

RHETORICAL REWORKING AND IDEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND IN THE *ISTORIJA ROSSIJSKAJA* OF V. N. TATIŠČEV

GIOVANNA BROGI BERCOFF

1. Together with several other features which penetrated into 18th century Russian culture from the Western Renaissance tradition (Brogi Bercoff 1986b, 1986a: 16–19), V. N. Tatiščev took over the habit of elaborating well organized rhetorical speeches supposedly pronounced in various instances by the protagonists of historical deeds. Although in some cases Tatiščev found in the medieval chronicles several lines containing the main information, he reworked them in accordance with the principles of ancient and humanistic rhetorical art, and created beautiful examples of *orationes fictae*.

An interesting example of such procedure is provided by the speech of Jaroslav the Wise to his družina s.a. 1015. In Tatiščev's reworking of the *Ipatevskaja letopis'*, the short and concrete information expressed by the chronicle in a simple dialogue between the prince and the Novgorodians, is transformed in a well organized *oratio deliberativa*: the *captatio benevolentiae* (Jaroslav admits his fault and laments having killed the soldiers he now needs), is followed by the *narratio* (i.e. the exposition of the situation: he has been informed of the death of his father and the usurpation by his brother), and the *confirmatio* (the demonstration of the necessity to raise an army and to march on Svjatopolk: to renounce this war could be even more

dangerous). Having obtained the Novgorodian's agreement, he insists on the necessity of the war by a further *peroratio* (an epilogue containing an emphatic appeal to his audience):

Se vidite koliko nužno mne na Svjatopolka idti... Esli že ja dopušču emu drugich izbit' ili izgnat', to ne mogu ja i vy v bezopasnosti byt'.

The idea expressed by the chronicle (the campaign against Svjatopolk is a God-blessed vengeance of the innocent blood of Boris and Gleb) is not altogether ignored by Tatiščev, but reduced to a few words re-worked into the new form of Jaroslav's speech, based on a totally lay conception of political and moral problems (*Ipat. let.* 1908: 208; IR II: 73).

Other good examples may be found in the speeches by Gromylo s.a. 1148 (IR II: 182–183), Jurij Jaroslavič and Andrej Jurevič s.a. 1155 (IR III: 53–54). The former two speeches follow a rather regular rhetorical pattern. Their structure and content may be summed up as follows:

Speech of Gromylo against a useless war

1. EXORDIUM

a) *ab adversariorum persona*: the young advisers feel they have got wisdom with the milk of their mothers; they desire a war to win the prince's favour;

b) *a nostra persona*: I am old and unable to wage war, although I have spent my whole life in war;

c) *topos modestiae*: my words are of no great value and will not be pleasant to you, but it is my duty to advise you.

2. NARRATIO

description of the situation — it would be useful for you to conquer Kiev, if the Russian princes were not so riotous and did not fight constantly; examples from the past are provided.

3. DIGRESSIO

further details on the present situation and pessimistic future forecasts;

4. CONFIRMATIO (or ARGUMENTATIO)

based on the problem of *utilitas*, with a subdivision into two criteria:

a) security (*tutum*): this war brings no advantage; this war brings destruction; you will get more advantage from good and peaceful administration of your state;

b) honour, uprightness (*honestum*): war is admitted when necessary, but you must be sure, that damage will not be bigger than any possible profit.

5. CONCLUSIO (or PERORATIO)

moreover: a dangerous aggression by the Bulgarians must be circumvented.

Speech by Jurij Jaroslavič in defence of the war

1. EXORDIUM *a rebus ipsis*:

it is definitely a good thing to keep the peace;

2. NARRATIO

it is necessary, unavoidably, to ascertain whether the damage ensuing from peace will be greater than one may expect from war; the present differences setting at variance all Russian princes rule out the likelihood for peace; historical examples are given;

3. DIGRESSIO

biblical example; summary of the present situation; pessimistic future outlook;

4. CONFIRMATIO (or ARGUMENTATIO)

the prince has a big country and a strong army, why should he hesitate attacking his unfaithful subjects?

5. CONCLUSIO

the prince's power is God-given.

Thus, the two speeches follow the same textual pattern. The first devotes more space to the exordium, whereas the second emphasizes the conclusion.

In his *Razgovor dvu prijatelej o pol'ze nauk i učiliščach*, Tatiščev stresses the usefulness of being well versed in rhetorics for homiletic literature and political speeches. He was well acquainted with such a master of rhetorics as Feofan Prokopovič. He is also well aware of the existence of two different rhetorical trends: a baroque one, inspired by handbooks which he defines "vral'jami" and considers empty and bombastic, and a 'classical' one, based on the ancient tradition of Cicero, Livius and so on (Tatiščev 1979: 108).¹ Thus, even if for historical writing he declared the expediency of a simple and concrete style (as the Aristotelian tradition of 17th century Europe demanded), Tatiščev was well aware of the ancient and Renaissance rhetorical rules and of their application in political speeches. To admit

¹ It is a well known fact that this was also the opinion of Feofan Prokopovič on rhetorics.

that Tatiščev found in medieval texts those speeches as they are given in the IR, would be to admit that in Kievan Rus' there existed a rhetorical tradition inspired by classical principles just as in Western literatures. Such an admission would run counter to all our knowledge of Old Russian literature.

2. It is not our main task, however, to highlight the rhetorical skills of Tatiščev or the fact that in 18th century Russian historiographic works such a typical Renaissance feature as the *oratio ficta* was still alive and 'productive'. In the *Istorija Rossijskaja*, as well as in ancient or humanistic culture, rhetoric was not a self-sufficient and self-aimed literary convention: its purpose was to focus the reader's or the audience's attention on a specific emotional and/or ideological reaction. Such a purpose was peculiar to historiography as well, i.e. to the *orationes* inserted in historical accounts. By the end of the 16th century one of the leading personalities in Western European culture, Justus Lipsius, gave a definition of this fundamental principle in one of the most popular books of that time:

Historici ... Praecepta clam & palam dant: saepe in ipsa narratione, aut extra eam in concionibus, velut data opera saluberrima monita et consilia miscuerunt (Lipsius 1604, I.V, cap.1).

The rhetorical framework of speeches in the IR corresponds exactly to this theoretical enunciation. In the first of the above examples, Jaroslav wishes to convince the Novgorodians that the war against his brother Svjatopolk (an act which in itself is 'not moral') was necessary. He bases this view on related considerations, on the one hand state security ('raison d'état') and the necessity of preserving the legal dynastic succession, on the other he looks to ethics, since he says he is punishing his brother for two crimes: the seizure of the Kievan throne against his father's will (an illegal action) and state interests (an action against public utility), and the murder of his brothers Boris and Gleb (an action against morals).

One may readily distinguish the fundamental difference vis-à-vis the account from the *Ipatevskaja letopis'*, where Jaroslav merely appeals to Divine Justice to sanction his fratricidal war. Tatiščev's reworking of the medieval text shows the extent of his adherence to the ideological debate which dominated the European intellectual and political world from the end of the 16th to the end of the 17th century. This debate focused on the contrast between (and the reconciliation

of) Machiavelism and Tacitism, where the main problems consisted in reaching a definition and seeking out a proper application of 'raison d'état' and morals, politics and religion, absolutism and social contract, divine kingship and natural right. Tatiščev was acquainted with Machiavelli's teachings but rejected Machiavelism, as he rejected Hobbes and Locke too (IR I: 359). In our opinion he has to be linked not only with the theories of the German philosopher Christian Wolff, a disciple of Leibniz, but also with Tacitism, a vast ideological movement which reelaborated some principles of the great historian of the Roman Empire in an attempt to reconcile political ideology and religion, state and morals. Among the main representatives of that movement are to be mentioned Justus Lipsius and Traiano Boccalini. Both authors are cited in the IR and were known to Tatiščev.²

3. The case of the *orationes* attributed to Gromylo, and to Jurij Jaroslavič and Andrej Jurevič, is more intricate as it concerns directly the well known problem of the 'tatiščevskie izvestija'. The three speeches, representing two different attitudes towards the expediency of beginning a war, are known in the first redaction of the IR in a short form (IR IV: 214, 247–248), but the Russian medieval chronicles ignore them. Rybakov (1972: 247) attributes their origin to a supposed *Letopis' Mstislavova plemeni* supposedly written by the bojar Petr Borislavič, a copy of which supposedly belonged to Tatiščev, but disappeared at a later time.

Actually, the main arguments used by the speakers (Gromylo, Jurij Jaroslavič and Andrej Jurevič) fit perfectly with 17th and 18th century theories on statecraft. Jurij Jaroslavič's speech shows striking analogies with the paragraph devoted by Christian Wolff (1736: paragr. 480, 500, 561–2) to war of aggression: to begin a war is always dangerous for the state — writes the German philosopher —, and the government should try by all means to live in peace; peace makes the country rich, whereas war is sure to bring destruction, dearth of cattle and human population, and therefore weakness in the state. In the IR (III. 53) it is written:

² Lipsius' works enjoyed broad circulation in Europe and went through several editions in German, a language familiar to Tatiščev. For more details cf. Brogi Bercoff 1986b: 389 ff., 416–417, with the cited bibliography.

Vsem že poddannym est' v mire žit' pol'za nemalaja, ibo v mire ne tokmo plody i skoty no ljudi množatsja i bogatjatsja, a vojnamy vse umen'saetsja i razorjaetsja.

More than one century before, the same idea had been set out by Lipsius who invited the ideal prince of his *Politicorum* to avoid the temerity of beginning a war, since the aggression of another country might wreak great havoc due to the destruction of agriculture and the country (Lipsius 1604, l. V cap. 5).

The above considerations in the IR reflect the theoretical considerations of 16th–17th century rationalism on the problems of war and peace and of moral and political rules. This is suggested by Tatiščev himself, who writes in Note 464 that the two speeches of Jurij Jaroslavič and Andrej Jurevič represent, one the “rassuždenie političeskoe k priobreteniju sily”, the other the “pravila morali i zakona estestvennago” (IR III: 241–242). What Rybakov writes about Tatiščev's adherence to Jurij Vladimirovič's centralizing policy, is correct: the son of Vladimir Monomach was, in the historian's opinion, a strong prince who succeeded in keeping together the riotous princes and making his country rich. Nonetheless, the author of the IR did not accept war in all cases or Jurij's aggressions, when they were not necessary or warranted. Otherwise, in his marginal notes, he would not have defined Gromylo (who defended peace) as “mudryj sovetnik”, Jurij's aggression as “zloba Jurija”, and Jurij Jaroslavič's opinion that there will be peace after the war as “laskanija licemerny” (IR II: 182; III: 52). Actually, in our opinion, Tatiščev admired Jurij Vladimirovič for having brought together his brothers and nephews inter alia by way of diplomacy not for having organized indiscriminate wars of aggression. War is necessary on occasion, but before initiating it, one has to try all possible diplomatic solutions. This was the kernel of Wolff's theory on war and peace, and the Russian historian followed it. However, Tatiščev criticized the German philosopher when he stated that the king had to follow the same ethical principle as any private person. The Note 464, is not a condemnation of peace or a defence of war in and of itself: it is directed against Wolff's optimistic, but utopian conception of morals, since the prince is to follow a different moral rule than that of the common people. That rule is ‘raison d'état’, the 17th century theory of the absolute state, as laid down, for instance, by Lipsius. Thus, the speeches on war of Jurij Jaroslavič (pro) and of Andrej Jurevič and Gromylo (con) represent the debate on similar questions in Tatiščev's time or

several decades earlier. The Russian historian merely ascribes them to medieval protagonists, as did almost all Renaissance historians in Western Europe. This is proven, among others, by the similarity of argumentation in the two speeches analyzed: the damage brought on by war, the advantages of peace, the necessity of defending the homeland, the search for unity and strength in the army and the state, the especial situation of the Rus' lands because of internal strife, the regret over the loss of past unity and power. All these speeches, for or against the expediency of war, are based on differing interpretations of a few identical ideas: the ideas on which Wolff's and Lispius' statecraft theories were based, as well as those on war and peace. Thus, it is incorrect to state, as Rybakov does, that Tatiščev faithfully reproduced medieval speeches because his opinion was in total contrast with the opinion of Petr Borisavič, the would-be author of the supposed medieval source of the IR.

Jurij Jaroslavič's speech contains a biblical quotation, introduced by "Jako Christos rek (*sic!*)" (IR III: 54). At first glance, this looks like a piece of evidence substantiating the medieval origin of the speech. It is not so. First: Medieval biblical quotations are not introduced by the indication that Christ said it: medieval readers recognized quotations without any need of indication, they knew them by heart. Second: Medieval writers did not use quotations for such a plain political aim as Tatiščev's — the "division" of our quotation concerns the reign of God and of Beelzebub, a medieval writer would probably not have attributed it to the political division of Rus'; in medieval writing quotations had a dual level of interpretation, a literal and a spiritual one, the second being the only true — here we have only a plain literal interpretation, which is strictly connected with the concrete political situation.³ Third: Tatiščev makes use of the same quotation in the *Razgovor dvu prijatelej* ..., written between 1733 and 1736; in this case he gives the exact indication of the quotation's origin (Mt. 12:25). The use of biblical quotations is not uncommon in the IR: we find one, for instance, attributed to Peter the Great in the "Foreword" of the IR, written surely by Tatiščev himself (IR, I, 88). Many quotations are to be found in the *Duchovnaja*, but also in the aforementioned *Razgovor dvu prijatelej*... In all these cases, quotations have a literal signification and are used to comment concrete

³ For the importance and function of biblical quotations in Church Slavic literature cf. Picchio 1977.

facts of Russian history. It is noteworthy that, in the latter, the author also stresses the importance attached by Peter the Great to the Bible and to its new commented edition (Tatiščev 1979: 82).

One would be mistaken, however, to assume that Tatiščev simply imitated medieval historical trends. For the IR, this also may have played a role, but the model of Western (especially protestant) rationalistic erudites, philologists and theologians was unquestionably of greater importance: Arnold, Van Dale, Grotius, Cellarius, for instance, who were all much admired by the Russian historian.

Thus, although there is some likelihood whereby a short version of the speeches existed in some manuscript source (a possibility which in our opinion is purely hypothetical, but which cannot be totally brush aside), we think that the three speeches, as they are in the IR, belong to the 18th century Russian author and reflect the ideologies of his own time.

4. In the sentence cited above from his *Politicorum*, Lipsius stresses the importance of history as *magistra vitae*, as a source of "saluberri-ma monita & consilia". This idea, rooted in the well known theoretical enouncements of Cicero, dominated historical writings during the whole 17th century. In his "Foreword" to the IR (I: 79–80), Tatiščev writes that history "nas ... učit o dobre priležat', a zla ostergat'sja". Actually, in the account of historical events in the IR, it is possible to reconstruct some of the main points of Tatiščev's ideology. The images of the perfect ruler, sound government and the strong state materialize by way of the narration of facts and the enouncements attributed to the *dramatis personae*. As an example of this we will focus on several episodes which should provide a bird's eye view of the ideological background to the IR.

In the IR (182–183) the old Gromylo is said to have given a long speech to dissuade Jurij Dolgorukij from attacking Kiev. He is defined as "iskussnyj i mudrejšij"; he listens to the others in silence; he reproaches the young advisers for thinking that "mudrost'" comes with one's mother's milk; he is frail in body and is no longer able to fight, but has got wisdom and experience having spent his whole life in war and state affairs; he knows that his statements will be unpleasant, but does not hesitate to set them out unequivocally; it would be "čestno i polezno" to conquer Kiev, he says, but the general situation and the bad disposition of the other princes will not allow it; the pro-

bable damage occasioned by such a war of aggression doubtless exceeds the usefulness which is uncertain and merely putative.

The personality of this old adviser provides the perfect frame for Tatiščev's ideal councillor. It coincides with the frequent observations scattered in the IR on the "vernye vel'moži" (or on the contrary, the "lestcy i nedobrochoty" who give bad advice) (s.a. 1067), on the "sovet dobryj o mire" (s.a. 1138), on the "bezumnoe razsuždenie" which ruined Mstislav Vladimirovič (II, 139), and so on. Such sentences are frequently written as 'marginal notes', a sort of visual grid or paradigm enabling us to read the text, and to read the message 'between the lines' as well.

The ideal image of the adviser was also a frequent subject of theoretical meditation in the 17th and 18th century. In Lipsius' ideal image the good councillor of the prince joined perfect political skills with strong moral uprightness: his main virtues were *fides, rerum hominumque peritia, pietas, libertas, constantia, modestia* [i.e. moderation], *silentium*; he was supposed to be aged ("aetate grandis"), probably weak in body ("corpus annis infirmus") but rich in wisdom and experience ("ingenium sapientia validum"); on the contrary, "adulescentium ... animi ... molles et aetate fluxi, dolis haud difficulter capiuntur" (Lipsius 1604, l. III, cap. 4). An examination of the single statements in Gromylo's speech proves that every single quality attributed to him responds exactly to the image given by Lipsius. Not far away from this image, is the one given by Wolff, who also dedicated a long chapter to this subject and underlined the capital importance of good advisers for the prince and for the state (chapter 6, paragr. 493). Many passages in the IR find an exact parallel also in this work.

As stated previously, Rybakov regards the speeches of Gromylo, Jurij Jaroslavič and Andrej Jurevič as proof of Tatiščev's exactness in reproducing medieval texts that he knew, but which have not been handed down subsequently: since he was a supporter of absolutism, writes Rybakov, the Russian historian was opposed to those wise advisers who represented an anti-absolute, boyar ideology. The fact that Tatiščev reported in the IR such speeches which were in contradiction with his own ideals — Rybakov concludes —, proves that he has not reworked his medieval sources, but has reproduced them faithfully and honestly.

Rybakov's considerations on this subject are contradicted by the fact that Tatiščev was not averse to the role played by good advisers; he was even very concerned with the ideal image of such personalities

and of their importance for the ruler. Tatiščev was adverse only to bad advisers, for instance to his own opponents (especially some members of the Verchovnyj sovet) whom he considered dishonest and dangerous for the Russian state of his own time. This is stated openly in the episode from the life of Peter the Great in the "Foreword" (IR I, 88): among the Emperor's qualities Tatiščev extols his capacity to distinguish between wise advice and flattery, and to listen even to an unpleasant commentary on his own person (as Gromylo also says in his *captatio benevolentiae*). Thus, the speeches and the digressions about wise advisers are most probably introduced (or at least very strongly worked out) by Tatiščev himself and reflect his own ideology.

This ideology had its codification in other works which Tatiščev himself wrote in the Thirties of the 18th century. In the *Proizvol'noe i soglasnoe razsuždenie i umenie sobravšego šljachetstva russkogo o pravlenii gosudarstvom*, he states for example that "Gosudari imejut sovetnikov, izbiraja iz ljudej blagorassudnych, iskussnych i priležnych", and that the good prince "jako gospodin v svoem dome" is concerned for the welfare of his country; on the contrary, if he "pol'zy ne razumeet, ni soveta mudrych ne primaet", this is to be considered a true punishment from God. Similar observations are in the *Duchovnaja* (Tatiščev 1979: 149, 142–43).

The same statements as in the *Proizvol'noe razsuždenie* are to be found in Wolff's work *Vernünfftige Gedanken* (chapter 6, paragr. 492–494, pp. 594–599). Literal concordance is not rare, for instance the statement that "Regierende Personen sind wie Hausväter" (paragr. 266). In other cases the definitions in the IR find their antecedent in Lipsius: "iskussnyj" responds quite exactly to "periti (hominum rerumque)"; "blagorassudnye" to "prudentes" or "qui ... salutaria suggerent"; "priležnye" or "vernnye vel'moži" to the qualities of "constantia" and "probitas". Moreover, Lipsius writes: "hoc regiae prudentiae caput censeam, adsumere prudentes. Nonne consilio stant regna, urbes, domus?" (l. III, capp. 3,4).

The *Proizvol'noe razsuždenie* also contains a natural explanation for an extended addendum which Rybakov (1962: 341–42) attributes to a medieval chronicle. After the defeat of Izjaslav Mstislavič in 1149, the IR (II, 192–193) provides the following indications:

Tako poznal Izjaslav vysokoumie svoe, skol'ko vredno prezirat' sovety starych, a nasledovat' umam molodych i neiskussnych v voinstve ljudej, kotorye bolee umejut o bogatom ubranstve jako ženy, i lakomoj pišče i pitii rassuždat', neželi o vojne; oni bo, nevidja nepriatelja i ne smeja k

nemu približit'sja, pobeždajut i dobyči deljat. I takovye u nerassudnych knjazej bole milosti i česti, neželi chrabrye i mudrye vojni, polučajut. No kogda beda priključitsja, togda v nich ni uma, ni vernosti net, strachom ob"jaty, jako trost' vetrom koleblema, ne znajut gde sami devat'sja i, učinja chuda, na nevinnyh svoju vinu i bezumstvo vozlagaja, pače oskorbljajut.

Here the reader finds not only the previously mentioned idea of the importance of good and wise advisers, in war as in peace. The bitter, but also emphatical considerations in this text, doubtless reflect the ideas of the author of the IR. The young and reckless captains who led Izjaslav to defeat and the state to ruin are to be identified with some of Tatiščev's antagonists in his own political orbs.⁴ The remark that such foolish and unfaithful courtiers are often given more honour and benefits from sovereigns, is to be linked to a paragraph in the *Proizvol'noe razsuždenie*, where the "favority ili vremenščiki" are accused to causing great damage to the state: this happened in the Greek and Roman republics, but also in our time with such people as Menščikov or Tolstoj. For good advisers — writes Tatiščev — are very useful to the state, but as it often happens, they end their lives in misfortune owing to the hatred and calumny of others. In the *Duchovnaja* it is written that loyal subjects receive not only reward and benefit from their sovereigns, but also "goresti i opasnosti" and "oklevetanie i gněv" from envious people. To draw a parallel not only with ancient history, but also with Izjaslav's time was all but natural for the Russian historian: in his view, Izjaslav Mstislavič was the heir and the guarantor of the unity and strength of the Kievan state. His defeat was an exemplum for the modern Russian state as well.

Striking are also the analogies between the accusations against the bad soldiers of Izjaslav in Tatiščev's text cited previously, and the image of such cowardly warriors in Lipsius' *Politicorum* (l.V. cap.8):

Lingua vana, manus rapacissima, gula immensa, pedes fugaces... Effundunt in luxum et epulas, et nocturnos coetus... Sua vires extollere, hostium paucitatem contemnere ... Sed, o dedecus, ad ipsos cum ventum est, neque animo, neque auris, neque linguam competere, ... pedes cunctis mens decedit imos.

⁴ An interesting study of the complicated situation of Tatiščev in Russia's politics in the 20-es and 30-es of the 18th c. has been made by Jucht 1985.

The problem of good and bad soldiers was the focus of Tatiščev's attention also in other works. In his *Duchovnaja* he recommends strength and bravery, but to avoid temerity, a characteristic of young, inexperienced soldiers, which may jeopardize their own lives and the homeland itself. He also recommends soldiers to be obedient to their chiefs and to avoid "vpered vyryvat'sja i nazadi ostavat'sja"; the paragraph concludes with a biblical quotation (once more!) [Luke, 3:14], requesting soldiers to be considerate of people and to be content with their salaries (Tatiščev 1979: 141–142): one must not forget that Tatiščev had taken to task the army of Izjaslav, Igor' Svjatoslavič in 1185 and the Russian troops which were defeated at Kalka in 1224 for the very same reasons (Brogi Bercoff 1986b: 410–13). As to the idea of the correct behaviour of the soldiers, we will find it in the speech of the Galician prince Jaroslav Osmomysl, which we analyze later.

Thus, the passage cited above concerning Izjaslav Mstislavič cannot be ascribed to an effete medieval source, nor does it reflect its supposed boyar ideology. It shows no real logical connection with the preceding historical account, it belongs to a late redaction of the IR (the manuscript "V"), and reflects Tatiščev's own experiences and meditations over the role of the "sovetnik" and of the soldier in the Russian state and in political life in general.

5. Among the many cases of such 'ideological' extensions, more examples may be cited. Following his baptism, the chronicle relates, Vladimir orders the children of many prominent families to seek education. The mothers weep for them as though they were dead, because their faith is not strong enough (*PSRL II*: 103). In Tatiščev's, version Vladimir sends learned priests throughout the country and the Metropolit Michail advises him to organise schools for young people. The mothers weeped, adds the Russian historian, because they

"ne vedali pol'zy učenija, čto tem um ich prosvěščaetsja i na vsjakoe delo blagougodny tvorit, i iskali bezumnii darami otkupat'sja" (IR II: 63).

Tatiščev's elaboration of the chronicle's text is most tendentious. In the Note 190 (IR II: 234), he exploits the first statement (about the learned priests sent throughout the country) as a demonstration that long before baptism the inhabitants of Rus' were acquainted with wri-

ting and had learned people.⁵ The detail on Metropolit Michail's school organisation and the explanation of the mothers' grief can be linked only with the 18th century Enlightenment views of the Russian historian about the necessity of disseminating culture among the people. The kind of "pol'zy učenija" cited by Tatiščev is that which Wolff wished for young people destined either for future service as state authorities or to upgrade the country's economical and political power (Wolff 1736, paragr. 313–315, pp. 257–260). This is the same principle which inspired Peter the Great's educational program and Tatiščev's pamphlet *Razgovor dvu prijatelej*. The attribution of the organisation of schools to the Metropolit also reflects the principle whereby the monastery and church goods should be used for the spread of culture: Tatiščev (1979: 82)⁶ himself wrote about this problem in the *Razgovor dvu prijatelej*. Another similar statement is attributed to prince Jaroslav of Galicia who, in his pre-death speech states he has entrusted the monks and their income with the education of children (IR, II, 143). Thus, the above cited additions cannot be used as proofs of the historical existence of the Metropolit Michail or of an extensive dissemination of culture in Rus' before Vladimir's time.

The second example also concerns Vladimir's time. Under the heading for the year 996, the chronicle's references to Vladimir's good relationships with the Polish, the Czech and the Hungarian princes, the IR (II, 67) is rounded off by the consideration that those rulers honoured the Kievan prince as the eldest and the strongest of all Slavic rulers. It is incorrect to take this detail as a piece of historical evidence, as has been done in modern times (Zernov 1950: 427–28): it is a clear result of Tatiščev's desire to extoll the worth of his country during the strong and centralized reign of Vladimir,⁷ and of his methodology to find in the past a pattern and exemplum of the

⁵ Cf. also the statement in IR I: pp. 94, 130–131, about the contacts that ancient Slavic people may have had with ancient Greek culture: in Tatiščev's view this is a serious indication for literacy between the forefathers of the Slavs many centuries before christianisation. Cf. also Brogi Bercoff 1986b: 382–385.

⁶ Here the author tells how Peter the Great obliged the monasteries to organize schools with their incomes.

⁷ Tatiščev considered Kievan Rus' a monarchy during the reigns of Vladimir I, Jaroslav the Great, Vladimir Monomach and his son Mstislav I. In his opinion only the 'absolute' rule of those monarchs guaranteed the power and welfare of the Rus'ian state (1979: 148; IR I: 366).

present. This methodology was the most typical for 17th century European historiography.

6. There is more than one example in the IR where the author amplified the text introducing some lines from an already described episode or from different medieval texts, not belonging to the episode described (Sazonova 1970: 41–41; Dobruškin 1974). This seems to be the case for the rhetorical questions on the past glory of Jaropolk and Oleg Svjatoslaviči (IR II: 144): they are missing in the first redaction of the IR (IV, 189) and in the chronicles as well. This does not prevent Rybakov (p. 234) from building on this passage a whole theory on the date (after 1146) and the author of this speech. It seems much more probable that Tatiščev embellished the short text that he found in the *Nikonovskaja letopis'* (PSRL IX: 157), adding the exemplum of the Svjatoslaviči that he could have found in another episode under the year 1146: here the reference to Oleg Svjatoslavič is already in the first redaction of the IR (IV, 205), although no medieval chronicle is really similar to Tatiščev's version.

Under the year 996 the chronicle refers that, because of the upsurge of crime in the country, the bishops invited Vladimir to resume his fathers' severe rules in punishing criminals (PSRL II, 1908: 111). The text of the first redaction of the IR (IV: 140) introduces a significant innovation: "mitropolit, sozva episkopy, ispytav o sem ot svjtago pisanija, posla k nemu episkopy". We would not hesitate to suggest that these lines are an exemplum attributed to old Russian history to plead the cause of the role of the Synod and of his duty to support the Tzar's policy of rigorous and absolute rule.

The definitive text of the IR (II: 67) contains not only a rhetorical reelaboration of the text (the dialogue between Vladimir and the bishops is substituted by a unique speech of the latters) and the name Leontij for the Metropolit, it introduces also very significant additions. Church authorities are said to have investigated Holy Writes as well as the "ustavy carskie i sobornye" to find out that it is "protivo zakonu božiju i ustavom vseh carej" to allow crimes to go unpunished. The medieval chronicle mentions only the divine law as an authority for the application of punishment. On the contrary, Tatiščev himself stresses several times the equal value and the importance of civil and of religious principles in state administration and justice (Tatiščev 1979: 86, 90–91, 106, 107, 137 and others). Thus, the text

of the IR reflects a typical 17th century ideology, based on the authority of Religion and Civil Law. This ideology is expressed in the clearest manner in such works as Lipsius' *Politiorum* and Wolff's *Vernünfftige Gedanken*. The first is organized rigorously on the examination of the two main pillars of human behaviour: *virtus* — in the two aspects of *pietas* (virtue towards God) and *iustitia, clementia, fides, modestia* (virtue towards men), and *prudentia* — articulated in many aspects. The second's main purpose is to demonstrate the identity of natural (human) right and divine law for a good behaviour in personal and public life.

Some details in Tatiščev's reworking of the medieval chronicle have not only a general, but also a very close analogy with the two cited works. In the IR (l. c.) the freeing of criminals entails as a consequence that

oni i drugie, smotrja na to [the exceeding mildness in punishment], v bestrašie prichodjat i bol'see zlo delajut, što est' protivno zakonu božiju i ustavom vsech carej.

Lipsius writes (1604, l. IV, cap. 9) that justice has to be meted out following severe rules

ut poena ad paucos, metus ad omnes perveniat ... ut unius improbi supplicio multorum improbitatem coercere.

On the same subject, Wolff states, on the one hand that a man who fears God does not hesitate to punish criminals, on the other that the redemption of an evil-doer is less important than the example of a public execution for preventing the others to do misdeeds (Wolff 1736, paragr. 341–2, and cf. Tatiščev's "protivno zakonu božiju i ustavom vsech carej").

To what extent Tatiščev cherished this idea, is shown by the Note 157, also dedicated to Vladimir: the punishment of the traitor Blud is said to be

dlja primeru izmennikom dostojno učineno, ibo kto edinoju izmenil i kljatvu prestupil, takogo vseгда opasatisja dolžno (IR II: 227).

With similar words Lipsius (l. IV, cap. 10) recommends to the wise prince the punishment of traitors even if they have been useful and writes in the marginal gloss: "quia inemendabiles" (cf. "kto edinoju izmenil") and "in exemplum" (cf. "dlja primeru izmennikom"), and concludes with a quotation from Plutarch which looks as though it

had been written exactly for Vladimir: "Proditionem amo, proditores non approbo".

The examples cited from Tatiščev's account of Vladimir Svjatoslavič's deeds are quite interesting also on account of the further reworking they received in another episode described in the IR.

In the portrait of the Galician prince Jaroslav Osmomysl and in the speech attributed to him before his death under the year 1187, many details are added by the IR (III: 143) to the account given by the *Ipatevskaja* (PSRL II: 656–657). The addition: "Ja dolžen byl ... nuždnym pomogat', obidymyja oboronjat', vinnych smirjat' i nakazyvat'" remembers the words pronounced in the *Ipatevskaja* (PSRL: 111–112) by the bishops who invited Vladimir I to be more severe in punishment ("ty postavljen esi ot Boga na kazn' zlym" a na milovanie dobrym"), but is even more close to Tatiščev's elaboration of those words in the IR (II: 67):

ty postavljen ot boga na pravosudie, v kotorom est' glavnoe zlych nakazyvat' i usmirat', a obidimim milost' i oboronu javljat'.

This similarity is emphasized by the following words: "da ne bol'see zlo bezstrašiem vozrastet", which reiterate the same idea expressed in the IR by the bishops speaking to Vladimir I: "i drugie ... v bezstrašie prichodjat i bol'see zlo delajut". As previously noted, those words do not belong to Tatiščev's medieval source, but to his 17th century ideology. In the case of Jaroslav's Osmomysl' speech, it is most probable that Tatiščev cited freely his own text from the account of Vladimir's reign. For the Russian historian Vladimir and Jaroslav of Galicia had the same value of historical exempla of an absolute, powerful and wise ruler.

Just as in the text concerning the administration of justice by Vladimir I, also in the Galician Prince's speech, the problem of "pravosudie" is followed by a statement on his constant concern with the strength and the good organization of the army: Vladimir is said to have accepted the invitation of the Metropolit to defend the state against the Pechenegs (IR II: 67); Jaroslav of Galicia emphasizes how his country lived in security and peace thanks to his army (IR III: 143). The *Ipatevskaja* relates that Jaroslav did not take part personally in war campaigns, but sent out his generals (PSRL II: 656). In the first redaction the IR modifies the chronicle account, stating that Jaroslav used to send out his army to help the Hungarian, Polish and

Greek states, but that he never began a war himself nor provoked to war the enemies (IR IV: 308). Such additions in the IR (first and second redaction) find exact equivalents in Wolff's treatise: the wise prince always avoids a war of aggression or provocation which can induce the enemy to war; his policy is to have strong allies for mutual support, and to keep a strong army and good defence even in time of peace (Wolff 1736, paragr. 497–499, pp. 606–610). In his speech, Jaroslav also adds that his soldiers know their duties and avoid harming the people: a remark all too reminiscent of Wolff's recommendations to the good prince to concern himself with the safety of civil population even in the enemy's country, avoiding indiscriminate destruction and killing, since this is just "Grausamkeit" (paragr. 500, p. 616).

Tatiščev twice recalls (in the portrait and in the speech) Jaroslav's concern with developing industry, craftwork and international trade. His successful policy attracted skillful foreigners and learned people who furthered the country's development. Here too the example of Vladimir who in 989 'imported' architects from Greece for the building of the Church of the Tithe, may be considered an important precedent for the IR. Even more similar are, however, the statements attributed by the IR to Gromylo about the advantages of peaceful economic development: "Being rich and peace-loving — says Gromylo to the prince —, your state will attract thousands of people from neighbouring lands and you will increase the population and wealth of your country much more than by a war of aggression (IR II: 182). Such statements, therefore, seem to be recurrent in Tatiščev's work: he probably repeated some ideas which he considered the most important. Such ideas can be found in Wolff's *Vernünfftige Gedanken* where several paragraphs are dedicated to the importance of industry and trade (paragr. 313–315, pp. 257–270). In the German philosopher's work immigration is also considered: a rich and well organized country attracts foreigners; the government must select them in order to bring into his state such a kind of new population, which will be useful for the development of economy and for the defence of the country (paragr. 257, pp. 210–211). Such statements can be considered as one of the theoretical cornerstones of Peter's (and Tatiščev's) policy and ideology. To attribute the same ideas to Jaroslav's speech was a temptation that probably could hardly be resisted by a Russian historiographer of Peter's time!

The above does not contradict historical truth, since Tatiščev's information about Jaroslav's activity correspond in the main to hi-

historical facts. This does not mean, however, that Tatiščev found in a medieval source Jaroslav's portrait or speech in the form we know it from the IR Tatiščev simply reconstructed on the basis of historical truth and other similar situations and historical personalities a piece of information intended mainly to provide an *exemplum* of a good ruler. The Note 543 (IR III: 253) looks quite enigmatic: it stresses the high value of Jaroslav's speech, which is "s glavnymi gosudarej svojstvami soglasno", even if his moral conduct (especially his divorce and the expelling of the son and the nephew) is not in harmony with it; anyway — concludes Tatiščev — it is enough that this speech serves as a useful "nastavlenie" for some people. This shows how strong was the didactic concern of Tatiščev's historical writings: he probably did not consider out of place to rework a short speech into a long one, attributing to it some general principles he deemed very useful and important. The news about the prince's policy in meting out justice, waging war and running the economy differ markedly from the Chronicle account, since they outweigh the religious character of Jaroslav's words in the *Ipatevskaja*. They agree, on the contrary, with 17th century Western ideology and Tatiščev's own views. If one is to seek out a source, it would be more appropriate to look for some late, probably Western (or West-influenced) text. At the present state of our knowledge, there is reason to doubt about the existence of a medieval source for Tatiščev's version of this episode, unless some concrete manuscript proof is brought to light (Milov 1978: 86–87).

Two more details may be added to such a conclusion. In his speech, Jaroslav of Galicia stresses his efforts to avoid robbery and to organize social life in such a way that everyone earns his money in an honest way, by trade, craftwork or state service. Similar considerations are made by Wolff (paragr. 279–281, pp. 212–214): to avoid distress and exploitation of some people by others, the government must assure work for every able man in his own state; a good organized country must regulate the amount of people working in the different branches of economy, in order to assure the production of natural goods and manufactured articles, and the exchange of such merchandise inside and outside the country. As to taxes — Jaroslav maintains — they should be light enough to be born by the people without tears or lamentations. Quite similar deeds are reported by the Polish chronicles for King Cazimir, Jaroslav's political partner, and Tatiščev was clearly familiar with those chronicles, since he carefully cites Kadłubek, Bielski, Strykowski, Długosz and Miechowita for the in-

tricate historical events of that period (IR III: 253).⁸ Here too, however, an ideological antecedent is given by Wolff (paragr. 496, pp. 604): taxes are necessary for the properly organized state, but they must be commensurate with the people's income, to avoid lamentation ("Klagen"), unrest ("Gemüthe zu beunruhigen") and unhappiness ("unglücklich [machen]"). Moreover, to the description of flowering craftsmanship and trade, Tatiščev adds that Jaroslav "ot svoich imenij pomogal" the organization of commerce and industry. In Wolff's state theory the prince is supposed to have a great income from large estates in order to organise, with those incomes, the administration of the state, but also the manufacturing and trade system (paragr. 496, pp. 601–604).

The final words of Jaroslav's speech (about slanderers and the damage they can cause innocent people and the state) are almost a common place in Tatiščev's works and ideology, a problem he felt to be personal because of his own negative experiences. In his *Duchovnaja*, for example, Tatiščev (1979: 141) complains in a very plain and open way that he was made to suffer several times from false accusations of bad and envious people in Peter's as well as in Anna Ioannovna's time. How strong was Tatiščev's concern with slanderers, "pluty", "lestcy" and similar kind of people, is shown also by several marginal notes commenting some episodes of the IR (cf. for instance II: 175, 179, 180, 182, 188–189, but many more cases may easily be found). The same idea is also present, as we have seen, in the 'lamentation' against bad courtiers after Izjaslav Mstislavič's defeat (IR II: 193) and in the *Proizvol'noe rassuždenie* (p. 149, about favourites and the disgrace brought to honest people by calumny). Jaroslav Osmomysl's words on his concern to avoid the bad influence of slanderers

smutitelej i navetnikov ne slušal, a klevetnikov pred vsemi ili dlja ich zaslug tajno, naedine, obličal, i vpred' to delat' zaprešal (IR III: 143)

are very similarly framed in the *Duchovnaja* (pp. 140, 141, 144), particularly where the author insists on the necessity of being wary of bad advisers and slanderers, but also on the way to rebuke them in private dialogue or in public debate:

⁸ For Cazimir cf. the description of his reign in the Chronicle of Marcin (Ioachim) Bielski, based on the account given by Kadłubek (*Zbiór dziejopisów polskich*, I, Warszawa 1764, pp. 102–103).

podčinennych snačala uveščevanijami i razgovorami prileži ot bezporjadkov uderžat', potom slovesno naodine ili, kogda bezstyden, pri ljudech i z ugrozoju bol'sego nakazaniya otvrašaj.

7. From our examination of some episodes of the Kievan history in the IR, we can draw the following conclusions:

(a) The IR is not "the last medieval letopisnyj svod", but the first modern work in Russian historiography: as any other historical work, it reworks source material following the time-honoured patterns and critical principles of its own time; hence, it reflects also ideological trends of the author's time period.

(b) Being written in the first half of the 18th century, the IR reflects the manifold trends of Russian culture from that period, where different elements grounded in the Renaissance, the Baroque and the Enlightenment co-existed and gave birth to one of the most interesting, but still more puzzling periods of Russian history. Thus, rationalistic and erudite principles co-exist in Tatiščev with Renaissance rhetorical art and with ideological principles characteristic of 17th century 'raison d'état'.

(c) The identity of some ideas in the IR (especially in the *orationes*), in other works by Tatiščev and, what is even more important, in the theoretical works of some leading personalities of the intellectual Europe of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century, leads us to doubt seriously about the reliability of many 'tatiščevskie izvestija'.

(d) It is not our intention to downplay the import of Tatiščev's work: an accurate evaluation of his actual worth and of his true cultural background (rooted in the best traditions of European culture over a period of two centuries) will only make his excellence stand out against the rather gray scenery of 17th century Russian historiography. Nor should critics deny the possibility that the Russian historian had at his disposal some text not handed down to future generations and containing in some cases information unavailable from other sources. However, this likelihood has to be considered in every single instance merely as a working hypothesis. Therefore, in order to reach general conclusions based on some indication which may be provided only by Tatiščev, critics are faced with a moot question, or the question may be settled only after a serious examination of all facets surrounding single questions. This

is true for the so-called *Ioakimovskaja letopis'* as well as for the later periods of Russian history (Koreckij 1986, Solodkin 1988). Our conclusion is that all data given by Tatiščev must always be assessed very carefully and that general theories can hardly be based on such data. Our considerations are not directed against persons or theories: they rather aim at serving to further investigations and enhancing our knowledge of truth.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brogi Bercoff G.
 1986a Dell'utilità e dei fini di un nuovo studio sulla storiografia della Polonia, dell'Ucraina e della Russia — In: Dall'opus oratorium alla ricerca documentaria. La storiografia polacca, ucraina e russa fra il XVI e il XVIII secolo, a cura di G. Brogi Bercoff [Europa orientalis 5 (1986)] pp. 7–20.
 1986b V.N. Tatiščev: l'innovation et la tradition — In: Dall'opus oratorium alla ricerca documentaria. La storiografia polacca, ucraina e russa fra il XVI e il XVIII secolo, a cura di G. Brogi Bercoff [Europa orientalis 5 (1986)] pp. 373–392.
- Dobruškin E. M.
 1974 K izučeniju tvorčestva V. N. Tatiščeva kak pisatel' russkoj istorii — In: XVIII vek (Sbornik 9). Leningrad 1974, pp. 156–165.
- IR
 I–VII Istorija Rossijskaja (voll. I–VII). Moskva 1964–1968.
- Jucht A. I.
 1985 Gosudarstvennaja dejatel'nost' V.N. Tatiščeva v 20–ch i 30–ch gg. XVIII veka. Moskva 1985.
- Koreckij V. I.
 1986 Istorija russkogo letopisanija vtoroj poloviny XVI–XVII v. Moskva 1986.
- Lipsius J.
 1604 Politicorum sive civilis doctrinae libri sex. Antverpiae 1604 (1st ed. 1589).
- Milov V.
 1978 Tatiščevskie portrety-charakteristiki i 'Simonova' letopis' — Istorija SSSR 1978, n. 6: 86–87.

Picchio R.

- 1977 The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of Slavia Orthodoxa — *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 1 (1977): 1–31.

PSRL

- II Pol'noe sobranie russkich letopisej, II. Spb. 1908.

Rybakov B. A.

- 1962 Drevnjaja Rus'. Skazaniya — Byliny — Letopisi, Moskva 1962.
1972 Russkie letopiscy i avtor 'Slova o polku Igoreve'. Moskva 1972.

Sazonova L. I.

- 1970 Letopisnyj rasskaz o pochode Igorja Svjatoslaviča na Polovcev v 1185 g. v obrabotke V. N. Tatiščeva — *Trudy ODRL* 1970, t. XXV.

Solodkin Ja. G.

- 1988 Review of: Koreckij V.I., *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XVI–XVII vv.*, Moskva 1986 — *Voprosy istorii* 1988, n.2: 125–128.

Tatiščev V. N.

- 1979 *Izbrannye proizvedenija*. Leningrad 1979.

Wolff Ch.

- 1736 Vernünftige Gedanken von dem gesellschaftlichen Leben der Menschen und insonderheit dem gemeinen Wesen. Frankfurt und Leipzig 1736 (1st ed. 1721).

Zernov N.

- 1950 Vladimir and the Origin of the Russian Church — *The Slavonic and East European Review* 28 (1950), n. 71: 427–428.