G e n n a d i   O b a t n i n

T H E   D I S C O U R S E   O F   A R C H A I C   I N   R U S S I A N   C U L T U R E

[Lecture summary]

Introduction | Own and Alien | Old and New | Notes | Literature | PDF

I n t r o d u c t i o n

For our purposes here, we will understand discourse to mean a certain aggregate of conceptions that can't be separated from a certain form of linguistic behaviour (strategy). In relation to this, two factors will be important here:

- Discourse is not linked directly to any 'historical-literary epoch' or 'social-political formation'. In other words, it is not linked with Hegelianism in any strict or popular (such as Marxist) form.
- The use of the term does not presume a difference between artistic and non-artistic texts. Thus, we are focusing on the word in its relation to things (referentially). The word in text and the word in speech interest us far more than the concepts of text and speech as objects of study - the textual connotations that the word develops within the text will be ignored by us.

This understanding of discourse is close to Foucault's, in the sense given by him in the book *Order of Things. An Archaelogy of the Human Sciences*: discourse is the aggregate (Foucault does not insist on a systemic approach) of unwritten rules that exist between the author (the user) and the text. An analogue can be found in epistolary rules. For example, in Russia, to this day, a letter written on a typewriter or on a computer signifies a lack of respect for the person it is being sent to - the poet Balmont, one of the first Russian writers to begin using a typewriter, continually apologised for his use of it in his letters. The theologian Yelchaninov, in a letter to the philosopher Ern of November 15, 1916, beginning with friendly and intimate inquiries and confessions, noted: "...but here I must switch to a pen, as the typewriter is a crude instrument." [1] It was also considered a mark of disrespect to leave a

large, empty space on a sheet of paper, without filling it with text - thus, Andrei Biely, towards the end of the page, would finish his letters with letters that continually increased in size. [2] These rules, regulating the creation of the text, are also the foundation of discourse. Foucault, who, by his own admission, was developing the Nietzsche's concepts of a "Genealogy of Morals", was interested in the process of the creation of such rules, demonstrating that all the conceptions that seem right to us, or natural, are in fact created or were once created with a historical, cultural and a non-absolute character. This is what Nietzsche called the 'genealogy', and Foucault the 'archaeology' of concepts. Developing Nietzsche's impulse to expose, Foucault saw rules as manifestations of power - as Ginzburg wittily noted, he was more interested in the process of repression than the content of these concepts and rules [3]. For our modest aims, it is important to note that discourse regulates behaviour, if the latter is understood in its widest sense. For example, the choosing of clothing and the selection of form for a poem can be seen as being within the sphere of behaviour: you can put on shorts or a suit and tie; you can use a sonnet or a stanza-form from *Eugene Onegin*. Any understanding of a text is an interpretation of an authorial choice, whether that choice is consciously or unconsciously made. Following in Bakhtin's footsteps (*K filosofii postupka*, (On the Philosophy of the Act), 1923), we can term behaviour based on choice as an act: discourse turns biological behaviour into a cultural act (strategy, writing).

The field of our attention is occupied by what we shall call "the discourse of archaism". The concepts of 'archaist' and 'innovator' were introduced by Tynyanov, who used the terms for the title of a collection of his articles (1929). Tynyanov belonged to a circle of Russian Formalists, a literary school of the 1920s, that was close to the Russian avant-garde and followed in the steps of the Italians by dubbing itself 'Futurist'. As a cultural activist close to the avant-garde, he was interested in the problems of innovation as the avant-garde is the art of the new. Tynyanov the academic involved himself in the history of literary techniques. Primarily, this concerned poetic language, as poetic language was the main object for the central experiments of the Russian Futurists ('zaum', for example). The issue of renewal of poetic language lay at the basis of the conceptions of 'archaist' and 'innovator', developing Tynyanov's ideas on 'the literary fact' (the centre and the periphery). In the main text on this subject, the article *Arkhaisti i Pushkin* (The Archaists and Pushkin), Tynyanov titled writers in opposition to Pushkin - the 'Beseda lyubitelei russkogo slova' (Conversations of Lovers of the Russian Word) literary school - the

'senior archaists' (Shishkov, Khvostov, Shalikov), while the 'junior archaists' comprised a group of romantics with nationalist leanings (the most famous being Kukhelbeker and Griboyedov). According to Tynyanov, the main characteristics of the literary aesthetics of archaism were:

- A linguistic theory on the age of the Russian language, which either developed out of Church Slavonic or directly from Greek (naturally, the linguistic theories of the German romantics, who discovered Sanskrit and traced their own language directly back to it, are mirrored here);
- An interest in lexical archaism, folk speech, folklore and the common language;
- The actualization of etymology (the inner form of the word) as a semantic technique;
- A rejection of the 'literary', which was associated with oratory, 'eloquence', rhetoric and 'beauty', 'smoothness' of style in general and language games, such as a focus on rhythm;
- An emphasis on the spoken rather than the written word, and hence an interest in the archaic, ie syllabic poetry [4];
- The translation of foreign words as a means of creating one's own.

Politically, the 'senior archaists' were conservatives, supporters of the national state and virulent opponents of the Enlightenment, Westernising tendencies and revolution [5]. The 'junior archaists', however, were radicals, even revolutionaries - Tynyanov stressed that 'archaism' was not bound to the reactionary [6]. The contradiction here is merely superficial: both the senior and the junior archaists were utopians, unhappy with the existing state of affairs (in literature, state and society).

Tyanyanov's main conclusion, though it may be formulated through an aggregation of the academic's other works, is that the archaists were genuine innovators (the original title for the book was *Arkhaisty-novatory* (Archaists-Innovators)). Their search for Russian antiquity turns out to be a search for innovation. Thus, the most concentrated conception of archaist discourse revolves around two, closely-interlinked themes: the problems of alien and own and the problems of the old and the new - in literature, society and state.

Own and Alien

We can take several examples of western cultural-political products being assimilated as illustrations.

- Lomonosov, in the 18th Century, converted the Russian poetry system to a syllabic-tonal system, entirely copying it, for the most part from German precursors. Shortly before, Peter I, having decided to turn Russian into a European state, began to copy westerners, first and foremost in dress and appearance - one body of opinion holds that he limited change to this alone. The collection of stories and sketches *Fiziologiya Peterburga* (The Physiology of Petersburg, 1845), which began the realist school, was copied from French models. The Russian language resisted Lomonosov and it took an entire century for the Russian poem to find its own system of construction (tonic). The consequences of Peter's reforms, primarily in the rivalry that arose between the 'two capitals', Petersburg and Moscow, can be felt to this day. Copying involves a certain strategy of behaviour in culture and here the significance of 'being Western', the West serving as a model, can be seen.

- Russian philosophy began with an interest in the philosophy of German idealism. Count Uvarov's thesis, 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality', which became the official doctrine of imperial Russia, is a reworking of a conception of the people as the carriers of the spirit and mysticism of religion and the secular authorities conceived by ?? Herder??, Hegel and other German romantics [7]. When Kaiser Wilhelm II sent the army to crush the Boxer Uprising in China, he was only concerned with saving a German colony. The Russian poet Solovyov wrote a 'Wagnerian' poem, *Zigfridu* (To Siegfried), on the event, welcoming the move as he saw the Chinese rebellion as being the beginning of an Asian campaign against the Christian world (the poem ends with an appeal to Wilhelm-Siegfried: "You understood: the sword and the cross are one" [8]). In addition, he wrote a letter to the editor of the *Questions of Philosophy and Psychology* journal, where he deemed the uprising to be the epilogue in a historical drama, the main episode of which is the defeat of the West by the East [9]. Dostoevsky and Tolstoy both consciously orientated themselves around Rousseau's *Confessions*, though each interpreted it in his own way, giving the confession a totally different stylistic and ideological modus. Russian realism took half a century to digest the

French model, before returning it to the West in the form of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky (this idea is covered in greater detail in Lotman's *Khudozhestvennoye prostranstvo russkogo romana* (The Fictional Space of the Russian Novel)). The copying of avant-gardist behaviour corresponds to the transformation of the modernist, with the aim here being 'to be Russian' (to have "our Platos and quick-witted Newtons"). The West is not consciously recognized as a model to be copied, but as a starting point for development (a variant of this was to see it as something to be overcome). This method of assimilation is characteristic of archaism.

Own and alien in language strategy

Translation as adaptation.

In the 1840s, there existed the so-called 'lyubomudry' circle: thinkers, writers and critics (Raich, Merzlyakov, Tyutchev in his early period, Odoevsky). The group's name came from a literal translation of the Ancient Greek word 'philosophy', it being significant that 'lyubomudrie' here denotes Russian philosophy. The presence of a national tradition in philosophy, for the participants in the circle, who were disciples of the Russian culture of romanticism (Odoevsky was acquainted with Beethoven and Tyutchev had mixed closely with Schelling), signified the maturity and fully-fledged nature of the culture. For these 'zapadniks' (Westerners), a literal translation was an important ideological instrument for adaptation - Odoevsky, with his deep-rooted interest in mysticism, even tried to translate hallucination into Russian as 'prividimost'' [10].

The meaning of another literal translation had a certain ideological tradition in Russian culture. In the political thinking of the 1830s, with its pro-government leanings, there was a body of opinion (Pogodin) that maintained that Russian autocracy had a popular, voluntary, non-violent character - the first tsars, the Varangians, were called upon to their positions by the people [11]. It is interesting that, at the same time, a zapadnik-pessimist such as Chaadayev, in *Apology of a Madman*, interpreted the same fact as proof of the inglorious beginnings of the Russian nation, a beginning that would have a destructive influence on its entire subsequent history. It is also interesting that at the same time in Germany, a conception of a German 'Sonderveg' (special way) was flourishing, a condition of which was a conception of the special, non-parliamentary but also non-despotic character of German political

organisation [12]. In Russia, one of the 'Slavophiles', the philosopher and poet Khomyakov, formulated similar ideas in the conception of 'popular sovereignty' - here, however, the guarantee of 'democracy' in Russian autocracy was the election (by the people, in his view) of Mikhail Romanov as Tsar in 1613. The idea that Russian democracy had its own, particular character, lived on until the 20th Century. In the political sense of the Russian philosopher-idealists, such as Florensky, Bulgakov, Ern and Vyacheslav Ivanov, it was embodied in the word 'narodopravstvo', a literal translation of the word 'democracy.' This received special significance, of course, during the period of the two Russian revolutions in 1917 [13], when a group of philosophers, concerned about the developing events, published a journal under that title.

O l d   a n d   N e w

Tynyanov's mechanism (modernization through archaism), can be successfully applied to the task of describing the modernist discourse where it confronts us as the 'discourse of archaism'.

Modernization of the literary system.

Archaism in the sphere of literary language.

In the history of Russian literature, there has been a definite tradition of implementing the archaic that can be identified from the very beginning of Russian literature. In the 18th Century, a representative of this was Tredyakovsky, who consciously used the stylistic and poetic potential of archaism, for which he was ridiculed throughout his career.

The above-mentioned 'senior' and 'junior' circles of archaists obviously stood in opposition to the 'Zapadnichestvo' that were close to Pushkin's circles, while Tredyakovsky was, like his main opponent Lomonosov, a 'zapadnik'. At the turn of the 19th-20th centuries, the archaist tradition, independently of each other, was taken up by Ivan Konevsky (Oreus) and Vyacheslav Ivanov, working in the sphere of the archaic as applied to Russian poetry on all levels of the text, from its stanza-form to syntax. At the root of Russian Symbolism, this tendency was developed in the poetry of Gorodetsky (and later, to some extent, in the 'popular (narodny) movement', particularly by Klyuyev) and, primarily, in the work of Khlebnikov. The latter made it one of the aesthetic principles of Russian

Futurism, allowing for it to go on to organically enter the poetics of the entire Russian literary avant-garde (an excellent example of this is provided by Tufanov).

The poetics of archaism in literature is founded on a narration of concerns over the divide between the 'old' ('own', 'Russian') and the 'new' ('alien', 'western'). Lexical archaism is close to the paronymic ('korneslovie', to use Khlebnikov's term) and wordplay ("samolyubie-samogubie" in Konevsky's poem *The Varangians*). In Aeschylus's *Agamemnon*, as translated by Ivanov, Clytemnestra puns following the death of her spouse: "...Vot on lezhit,/Suprug moi, Agamemnon, ubienny mnoi./Ruk zhenskikh delo! Ya l' ne rukodelnitsa?" [14] This was noted by parodists (see Izmailov's parody of Ivanov with the line: "Ya zryu tebya, blagaya von" ('blagovonie'). Ivanov himself continually played with words, preferring bilingual puns: 'feoria' ('procession' in Greek) - 'teoria'. Archaism is close to wordplay because play arises, as it were, between the meanings that are known and those that have been forgotten, and the outdated word performs as an alien language. In Ivanov's poem *Bog v lupanarii*, the neologism 'lik' - the verbal subject from the verb 'likovat'' ('to rejoice/exalt') - also retains its outdated meaning, 'litso' ('face'). For comparison, one can take Konevsky's poem *Gnomes*, under the same heading as Ivanov and only surviving in the manuscript of Odoevsky's tract. The punning in Apollon Apollonovich's speech in Andrei Bely's *Petersburg* ("Who's the Countess's husband?" - "The Count" - the Russian word used being 'grafin' - 'decanter') is part of the theme of the birth of reality out of words. Solovyov, the editor of the journal *Missionerskogo obozreniya* (Missionary Survey), dubbed the priest at the Preobrazhensky 'Preobramuzhskaya' (from S.Solovyov's book on the philosopher), the comic effect of which is enhanced if one recalls Solovyov's main myth - on the Transfiguration of Sophia, the female hypostasis of God. This linguistic strategy is not limited to literary texts. For example, Ivanov's political prose is full of wordplay, employed conceptually: 'organism' and 'organization' - here they cover the principle and type of human society, 'golos' and 'golosovanie' - when Ivanov speaks of democratic procedure of the expression of the will of the people (compare with the punning construct of the rhythm "Slavte, molot i stikh/Zemlyu molodosti" by Mayakovsky). Naturally, in wordplay and archaism, the division between own and alien languages is critical, which moves this discourse strategy closer to the method of translating foreign words into one's own language which is being studied (compare with Nabokov's invention 'krestoslovitsa' to replace 'crossword'). It is a short step from here to pure neologisms founded on root-words, which is to say neologisms

that sound like archaisms (Khlebnikov's 'Smekhachi'). In Nabokov's novel *The Gift*, where the poems of the central character, the author's alter-ego, Godunov-Cherdynets, are discussed at the Chernyshevskys, he comments on the phrase "vily v allee", indicating that he means figures made by an inexperienced cyclist (from the verb 'vilyat'' - 'to make sharp turns'), who is having trouble steering, rather than agricultural tools (pitchforks). For the émigré Nabokov, playing with meaning and confusing the reader, it seems, was linked with complete mastery of the Russian language, which is to say with his own experience of being Russian. For this reason, the technique is also motivated by his wish to distance himself from the corrupted mass of borrowings in language in the émigré environment.

Archaism in political thought at the turn of the centuries.

In the summer of 2000, Nikolai Romanov was canonized by the Russian Orthodox Church (in the orthodox church abroad he had already been canonized years before). He is increasingly seen not only as a political but also as a cultural activist. In that capacity, he began to attract the attention of various researchers (as with Peter I, Napoleon or any number of other famous political activists). The main questions put to Nicholas post factum, are why he stubbornly refused to admit the need for a constitution, why did he just as stubbornly hang on to the autocratic form of rule and why, finally, did he so stubbornly support the 'black hundred', a right-wing terrorist organization that arose in support of the government in 1905, even supporting it during the 'Beilis case' (thereby giving Beilis's acquittal such a revolutionary character).

Haltingly, Nikolai abdicated from the throne, though he could have made concessions and become a constitutional monarch, along the lines of the English monarchy. He was offered this opportunity, for example, by Milyuk, the leader of the rightwing Cadets. Just as haltingly, he made certain democratic concessions during the first Russian revolution: on February 18 he promised democratic freedoms, but only introduced them on October 17, though he soon disbanded the First Duma in the spring of 1906, only calling a Second almost a year later in March 1907.

There are many answers to these questions: Nicholas was raised by his father, Alexander III, who supported the old and Russification. Nicholas had mystical leanings, as evidenced by his association with Rasputin who, even after his murder, the imperial family believed to be saintly. The young Empress Alexandra Fyodorovna, as Princess Alice of Hesse, occupied herself

with the dry mysticism of the English philosopher-moralist David Strauss. On becoming Russian Empress she developed an interest in the American Presbyterian minister James Russel Miller), leaving hundreds of pages of synopses [15]. Thus, the Protestant mysticism of the empress had a strong foundation and combined with the mysticism of the Russian official doctrine of 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality'. Prior to Rasputin, as is well-known, the Tsar's family received the French Philippe, blessed by the famed French occultist Papus (G.Encosse). For Nicholas Romanov, mysticism meant a belief in the holiness of the tsar's power, making it, naturally, something very difficult to give up. Wortman, with justification, notes that the scenario for power of Nicholas II was based on the creation of a direct spiritual union with the people [16], and Nicholas conceived of himself as being the mystical leader of Russia.

Nevertheless, it remains unclear why Nicholas stubbornly clung on to the old. The apotheosis of state ideology in this sense was the celebration of the 300th anniversary of the House of Romanov in 1913. Here, the Tsar appeared in the clothing of the pre-Petrine era, which is to say the time of Alexei Mikhailovich [17]. On the one hand, this stressed the beginning of the rule of the Romanov family, while on the other, this antique clothing was perceived as an innovation. It was Nicholas's answer to the demands of the constitution and other western forms. As Wortman notes, the Romanovs' faith in the national idea and their perceiving of themselves as ancient leaders is important in that it coincides with the behaviour of European monarchs, who also tried on the mantles of national leaders [18].

What did this symbolic masquerade embody? Peter the Great, who westernized the upper strata of Russian society, introduced the concept of the emperor to Russia, with its associations with Rome, empire, Europe, etc ('amperator' said the Russian peasants, associating Peter with the antichrist [19]). Nicholas seemed to be proposing that it be replaced with 'tsar' ('tsar-father' said the Russian peasants). The tsar, despite the holiness of his authority, was a father to his people, and the entire nation could be seen as one big family. Panchenko long ago demonstrated that Russian society in the 17th Century (the time of the beginning of the rule of the Romanov House) was constructed along the lines of a family [20]. Every family had its spiritual guide, 'dukhovnik', who received the confessions of the members of the family. Society's family structure, elevated into a state principle (so-called 'mestnichestvo' or an 'order of precedence'), was one of the main objects in the reprisals carried out by Peter, putting people "without family, without clan", into the state bodies - talented adventurers

such as Menshikov and Gannibal, Pushkin's ancestor. Thus, the destruction of the image of the tsar and tsaritsa amongst the people was based on their being accused of debauchery: the tsarina with Rasputin and the tsar, for example, with frontline nurses [21]. The ideological foundation of these constructions is all the more significant as the real ruling family, as is well-known, had no links with the people for whom they were monarchs: European kings and Tsars were only to breed amongst themselves, creating a kind of super-national family.

The adventurer is a figure that is characteristic of the 18th Century [22], such as Kazanova. The adventurer is a person that embodies movement up the social ladder by virtue of certain talents. Thus, the adventurer is interested in a change of his personal position, just as he is interested in the replacement of that ladder altogether. In *The Genealogy of Morals*, Nietzsche wrote that in the Middle Ages, revolutions weren't needed because peasants didn't need to change their social position, and peasants had dignity (Nietzsche was always interested in threats to one's dignity). Here, it would make sense to mention the appearance of the pretenders to the throne that arose at the end of the 19th Century, when the myth of Fyodor Kuzmich appeared - Alexander I who, allegedly, left the throne to wander Russia, in order to move closer to the people. We should also note that one of the sections in the first collection of Russian decadence, Dobrolyubov's Natura Naturans, is dedicated to Fyodor Kuzmich.

There is no doubt that in Nicholas's consciousness, Petrine Russia was linked with unavoidable revolution - following the destruction of 'mestnichestva' or the order of precedence, the system itself would sooner or later demand that revolution (we can recall that Voloshin wrote in his poem *Rossiya* that "Peter I was the first Bolshevik, who thought of overturning Russia..."). In offering the people antiquated, patriarchal, feudal relations between the tsar and the nation, Nicholas was fighting against revolution with its very cause, which was to be found in new relations between the people and the tsar.

Notes

[1] "Взыскующиеграда". *A chronicle of the private lives of Russian religious philosophers in letters and diaries* Compiled and edited, with an introduction and commentary, by V.I Keidan. M. 1997. Page 670.

[2] The latter observation belongs to N.V. Kotrelev and was given by him in a lecture entitled *Epistolyarnoye povedeniye russkikh pisatelei* (November 1990).

[3] Carlo Ginzburg *The Cheese and the Worms. The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* Translated

by John and Anne Tedeschi. London and Henley, 1980. P. 5. For me, there is absolutely no doubt that Foucault's 'forbidden' society of a homosexual orientation played an enormous role in this. In the sphere of Tartus semiotics, an analogue for the concept of the discourse could be Lotman's 'semiosphere'. Without giving a review of these two concepts, I will only note the most important destinction between the two: Lotman is not interested in the process of the creation of the semiosphere, his approach in this instance being theoretical rather than historical.

[4] For more detail, see: A.M. Panchenko *Sillabicheskaya poeziya kak zvuchaschaja rech'*// A.M. Panchenko *Russkaya stikhotvornaya kul'tura XVII veka* L., 1973. It is from here, it seems, that Tynyanov's interest in 'pronounced' forms of poetry comes (the article *Oda kak oratorskii zhanr*, which is included in the same collection). Futurist poetry, in which Tynyanov orientated himself, is unthinkable without pronouncement or performance (take the famous *Poema konca* (Poem of the end) by the Futurist Vasilisk Gnedov, which consisted of a silent gesture of the hand).

[5] The link between the discursive practices of archaism and implicit political conservativism (if not nationalism) are analysed in a rather over-zealous work by the linguist I. Sandomirskaya (*Kniga o Rodine. Opyt analiza diskursivnykh praktik* Wien, 2001).

[6] Yu.M. Tynyanov *Arkhaisty i Pushkin* // Yu. Tynyanov *Arkhaisty i novatory* L., 1929. Page 91.

[7] It is interesting that F. Tyutchev, a romantic poet and conservative political thinker, had already understood this. For more detail on the sources of Uvarov's triad, see the chapter *Zavetnaya triada. Memorandum S. S. Uvarova 1832 goda i vozniknovenie doktriny "pravoslaviye - samoderzhaviye - narodnost'* in Andrei Zorin *Kormya dvuglavogo orla… Literatura i gosudartvennaya ideologiya v Rossii v poslednei treti XVIII - pervoi treti XIX veka* (M., 2001).

[8] The expression "sword and shield", of course, refers to the Templars. It is interesting that in 1915, one of the most passionate ideologists of conservatism, Vladimir Ern, would name his patriotic, anti-German collection of articles thus.

[9] For detail on Solovyov's view and similar moods within Russian governmental circles, see the article *The Yellow Peril* in: David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye *Toward the Rising Sun. Russian Ideologies of Empire and the Path to War with Japan* Nothern Illinois University Press, 2001.

[10] "...by the word 'hallucination' (which can be translated as: 'an aptitude to experiencing visions'; is it not 'a vision'?) we mean that condition of the organism when objects appear before a man that are not actually there, often in their real form, but with a symbolic meaning." (V. F. Odoevsky. *Letter to Countess E. P. R.---------a* [Rostopchina on visions, superstitious fears, cheating of the senses, magic, cabal, alchemy and other mysterious sciences//Native Notes. 1839. T. I. Page 6 (IX pagination)).

[11] This largely recreated the Scandinavian tradition: "Popular acknowledgement and the legitimacy of his power were demanded by the 'konung' on his accession to the throne and every time he was to lead his subjects. In short, one can say that the 'konung' was someone who belonged to the king's clan, was elected by the 'ting' and recognized by the people. In a situation where a choice was possible, the various qualities of the candidates were compared" (F.B. Uspensky *Name and Power. The choice of a name as an instrument in dynastic struggle in Medieval Scandinavia* M., 2001. Page 11).

[12] G.-F Budde, Yu. Koka *The concept of the German "Special Way": history, potential, limits of Applicability* // Ab Imperio. 2002. ? 1. Page 67 and further on.

[13] For different understandings of this term, see: Kolonitskii Boris Ivanovich *"Democracy" in the Political Consciousness of the February Revolution*, *Slavic Review*, 57 (1) (1998).

[14] Aeschyllus, *Tragedii* Translated by Vyacheslav Ivanov. M., 1989. Page 115.

[15] Richard S.Wortman *Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy* Princeton, 2000. Vol. 2. P. 332, 334. Little can compare with this comprehensive analysis in terms of the breadth of material covered and I'm obliged to this work for much inspiration, with many references omitted here due to a shortage of space.

[16] Wortman. Op. Cit. P. 365-366.

[17] For more detail, see: Richard Wortman *Publicizing the Imperial Image in 1913* // *Self and Story in Russian History* Ed. by Laura Engelstein and Stephanie Sandler. Ithaca, London, 2000 (this article

was included in *The Scenario of Power*). It should be noted that attention to the epoch of Muscovite Rus as a model had already been paid by Nicholas's father, Alexander III (see: R. Bortman *"Official Narodnost" and the national mysth of the Russian Monarchy of the 19th Century* //Russia. 1999. ? 3 [11]. Pp. 238-244).

[18] R. Wortman. *Nikolai II i obraz samoderzhaviya // Reformy ili revolyuciya? Rossiya 1861- 1917. Materialy mezhdunarodnogo kollokviuma istorikov* St. Petersburg, 1992. Page 19.

[19] See the work of M.B. Plyukhanova on the sacred character of the monarchy in Russia. For associated symbols and rituals, see the work of V. Zhivov and B. Uspensky.

[20] In the book *Russian Culture on the Eve of Petrovine Reform* (L. 1984).

[21] See: B. I. Kolonitsky *K izucheniyu mekhanizmov desakralisacii monarkhii (slukhi "politicheskaya pornografiya" v gody mirovoi voiny) // Istorik i revolyuciya, sbornik statei k 70-letiyu co dnya rozhdeniya Olega Nikolayevicha Znameskogo* St. Petersburg, 1999. Page 80-85.

[22] See, for example: A. Stroev *"Te, kto popravlyayet fortunu". Avantyuristy prosvescheniya* M., 1998, and Yu. Lotman's interesting thoughts on the subject given in his book *Kul'tura i vzryv*.

Literature

Al'tshuller, M.G. *Predtetshi slavjanofil'stva v russkoj literature*. Ann Arbor, 1994.

Bahtin, M.M. K filosofii postupka. *Raboty 1920-h godov*. Kiev, 1994: 9-68.

Foucault, Michel. *Mots et les choses: une archéologie des sciences humaines*. 1966 [Engl. *Order of things: an archaeology of the human sciences*].

Ginzburg, Carlo. *The Cheese and the Worms. The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-century Miller*. Translated by John and Anne Tedeschi. London and Henley, 1980.

Gorodetski, Sergei. "Blizhajshtshaja zadatsha russkoj literatury". *Zolotoe runo* 4/1906.

Kolonitskij, B.I. "K izucheniju mehanizmov desakralizacii monarhii (sluhi i "polititsheskaja pornografija" v gody Pervoj mirovoj vojny). *Istorik i revoljucija. Sbornik statej k 70-letiju so dnja rozhdenija Olega Nikolaevitsha Znamenskogo*. Sankt-Peterburg, 1999: 80-85.

Lotman, Ju. M. *Kul'tura i vzryv*. 1992.

Nietzsche, F. *Zur Genealogie der Moral*. Leipzig, 1892.

Pesonen, P. & Suni, T. (toim.) *Venäläinen formalismi: antologia*. Pieksämäki, 2001.

Tynjanov, Ju.N. *Arhaisty i novatory*. Leningrad, 1929.

Wortman, Richard S. "Nikolai II i obraz samoderzhavija". *Reformy ili revoljucija? Rossija 1861-1917. Materialy mezhdunarodnogo kollokviuma istorikov*. Sankt-Peterburg, 1992: 19.

Wortman, Richard S. *Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*. Princeton 2000a. Vol. 2.

Wortman, Richard S. "Publizing the Imperial Image in 1913". *Self and Story in Russian History*. Ed. by Laura Engelstein and Stephanie Sandler. Ithaca, London, 2000b.

[nikolai_2.jpg] [moneta.jpg]