii teatr petrovskogo vremeni, komedial’naia khramina i domashnie komedii tsarevny Natal’i Alekseevny,” Pamiatniki kul’tury. Novye otkrytiia. Ezhegodnik 1990 (M., 1992), 137-156, here 140; and Sazonova, op. cit., 91 (Illustration 8). Even since the mid-seventeenth century, the engravings from the “Piskator” Bible served as a visual aid (posobie) in the creation of theatrical costumes and decorations. On the “Piskator” Bible, see D. A. Rovinski, Russkie narodnye karinki, ed. N. P. Sobko (SPb., 1900), ch. 2; and O. A. Belobrova, “Biblia Piskatora v sobranii BAN SSSR,” Materialy i soobshchenia po fondam otdela rukopisei i redkoi knigi BAN SSSR za 1985 g. (L., 1987). 184-216.
lavish masquerade ball held in Vienna by Leopold I of Austria, nearly twenty years ago.\textsuperscript{152} During the 1698 celebrations of \textit{Wirtschaft}, a German holiday reminiscent of Russian Yuletide (\textit{sviatki}), Peter had also donned the dress of a “Boor [\textit{Bauer}, peasant] of Frieseland” – a costume which was intended to evoke the simple habit of a “Friesian,” that is, a Dutch ship-captain (Ger. \textit{Friesslaendischer Shiff-capitain}).\textsuperscript{153} As we saw in Chapter Three, during the naval “amusements” staged in the early 1690s, Peter had adopted the \textit{nom de guerre} of a Dutch skipper (“Piter”) not out of humility, but, rather, in order to demonstrate his divine calling as the Christ-like “artisan tsar,” the charismatic founder of the imperial Russian navy. Like the “incognito king” of the Gospels, the tsar had taken on a lowly identity in order to create a new community of believers among those who would accompany him on his mission to transfigure the world.\textsuperscript{154} Similarly, after the battle of Hangö, the former “Skipper” donned the same dress as he did at the court of the Holy Roman Emperor, underscoring the connection between the naval successes of the new Russian fleet and Peter’s expansionist foreign policy, and strengthening the royal claims to the much-coveted title of “emperor.”\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{151} For a discussion of the trope of \textit{humilitas/sublinitas} – the Latin Catholic “equivalent” of the Greek Orthodox \textit{kenosis} – in relation to “Davidic kingship,” see Mazzeo, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{152} M. M. Bogoslovskii, \textit{Petr I: Materialy dlia biografii} (M.-L., 1941), 2: 513-520.

\textsuperscript{153} For a contemporary description of the tsar’s costume, see the official list of guests at the 1698 \textit{Wirtschaft} celebration, cited by Bogoslovskii, \textit{op. cit.}, 514 n. 1. On the strong similarity between the costume of a Friesian peasant and sailor, see the comments of the Venetian ambassador to Vienna, cited in \textit{ibid.}: “il Czar però amò d’essere un paesano di Frisia, il che s’avvicinava assai alla qualità d’un marinaio.”

\textsuperscript{154} For an insightful analysis of the trope of the “incognito king,” see Brian Weiser, “Owning the King’s Story: The Escape from Worcester,” \textit{Seventeenth Century} 14: 1 (1999), 43-62, esp. 48.
Both the prominent role of the mock “Prince Caesar” (kniaz’-kesar’) and the relatively humble role of the actual tsar, therefore, underlined the fact that the organizers of the 1715 St. Peters burg masquerade sought to assert, if as yet only in play, Russia’s parity vis-à-vis the imperial and the confessional claims of the Catholic kaiser (Rus. kesar’). Thus, by invoking the antithesis between the Holy Roman Emperor (Rus. tsesar’) and Peter’s mock “Anti-Caes ar” (Rus. anti-tsesar’), the wedding of one court “jester” (N. M. Zotov) repeated the argument made at the funeral of another (Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi). In this way, the royal charivari that accompanied the marriage of the mock pontiff of the “Transfigured Kingdom” demonstrated the centrality of sacred parodies (parodia sacra) – and, in particular, travesties of the seventh sacrament – for the enactment of charismatic authority at the court of Peter the Great.

*The Petrine Civilizing Process*

In a letter dictated on 13 February 1715, just one month after Peter and his “company” had organized one of the most elaborate, “carnivalesque,” matrimonial spectacles ever staged at the Muscovite court, the tsar articulated his ideas about the civilizing role of the new-style weddings introduced during his reign. The letter was addressed to Prince Ia. F. Dolgorukov – the powerful Russian courtier and government

---

156 For a reference to “Anti-Caes ar” Romodanovskii, see the description of the funeral of “archdeacon Gideon,” the so-called “Cavalier of the Order of Judas.” See *PZh 1713 g.*, 53; and *infra*, Chapter Three.
official who, in 1712, had himself gone through a matrimonial induction into the
Transfigured Kingdom, but who now sought to prevent his niece from marrying a
foreigner out of political prudence and feelings of clan pride. Reiterating the
comments which he had already made to the prince in private, the tsar explained that
the reason why a marriage between a Russian noblewoman and a non-Orthodox
Christian was essential to his reformist vision was “because we have a great need to
have all kinds of intercourse (vsiakimi obrazy soobshchatsa) with other European
peoples (Evropskimi narodami), not only in great, but also in minor affairs, so that by
this [means], the crudeness of old customs (grubost’ starykh obychaev) gradually
disappears [...].” According to Peter’s reasoning – which was later codified in a
royal decree on the issue – although such a union could still technically be considered
an unequal marriage from the point of view of the courtier and his relatives, as well as

157 Judging by the tsar’s detailed rebuttal, Prince Dolgorukov was apparently concerned not only
about the (insufficiently elevated) status of the German bridegroom, but also about his political loyalties,
in the event of a war between Russia and the country of his birth. Dolgorukov was particularly worried
about the way his family would be treated in the event of such a war. See Peter to Prince la. F.
Dolgorukov (13 February 1715), in SPB F IRI, koll. 277, op. 2, ed. khr. VI, fols. 3-3v.

158 At the end of the letter, the tsar commanded Prince Dolgorukii not to interfere in the marital
affairs of his brother’s family. “[... for, as you know, I cannot stand whatever is done against
[someone’s] will and [self-] interest (ibo ia terpet’ nemogu chto protiv interesu i voli delaetsa).” See op.
cit., 3v. The tsar’s sense of personal responsibility for the transfiguration of the Muscovite realm may
explain why he missed the irony of ordering someone to stay out of people’s private business, while
interfering himself.

159 For the text of the Synodal decree regarding intermarriages, see “Poslanie Sviateishego
Sinoda k pravoslavnym o bespreiatstvennom im vstuplenii v brak s inovertsam (Avgusta 18 dia 1721
719-725.
from that of the Orthodox Church, the inequality would work in the favor of the Russian crown, and therefore, serve the “general good.”

If there is an element of truth in every joke, then the crude sexual pun about “intercourse” with “European peoples” may be taken to summarize the essence of the Petrine “civilizing process.” As we have seen, intermarriages, unequal weddings, and the new matrimonial rituals introduced at Peter’s court were an important part of the tsar’s efforts to police the morals and to polish the manners of the St. Petersburg elite. In fact, the masquerade-wedding of the “Prince Pope” marked the apogee of the court-sponsored program, which was first revealed with outmost clarity in the wargames and “jester weddings” staged on the fields outside of the suburban royal estate of New Transfiguration. Together with other measures designed to create a cosmopolitan service elite – such as the new Law of Single Inheritance (1714), the forcible

160 For an elaborate justification of the “utility” and “Orthodoxy” of mixed marriages, see Feofan (Prokopovich), Razsushdenie sv. Sinoda o brakakh pravovernyh s inoavernymi (SPb., 1721).


162 On the connection between the institution of “policed” (Fr. polici) government and “polite” (Fr. poli) manners in 17th- and 18th-century Europe, see Jean Starobinski, “The Word Civilization,” in Blessings in Disguise; or, The Morality of Evil (Oxford, 1993), 1-35; and Peter France, Politeness and Its Discontents: Problems in French Classical Culture (Cambridge, 1992), ch. 4. For the discussion of these concepts in the case of imperial Russia, see Marc Raeff, “The Well-Ordered Police State and the Development of Modernity in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Europe: An Attempt at a Comparative Approach,” American Historical Review 80:5 (December 1975), 1221-1243; and Hughes, op. cit., 118, 219, 387.

163 For a copy of the new legislation on entailed estates (18 March 1714), with Peter’s corrections and signature, see SPb. FIRI RAN, f. 270, No. 75, fols. 187-190; and “O nasledii imeni. Imennoi ukaz (Marta 23 dnia 1714 goda),” in Preobrazhenskii and Novitskaia, eds., op. cit., 698-702. For the most recent discussion of this law, see Lee A. Farrow, “Peter the Great’s Law of Single Inheritance: State Imperatives and Noble Resistance,” Russian Review 55 (1996), 430-447.
colonization of the new imperial capital (1710-1715), and the decree on “assemblies” (1718) – this royal charivari served to demonstrate, in the most public and “witty” way possible, the close relationship between antinomian travesty and “good order” at the court of Peter the Great. As if to underline the interrelationship between carnival and police, Antonio Da Vieira, the tsar’s new police chief, insisted that the first host of the evening soireés prescribed by the law on “assemblies” was to be none other than the “Prince Pope” (Kniaz’ Papa). Perhaps better than any other piece of evidence, this fact reveals that the attempt on the part of the tsar and his advisors to codify the ideals of polite sociability was intimately related to two of the most important

---


165 For the 26 November 1718 decree instituting the St. Petersburg “assemblies,” see PSZ, 5: 597-598 (No. 3246).

166 The preamble to the “Military Statute” of 1716, one of the most important “police regulations” (Polizeiordnungen) of Peter’s reign, included the following formulation about the didactic role of parody: “But when (with the Almighty’s help) the army was brought to order, then what great progress was made with the Almighty’s help against glorious and regular nations. Anyone can see that this occurred for no other reason than the establishment of good order, for all disorderly barbarian practices are worthy of ridicule and no good can come of them.” Hughes, op. cit., 122-123. For the full text of Peter’s “Military Statute,” see PSZ, 5: No. 3006 (31 March 1716); and “Ustav voinskii [...] (Marta 30 dnia 1716 goda),” in Preobrazhenskii and Novitskaia, eds., op. cit., 155-231. In a handwritten note intended for inclusion in the ongoing History of the Northern War, the tsar recalled that this “Military Statute” was started in St. Petersburg in 1715 – immediately after the celebrations of the masquerade-wedding of the “Prince Pope.” See the note dated 29 November 1722, in SPb. F IRI RAN, f. 270, d. 101, fol. 613, cited by Hughes, op. cit., 383, 545 note 244.


168 Semenova, op. cit., 199-200, 199 n. 131; Hughes, op. cit., 268. For a list (reestr) of the courtiers scheduled to host the first assemblée in St. Petersburg, see § 8 of the rough draft (korrekturnyi ekzempliar) of the decree on “assemblies,” reprinted in Ageeva, op. cit., 287-288, here 288. The second
institutions of Peter's reign: the newly-founded office of the "General-Policemaster" (Ger. General-Polizeimeister; Rus. general polits meister) and the long-standing post of the "Prince Pope." In essence, the "General Policemaster" and the "Prince Pope" – bureaucratic order and carnivalesque disorder, "police" and travesty – served as the two inverse, but complementary sides of the Kingdom Transfigured. In this light, the 1718 "police regulation" (Polizeiordnung), that first introduced French-style salons into St. Petersburg court society, recapitulated the cultural developments already hinted at during the weddings of Peter's "jesters."

host of the new, polite form of sociability was none other than T. N. Streshnev, the mock "Arch-Hierarch of St. Petersburg" (Sanktpiterburgskii arkhierei Streshnev). Ibid., 288.
CHAPTER FIVE

Sons:
Orthodox Imperial Reform and the
Legacy of the Transfigured Kingdom

The conflict between Peter and his first-born son, tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich (1690-1718), over the question of the imperial succession parallels the struggle which had brought the Naryshkin candidate to power at the end of the seventeenth century.¹ This dynastic dispute, like the one during the nominal diarchy of Peter and Ivan Alekseevich, took the form of a divisive family quarrel between the supporters of two different sides of the Russian royal house – a political dynamic created partly by the marital choices of the ruling monarch and partly by the high infant mortality rates at the Romanov court. The dispute between Peter and Aleksei, as the earlier struggle between the Naryshkins and the Miloslavskiis, was as much about the legitimacy of royal authority – the criteria by which either candidate could claim divine sanction for his rule – as it was about royal virility and Orthodox imperial reform. As before, such an unstable political situation could not have lasted indefinitely. And, indeed, the bloody resolution of this new dynastic stand-off resembled the one imposed by the proponents of the “Naryshkin Restoration.” However, the victory of Peter’s supporters was now signaled not only by the fatal, judicial investigation into the flight of tsarevich

¹ For an analysis of the “Naryshkin Restoration,” within the context of the post-Alekseevan succession struggle, see supa, Chapters One and Two.
Aleksei Petrovich, but also by the “institutionalization” of the mock ecclesiastical
council of the “Most Foolish and Most-Drunken Prince Pope.”

More broadly, the (temporary) triumph of Peter’s new dynastic scenario
coincided with, and marked the culmination of a period, that witnessed a
“bureaucratization” of the entire Kingdom Transfigured. During this period of
administrative reform and cultural experimentation (1709-1721) – that is, of a sustained
and deliberate attempt to actualize in real life the ideals of a neo-Stoic, Orthodox,
imperial reform – Peter and his courtiers oversaw the implementation of policies, that
transformed the way in which the tsar and his “company” mobilized the loyalties of the
Muscovite political elite. The very act of writing things down in properly-bound,
ministerial ledgers⁴ – a process, which, as we saw in Chapter Four, had begun much
earlier than the masquerade-wedding of “Prince Pope” Zotov (1715) – signaled that the
political significance of Peter’s mock court was coming to an end. Indeed, as I will
argue in this chapter, the obscene parodies of the sacrament of Holy Orders (Rus.
Tainstvo sviashchenstva) staged by the tsar and his “company” during the winter of
1717-1718 constituted, perhaps, the last political act of the “Unholy Council”
(neosviashchennyi sobor). Harking back to the private court spectacle that inaugurated
the Transfigured Kingdom (1691/92), the organizers of this “sacred parody” (parodia

---

⁴ On the “bureaucratization” of the “Unholy Council,” see V. M. Zhivov, “Kul’turnye reformy
v sisteme preobrazovanii Petra I,” in Iz istorii russkoj kul’tury, ed. by A. D. Koshelev (M., 1996) 3:
528-583, here 551-552, 562.

⁵ For a discussion of the new record-keeping procedures, which were introduced into the
Muscovite chancellery system, see Marc Raeff, The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional
Change Through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600-1800 (New Haven and London, 1983).
sacra) sought to rally the believers in Peter’s personal gift of grace and to mobilize the Russian political elite against the tsar’s personal and political opponents. But unlike before, Peter and his advisors were now in a position to use the “election” and “ordination” of the new “Prince Pope” in order to enact his own paternal authority at the expense of both the tsar’s first-born son and his (as well as Russia’s) “spiritual father” – the patriarch of Moscow. In fact, the same “royal priesthood,” that had personally picked Zotov’s rightful “successor” would eventually go on to support the tsar’s decision to abolish the patriarchate (1721) and to declare himself the first (Lat. primus), Great (Lat. maximus), Russian Emperor (Lat. imperator) – the true “Father of the Fatherland” (Lat. Pater patriae). In this sense, the events of Yuletide 1717/18 appear less a playful illustration of the tsar’s dark “sense of humor,” than as the blasphemous “anti-rite” of an antinomian brotherhood of believers in the imperial cult of Russia’s new “High Priest” (Lat. Pontifex maximus).

---


A Paternal Testament

Ever since 1712, after his second marriage to a foreign-born commoner, Peter and his advisors increasingly asserted the claims of the tsar’s children by his former mistress, Catherine Alekseevna (née Marta Skavronskaia). Having (belatedly) legitimized the daughters born to him and Catherine, Peter anxiously awaited the birth of a male heir to replace tsarevich Aleksei, the child from the tsar’s unhappy first marriage to tsaritsa Evdokiia Fedorovna (née Lopukhina). However, despite the fecundity and relative youth of his new wife and consort, Peter watched two (or three) boys die, one after the other, before celebrating their first birthday. The tsar’s apparent inability to father a male heir raised the hopes of tsarevich Aleksei’s political advisors, who expected and prayed that the son would outlive his father. Aleksei’s claims to the throne relied on both his position as Orthodox tsarevich and on the customary laws of the Romanov house, according to which the first-born son had precedence over the children of the second marriage, especially those children who had once been described (if only unofficially) as royal bastards. Thus, although Peter had exiled Aleksei’s mother from court and had her confined to a convent in distant Suzdal’

Hughes, Russia in the Age of Peter the Great [hereafter, Hughes] (New Haven and London, 1998), 91; and supra, Introduction.

On Evdokiia Lopukhina, the “last Russian tsaritsa,” see S. V. Efimov, “Evdokiia Lopukhina – posledniaia russkaia tsaritsa XVII veka,” in Srednevekovaya Rus’: Sbornik nauuchnykh statei k 65-letiiu [...] R. G. Skrynnikova, ed. by S. V. Lobachev and A. S. Lavrov (SPb., 1995), 136-165. On the role of Marfa/Catherine in Peter’s new dynastic scenario, see supra, Chapter Four.
province, the tsarevich still remained the nominal, if increasingly estranged, heir-apparent.

As in the course of the “Naryshkin Restoration,” a sham “personal letter,” which served as a political manifesto about who had the right to oversee the program of religious enlightenment and imperial renovation begun in the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, captured the stakes of this dynastic conflict. Peter’s 1715 letter to his son, much like the 1689 letter to his half-brother, served as the opening salvo in the final show-down between two opposing sides of the Russian royal family over the children of Peter’s first and second marriages. The timing of this “October manifesto” is as significant as its politically-inflammatory contents, for it reveals how intimately the question of succession was tied up with the issue of royal virility and Orthodox imperial reform. Peter signed this ultimatum in the new Russian capital (pri

---

7 For an attempt to determine the exact number of Peter’s children, see Hughes, op. cit., xxi, 399; and idem, “A Note on the Children of Peter the Great,” Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia Newsletter 21 (1993), 10-16.

8 Efimov, op. cit., 141.


10 By calling Peter’s 1715 letter an “October manifesto,” I hope to emphasize (1) its public, political nature and (2) its remarkably wide circulation, both before and after it was included in the official, published “case” against tsarevich Aleksei. The correspondence between Peter and his son opens the materials collected in the Russian version, Ob "izvlechenirozyskogo dela i suda po ukazu ego tsarskogo velichestva na tsarevicha Aleksea Petrovicha v Sankt ‘piterburkhe opravlennago i po ukazu ego velichestva v pechat’, dla izvestiia vseiarodnago, sego iunia v 25 den’, 1718, vydannoe (SPb., 1718; [2nd ed. SPb., 1720]), which came out in a total press run of 4536 copies. This “case” was also immediately translated into German and French. For an insightful analysis of the propaganda-value of the documentary collection, and, in particular, of Peter’s correspondence with his son, see M. V. Nikolaeva, “‘Testament’ Petra I tsarevichu Aleksei,” XVIII vek 9 (1974), 93-111; for the publication history, see ibid., 96 n. 2.
Sankpiterburgh) on 11 October 1715, just a few weeks before the date when both his wife and his daughter-in-law were expected to go into labor. However, he did not hand it over to its intended addressee until 27 October 1715 – the same day as the funeral of Aleksei’s foreign-born wife, Crown Princess Charlotte-Christina-Sophia of Wolfenbüttel, who died shortly after giving birth to the tsarevich’s long-awaited male heir. Although Aleksei’s son was quickly christened Peter, in honor of his royal grandfather, the tsar could not have been pleased by the birth of his young namesake; for the possibility which Peter had dreaded, and which had pushed him to authorize the composition of the “October manifesto” in the first place, had finally come true. With the birth of a son, Aleksei’s claim to the Russian throne had become more secure than it had ever been – at least since Peter’s decision to confine tsaritsa Evdokiia Fedorovna to a convent and to raise their first and only surviving child by himself. Even after Catherine, the tsar’s second wife, finally gave Peter another male heir, any


12 Hughes, op. cit., 406-407.

13 See tsarevich Aleksei to Peter (31 October 1715), in Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 348-349, here 348.

14 I say “authorized,” because the original document inspected and published by Ustrialov is a “clean,” scribal copy (pisarskaia kopiia), which is only signed by Peter himself. See Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 236 n. 62; Nikolaeva, op. cit., 100 n. 113. This fact makes it difficult to determine whether the tsar dictated this missive or whether he hired a ghost-writer. On the basis of internal, primarily stylistic evidence, it is not too far fetched to suggest that the real author of this document may have been Feofan (Prokopovitch) – a suggestion that cannot, however, be addressed here. For convenience sake, I shall maintain the epistolary fiction and refer to the author of the October ultimatum as Peter himself.

15 Catherine went into labor on the day after Charlotte’s funeral; her son, tsarevich Peter Petrovich, was born sometime after eleven at night on 28 October 1715. See Peter to Stefan (lavorskii)
plan to exclude the issue of his first marriage from the imperial succession would still have to dispose of the heir-apparent’s own male progeny. Thus, just as twenty years earlier, the pregnancies of royal consorts heightened the political tensions between the distaff sides of the Russian royal house and ultimately precipitated the final confrontation between the contenders for the legacy of imperial reform.

In the context of the baby-making competition between father and son, Peter’s attempt to depict himself in the “October manifesto” as a ruler who prudently elevates reasons of state above feelings of paternal affection functions polemically to exclude tsarevich Aleksei and his progeny from the royal succession.\textsuperscript{16} Much of the “sadistic playfulness” of this epistolary narrative\textsuperscript{17} lies in the juxtaposition of two mutually incompatible literary texts: the ethical will and the political broadside. As the tsar’s “last testament” (poslednii testament),\textsuperscript{18} Peter’s first-person “declaration to my son” (ob "iavlenie synu moemu) partakes of the rhetorical conventions of an “ethical will” (dukhovnoe zaveshchanie), a didactic literary genre popular with Russian moralists of

\textsuperscript{16} For an insightful discussion of the neo-Stoic virtue of “prudence” (Lat. prudentia or prudentia civilis) and its relation to “reasons of state” (Lat. prudentia mixta), see Gerhard Oestreich, Neostoicism and the Early Modern State, trans. by David McLintock (Cambridge, 1982), 48, 90, 104, 107f., 155-165, 195.

\textsuperscript{17} The “pleasure” of a “sadistic narrative construction” lies “in ascertaining guilt, asserting control, and subjecting the guilty person” to “punishment or forgiveness.” For a suggestive discussion of the “sadistic narrative” of George Eliot, see Mary Wilson Carpenter, “‘A bit of Her Flesh’: Circumcision and ‘The Signification of the Phallus’ in Daniel Deronda,” Genders 1 (Spring 1988), 1-23, here 1.

\textsuperscript{18} Peter to tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich (11 October 1715), in Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 348.
all political persuasions. However, the royal author transforms the fatherly advice—moral and practical—usually given in such “paternal testaments,” into a self-serving justification of the reasons for his declared intention to deprive tsarevich Aleksei of his rightful inheritance. Chief among these reasons is the heir-apparent’s unwillingness even “to hear anything about military affairs (voïnskom dele), [even though it is precisely] by this [that] we have come from darkness into light (chem my ot t’my k svetu vyshli), and from anonymity into world renown (kotorykh ne znali v svete nyne pochitaiut).”

---

19 See the almost contemporary “paternal testaments” of I. T. Pososhkov, Zaveshchanie otecheskie, k synu svoemu [1712-1719], ed. E. M. Prilezhaev (SPb., 1893); and V. N. Tatishchev, “Dukhovnaya [1734],” in Izbrannye proizvedeniya, ed. by S. N. Valk (L., 1979), 133-145. For a comparison between the “testaments” of Pososhkov (1652-1726) and Tatishchev (1686-1750), see P. N. Miliukov, Ocherki po istorii russkoi kul’tury (Paris, 1930), 3: 234-259, esp. 256-259. On the native, Russian tradition of moralistic, epistolary “teachings,” see Nikolaeva, op. cit., 101 and 101 n. 14-16. Nikolaeva does not mention, however, another important source of Peter’s “testament,” namely, the “paternal testaments” of Peter’s royal contemporaries, especially among the ruling houses of Germany, with whom Peter had established both personal and dynastic ties. For Peter’s close relationship to Friedrich Wilhelm I of Brandenburg-Prussia, a ruling house famous for the “paternal testaments” of its representatives, see G. V. Kretinin, Prusskie marshruty Petra Pervogo (Kaliningrad, 1996); for an example of these neo-Stoic documents, see Politische Testamente der Hohenzollern, ed. by Richard Dietrich (Vienna, 1986). For an insightful discussion of the practical political ideals informing both the Baroque “mirrors of princes” and the “political testaments” of contemporary monarchs, see Oestreich, op. cit., 8-9, 121, and passim.

20 On the “rhetorical” nature of Peter’s letters to his son, see Nikolaeva, op. cit., 94-95, 100-102; 103-105, 106-111; and V. D. Levin, “Petr I i russkii iazyk (K 300-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia Petra I),” Izvestiiia AN SSSR. Seriia literatury i iazyka 31: 3 (1972), 217-227, here 223, 226; on Peter’s literary views, in general, see I. Z. Serman, “Literaturno-esteticheskie interesy i literaturnaia politika Petra I,” XVIII vek 9 (1974), 5-49; V. M. Zhivov, Iazyk i kul’tura v Rossii XVIII veka (M., 1996), ch. 1; and S. I. Nikolaev, Literaturnaia kul’tura petrovskoii epokhi (SPb., 1996).

21 Peter to tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich (11 October 1715), in Ustrialov, op. cit., 346. The biblical phraseology of this line (“from darkness to light”) was to be echoed some six years later in a speech delivered by Chancellor G. I. Golovkin, during the celebrations marking the end of the Great Northern War (1721). Whether or not Golovkin’s speech consciously referred to the 1715 “October manifesto,” it is obvious that the imagery came from some of the same biblical and liturgical sources. For the biblical and liturgical sources of this imagery, see Hans-Joachim Härtel, Byzantinisches Erbe und Orthodoxie bei Feo-fan Prokopovic [ = Das östliche Christentum, 23] (Würzburg, 1970), 86. For a discussion of the ceremonies associated with the adoption of the new imperial title, as well as the
monarch can learn about “order” (rasporiadok) and “defense” (oborona) – the two things which he deems absolutely necessary for the divinely-appointed task of ruling a well-ordered, Orthodox realm\(^ {22}\) – the tsar acknowledges that, despite tsarevich Aleksei’s royal blood and sacred vocation, the heir-apparent is unqualified for his future imperial post.\(^ {23}\)

The “joy” (radost’) with which Peter surveys the lessons that God has deigned to teach him on the battlefield\(^ {24}\) changes into an “all-consuming sadness” (gorest’ menia snedaet) when he turns to the succession and sees that his own son “is completely useless (ves’ma nepotrebnago) for the administration of the affairs of the realm (na pravlenie del gosudarstvennykh).”\(^ {25}\) This accusation serves as the leitmotif of the “October manifesto” and informs the juxtaposition between the tsarevich’s “uselessness” (nepotrebnost’) and the exemplary service rendered to the “fatherland” (otechestvo) by the tsar and the “true sons of [imperial] Russia” (istinnykh synov Rossiiskikh).\(^ {26}\) The repeated invocation of Aleksei’s “uselessness” demonstrates that

---

\(^ {22}\) Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 347.

\(^ {23}\) For contemporary notions about the importance of military training for the cultivation of (Roman imperial) virtues, see Oestreich, op. cit., chs. 2-5.

\(^ {24}\) For a discussion of the alleged connection between providence (Lat. providentia) and martial valor in neo-Stoic political thought, see Oestreich, op. cit., 22f., 29, 42.

\(^ {25}\) Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 346.
the tsar pushed past the contemporary meaning of that epithet – which primarily referred to someone's personal faults – towards a much more highly-charged, "religious" use of the term. Indeed, all throughout the "October manifesto" of 1715, the tsar insists on linking the "secular," neo-Stoic ideal of moral development though martial virtue with the notion of total obedience to divine (and paternal) authority.

On the one hand, the tsar's disparaging remarks about Aleksei's unmanly love for the comforts of home demonstrates that Peter saw the tsarevich's "uselessness" as a defect in moral character. "God," the tsar writes in an important parenthetical remark, "is not at fault (ibo Bog ne est' vinoven), for He has neither deprived you of reason (ibo razuma tebia ne lishil) nor of all your bodily strength (nizhe krepost' telesniui ves'ma otnial); for while you are not naturally of a very strong [constitution] (ibo khotia ne ves'ma krepkoi prirody), you are not completely weak either (obache i ne ves'ma slabo) [...]." Echoing the theological debates of an earlier succession struggle at the Muscovite court, this proposition suggests that neither the royal "seed" which

---

27 In fact, this "patriotic" theme informs most of Peter's correspondence with his son regarding the question of the imperial succession. Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 346. On the neo-Stoic stress on a "prudent" love of one's country (Lat. patria), see Oestreich, op. cit., 19-23, 28-29.


29 Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 348. In the second ultimatum. Peter inveighs against Aleksei's immoral and dissolute lifestyle, supposedly encouraged by the tsarevich's father-confessor, Iakov (Ignat'ev), and the other superstitious "long-beards" (bol'shia borody) from his entourage. See Peter to tsarevich Aleksei (19 January 1716), in Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 349-350. For a discussion of the epistolary style of tsarevich Aleksei and his "company," who – like Peter and his intimates – used the imagery of drunkenness to create a sense of mutual fellowship, see M. P. Pogodin, "Tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich, po svidetel'stvam vnov' otkrytym." Chteniiia v Imperatorskom Obshchestve Istoriui i Drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete 3 (1861), part 2, i-xvii, here xiv-xvii; and Schuyler, op. cit., 2: 264, 267.
gave form to the tsarevich, nor the divine spark which animated his soul, accounts for the fact that Aleksei does not share his father’s martial interests. Taking a firm position in the scholastic debate over the “philosophical question” (vopros filosofskii o dushe) of whether the soul is “generated” (rozhdaetsia) by the “seed of the male” (ot semene muzheska) or by the will of God (posylaetsia otvne, rekshe ot Boga), the tsar sides with those who exonerate Providence for the faults of man.

According to the “October manifesto” of 1715, the real reason why tsarevich Aleksei refuses to join his father on the field of battle; why he expresses such lukewarm interest in the military arts; and why he does not partake of “the joy come of God to our fatherland (Bogom dannuiu nashemu otechestvu radost’),” is because he does not believe that Peter is Russia’s “anointed one.” Indeed, according to the biblical parable invoked at the end of Peter’s “paternal testament,” Aleksei’s real problem is his lack of faith in the tsar’s divine gift of grace. After a long digression summarizing Aleksei’s personal faults and demonstrating his inadequacy for assuming the tasks of rule, Peter picks up the thread of the argument against the tsarevich’s candidacy for the Russian throne: “And as I am a man and subject to death, to whom shall I leave what, with God’s help, has been sown (s pomoshchiiu Vyshniago nasazhdenie) and the little that has already been raised (i uzhe nekotoroe vozvrashchennoe)? To him, who in imitation

---

30 The quotes in the text come from the Leichudes brothers’ Akos, ili vrachevaniye [...], in Pamiatniki k istorii protestantstva v Rossii, ed. by Dm. Tsvetaev (M., 1888), 1: 240-242. On the political and religious context of the Leichudes’ treatise, the product of an earlier succession struggle over the Russian throne, see supra, Chapter One. On the biological and philosophical aspects of this “theological” question, see Thomas Laqueur, Making Sex: Body and Gender From the Greeks to Freud (Cambridge and London, 1990), 35, 42, 59, 116, 142, 147.
(izhe upodobilsia) of the lazy slave from the Gospels (lenivomu rabu Evangel'komu), buried his talent\textsuperscript{32} in the earth (that is, who threw away everything that God gave him)?\textsuperscript{33} This rhetorical invocation of the "lazy slave" refers to a parable from the Gospel of Matthew (Mat. 25:14-30; cf. Luke 19:12-27) – a story, positioned in the biblical narrative, immediately before Jesus' final, triumphal entry into Jerusalem, on Palm Sunday, and intended to foreshadow the messiah's own imminent death and resurrection. While the obscure language of Jesus' parable – which is addressed to the faithful and can only be understood by those who are already initiated into the Nazarene's messianic mission ("He who has ears to hear [kto imeet ushi slyshat'], let him hear [da slyshit']!" [Mat. 25:30]) – hints at the cosmic significance of the tragic events that are about to transpire, the story itself is intended to empower his listeners to spread the Good News about the coming Kingdom of God. In this respect, the parable of the talents extols the virtues of faith and evangelism – the twin pillars on which the cult of the crucified messiah rests. Their invocation in Peter's ultimatum to Aleksei suggests that the tsar intended his first-born son to draw a similar conclusion regarding the need for "order" and "defense" – the twin pillars of the new imperial cult.

In the allegorical parable of the talents, a wealthy master (Jesus of Nazareth) entrusts his entire fortune (moral and eschatological teachings, or the Christian religion) to his slaves (disciples), for safekeeping, before embarking on a long trip "to a foreign

\textsuperscript{31} Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 346; Schuyler, op. cit., 2: 273-274.

\textsuperscript{32} This word, which derives from the biblical Greek (Gr. talanton), refers to "a silver coin worth more than fifteen years' wages of a laborer." See The Holy Bible. New Revised Standard Version (NY and Oxford, 1989), 29 n. f.
country” (Rus. v chuzhuiu stranu). Upon his return from abroad (the Second Coming), the lord questions his servants about what each of them has done with his share of the property (Final Judgement). Those “good” (dobryi), “faithful” (vernyi), and industrious servants, who believed that their lord would return from his voyage and who prepared for his return by investing the silver coins (talents) allotted to them in profit-making activities (moral acts aimed to bring about the coming of the messiah, such as evangelism), received a generous reward and “enter[ed] into the joy of [their] master” (Mat. 25:21, 23; cf. Isaiah 61: 7). However, the lord is chagrined to discover that one “wicked” (lukavyi) and “lazy” (lenivyi) slave had decided to bury his portion in the ground (Mat. 25:25-26). In order to escape the wrath of his master, whom he characterized as “a harsh man,” who “reap[ed] where [he] did not sow, and gather[ed] where [he] did not scatter seed” (Mat. 25:24), that particular slave simply resolved to play it safe and not to take any risks. If the master came back, as he promised, the slave could claim to have guarded the master’s treasure; if he stayed away indefinitely, he could still claim to be doing the will of his lord (“justification by works”); and if he never came back, then there was no reason to make the extra effort required to increase his master’s fortune. Appalled by such sloth and hypocrisy, the vengeful lord chastises the “useless” (Rus. negodnyi; Gr. a-chreios, “good-for-nothing”) slave, takes away his share of the property, and throws him out of the house, “into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth” – a biblical expression describing the

33 Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 348.
experiences of those tortured souls, who, like the "hypocrites" (*litsemery*), are consigned to the fires of hell (Mat. 25: 30; cf. Mat. 24:51).

For Peter, the biblical allegory had a contemporary, political resonance. The story of the "master's" long voyage to a "foreign country" – an allegory of Jesus' death served as a *memento mori* for a tsar whose recurrent health problems prompted him, in 1716-1717, to go on a long trip, the final destination of which was a European spa. Peter's version of the parable of the talents, just like the one in the Gospels themselves, provided the necessary background against which to see the apotheosis of its charismatic protagonist. Adopting the position of the wrathful lord, Peter relegated his first-born son to the unenviable role of the lazy slave. In this analogy, tsarevich Aleksei appeared as a "good-for-nothing," dissimulating ne'er-do-well, who refused to learn his royal trade and, therefore, simply threw away his God-given talents. In the best tradition of an ethical will, Peter offered his advice, based on a relevant biblical passage, about how the tsarevich could correct his behavior. But the choices that the tsar actually provided his son left very little room for maneuver. "Sadly reflecting" (*s gorest'iu razmyshliaia*) on the fact that he was not able to "turn [Aleksei] to good by any means" (*nichem tebia sklonit' ne mogu k dobru*) – either through verbal reprimands (*branival*) or physical beatings (*bival*) – Peter effectively made the tsarevich an offer which he could not refuse:

---

34 Peter had been ill, on and off, for most of 1714 and 1715, and the necessity to take care of his failing health provided one of the main reasons for the tsar's second, long voyage to western Europe. See Pavlenko, *op. cit.,* 374-380, esp. 374.
I have decided to write to you this last testament and wait a little longer, [in order to see] if [in truth and] without hypocrisy (nelitsemerno), you convert (obraitish'sia). If this does not happen, be advised that I shall cut you off completely from the [royal] succession (ves'ma tebia nasledstva lishu), like a gangrenous member (ud'gangrennyi). And do not think that [since] you are my only son [and, therefore, the only hope for the continuation of the royal line,] that I write this just to scare you (na ustrastku pisnu): truly, (if God so wills it), I shall carry out (ispolniu) [the implied threat]. For since I do not now, nor did I ever spare my own life (zhivota svoego ne zhalei i ne zhaleiu) for my fatherland (otechestvo) and people (ludi), how can I spare (pozhalet', lit. have pity on) you – a good-for-nothing (nepotrebnago)? Better a worthy stranger (luchshe chuzhoi dobroi) [should administer my patrimony], than one's own good-for-nothing (nezhe svoi nepotrebnyi).  

The fact that the only underlined word in the entire “paternal testament” refers to Aleksei’s alleged “hypocrisy” suggests that one of the most weighty reasons why Peter was never satisfied with his son’s repeated pledges of allegiance abided in the tsar’s skepticism towards the man whom he imagined as the lazy, good-for-nothing slave of the Gospels. Peter did not want Aleksei’s formal obedience to the paternal power of the tsar, just as the messianic lord in Jesus’ parable would not accept the cautious actions of the faithless servant who buried his God-given gifts in the ground. Instead, the tsar demanded that his son undergo a political “conversion” (obrashchenie).

Although Peter never specified what he meant by this term, his model of conversion came from the New Testament itself, which describes in some detail the formal adoption of belief in the messianic status of Jesus by his first followers. In particular, the apostolic Acts and Epistles (Rus. Apostol) reveal that Jesus’ earliest followers spent many years trying to decide whether accepting the divinity of Jesus

---

necessitated abandoning the laws and rituals prescribed by Hebrew scriptures. The
"stubborn" persistence of the doctrine of "justification by works" (whether through
charity, circumcision, or the Jewish dietary laws), even under the messianic conditions
of the New Dispensation heralded by the death and resurrection of the crucified
messiah, explains Paul's repeated attacks on the "hypocrisy" of these recent converts
(Gal. 2:11-21). It also sheds light on the tsar's decision to use Paul's admonitions in
the "October manifesto" of 1715. Chastising his son in the terms of Christian neo-
Stoicism, Peter wrote: "Do you plead that your weak health prevents you from carrying
(ponesti) [the burden] of martial labors (voinskikh trudov)? But this is no excuse
(rezon)! It is not works (trudov) that I require, but only the [spiritual] inclination
(okhota), which no [physical] illness (bolezn') can remove (otluchit')." 36 By combining
Peter the Apostle's discussion of the unbearable lightness of God's "burden" (Acts
15:10) with Paul's emphasis on the primacy of faith, the tsar stressed that actual belief
in his imperial mission - not simply external acts of deference to his paternal power -
would be the best proof of the tsarevich's personal devotion to Russia's "anointed one"
(Gr. christos). 37

Although Peter's "paternal testament" did not make any explicit references to
the Epistle to the Romans, it is not too far fetched to suggest that in the context of his
injunctions about the necessity of taking up the "burden" of military service and his call


37 Compare this invocation of Paul's epistles with the unmistakeable reference to Galatians 2: 18 in
Peter's 1713 letter to Zотов, cited supra, Chapter Four.
for Aleksei’s “conversion,” the tsar sought to evoke one of the most arresting images of conversion in the entire New Testament – Paul’s notion of the “circumcision of the heart” (Rom. 2: 28-29).38 This hypothesis seems to be confirmed by the prominence which the “October manifesto” assigned to the symbol of Aleksei’s stubbornness – the “gangrenous member” (удъ гангренни). This disturbing, grotesque image derives, in part, from Paul’s exegesis of the message which Jesus conveyed to his disciples by means of such stories as the “parable of the talents.”39 In particular, it relies on the somatic analogy between the “body natural” and the “body politic” of the divinely-ordained Christian monarch, whom the defenders of royal absolutism described as the head of the earthly Church and as God’s personal representative.40 Demonstrating his

38 “For a person is not a Jew [Rus. иудей, read. one of the elect] who is one outwardly, nor is true circumcision something external (наружное) and physical (на плоти). Rather, a person is a Jew who is one inwardly (внутренний), and real circumcision is a matter of the heart (i to obrezanie, kotoroe v serdse) – it is spiritual and not literal (по душе а не по буке). Such a person receives praise not from others but from God” (Romans 2: 28-29).

39 In his epistles, Paul expounded upon the significance of the fact that Christ inspired His disciples with His spirit. Using the classical analogy between somatic and social organization, the apostle argued that each of the “members” of Christ’s “mystical body” – the Church – had received the “gifts of the Holy Spirit” so that they could utilize their various skills “for the benefit” (на пол’зу) of the whole community of believers (1 Cor. 12: 7; cf. Rom. 12: 5-8). Paul’s definition of divine grace (Gr. charis) would later serve as one of the sources for Max Weber’s sociological analysis of “charisma.” See From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, trans. and ed. by H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (NY, 1946), 245-252; and Max Weber on Charisma and Institution Building: Selected Papers, ed. by S. N. Eisenstadt (Chicago and London, 1968). See also S. N. Eisenstadt, “Charisma and Institution Building: Max Weber and Modern Sociology,” ibid., ix-lvi, and Edward Shils, “Center and Periphery,” “Charisma”, “Charisma, Order, and Status.” in The Constitution of Society (Chicago and London, 1982), 93-142; and supra, Introduction.

40 As E. H. Kantorowicz has demonstrated, Paul’s definition of the Church as corpus Christi came to occupy an important place in the “political theology” of the Christianized Roman empire through the idea of the “body politic.” This concept also proved useful to those early modern royal apologists who insisted that by striving to imitate Christ – the head of the mystical body of the Church (Ep. 1: 22; 5: 23; Col. 1: 18) – crowned heads of state could promote learning and piety, encourage socially-beneficial occupations, foster the productive capacity of each of their subjects, and thereby protect the common weal of their realms. See Ernst H. Kantorowicz, The King’s Two Bodies: A Study in Medieval
familiarity with the contemporary political uses of this religious imagery,\textsuperscript{41} the author of the "October manifesto" of 1715 applied Paul's somatic analogies to the case of the Russian Orthodox tsar.

In his "paternal testament," Peter argued that the iconic status of the divinely-anointed, Orthodox emperor – whether Greek basileus or Russian tsar – guaranteed that his example, especially in matters of war, translated to his subjects. "Everyone looks upon the head (vsiak smotrit na nachal'nika); they study his inclinations and conform themselves to them (daby ego okhote posledovat'); all the world owns this [...] [F]or [all the members of the 'political nation'] are inclined to imitate him [the tsar] in liking a thing as well as disliking it."\textsuperscript{42} Just as the Byzantine emperors' "neglect of arms" (oruzhie ostavili), as well as their desire "to live in repose" (zhit' v pokoe), occasioned the decay of their imperial might and ultimately reduced them to the status of "slaves"


\textsuperscript{42} F. C. Weber, The Present State of Russia [...] (London, 1723), 2:97-105: reprinted in Imperial Russia: A Source Book, 1700-1917, ed. by Basil Dmytryshyn (NY, 1967), 25. I have used a contemporary translation of this passage because it brings out and underlines the somatic imagery implicit in the Russian text. For the original Russian text, see Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 347. On the "iconic" status of the tsar, to which the "taken-for-granted" nature of this formulation is ultimately indebted, see Stephen L. Baehr, The Paradise Myth in Eighteenth-Century Russia (Stanford, 1991), 16-18, and 191 n. 18.
(rabotii), so Aleksei's apparent "worthlessness" threatened the political order created by the tsar's reforms and undermined the spiritual health of the "Third Rome." According to the logic of this historical analogy, Aleksei's desire to stay at home and his unwillingness to wield the royal scepter for the "general good" of his imperial subjects brought to light the tsarevich's shameful selfishness and exposed him as the pitiful, "gangrenous member" (gangrennyi ud") of Peter's Kingdom Transfigured. And, since according to Jesus' apocalyptic injunction, "it is better for you to lose one of your members (ud") than for your whole body to be thrown into hell" (Mat. 5:29-30), the New Dispensation announced by the Russian tsar could not be realized until this "useless" appendage was demonstratively excised from the body politic (Mat. 18:8-9; Mark 9: 43-47; cf. Deut. 13: 6-8).

At the same time, the tsar attempted to perform this excision with minimum damage to the prestige of the royal line. Peter's rhetorical reference to his inheritance as that, which "with God's help, has been sown (s pomoshchiiu Vyshniago nasazhdenei)

43 Compare this explanation of the fall of Byzantium with an entry in one of Peter's notebooks, dating from 1719: "On the fall of the Greeks from contempt for war." See Zakonodatel'nye aky Petra I, ed. by A. Voskresenskii (M.-L., 1945), 78.

44 On the phallic "scepter of governance" as a synecdoche for God-given authority and political potency, see supra, Chapter One. For a reference to this synecdoche in Petrine propaganda associated with the royal succession, see Feofan (Prokopovich), "Slovo pokhval'noe v den' rozhdestva blagorodnichego gosudaria tsarevicha i velikogo kniazia Petra Petrovicha [29 October 1716]," in Eremin, ed., op. cit., 38-48, esp. 42.

45 See the entry on "ud," the Church Slavonic version of "chlen," in Sreznevskii, op. cit., 3: 1155-1156.

46 Peter was thus in full agreement with the church fathers, like St. Jerome, who insisted that the spiritual health of the true believers demanded that the "rancid flesh" of heresy be "cut off [...] lest the body rot." This quote, from Jerome's diatribe against the heresiarch Arius, comes from his
and the little that has already been raised (i _uzhe nekotoroe vozvrashchennoe_ )" suggests that the "October manifesto" depicted the tsar as the royal gardener of Muscovite panegyrics.\(^47\) Implicitly comparing himself to the Heavenly Father who plants as well as uproots (Mat. 15: 13), the tsar asserted that the issue of his first marriage did not flower according to his expectations. Invoking the righteous wrath of the Lord, the tsar threatened to prune Aleksei's branch of the family from the genealogical tree of the Romanov dynasty (cf. Rom. 11:22; John 15: 2). Urging the tsarevich to rise above the accidents of his birth – "for," according to Peter, "everything contrary" (vse protivno) to the new imperial order ultimately "derives" (idot) from the tsarevich's association with "the other [maternal] half" (ot drugoi poloviny) of his inheritance (i. e. the Lopukhin clan)\(^48\) – the tsar sought to define the new criteria by which to determine whether his son truly deserved to inherit the Kingdom Transfigured. The tsarevich's prior behavior demonstrated that neither formal obedience to the tsar's decrees nor the ceremonial performance of his duties – the external signs of political loyalty – constituted enough proof to guarantee his place among the new chosen people. For tsar Peter, as for the apostle Paul, the performance of these "works" did not demonstrate that a convert to the faith truly believed in the New Dispensation. That kind of faith was a matter of conscience, a spiritual "inclination" which could only come from

---

\(^{47}\) On the image of the "tsar as gardener," and his realm as an Edenic "garden," in Muscovite panegyrics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Baehr, _op. cit._, ch. 4, esp. 65, 82, 86, 222 n. 3.
within. And, judging by Peter’s second, and “final ultimatum” (poslednee napominanie eshche), the tsar never really believed that his incorrigibly “hard-hearted” (zhestokoserdie), first-born son would convert “without hypocrisy”; for as Peter affirmed, invoking the scriptural authority of the “humble psalmist” who was his biblical model of kingship: “Every man is a liar (vsiak chelovek lozh’).”

The Yoke of Faith

The spiritual admonitions included in the “October manifesto” of 1715 suggest that the same imperial vision that informed Peter’s uncompromising approach towards his son also shaped his view about the projected renewal of the Russian Orthodox church. Indeed, the tsar’s repeated references to the dichotomy between “works” and “faith” demonstrates that the issue of religious reform was as much a part of the succession struggle between Peter and his heir-apparent as the question of imperial renovation (Lat. renovatio). After hinting that Aleksei’s “laziness” could have dangerous consequences, not only for the tsarevich himself, but also “for the realm as a whole” (vsemu gosudarstvu), Peter quoted the “truth” (istinu) contained in one of St. Paul’s epistles to Timothy (I Tim. 3:5): “[I]f someone does not know how to manage his own household (izhe o dome svoem ne radit), how can he take care of God’s church

---

48 Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 348. According to Ustrialov, this line from the October ultimatum was omitted from the published version of the case against tsarevich Aleksei.

49 Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 349.
(kako to mozhet tsar’kov’ Bozhiiu upravit’)? This biblical citation, which comes in
the context of the “fatherly” exorciation of Aleksei’s faults, suggests that Paul’s
instructions (1 Tim. 3:1-10, 12-13) about the qualities of a good bishop (episkop) or
deacon (diakon) served as another standard against which Peter judged his “good-for-
nothing” son. By this analogy, Peter implied that a “worthless slave” like tsarevich
Aleksei could not be trusted with the task of reforming the Orthodox church – a
responsibility which he would have to take up upon his confirmation as Peter’s
legitimate successor.

While Peter may have been the only person to equate the “hypocrisy”
(litsemere) of the heir-apparent with the contemporary state of Russian Orthodoxy,\(^5\) he
was certainly not the only one to link the reform of the church with the outcome of the
dynastic dispute between the tsar and the heir-apparent. In fact, by formulating the
problem of Aleksei’s political loyalty in terms of belief in the divinely-ordained
authority of his father and sovereign, Peter’s ultimatum echoed contemporary debates
among Orthodox clerics about the theological notion of “justification” (opravdanie).
Indeed, as even a brief analysis of the disagreements between Feofan (Prokopovich) and

\(^{50}\) Peter to tsarevich Aleksei (19 January 1716), in Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 349-350, here 349.
For a discussion of Peter’s “Davidic kingship,” see supra, Chapter Four.

\(^{51}\) Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 348.

\(^{52}\) For Peter’s personal views about the “sin” of hypocrisy, compare the October ultimatum of
1715 to his treatise about the Decalogue. a “program” (programma sochinenia) which was to serve as a
template for a book on the Beatitudes by Feofan (Prokopovich). For the text of Peter’s treatise, “O
blagoshenstvakh protiv khanzhei i litsemerev,” see RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, kn. 31, fols. 31-44; published by
I. A. Chistovich, Feofan Prokopovich i ego vremia (SPb., 1868) [ = Sbornik statet, chitanikh v
Otdelennii russkago izyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 4], 125-127. For other comments
on hypocrisy, see PIB 3: 532; James Cracraft, The Church Reform of Peter the Great [hereafter:
Cracraft] (London and Basingstoke, 1971), 25-26; and Chistovich, ibid., 125, 128.
the protégés of Stefan (lavorskii) will demonstrate, the contemporary theological controversy over the problem of “works” versus “faith” derived their explosive power (and their political topicality) from the fact that they addressed many of the same kind of concerns that motivated Peter’s “paternal testament” – a document, which turned precisely on the question of whether or not the unprecedented hardships and duties imposed by the tsar’s new imperial program represented a bearable “yoke.”

And at least part of the reason why Feofan (Prokopovich) (1681-1736) – the chief architect of Peter’s program of religious reform – found such stiff opposition among his new Russian colleagues derived from the way in which the tsar’s new ecclesiastical protégé justified the new imperial cult. Despite Feofan’s attempt to impute the basest of motives to his religious opponents, it appears that his conflict with

\[\text{\footnotesize 53} \text{ Indeed, Feofan’s eloquent (if self-serving) defense of the spiritual obligations imposed upon the Orthodox faithful by the newly-proclaimed cult of Russia’s imperial “Father” and “High Priest” (Pontifex maximus) repeated in the language of Orthodox polemics the neo-Stoic propositions found on the pages of the “October manifesto” of 1715. For a defense of the proposition that the Roman title of Pontifex maximus can be applied to the Russian Orthodox emperor, see Feofan (Prokopovich), Rozysk istoricheskii, kolikh radi vin i v iakovom razume byli i narisauutsia imperatory rime, kak izychevskie, tak i khristianskie, pontifeksami ili arkhieraeami mnogobozhnogo zakona; a v zakon khristianskem khristianskie gosudari mogut li nareshchisia episkopi i arkhiepiskopi v kakom razume (Spb., 7 July 1721); re-published by P. V. Verkhovskoi, Uchrezhdenie dukhovnoi kollegii i dukhovnyi reglament: K voprosu ob omoshenii Tserkvi i gosudarstva v Rossii. Izledovanie v oblasti istorii russkogo tserkovnogo prava (Rostov-on-the-Don, 1916), 2 (3): 5-20. See discussion in Verkhovskoi, ibid., 2(3): 3-4; and Chisovich, op. cit., 128-129.}
\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 54} \text{ For a biography of Feofan (Prokopovich), see Chisovich, op. cit.; Verkhovskoi, op. cit.; Cracraft, op. cit.; V. M. Nichik [Nichyk], Feofan Prokopovich (M., 1977); and V. G. Smirnov, Feofan Prokopovich (M., 1994).}
\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 55} \text{ In fact, the “Protestant” theological position of Feofan (Prokopovich) on the question of justification by faith constituted one of the main points against his candidacy for the position of Russian Orthodox bishop. See Stefan (lavorskii), “Poslanie mestobliustelja patriarsheskogo prestola, riazanskogo mitropolita, Stefanu lavorskogo k preosviaschennym Varlaamu tverskomu i kasheiskomu, 1718,” in I. A. Chisovich, Reshilovskoe delo. Feofan Prokopovich i Feofilakt Lopainskii. Materialy dlia istorii pervoi poloviny XVIII stoletia (Spb., 1861), appendix I: 1-4, here 3 (objections 4 and 5), 4 (objections 1 and 2).}
\]
metropolitan Stefan and the Moscow "Latinizers" was as much about matters of principle as professional rivalry.\textsuperscript{56} Indeed, in the letters which Feofan wrote to his friends in Kiev, as well as the sermons which he preached immediately upon his arrival in St. Petersburg, he connected his own struggle against Stefan (lavorskii) with the religious questions raised by the tsar's attempt to deprive the heir-apparent of his rightful share of royal patrimony, and, particularly, with the question of justification by faith. Upon arrival in his new, adopted homeland, Feofan immediately took up the combative confessional style that had characterized his work as the rector of the Kiev-Mohyla academy. Feofan transferred his campaign against the pretensions of the Latin-educated, Polonophile scholars who had borne the brunt of his acerbic attacks back in the Ukraine, unto his Russian colleagues.\textsuperscript{57} In a letter to his long-time friend and confidante, Jacob Markiewicz (Ia. A. Markevich), written soon after his arrival in the "Third Rome," Feofan lumped the Russian "priests and monks" (popy i monakhi) who had greeted him in Moscow together with "our own Latinizers" (nashi latinshchiki), the

\textsuperscript{56} According to a self-serving account written by Feofan (Prokopovich) already after he had been ordained as the new bishop of Pskov, a political "conspiracy" spearheaded by Feofilakt (Lopatinskii) and Gideon (Vishnevskii), the protégés of metropolitan Stefan (lavorskii), almost succeeded in ending his political career at the Muscovite court almost before it ever began. See Feofan's letter to the professors of the Kiev Academy (after 8 June 1718), in Epistolae illustrissimi ac reverendissimi Theophanis Procopovitsch, varis temporibus et ad varios amicos datae, ed. by metropolitan Samuil (Mislavskii) (M., 1776), no. 6; trans. into Russian by Chistovich, op. cit., 33-34, 41-43; re-published by Smirnov. op. cit., 188-193.

graduates of the Kiev academy called to serve in the Russian church before his own advent. 58 Although he does not specify which "Latinizers" he has in mind, it is clear that Feofan could not endure any of these self-satisfied "sages" (mudretsy), no matter what their national origin. For Feofan, as for most early modern religious reformers, the problem was not one of nationality, but of confessional allegiance. 59 And, as the Ukrainian monk "ruefully" (s bol' shim neudovol'stvom) acknowledged, in Moscow he found Orthodox priests who, in their vanity and scholastic pride, acted "even sillier than the Roman Pope" (glupee rimskago papy). 60

In Feofan's letter to Markevich, the enlightener's reformist agenda found an outlet in humorous, as well as virulently anti-Catholic imagery reminiscent of popular, seventeenth-century, anti-clerical satires. Keeping in mind the stock characters of Ukrainian puppet-shows (vertep) and comical "interludes" (intermedi), 61 Feofan

---

Orthodoxy Under the Old Regime, ed. by Theofanis George Stavrou and Robert L. Nichols (Minneapolis, 1978), 44-64.

58 Feofan (Prokopovich) to Ia. A. Markevich (1716), Epistolae, no. 20, in Chistovich. op. cit., 38-39, here 38.


60 Feofan (Prokopovich) to Ia. A. Markevich (1716), Epistolae, no. 20, trans. in Chistovich. op. cit., 39.

61 On the relationship between intermedi, Ukrainian puppet theater, and Orthodox "school drama," see D. M. Sadykova, "Iz istorii masovoi dramaticheskoi literatury XVIII v. Teatr intermedi," Avtoref. diss. kand. filologich. nauk, V. P. Potemkin Pedagogical Institute (Moscow, 1956), 7-9; N. K. Gudzii, "Ukrains'ki intermedi XVII-XVIII st.," in Ukrains'ki intermedi XVII-XVIII st.: Pam'ятники dav'ioi ukrainski literaturi (Kiev, 1960), 5-30; Paulina Lewin, "Vostochnoslavianskie intermedi, in Drevnerusskaia literatura i ee sviazi s novym vremenem, ed. O. A. Derzhavina (M., 1967), 194-205; O. A. Derzhavina, "Russkii teatr 70-90kh godov XVII v. i nachala XVIII v.," in Russkaia dramaturgiiia
compared the Eastern Orthodox clergymen whom he met in Moscow to the Pope, “who imagines that he cannot make mistakes because he is possessed by the Holy Spirit (emu prisushch Dukh Sviaty) and [who] preaches (ucha s kafedry) [...] as if pronouncing dogma (izrekaet dogmy).” In the best tradition of confessional mudslinging, Feofan suggested that “our Latinizers” – the Orthodox priests who are the subject of his epistolary reflections – “thought as highly of themselves” (takzhe wysoko o sebe dumaiut) as their supposed, confessional arch-nemesis. Indeed, Feofan continued, they are so similar to the Roman pontiff, that they “do not doubt that they have swallowed (proglotili) a whole ocean of wisdom (tselyi okean mudrosti)”62 – a grotesque image of insatiable and misdirected appetite which transforms the thirst for knowledge and enlightenment into something straight out of Gargantua and Pantagruel.62

Towards the end of his diatribe against the “fatuous” (glupoe) world of Orthodox scholasticism, Feofan hinted at the main point of his disagreement with the “Latinizing sages” of Moscow and Kiev: the connection between justification (opravdanie) and religious enlightenment (prosveshchenie). Addressing Markevich, the

---

62 Feofan (Prokopovich) to Ia. A. Markevich (1716), in Chistovich, op. cit., 39.

63 Feofan criticized the “Polish eloquence” of his “Latinophile” colleagues for the same kind of things (affectation, pretense, use of artificial arguments) as the Jesuits and Uniates. See Feofan (Prokopovich) to Ia. A. Markevich (1716), in Chistovich, op. cit., 39; and Cracraft, op. cit., 55-56. For other examples, see the excerpts from Feofan’s De arte rhetorica, in Chistovich, op. cit., 9-11, 11-13; Barbara Joyce Merguerian, “Political Ideas in Russia During the Period of Peter the Great (1682-1730)” (Ph.D. diss. Harvard University, 1970), 211-212; and Cracraft, “Feofan Prokopovich and the Kiev Academy,” op. cit., 53-54.
young Ukrainian nobleman whom he counseled on the virtues of theological study and the dangers of scholastic excess,\textsuperscript{64} Feofan exclaimed:

Oh, if only, following your splendid example, everyone was consumed by a thirst for knowledge and study (\textit{zhazhda znaniia i izhucheniiia}), as opposed to the tyranny of preconceived opinions (\textit{tiranstvu predzaniatagho mnieniiia}). Then there would be hope that truth might shine forth from out of the darkness (\textit{iz t'emy vozziiaet istina}). But this, as we see, is not the case. Everyone aspires to teach and almost no one wants to be taught. And it is precisely in these gloomy times, when it is almost impossible to find a fervent (\textit{revnosinago}) and diligent (\textit{userdnago}) student of theology (\textit{uchenika bozhestvennikh znaniia}), here [in Moscow] you have an innumerable number of teachers! In other words, when the world (\textit{mir}) has attained the highest degree of impiety (\textit{vysshei stepeni nechestiiia}), it attempts to pass itself off as [possessing] the highest degree of holiness (\textit{v vysshei stepeni sviytm}). And what displeases it most (\textit{chtio vsego bolee ne nрав sitio emu}) is the effortless justification though Christ (\textit{opravdanie chrez Khrista tune}).\textsuperscript{65}

The last sentence of this letter refers to one of Feofan’s early theological treatises,\textsuperscript{66} in which he draws an implicit analogy between his teaching activity in the Ukraine and Paul’s mission to the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{67} In this little-known work, Feofan offers an extended commentary on Paul’s repeated confrontations with Peter over the question of whether

\textsuperscript{64} Feofan (Prokopovich) to la. A. Markevich (1716), in Smirnov, \textit{op. cit.}, 188.

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Ibid.}, 187.

\textsuperscript{66} During his tenure at the Kiev academy, Feofan sent Markevich a copy of a “full,” if “hurriedly-written [...] tractate on justification (\textit{trcat ob opravdanii}),” which he hoped to expand and systematize (\textit{izlozheno budet prostrannee i nauchnym metodom}) into “a whole book” for “our [i.e. academic] course on theology.” See \textit{Epistolae} (nos. 2 and 3); cited in Chistovich, \textit{op. cit.}, 22-23.

\textsuperscript{67} Chistovich, \textit{op. cit.}, 39, 19. Feofan’s 1712 treatise was first published at the end of the eighteenth century, along with three other theological works, as “part four” of his collected works, entitled \textit{Bogoslovska\={i}e sochineniiia: polnago sobraniiia} (SPb., 1774), 4: 83-242; it was printed separately by N. I. Novikov, ed., \textit{Knizhitsa, v nei zhe Povest’ o raspre Pava\={i} i Var\=navy s ludeistviuishchimi, i trudnosti’ slova Petra apostola O neudob’nosim zakonnom ige prostranno predlagaetsia} (M., 1784). On the publication history, see James Cracroft, “Feofan Prokopovich: A Bibliography of His Works,” \textit{Oxford Slavonic Papers} 8 (1975), 1-36, here 11 (no. 5), 26 (no. 116), 30 (no. 141).
or not the Gentiles need to be circumcised in order to enter the new covenant heralded by Jesus’ death and resurrection (Gal. 2:1-14). Adopting the persona of the “apostle to the uncircumcised,” the Ukrainian religious reformer casts his academic opponents in the same roles as the “Judaizers,” the early Christian sect that confronted Paul in Galatia, Antioch, and Jerusalem. According to Feofan, his “Latinizing” colleagues misinterpreted Peter’s words about the “yoke” of the law (Acts 15:10-11) in the same way as had the defenders of the “Judaizing” heresy. In both cases, the pedantic insistence on the performance of the “law” – whether, in the first case, through the compulsory circumcision of new converts, or, in the second case, through the ignorant veneration of unattested Orthodox relics and icons – only serves to conceal the fact that God’s grace is given “freely” (tune) to all who believe in Christ. The conclusion that Feofan wanted people to draw from his treatises about “justification” is that true religious enlightenment occurs when the diligent “student of theology” realizes the “truth” (istina) contained in his rational exposition of the facts and learns to distinguish

---

68 The Greek verb “to Judaize” is found only in the New Testament, in the context of Paul’s rebuke of Peter (Gal. 2:14). In the ancient sources, the noun “Judaizer” and the verb “to Judaize” refer primarily to the actions of gentiles. While the verb can be used to designate the forced conversion of gentiles to Judaism, it normally refers to the taking over of Jewish customs by gentiles without conversion. However one may wish to define the specific profile of these “Judaizers,” it is clear that their “different gospel” (Gal. 1:6) included such Jewish practices as circumcision (Gal. 5:1-6), the celebration of feasts according to the Jewish calendar (Gal. 4:10), and the keeping of Jewish dietary laws. See James W. Aageson, “Judaizing,” The Anchor Bible Dictionary, ed. by David Noel Freedman, et. al. (NY, 1992), 3: 1089; and Karl P. Donfried, “Peter,” in op. cit., 5: 251-263.

69 Addressing a council of church elders, who had gathered in Jerusalem in order to decide whether or not to accept the “Judaizing” proposition that “Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved” (Acts 15:1), Peter asks: “[W]hy are you putting God to the test by placing on the neck (vozlozhit' na yyi) of the disciples (uchenikov) a yoke (igo) that neither our fathers [the Jews] nor we [the Jewish Christians] have been able to bear. On the contrary, we believe that we will be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, just as they [the uncircumcised Gentiles] will.”
sincere piety from the "hypocritical" religion of the scholastics. Thus, what mattered to the Ukrainian monk who would soon become the tsar's new ecclesiastical protégé was the spiritual inclination towards the Lord, not the extravagant display of personal piety.

In his very first St. Petersburg sermon, the rector of the Kiev academy quickly conflated his own critique of unenlightened hypocrisy – which came out of his own doctrinal position on the question of justification by faith – with the tsar's views about the purely formal, external obedience of his first-born son. Under the guidance of Prince Menshikov and several unnamed "senators," who favored the tsar's plan to exclude tsarevich Aleksei from the inheritance, Feofan grasped the crux of the succession struggle and tailored his speech to fit the occasion. On 29 October 1716, just five days after his arrival in the new imperial capital, Feofan delivered a panegyrical oration in honor of tsarevich Peter Petrovich, the long-awaited issue of Peter's second marriage and the "universally-acknowledged hope" for the continuation


70 In response to Feofan's treatise on "justification," Feofilakt (Lopatinskii), his colleague from the Kiev academy, wrote a two-volume refutation, entitled Igo Gospodne blago i bremia Ego legko, si est' zakon Bozhii s zapoved'mi svoimi ot prizrachnykh novootzmyshlennykh o svobozhdeta (Kiev, 1712). Chistovich saw two copies of this work, which appears to be an extended commentary on Jesus' words, as recorded in the Gospel of Matthew (Mat. 11:29-30) – one in the files of the "Secret Chancellery" and one in the "Synodal archive, No. 61" (now both in RGADA). See Chistovich, op. cit., 19 n. 2. Another copy of Feofilakt's treatise, entitled Vozrazhenie na knigu i go neudobnonosimo, is located in RO BAN, No. 31.4.28. See Nichik, op. cit., 183 (no. 97).


72 For a description of his first meeting with Prince Menshikov, see Feofan (Prokopovich) to Io. A. Markevich (1716), in Chistovich, op. cit., 25-26.
of his reformist legacy. This birthday sermon gave Feofan the opportunity to present himself as the only ecclesiastical leader willing to take up the burden of defending Peter's reforms, and, in particular, of justifying the tsar's new dynastic scenario. From the pulpit of the St. Petersburg Trinity Cathedral, Feofan publicly acknowledged the hereditary claims of the one-year-old Peter Petrovich, the "royal seed" which promised to take "root" and the only hope for the future "bliss of the All-Russian realm" (blazhennstvo vserossiiskoe). Significantly, Feofan mentioned tsarevich Aleksei only once, at the tend of the sermon, and then only in a clause of a sentence in which the female members of the Russian royal family are urged to recognize the divine favor visited upon them through the birth of their new brother, tsarevich Peter Petrovich. Feofan's polemical juxtaposition of the tsar's two sons thus echoed Paul's argument (Rom. 9:8) that "it is not the children of the flesh (plotskie deti) who are the children of God, but the children of the promise (deti obetovaniia) who are counted as descendents (priznaiutsia za semia, lit. acknowledged as the seed)."

---

73 Eremin, ed., op. cit., 463. On 14 February 1717, this sermon was published as a separate pamphlet, with the explanatory title, "Peter Petrovich [...] - The Universally-Acknowledged (vsem at sebe vedomaia i izvestnaia) [...] Hope for a Good, Long Life of the All-Russian Monarchy (Nadezhda dobrykh i dolgikh let Rossiiskoi monarkhii) [...]." See T. A. Bykova and M. M. Gurevich, Opisanie izdaniia, napechatannykh kirimtei. 1689-iantvar' 1725 (M.-L., 1958), 192-193.

74 For Feofan's claim to be "the one, and, seemingly, the only" Orthodox cleric to preach on topical issues, or "to catechize" (kitikhizatorstvovat') the St. Petersburg political elite, during the tsar's second trip abroad, see Feofan (Prokopovich) to Ia. A. Markevich (1716), in Chistovich, op. cit., 26. For a discussion of this sermon, see Merguerian, op. cit., 222-226.

75 By describing the dangers which could befall a hereditary monarchy if the "royal seed shrivels up" (issokshshia semeni monarshemu), Feofan may have meant to invoke the "gangrenous member" of the October ultimatum. For the reference to the "royal seed" as the "root" (koren') and "foundation" (osnovanie) of the "common weal" (vsenarodnykh blag), see "Slovo pokhval'noe," in Eremin, ed., op. cit., 38, 39.
Feofan drove home this point at the beginning 1718, in a “Sermon (slowo) on Royal Power and Authority (o vlasti i chesti tsarskoi), How It Is Established (uchinenina) in the World by God Himself (ot samogo Boga), and How Men Are Obliged to Honor Tsars and Obey Them, and Who the People Are Who Oppose Them, and How Great Is the Sin (grekh) They Have”77 – one of the most eloquent justifications of royal absolutism ever made at the early modern Russian court.78 In the course of his defense of the tsar’s campaign of terror against anyone suspected of supporting the candidacy of tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich – a defense based as much on arguments from “natural law” as on citations from the Scriptures79 – Feofan also scored a victory against his own ecclesiastical rivals, who had accused him of “Protestant heresy” in the theological controversy over the question of “justification.” Thanks to his rhetorical strategy, the former rector of the Kiev academy not only successfully defended himself from the


78 On 18 August 1718, the sermon which Feofan had originally delivered in front of the tsar and the entire political elite of St. Petersburg was published as a separate “pamphlet.” See Bykova and Gurevich, eds., op. cit., 205-206 (no. 117); and Eremin, ed., op. cit., 467. For the text of the sermon, see Feofan (Prokopovich), “Slovo o vlasti i chesti tsarskoi, iako ot samogo Boga v mire uchinena est’. i kako pochitati tsarei i onym povinovatia liudie dolshenvstvuiut; kto zhe sut‘ i kolikii imeiut grekh protivliaiushchiisia im [...]”, [hereafter, “Slovo,”] in Eremin, ed., ibid., 76-93; and “Sermon on Royal Authority and Honor [...]”, [hereafter, “Sermon”], trans. by Horace G. Lunt in Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology, ed. Marc Raeff (NY, 1966), 14-30.

79 For a discussion of the “natural law” arguments used by Feofan in this sermon, see Merguerian, op. cit., 229-236. However, I do not agree with Merguerian’s assertion that Feofan’s “rational” arguments are merely “augmented” by his “appeal to scriptures,” and that “even without scripture, the argument from natural law would hold.” Merguerian, op. cit., 237-238. Her assertion simply repeats the thesis of G. D. Gurvich, “Pravda voli monarshii” Feofana Prokopovicha i ee zapadnoeuropeiskii istochniki (lur’ev, 1915), 37; cf. Nichik, op. cit., 153-154.
charges leveled against him, but also managed to declare his own (and to enjoin others to declare their) whole-hearted commitment to the tsar’s program of imperial and moral renewal, as embodied by tsarevich Peter Petrovich, the newly-proclaimed heir to the throne.

Without mentioning their names, Feofan’s Palm Sunday sermon relegated Stefan (Iavorskii) and his protégés to the ranks of those “hypocritical,” “ungrateful,” and politically-unreliable Orthodox clerics who had allegedly supported Aleksei’s challenge to his father’s God-given authority. Using the story of Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem to make a contemporary political reference to the wide-spread support that tsarevich Aleksei enjoyed in clerical circles, Feofan placed the fault for these developments squarely on shoulders of all those who refused to recognize the Davidic pedigree of the divinely-anointed “King of Israel,” simply because their reason had been “obscured by rabbinic [read, scholastic] traditions” (rabbiskimi predaniiami pomrachenhykh). Here, as in the 1712 treatise against the Kievian “Latinizers,”

---

80 Although bitter religious polemics and denunciations to the secular authorities constituted two of the most reliable strategies in the political arsenal of many Orthodox clerics in the first half of the eighteenth-century, Feofan was particularly good at this deadly game. See Nichik, op. cit., 169-170, 172-173.

81 The official manifesto (3 February 1718) which deprived tsarevich Aleksei of the inheritance also named Peter’s second son, tsarevich Petr Petrovich, as the legal heir-apparent. See Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 438-444, here 443-444.

82 Adopting bestial imagery in order to disparage unholy alliance between the stubborn, the haughty (“mules and lions”) and the self-righteous (“grasshoppers” and “vile caterpillars”). Feofan bemoaned the fact that “[s]ome [of the tsar’s own subjects] have thought not only of reducing the powers of government, the honor due to the God-given tsar (enough right here to warrant eternal damnation), but of begrudging both his scepter and his life.” See “Sermon,” 27; 16 (on bookworms); and “Slovo,” 90.

Feofan’s old rivals appeared in the guise of their evil biblical prototypes, the “Judaizers,” “arch-hierarchs,” “scribes,” and “holy Pharisees” (sviatii farisee).

Hinting at what would become the official interpretation of the “case” of the “new Absalom,” Feofan argued that those clerics who supported tsarevich Aleksei acted against the divine basis of imperial rule, as embodied in the biblical King David.

In fact, Feofan’s refutation of those who cited the Gospel of Luke to excuse political disobedience reveals that the tsar’s new ecclesiastical protégé was keenly aware of previous comparisons between Peter and the “humble Psalmist,” who was himself a type (Lat. typus) of Christ. In the Palm Sunday sermon, Feofan attacked those “hypocritical” clerics whose “outward poverty, [...] gloomy faces, and [...] whole Pharisee hide [...],” arouses “admiration in men” solely in order to “deceive the hearts of the innocent [...].” Countering their assertions, Feofan argued that “God’s word [specifically, the quote from Luke 16:15]” was not directed at the “high esteem of government authorities, for the lowliness that God loves is found also in purple robes when a king confesses before God that he is sinful and places his hopes solely in God’s

84 Aleksei’s unflattering new sobriquet was based on the story in II Chronicles 15-18, which recounted the rebellion, flight, and ignominious death of King David’s son, Absalom. For an explicit reference to the “example of Absalom” (Avessalomov priklad), see the 13 June 1718 royal decree addressed to the Russian Orthodox clergy, as well as their collective verdict (18 June 1718) against tsarevich Aleksei, both in Ustialov, op. cit., 6: 515-516, here 516; 518-523, here 518-519, 520, 522-523. The reference to II Samuel 15-18 is also implicit in the 3 February 1718 “manifesto” depriving Aleksei of the throne; the 13 June 1718 royal decree addressed to the secular ranks, as well as their collective verdict (24 June 1718), respectively, in Ustialov, ibid., 438-444, esp. 440, 441, 443; 516; and 529-536, esp. 530. Aleksei’s “Absalom-like malice” (Avesalomskaia zlost’) is also cited in the new imperial law on succession, “Ustav o nasledstvi prestola rossiiskogo” (5 February 1722), in Voskresenskii, ed., op. cit., 174-176, here 175. On the story of Absalom and David as the “official” point of view on the “case of tsarevich Aleksei,” see Nikolaeva, op. cit., 96.
mercy, as did David, Constantine, Theodosius, and the rest. On the contrary, the Pharisee’s high esteem, lives even in a beggar’s dress.” Feofan’s imperial genealogy suggested not only that Peter – like the first Christian rulers of the eastern Roman Empire – had inherited the God-given responsibility for reforming the church, but also that, like King David, he embodied the paradoxical combination of humility and sublimity typical of the kenotic, suffering Christ.

Invoking the highly-charged, anti-Catholic rhetoric unveiled against the “Latinizers” back in his days as the rector of the Kiev-Mohyla academy, Feofan implied that his Orthodox rivals were infected with the “papist spirit” (papezhskii dukh) – the dangerous and erroneous belief that unlike all the other “orders” of society, the clergy was exempt from the duties of service and loyalty to the tsar. Foreshadowing the point which he was to make just a few years later, in the Spiritual Regulation of 1721, Feofan argued that regardless of whether this Orthodox “papalism” issued from a sense of puffed-up pride in their own exalted spiritual calling; a “misanthropic” disdain “for anything wondrous, merry, great, and glorious”; or from a mistaken belief that nothing “useful” (poleznoe) can be accomplished without the

---

85 For a “playful” comparison between the “humble psalmist” and Peter – the “Davidic” founder of a “new Jerusalem,” see supra, Chapter Four.


88 Cracraft, op. cit., 59. For other references to the political pretensions of the “headless head of Rome [the Pope]” and his clergy (kliur),” see “Sermon,” 17, 27.

89 “Sermon,” 17-18; “Slovo,” 79-80. Chistovich pointed out that the quote on “melancholics,” who refuse to believe in the “joy” of the tsar’s Transfigured Kingdom, seems to be directed against
Russian Orthodox patriarch, the “philosophizing” of the “Latinizers” sowed the seeds of heresy, treason, and domestic unrest. Seduced by the “mellowed words” and affected “emotional countenance” of pedantic book-worms, good Christians – not to mention the “simple and ignorant” rabble – could easily be led astray into the belief that the Russian Orthodox patriarch (or his locum tenens) was a “second sovereign.” Drawing on his earlier attacks against the homiletic style of Jesuits, Uniates, and their Orthodox imitators, Feofan’s renewed attack against the so-called “Latinizers” thus took on the contours of the argument which he would later use to justify the tsar’s decision to abolish the Russian patriarchate and to institute a “Spiritual College” in its stead.

Stefan (Iavorskii). See Chistovich, op. cit., 28. However, it can just as easily be a reference to Aleksei’s stubborn unwillingness to share in the “joy come of God to Russia.”

This appears to be a reference to metropolitan Stefan’s hesitating acquiescence to the defrocking of Dositheos (Glebov), the bishop of Suzdal’, one among a number of prominent Orthodox clerics implicated in the concurrent investigations into the lives of tsarevich Aleksei and his mother. Privately, metropolitan Stefan argued that removing the signs of sanctity imparted during the sacrament of ordination could not be done without the blessings of the patriarch. See Cracraft, op. cit., 139, 146; and V. M. Zhivov, “Church Reforms in the Reign of Peter the Great,” trans. W. Gareth Jones, in Russia in the Reign of Peter the Great: Old and New Perspectives, ed. by Anthony Cross (Cambridge, 1998), I: 65-75, here 71.

On Feofan’s critique of this baroque homiletic style, one which included exaggerated “sighings and noddings of the head,” see “Sermon,” 18.; “Slovo,” 80.

According to Feofan, this explains the easiness with which the ignorant “common people” could be enticed into heresy, or what is worse, into words and deeds against the tsar. See The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great, trans. and ed. by Alexander V. Muller (Seattle and London, 1972), 10-11.

“Sermon,” 23-24, 25; “Slovo,” 86, 88. Feofoan even signals his readiness to write a whole treatise (tseluiu knigu) in defense of the position which has outlined in his sermon (slovo): “But if one were to enumerate all this [evidence about the clergy’s subordination to imperial authority] in detail, it would be a book and not an ordinary sermon. For the lovers of truth even these [brief comments] suffice: for the stubborn and the stiff-necked, however, nothing could be enough.” See “Slovo,” 90; and “Sermon,” 27.
Summarizing the points which he had already made in his 1712 treatise on St. Paul’s confrontation with the “Judaizers,” Feofan also argued that the failure to understand the fundamental difference between the conventions associated with paying respect to Orthodox clerics and the immutable laws regarding the authorities – that is, between “ritual” and “moral” law94 – led the “Latinizers” and their “ignorant” followers to misinterpret the apostle Peter’s words about the yoke of the law. In turn, this fundamental theological error caused them to reject the “truth” contained in Feofan’s sermon: namely, that a well-ordered realm could have only one “supreme law” (vsekh zakonov glavizna) – the divinely-inspired natural law that was “written in the hearts of men” (Rom. 2:14-15) and that commanded all Orthodox believers to obey the decrees of Russia’s “anointed one” (chrestos).95 And since man had a conscience (sovest’), “which itself is also the seed of God (semia bozhie),” in the final analysis, that obedience could not be coerced; in other words, political loyalty, like religious belief, had to come straight from the heart.96 By citing fully most of the biblical allusions of the “October manifesto” of 1715, Feofan’s Palm Sunday oration thus argued that true “Christian freedom” lay precisely in the inner burden of faith.97


95 For Feofan’s explicit defense of the idea that earthly tsars deserve to be referred to as “gods (bozi) and christs (chresty) [the anointed ones],” see “Sermon,” 22, 16; “Slovo,” 84-85.

96 “Sermon,” 19; “Slovo,” 81-82. Cf. Feofan’s Palm Sunday appeal to the “conscience” of his audience with Peter’s attempt to use the parable of the talents as a way of reaching the “hard-hearted” tsarevich Aleksei.

97 Comparing the views of his theological opponents to those of the ancient “monarchomachs, or fighters against kings,” Feofan attacked those who insisted that Christ had “given us the freedom from obedience to the laws of God” and “from submission to the reigning powers.” On the contrary, Feofan
invocation of “justification” in the context of a defense of royal authority demonstrates
Feofan’s awareness of the important role of this question in the succession struggle
between Peter and Aleksei. It also lends credence to the hypothesis that the tsar’s new
ecclesiastical protégé used the opportunity provided by the investigation into the
“affair” of tsarevich Aleksei to silence his long-time rivals by associating them with the
recently-uncovered clerical “opposition.” Feofan’s panegyric, therefore, not only
branded his theological rivals as dangerous “Papists”; it also presented Feofan himself
as the spokesman of a new, “rational” Orthodoxy and as the most ardent defender of
Peter’s God-given authority.

After explaining the reasons why the subjects of the Russian tsar must obey
Peter as God’s anointed, Feofan went on to offer an explanation of why they must also
heed him as “Father of the Fatherland.” Echoing the tsar’s letter to his son, Feofan
argued that “our sovereign (samoderzhets), [like] all sovereigns,” expects that his
subjects fulfill their filial duty “to honor the authorities sincerely and conscientiously” –
“unhypocratically” (nelitsemerno), as Peter would say – in accordance with God’s
injunction to “Honor thy father […]” (Exod. 20:12). “For,” the preacher asked
rhetorically, “if [biblical and patristic history demonstrates that] Christians have to be

intoned, “Christ freed us by His cross from sin, death, and the devil, that is eternal damnation, if we
believe in Him in true repentance. This is the same as our being redeemed from the oath of the law [Gal.
3:13]; the same as our not being under the law, but under grace [Rom. 6:15]; the same as the law dying
for us that we may be living gods [Gal. 2:19]; the same as our being saved from the power of him who
had the power of death, that is, the devil [Heb. 2:14], and any other comparisons at all that may be found
in the Scriptures. Christ freed us too from the legislation of ritual and from human inventions,
supposedly necessary for salvation but in fact arbitrary, as the Apostle [Paul] instructs us more than
once. However, this is not the time to expound on this [i.e. the relationship between “Christian
subject even to willful (stroptivym)\textsuperscript{98} and pagan (nevernym) rulers (vladykam), how much more must they be utterly obligated to true-believing (pravoverenyi) and true-judging (pravosudnym) sovereigns (gosudarem)?” The answer is clear: while the former are merely despotic “masters” (gospodiia), who administer their patrimony like an estate populated with serfs – that is, for their own personal benefit, and perhaps, for the benefit of their own ruling house (dom) – the latter are also “fathers” (ottsy), who are responsible for the general welfare of the entire realm. Entrusted with the God-given “authority” (vat'st') in order to ensure “the life (zhitie), the integrity (tselost'), and the welfare (bezpechalie) of a whole great people (vsego velikago naroda),” the Orthodox sovereign possesses “the primary and ultimate degree of fatherhood (samoe perveishee i voschaishie otechestvo).”\textsuperscript{99} Feofan’s attempt to distinguish between patrimonial and legal rule – one of the first self-conscious efforts to locate sovereignty outside of the person of the monarch – here transcends the sordid realities of the moment in order to make a more general observation about the religious and political ideals embodied in the notion of a Kingdom Transfigured.

In the context of his discussion of the difference between pagan and imperial Christian rule, Feofan’s invocation of the idea of “fatherland” (otchestvo) hints at the honorific title by which the Romans addressed their emperor (Lat. Pater patriae). Indeed, the appearance of the Russian translation of the Latin term for “Father of the

\textsuperscript{98} Feofan gets this word for “stubbornly willful” or “unruly” from 1 Peter 2:17-18: “Fear God, honor the tsar. Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward (stropopnyi).” See “Slovo,” 86; “Sermon,” 23: Marguerian. op. cit., 235 n. 1.

Fatherland” (otets otechestva) foreshadowed by more than four years the tsar’s decision to accept that very same title\textsuperscript{100} from the official representatives of “[Imperial] Russia” (Rossiie).\textsuperscript{101} At the end of his sermon, Feofan appealed to this elite’s sense of honor, as well as its fear of earthly punishment and eternal damnation, in order to “hammer home”\textsuperscript{102} the point about the honors due to Russia’s “founding father.”\textsuperscript{103} Focusing on the same twin aspects of imperial rule which the tsar had outlined in the 1715 letter to his son, Feofan identified the “renewal” (obnovlenie) of the “Fatherland” with the man (Rus. sei; cf. Lat. ecce homo) who had “given birth” (otrodil) to the new Russia – both literally, in the person of the new heir-apparent, and metaphorically, in the new patriotic ideal acknowledged by the assembled representatives of the political nation. Implicitly addressing his listeners as the “true sons of the fatherland,” the court preacher appealed to contemporary notions about the procreative powers of fathers, the classical Roman ideals of patriotism (Lat. dulce et decorum est pro patria more), as

\textsuperscript{100} This is in fact the very same title which the imperial Russian “Senate” conferred upon the tsar in 1721, at the end of the Great Northern War. See Ageeva, op. cit.; de Madariaga, op. cit.; and infra. Conclusion.

\textsuperscript{101} In particular, Feofan addressed the “honorable and noble men, glorious in rank and deed, [the very same ones] who can be referred to (pozyvati) by the general ethnonym (obshchenarodnym imianem)” of “[Imperial] Russians (Rossiie).” See “Sermon,” 28; “Slovo,” 91.

\textsuperscript{102} This is the phrase that Feofan uses to describe the way in which Paul the Apostle repeats his message that there is no power except from God, “as though pounding with a hammer (aki mlatom tolchet) [...].” Feofan’s words about the rhetorical strategy of the “apostle to the uncircumcised” sheds light on how the rector of the Kiev academy saw his own mission in Muscovy: “This is not idle repetition; he is teaching from the [spark of divine] wisdom (premudrosti) given him. This is not flattery. It is not one desirous of pleasing men (chelovekougodnik) who speaks, but Christ’s chosen vessel (izbrannyi sosud Khristov). He drum(s away (dolbet) so actively in order to make sensitive and vigilant Christians and not allow anyone to doze for a short time. And I beg you all to think carefully – what more could the most loyal minister of the tsar (samyi verneishii ministr tsarskii) say?” See “Sermon,” 22; “Slovo,” 84.
well as to the imperatives of divine and natural law, in order to shame the congregation of “Orthodox [men]” (provoslavnii) into realizing that “the doctrine (uchenie) presented here about [the divine nature of] royal authority is indeed the truth (istinnoe),” and, therefore, must be conscientiously obeyed, on pain of eternal punishment of their immortal souls.\textsuperscript{104}

Taking full advantage of the moment,\textsuperscript{105} Feofan concluded his Palm Sunday sermon by calling for universal repentance and divine judgement.\textsuperscript{106} For, as he argued, it is only by, first, confessing to, and then, by expiating their sins against the “honor” and “authority” of Russia’s “anointed one” – in all their “doings and makings, first, last, and always”\textsuperscript{107} – that the Russian political elite could ever hope to enter the world of regular, polite, and civilized “nations.” By urging his audience to receive the earthly tsar with the same kind of awe and respect as the people of Jerusalem received the heavenly Tsar,\textsuperscript{108} the new official court preacher thus made a very deliberate parallel between the redemptive suffering of the son of God and the personal

\textsuperscript{103} “Slovo,” 91-92; “Sermon,” 28-29; and Marguerian, op. cit., 236-237.

\textsuperscript{104} “Sermon,” 29; “Slovo,” 93.

\textsuperscript{105} On Holy Week as a liturgically-significant moment, traditionally interpreted as a sign of the coming Kingdom of God, see Timothy Ware, The Orthodox Church (Middlesex, 1964).

\textsuperscript{106} In his concluding prayer, Feofan asks God to forgive the congregation for “our great ingratitude,” to which “we have added this, too, that we have not recognized many of Thy good deeds, shown forth to us in Peter [...].” He then proceeds to address the following prayer of retribution on behalf of Russia’s anointed one: “Lord, save Thine anointed one (spasi chriста твоего) and hear him from Thy holy heaven. [...] May Thy hand be on all his enemies, may Thy right hand find out all them that hate him [...].” See “Sermon,” 30; “Slovo,” 93.

\textsuperscript{107} “Sermon,” 29; “Slovo,” 93.

\textsuperscript{108} On Feofan’s self-conscious use of the homology between the earthly and heavenly “King” (Church Slavonic, tsar), see the translator’s comment in “Sermon,” 15 n. 1.
tribulations experienced by Russia’s “Father of the Fatherland.” In both cases, Feofan suggested, only those chosen few who “walked near the light” (bliz sveta khodiashchii) of Mt. Tabor, would ever be able to recognize the gift of grace (Gr. charisma) possessed by the divinely-anointed sons of David and to participate fully in the imminent transfiguration of the world. And in both cases, those chosen few constituted the intimate, inner circle of the royal apostles.

Fathering the Fatherland

As the only group within the Muscovite political elite who even came close to matching the zeal with which Feofan (Prokopovich) extolled the virtues of obedience to the Russian imperial “High Priest,” the apostles of Russia’s “anointed one” formed a crucial linchpin in the tsar’s attempt to father the “Fatherland.” Although by the first decade of the eighteenth century the members of Peter’s “company” had become important political players (in the expanding bureaucracy of the “well-ordered police

109 Despite Feofan’s protestation that he did not have any “intention” (namerenie) of making a direct comparison (sravnenie) between “the earthly tsar (zemnogo tsaria) and the heavenly one (nebesnogo),” he proceeded to argue that “we have models in God’s Word for taking God’s honor and love to be a reason for man’s love and honor, not in equality (в равенство), but as an example (в пример).” See “Sermon,” 15: “Slavo,” 76-77. In fact, this sermon is a prime example of the “allegorical” hermeneutics practiced by Orthodox religious reformers since at least the mid-seventeenth century. For a linguistic analysis of this religious hermeneutic, see B. A. Uspenskii, “The Schism and Cultural Conflict in the Seventeenth Century,” in Seeking God: The Recovery of Religious Identity in Orthodox Russia, Ukraine, and Georgia, ed. and trans. by Stephen K. Batalden (De Kalb, 1993), 106-143.

110 I am here putting a positive spin on the “blindness” (slepotá) of the Apostles, as well as on Feofan’s exhortation of all those “chosen people,” whose “theology was blind, filled with many foolish
state," with their own, relatively independent, administrative bailiwicks), the tsar never forgot to remind them of the fact that they owed their livelihoods (and their lives) to the unrestrained, unrestricted, and un-codified, “charismatic” authority of the Russian Orthodox emperor. So while the mechanisms of political mobilization did undergo an unmistakable process of “bureaucratization,” at the end of Peter’s reign, as at the beginning, the tsar’s intimates continued to derive their legitimacy from their close association with the charismatic person of the Russian tsar. And participation in the rituals of the Kingdom Transfigured was as central to the tsar’s accessible (and frequently antinomian) style of rule as to his courtiers’ sense of election. This is part of the reason why the blasphemous ceremonies staged at Yuletide 1717/1718, on the grounds of the suburban royal estate of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe, offer such a good way of analyzing how Peter’s “company” could successfully integrate the political execution of the tsar’s heir-apparent, and the abolition of the Russian Orthodox patriarchate, into the court’s (self-avowedly innovative) program of Orthodox imperial reform. By putting the “election” and “ordination” of “Prince Pope” P. I. Buturlin and “Prince Caesar” I. F. Romadanovskii into the context of the political practices and allegorical language by which the tsar and his advisor (secular and religious) justified the excision

fables, so it knew not the Messiah either by His person or by his deeds." See "Sermon," 15; “Slovo,” 76-77.

111 For two very different attempts to explain the relationship between “bureaucracy” and “autocracy” in the reign of Peter the Great, see A. N. Medushevskii, Utverzhdenie absolutizma v Rossii (M., 1994); idem, Reformy Petra I i sud’by Rossii (M., 1994); and E. V. Anisimov, Gosudarstvennye preobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka (Spb., 1997), 270-292.

112 For an attempt to explain the origins of Peter’s “participatory” ruling style, see supra, Chapter Two.
of Aleksei’s “gangrenous member” from the Russian body politic, we can thus attempt to understand some of the mechanisms by which an important segment of the Russian political elite came to accept the grandiose claims of tsar Peter Alekseevich.

The way in which the tsar and his “company” handled the almost simultaneous deaths of Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii and Count N. M. Zotov – respectively the mock “King” and the mock “Patriarch” of the Transfigured Kingdom

113 -- demonstrated Peter’s eagerness to resolve his own succession question once and for all. Upon his arrival in St. Petersburg, at the beginning of October 1717,114 the tsar was immediately informed of the “political” developments from “Pressburg,” the capital of his play-world. His source of information was none other than Prince Ivan Fedorovich (1678[?]-1730), the last, surviving male heir of the Romodanovskii clan.115 In a letter written on 21 September 1717, four days after his father’s death, Prince Romodanovskii notified his “Most Merciful Great Sovereign” about their mutual loss:

By the will of the Almighty, at one o’clock in the afternoon of September 17, death [finally] struck down (posekla) my father, Prince Fedor Iur’evich. Until your Royal Highness commands [otherwise], his body has been placed in the Church of the Three Prelates (pri tserkvi Trekh Sviatitelei), which is located [here in Moscow], near the Earthen City (chtu v Zemliannoy gorode), on Butcher’s [Street] (na Miasnitskoi). With the most-bitter tears (vsegorestnymi slezami) of a complete orphan (konechnym sirotstvom moim), I [now] run

113 Prince Romodanovskii died in Moscow, on 17 September 1717, just six days before his “spiritual” counterpart, N. M. Zotov. See Pokhodnyi zhurnal 1717 goda (SPb. 1855), 36. On Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii’s role as the mock tsar, see supra, Chapters Two and Four.

114 The tsar returned from his eighteen-month voyage to western Europe on 10 October 1717. See Pavlenko, op. cit., 380.

(pritekaiu) to Your protection (pokrov). Reminding (napominaniem) Your Tsarist Highness of my father’s services with respect to your Most Luminous Majesty (sluzhb k presvetleishemu vashemu tsarskogo velichestva maestatu byvshikh ot otssa moego), I beg that Your Highness’ merciful commands (milostivym vashego velichestva poveleнием) and [Your] charity (prizreniem) will not abandon me [at this moment, when I have become] a complete orphan (vsekonechnom sirotstve moem). Your Tsarist Highness’ slave (rab), Ivan Romodanovskii.

In this carefully-crafted letter, Prince Romodanovskii combined the formulaic language of a petition (Rus. chelobitnaja) with the emotional appeal of a supplication (Rus. molitva). Indeed, the figurative language of Romodanovskii’s epistle evokes the “tearful” (sleznye) prayers of pious Orthodox believers – the “orphans” (sirota) and “slaves” (rab) who “pour into” (pritekaiut) the church on the Feast of the Protective Veil (Pokrov) of the Virgin in order to beg for the intercession of the Mother of God.\(^{116}\)

However, adopting the kind of language favored by Peter and his “company,” this knowledgeable Muscovite courtier addressed his prayers not to the heavenly Mary, but to the earthly Peter – the only authority who could guarantee the Romodanovskiis’ salvation in the here and now.

By using the Russianized calque of the classical Roman term for regal splendor (Rus. maestat, Lat. majestas), the young Prince Romodanovskii sought to underline his father’s career as the “anti-Caesar,” the mock sovereign whose antics only served to emphasize the true majesty and the imperial pedigree of the Russian Orthodox tsar.\(^{117}\)

\(^{116}\) For a discussion of the symbolism associated with this Orthodox feast day, see M. B. Pliukhanova, Sluzhety i simvoly Moskovskogo tsarstva (SPb., 1995), ch. 1.

\(^{117}\) On the repeated efforts of Russian diplomats to get the Holy Roman Empire and the Papacy to recognize Peter’s imperial pretensions and to address the tsar as “His [Imperial] Majesty,” see de Madariaga, *op. cit.*, 30-31.
The tsar's response to Romodanovskii's pathetic attempt to curry royal favor revealed just how much Peter valued the personal contribution of the "Prince Caesar" to the articulation of his imperial project: "I received your letter of 21 September upon arrival in which you inform me of the death of your father, for which I offer deepest condolences that he did not lose his life as a result of old age but from an attack of gangrene; still, there goes everyone one way or another by God's will, bear this in mind and don't give in to grief. And please don't imagine that I have abandoned you, or forgotten your father's good deeds. I shall write to you anon about the time and place of the burial."\(^{118}\) So, for more than a month after his death, the body of Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii, the dreaded investigator of the Preobrazhensk Chancellery and mock tsar of "Pressburg," lay in state, in the Moscow Church of the Three Prelates. The delay, however, was less a sign of Peter's indifference to the fate of this old princely family, than of the tsar's frantic preparations for the long-awaited arrival of his first-born son. In fact, as we will see, despite the tsar's apparent neglect, Romodanovskii fils et père were never far away from Peter's thoughts.

During the investigation into the affair of tsarevich Aleksei, Prince I. F. Romodanovskii became as important to the fulfillment of Peter's dynastic scenario as Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii had been to the articulation of the tsar's imperial mission. In both cases, the Romodanovskiis acted as the tsar's personal doubles, doing things which Peter would not, or, perhaps, could not do for himself. Primary among these,

---

\(^{118}\) Peter to I. F. Romodanovskii (21 October 1717), *SPb. F IRI RAN*, f. 270, d. 84, fol. 179, quoted from the English translation in Hughes, *op. cit.*, 373, 543 n. 159.
was administering the chancellery entrusted with investigating all cases of lesè-majesté. Although Peter handed over the responsibility of trying Aleksei to the special investigative commission headed by P. A. Tolstoi (1653-1729),¹¹⁹ Prince Romodanovskii played a role consistent with his familial heritage. Soon after the tsar dispatched the above-mentioned letter of condolence, Peter had a private chat with the grieving prince. During the course of this unrecorded conversation, Peter promised to allow Ivan Fedorovich to inherit the important administrative position once occupied by his father. In addition, Peter vowed to treat “junior” with the same kind of half-joking formality with which he had treated the elder Romodanovskii. Although the tsar did not send a written confirmation of this verbal agreement until 21 February 1718,¹²⁰ almost immediately Peter began referring to Ivan Fedorovich by the mock royal titulature of his late predecessor. A private conversation, on the eve of the investigation into the case of tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich, thus inaugurated the “reign” “Prince Caesar” Ivan Fedorovich Romodanovskii.


¹²⁰ See Peter to Prince I. F. Romodanovskii (21 February 1718), original hand-written note in RGIA, f. 1329, op. 1, d. 65, fol. 213; nineteenth-century copy in SPb. F IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 87, fol. 185; published by P. Baranov, Opis’ voschoaishim ukazam i poveleniam, khraniaschchikhsa v Senatskom arkhive, 1704-1725 (SPb., 1872), I: 48: “Sire. Just as we had petitioned Your Highness in person (kak slovesno vashemu velichestvu bilt chelom), so now we request in writing (tak i pismennno donosim) that you kindly take over the affairs of the Preobrazhensk chancellery (daby blagovoli dela prkazu preobrazhenskogo primiai), [and] administer it in the same way as your father, of blessed memory (tak kak blzhennya pamiati otets vash upravliai).” By couching his decision in the form of a humble request more typical of a plaintiff’s petition (chelobitnaiia) or subordinate’s report (donos), Peter’s five-line
The tsar’s acceptance of the principles of primogeniture and administrative continuity within the Romodanovskii clan contrasted sharply with his efforts to deprive tsarevich Aleksei, his own first-born son, of the right to the Russian throne. The tsar’s “company” had long ago come to identify Prince Ivan Fedorovich as the heir-apparent to “Prince Caesar” F. Iu. Romodanovskii. For example, as early as 21 June 1706, the tsar, in his capacity as the dutiful subject (“Piter”), congratulated “His [Royal] Highness (vashe velichestvo) on this, the name-day (tezoimentistvom) of your son, and our Sovereign (gosudaria), tsarevich and Grand Prince (velikogo kniazia) Ioann Fedorovich.” In the same letter, the tsar went on to inform (izvestit’) his mock superior that “your royal uncle (vas’h gosudaev diadia), the Right Reverend [Bishop] Mikey (preosviashchennyi Mishura) passed around (vsem razdaval)” quite a few “cups [of wine] (chashu zazdravniu),” so that everyone could drink to the “health (zdravie)” of the twenty-eight-year old “tsarevich.” But in the current political situation, this reference acquired sinister political connotations. Indeed, the tsar’s confirmed the his intention to re-establish the playful, hierarchical relationship which the tsar had cultivated with the previous “Prince Caesar.”

121 Peter to Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii (21 July 1706), cited by Petrov, op. cit., 121.

122 This was the joking, “episcopal” nickname by which Prince M. G. Romodanovskii (1653-1713), privy counselor (boiar), military commander (voevoda), and future governor-general (gubernator) of Moscow, was apparently known to the intimate members of the tsar’s “company.” For a biography of Prince M. G. Romodanovskii, see B. Modzalevskii, “Romodanovskii, kn. Mikhail Grigor’evich,” Russkii biograficheskii slovar’ (NY, 1962), 17: 124-126, here 126.

123 The fact that Prince Ivan Fedorovich was indeed related (by marriage) to the Russian royal family only underlined the tsar’s ironic treatment of his “sovereign’s” son. By marrying A. F. Saltykova, the sister of tsar Ivan Alekseevich’s widow, Prince I. F. Romodanovskii had, in essence, married into the Russian royal family. See Petrov, op. cit., 124; Khmyrov, op. cit., 72. In July 1718, the entire Romodanovski clan lived in the Kronstadt palace assigned to the tsaritsa-dowager Praskov’ia Fedorovna (nee Saltykova). See Khmyrov, ibid., 82.
elevation of "Prince Caesar" Romodanovskii's "legitimate" heir only underlined the "illegitimacy" of tsarevich Aleksei.

In order to make sure that all the courtiers who would be involved in the sensitive investigation into the private life of tsarevich Aleksei (and his mother) understood the allusions,¹²⁴ the tsar and his inner council decided to convene a conclave of the entire "Unholy Council" (neosviashchennyi sobor). At the beginning of December 1717, just one month before the fugitive tsarevich and his chaperones returned to Moscow, Peter asked his personal secretary to begin preparations for the parodic election of a new mock patriarch. On 10 December 1717, Cabinet secretary A. V. Makarov (c. 1680-1740)¹²⁵ immediately dispatched the following missive to A. I. Ushakov (1670/2-1747), an officer from the Preobrazhensk guards regiment and one of the tsar's most trusted adjutants (ad"iutant)¹²⁶: "His Tsarist Highness has ordered [me] to notify you in writing [of the fact] that he requires you to have his royal mansion (ego

¹²⁴ The questioning of the tsarevich and his "accomplices" was accompanied by a simultaneous investigation into the "affair" of his mother, tsaritsa Evdokiia Fedorovna (nee Lopukhina), who, it turned out, had not taken the veil, despite the fact that she was confined to a nunnery in Suzdal' almost twenty years earlier. This situation threatened the validity of Peter's marriage to Marta/Catherine and cast doubt on the legitimacy of tsarevich Peter Petrovich. See Efimov, op. cit.; and Sedov, op. cit., 60-61 n. 75.

¹²⁵ For a biography of A. V. Makarov (c. 1680-1740), see Pavlenko, Ptentsy, op. cit., 233-308. His year of birth is calculated using the average age (13.4) at which clerks entered royal service and the date of his first official appointment (c. 1693). See Serov, op. cit., 23-24 n. 10, 237-238.

¹²⁶ Like several other of Peter's adjutants, this son of a poor nobleman rose through the ranks of the Preobrazhensk guards regiment to become "one of the tsar's trusted minions." In 1718, he served as one of the judges (суд'ia) who presided over the investigative commission responsible for handling the case of tsarevich Aleksei. In the reign of Anna Ioannovna, he went on to replace P. A. Tolstoi's as the head of the Secret Investigative Affairs Chancellery (Тайныkh rozysknykh del kantselariia). On A. I. Ushakov, see Hughes, op. cit., 427; Anisimov, op. cit., 245; Serov, op. cit., 79, 96 n. 62, 252; and I. Iu. Airapetian, "Feodal'naia aristokratiiia v period stanovleniia absoliutizma v Rossii" (Diss. kand. ist. nauk, M. V. Lomonosov State University, 1987), 121. On the special investigative role of Peter's guards officers, see Serov, ibid., 18-20; and Anisimov, ibid., 94.
velichestva khoromy) repaired immediately, so that it will be completely ready by his arrival [in Moscow]. Also, be so kind as to repair the mansion (khoromy) on the Iauza [River], in the little city (v gorodke) of Pressburg (Pleshburkh),128 where the election of the Caesar and Pope usually takes place (gde byvaet postanovlenie tsesaria i papy)."129 Since Peter and his suite left St. Petersburg on 15 December,130 just as soon as the post-roads were once again passable in winter,131 major Ushakov did not have much time to fix up the delapidated wooden structures before for the tsar’s arrival.132

127 Judging by the information presented to Peter just four years later, during the remodeling of the tsar’s childhood playground, the wooden structures (khoromy) on the Novo-Preobrazhenskoe estate must have been in a very sorry state. See D. Zheludkov, “Novye materialy o dvortsovom stroitel’stve v Moskve petrovskogo vremenii,” in Tsarskie i imperatorskie dvortsy. Staraia Moskva (M., 1997), 120-133, here 126-128.

128 Literally, “Bald-Patch Borough,” a neologism formed from the Russian word for “bald-spot” (plesh’) and the German word for “city” (burg), caused by the common confusion of soft “L’s” and “R’s” in translating foreign loan-words. For a discussion of similar orthographic changes, see N. I. Gainullina, “Zaimstvovannaa leskika v ‘Pis’makh i bumagakh Imperatora Petra Velikogo’” (K probleme osvoeniia slov inoizychnogo proiskhozhdeniia v Petrovskuiu epoku)" (Avtoref. kand. filologicheskikh nauk. S. M. Kirov Kazakh State University, 1973), 12.

129 A. V. Makarov to A. I. Ushakov (10 December 1717), in RO RNB, f. 874, op. 2, No. 207, fols. 38, 55 (two nineteenth-century copies of the original letter, located in RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, ch. 1).

130 Semevskii, op. cit., 307.

131 Pavlenko, Petr Velikii, op. cit., 380.

132 The fact that the election of the “Prince Pope” took place in the little wooden mansion (khoromy) hurrriedly fixed up by major Ushakov casts doubt upon Semevskii’s reconstruction of the events of Yulette 1717-1718, for, according to the (undated) “ceremonial of election” (chin izbranit), the mock conclave was to assemble at N. M. Zotov’s “old stone house” (na starom kamennom dvore papy). See Semevskii, op. cit., 297, 298. However, the only stone house that Zotov ever owned was located in St. Petersburg. A few years after his death, it was handed over to the new “Prince Pope,” P. I. Buturlin, on the occasion of his marriage to Zotov’s widow (12 September 1721). For the construction of Zotov’s stone house, see Peter to Prince A. M. Cherkasskii (12 June 1715), Optsanie voschastikh povelenii po prvorumnomu vedomstvu (1701-1740 gg.) (SPb., 1888), 51; on Zotov’s request for financial aid in order to defray the costs of building his house to the same size as that of Vice-Chancellor P. P. Shafirov, see N. M. Zotov to Peter (18 February 1717), RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. II, No. 32 (1717), fols. 611-612, here 611v.; for a copy of Peter’s decree, dated 26 October 1721, “granting Prince
By Christmas eve, Peter was already in Preobrazhenskoe, writing a letter to A. D. Menshikov, the governor of St. Petersburg and the tsar's close, personal friend, who was left behind to maintain order in the new capital while Peter dealt with his son in the old one. Thus, at the height of the Yuletide season of 1717-1718, in the tense days immediately preceding the arrival of tsarevich Aleksei and the start of the investigation into the reasons for his treasonous flight to the Holy Roman Empire, the Russian tsar proceeded to stage the election of a new "Prince Pope" in the mock capital of his Transfigured Kingdom.

Despite a wealth of documents about the "ceremonial election" (chin izbraniia) and "ordination" (chin postanovleniia) of the "Prince Popes" who succeeded N. M. Zотов, the archival file which contains a description of this particular carnivalesque spectacle does not allow us to reconstruct the events that took place on the royal suburban estate of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe with any degree of certainty. Our only

---

Pope Buturlin the stone house of Count Zотов, located on the island of St. Petersburg, on the shores of the Big Neva River," see RGIA, f. 1329, op. 1, No. 20. fol. 105; published by Baranov, op. cit., 1: 76.

133 Peter to A. D. Menshikov (24 December 1717), SPb. F IRI RAN, f. 270, No. 85, fol. 319. In a letter written from Preobrazhenskoe, Peter informs Menshikov of his arrival and, after taking care of some business, congratulates him on "tomorrow's solemn holiday [i.e. Nativity of Christ]."

134 This fact was first pointed out by Semevskii, op. cit., 296-297, 307.

135 Many of these documents – which are, for the most part, undated letters between the tsar and selected members of his "company" – refer to events that occurred either a few years before, or a few years after the 1717-1718 Yuletide celebrations. A few papers do appear to be drafts of "ceremonials" (chiny) for the election of the "Prince Pope." It is these variants that Semevskii edited, collated, and published in his article on Peter's "sense of humor." However, as Semevskii himself recognized (op. cit., 304 n. 3), without more archaeological research, there is no way to determine the date of the different redactions. For Semevskii's editorial principles, see op. cit., 282, 286 n. 2, 297, 300 n. 1, 304 n. 1, 306 n. 3, and esp. 307 n. 2; and in general, see N. G. Simina, "Istoricheskie dokumenty na stranitsakh 'Russkoi stariny' v 70-80-kh godakh XIX v.," Issledovaniia po otechestvennomu istorichnikovedeniuiu. Sbornik statei, posviashchennkh 75-letiui professora S. N. Valka (M.-L., 1964).
piece of solid evidence for the events of the years in question consists of a letter from P. I. Buturlin, the former “Metropolitan of St. Petersburg” and Zотов’s first successor to the (in)dignity of “Prince Pope.” In this obscene missive, addressed to the “Princess Abbess of St. Petersburg” (D. G. Rzhevskia) – the “Most Drunken (vsekhumneishaia) and Most Foolish Mother (vseshtushaia mati), beloved mother-in-law of Bacchus (vozliublennaia o Bakhuse tshchi)” – the new mock pontiff announced that:

on the 28th day of this month, by the will of the universal Prince Caesar (vseleuskago kniazia tsesaria) and the entire Extravagant Council (vsego sumazbrodnago sobora), yours truly, unworthy that I am, was elected (izbran), and, on the 29th [day], elevated (vozveden) to the most-high throne of the Prince Pope (na prevysochaishii kniaz’ papin” prestol). And because Our Intemperance (nasha nemernost) has always promised to take good care of Our flock (pastu svoiu dobre smotreli i vo onoi peshchisia obeshchakhusta), that is why I have not forgotten about you, our ancient nun-prick (monakhvinia) and mentor (nastavnitsa). I have presented (pred”iavil) your exploits (podvigi) to His Highness, the Prince Caesar, and to the entire Council, which is why [they] have deigned (soizvolili) to accept my suggestion about your promotion]. So, standing up with my body and witnessing with my soul (ashche i telom otstom obache dukhom prisudstvui), by the power vested in me


G. I. Buturlin to D. G. Rzhevskia (28 December 1717), RGADA, f. 9, otd. I, No. 67, fols. 64 (rough draft); 65-65v. (clean copy); an expurgated version of the clean copy was published by Semevskii, op. cit., 311.

On D. G. Rzhevskia (neé Sokovnina), see supra, Chapter Four.

This pun on “Our Temperance” (nasha nemernost’), one of the titles by which the Russian Orthodox patriarch referred to himself in his correspondence, is formed by adding the negative prefix “un-,” or “in-” (ne-) to the root of the Russian word for “measured, temperate” (mernost’ ) in order to express the very opposite. On the use of this patriarchal title, see patriarch Adrian to Peter (31 July 1696), PiB, I: 542-526, here 525.

This is an obvious pun, made by combining the Russian words for “nun” (monakhvinia) and “prick” (khui). For a more elaborate, though no less obscene reference to her reputation as a virago, who dominated her husband, I. I. Rzhevskii, see Peter to D. G. Rzhevskia (9 April 1711), PiB 11: 167; and Hughes, op. cit., 516-517 n. 43-44.
by Bacchus (dannoiu ot Bakhusa vlastiui), I promote you (proizvozhdu tia) from the degree of Princess Abbess (ot stepeni kniazi igumen'inho) to that of Arch-Abbess (v arkhi igumen'io); and, as if I were present (iako prisutstvia) [at your consecration], I [now] pronounce [the final words of the sacramental liturgy]: “Holy, Holy, Holy.”

Upon your promotion, the nun (monakhinia) Anastasia [Princess A. P. Golitsyna],141 who has come from the far-away hermitages (iz dal'nikh pustyin'), has been elevated (vozvedena) to your [former] position (na mesto vashe). [This decree was] given in Pressburg (Pleshburkh), on the 28 day of the month of December, in the year 1717 [by] the universal Prince Pope Peter-Prick (vseleneskii kniazi papa Petrokhui).

According to the confused chronology of this mock letter of patent, at the request of the “universal Prince Caesar,” Buturlin was “elevated to the Most High Throne of the Prince Pope” on 29 December 1717. However, because the letter exists in two copies, only one of which is actually signed by “Prince Pope Peter-Prick” himself, it is very difficult to determine to what extent the events really occurred in the way the decree...

140 The Greek word for “holy” (αγιός, or aksios, in its Russianized spelling), is repeated three times at the end of the Orthodox sacrament of Holy Orders – in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit – to indicate the ordained person’s changed status. On the sacrament of Holy Orders (Tainstvo sviaschtensvva) in seventeenth-century Muscovy, see A. Golosov, Tserkovnata zhizni na Russi v polovine XVII veka v izobrazhenii eta v zapiskakh Pavla Aleppskogo. Chast' I: Zapiski arkhidiakonova Pavla, kak tserkovno-istoricheski dokument (Zhitomir, 1916), 232-236. On the Orthodox conception of “holiness” (Gr. αγίος, Lat. sanctitas), see V. M. Zhivov, Sviatos'': Kratkii slovar' agiograficheskikh terminov (M., 1994), 90-99.

141 On Princess Anastasia Petrovna Golitsyna (1655-1729), wife of Prince I. A. Golitsyn (d. 1722); daughter of Prince P. I. Prozorovskii; and “female jester” (shutikha) at the court of Catherine I. See Zapiski o rode kniazei Golitsynikh, ed. Evgenii Serchevskii (SPb., 1853), 57, 292; G. V. Esipov, “Kniaginia-igumen’ia,” RS 1 (1870), 400-403; P. F. Karabanov, “Stats-damy i freiliny russkogo dvora v XVIII stoletii [Part I],” RS 2 (1870), 478-479; and Hughes, op. cit., 194, 201, 253, 261, 291, 504 n. 254, 516-517 n. 42-46. Sometime between 1719 and 1722, a sketch of the “Princess Abbess” was done by Fedor Vasil’ev, a Russian architect who presented the tsar with some of the earliest drawings of St. Petersburg ever made. On Vasil’ev and his drawings, see E. I. Gavrilova, “Sankt Piterburkh” 1718-1722 gg. v natural’nykh risunkakh Fedora Vasil’eva,” in Russkoe iskusstvo pervoi cheverti XVIII v. Materialy i issledovaniia (M., 1974), 119-140; on his portrait of the “Princess Abbess,” see ibid., “O metodakh atributsii dvukh grupp proizvedenii Petrovskoi epokhi (zhiopis’, risunk.),” in Nauchno-isследovatelskaia rabota v khudozhnevennykh museiah (M., 1975), 2: 45-75, esp. 63-64. Around 1728, Princess Golitsyna’s portrait was also painted by the renowned Petrine artist Andrei Matveev. For a reproduction of this painting, see N. G. Kaliazina and G. N. Komelova, Russkoe iskusstvo Petrovskoi epokhi (L., 1990), Illustration 109.
describes. The fact that this mock epistle is actually dated “Pressburg, 28 December 1717” – one day before the events recounted by Buturlin were supposed to take place – further compromises the facticity of the source -- though not its significance as the “script” for the day’s festivities.

Although we do not have any reliable evidence on the basis of which to determine whether the events described in Buturlin’s epistle ever actually took place, we now have another, unimpeachable source for the 1717/18 ceremony – a letter from its organizer, the tsar himself. On 12 January 1718, the tsar informed Menshikov of the fact that on 9 January, a courier named Tanaev “arrived with the news that my offspring (izchadie) [a pun on the Russian word for “child” (chado)] has left Imperial territory (vyekhal iz Tsesarskoi zemli) and is already in Krosen [?]. I expect him, along with his chaperons (i z diatkami [sic.]), to be here soon.” Only after describing the actual whereabouts of his prodigal son – the “devilish” offspring who was still

---

142 According to Semevskii, Buturlin merely made a clean copy of the rough draft, supposedly written by the tsar himself. See Semevskii, op. cit., 311 n. 1.

143 As does the fact that, according to Semevskii’s reconstruction, the newly-promoted “Arch-Abbess” was supposed to have attended the pope’s “election.” Semevskii, op. cit., 297. The document cited here by Semevskii (RGADA, f. 9, oud. 1, No. 67, fols. 17-17v.) apparently refers to a later ceremony – perhaps the election of Buturlin’s own successor as “Prince Pope.” This may explain why one on the back of another one of the documents in this archival collection, an eighteenth-century scribe had written the following note, dated 20 December 1724: “On the 19th day of December in the year 1724, a copy of this [document, a thirteen point “ceremonial of election” (chin izhiraniia)], was given to Count Ivan Alekseevich Musin-Pushkin.” See RGADA, f. 9, oud. 1, No. 67, fols. 5-7, here fol. 7v.; Semevskii, op. cit., 317. On the preparations for the election of Buturlin’s successor, which was scheduled for the year of Peter’s death (1725), see F. [A.] Ternovskii, “Imperator Petr I-i v ego otnosheniakh k katolichestvu i protestantstvu,” Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii (1869), 1: 373-403, here 377-378.
wandering in the nether regions of the Holy Roman Empire\textsuperscript{144} – did Peter notify Menshikov about the latest developments in “Pressburg”:

A letter [of patent] (gramota) regarding the election of the P.[rince] Pope (o vozvedenii k. papy) has been sent to the new Arch-Abbess (k novoi arkhi-
igumen’i). [In this document, you will find] an extensive description (prostranno opisano) of when (kogda) and in what manner (kakim obrazom)
[this ceremony] was staged (uchineno). [I don’t know what kind of] government this will be (kakovo budet pravlenie), but the selection [process itself] (vybor)
was quite spiritual (zelo dukhonosen). On the fifth of this month [i.e. 5 January
1718], P.[rince] Caesar (k. tsesar’)[I. F. Romodanovskii] was anointed as the Prince Abbot (pomazan v knez’ igumen) [alongside] the termagant (kalotofocka)
[who] was ordained (posveshena) [as the new “Princess Abbess”].\textsuperscript{145} I have
nothing else to report, besides [the fact that, as of now], thank God, everything
is fine (slava Bogu, vse dobro).

The “ordination” of Princess A. P. Prozorovskaia-Golitsyna underscored that the tsar
and his entourage used the blasphemous ceremonies surrounding the election of the new
“Prince Pope” to demonize tsarevich Aleksei and all his “Catholic” supporters,
whether in the Holy Roman Empire or in Russia.\textsuperscript{146} As her epithet (“nun from the far-
away hermitages”) signifies, Princess Golitsyna’s induction into the tsar’s “company”

\textsuperscript{144} Peter’s “devilish” pun on the Russian word for “offspring” (chado) apparently seeks to
underline the symbolic link between the territory of the Catholic Kaiser and the nether regions of hell.
The word by which Peter actually referred to his first-born son (izchadie) is a term of reproach, often
used to express disapproval, as in the curse invoking the “Devil incarnate” (ischadie ada). For the
difference in meaning between the more neutral, traditional Russian word for “offspring” (chado) and the
evocative word used by the tsar, cf. Dal’, \textit{op. cit.}, 2: 65; 4: 580; and Marcus Wheeler, \textit{The Oxford

\textsuperscript{145} “Kalotofoka ([sic.] kolotovka)” is a coarse word for a mean (zlaia) and foolish (vzdornyii)
woman (baba), also known as a kolotyrka; it is the feminine case of the word for a “restless”
(bespokoinyi) and “quarrelsome” (vzdornyii) person, who can be described as “prickly” (kolotivyi). See
Dal’, \textit{op. cit.}, 2: 141. Since the new “Arch-Abbess” was presumably in St. Petersburg, it is more than
likely that the woman who was actually ordained (posveshena, or posveshchena) in Moscow was none
other than Princess A. P. Golitsyna, the “nun from the far-away hermitages.”
brought her back into the fold of royal intimates, after a period of time, during which she appears to have suffered some kind of temporary disgrace (opala). As later events were to reveal, the princess had fallen out of favor because of earlier conjectures about her alleged dealings with the supporters of the tsar’s first-born son, including, among others, the émigré Prince A. P. Prozorovskii, suspected of aiding and abetting the fugitive tsarevich during Aleksei’s own attempt to emigrate from Peter’s “edenic” realm.

Peter’s letter to Menshikov, therefore, confirms that the tsar and his closest political advisors saw a direct connection between the successful completion of the covert operation to return the fugitive tsarevich and the court’s blasphemous parody of the sacrament of ordination. Under the aegis of a newly-anointed “Anti-Caesar,” himself a recent inductee into Peter’s “royal priesthood,” the mock conclave of Russian

---

145 As we saw in Chapter Four, the demonization of the Holy Roman Emperor and the Catholic Pope formed the basis for the apotheosis of the “edenic” imperial capital founded by the Russian Orthodox tsar.

147 In March 1718, the judges who were in charge of the investigation into the “Aleksei affair” convicted Princess Golitsyna of “conveying information” (za perenosku slov) between the courts of tsarevich Aleksei and the disgraced tsarevna Mariia Alekseevna (née Miloslavskaia) as well as for “not reporting” (za nedonesenie slov) the anti-Petrine “prophecies” (prorocheftva) of Dosideos, the former bishop of Rostov; for these crimes, she was sentenced to hard labor in the royal spinning mill (Priadil’nyi dvor). For the sentence against Princess Golitsyna, as well as an eyewitness account of her actual punishment, see Ustrialov, op. cit., 6: 221; 221 n. 78; 225 (the Austrian ambassador’s report, dated 29/18 April 1718); and 222 n. 80 (P. A. Tolstoi’s [undated] order not to exile the princess).

148 Princess Golitsyna was a cousin (dvoiurodnaia pleniamuista) of Alexander Petrovich (“The Younger”) [syn men’shogo] Prozorovskii, a “privy chamberlain” (stol’nik) at the court of tsar Ivan Alekseevich. In 1697, Prince Prozorovskii had been sent to Vienna on one of Peter’s study abroad programs; after spending some time in the capital of the Holy Roman Empire he decided not to return to Russia, leaving his wife and children, as well as his property, for some “peace of mind.” For a wistful biography of A. P. Prozorovskii, “one of Russia’s first political émigrés,” see S. F. Platonov, “B. I. Kurakin i A. P. Prozorovskii (1697-1720), Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR. Seriia istorii i filosofii 12 (1929), 236-243; on the tsar’s suspicions about the Prozorovskii’s involvement in the case of tsarevich
courtiers was instructed to nominate, select, and ordain a new mock pontiff of the Kingdom Transfigured. By invoking the pagan god of wine and sexual potency, in a “spirited” (Rus. dukhonosnaja, literally, spirit-bearing) ceremony, the election of Zotov’s successor, like that of his predecessor, intended to evoke the notion of “sober drunkenness.” After this Yuletide Bacchanal, sometime between 28 December 1717 and 12 January 1718, the new “Prince Pope” forwarded the documents intended for the other members of the tsar’s “company” to St. Petersburg, in order to signal that, with God’s help, everything would be fine (vse dobro) from now on. In this way, Peter

Aleksei, see ibid., 241, 243, 243 n. 2. On the genealogy of the Prozorovskii clan, see M. M. Golitsyn, “Materialy dla istorii roda kniazei Prozorovskikh,” Russkiy arkhiv 7 (1899), 21-23, 28-39.

149 “Bacchus” (Bakh) appeared both in the “letter patent” (gramota) to the “Arch ABBess” and in the “Prince Pope’s” solemn vow (obeshchanie) to uphold the dignity of his office. For the text of the latter, undated document, see RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fol. 18; and Semevskii, op. cit., 310. Ever since the Renaissance revival of Greek medical lore, Bacchus was seen as a personification of male procreative power. For example, citing the authority of “the Ancients,” Vesalius argued that “without Bacchus, Venus waxeth cold.” On Vesalius’ treatise, see Laqueur, op. cit., 116. For indirect evidence that Peter and at least some members of his entourage were familiar with the ideas of “Hippocrates and Galen” about the role of the masculine (and divine) seeds of life in the conception of children, see G. I. Golovkin to Peter (14 May 1696), PiB, 1: 570. On the aural similarity between Bacchus (Bakh) and God (Bog’), see V. M. Zhivov and B. A. Uspenskii, “Metamorfozy antichnogo iazychestva v istorii russkoj kul’tury XVII-XVIII veka,” in Iz istorii russkoj kul’tury, ed. A. D. Koshelev (M., 1996), 4: 449-536, here 482.

150 For the invocation of the mystical notion of “sober drunkenness” during the election of “Patriarch Dearie” (Milak), the first mock patriarch, see supra, Chapter One. It is worth pointing out that Prince Lu. F. Shakhovskoi, the mock “Cavalier of the Order of Judas,” also known as “Archdeacon Gideon,” was described as a “spiritual” [dukhonosnyi, lit. “spirit-bearing”] man in the collective epistle written by “Prince Pope” Zotov and signed by several of his most important “clerics.” See N. M. Zotov to Peter (September 1710), RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. 1 (1710 g.), ed. khr. 11, fols. 189v., 190-190v. (original), here 189; and RO RNB, f. 824, op. 2, No. 200, fols. 20-20v., 26. On Prince Shakhovskoi, see supra, Chapter Three.

151 From Peter’s letter to Menshikov, it is difficult to determine whether in addition to Rzhevskii’s mock patent (gramota), Buturlin sent some other documents about the events of December 1717. If so, these may have included the “Prince Pope’s” solemn “vow” (see above), the mock council’s collective petition to the “Prince Caesar” (RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fol. 1; Semevskii, op. cit., 297), and probably an early draft of the relation entitled “O kniaz’-papy postavleniia v episkopy v 1 nedeliu po kreshchenii, genvaria 10 [no year]” (RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fols. 44-46v.). The latter
took advantage of the brief span of time between the death of "Prince Pope" Zотов and the arrival of the tsarevich Aleksei to prepare the "brotherhood" of believers in the tsar's divinely-inspired imperial mission for the trials and revelations yet to come.\textsuperscript{152}

The repeated references to the obscene Russian term for the male organ (\textit{khui}), in the mock epistles and letters of patent sent out to the St. Petersburg "branch" of the "Most Foolish and Most Drunken Council," seems to underscore the connection between the court's turn towards a scatological parody of the sacrament of Holy Orders and the political emasculation of tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich and his "Papist" supporters.\textsuperscript{153} The fact that the "servants" of the "Arch-Prince Pope" referred to each other as "pricks,"\textsuperscript{154} suggests that all the "members" of the tsar's mock ecclesiastical

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotetext{152}{Like other of the tsar's intimates, boiar P. I. Buturlin and blizhnii stol'nik Prince I. F. Romodanovskii were among those courtiers and clerics, who had been called to the Main Banquet Hall (\textit{Stolovaia palata}) of the Moscow Kremlin in order to hear the reading of the manifesto depriving tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich of the throne in favor of tsarevich Peter Petrovich. See "Spisok lits, zasvidetel'stovavshikh v sovete 3 fevralia, 1718 goda," in Pogodin, \textit{op. cit.}, 317-320, here 318, 319. They were also among those members of the elite who attended the reading of the 5 March 1718 manifesto, about the "crimes" of the tsar's first wife, the "former tsaritsa Evdokia." See "Povestka o sobranii 5 marta [1718]," \textit{ibid.}, 320-326, here 321, 322, 323, 325. Note that both men are listed alongside the other two men still holding the old-fashioned rank of "boiar" – A. P. Saltykov and Prince P. I. Prozorovskii, the father of "Princess Abbess" Golitsyna; in the meantime, the other members of Peter's entourage hold the new-style ranks of "Privy Counselor" (\textit{tainyi sovetnik}) or "Senator." Also note that during the reading of these manifestoes, "Prince Pope" Buturlin and the mock-clerics of his "Unholy Council" appeared in the same hall as the patriarch-less Holy Council (\textit{osviashchennyi sobor}). For the circumstances of these public readings, and particularly for an explicit reference to the attendance of the entire Holy Council, see Ustrialov, \textit{op. cit.}, 6: 143-144; 477-487, esp. 477.}

\footnotetext{153}{In a more Freudian reading, Richard Wortman has suggested that Peter invoked the "phallic theme [...] as a form of compensation: after all, Alexei had produced the male heir and done him one better." For a similar, psychohistorical explanation, see Alain Besançon, "Emperor and Heir – Father and Son," in Marc Raeff, ed., \textit{Peter the Great Changes Russia}, 2nd ed. (Lexington and Toronto, 1972), 160-170.}

\footnotetext{154}{For a list of the "servants" (\textit{sluzhiteli}) of the "Arch-Prince Pope" (\textit{arkhi kniaz' papa}), which was probably written sometime before P. I. Buturlin's second wedding (10 September 1721), see}
council (both male and female) metaphorically partook of the virility of the royal Phallus. Indeed, their mock pseudonyms reveal that the tsar and his “company” quite literally sought to embody the connection between religious charisma and political potency. In turn, this strategy was as much a product of the succession struggle between Peter and his son, as of the theological dispute between Feofan (Prokopovich) and the “Latinizers.” In fact, the figurative importance of circumcision (obrezanie) in the debate about “justification through faith” provides the crucial link for understanding why Peter and his scribes decided to draw up the mock “ceremonials for the election” (chin izbraniia) and “installation” (chin postanovljenia) of “Prince Pope Peter-Prick” at the very moment that the succession struggle between the tsar and his son reached a critical stage. For only those courtiers, who had sided with tsar Peter Alekseevich could be said to have undergone a conversion experience comparable to the one described by Paul’s notion of “circumcision of the heart”; and, therefore, only those “members” of the royal entourage, who had publicly declared their whole-hearted commitment the tsar could have the privilege of being referred to by the obscene word for the membrum virile.\footnote{\textit{RGADA}, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fol. 73; published, in an edited version, by Semevskii, \textit{op. cit.}, 313-314. Eve Levin has suggested that the use of this “three-letter word” (\textit{khu}) before the pseudonymous name of a particular mock cleric may have been intended as an obscene pun on the polite form of address (\textit{kir}), conventionally used by Orthodox clergymen in their epistolary correspondence.} \footnote{\textit{RGADA}, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fol. 73; published, in an edited version, by Semevskii, \textit{op. cit.}, 313-314. Eve Levin has suggested that the use of this “three-letter word” (\textit{khu}) before the pseudonymous name of a particular mock cleric may have been intended as an obscene pun on the polite form of address (\textit{kir}), conventionally used by Orthodox clergymen in their epistolary correspondence.}
The royal “Arch-Deacon’s” humble rank within the “brotherhood” of believers in the (pro-)creative power of the divinely-ordained “Father of the Fatherland” marked the tsar’s desire to embody the most active generative principle. Peter’s decision to use the Christian name of his paternal grandfather – Mikhail Fedorovich, the first Romanov tsar – as his own last name, suggests that these principles referred to the procreative power of the imperial persona. By assuming the name “Mikhailov,” Peter presented himself as the only Romanov male who could fulfill his duties to the royal house – whether those duties included restoring his grandfather’s patrimony in the Baltic, fathering a worthy successor to the throne, or renovating the Orthodox church. Indeed, to those courtiers who took an active part in organizing Muscovite coronation ceremonies, and who were somewhat knowledgeable in the political history of Byzantium, the lowly rank of “Deacon” only served to underline the tsar’s divine

Great.” in Russia and the World of the 18th Century, ed. R. P. Bartlett, et. al. (Columbus, 1986), 2-21. here 8, 17 n. 56.

157 For Peter’s pseudonym, “Pachomius Crans-with-his-Prick Mikhailov” (Pakhom pikhai khui Mikhailov), an un-translateable alliterative pun based on the clerical name Pachomius (Rus. Pakhomii) and the dative case of the Russian word for “groin” (pakh), see RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fol. 73; and Senevskii, op. cit., 877.

158 On the Muscovite practice of using the Christian name of a grandfather as one’s own last name (dedichestvo), see V. B. Kobar, Vlast’ i sobstvennost’ v srednevekovoi Rossi (XV-XVI vv.) (M., 1985), 25-26. On Peter’s deliberate appropriation of this practice, see T. Maikova, “Petr I i pravoslavnaia tserkov’.” Nauka i religiya 7 (1972), 38-46, here 44, 46.

159 According to one of the arguments invoked by Petrine diplomats in order to justify the tsar’s aggressive foreign policy, the Russian tsar declared war on Sweden because he sought to restore the territory that had been “stolen” at the beginning of the seventeenth century, during the period of unrest which preceded the election of tsar Mikhail Fedorovich. See P. P. Shafirov, A Discourse Concerning the Just Causes of the War Between Sweden and Russia, 1700-1721, trans. and ed. by William E. Butler (Oceana, 1973). Vice Chancellor Shafirov, who signed his name to a collective epistle from the members of the mock ecclesiastical council of “Prince Pope” Zotov, also belonged to the tsar’s “company.” See N. M. Zotov to Peter (c. 3 September 1710), RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. 1 (1710 g.), ed. khr. 11.
calling.\textsuperscript{160} Judging by the evidence gathered by B. A. Uspenskii, it appears that Peter played the part of “Deacon” because this official clerical rank denoted the position of Byzantine emperors in relation to the patriarch of Constantinople.\textsuperscript{161} According to Uspenskii, this ecclesiastical title allowed the tsar to underline his special charismatic status as the doubly-anointed Orthodox tsar – the only layman allowed to receive communion like a priest (directly from a chalice, behind the Royal Gates). Peter’s embrace of his lowly clerical position, like that of the persona of the humble “shipwright” – a paradoxical trope, which, as I have suggested, derived from a rhetorical combination of Davidic kingship and Orthodox kenoticism\textsuperscript{162} – thus served to

\textsuperscript{160} Although Peter was frequently “promoted” for his “exemplary service” in the army and navy, he seems to have held the rank of “Deacon” for his entire career as a member of the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope.” Around 1710, “Peter-Prick” (Buturlin), the mock “Metropolitan of Izhorsk and St. Petersburg,” promoted (povyshenie) the tsar from the rank (chin) of “Proto-Deacon (protodiakon) […], of the eparchy of the Most Foolish Patriarch (eparkhi vesheustvado patriarkha)” to that of “Arche-deacon (arkhidiacon) […] of Our eparchy” (k sebe v eparkhiu). See P. I. Buturlin to Peter (c. 1710), in RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. I. No. 11 (1710), fol. 188-188v., 188a, here 188. The relative constancy of this humble title suggests that promotion based on merit, according to properly-constituted and clearly-defined lines of authority, did not constitute the only operative principle in the “scenario of power” associated with the Transfigured Kingdom. On “scenarios of power,” see Richard S. Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy. 2 vols. (Princeton, 1995), I: 6.

\textsuperscript{161} For a discussion of the Byzantine-inspired, Muscovite coronation ritual, which was invented at the end of the sixteenth century and updated during the reign of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and his children, see B. A. Uspenskii, Tsar i i patriarkh: kharizma vlasti v Rossii (Vizantiiskaiia model’ i ee russkoe pereosmyslenie) (M., 1998), 154-156; 166-170. For an explanation for why Peter played the part of “deacon,” see ibid., 156 n. 5; and M. V. Zazykin, Patriarkh Nikon: ego gosudarstvennye i kanonicheskie idei. V trekh chastiakh, repr. ed. (M., 1995), I: 191.

\textsuperscript{162} On the connection between the trope of humilitas/sublimitas and typological readings of Davidic kingship, see Joseph Anthony Mazzeo, “Cromwell as Davidic King,” in his Renaissance and Seventeenth-Century Studies (NY and London, 1964), 189-191. On Peter as Christ-like “carpenter” and “humble Psalmist,” see supra, Chapters Two and Four.
underline his exalted imperial dignity. Furthermore, the very fact that the mock arch-priest of the Transfigured Kingdom could be referred to either as “Patriarch” or as “Pope,” suggests that the tsar asserted the charismatic authority of the Christian emperor against “Catholicism” as a whole, represented either by the head of the eastern (Apostolic) church or by his western (Latin) counterpart. In this interpretation, therefore, Peter’s carnivalesque performance of the role of “Deacon” turned all “Catholic” arguments about the predominance of Clergy (Lat. sacerdotium) over Empire (Lat. imperium) on their head.

This ironic take on Byzantine “Caesaropapism” also underlay Peter’s decision to “ordain” I. F. Romodanovskii as “Prince Abbott” (kniaz’ igumen) of the Transfigured Kingdom. According to the collective petition “submitted” on behalf of the “Most Extravagant Council” (sumozbrodneishii sobor) to “His Highness,” the “Great S[overeign] · P[rince] · C[aesar],” the “throne left widowed” (vdoystvuiushchii prestol) by the death of “His Most Foolish [Highness], Prince Pope Anikit [Zotov]” could not

---

163 By contrast, in the Latin Catholic church, the lowly, supporting role of “Deacon” served as an attempt to humble Christian emperors before the Pope. See the papal ceremonial book cited by Härte, op. cit., 76-77.

164 On the ideological conflict between tsar and patriarch, particularly during the “pontificate of Nikon,” see Bennett, op. cit., 143-206; and, more generally, Cathy Jean Potter, “The Russian Church and the Politics of Reform in the Second Half of the Seventeenth-Century” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1993).

165 See the hand-written, rough draft of the mock collective petition, in RGADA, f. 9, otd. 1, No. 67, fol. 1; published by Semenskii, Selo i delo, 297; and Zhivov, Iazyk, op. cit., 127 n. 20. In this document, the name (imia) of “His Highness,” the “Great S[overeign]. P[rince]. C[aesar] (Velikii G·K Ts)” is left blank, as is the time “when [the unnamed “Prince Caesar”] deigns to notify [the mock council]” (kogda soizvolit potom dolozhit’) exactly “when the election is to be held” (kogda elektssii byt’). This particular archival file does not, however, contain a “clean” copy of the mock collective petition.
be filled by another "Bacchusomimetic father" \( (Bakhusopodrazhatel'nyi otets) \)

without the approval of the new "Prince Caesar." This ironic formulation echoed the procedures of previous patriarchal successions, during which the task of calling a church council devolved upon the anointed representative of imperial authority.

However, the parody presided over by "Prince Caesar" Romodanovskii suggested that, Peter and his religious advisors took the tsar's role in these Orthodox rites of ordination both more and less seriously than his royal predecessors: less seriously, because they felt free to mock, alter, and (in the case of the patriarch), even abolish these ceremonies altogether; more seriously, because they were truly committed to ordaining the most educated, Orthodox clerics of the day. Indeed, if the "sacred parodies," that were staged on the royal suburban estate of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe (New Transfiguration), could be said to have demonstrated anything about Peter's attitude to Orthodox ordination rites, than it is the extent to which Feofan's anti-Catholic rhetoric resonated

---

165 "Most Foolish" \( (vshushuteiši) \) is a pun on “Most Holy” \( (vsevišteiši) \), the honorary title that used to refer to the Russian Orthodox patriarch and his council. Here, the word “jester” \( (šlut) \) is substituted for the root-word “holy” \( (sviat) \), while keeping the laudatory prefix \( (vše-) \) and the comparative suffix \( (-etšiši) \).

166 Substituting the pagan deity of drink (Bacchus) for the God of the Eucharist, this title parodies the idea that the Russian Orthodox patriarch re-presents (literally, imitates) here one earth, the authority of Christ Himself. On Christomimesis, imperial and episcopal, see Kantorowicz, op. cit., 47ff., 49 n. 13, 58 f., 61, 65, 90 n. 9, 87 f., 102, 143, 156ff., 319ff., 320 n. 17, 495 n. 125, 500 n. 17, 537.

167 For an example of the ceremonies surrounding the election of a seventeenth-century Russian patriarchs, see N. I. Novikov, ed., "Chin vozvedeniia na Vserossiiskii prestol Patriarsheskiii Velikogo Gospodina Sviatetishego Kir Adriana Moskovskago i vseiia Rossi v i vsekh severnykh stran Patriarkha vo preimenitom tsarsstvuiushchem grade Moskve vo sviatei Sobornoi i Apostol'skoii tserkvi (7198) 1690," Drevniia Rossiiskiaia Vevliofika, 8 (1789): 329-357. Compare this patriarchal election, which took place in the presence of tsar Ivan and Peter Alekseevich, with the ones that took place in front of their father and grandfather: "Chin izbraniia na Patriarsheskiii Rossiiskii prestol [1642]," in ibid., 6: 223-245: "O izbraniia na Patriarsheskiii Prestol Iosaafa Troitskago monastyria Arkhimandrita, v leto 7175 [1667]."
with the tsar’s own, political attack on “hypocrites.”¹⁶⁹ Whatever the case may be,
even before a secret investigative chancellery uncovered evidence of widespread
sympathy for the fate of the luckless tsarevich on the part of many prominent clerics,
and certainly before the tsar ordered Feofan (Prokopovich) to come up with a plan to
reassert royal control over top-level ecclesiastical appointments,¹⁷⁰ Peter and his closest
advisors had moved one step closer to the general “reformation” (Rus. ispravlenie, lit.
correction) of the Russian Orthodox Church mandated in the Spiritual Regulation of
1721.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ Although the tsar had probably never actually read Feofan’s description of the second
Council of Lyons, which appears in the monk’s treatise on the “procession of the Holy Spirit,” it is
certain that Peter not only would have agreed with its sardonic attack on the externals of faith, but that he
would have found some striking parallels between the “comedy” enacted at this unsuccessful attempt to
reunite the Eastern and Western Churches under supremacy of the Papacy and his court’s parodic election
of the “Prince Pope.” See Feofan (Prokopovich), De processione Spiritús Sancti (Gotha, 1772), trans.
and cited in Chistovich, op. cit., 18-19 n. 2. On the 1274 Church Council, see Georges Goyau, “Lyons,
Council of,” Catholic Encyclopedia (NY, 1913), 9: 476-478, esp. 477. For Feofan’s avowed hatred for the
externals surrounding the “comedy” of Orthodox ordination, see Feofan (Prokopovich) to I. A.
Markevich (9 August 1716), Epistolae, op. cit., 10-11 (no. 5), cited and trans. in Verkhovskoi, op. cit.,
1: 130 n. 3; Chistovich, op. cit., 24-25; and Cracraft, op. cit., 54.

¹⁷⁰ On 20 November 1718, during an interview with Stefan (lavorskii), Peter informed the
metropolitan of Riazan’ that “in the future, for the better management (dlia luchshego vpred’
upravleniia) and the correction (daby udobnee takitia velikia dela ispravitiat’ bylo vosnožno) of such
important matters [as the filling of episcopal vacancies], an Ecclesiastical College would seem to be
appropriate (mnitstia byt’ udobno Dukhovni Kollegii).” See “Most High Resolutions to the Submissions
of Metropolitan Stefan of Riazan’” (20 November 1718), Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossii
er imperii (SPh., 1830), 5:594-594 (no. 3239), cited by Verkhovskoi, 1: 153-155, here 155; English translation in
Cracraft, 147-148. The tsar assigned the task of writing up a position paper on this question to Stefan’s
arch-rival, Feofan (Prokopovich). Soon thereafter, Feofan began work on an extensive “description
(opisiatnie) and [an] argument [in favor] (rassuzhdenie) of a Spiritual College (Dukhovnogo
Kollegium),” a “book” (kniga) which became the first draft of the “Spiritual Regulation” (Dukhovnyi
Reglament) of 1721. On the tentative, polemical, and “literary” nature of Feofan’s first draft of the “Spiritual
Regulation,” see Verkhovskoi, op. cit., 1: 156-159, esp. 159.

¹⁷¹ For the text of the “Spiritual Regulation” of 1721, see Verkhovskoi, op. cit., 2:6-7, 12-105;
and Muller, ed. and trans., op. cit. On the tsar’s God-given obligation to “reform (Rus. ispravit’ lit.
“correct”) the clerical estate,” see Verkhovskoi, ibid., 6.
While the tsar probably did not decide to abolish the Russian Orthodox patriarchate until the end of 1718, the increasingly anti-"Catholic" thrust of the mock ecclesiastical council hinted that the tsar was moving towards a radical solution to the question of patriarchal succession. By entrusting the task of explaining precisely how a thorough-going ecclesiastical reform could serve as an aspect of imperial renovation to Feofan (Prokopovich), the tsar signaled that his views about the administration of the Orthodox church had evolved beyond the ad hoc, fiscal tinkering of his early policies. Invoking the examples of David, Constantine, and Justinian, the tsar's new religious advisor drew his royal patron into the orbit of those illustrious "orthodox" emperors who took an active role in correcting the vices of the Church and in curbing the political pretensions of the clergy. Transforming these emperors' essentially conservative positions vis-à-vis ecclesiastical administration into a spirited defense of royal intervention in the government of the Orthodox church, Feofan signaled his own willingness to defend the controversial proposition that there could be only one "High Priest" in the "renovated" Russian empire. In the process of justifying the "clerical" position of the divinely-ordained "Father of the Fatherland," Feofan thus repeated in all seriousness what the tsar and his inner council had first mentioned only in jest, during the "ordination" of the "Prince Abbott" of the "Transfigured Kingdom."


173 For a detailed discussion of the "phases" of ecclesiastical reform, and of Peter's progressive radicalization, see Cracraft, op. cit., chs. 3-4; and Zhivov, "Church Reforms," op. cit. 75.

174 "Sermon," 25 (on David and Solomon); 26 (on Constantine); and 27 (on Justinian).
The ultimate success of the imperial reform envisioned by the tsar and his closest advisors also depended on the resolution of the conflict between Peter and his first-born son. And here, too, the “ordination” of the new “Prince Caesar” hinted at the way that Peter and his advisors intended to confront the other challenge to the “patriarchal” authority of the Russian Orthodox emperor. As the presumptive heir of the first sovereign of the “Transfigured Kingdom,” Prince I. F. Romodanovskii served as a living rebuke to tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich – the “good-for-nothing slave” who simply “refused” to invest his “talents”; or, alternatively, to take up the “burden” of faith in the divine vocation of his father. The ignominious end of the rebellious son – a second Absalom – confirmed the typological parallel between Peter and King David, the “humble psalmist,” whose war-like exertions heralded an era of imperial renovation and religious renewal, and prefigured the inauguration of an edenic reign of peace and justice on earth.\textsuperscript{176} Thus, the Yuletide parody of the sacrament of Holy Orders effectively justified Peter’s divine gift of grace among the tsar’s intimates, serving the same political ends as the panegyrics of Feofan (Prokopovich) and, more ominously, the torture-chambers of “Prince Caesar” Romodanovskii’s “Chancellery of Transfiguration” (\textit{Preobrazhenskii prikaz}).

\textsuperscript{175} Verkhovskoi, \textit{op. cit.}, 2(3): 3-4; Chistovich, \textit{op. cit.}, 128-129.

\textsuperscript{176} On the reign of David’s son, King Solomon (lit. the peaceful one), as a prefiguration of the reign of Christ, see \textit{supra}, Chapter Two.
CONCLUSION

‘And the Last Will Be First’:
The ‘Fledglings of Peter’s Nest’ and the Persistence of Royal Charisma

“So the last will be first, and the first will be last, for many are called, but few are chosen.”

(Matthew 20:16)

Long before the acclamation ceremony, in the course of which the last Muscovite tsar formally accepted the title of the “first” (pervyi), “great” (velikii), Russian “Emperor” (imperator),¹ the “company” of Peter Alekseevich had succeeded in transforming the public rituals of his court into celebrations of the “Kingdom Transfigured.”² Despite these spectacular proclamations, however, the acceptance of Russia’s new place in the world,³ like many of the domestic reforms initiated during

¹ For a description of the celebrations, which accompanied the signing of the Peace of Nystadt (1721) – the treaty, that marked the end of the “Great Northern War” between Russia and Sweden, see O. G. Ageeva, “Obshchestvennaia i kul’turnaia zhizn’ Peterburga pervoi chetverti XVIII v.,” (Diss. kand. ist. nauk, Institute of History, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1990), 72-77, 220-221 n. 70-83; idem, “Titul ‘imperator’ i poniatie ‘imperiia’ v Rossii v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka,” Mir istorii: Rossiiskii elektronnyi zhurnal 5 (1999), 1-15, esp. 1-3; Marinus A. Wes, Classics in Russia, 1700-1855: Between Two Bronze Horsemen (Leiden, 1992), 34-36; and Richard S. Wortman, Scenarios of Power: Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1995, 2000), I: 60, 63-64;

² Contemporary diplomats were quite conscious of the imperial pretensions behind these seemingly insignificant (to our eyes) ceremonial changes. See the insightful comments of Otto Pleyer, the long-time Habsburg ambassador to Muscovy, “O nyneshnem sostoinii gosudarstvenno upravleniia v Moskovii v 1710 godu,” Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnosti Rossiiiskikh 89: 2 (1874), 1-21, here 8-10. On the ideological importance of Muscovite diplomatic etiquette, see L. A. luzevovich, “Kak v posol’skikh obychalakh vedetsia...” Russkii posol’kii obychai kontsa XV-nachala XVII v. (M., 1988). On negotiations about Peter’s new imperial title see Isabel de Madariaga, “Tsar into Emperor: The Title of Peter the Great,” in her Politics and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Russia. Collected Essays (London and NY, 1998), 15-39.

³ For the time lag between Peter’s assumption of the imperial title, and its general acceptance by international public opinion, see de Madariaga, op. cit., 39 n. 91.
Peter’s reign, remained confined to a small group of supporters and enacted, if at all, in selected regions of the realm. Indeed, judging by the debates which followed immediately after his death, even maintaining Russia’s new geopolitical status was not a foregone conclusion. It is only from hindsight that the ideals of rulership evoked during the celebrations which followed the signing of the Peace of Nystadt (1721) could be taken as marking the end of Muscovy and the beginning of Imperial Russia. So, if Peter’s unique, “charismatic” scenario of power died with him, as it most surely did, then why weren’t his innovations abandoned by his successors? Why did Peter’s reformist legacy continue to influence the rhetoric, if not the policies, of all the Russian monarchs who came after him? As I hope to suggest in this conclusion, the answer to

---


these questions lies in the political importance of Russian imperial ideology in general,\textsuperscript{6} and the cult of the “great” Peter, in particular.\textsuperscript{7}

In tracing the history of the “Transfigured Kingdom” – a heretofore neglected aspect of Muscovite political theology at the court of Peter Alekseevich – I have tried to demonstrate the proposition that the tsar and his entourage succeeded in mobilizing support in favor of their particular vision of imperial reform, at least in part, because they were able to appeal to the interests and values of a new generation within the Muscovite political elite. By articulating a convincing explanation for the failure of their fathers’ “baroque” scenarios of power, the tsar and his entourage tapped into the disaffection of a generation of hereditary military servitors, which had grown up in the shadow of the Church Council of 1666-1667. Their formal commitment to the tenets of Orthodox religious “enlightenment” (prosveshchenie) only underlined the radical disjuncture between the solemn, imperial rhetoric and the sordid political reality of the period of military defeat and religious fragmentation signaled by the triumph of the court-sponsored program of confessionalization. This perception of moral decline was only compounded by the seven-year rule (1682-1689) of a female regent, who came to be associated (by important groups within the ruling class) more with domestic unrest,

\textsuperscript{6} This has been the argument of Richard Wortman’s two-volume study of the “myth and ritual in Russian monarchy,” the subtitle of his Scenarios of Power.

\textsuperscript{7} For the development of the image of Peter the Great, see E. F. Shmurlo, Petr Velikii v vosenke sovremennikov i potomstva (SPb., 1912); Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, The Image of Peter the Great in Russian History and Thought (NY and Oxford, 1985); Hans Bagger, Reformy Petra Velikogo: Obzor issledovanii (M., 1985); and Xenia Gasiorowska, The Image of Peter the Great in Russian Fiction (Madison, 1979). See also V. M. Zhivov, “Ivan Susanin and Petr Velikii,” Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie 38 (1999), 51-65, esp. 59-65.
factional intrigue, and humiliating military losses, than with the baroque Orthodoxy of the House of Romanov. By offering an attractive, positive alternative to the feminized piety of the hereditary service elite associated with the reign of Sophia, the Naryshkin Restoration thus suggested that the future of imperial reform, and Russia’s ultimate redemption, lay in the hands of the manly court of the youngest son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich.

The creators of Peter’s “Transfigured Kingdom” sought to take advantage of this perception by cultivating the young tsar’s martial image and by emphasizing his personal election as Russia’s savior. In fact, the unmistakable allusion to the deification (Gr. theosis) – which was initiated by God during the Incarnation and which was to culminate in the Second Coming (Gr. Parousia) at the End of Days (Gr. eschaton)\(^8\) – suggests that the play-world of the Transfigured Kingdom imagined by the tsar and his retinue was never intended to be an end in itself (Gr. telos). For all the assertions of imperial power and earthly glory, the goal which motivated the tsar and his company was, and always remained, the quest for both personal and collective salvation, in this world and the next. However, contrary to their religiously-inspired teleology, the realization of Peter’s imperial project was not foreordained. It was simply re-presented

---

as such, during the spectacles organized by the tsar and his closest political advisors.

Thus, behind the Muscovite court's antinomian and often blasphemous assertions of royal charisma, lay a belief in the divine gift of grace reputedly possessed by tsar Peter Alekseevich, the man whom royal panegyrists hailed as Russia's "anointed one" (Gr. christos). The political mobilization of this belief in Peter's imperial vocation, and the unique rhetoric of authority forged to sustain it, has been the main focus of my dissertation.

I have also suggested, however, that the very success of Peter's imperial project undermined the accessible style of rule that predominated in the Transfigured Kingdom. The tsar's attempt to transform the noble cabal that had put him on the throne into a well-organized ruling regime⁹ resulted in the simultaneous "rationalization"¹⁰ and "dispersion"¹¹ of his personal charisma. Although the empire continued to be run by

---


¹⁰ By "rationalization," I mean to invoke Weber's definition of "rational-legal," or "bureaucratic" authority, as enshrined in the founding documents of the "well-ordered police state." For the cameralist sources of Peter's administrative reforms, see Raeff, op. cit.; C. Peterson, Peter the Great's Administrative and Judicial Reforms: Swedish Antecedents and the Process of Reception (Stockholm, 1979); and E. V. Anisimov, Gosudarstvennye proobrazovaniia i samoderzhavie Petra Velikogo v pervoi chetverti XVIII veka (SPb., 1997).

¹¹ For the notion of "dispersion" and "attenuation" of charisma, see Edward Shils, "Charisma," in his The Constitution of Society (Chicago and London, 1982), 110-118, esp. 117-118. In institutional terms, the dispersion of Peter's charisma was expressed in the creation of the provincial governor-generalships (gubernia), a project known as the first "provincial reform," but which John LeDonne has, with equal accuracy, described as a declaration of an imperial-wide "state of emergency." See his "Ruling Families in the Russian Political Order, Part I: The Petrine Leadership, 1689-1725," Cahiers du
the tsar's favorites – the men who organized and participated in the celebrations of the "Kingdom Transfigured" – their repeated attempts to reform the Muscovite chancellery system brought Russia closer to the ideal of government espoused, and, at least to some extent, embodied by Muscovy's northern European contemporaries. Thus, the larger the number of agents and governmental agencies that could claim to exercise the will of the charismatic "reforming tsar," and the more elaborate and hierarchical the structure of civil and military subordination, the less accessible Peter became to his subjects.

This shift in the policy of access accompanied, and found a justification in the simultaneous re-definition of Peter's royal authority. Led by Feofan (Prokopovich), the tsar's new court preacher, apologists for Russian absolutism increasingly came to depict the last Muscovite tsar as the first, all-powerful, imperial father – the original

---

Monde russe et soviétique 28:3-4 (1987), 233-322. By de-centralizing Muscovite chancellery administration, the creation of these glorified satrapies constituted an attempt to cut down on red tape and to increase the tsar's power to extract men and materiel, during a particularly crucial period of the Northern War. The second "provincial reform," which included the formation of the "Senate" and the attempt to introduce a "collegial" form of central administration, sought to re-centralize authority, by creating a more "rational" mechanism of rule, one which could function without the divinely-ordained founder, who had supposedly set the whole machine in motion. For an insightful summary of the waves of administrative reform in eighteenth-century Russia, see George L. Yaney, The Systematization of Russian Government: Social Evolution in the Domestic Administration of Imperial Russia, 1711-1905 (Urbana, Chicago and London, 1973); John P. LeDonne, Ruling Russia: Politics and Administration in the Age of Absolutism, 1762-1796 (Princeton, 1984); and idem, Absolutism and Ruling Class: The Formation of the Russian Political Order, 1700-1825 (NY and Oxford, 1991).


13 Paradigmatic of the changing policy of royal access was the imperial decree (ukaz), which insisted that people petition the emperor only through proper channels, i.e. the tsar's personal "Cabinet." On the growing importance of the privy Cabinet and its secretary, A. V. Makarov, see Anisimov, Gosudarstvennye, op. cit., 282-286; and Lindsey Hughes, Russia in the Era of Peter the Great (New Haven and London, 1998), 112-113.
embodiment of natural sovereignty and the ultimate source of power for resolving disputes within the multi-ethnic, and multi-confessional ruling class, which governed the Russian empire. Particularly after the violent resolution of the succession struggle between Peter and his heir apparent, the tsar’s military, civilian, and even clerical servitors were increasingly urged to identify with the heroic figure of the suffering royal servant, depicted as the paragon of patriotism, self-discipline, and a rational obedience to God. Indeed, as archbishop Feofan insisted, it was only by becoming conscientious, skilled, and socially-responsible subjects, that the members of the new chosen nation could ever hope to live up to the tremendous personal sacrifices which Russia’s anointed one made for the sake of the common good. The institutionalization of Peter’s personal charisma was thus accompanied by the intensification, not diminution, of references to the tsar’s redemptive significance.

---

14 Michael Cherniavsky has described the theological implications of this shift, in his “The Old Believers and the New Religion,” *Structure of Russian History: Interpretive Essays*, ed. by Michael Cherniavsky (NY, 1970), 140-188, esp. 177-178, 188 n. 178: “Theologically, one can argue that the secular absolute ruler meant in general the shift from the ruler as the image of Christ to the ruler as the image of God the Father. [...] [T]he Christomimesis of the theocratic ruler involved a model and a standard which were above the ruler and outside his realm; or, to put it in another way, the ruler who judged all was judged by at least one, Christ. To be God the Father was to be the lawgiver, the Creator, and this was the constant theme in the panegyrics to Peter I.”

15 On the broader, imperial implications of Peter’s new scenario of power, see Wortman, *op. cit.*; and James Cracraft, “Empire Versus Nation: Political Theory under Peter I,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 10: 3-4 (December 1986), 524-540. For a non-Marxist notion of “ruling class,” see LeDonne, *op. cit.*

Even before the demise of Peter’s body natural royal panegyrists sought to suggest that the “Kingdom Transfigured” could serve as a visible demonstration of the deification of the imperial body politic. In fact, despite the growing recourse to classical mythology, Peter’s new scenario of power derived at least some of its rhetorical force from its connection to the apocalyptic prophecy about the “first” and “last things” in the Kingdom of God (Matthew 19:30; cf. Mark 30:31; Luke 13:30). Thus, during the carefully-scripted acclamation ceremony of 1721, the grateful subjects of Peter Alekseevich – the “last” son of tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich – unanimously recognized their monarch’s physical exertions on behalf of the common good, celebrated his personal contribution to Russia’s future glory, and urged him to accept the imperial title of “First” (Lat. Primus). By emphasizing Peter’s unprecedented primacy, his subjects thus signaled that they had accepted him as the “foundation stone” (Gr. petros) of the New Dispensation, heralded by the long-awaited victory over Sweden and the relocation of the imperial capital of his polity, well-ordered, and

17 Vergil’s Fourth Eclogue, about the “Golden Age” heralded by the return of Astraea, the mythological goddess of justice, was especially important for the legitimation of Peter’s successors (just as it had been for his European predecessors). On the connection between this image and the notion of imperial reform, see Frances A. Yates, Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century (London, 1985); and supra, Introduction. On the succession of “Russian Astraeæ,” see Wortman, op. cit., ch. 3; and 14-15, 18, 81, 120, 123, 143, 199; Stephen Lessing Baehr, The Paradise Myth in Eighteenth-Century Russia (Stanford, 1991), 2, 6, 38-40, 45, 49, 59, 116, 121, 147, 159, 206, 208, 234. In sociological terms, the emphasis on what Wortman (ibid., ch. 1) has termed the scenario of “foreign origins” (i.e. “Westernization”), can be seen as a product of the fact that “[t]he legitimacy of the norms enunciated by charismatic authority lies outside the norms practiced in the existing society.” In direct contrast to the defenders of the status quo, both “the bearer and the adherents of charismatic authority [...] tend to think of their norms as legitimated by a source remote in time or timeless, remote in space or spaceless.” See Shils, “Charisma,” op. cit., 113; cf. Wortman, op. cit., 44.

18 de Madariaga, op. cit.; Ageeva, op. cit., 70-77, esp. 72-77; and idem, “Titul ‘imperator,’” op. cit., 1-3.
Orthodox realm, to the shores of the Neva River. In this way, despite (or maybe because) of the fact that Peter was a miserable failure as a natural father, he could still claim to be the “Founding Father” (Lat. Pater patriae) of Imperial Russia.

The tsar was not the only member of the “Kingdom Transfigured” to have experienced the heady exhilaration of having crossed the sacred boundary between the “first” and “last things.” During the celebrations of the third anniversary of the Peace of Nystadt (1724), Catherine Alekseevna (née Marta Skavronskaia), Peter’s second wife – a foreign woman reputed to be have been born into a Livonian peasant family – was also raised to the heights of imperial power and renamed “The First.” In order to justify the radical step of crowning the tsar’s former mistress – a political move necessitated by the unstable succession politics which followed the death of Peter’s only surviving male heir, tsarevich Peter Petrovich (d. 1719) – the organizers of Catherine’s coronation suggested that she received her promotion to the ranks of royalty as a reward for her services to the Fatherland, as well as her close association with the charismatic founder of Russia’s new, imperial cult. The androgynous imagery

---

19 Peter’s adoption of Latin (“Western,” or Augustan) Roman imperial titles did not mean, however, that the tsar had abandoned his role as Orthodox (“Eastern,” or Constantinian) Roman emperor. For an interpretation which stresses both aspects of his classical “Roman” (and Romanov) heritage, see Ageeva, “Titul ‘imperator,'” op. cit., 8-15; and supra, Introduction.

20 Not surprisingly, the image of the “Rock,” on which Peter founded his renewed, Orthodox empire, proved central to the legitimations put forth by his successors. On Peter as model and symbol for future generations of rulers, see Wortman, op. cit., 1: 85, 264, 271, 316, 318-319, 396, 399, 400, 462; Bahr, op. cit., 46; Whittaker, op. cit.; Wes, op. cit.; and Karen Rasmussen, “Catherine II and the Image of Peter I,” Slavic Review 37: 1 (March 1978), 57-69.

employed by royal panegyrists — who stressed Catherine’s uncommon valor and her unwomanly heroism
— could not disguise that it was her distinctly feminine role, as mother of the Fatherland, which guaranteed the royal consort’s continued favor at the court of the first Russian emperor. The coronation thus sought to provide a legitimate regent for the long-awaited (and continually-deferred) young messiah — the unborn male heir, whom Peter expected from his fecund, young wife. However, the accidents of birth, Catherine’s extramarital dalliances, and Peter’s fatal illness foreclosed that option. As a result, on the eve of Peter’s death, the only person left to oversee the transformation of the tsar’s war-like, Davidic monarchy into a peaceful Solomonic empire was Catherine herself. Thus, in an ironic twist of fate, prepared by Peter’s frenetic attempts to reshape the imperial succession in his own image, the libertine warrior-king who had come to power by overthrowing one female relative — tsarevna


For example of the tropes used vis-à-vis Peter’s consort, see Feofan (Prokopovich), “Slovo pokhval’noe [...] na tezoimenitsstvo blagoverniya gosudarnyi Ekateriny [...] (24 November 1717),” in Sochineniia, ed. I. P. Eremin (M.-L., 1961), 68-76, 466-467.

Indeed, the fact that the “election” of the fourth, and final “Prince Pope,” was timed to coincide with the execution of Catherine’s reputed lover and the beginning of yet another wave of repression against the St. Petersburg-based political elite, suggests that the two events may have been connected. For an insightful analysis of the coming “purge” of the elite, which was only halted by Peter’s untimely demise, see D. O. Serov, Stroiteli imperii: Ocherki gosudarstvenoi i kriminal’noi deiatel’nosti spodvizhnikov Petra I (N., 1996), ch. 1; and Franz Villebois, Mémoires secrets pour servir à l’histoire de la cour de Russie, sous les règnes de Pierre le Grand et de Catherine I°, ed. M. Théophile Hallez (Brussels, 1853), ch. 2; trans. by G. F. Zvereva in A. A. Nikiforov, “Vil’bua. Rasskazy o russkom dvore,” Voprosy istorii 12 (1991), 192-206, esp. 195-199.

For Peter’s new dynastic scenario, see Martin, op. cit., ch. 5; and supra, Chapters Four and Five.
Sof’ia Alekseevna – wound up leaving his inheritance in the hands of another –

Empress Catherine I.\footnote{As the Galatea to Peter’s Pygmalion, the image of the first Russian Empress continued to be shaped by men – like the elite guards’ officers to whom Feofan (Prokopovich) addressed his sermons on “royal authority,” and who led the bloodless coup which guaranteed her succession – into the feminized ideal of a polite and patriotic Motherland. In this way, Catherine the First became the model for female rulers for the rest of the eighteenth century (including Catherine the Second) – not only in terms of the ceremonial used to crown her, or the violence (actual or implied) by which she was put on the throne in 1725, but also in terms of the ideals of imperial renovation and renewal, of trying to live up to the legacy left by the charismatic “Founding Father” of Imperial Russia. On Catherine’s role in Peter’s imperial myth, see Wortman, \textit{op. cit.}, 59-61, 64-66, 78, 86, 133, 185; and supra. Chapters Four and Five. On the role of Peter’s life-guards’ regiments, see Anisimov, \textit{Rossia bez Petra, op. cit.}; and E. Boltunova, “Russkaiia gvardiia pervoi chetverti XVIII v.: absoliutno novoe ili traditsionnoe?”, in \textit{Srarviel’no-istoricheskie issledovaniia. Sbornik studencheskih rabot}. ed. M. F. Rumiantseva (M., 1998), 9-18.}

For those lucky few who had been initiated into the “Transfigured Kingdom,” the fairy-tale about the Livonian peasant girl-turned-first Russian empress – one of the more shocking manifestation of the millenarian transmutation of “last things” into “first” – also served as an allegory for the transformation of Russia’s place in the world. Like the emblem on Peter’s personal seal, which depicted the tsar as a royal Pygmalion, sculpting a martial, but definitely feminine Galatea (New Russia),\footnote{On the imagery of Pygmalion and Galatea, see V. Iu. Matveev, “K istorii vozniknoveniia i razvitiiia iuzheta ‘Petr I – vysekaushchii statiu Rossiiz”, in \textit{Kul’tura i iskusstvo Rossii XVIII veka} (L., 1981), 26-43; Wortman, \textit{op. cit.}, I: 59, 63, 66; and Hughes, \textit{op. cit.}, ix, 207, 299, 470.} the story of Catherine’s elevation captured both the creative and the procreative sides of the tsar’s imperial project.\footnote{For a graphic representation of the correspondence between the political and sexual potency of the aging Russian emperor, see the obscene drawing on the back of the book of “statutes” of the mock “British monastery,” \textit{RO BAN}, No. 17.7.12, fol. 110v, discovered by S. F. Platonov, “Iz bytovoi istorii Petrovskoi epokhi. I. Bengo-Kollekzia ili Velikobritanskii monastyr’ v. S.-Peterburge pri Petre Velikom,” \textit{Izvestia AN SSSR} 7-8 (1926), 527-546, here 527 n. 1, 532; see the comments of A. G. Cross, “The Bung College or British Monastery in Petrine Russia,” \textit{Newsletter of the Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia} 12 (1984), 14-24, here 21-22. The fact that this document was drawn up ca. Yuletide 1720-1721 – presumably, by an anonymous Russian scribe, from the Foreign Affairs Chancellery – in time for the celebrations of the Peace of Nystadt is suggested by the inscription (\textit{finis’}; \textit{coronat’}; \textit{opus’})} For it suggested that a virile and pious monarch, one who
knew how to handle the tools of his trade and who whole-heartedly relied on the free
gift of grace, represented by that divine love, which allowed the mythological Galatea
to come to life, could literally polish away the rough edges which had prevented his
realm from joining the exclusive fraternity of polite Christian kings. As the artisan
tsar, the figure of Peter thus expressed the life-giving tension between the human and
divine natures of Jesus himself, the humble carpenter’s son whose earthly labors
redeemed the world. In this context, it is not surprising that the speech pronounced by
Chancellor G. I. Golovkin – the “drunken proto-presbyter Gavrilo” of the Unholy

beneath the image of an enormous, ejaculating penis, called “My Little Gabriel” (moi gavrilushka). The Latin inscription is an abbreviated version of the “device” (Lat. finis coronavit opus; Rus. konets
uenchal dole: “At the end, you see the work”) found on the main fireworks display, which accompanied the 1721 celebrations. For a description of this elaborate fireworks display (ognennaia potecha), which included a scene, depicting a tempest-tossed ship entering the harbor, see Ageeva, “Obshchestvennaia i
kul’turnaia zhizn’,” op. cit., 75; for the emblem and its device, see Emblem i simvoly, ed. by A. E.
Makhov (M., 1995), 96-97. It appears that the members of the merry “Bung College” deliberately
interpreted this “suggestive” scene in a way which equated the military victories of the Great Russian
“Skipper” with his sexual prowess. On Peter’s role as the “Great Skipper,” see supra. Chapter Three;
the word that 488 expanded sexual potency, see supra. Chapter Five. The unusual reference to “my little Gabriel”
may be an obscene pun on the Christian name of the Russian foreign chancellor, Gavrilo Golovkin. It is
certainly not among the most common euphemisms for the male member, most of which are listed in
“Metaforicheskaia leksika, ispol’zueaia dlia oboznacheniiu genitalii i osnovnykh seksual’nykh poniatii,”
in Russkii eroticheskii fol’klor, ed. by A. Toporkov (M., 1995), 639-642, here 639-640; T. V.
Akhmetova, Russkii mat: tolkovyi slovar’, 2nd ed. (M., 1997); and D. A. Drummond and G. Perkins,
Dictionary of Russian Obscenities, 3rd ed. (Oakland, 1987). But see the entries for gavrik” (alternatively,
gava) and gaved’ in V. I. Dal’, Tolkovyi slovar’ zhivogo velikorusskogo iazyka (M., 1955), 1: 339, where the first term denotes the more neutral “simpleton” or “gaper” (prostak, prosteftia, raznia); while the latter one is an archaic term of abuse, used to characterize someone who is a scatter-brained ignoramus (neuch’, razinia) and/or something that is foul and repellant (gadkii, govennyi); see also Marcus
Wheeler, The Oxford Russian-English Dictionary, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1992), 123, where the word gavrik is
defined as either “petty crook” or “mate” (as in “buddy, pal”).

For the contemporary connection between “police,” “polish,” and “politeness,” see Jean
Arthur Goldhammer (Cambridge, 1993), 1-35; and Peter France, Politeness and Its Discontents:
Problems in French Classical Culture (Cambridge, 1992), ch. 4. For Peter’s comments about the “veil”
of ignorance, which kept Russia from joining the rest of the world, see Peter’s political testament of
Russia: A Source Book, 1700-1917, ed. by Basil Dmytryshyn (NY, 1967), 24. For a discussion of this
document, see supra, Chapter Five.
Council ruled by the Prince Pope—echoed a liturgical text about Christ’s role in leading his followers from darkness to light, from non-being to being. For, according to this panegyrical interpretation, only the “anointed one” (Gr. chrestos) could transform barbaric Muscovy—the “last” among the Christian kingdoms of Europe—into one of the “first” representatives of enlightened absolutism.

The speech of G. I. (“Proto-Presbyter Gavrilo”) Golovkin equated the charismatic authority of a secular worldly ruler with the grace of God. This linkage demonstrates the two fundamental findings of this dissertation: first, that the libertine tsar and the solemn emperor were twin sides of a single royal body; and second, that the “fledglings of Peter’s nest” continued to shape the way in which Peter’s

29 On G. I. Golovkin’s role in the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope,” see supra. Introduction; and infra, Appendix.

30 Hans-Joachim Härtel, Byzantinisches Erbe und Orthodoxie bei Feoan Prokopovic [= Das östliche Christentum, 23] (Würzburg, 1970), 86. Reciting a speech composed by a clerical ghost-writer from the Synodal administration, most likely by Feoan (Prokopovich) himself, Golovkin thanked the tsar for “bringing forth (protizvedeni) Your faithful [imperial] subjects (Vashy vernye podannye) from the darkness of ignorance (is t’my nevedeniia) into the glorious theater of the world (na feart slavy vsego sveta), and, as it were (i tako reshchi), from non-being into being (iz nebytiia v bytiye).” For the published text of Golovkin’s speech, see Rech’, kakova [...] ego imperatorskomu velichestvu [...] ot gospodina kantslera grafa Golovkina govoreva v 22 den’ oktiabria 1721 godu (SPb. 1721); and Pamiatniki russkogo prava: Zakonodatel’nye akti Petra I (M., 1961), vyp. 8, here 167. For the question of authorship, see Ageeva, “Titul ‘imperator,’” op. cit., 2.

31 The line about the “fledglings of Peter’s nest” comes from A. S. Pushkin’s poem, “Poltava” (1828), where it is used to characterize the “ill-assorted” (raznoshersnye) members of Peter’s “company.” By referring to Peter’s “fledglings,” Pushkin was appropriating (and subverting) a panegyrical trope dating to the Russian Imperial Eagle (1667) of Simeon of Polotsk. In that panegyrical work, tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich appears as the “king” of birds, flying towards the sun (representing Jesus Christ, the Sun/Son of Righteousness), alongside his heirs—“eaglets.” This same image would later become one of Peter Alekseevich’s personal devices. By applying this panegyrical trope to what he imagined as the socially-, nationally-, and morally-mixed entourage of Peter I, Pushkin sought to denigrate the “wisdom” of the “great” Russian monarch (and, by implication, his contemporary follower, tsar Nicholas I). In this respect, Pushkin’s approach to the trope of Peter’s “eaglets” echoed the subversive tactics of his literary brothers from the “Arzamas society.” For the text of “Poltava,” see A. S. Pushkin, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii (L., 1977), vol. 4, here 214. For a historical appropriation of
eighteenth-century heirs understood their own imperial vocation. Rather than proving
the existence of a secular well-ordered police state, Golovkin’s 1721 speech hinted at
the loose configuration of parties, responsible for re-drawing the official boundaries
between the sacred and the profane, the modern and the traditional, the native and the
foreign for the rest of the eighteenth century. The speech also emphasized the role
which the members of the tsar’s personal retinue, played, and would continue to play in
guarding the memory of Petrine enlightened absolutism – the reality of which was
neither enlightened, in the eighteenth-century sense of the word, nor wholly absolutist.
The archbishop of Novgorod and Pskov played a central role in this project of recasting
and commemorating the Petrine legacy.\textsuperscript{32} Feofan invented and applied most of the
panegyrical tropes by which his contemporaries understood the redemptive significance
of Peter’s personal sacrifices. During his long and productive life, this ambitious,
ruthless, and politically-savvy Orthodox cleric would not hesitate to sanction the use of
force in order to spread the absolutist gospel of Peter I.\textsuperscript{33} Under the leadership of such

\textsuperscript{32} On Feofan’s post-Petrine career, and particularly his key role in the “absolutist” resolution of
the “affair of 1730,” see Cracraft, \textit{op. cit.}

\textsuperscript{33} Seeing himself as the tsar’s personal “apostle to the gentiles” (i.e. the Orthodox Muscovites),
Feofan took advantage of his position as the most important person in the administrative hierarchy of the
enlighteners as Feofan and Gavriilo Golovkin, the Most Holy Governing Synod would come to take its place alongside the imperial Russian Senate, and even the court itself, as the official guarantor of Peter’s “Transfigured Kingdom.”

At the same time, ideas about the personal and charismatic basis of royal authority found expression in the ideal of the “reforming tsar,” who was surrounded by a group of loyal disciples and freed from all institutional constraints. Even as the formal apparatus of imperial administration continued to expand, every monarch after Peter would rely on his own “company” – people, who derived their power from proximity to the monarch, who dedicated themselves to the monarch’s reforming projects, and whose administrative role transcended the framework of existing ruling bodies. Indeed, the paradoxes of the Petrine project of Orthodox imperial renewal, which demanded both the routinization of sovereignty and the persistence of royal charisma, continued to shape the scenarios of power staged by the supporters of the Russian autocracy throughout the imperial period.34

34 Whittaker, op. cit.; Wortman, op. cit., 2 vols.
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APPENDIX

Towards a Prosopography of the Transfigured Kingdom

The history of Peter’s court is the history of the Transfigured Kingdom, and the story of the latter cannot be written without at least mentioning the “Unholy Council” (neosviashchennyi sobor) of the “Prince Pope.” As an obvious parody of the Muscovite Holy Council (osviashchennyi sobor), Peter’s mock church constituted an integral part of the counter-cultural play-world, created on the fields of the suburban royal estate of Novo-Preobrazhenskoe, at the turn of the seventeenth century. Indeed, all of the “clerics” listed below were “subordinated” to “Prince Caesar” F. Iu. Romodanovskii, the mock “King of Pressburg,” as well as his spiritual counterpart. More importantly, however, all of them also held some other rank within the official military, civilian, or court hierarchies of the “well-ordered police state.” It is this fact that justifies making the effort to identify the courtiers concealed behind the obscene pseudonyms and to reconstruct the social composition of Peter’s Transfigured Kingdom. This appendix – a catalogue of all known members of Peter’s mock ecclesiastical council – is the first step in that direction.

Regardless of their religion, nationality, rank, or social station, all of the members of Peter’s entourage shared three common traits: [1] intimate access to the person of the tsar; [2] a commitment to the tsar’s reforming mission; and/or [3] a belief in Peter’s personal gift of grace. The core membership of this Transfigured Kingdom was a remarkably cohesive and ideologically-committed group of Muscovite courtiers, who referred to themselves as the tsar’s “company” (kompaniia). This cadre group consisted of the young tsar’s kinsmen, friends, and political allies and was composed of some of the very same people who had organized the 1689 court coup, which had put the Naryshkin candidate on the throne. The original members of the “Unholy Council” came from this small group, which was responsible for organizing the spectacles, devising the rituals, and supervising the induction of other courtiers into the “mysteries” of the Transfigured Kingdom.

While the actual authors of the “sacred parodies” (Lat. parodia sacra) assumed minor ranks within the mock ecclesiastical hierarchy (e.g. “Deacon Peter”; “Arch-Deacon Gideon”), the leading actors – the ones who were given the most prominent roles and who were forced to play the most demeaning parts in these spectacles (e.g. the “Prince Pope” and the other “Arch-Hierarchs”) – were usually older men, who were often ambivalent towards the changes introduced by the young tsar and his entourage.1 Their

---

1 A prime example of this type is “Metropolitan” I. I. Khovanskii the Elder, a courtier tainted by his familial ties to the leaders of the Moscow mutiny of 1682. Khovanskii was reputed to have described his induction into the mock ecclesiastical council as follows: “God had given me a [martyr’s] crown, but I lost it. They took me to the General’s Yard at Preobrazhenskoe, [where] Nikita Zotov
adherence to what the “company” defined as “outmoded” Muscovite values only heightened the polemical charge of the rituals meant to evoke their humorous discomfort. All the other people inducted into the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope,” served both as the supporting cast and as the main spectators of this carnivalesque “scenario of power.”

Over the course of the reign, as the core group became dispersed to all the corners of the empire, this mock church expanded its membership base and spawned its own imitators. Both trends were encouraged by the fact that, after the founding of St. Petersburg, the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope” became an important part of Petrine public celebrations. Thus, one can imagine that whenever the court would get together to celebrate Yuletide, the launching of a ship, or yet another military victory, the far-flung members of the tsar’s “company” would bring with them the “clerics” (local officials, junior officers, etc.) whom they had inducted into the royalist cause. However, these trends also subverted the original purpose of the mock church, so that by the end of the reign, the travesties associated with the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Prince Pope” became no more important than the other carnivalesque elements of the masquerades celebrating the Kingdom Transfigured. In this way, even before Peter’s death, the “Unholy Council” had become just another element within the Imperial Russian court’s new, St. Petersburg-based, social calendar – “an

ordained me as a metropolitan, and for the renunciation [i.e., pledge of belief in Bacchus] they gave me a scroll, and in accordance with that writ I made my renunciation [of Bog “in favor of Bag”]. During the renunciation they asked me instead of “Do you believe?” [in the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost, the standard question of the Orthodox catechism], “Do you drink?” And with my renunciation I lost more than the beard I disputed. It would have been better for me to receive the crown of martyrdom than to have effected such a renunciation.” See the “testimony” of Grigori Talitskii (1700), in G. V. Esipov, Raskol’nich’i dela XVIII stoletii (SPb., 1861), 68-69.

2 Based on a qualitative analysis of the (admittedly fragmentary evidence), it is clear, for example, that the number of “arch-hierarchs” [ = the higher levels of the hierarchy, composed of bishops, archbishops, metropolitan, abbots, abbeses, and archimandrites] who attended the St. Petersburg masquerade of 1723 was much higher than the number mentioned in Peter’s 1698 letter to Vinius. See Peter to A. A. Vinius (9 July 1698), PIB, I: 265, 741. Even if one includes “ianikit, the Patriarch of Pressburg” and “Andrei, the Patriarch of Palestine,” alongside “the three metropolitans” mentioned in this letter, it is clear that by the end of Peter’s reign, the top echelons of the mock ecclesiastical hierarchy increased dramatically. This increase corresponds to the veritable explosion in the number of lower-ranked “servitors” of the “Arch-Prince Pope.”

3 Three “institutions” of note are [1] what may be described as a “Ladies’ Auxiliary,” based around the St. Petersburg court of the new royal consort, tsaritsa Catherine Alekseevna and her ladies-in-waiting; [2] the “Great British monastery,” a foreign “affiliate” of the mock ecclesiastical council, composed of those British, German, and Dutch men and women who were, in one way or another, connected to serving the needs of the Russian court; originally based in Moscow, the “Great British Monastery” re-organized itself into a St. Petersburg-based “Bung College,” in preparation for the 1721 wedding of “Prince Pope” P. I. Bunulin; and, finally, [3] the parody of Peter’s mock church, centered around the court of tsarevich Aleksei Petrovich.
institutionalized artifact of Peter’s youth,”

when his position at the Muscovite court,
and Muscovy’s position within the concert of Christian sovereigns was still in flux.

1690s-1710

P. A. Romanov (1672-1725) – “Humble deacon Peter”; “Protodeacon Piter”;
Protodeacon Pitirim”; “Protodeacon Pachomius. Crams with his Prick Mikhailov” (pakhom pikhai khui Mikhailov), servant (sluzhitel’) of the “Arch-Prince Pope”

V. A. Sokovnin (d. 1697) – “Prophet (prorok)”

T. N. Streshnev (1649-1719) – “Right Reverend Tikhon”; “Metropolitan of Novgorod”

Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii (d. 1718) – “Generallissimus Friedrich (Rus. Fridrikh)”; “King of Pressburg”; “Prince Caesar (Kniaz’-Kesar’)”; “Anti-Caesar (Anti-Tsesar’)”

M. F. Naryshkin (d. 1692) – “Patriarch Deary (Patriarkh Milak)”


5 However, the fact that, on the eve of his death, the tsar was planning to organize the “election” of yet another “Prince Pope” demonstrates that more than thirty years into his reign, Peter was not as secure as he wanted to be. Indeed, the fact that this “election” coincided with the beginning of another wave of repression against the court and the St. Petersburg-based political elite, suggests that the two events may have been connected. See infra, Conclusion.

6 Peter to F. M. Apraksin (ca. April 1695), PiB, I: 28.

7 Collective “epistle” to A. D. Menshikov (March 1706), in PiB, 4: 184.

8 PiB, 2:126-128.

9 Undated list of the “servants (sluzhiteli) of the Arch-Prince Pope (arkhi kniaz-papy)” (before 1722), in Semevskii, 313-314.

10 See above, Chapter Two.

11 Peter to A. A. Vinius (9 July 1698), PiB, I: 265, 741. In addition to his “sovereign” and “His Holiness,” Peter mentions three archhierarchs (Tikhon, Misail and Aleksii), “presbyter Alexander the Hairy One,” and “deacon Gavrill the Long-Lived One”

12 RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. 129, fol. 22; see infra, Chapter Four.

13 Peter to Prince F. Iu. Romodanovskii, PiB, I: 29-30, mentions the latter’s “capitol city, Pressburg (stol’nyi grad Presspurkh).”

14 See above, Chapters Two, Four, and Five.
I. A. Musin-Pushkin – “Iannikii, Metropolitan of Kiev and Gaditsia
[sic. Galicia?]” (mitropolit Kievskii i Gaditskii);16 “His Meekness Anikit of Kiev and Galicia”17

G. I. Golovkin (1660-1734) – “Deacon Gavriil the Long-Lived (diakon Gavriil Dolgoveshchnyi);18 “Gavriil, protodeacon [of His Meekness Anikit] of Kiev (Kievskogo protodiakon)” 19

N. M. Zotov (d. 1718) – “Most Holy Patriarch (sviateishii patriarkh)”;20 “Great Sovereign, His Holiness, Sir Ianikit, Archbishop of Pressburg and Patriarch of all lauza and Kokui”;21 “Prince Pope (Kniaz’-Papa)” (ca. 1693-1718)22

I. I. Buturlin the Elder (d. 1711) – “Generalissimus Johann (Rus. Iagan) of the Semenovsk regiment”;23 “King of Semenovsk”; “The Polish King”


15 See supra, Chapter Two.


17 From the undated (ca. September 1710) “collective epistle” written by “Prince Pope” (N. M. Zotov), see RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. 1 (1710 g.), ed. khr. 11, fols. 189, 189v., 190, 190v.; and RO RNB, f. 824, op. 2, No. 200, fols. 20-20v., 26.

18 PiB, I: 265, 741.

19 From the undated (ca. September 1710) “collective epistle” written by “Prince Pope” (N. M. Zotov), see RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. 1 (1710 g.), ed. khr. 11, fols. 189, 189v., 190, 190v.; and RO RNB, f. 824, op. 2, No. 200, fols. 20-20v., 26.

20 Peter to F. M. Apraksin (11 October 1693), PiB, I: 17-18, 491. It appears that just one year after the death of “Patriarch Deary,” dumnyi diak N. M. Zotov had taken his place as the head of the mock ecclesiastical council of the “Transfigured Kingdom.”

21 Peter to Prince F. Ju. Romonovskii (10 June 1695), PiB, I: 31-32, mentions “otets nash velikii gospodin sviateishii kir Ianikit, arkhiepiskap Preshpurshkii i vseia lauzy i vsego Kokuiu patriarkh,” a pun on the full title of the Russian Orthodox patriarch, “vsesviateishii kir Adrian, Bozhiei milost’u arkhiepiskop Moskovskii i vsea Rossi i vsekh severnykh stran patriarkh.” See Peter to patriarch Adrian (19 July 1695), ibid., 41. New geographical references could be added at will to Zotov’s patriarchal title; see, for example, ibid., 520-521 (“Archbishop of Paris”); and ibid. 532-533 (“Ianikit of Pressburg and Azov and Patriarch of all the Lower Lands from Down There [in the Crimea] (vsekh tamoshnikh ponizovyk stran patriarkh).”

22 See above, Chapters One and Four.

Palestinskii or patriarkh Palestinskii" 25  
A. P. Protas'ev – "Presbyter Aleksander the Hirsute (presviter Aleksandr Volosaty)' 26  
Prince M. N. L'vov (d. 1704) – "Right-Reverend [Metropolitan] Misail  
(prosvishchennyi Misail)" 27  
Prince M. F. Zhirovoi-Zasekin – "His Meekness, the Right Reverend Misail,  
Metropolitan of Kazan' and Sviazhsk" (Smirennyi Prosvishchennyi Mitropolit Misail Kazanskii i Sviashskii) 28  
F. P. Shanskii – "Prastav" and "parishioner" (soborian) of "Patriarch Andrei of  
Palestine" 30  
I. I. Khovanskii the Elder (d. 1701) – "Metropolitan"  
Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi (ca. 1672-1713) – "Archdeacon Gideon (arkhidiakon  
Gedeon)"; 31  "Cavalier of the Order of Judas" (1709-1713) 32

24 Peter to A. A. Vinius (17-28 September 1696), PiB, I: 110, 606.

25 "Andrei, Patriarch of Palestine" to Peter (23 July 1697), ibid., I: 628.

26 PiB, I: 265, 741.

27 PiB, I: 265, 631, 632, 644, 741. From 1685-1687, Prince M. N. L'vov was one of Peter's  
privy (komnatnyi) stol'nik; from 1687 to 1692, he served as an okol' nichii; from 1692 until 1704 (the  
year of his death?), he served as a boiar. See Airapeti'ian, 332; 322; 317. The Prince was married to  
Neonila ("Chiiiliuka") Erofeevna, Peter's former wet-nurse (kormilitsa). See PiB, ibid.; and E. F.  
Shmurlo, "Kriticheskie zamenki po istoriy Petra Velikogo, IX: V chest' kakogo sviatogo Petr Velikiia  
poluchil svoe imia." Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveshcheniia 330(July-August 1900): 209-222,  
here 212-213.

28 From the undated (ca. September 1710) "collective epistle" written by "Prince Pope" (N. M.  
Zotov), see RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. I (1710 g.), ed. kir. 11, fols. 189, 189v., 190, 190v.; and  
RO RNB, f. 824, op. 2, No. 200, fols. 20-20v., 26. On the (unverified) identification of Prince M. F.  
Zhirovoi-Zasekin as the mock metropolitan of Kazan', see L. N. Semenova, "Tserkovnye  
preobrazovaniia v pervoi chetverti XVIII v.," Voprosy nauchnogo ateizma 25 (1980), 132.; and idem,  
Ocherki istorii byta i kul'turnoi zhizni Rossii, pervaia polovina XVIII v. (L., 1982), 187.

29 Peter to A. A. Vinius (9 July 1698), PiB, I: 265, 741.

30 "Patriarch Andrei of Palestine" to Peter (ca. 1690s), in RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 4, ch. I.  
No. 53, fol. 504, mentions "prastav. Filat Shanskii" as one of his "parishioners" (soboriane); others  
include "the priest (sviashchennik) Feodor," "deacon Prince Iurii [F. Shakhovskoi]," and "the Ataman of  
Lapland (Lapskii ataman)." It is of royal councilors (boiar'skie spiski) confirm that contrary to common  
assertions, F. P. Shanskii did not die immediately after his 1694 wedding; in 1694-1695 he served as a  
rank-and-file (riadovoi) stol'nik. See Airapeti'ian, 431; infra, Chapter Four.

31 "Patriarch Andrei of Palestine" to Peter (ca. 1690s), in RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 4, ch. I.  
No. 53, fol. 504, mentions "deacon Prince Iurii" [Prince Iu. F. Shakhovskoi?] as one of his  
"parishioners" (soborean).

32 See above, Chapter Three.
Prince M. G. Romodanovskii – “Right Reverend [Metropolitan] Mikey (Preosviaschenniy Mishura)” (1709)

P. I. Buturlin (d. 1723) – “Metropolitan Petro-Prick (Petrokhui) of Izhorsk and St. Petersburg”;33 “Prince Pope (Kniaz’-Papa)” (1718-1723)34


[N. N.] – “Priest (sviaschennik) Feodor”36

[N. N.] – “Protopresbyter (protopresviter) Feodor”37

I. M. Golovin (1672-1737)38 – “Prince Johann (loagan), Master-Craftsman (kniaz’-Bas)”; “Chief Surveyor (obor-sarvair)” (ca. 1717-1720)

[N. N.] – “Paul, Metropolitan of Great Britain” (mitropolit Velikobritanskii)39

[N. N.] – “Nominee (naminat) Kuska”; “Priest (dukhovnik) Koz’ma”40

William P. Loyd – “Archdeacon”41

1718-1721

Prince I. F. Romodanovskii – “Prince Abbott (kniaz’-igumen)” (1718); “Prince

33 P. I. Buturlin to Peter (5 January 1709), in Senevskii, 288.

34 See above, Chapter Four.

35 Peter to F. M. Apraksin (29 August 1694), PiB, I: 25-26; see also Peter to F. M. Apraksin (ca. April 1695), PiB, I: 28.

36 “Patriarch Andrei of Palestine” to Peter (ca. 1690s). in RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 4, ch. 1, No. 53, fol. 504, mentions the “priest (sviaschennik) Feodor” [F. A. Golovin?] as one of his “parishioners” (soboriane).

37 From the undated (ca. September 1710) “collective epistle” written by “Prince Pope” (N. M. Zotov), see RGADA, f. 9, otd. II, op. 3, ch. 1 (1710 g.), ed. khr. 11, fols. 189, 189v., 190, 190v.; and RO RNB, f. 824, op. 2, No. 200, fols. 20-20v., 26, where he is (incorrectly) identified as F. A. Golovin (d. 1706).

38 Lindsey Hughes, “‘For the Health of the Sons of Ivan Mikhailovich’: I. M. Golovin and Peter the Great’s Mock Court.” Paper delivered at International Conference of Study Group of Eighteenth-Century Russia, Leiden, July 1999.


40 “Patent” to William Peter Loyd (10 August 1709), in Platonov, I: 532. Platonov suggests that “Nominitus Kuska” may have been the same person as “priest Koz’ma,” who is mentioned in a letter from P. I. Buturlin to Peter, in Senevskii, 290-291.

Caesar” (1718-1725)\textsuperscript{42}

D. G. Sokovnina (nee Rzhevskaka) – “Princess Abbess”; “Arch-Abbess (arkhi-
igumen’i)a”\textsuperscript{43}

Princess P. A. Prozorovskaia (nee Golitsyna) – “Princess Abbess (kniaaz’-igumen’i)a” (1718-1729)\textsuperscript{44}

[N.N.] Mukhanov – unranked servant (sluzhitel’) of the “Arch-Prince Pope”\textsuperscript{45}

[I. I.?] Buturlin – “Deacon John (Russ. Ion),” servant (sluzhitel’) of the “Arch-Prince Pope”

[N. N.] Apraksin – “Sacristan” (kliuchar’)

[N. N.] Khilkov – “Sacristan”

[N. N.] Subbota – “Sacristan”

[I. A.?] Musin-Pushkin – “Vestry” (rizhnichii)

[N. N.] Repnin – Ustavshchik

[N. N.] Shusherin – “Priest Feofan”


[N. N.] Voeikov – “Deacon”

[N. N.] Ronov – “Deacon”

[N. N.] Shemiakin – “Deacon”

[N. N.] Prozorovskii – “Sub-Deacon Filaret”

Stepan Vasil’ev (“The Bear”) Medvedev (d. 23 February 1722)\textsuperscript{46} – “Crozier-Bearer (pososhnik)” and “Sub-Deacon” (ipodiakon)

[N. N.] Lushkov – “Blagochinnoi” and “Sub-Deacon”

S. Ia. Turgenev\textsuperscript{47} – “Groznii” and “Sub-Deacon”

[N. N.] Kolovskii – “Gerfalcon-keeper” (krehetnik) and “Sub-Deacon”

[N. N.] Palibin – “Lopatchik” and “Sub-Deacon”

[N. N.] Gubin – “Sub-Deacon”

\textsuperscript{42} See above. Chapter Five.

\textsuperscript{43} See above. Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{44} See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. No. 186, fols. 31v.; and above, Chapter Five.

\textsuperscript{45} Undated list of the “servants (sluzhiteli) of the Arch-Prince Pope (arkhi kniaz-popy)” (before 1722), in Semevskii, 313-314.

\textsuperscript{46} For the career of Stepan “The Bear” (medved’) Medvedev-Vasil’ev, a commoner who went from being a watchman in Novo-Poebrazhensk (storožh Serzhanskogo dvora), to a rank-and-file soldier in the Poebrazhensk guards’ regiment, and then to one of the tsar’s personal household servants (sluzhitel’ dome tsarskogo velichestva), see S. F. Platonov, “Iz bytovoi istorii Petrovskoi epokhi. II. Liubimtsy Petra Velikogo: Medved’, Bitka i dr.,” Izvestiia AN SSSR. Series 6 (1926), 655-678, esp. 659-663; for the date of his death, see 662.

\textsuperscript{47} In 1711, Peter promoted this rank-and-file (riadovoi) stol’nik (1692-1710) to the rank of dummyi dvorianin. See Airapet’ian, op. cit., 67: 421; 328. In 1725, Turgenev was listed as belonging to the tsar’s personal household staff (sluzhitel’ dome ego velichestva). See Platonov, op. cit., 664.
[N. N.] Vasil’ev – “Sub-Deacon”
[N. N.] Timashev – “Sub-Deacon”
[N. N.] Klucharev – “Sub-Deacon”
[N. N.] Likharev – “Sub-Deacon”
[N. N.] Kozyrev – “Novgorodian scribe (pod”iachii)” and “Sub-Deacon”
Grigoriy [N.] Kashnin – “Siberian commandant” and “Sub-Deacon”
[N. N.] Trokhaniatov – “Sub-Deacon”
Ivan Losev – “Clerk (d’iak)”
Osip Metlin – “Clerk (d’iak)”

1723

[N. N.] Streshneva – “Arch-Abbess”
F. P. Sheremetev – “Arch-hierarch”
Prince Iu. F. Shcherbatov – “Arch-hierarch”
M. V. Kolychev – “Arch-hierarch”
Mikhailo [N.] Sobakin – “Arch-hierarch”
Prince Io. I. Lobanov-Rostovskii – “Arch-hierarch”
Matvei Golovin – “Arch-hierarch”
Vasiliy Rzhhevskoi – “Arch-hierarch”
Anton Savelov – “Arch-hierarch”
Ivan Denisov, son of Subota, a.k.a. [on zhe] Danilov – “Sacristan” (kliuchar’)
Fedor Protas’ev – “Sacristan” (kliuchar’)
Prince M. M. Obolenskoi – “Priest”
Vasiliy, a.k.a. [on zhe] Samoila, Glebov – “Priest”
I. R. Streshnev – “Priest”
Lev Voeikov – “Deacon”
[N. N.] Strov – “Archdeacon”; servant (sluzhitel’) of the “Arch-Prince
Pope” 50; the last “Prince Pope”

48 RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. No. 186, fols. 31v. During the 1723 masquerade in St.
Petersburg, there were eight “metropolitans,” all with obscure pseudonymous names and titles; they
were attended by “archdeacon” Strov and “sacristan” Protas’ev. See RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr.
No. 186, fol. 30v. There was also an unspecified number of mock clerics known as the “Sleepless
Cloister” (neuspaaemaia obitel’), which was headed by a mock “archimandrite,” and included, among
other “servants” (sluzhashchich obitelia), the families of guards officers (fendrik) Afonasiy Tatishchev
and “Iaraslav Prince” and fendrik Vasiliy Neliubokhchin. RGADA, f. 156, op. 1, ed. khr. No. 186, fol.
27v.

49 This, and the following names, are from P. I. Buturlin to Vice-Governor Voeikov (23 April
1723), in Semevskii, 312-313. For a prosopographical analysis of this document, see Ernest Zitser,
“Reestr” of the Unholy Synod of Fools and Drunkards,” Paper presented at the “Colloquium on Pre-
Petrine Russia,” Columbia University (NY, 1995).
50 Undated list of the “servants (sluzhiteli) of the Arch-Prince Pope (arkhi kniaz-papy)” (before 1722), in Semevskii, 313-314.
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