Foreword

Russia’s first narrative history, The Book of Degrees of the Royal Genealogy (Kniga stepennaia tsarskogo rodoslovia), was produced in the Kremlin scriptorium of the Moscow metropolitans during the reign of Ivan IV (1533–84). A collaborative project to prepare a new critical edition in three volumes, based on the text of the earliest surviving copies with variants and commentary, spurred intensive research into the book’s manuscripts and its sources. In February 2009, an international group of scholars with expertise in a range of disciplines convened at UCLA to consider the book’s representation of Kievan and Muscovite history, the politics of its creation, its literary status, and its ideological uses in its time as well as larger themes: What are the preconditions for a “culture of history”? How do historical narratives legitimize and influence their present? Selected articles presented at this forum, which build on and reference these discussions, have been arranged in thematic groups.

Section 1 focuses on the Stepennaia kniqa’s genesis, production, and institutional status. Nikolai N. Pokrovskii summarizes the manuscript and internal evidence suggesting that the book was completed by the Annunciation Cathedral priest Andrei (invested in 1564 as Metropolitan Afanasii) in the early 1560s to convey the church’s view of the history of Rus’ and its rulers. Andrei S. Usachev’s detailed comparative study of watermarks on the paper used for the three earliest manuscripts dates work on the Tomsk codex somewhat earlier in the mid-1550s. Ol’ga D. Zhuravel’s analysis of handwriting confirms Usachev’s dating and argues that the Tomsk codex preserves the book’s first draft. Sergei N. Bogatyrev claims that the Stepennaia kniqa could not have been compiled before Andrei-Afanasii’s tenure as metropolitan (1564–66), when the chronicle compilation of the 1560s was prepared, and that its form may have been “stabilized” as late as the prelacy of Metropolitan Filipp (1566–68). Edward L. Keenan contends that the Stepennaia kniqa took on its final shape in the administration of Boris Godunov, the guardian and power behind Tsar Fedor Ivanovich, soon after Ivan IV’s death in 1584. Charles Halperin’s heuristic inquiry examines the criteria for distinguishing official from unofficial texts in pre-Petrine Rus’.

Section 2 looks at the book’s narrative and stylistic models. David Prestel analyzes how models of redemptive history in the Primary Chronicle and the Kievan Caves Patericon were applied to steps 1 and 3. Aleksei V. Sirenov compares the Stepennaia kniqa’s framework, treating history as biography, to Archbishop Danilo II’s anthology containing lives of Serbian rulers and arch-
bishops. Wolf-Heinrich Schmidt argues, to the contrary, that the Danilov zbornik, whose author seeks to present a complete chronicle of the Serbian church through its archbishops and treats only selected rulers, could not have been a model for the Stepenniaia kniga, whose creators focus on royal genealogy and work primarily within the genre of dynastic historiography. Viktor M. Zhivotov’s paper offers salient examples of bookish syntactic constructions that compilers superimposed on their sources, showing that the desire to glorify the rulers and churchmen at times took precedence over grammatical correctness.

Section 3 traces and contextualizes the book’s construction of historical narratives in successive steps. Gail Lenhoff, who identifies the foundation of the Kazan’ bishopric in 1555 as the impetus for the Stepenniaia kniga project, links the book’s themes in steps 1 and 17 to contemporary documents promoting the Christianization and colonization of Kazan’. Andreas Ebbinghaus shows how the compilers of the “Povest’ na sretenie” in Step 13 rework their sources (including passages from the tale of the wonder-working Vladimir icon of the Mother of God previously compiled for Step 6) to thematize the miraculous victory over Tamerlane in 1395 as a turning point in the Tsardom’s history. Anton A. Gorskii counters the widely accepted myth, articulated in Step 6 and developed in later steps, that Andrei Bogoliubskii transferred the center of power from Kiev to Moscovy and laid the foundations for the Russian Empire, with analyses of 55 territorial transactions (primysli) under Mongol rule. Janet Martin contrasts 16th-century chronicle sources on Muscovite-Mongol relations with the Stepenniaia kniga’s treatment, focusing on the portrayal of Shah-Ali in steps 16 and 17 as a faithful agent of the tsar who plays a supporting role in the unfolding drama of Moscovy’s conquest of Kazan’. Ann Kleimola compares the official narratives vilifying the figures of Evfrosinia Staritskaia and her son Vladimir (both appear in cameo roles in the Stepenniaia kniga) with the evidence preserved in their works of cultural patronage, which convey their genealogical consciousness and alternate views of the dynastic conflict with Ivan.

Section 4 considers religious patronage and observance in the broader Muscovite context. Pierre Gonneau documents the central role of St. Sergius, who is depicted as a revered monastic ascetic in steps 11 through 13, but then redefined as a protector of Russian Orthodoxy, a defender of Moscow against Tatar and Latin enemies, and as the miraculous provider of royal sons in steps 15–17. David Miller examines how the culture of genealogical commemoration expressed in the Stepenniaia kniga is reflected in charters of donation and records of commemorative services at the Trinity-Sergius Monastery. Daniel Kaiser contrasts the book’s focus on legends of icons and saints as intercessors for the nation with the evidence of icon veneration from 200 Muscovite wills.

The final section explores church efforts to exert moral influence on Russian rulers. Robert Romanchuk examines the Stepenniaia kniga as spiritual reading for Ivan IV and extrapolates key theological premises of Step 1. David
Goldfrank identifies hesychastic themes, expressed in the writings of SS Nil Sorskii and Iosif Volotskii, that were incorporated into the portraits of ideal rulers in the Stepennaia kniga. Elise K. Wirtschafter considers the legacy of the Stepennaia kniga’s representation of ideal Christian rulers in the sermons delivered by Metropolitan Platon at Catherine’s court. Nancy S. Kollmann distinguishes between Muscovite and Catherinian Enlightenment views of Christian rulership.

Some of the articles in this volume present sharply differing views and interpretations, while in other cases we find more nuanced readings of the evidence than earlier scholarship had considered. Over-all, these essays raise more questions than they answer, and we hope that this reconsideration of the Stepennaia kniga will stimulate continuing discussion and analysis of the role and importance of narrative history in Muscovite Rus’ and in subsequent Russian culture.
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