

Konstantin Erusalimsky  
Moscow

## The Notion of People in Medieval and Early-Modern Russia

It is difficult to find in Medieval Russia a social discourse as a set of énoncés on rules and principles of communal life and on their implementation. Historians of social thought negate capacity of Muscovites to produce social theory until the late XVII century. Shouldn't we change our optics and look for it in other place? European authors of XVI and XVII centuries were pioneers in juridical study of societies, but their theories do not seem now compatible with what was called "social theory" in the Enlightenment or what we may call social theory now.<sup>1</sup> In that sense the late XVII century, and the large part of the next century haven't yielded essential changes in Russia, despite rapid and numerous reforms: "Russia's civil society of educated" (*obshchestvo*) arose only in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century and at the time did not describe a universalist society encompassing all citizens. Thus although educated Russians invoked concepts such as "the public" (*publica*), "society" (*obshchestvo*), and "the people" (*narod*) that transcended social particularism, historians must be wary of applying the nineteenth-century meanings of these categories to eighteenth-century social relationships. Similarly, they must be wary of applying the categories of sociology and political theory — for example, Habermas's "bourgeois public sphere" — to historical contexts in which comparable categories had not yet been articulated. The historian who seeks to recover the voices of the people would do well to employ the language, categories, and concepts articulated by those very people. This can be well nigh impossible with respect to people who did not express themselves in writing, and with respect to those who

<sup>1</sup> А.Ю. Согомонов, П.Ю. Уваров, *Открытие социального (парадокс XVI века)*, „Одиссей”, 2001, М., 2001. С. 199-215.

did leave a written record, the discernible voices of a particular historical context, like the manifestations of social agency, can leave historians with a multiplicity of discrete articulations.<sup>2</sup> Vera Tolz was even more pessimistic, pointing that making up of the Russian nation had been up till the moment when she wrote her book a “failed project”, in which an imperial doctrine suppressed a contract conception of the nation, and a long-term antagonism between elites and masses impeded development of universalist social categories. Tolz makes reference to the category “people” which, in her view, didn’t encompass in Russia a typical for the European Early-Modern period social stratum — bourgeoisie.<sup>3</sup>

Among notions by which Russian educated society of the late XVIII and early XIX century described itself, earlier Russia and Russian lands under the power of grand princes of Moscow weren’t acquainted with the one (*публика*), and didn’t use the other one to describe societies (*общество*). The nearest to social identities was the word “people” (*народ*), and in my present analysis I’m going to make its meaning more distinct against the background of the Russian social thesaurus of XVIII and XIX centuries. Russian “people” was invented and discovered as an agent of the past by XIX century historians-populists from Slavophil circles. This term was controversial, disputable, it didn’t have a stable referent. With its help Nikolay Polevoy criticized Karamzin’s “History of the Russian State”, Slavophiles polemized with Westernizers about ways of development of Russia and sought to prescribe it the idea of original unity of Slavic peoples. Vasily Kluchevsky summarized historical-terminological discussions and pointed out that pre-XVII century sources do not mention “Russian people”. According to Zenon Kohut, in Ukrainian intellectual thought of XIX century the notion of people “also allowed the historian to oppose the (Ukrainian) *people* to the (Russian) absolutist *state*, thus implicitly stressing the separateness of Ukrainian history from Russian.”<sup>4</sup> Nancy Kollmann writes, that social conceptions in Early-Modern Russia were known in texts which had weak manuscript traditions, were quite limited number of copies, rarely read and unpopular (“*Secreta secretorum*”, “*Domostroy*”, letters of Ivan Peresvetov, Ivan the Terrible, Andrei Kurbskii). In sum, in Kollmann’s view all these theories

---

<sup>2</sup> E.K. Wirtschafter, *In Search of the People, In Search of Russia*, “Russian Review”, 2001, Vol. 60, No 4, p. 497-504, here p. 501.

<sup>3</sup> V. Tolz, *Russia: Inventing the Nation*, London, 2001, pp. 15, 86.

<sup>4</sup> Z.E. Kohut, *The Development of a Ukrainian National Historiography in Imperial Russia*, in: *Historiography of Imperial Russia: The Profession and Writing of History in a Multinational State*, New York, 1999. pp. 453-477, here p. 461.

“were not systematized and their influence was insignificant.”<sup>5</sup> Although copies of theory-bearing texts were dispersed abundantly in the XVII century, we cannot be, of course, satisfied with such data. Except editorial remarks on books with these copies, we know too little about how such potentially theoretical texts were read in Medieval Russia. The heritage of the Bible and Patrology drew more attention of bibliophiles, scribes, and readers. Did it have theoretical potential?

There is no direct answer to this question. The notion of society is absent in texts, based on the “Genesis”, devoted to emergence of the world and spread in Russian lands in sacred and historical compilations and in the comments on Bible. God didn’t have intention to create societies, so that they could be imagined by the readers of these texts as a fruit of transgressions and sins. Other creatures could serve a model for human beings and, in fact, were not separated from them by impassable barriers. Not surprisingly, the first community mentioned in the “Chronograph of 1512” in the chapter titled “On four great seas” has to do not with human beings in the strict sense, but rather with monsters: “Thus, the first great sea verges on mankind with dogs’ heads”. It seems to me comprehensible, that the main abstract notion for collectives in Slavonic and Old-Russian is “narod” (later an equivalent for the “people”) and “rod” (later an equivalent for the “kin”) which encompass any set of creatures, and not necessarily human beings. The readers of the “Chronograph” could find out, that there are many other communities along with mankind. All of them finally are subordinated to Adam, but it is again quite unusual for modern social thought, in that first and ideal society includes just two representatives of mankind and many other creatures who serve them as slaves to their masters. All changes which occurred after the Paradise was lost and especially after the Tower of Babel collapse led to appearance of “tsardoms”, “princedom”, “countries”, “languages”, and “peoples”.

To some extent medieval people didn’t care about identities. First, they normally had several, being part of more than one community stricto sensu. Any question on to what community he or she belongs would have

---

<sup>5</sup> Н.Ш. Коллманн, *Соединенные чesтью. Государство и общество в России раннего нового времени*, Пер. с англ. А.Б. Каменский; Науч. ред. Б.Н. Флоря. М.: Древлехранилище, 2001, С. 104; N.S. Kollmann, *Concepts of Society and Social Identity in Early Modern Russia*, in: *Religion and Culture in Early Modern Russia and Ukraine*, Ed. by S.H. Baron, N.S. Kollmann. DeKalb, 1997, pp. 34–35, 45. n. 3. Nevertheless, this generalisation seems to me questionable. All above-mentioned texts exist in large manuscript traditions and in numerous fragments, extracts, citations and remakings. An opposite H.Sh. Kollmann’s opinion lacks chronological gradation and comparative criteria and is not supported by works mentioned in the note of her article.

been confusing as far as for the readers of the “Chronograph” it contains *contradictio in adjecto*. On the other hand, such questions met quite simple answers in narrow contexts of everyday life, which were no less far from social theories whatever: “I am from Vladimir”, “We are men of Dormition of Virgin”, “I am prince Ivan’s man” etc. Second, Russian political elites and their supporters didn’t come up with ideas of social coherency either. The only analogue for Medieval conception of king’s two bodies and its attributes could be grand prince’s titles, and they also included not peoples, but tsardoms, principedoms, lands, regions. In many other respects, including those which presupposed the power — people relations, Russian elites knew one body of the king, his natural, physical body, mortal and sacred at the same time. And third, beyond Bible and prince’s bodies, until the late XVII century Russians had apparently no coherent identities for themselves as distinct social or political body.<sup>6</sup> They had the “Russian land”, but since XIV century there were at least three Russian lands as political units which pertained to different sovereigns — Polish kings, grand princes of Lithuania and grand princes of North-Eastern Rus’. They did have their “people”, but it wasn’t unified as well and the meaning of the term seems to be in a sense broader and in a sense narrower than what the term “nation” meant in up-to-date Europe.<sup>7</sup>

One of the most troublesome semantic constellations appears to be the term “Russian” and its derivatives. It doesn’t grow precise in terms of lands, peoples and languages implied. In the XV and XVI centuries it turns into historical and at the same time projected identity with numerous implications which corresponded sporadically to meanings of earlier sources.

---

<sup>6</sup> In Old-Russian word “общество” and its paronyms meanings of involvement, communion, religious solidarity prevail. Still, there is no evident reasons either to oppose, to demarcate in any way Russian equivalents for Greek *κοινωνία* and *κοινός* or to deny that their Russian calques have societal connotations (see: *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)*. М., 2002. Т. V. С. 566–572).

<sup>7</sup> N.Sh. Kollmann in her article refers to P. Bushkovitch, M. Cherniavsky, A.N. Nasonov and D.B. Miller and maintains that “studies of Muscovite ‘national’ consciousness find the root principle to be religious, rather than social — elite writers depict the society as the Godly Christian community, not as a cohesive political unity of a common people” (Kollmann N.S., *Concepts of Society...*, pp. 38-39). The skipped correlate of this contrasting makes an effect of differentiation. But it is just the effect. No less successfully, I think, we could have construct some “religious social” community without contrasts between “social” and “religious” in medieval Europe till latest repercussions of Medieval Ages (see, for example: E.H. Kantorowicz, *Pro Patria Mori in Medieval Political Thought*, “American Historical Review”, 1951, No 56, pp. 487-492; P.J. Geary, *The Myth of Nations. The Medieval Origins of Europe*, Princeton, Oxford, 2002, pp. 52-56, 68-69; Ж. Ле Гофф, *Замечание о трехчленном обществе, монархической идеологии и экономическом пробуждении в христианстве IX–XII веков*, in: *idem*, *Другое Средневековье: Время, труд и культура Запада*, перев. с франц. С.В. Чистяковой, Н.В. Шевченко под ред. В.А. Бабинцева. 2-е изд., испр. Екатеринбург, 2002, С. 58-62).

Those which are found in ambassadorial documents are controversial, most of them compete with notions of “Russian” in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and ambassadorial texts mention them in order to stage their implications, and the more they do it, the less we are likely to accept it at its face value.<sup>8</sup> Muscovite writers called their land “Russian” often in lamentations, mournful contexts or in abstract ideas without direct relation to topographic reality.<sup>9</sup> Polish and Lithuanian ethnography both divided Russians and Muscovites, and gave buttress for their unification. Sovereigns with help of their diplomatic services and propaganda did their best to equate the notions of Russian lands to all-Russian ambitions in their titles.<sup>10</sup> And of course, the speculations on unified “Russian land” as ethnic entity, ethnically,

---

<sup>8</sup> J. Pelenski, *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus'*, N. Y., 1998; M. Khodarkovsky, *“Third Rome” or a Tributary State: A View of Moscow from the Steppe*, “Die Geschichte Russlands im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert aus der Perspektive seiner Regionen“, Wiesbaden 2004, pp. 363–374; А.И. Фильюшкин, *Проблема генезиса Российской империи*, “Новая имперская история пост-советского пространства”, Казань 2004, С. 375-408.

<sup>9</sup> The perspectives of reinterpretation of these notions in their relation with the topic of sacred heritage are outlined in: М.В. Дмитриев, *Представления о «русском» в культуре Московской Руси XVI века*, in: Общество, государство, верховная власть в России в Средние века и раннее Новое время в контексте истории Европы и Азии (X–XVIII столетия): Междунар. конф., посвящ. 100-летию со дня рождения акад. Л. В. Черепнина. Москва, 30 ноября — 2 декабря 2005 г.: Тезисы докл. и сообщений. Препринт, М., 2005, С. 182-187. Based on the *Tale of princes of Vladimir* and its manuscript tradition, some researchers are inclined to find in these two tendencies interrelated parts of one doctrine: Maniscalco Basile G., *Power and Words of Power: Political, Juridical and Religious Vocabulary in some Ideological Documents in 16-th-Century Russia*, in: Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte. Beiträge zur “7. Internationalen Konferenz zur Geschichte des Kiever und des Moskauer Reiches”, Berlin 1995., Bd. 50, pp. 51-79; А.Л. Хорошкевич, *Россия в системе международных отношений середины XVI века*, М., 2003.

<sup>10</sup> The notion “Russian land” is still in use in XVI century not only in historical texts, but in such an actual language as diplomatic as well. The translations of the papers of Danish ambassadors Klaus Urne with “his comrades” in the course of negotiations in Moscow in April 1559 contain notions “rusaki” (Russians) for the subjects of the tsar, fragments about merchants coming “в рускую землю” (to Russian land) with the meaning of the land of Russian tsar and his Russian subjects (РГАДА. Ф. 53 (Сношения России с Данией). Оп. 1. Кн. 1. Л. 37 об.; see also in the letter of Frederik II from March 1562. — *Ibid*, f. 78v). What is interesting here, Russian diplomatic commission headed by A.F. Adashev respond about international trade with such words: “And king’s people are to come to our states to Moscow and to our other states and they are to deal without obstacles” («А его б люди королевские потому же наши государьства к Москве и в ыные наши государьства ездили торговати безвозбранно»: *Ibid.*, f. 43). The word “русаки” is common in Russian Ambassadorial Chamber, its meaning is close to the meaning of the word “немцы” (Germans of all types, German peoples, including Englishmen, Scots, Dutch *etc.*), and it can be found not only in translations, but in the inner texts in agreement with the term “русские люди” (Russians), which was also in use (*Ibid.*, f. 93-93v).

or proto-national identity are much less convincing than in the cases of the “lands” of the European Latin tradition.<sup>11</sup>

## II

Muscovite “Russians” and Ruthenian “Russians” had more in common than barely their homonymic name. They could imagine in this or that way their common provenance and belonging to a larger group. Both inherited a paronym *народ* from Slavonic language. Pre-Mongol semantic fields of the word are to a very large extent related to the tradition of the Holy Scripture and charged with the ideas of community of all kinds of God’s creatures, unity of what is different for Hegelian social thought and positivist sociology: “species” (*род*), “kin” (*народ, род*), “ethnos” (*род, народ*), and “people” (*народ*). An attempt to find these notions in Old-Russian sources has been made by Vladimir Kolesov, who painted a picture of growing by and by identities of “kins”, “tribes” and “people”. He thinks, that the concept *народ* corresponds with the concept “language” and forms the highest social level, although even in the XIII century the term *народ* simply designates a number of men and women and doesn’t mean a national state covering kins, tribes, languages and countries.<sup>12</sup> Kolesov’s conception springs from the XIX century discussions provoked by the “State school” in Russian history-writing and continued in Soviet Marxism. It was criticized by Ukrainian historian Tetyana Vilkul from the perspectives of postmodern “linguistic turn” and with theoretical borrowings from S. Reynolds. The term *народ*, in her view, is polisemantic, and that makes it inconvenient for classifications of those who participate in meetings as *народ*. She sees it as synonymous, in general, with the word *людие*, but to a larger extent linked with higher book culture and biblical contexts. The differences, however, are very significant. The book of “Genesis” and its manuscript tradition often attribute the term *народ* to species of fauna. The New Testament and liturgical texts borrow from the Old Testament the concept of the chosen people. Several texts, such as Joseph Flavius’s “History of Jewish war”, “Alexandria”, Byzantine Chronographs often deal with crowds under the name of *народ*. And it can be

---

<sup>11</sup> In the discussion about emergence of national identity E.D. Smith defined the term “Russian land” (“Русская земля”), applied to the Russian state, as widening community with monolithic ethnic core (A.D. Smith, *The Myth of the “Modern Nation” and the Myths of Nations*, “Ethnic and Racial Studies”, 1988, Vol. 11, No 1, p. 11, with reference to M. Cherniavsky and R. Pipes; cf.: S. Zubaida, *Nations: Old and New. Comments on Anthony D. Smith’s ‘The Myth of the “Modern Nation” and the Myths of Nations’, “ERS.”*, 1989, Vol. 12, No 3, pp. 329-339).

<sup>12</sup> В.В. Колесов, *Мир человека в слове Древней Руси*, Л., 1986. С. 23, 29, 135-136, 138.

met only rarely in Russian chronicles, either because writers thought it more relevant to use more usual for the Old Testament word *людие*, or because they found the meaning “a crowd” for *народ* as something agreed and in this case the word *людие* was more suitable for their purposes.<sup>13</sup>

Do these semantic fields overlap? It seems to me significant, that Old-Russian gave basic possibility to identify by the word *народ* a number of various living creatures — men and women, demons, birds, elephants *etc.*<sup>14</sup> That draws this word together with the Ancient Greek *εθνος*.<sup>15</sup> At the same time, notions *народы* and *весь народ* in texts of the Old Testament can be found with the meaning “multitude of men and women united on one territory and sprung from the same ancestor.”<sup>16</sup> Ostromir Gospels, translations of vita of fool-in-Christ Andrei and other sources describe by this word a number of men and women gathered in one place translating it from the Greek word *οχλος*.<sup>17</sup> It is, apparently, in this sense it can be met thrice in Russian “Tale of bypassing years”, although in two cases “a number of people” (*бещисленное множество народа*) and “people” (*народ*) are participants of purely Christian ceremonies on Dormition of Virgin Mary and transfer of Boris and Hleb’s relics.<sup>18</sup> Russian land according to chroniclers of the “Tale” was populated by men and women who composed Christian people, symbolized it and were themselves part of it when during the Church ceremonies.<sup>19</sup>

One more condition which was probably indispensable to define Russian population as “people” was participation in a ceremony or in meeting of the head of the Russian Church — metropolitan, archbishop, or bishop. Tetyana Vilkul scanned all main Old-Russian chronicles and found the notion *народ* in 996, 1072 (Lavr./Ipat.), 1146, 1147, 1156, 1206, 1218, 1227, 1237, 1263 (Lavr.), 1276, 1278 (Troits./Sim.), 1111, 1115, 1125, 1147, 1149,

<sup>13</sup> Т.В. Вилкул, «Людье» и князь в конструкциях летописцев XI–XIII вв, Кид’в 2007, С. 52.

<sup>14</sup> *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)*, Т. V., С. 184.

<sup>15</sup> Here I deliberately come around the question of Old-Russian equivalents for Old-Greek *εθνος*. The semantic demarcations between words are of no less importance. I find resemblance between Old-Greek *εθνος* and Old-Russian *народ* in connotations which refer to communities-populations of animals and presuppose closeness of societal characteristics, for instance, of bees and Persians.

<sup>16</sup> *ПСРЛ*, Т. XXII, Ч. 1, С. 41 (cf.: Gen. XXIII. 7).

<sup>17</sup> *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.*, Вып. 10, С. 214-215; А.М. Молдован, «Житие Андрея Юродивого» в славянской письменности, М., 2000, С. 396, 449, 593, 630.

<sup>18</sup> *ПСРЛ*, М., 1997, Т. I, Стб. 125 (л. 43), 182 (л. 61 об.); Т.В. Вилкул, *op. cit.*, С. 48-50.

<sup>19</sup> I don’t understand, what Russian equivalent for English “people” assumes J. Pelenski, when he writes: “The “Riurikide” dynasty and the ruling elite of Kiev and the Kievan land... attempted to impose on their highly diverse polity the integrative concept of *rusaskaia zemlia* (“the Rus’ land”) and the unifying notion of a “Rus’ people” (J. Pelenski, *op. cit.*, p. 4).

1150, 1154, 1155, 1160, 1161, 1175 (Ipat.), 1156, 1329 (NPL eld./young), 1240, 1242, 1251 (NPL young). All attempts to limit the term within some social confines failed. Vilkul insists that chroniclers use the terms *народи*, *множество народа людии* to blur social differences or without any precision as for their meaning<sup>20</sup>. Her analysis of all chronicle contexts led her to the conclusion, that in most cases chroniclers mention *народ* in situations when citizens meet new princes, on funerals of princes, or on significant Church occasions.<sup>21</sup>

In North-Eastern Russian chronicles of the XIII century the term *народ* means a town community or simply a population of town dwellers.<sup>22</sup> Given the semantic fields of the word, as they were formed in XI–XIII centuries, we can explain, why this notion appears here rarely till the beginning of the XIII century (3 examples in the middle of the XIII century) and becomes so frequent in 1206–1278 (including Troits./Sim.). The chronicle mirrored metropolitan Cyril's participation in everyday life of the region, where he has spent the large part of his office.<sup>23</sup> The transfer of the metropolitan's cathedra from Kiev to Vladimir-on-Klyazma took place in the end of the XIII century, and it was transferred again to Moscow in 1322–1326. Since 1347 and more regularly since 1390-s metropolitans of Moscow used the title "of Kiev and the whole Rus."<sup>24</sup> In the middle of the XIV centuries North-Eastern chroniclers start to apply the term "Russian land" to their region.<sup>25</sup> And not until metropolitan Cyprian at the turn of the XV century the term "Russian land" in North-Eastern chronicles starts to encompass Kiev.<sup>26</sup> In the middle of XV century, when apparently the Extended version of the Chronicle tale "On the Don battle" and the Sofiyskaya I version of the Dmitrii Donskoi's Vita emerged, Moscow came out with the idea of her rights on the so-called "Kievan heritage."<sup>27</sup> In these texts the notion "Russian land" is

---

<sup>20</sup> Т.В. Вилкул, *op. cit.*, С. 32.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, С. 48-49.

<sup>22</sup> See, for example, the chronicle tale about death of the prince of Rostov Vasilko Konstantinovich: *ПСРЛ*, Т. I, Стб. 521 (л. 244).

<sup>23</sup> J. Pelenski, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>24</sup> A. Pliguzov, *On the Title "Metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus"*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", 1991, Vol. 15, No 3-4, pp. 340-353.

<sup>25</sup> C.J. Halperin, *The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar: The Emergence of Muscovite Ideology, 1380–1408*, "Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte", 1976, pp. 7-103.

<sup>26</sup> The discussion around the dating and content of the Troitskaya chronicle in: C.J. Halperin, "Text and Textology": *Salmina's Dating of the Chronicle Tales about Dmitrii Donskoi*, "Slavonic and East European Review", 2001, Vol. 79, No 2, pp. 248-263.

<sup>27</sup> М.А. Салмина, «Летописная повесть» о Куликовской битве и «Задонщина», in: Слово о Полку Игореве и памятники Куликовского цикла. М.; Л., 1966, С. 344-384; J. Pelenski, *op. cit.*, pp. 80-85, 89, 105, 117-118.



grounded in grand prince Dmitrii Ivanovich's succession of virtues, support and territories of his Kievan ancestors. His principedom was also marked with renewal of the term *народ*, which, however, conserved its Church and ceremonial semantics.

In the early chronicle tales about a sack of Moscow by Tokhtamysh it is rendered, that khan rushed on Moscow "slashing and killing the Christian people (*народ христианьскыи*)", as prince Ostei closed himself in Moscow with "a multitude of people."<sup>28</sup> A variety of variants meets us in the passage on the fatal procession which went out of the Kremlin to greet Mongols. This passage is briefly outlined in the chronicles sprung from the compilation of 1408 or 1409. And in chronicles composed in the middle and in the second half of the XV century the tale accumulates ceremonial details:

Рог.	Ермол.	Соф. I	Моск.	Ник.
царь же	И	И	Отвориша	и отвориша
стоя у города	отверзьше	отвориша	бо врата градная	врата градныя
3 дни, а на 4	врата, выидоша	врата градная,	и выидоша со	и выидоша
день оболга	преже со князем	и выидоша с	князем своим, с	со кресты,
Остея лживыми	лучьшии люди с	князем своим и	дары многыми	и со князем,
речми и миром	дары многыми,	с дары многыми	ко царю, тако же	и з дары, и
лживым, и	а по них чин	к царю, такоже	и архимандриты	с лутчими
вызва его из	священничьскы	и архимандрити,	и игумени	людми****
града, и уби	[со кресты]**	игумени и	и попове с	
его пред враты		попове со	кресты, а по них	
града*		кресты, а по них	бояре и болшини	
		бояре и болшие	люди и потом	
		люди, и потом	весь народ града	
		народи и черные	Москвы****	
		люди***		

\* *ПСРЛ*, Т. XV, Стб. 144; see also Simeonovskaya chronicle: *ПСРЛ*, Т. XVIII, С. 132 (л. 258 об.) (but "пред спы града").

\*\* *ПСРЛ*, М., 2004, Т. XXIII, С. 128-129 (л. 222 об.). The shorter variant is in Lvovskaya chronicle: "отверзьше врата, выидоша преже со князем, а по них чин свещеннический со кресты" (*ПСРЛ*, М., 2005, Т. XX, С. 204).

\*\*\* *ПСРЛ*, М., 2000, Т. VI, Вып. 1, Стб. 478 (л. 409 об.). See also: *ПСРЛ*, М., 2001, Т. VIII, С. 45; М., 2000, Т. XVI, Стб. 125; М., 2000, Т. XI, С. 76 (here after "ко царю" follows "и с лучьшими людми такоже..." and then close to Sofiyskaya I chronicle); М., 2000, Т. IV, Ч. 1, С. 333 (л. 227) (instead of "болшие люди" follows "болшини мужи"); М., 2004, Т. XLIII, С. 140 (л. 264 об.) (here instead of "болшие люди" follows "лутшини мужи").

\*\*\*\* *ПСРЛ*, М., 2004, Т. XXV, С. 208 (л. 289 об.). The close text is in Tipografskaya chronicle (*ПСРЛ*, М., 2000, Т. XXIV, С. 152 (л. 215)).

\*\*\*\*\* *ПСРЛ*, Т. XI, С. 75.

<sup>28</sup> *ПСРЛ*, М., 2000, Т. XV, Стб. 144 (л. 336 об.); *СПб.*, 1913, Т. XVIII, С. 132 (л. 258).

As it can be seen, only copies which are close to *Soph. I* and *Mosc.* contain amplifications with the word *народ*, and in *Soph. I* the words *народ* or *народи* are more linked to the social sequence of enumeration from the prince to simple town dwellers. In *Mosc.* “the whole people of the city of Moscow” conserves social implications, but they are concealed by the univesalist idea and presuppose the set of meanings, which is relevant for descriptions of Church processions of town dwellers.

The Church context of the term *народ* seems to be strictly kept by Novgorodian chronicles, where this term appears only rarely. The case of the phrase *шедше весь народ* is revealing. It deals with solemn bringing bishop Arkadii into the “archbishop’s court”. As far as it was the time when the princely throne and metropolitan’s cathedra in Kiev were empty, a chronicler could find the word *народ* legitimate and even legitimizing for actions of Novgorodians.<sup>29</sup> In the Novgorodian IV chronicle the fragment concerning the year 1359 shows how during contradiction between Sophya side and Slavensk side of the town the archbishop Moysei and the monk Aleksey blessed the people (*благословиша народ*), and how it caused general reconciliation. At the same time the reading *народ* appears in copies not earlier than in the second half of the XV century on the place of the pronoun “them” (*благослови я [или: их], рек [или: рек им, или: рек ти]*).<sup>30</sup> Here the town and the Church implications of the word are as close to each other, as in Moscow chronicles of the XV and XVI centuries.<sup>31</sup>

In the chronicles of the second part of XV–XVI centuries the term *народ* becomes more frequent. I am not aware about the contexts in which this term was applied to communities and had political or ethnic implications. According to the *Sim., Rog., Mosc.* group of chronicles which all come up to the compilation of the beginning of the XV century,<sup>32</sup> in 1378 metropolitan Cyprian was met by the people and the prince (*и многу народу шедшуся на сретение его и весь град подвижася, князь же великии с великою честью*

<sup>29</sup> Вилкул Т.В., *op. cit.*, С. 50.

<sup>30</sup> *ПСРЛ*, Т. IV, Ч. 1, С. 288 (л. 192 об.); М., 2000, Т. III, С. 366 (л. 218 об.).

<sup>31</sup> The tale of the Novgorodskaya IV chronicle about an assault of brigands-Ushkuyniks on Kostroma mentions, that in the course of looting Novgorodians took many captives (“множество народа крестьяньскаго полониша, мужей и жен и девиц”) (*ПСРЛ*, Т. IV, Ч. 1, С. 304 (л. 205 об.)). In this case there is no ground to look for specific social organization in the word “народ”. I think, that simply a crowd, irregular multitude of Christians is meant here.

<sup>32</sup> There is no information on coming of metropolitan Cyprian from Kyiv in the group of chronicles close to *Sof. I* and *Novg. IV*.

и с мноюю любовию и верою,<sup>33</sup> весь народ града Москвы, князь же велики Дмитрей Ивановичъ прият его с великою честью и любовью<sup>34</sup>). The Muscovite chronicler puts stress on local provenance of the “people”, and the compiler of 1520-s enlarges the list of participants of the ceremony, adding the grand prince’s children and boyars, and mentions the “people” at the very end (*и сретѣ его князь великии з детми своими и з боары и со всем народом со мноюю честью*<sup>35</sup>). The tendency in evolution of readings seems to go from an abstract “town” identification of the *народ* in the beginning of the XV century to its localist implications in 1470-s and more general in 1520-s.

The ceremonies of XV century Moscow provoke less disagreements in official chronicles. That is an example of the ceremony, in which Muscovites meet Ivan III after his victorious campaign against Novgorod in 1472:

Филипп митрополит со кресты близ церкви, толко с мосту болшого сшед, каменого, до кладязя площадного, со всем освященным собором, а народи московстии многое их множество далече за градом сретали его, инии за 7 верст пеши, а инии ближе, малые и великие, славнии и неславнии, бесчисленое их множество, а сын его князь велики Иван и брат его князь Андреи Меньшой и князи его и боаря и дети боарьские и гости и купци и лучшие люди, сретили его на канун Семеня дни, идеже бе ему начевати ему. Велия же бысть радость тогда в граде Москве.<sup>36</sup>

In the narrowest sense, these “people of Moscow” are town dwellers of uncertain social strata, they are mentioned together just because of the occasion to be together. Some of the town dwellers went out by foot even as far away from the town as 7 versts. Their social structure is not important for the chronicler, so that his “small and grand people” is nothing more than an euphemism for the idea that all kinds of people took part in the ceremony. I would distinguish two groups, of which the one were to include *народи*, the metropolitan and the holy council and the other could consist of relatives of the grand prince, courtiers, tradesmen and the “best men and women” (*лучшие люди*). If we choose somewhat broader context and take the passage on the Moscow — Novgorod war in this tale into consideration, it appears that Novgorodians are never mentioned as *народи*, but only as

<sup>33</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XVIII, С. 125 (л. 241 об.); the same reading is in Rogozhskiy chronicle, but “яко весь град подвижася” and “князь же великии Дмитрей Ивановичъ”: ПСРЛ, Т. XV, Стб. 131 (л. 329).

<sup>34</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 199 (л. 273).

<sup>35</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XI, С. 49. See also: М.В. Дмитриев, *Киево-Могиланская академия и этническая историческая память восточных славян (Иннокентий Гизель и Феодосий Софонович)*, Кид’вська Академія, Кид’в, 2006. Вип. 2-3. С. 21.

<sup>36</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 292 (л. 408 об.); Т. XXII, Ч. 1, С. 484 (л. 784 об.-785).

“Novgorodians” (*новгородци*), or as “a huge multitude of men and women” (*многое множество людей*).<sup>37</sup> Especially impressive is contrast between Muscovites and Novgorodians in the fragment, which touches the ultimatum sent by the grand prince to Novgorod:

Си же паки людие Новгородстии о всем о том не внимаху, но свое зломыслие творяху, то не горее ли сии неверных: невернии бо изначала не знааху Бога, ни научишася ни от кого же православию, перваго своего обычая идолопоклонья дръжахуся, а си многа лета бывше в христианстве и наконец начаша отступати к латынству. И так поиде на них князь велики не яко на христиан, но яко на иноязычник и на отступник православия.<sup>38</sup>

Novgorodians for the Muscovite chronicle incarnate apostasy, they are worse than pagans, they turned from Orthodoxy to Latin faith (*к латынству*), and the grand prince launches the campaign against them as adherents of different creed (*яко на иноязычники*). Muscovite chronicler calls Novgorodians *людие* in the context, which is close to the one, where he calls inhabitants of Moscow *народи*. I assume, that the term *народи* is usually used by chroniclers of the Church capital of Russian lands to describe Orthodox Christians, and Novgorodians, in his or their view, broke away from Orthodoxy.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 292 (л. 408 об.); Т. XXII, Ч. 1, С. 484 (л. 785).

<sup>38</sup> The reading “не горее ли сии неверных” is corrected on the base of “Chronograph of 1512” from “не горее ли еси иноверных” of the Muscovite chronicle: ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 288 (л. 402-402 об.); Т. XXII, Ч. 1, С. 479 (л. 773-773 об.).

<sup>39</sup> V.V. Kolesov thinks, that “слов *люди* — *языци* и *народи* — *страны* вполне достаточно, чтобы в обобщенно-собирательном виде указать и на противоположность «верных» «неверным», и на отличия в их размещении на земле» (В.В. Колесов, *op. cit.*, С. 151). Meanwhile G. Maniscalco Basile points out: «The term *ljudie*, in the meaning of “people”, is mainly used to indicate *subjecti* of the prince whom he must protect from evil and judge with justice, But it also indicates the “people” who gather in the cathedral and pray for their sovereign. In one context [п. 112: Сочинение Псевдофилофея об «обитах» церкви...] *ljudie* indicates the people of Israel whom God frees from Egyptian servitude, and in other contexts it indicates the Greeks who defend the Second Rome from the Ottoman onslaught». And then on “others”: «*Latyn*, when related to the heresy of the unleavened bread and of the “evil fourth person of the Trinity” and not to the “Romans”; *varvar* and *jazyk*, which simply indicate peoples not yet illuminated by baptism. It thus seems evident that the interest in the definition of the zone of ‘allegiance’ clearly has religious rather than ethnic or national connotations, a fact that is not without some importance in the general picture I have attempted to define. It would appear to me that these zones — if we interpret them together with those described above of *vseleennaja, vlast’* and *sila* — very clearly define the field of power and its words» (Maniscalco Basile G., *Power and Words of Power...*, pp. 77-78). Perhaps, a Muscovite chronicler, who described the Moscow — Novgorod war, comes here from dichotomy *Москва, православные, народ vs. Новгород, язычники, люди*.

In April 1472, when the Church of the Dormition was initiated, metropolitan Fillip marked the commencement of the construction in a solemn manner. That ceremony took place on April 30 and gathered the metropolitan, the holy council, and “pious and devout to Christ grand prince Ivan Vasilevich of the whole Russia and his mother, and his brothers, boyars and grandees, and the whole people of the town of Moscow” (*благочестивыи и христолюбивыи велики князь Иван Васильевич всеа Руси и сын его великии князь Иван и мати его и братиа его, боаре же и велможя, и всенародное множество града Москвы*).<sup>40</sup> When the Church grew up to the height of a man, it was decided to transfer there the relics of Russian metropolitans from the old Church:

[29 мая 1472 г.] В начале же 2-го часа в той день повеле митрополит звонити, и събрася к нему весь освященный събор, епископ Сарский Прохор и архимандрити и протопопи и игумени и вси священници града Москвы, и начаша пети надгробныя песни, и тогда прииде благоверныи великии князь Иван с сыном и мати его и братиа его, Юрьи, Андреи, Борис, Андреи, и князи их и боаря и все православных христиан множество славного града Москвы, мужие и жены, малыи и велиции.<sup>41</sup>

The April and May festivities gather “the whole people of the town of Moscow” (*всенародного множества града Москвы*) and “the multitude of all Orthodox Christians of the famous town of Moscow (*всех православных христиан множества славного града Москвы*). Those ceremonial social categories are interchangeable. The multitude of all town dwellers can be in this case all Christians of the town. On the one hand, if there is parallelism of the clergy and secular persons and in this sense identity of “all the Christians” with “all the clergy” the May list, thus we may assume that “all the Christians” do not include the highest secular power. But on the other hand, in both lists it is not necessary to separate “all” from previous before them, what can be maintained by the description of the opening of metropolitan Iona’s relics, when “all the multitude of Orthodox Christians, having seen what occurred, shed tears about miraculous apparition and praised God and His Virgin Mother for glorification of their saints” (*все... православное христиан множество бывшее видевше многи слезы излиша о преславном видении и благодариха Господа Бога и Пречистую Матерь Его, прославльших угодник своих*).<sup>42</sup> I think, in this case, as in the aforementioned, those “all” Christians are implied, who take part in the beginning of the ceremony, and

<sup>40</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 294 (л. 411-411 об.); Т. XII, С. 144. My division into words.

<sup>41</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 294 (л. 411 об.); Т. XII, С. 144.

<sup>42</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 294 (л. 412); Т. XII, С. 145.

it is difficult to imagine, that only those shed tears, who do not pertain to the clergy and the secular power.

In September 1472 Ivan III's brother Yurii Vasilevich died, and the chronicler reports again about mass ritual:

В четвертый же день в среду прииде князь великий Иван Васильевич из Ростова и многи слезы излиа и рыдание велико сътвори, тако же и прочии князи, братиа его, и прочии князи и боаря и все православное христианство многи слезы излиаша, и вопль и кричание велико сътвориша, аще бы кто и от роду слезы не испускал и той, зря на народное кричание, плакашеся.<sup>43</sup>

Here the “Orthodox people” is mentioned twice, both as those “all Orthodox Christians” who shed tears and as those “people” who cry in subsequent words. Of course, the grand prince, princes and boyars are high-ranking parts of this “people”. Parallelism of the “all Orthodox Christians” and “the whole people of the town of Moscow” appears in the chronicle tale about the conflagration in Moscow and metropolitan Phillip’s death in 1473. People of different ranks come to see the metropolitan in the Epiphany monastery for benediction (*всем же приходящим к нему, князем и княгиням и бояром и священником и всему православному христианьству*), and then on his burial (*сущу ту на погребении его великому князю и матери его и сыну его и множество бояр и велмож и весь народ града Москвы, епископ же был един Прохор Сарьскы на погребении его, и архимандрити московстии, протопопи и игумени и вси священници града Москвы*).<sup>44</sup> The community of Orthodox people is limited here within Moscow. The following words supplement the list and make impression that the clergy is not a part of the “people” and construct its separate hierarchy. If so, it may be acknowledged, that “the whole people of the town of Moscow” would be in direct opposition with “all priests of the town of Moscow”, and it would be a rare example of separation of seculars and clergy on the ceremonies. What urges us to be wary about this explanation; it is the list of “all Orthodox Christians” who come to see the metropolitan, without any classifications into clergy and non-clergy. Another passage of the chronicle allows the assumption, that for Muscovites of the period the term *народ* did not include either Catholics or doubtful Orthodox Greeks. The wedding ceremony of Ivan III and Sophia Paleologue attended

[...] матери великого князя великая княгиня Мариа, и сын его Иван, и братиа его, благовернии князи Андрей и Борис и Андрей, со всеми прочими князи и боялары своими, и множество народа, и тот посол римский

<sup>43</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 298 (л. 418–418 об.); Т. XXII, Ч. 1, С. 491 (л. 800–800 об.).

<sup>44</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 300–301 (л. 421 об.); Т. XII, С. 153.

Антоний легатос с своими римляны, и Дмитрий Грек посол от цареви-  
чев братии царевнины, от Андреа и Мануила, и прочии с ним греци, и  
мнози греци, иже приидоша, служаще царевне.<sup>45</sup>

In this fragment the words “the multitude of people” (*множество народа*) close the list of “ours”, and then go Catholics and Orthodox Greeks altogether, so that “many Greeks” are put at the same position as the Orthodox “people”.

In sum, in processions on the occasions of Ivan III’s return after the Novgorod campaign, the commencement of the construction of Dormition Church, transfer of Russian metropolitans’ relics, death of prince Yurii Vasilevich, Ivan III and Sophia Paleologue’s wedding ceremony, death of metropolitan Fillip the terms *народи московьстии, всенародство, множество народа* do not appear to represent social categories comparable to princes, boyars, metropolitan or the grand prince’s brother. In all scrutinized cases the term “people” applies to the population of Moscow and at the same time “all Orthodox Christians”, although it may exclude foreigners, no matter if they are Orthodox or not. The people in the Muscovite chronicler’s view does not act as a constant historical force, which were identical to some territorial, political or ethnical entity, it emerges during the ceremony and embodies the whole town, the whole Muscovite land and the Orthodox Christianity. The reason and at the same time the form of existence of the “people” is the ceremony as such. It can be occasioned by a significant event in social life or in the grand prince’s family, a Church holyday, severe trials which have happened or are supposed to happen in future. In 1518 the decision to transfer icons from Vladimir to Moscow was taken simultaneously with the decision of the grand prince to set out in pilgrimage before the campaign against “his enemy Sigismund the king of Poland”. Metropolitan Varlaam together “with all councils and with the people” (*со всеми соборы и с народом*) had to organize a welcome ceremony for the icons. From the following narration it can be found out, that this expression is to divide the participants into two groups: the Church authorities and all the others. The metropolitan and higher clergy go in special list “with crosses solemnly, singing psalms and prayers” and “also peoples of famous town of Moscow in a numerous multitude, princes and boyars, and tradesmen, and older people with younger, mothers, maidens, and monks, and nuns, men and women and infants” (*такоже и народи славнаго града Москвы, многое множество, князи и бояре и гости, старци со юнотами, матери, девици, и иноки, и*

---

<sup>45</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XII, С. 151. Here the Uvarov copy of Mosk. is corrupted: ПСРЛ, Т. XXV, С. 299 (л. 419 об.).

инокини, мужие и жены и младенци).<sup>46</sup> It can hardly be assumed, that a Muscovite chronicler describes here social structure. What he does describe, it is rather a procession, and his enumeration does not sound as an ideological metaphor, as an abstract idea of the upper level abstract idea. The “people” does not come from the social imagination of the time as a notion of the collective sovereign or “the spirit of nation”.

### III

The “people” in Muscovite texts of the XV–XVI centuries is a ceremonial community of all Christians of Moscow, all Christians of Russian stardom and all Christians at all.<sup>47</sup> This identity scarcely has any stable referent. It is actual till a ceremonial procession of Christians is actual. It differs Christians from other Christians and appears in lists of ranks as a generalization category which includes all those who do not have place among clergy, grand princes, boyars, princes, *deti boyarskiye etc.* In every case, when lists of ranks are shortened, these higher classes and others which go after them join the category *народ* and lose nothing in their prestige or identity.<sup>48</sup> In coronation order books the term *народ* stresses grandeur and festivity of the ceremony:

И тогда великии князи изходят из царьских своих полат и идут к соборной церквы по царьскому своему чину со всяким благочинием... А за великими князи идут великого князя братья, и дети их, по тому же царьскому их сану, со всяким благочинием, и по них бояре, и прочие вельможата, и дети боярские, и вся благородная юноша, множество много потому ж, а идут со страхом и с трепетом. И бывает же тогда и всенародное многое множество православных крестьян, им же несть числа, и все предстоят с страхом и с великим вниманием по своим местом. И никто же тогда дерзнет приходитьи царьского пути до соборные

<sup>46</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XIII, С. 29, 35; М., 2001, Т. VIII, С. 264, 269.

<sup>47</sup> See: ПСРЛ, Т. XIII, С. 49.

<sup>48</sup> I cannot agree with V.V. Kolesov, when he comments on the fragment from Pafnutii of Borovsk's *Vita* “не токмо же от князь и от княгинь, но и от прочего народа, от бояр же и от простых со всех стран приходящих” and makes conclusion: «в этом отразилось совершенно новое представление о совокупности лиц: князь выделены из народа, обособлены от него. Однако все остальные понимаются здесь как собирательная совокупность *народа* (*простые и бояре*)» (В.В. Колесов, *op. cit.*, С. 151). The princes in this case, so far as in the processions of the Russian chronicles are not separated, but *vice versa* are included into “народ”. In *Pafnutii's Vita* this is clear from the construction *не токмо... но и от прочего народа*.



церкви, но вси со страхом предстоят коиждо на своем месте и славят Бога и дивятца царскому их чудному приисхождению.<sup>49</sup>

The Christian ceremony makes up the discursive entity, a part and the whole of which at the same time can be *народ*, *православное всенародство*. The people emerges on the eve or at the dire moments of every-day life, as a representation of devout Christians in the face of infidels, during the Cross processions, sovereign's appearance and higher hierarchs. The people can be gathered like a flock. It exists only if and when it is watched, if and when it finds its place in the ceremony.

Muscovite Christianity and its head, the autocephalous metropolitan, were unifying force for the "people". Before the Union of Brest it impeded recognition of the affinity of Church hierarchy and the Orthodox doctrine of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. On the other hand, there is no evidence that official Muscovite Orthodoxy spread a category "people" onto Orthodox Christians of the Polish-Lithuanian Orthodox Church. And at the same time, during the persecutions of heretics in Moscow in the 1550-s alleged heretics were accused, among the other, in confession of the equality of men and women in the face of God. The council in 1553 charged Feodosii Kosoi with propagation of the idea of equality of *языки* in the face of God what could mean equality of monotheistic faiths (*вси людие едино суть у Бога: и татарове, и немцы, и прочие языци*).<sup>50</sup> This doctrine broke the idea of the chosen "people", that Church sought to impose on Orthodox Christians of Muscovite metropol.

At least since the first years of Ivan the Terrible's reign the "people" acquires outlines of specific social, or so to say secular group, which acts for the tsar's sake, turns up in tsar's village Vorobyevo, together with him repents and forgives boyars, together with him punishes and grants pardon. The people before his reign is void of the idea of state service, and is never compared or paralleled with the category of the serving nobility. Under Ivan IV's rule the new term *народ* appears in Russia, which is opposed to classes of serving men (*государевы холопы*) and clergy. Establishing his

---

<sup>49</sup> *Идея Рима в Москве XV–XVI века. Источники по истории русской общественной мысли. Предварительное издание*, М., 1989, С. 80 (л. 9-10), 93 (л. 42 об.-44), 107 (л. 8-9), 119 (л. 48 об.-49 об.). See also the supplement to the Order of consecration of bishops of 1505–1511: *Ibid.* С. 127 (л. 160-160 об.).

<sup>50</sup> А. Попов, *Послание многословное: Сочинение инока Зиновия*, ЧИОИДР., 1880, Кн. 2, С. XV, 143. It is difficult to find out, whether Feodosii's idea were conveyed by Zinovii Ottenskii with precision. At the same time, taken this fragment, it seems impossible to confirm, if Feodosii saw polytheists, pagans and nonbelievers as really close to God. That is why there are no reasons to assume, that Feodosii took up the cause of all the confessions and all the people as equal in face of God.

*опричнина*, the tsar formulated such an interrelation of social classes which could have seemed inappropriate during the Vasiliï III's reign. Tsar's rage and punishment (*опала*), according to the chronicle rendering of his letters to Moscow, apply to his prayers, archbishops, bishops, fathers superiors, boyars, major-domos, equerries, *okolnichii*, treasurers, diaks, *deti boyarskie* and "all the chamber men", because after Vasiliï III "during his [Ivan IV's] reign when he was under his age" they made much harm to men and women of his state" (*при его государстве въ его государские несвершенные лет... его государства людем многие убытки делали*). Then the other faults of those who are guilty are enumerated, and finally the conclusion follows:

[...] и о государе и о его государстве и о всем православном христианстве не хотя радети, и от недругов его от крымского и от литовского и от немец не хотя крестьянства обороняти, наипаче же крестьяном насилie чинити, и сами от службы учили удалятися, и за православных крестьян кровопролитие против безсермен и против латын и немец стояти не похотели.<sup>51</sup>

The second letter sent by the tsar to Moscow contains unusual division, which is, apparently, not so important against the background of reforms which led to *опричнина*. He writes to "merchants and tradesmen and to the whole Orthodox Christianity of the town of Moscow... that they should not have any doubt, the tsar does not keep his wrath and disgrace on them" (*к гостем же и х купцом и ко всему православному крестьянству града Москвы... чтобы они себе некоторого сумнения не держали, гневу на них и опалы некоторые нет*).<sup>52</sup> And although a multitude of people is frightened by the reforms no less than those disfavored, still there is the opposition of the *народ* and *опальные* in the discourse of the chronicle, and what is quite unusual about it, it is that the Orthodox clergy and tsar's servitors had equally difficulty to escape from tsar's wrath into the category of the "Orthodox Christianity". The higher clergy and the Court nobility are removed from the ranks of the Orthodoxy, and *народ*, which had to participate in punishments and massacres along with the tsar, is turned to accomplice of tsar's plans.

The Orthodox people — or "all men and women" (*все людие*) — as expressed in tsar's letters in December 1564 and in tsar's speeches on the so-called repentance councils in Moscow in 1549, in Novgorod in February 1570, in Moscow in 1580 is opposed to pagans, heretics, blasphemers and

---

<sup>51</sup> ПСРЛ, Т. XIII, С. 392.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*

other enemies of the Christianity, and to main opponents of the tsar, from the point of view of this political theology, the traitors of the sovereign.<sup>53</sup>

The image of martial traitors opposed to the whole state, is formed by Ivan the Terrible's letters and the texts related to them. Since the First Letter to Andrei Kurbskii, finished in July 1564, Ivan IV regularly in his works comes back to the topic of traitors, which allegedly wage war against him from abroad. It met with a rebuff and irony of Polish and Lithuanian monarchs. However, in Russia an explanation of hostility of the neighbor state with scheming of traitors became a stereotype. Enemies of the Orthodoxy, gathered with traitors, are depicted in the "Tale of the Expedition of Stefan Batory's to the City of Pskov" as a force seeking to destroy the Orthodox people. In the beginning of the story Kurland Germans betray the tsar and address themselves to Kurbskii and other traitors, who rouse king Stefan and his warriors against the Russian tsar (*на российский царя воинством подъявляют*)<sup>54</sup>. During the offensive after the bombardment of the walls, Pskov boyars, voevodas, warriors and Pskovian dwellers rang the siege bell in the middle-town on the city wall near the Church of Great Vasilii on the Gorka giving knowledge to the whole multitude of people of Pskov about Lithuanian offensive (*в осадный же колокол звонити веляше в Середнем городе, на стене градовой, у Великаго Василья на Горке, весть дающе литовского ко городу приступу всему псковскому народному множеству*).<sup>55</sup> The term *псковское народное множество* is in this case applied to all city dwellers,

---

<sup>53</sup> While sociological interpretations of the "repentance councils" keep the firm positions in the up-to-date cultural history, researchers payed much less attention to the Muscovite ceremonies of collective repentance and unanimously put these councils in the context of "reforms of Ivam the Terrible", "reforms of the Chosen Council", or "politics of Government of Compromise". This topic needs further evaluation, but for my present research it is important, that the repentance ceremonies are mentioned in the sources from the years after the "Chosen Council". Semantics of the terms *измена* and *изменник* in Early-Modern Russia is analyzed in details in: O.P. Backus, *Treason as a Concept and Defections from Moscow to Lithuania in the Sixteenth Century*, "Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte", 1970, Bd. 15, pp. 119-144; I. Auerbach, *Ivan Groznyj, Spione und Verräter im Moskauer Russland und das Grossfürstentum Litauen*, "Russian History", 1987, Spring-Winter, S. 5–35; К. Ингерфлом, *Между мифом и логосом: действие. Рождение политической репрезентации власти в России*, in: Homo Historicus: К 80-летию со дня рождения Ю.Л. Бессмертного: В 2 кн. / отв. ред А.О. Чубарьян; Ин-т всеобщей истории. М., 2003, Кн. 2, С. 65–96; К.Ю. Ерусалимский, «Изменным обычаем»: *Ливонская война и представления о государственной измене в России*, „Соціум. Альманах соціальної історії“, Київ, 2006, Вип. 6, С. 61-84; A. Rustemeyer, *Dissens und Ehre: Majestätsverbrechen in Russland (1600–1800)*, Wiesbaden 2006.

<sup>54</sup> *Повесть о приходе Стефана Батория на град Псков*, Подг. текста В.И. Мальшева, М.; Л., 1952, С. 40-41.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.* С. 65 ff.

but given the further description of the offensive, it doesn't encompass the holy council, vоеvodas and warriors. Then the triunity of the multitude of people, the holy council and Russian Christian host fights against infidels: the Lithuanian king, his nobles and secret counselors, Lithuanian men and women, Lithuanian host, captains and haiduks. The people, in the author's view, is the whole with the Christian host, and traitors are part of infidels. There are no such implications of the Tale in the "Narrative of the Annexation of Pskov" of some Pskovian author, who wrote it right after the siege and treated enemies as coreligionists.<sup>56</sup>

Definition of neighbors as false Christians supplemented by the image of traitors did not impede appellation to common Christian values in truce talks. Sometimes, secular power added religious semantics of the term *народ* to separate it from enemies of Russia and apply to all Christians. In the letter of the Boyar дума to Lithuanian Rada from June 1581, written on the eve of the Pskov campaign of Stefan Batory, the first words of the protocol sound: "You, our brethren, know well and it is not a secret for the whole Christian people..." (*ведомо вам, братье нашей, да и всему народу хрестьянскому то не таино...*).<sup>57</sup> In the following words about peaceful settlement the term *народ* serves to embody Christians of Russia and Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the letter finishes with an appeal to restore peaceful relations "for the whole Christian people's benefit and piece" (*всему народу хрестьянскому к прибытку и к покою*).<sup>58</sup> In October 1581 the tsar planned to withdraw his troops, weapons, and stocks from Livonia. It was stipulated, that not all Muscovites would leave at once. The ambassadorial instruction for talks with Lithuanians mentions Muscovites in Livonia as *народ* (*а что останетца в немецких городех народу и запасов всяких, а со государскими людьми чего не подоимут, то и после вывозить*).<sup>59</sup> This word encompasses not all the men and women in Livonian castles, but exactly and only Muscovites, the subjects of the tsar.<sup>60</sup>

<sup>56</sup> *Хрестоматия по древней русской литературе*, М., 1973, С. 257-260; see also: S. Plokhy, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-156.

<sup>57</sup> РГАДА, Ф. 79. Оп. 1. Кн. 13. Л. 127 об.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.* Л. 135 об., 137 об.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.* Л. 361 об.

<sup>60</sup> In the October 1581 diplomatic instruction for prince D.P. Eletsksii the Muscovite part insists: "И без сроку и не укрепяся государем меж себя как из городов люди с обе стороны выводить, мы о том записи договорные напишем..." (*Ibid.* Л. 418 об.). The same instruction mentions Muscovite people who have to leave Livonian castles. They consist of such groups: "... как почнут людей государских выводить ис тех городов: владыку юрьевьского с образы и со всяким церковным украшением, и попов, и всякой причет церковной, и воевод, и детей боярских, и стрелцов, и казаков, и всяких людей" (*Ibid.* Л. 449 об.).

## IV

Used in this sense, the term *народ* stays in Moscow without changes up till the Time of Trouble, when spread of Uniate Christianity in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the reforms of patriarch Filaret resulted in its “cleansing” of meanings, which bring together Orthodox Christians, and, what could be implied, Polish and Lithuanian Orthodox Christians with Muscovite Orthodox Christians.<sup>61</sup> The category of Orthodox Christians narrowed, whereas the image of “traitors” developed in many aspects. In the Time of Trouble a phenomenon of the secret traitors appeared. The “Russian traitors” in collusion with infidel Lithuanians destroyed their homeland, disorganized Russian state, provoked intervention into Russia. The treason was not perceived as an act directed against the community as such. Its target were allegedly a sovereign and his subjects, even if legitimacy of the sovereign was doubtful. The category of traitor who commits a crime against the people was separated in Peter I’s Russia under influence of Kiev-Mogilyan and Cossack ideals. The concept *народ* and related to it categories of European intellectual tradition were spread in Russia due to the Nikon’s Church reform and acceptance of Kievan theology as a source of the reform. In the “Synopsis” (in the beginning of 1670-s) the idea of the Slav-Russian people (*славенороссийский народ*) was realized, which was supposed to unify Muscovite and Ruthenian population.<sup>62</sup> On the eve of the Poltava battle Peter I exploited this idea, when he applied to the people of the Minor Russia urging them to support him against Mazepa and Karl XII. Peter defined Mazepa “the traitor and betrayer of his people” (*изменник и предатель своего народа*).<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> S. Plokhy writes: «The term *narod*, which is occasionally encountered in Muscovite texts of the period, is not used in the sense of “nation” or “ethnocultural community”, as in Ukraine and Belarus of the period, but simply means “a number of people”. The nouns that Muscovites used to refer to themselves were not usually ethnonational (the ethnonym *Rus’* was seldom used in that capacity) but political (*moskvich*, “Muscovite”) or religious (“Orthodox”, “Christians”) (S. Plokhy, *op. cit.*, pp. 216-217, see also pp. 218, 224, 235. However, in the other place of his work the author assumes that Muscovites of the beginning of the XVII century had some feeling of national solidarity, but lacked the means to express it: *ibid.*, p. 220).

<sup>62</sup> Z.E. Kohut, *op. cit.*, pp. 454-455.

<sup>63</sup> Е. Погосян, *И.С. Мазепа в русской официальной культуре 1708–1725 гг.*, in: *Мазепа and His Time: History, Culture, Society*, Ed. G. Siedina, Alessandria 2004, С. 320. Cited in: S. Plokhy, *op. cit.* p. 280, n. 100.

## V

In the last part of this work, as a kind of case study, I would like to address the Kurbskii Miscellany, a compilation of essays and translations of the most prolific intellectual among the Muscovite secular emigrants. It was produced in the last years of the author's life, no earlier than 1579. Andrei Kurbskii had an assortment of enigmatic social categories — enigmatic, if one looks on them from the viewpoint of sixteenth-century Muscovite ideology. Many of them, even those with a “Russian” sound, like *народ*, do not conform to their Muscovite meaning. The word “*народы*” in the Miscellany is closest to the Polish analogue one encounters among A. M. Kurbskii's contemporaries. As K. Grzybowski remarked, since the XV century, “*populus*” had become the main term used in the Polish legal tradition to denote a public whole, excluding non-nobles and the legally powerless persons from its semantic field.<sup>64</sup> The thesis of the Polish “noble democracy” and “noble nation,” asserted with particular emphasis in the work of the Polish historians J. Kot and J. Tazbir, drew criticism from D. Alten as an invention of historians of the nineteenth century and most recent times that was not known to sixteenth-century sources.<sup>65</sup>

The interpretation of Polish historians as discussed today, however, finds corroboration in the Kurbskii Miscellany. Nations, in his opinion, have representation in the Sejm, which is interchangeable with the statement that nations consist of electors and lawmakers. Russians turned into a political nation, finding and in a sense creating for themselves a sovereign — the tsar — after which the sovereign abandoned his nation and turned into a tyrant. Unity between the two halves of Rus' was not in people's consciousness in the second half of the sixteenth century, a legacy of the “real past.” The past served as a source of identities, which were often extremely distant from those lived and conceived of by people in the past. One of these was the unity of the entire Orthodox Rus' world. This idea arose among Polish chroniclers in connection with the idea of Orthodoxy as the basis for Rus' ethnic unity. In the sphere of religion, Ruthenian intellectuals displayed an animated interest in this idea in connection with the preparation of the full text of the Bible in Slavonic among princes Slutskiis and Ostrozhskiis. The realization of

---

<sup>64</sup> K. Grzybowski, *Ojczyzna — Naród — Państwo*, Warszawa 1977, p. 58. Cited in: М.В. Лескинен, *Мифы и образы сарматизма: Истоки национальной идеологии Речи Посполитой*, М., 2002, С. 53.

<sup>65</sup> D. Althoen, ‘*Natione Polonus’ and the ‘Naród Szlachecki’: Two Myths of National Identity and Noble Solidarity*, “*Zeitschrift für Ostmitteleuropa-Forschung*”, 2003, Bd. 52, No 4, pp. 475-508. This article and D. Althoen's dissertation are discussed in: S. Plokhyy, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-173, 190.

the fact that the Rus' lands were temporarily divided into "there" and "here" was also typical for M. Strykowski, who enjoyed the patronage of princes Slutskii.<sup>66</sup>

The Miscellany, which included Kurbskii's "History" and his letters to the tsar, was completed in the last three or four years of the prince's life. At that point, the preparation of the Ostrozhsky Bible came at the moment of the writing of Kurbskii's Third letter, which contains the concept of "Russian sons". Prince K. K. Ostrozhskii addressed the Bible to the "sons" of the eastern church, who belonged to the "Rus' nation." Regarding the Rus' nation, Ostrozhskii imitated the position Kurbskii's "History" assigned to the tsar: the magnate created a legend about his descent from Vladimir Svyatoslavich through Daniil Romanovich of Halich<sup>67</sup>, and took upon himself the mission to lead and protect the Orthodox people.<sup>68</sup> In Turov, Vladimir, and Slutsk, Ostrozhskii and Slutskii's first schools sprang up.<sup>69</sup> The preface to the Ostrozhskii Bible mentions the idea of *translatio sacrae* from the Muscovite tsar, who had agreed to present the Bible, which was in accord with the prince's initiatives on the transfer of the Constantinople patriarchy in the 1580s to Ostrog.<sup>70</sup> Kurbskii, as a colleague of Ostrozhskii during this period, must have been a participant in the creation of this new religious-political ideal.

The textual realia of the Kurbskii Miscellany leave little hope for discerning a mass social consciousness in the scholarly discourse of the Ruthenian intellectual, in whom, apparently, some incorrectly see a lightly recast Muscovite. Princely irredentism in the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth was a cultural-political movement, which at least several Muscovites actively supported. Of course they did this not because their presence embodied the path of "Great-Russian colonization", as the Russian pre-Revolutionary historians supposed. However, if one shifts the emphasis of the imperial historiographic model, we arrive, I think, at some

---

<sup>66</sup> К.Ю. Ерусалимский, *Идеология истории Ивана Грозного: Взгляд из Речи Посполитой*, in: *Диалоги со временем: Память о прошлом в контексте истории*, М., 2008, С. 589-635.

<sup>67</sup> Л.В. Соболев, *Генеалогическая легенда рода князей Острожских*, „Славяноведение”, 2001, No 2, С. 32-33; Н. Яковенко, *op. cit.*, С. 232-269.

<sup>68</sup> Т. Кемпа, *Konstanty Wasyl Ostrogski (ok. 1524/1525–1608), wojewoda kijowski i marszałek ziemi wołyńskiej*, Toruń 1997.

<sup>69</sup> І.З. Мицько, *Острозька Слов'яно-греко-латинська академія (1576–1636)*, Київ 1990.

<sup>70</sup> J. Krajcar, *Konstantin Basil Ostrozkij and Rome in 1582–1584*, "Orientalia Christiana Periodica", 1969, T. 35, No 1, pp. 193-201; B. A. Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform. The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest*, Cambridge (Mass.), 2001, pp. 119–142.

results which would be impossible to anticipate within the framework of a competition between Moscow and Krakow over the “Kyivan legacy”. The Muscovites not only integrated while maintaining the memory of their origins, but also created a significant layer of a nobility of Muscovite descent, suggesting to their compatriots the manner in which one might find freedom in maintaining their identity. Against this background, princely irredentism played the role of a model of integration not only for the Ruthenian lands of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, but also for Muscovite Rus’. These discourses were in part suppressed and reduced to pro-Moscow or pro-Lithuania separatism, and in part lost relevance after the Union of Brest and were revived under different conditions and with different emphases in the Cossack wars of the middle of the XVII century. The term *народ* in the Ruthenian community played an important role for transmission of Ruthenian identities into the thesaurus of Slavic peoples. Unlike in Russia, it didn’t have universalist, imperial or ecumenical meanings, and it had more political, juridical, administrative implications. Nevertheless, while a Muscovite Kurbskii easily used the term *народ* with Ruthenian semantics in the XVI century, his Polish and Lithuanian works were read and understood by Russians and became popular in the late XVII — early XVIII century Russia, where they took part in creation of new imperial ideology.

### **The Notion of People in Medieval and Early-Modern Russia**

*by Konstantin Erusalimsky*

#### **A b s t r a c t**

It is difficult to find in Medieval Russia a social discourse as a set of énoncés on rules and principles of communal life and on their implementation. Historians of social thought negate capacity of Muscovites to produce social theory until the late XVII century. Shouldn’t we change our optics and look for it in other place? European authors of XVI and XVII centuries were pioneers in juridical study of societies, but their theories do not seem now compatible with what was called “social theory” in the Enlightenment or what we may call social theory now. In that sense the late XVII century, and the large part of the next century haven’t yielded essential changes in Russia, despite rapid and numerous reforms: “Russia’s “civil society of educated” (*obshchestvo*) arose only in the late eighteenth or early nineteenth century and at the time did not describe a universalist society encompassing all citizens. Thus although educated Russians invoked concepts such as “the public” (*publica*), “society”



(*obshchestvo*), and “the people” (*narod*) that transcended social particularism, historians must be wary of applying the nineteenth-century meanings of these categories to eighteenth-century social relationships. Similarly, they must be wary of applying the categories of sociology and political theory to historical contexts in which comparable categories had not yet been articulated. The historian who seeks to recover the voices of the people would do well to employ the language, categories, and concepts articulated by those very people. This can be well nigh impossible with respect to people who did not express themselves in writing, and with respect to those who did leave a written record, the discernible voices of a particular historical context, like the manifestations of social agency, can leave historians with a multiplicity of discrete articulations.

The notion of society is absent in texts, based on the “Genesis”, devoted to emergence of the world and spread in Russian lands in sacred and historical compilations and in the comments on Bible. God didn’t have intention to create societies, so that they could be imagined by the readers of these texts as a fruit of transgressions and sins. Other creatures could serve a model for human beings and, in fact, were not separated from them by impassable barriers. Not surprisingly, the first community mentioned in the “Chronograph of 1512” in the chapter titled “On four great seas” has to do not with human beings in the strict sense, but rather with monsters: “Thus, the first great sea verges on mankind with dogs’ heads”. It seems to me comprehensible, that the main abstract notion for collectives in Slavonic and Old-Russian is “narod” (later an equivalent for the “people”) and “rod” (later an equivalent for the “kin”) which encompass any set of creatures, and not necessarily human beings. The readers of the “Chronograph” could find out, that there are many other communities along with mankind. All of them finally are subordinated to Adam, but it is again quite unusual for modern social thought, in that first and ideal society includes just two representatives of mankind and many other creatures who serve them as slaves to their masters. All changes which occurred after the Paradise was lost and especially after the Tower of Babel collapse led to appearance of “tsardoms”, “princdoms”, “countries”, “languages”, and “peoples”.

To some extent medieval people didn’t care about identities. First, they normally had several, being part of more than one community *sensu stricto*. Any question on to what community he or she belongs would have been confusing as far as for the readers of the “Chronograph” it contains *contradictio in adjecto*. On the other hand, such questions met quite simple answers in narrow contexts of everyday life, which were no less far from social theories whatever: “I am from Vladimir”, “We are men of Dormition of Virgin”, “I am prince Ivan’s man” etc. Second, Russian political elites and their supporters didn’t come up with ideas of social coherency either. The only analogue for Medieval conception of king’s two bodies and its attributes could be grand prince’s titles, and they also included not peoples, but tsardoms, princdoms, lands, regions. In many other respects, including those which presupposed the power — people relations, Russian elites knew one body of the king, his natural, physical body, mortal and sacred at the same time. And third, beyond Bible and prince’s bodies, until the late XVII century Russians had apparently no coherent

identities for themselves as distinct social or political body. They had the “Russian land”, but since XIV century there were at least three Russian lands as political units which pertained to different sovereigns — Polish kings, grand princes of Lithuania and grand princes of North-Eastern Rus’. They did have their “people”, but it wasn’t unified as well and the meaning of the term seems to be in a sense broader and in a sense narrower than what the term “nation” meant in up-to-date Europe.

**K e y w o r d s :** Medieval Russia, Early-Modern Russia, notion of People.