Вестник МГИМО-Университета. 2018. 2(59). С. 7-25
DOI 10.24833/2071-8160-2018-2-59-7-25

NEW WORLD OUTLOOK IN THE LIGHT OF THE WESTERNIZATION OF PETER I

T.V. Chernikova

Moscow State Institute of International Relations (University), 76 Prospect Vernadskogo, Moscow, 119454, Russia.

The reign of Peter I paradoxically combined both the apogee of the might of the old patrimonial state and the accelerated westernization of the country. The article briefly analyzes some of the factors that strengthened the state patrimonial system: the consequences of the decree on the Unified Heritage of 1714 and the expansion of serfdom due to the appearance of new categories of serfs.

To a greater extent, the article is devoted to the study of accelerated Westernization in Russia under Peter the Great. It resulted in the curtailment of the patrimonial way of life in Russia.

The article focuses on the emergence of a new worldview doctrine. It considers various forms through which the formation of new understandings of social structures, culture, system of power and life in general took place. Such new practices as uttering panegyrics in honor of the monarch and his policies, public celebration of military victories (the organization of the so-called «Triumphs») and the church reforms greatly contributed to the formation of the new worldview. One of the vivid figures exemplifying it was Theophan Prokopovich.

In the first quarter of the 18th century westernization came to Russia directly from Western Europe. It removed all barriers to direct communication between Russians and foreigners, discredited the old ecclesiastical postulate that all Western Christians were "heretics", paved the way for the beginning of internal modernization as well as for the tragic fate of the socio-cultural split in Russia between the upper educated social strata and the bulk of the Russian population that remained in the Middle Ages.

Key words: Reforms of Peter the Great, state patrimonial structure, Westernization, the decree on the choice of one heir, the expansion of serfdom, panegyrics, «Triumphs», church reform, Theophan Prokopovich, the beginning of the socio-cultural split.

УДК 93/94
Поступила в редакцию 05.03.2018 г.
Принята к публикации 15.04.2018 г.

The epoch of Peter I left its imprint on the Russian history as a time of rapid westernization. However, in terms of the essence of this process, not all of the reforms implemented by the first Russian Emperor led to the destruction of the old Moscow foundations. The paradoxical combination of the old Moscow heritage and the new stage of Westernization made the essence of the reign of Peter I. The aim of this article is analyzing the legacy of the state patrimonial system during the early westernization and providing the evidence of emergence of a new worldview in Russia in the late 1690s and 1725s.

The evolution of Russian ideology and world outlook has been studied quite well by Russian and foreign scholars. The curious point about it, that the most devoted Peter's apologists – such as S.M. Soloviev, the founder of the Statist School in history studies, and N.I. Pavlenko, the modern historian who developed perfectly his concept, and V.O. Klyuchevsky, P.N. Milyukov, who were more critical in the Peter's reforms assessment, as well as Richard Pipes [18] and Helene Carrere d`Encausse [20], tough skeptics and critics of Peter's reorganization, – all of them agree that it was Peter I who initiated the real modernization of Russian social and political system. This viewpoint is concurred by nearly all authors who wrote about the Peter's era.

In contrast to the majority of historians studying the epoch of Peter I, we suggest the reign of Peter the summit of old patrimonial way of life in Russia. In late XVII – first quarter XVIII the object of true modernization was elite's thinking, not the mentality of the most of the Russian population. Moreover, the army and official institutions with their rules and regulations were also put under modernizing. Richard S. Wortman presents the most appealing understanding of novelties in public thinking in Russia in the times of Peter I [19].

The legacy of the epoch of the patrimonial structure in the time of Peter I

The social policy that was pursued by Peter I did not undermine the patrimonial structure («вотчинный уклад»)[1] of the Russian state at all. On the contrary, the control of the tsarist power over all social strata became tougher with the simultaneous restriction of the rights of movement, occupation and disposal of real estate. That is why it is no coincidence that historians and jurists of the 19th century characterized the social policy of Peter I as «the enslavement of all estates».

Indeed, according to the decree of 1714 [9, p. 91] about property inheritance both the owners of the *pomest`es* (conditional land tenures) and owners of the *votchinas* (unconditional land tenures) lost their right to divide their estates among heirs, being obliged to transfer them only to one of them. The interchange, sale, donation

[1] The peculiarity of the internal structure of patrimonial states is not only the existence of the highest political power of the monarch, but also the concentration in his hands of the right of supreme ownership over the entire land fund of the country and its other economic resources. Wartime way of life in the Middle Ages and early Modern times was characteristic of many Asian countries, the Ottoman Empire and Russia since the formation of a single Moscow state in the second half of the 15th century and until the early 1730's.

and the pledge of estates were forbidden. Young representatives of *szlachta* (legally privileged noble class) who went to the service as well as those common people who served in the noble rank no longer received estates (conditional land tenures). That took place against the background of an abrupt intensification of the regular service, that was still lifelong. Young people at service had no opportunity to choose the kind and place of service, because that was the prerogative of the authorities. The control of the noble children was established through the inspections and all of them according to the tsar's decree, were recruited. So they started a career with the lowest military ranks.

It should be noted that in spite of the tide in the reign of Peter I in the nobility of a large number of natives of the lower strata of the nobility and the formation of a new nobility of the Tsar's favorites, the most of the generals and the upper layer of the bureaucracy both during the time of Peter I and in the middle of the 18th century by calculations, Ivanov was 93% composed of old noble families [17, c. 33-34].

The merchants turned out to be responsible tax collectors in 1699-1708 and distributors of the monopoly state goods during the reign of Peter I. As a result, from 30 to 50% of merchants of two higher guilds (*gostinaya sotnya* and *sukonnaya sotnya*) went broke. Merchants were forced to unite in kumpanstva (partnerships) in order to construct military ships on their own funds. They lost the right to have estates with serf people. At the same time management or ownership of state-owned factories was often imposed upon merchants on unfavorable conditions.

Tens of thousands of *posad* people (towns people) had to leave their business because they were involved in the construction of shipyards, fortresses and St. Petersburg.

Even more pronounced was the state pressure in relation to rural residents. They accounted for more than 90% of the Russian population. Their obligations to the state included both the payment of taxes and work in favor of the state. At the same time, serfdom expanded in depth and breadth. New categories of serf people emerged. Among them were so called *posessionny`e* and ascribed peasants, serving manufacturing industry. *Chernososhny`e* peasants (personally free peasants), landowners supporting the border guard service, including those from Siberia, and several other rural social groups that had carried duties in favor of the state, turned into serfs of the state. According to the tax reform of 1724, there were no more free people who do not have a permanent place of residence or not registered in census books (вольные гулящие люди – *vol`ny`e gulyashhie lyudi*) as well as slaves. Both were obliged to pay head taxes (подушная подать – *podushnaya podat`*). The first census and its revision took place in 1718-1724. By a special decree of 1722, members of the clergy families who were not involved in the church service as well as priests out of service, sextons, deacons living in churches also became serfs. All of them were assigned to the owners of the villages where the church was located or to the landowners-parishioners of the temple, if it was not located in the owner's land. At the same time, government tax burden of privately owned and monastery peasants was almost 2 times stronger than a tax burden in favor of landowners (74 kopecks per year - against 40 kopecks per year).

The old Moscow connection of the Russian monarch with his subjects, built along the lines of «the tsar - the slaves», did not change, but took only new forms by 1725. Virtually all the means extracted through taxes were spent under Peter I on the army and the highest state authorities. However, in the middle and in the second half of the XVIII century the same thing was observed [16, c. 80].

However, the fact that the fundamental socio-political foundations of the patrimonial structure were not eliminated by Peter I did not mean that there were no innovations introduced during his epoch.

Radical innovations of the westernization

Russia entered a new era since the time of Peter the Great. A scheme of superficial Westernization that had been used since the second half of the 15th century till the middle of the 17th century and had been aimed at using of western military, technical, administrative and cultural experience, stayed during the reign of Peter the Great, but several significant changes appeared. In addition to the explosive growth in the number of borrowings, there was a transition from the Polish-Lithuanian «reading German innovations» to the direct receipt of them from Western Europe. At the end of the reign of Peter I the influence of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth resulted only in the preservation of the estate term *szlachta* (nobility). Discovered and more cardinal novelties:

1. The Supreme Power removed almost all obstacles on the way of direct communication between Russians and foreigners, both in Russia and abroad. In former times, the tsarist power had initiated Westernization, but at the same time it had created a socio-cultural barrier between Russians and foreigners.

2. The unequivocal religious and ideological postulate concerning «heretical» Western non-Orthodox Christians as well as their states deprived of divine grace disappeared. On the contrary, the tsar set an example of admiration for the achievements of the Western Europe. The adherents of an old Moscow piety became victims of rude mockery both from the monarch and successful part of the society, especially the youth.

3. The reforms of Peter I laid the preconditions for the further transition to deep Westernization and organic modernization. The term «western influence» that V.O. Klyuchevsky used to describe process that took place in the 17th century (in other words the superiority of various Western European achievements over the native antiquity) described not only the desire to obtain the achievements, but to understand which social foundations allowed these achievements to emerge.

4. However, such sentiments influenced only the minds of the nobility and the urban population. The main part of the Russian population, especially peasantry, was not ready for modernization that was needed to bridge the gap between Russia and the most developed countries of Europe.

Taxable strata of society remained in the Russian Middle Ages. This concerned their cultural and socio-economic situation, where even more than before, the people

were being crushed by the state and by its service class – *szlachta* (nobility). At the same time the Russian social elite (old and new nobility, bureaucracy, prosperous merchants) started to represent a new Russian culture that was a part of the European culture of the 18th century. A huge split between the culture of the elite and popular culture was formed, and that led to chronic incompleteness and inconsistency of the modernization process in Russia.

This new social and cultural split of Russia was deeper than the church schism of the 17th century. The church schism was one of so-called innovations of that century. It reflected the spiritual awakening of society that was still medieval, but not ready to remain silent. Thus they declared the position using the only possible way - the language of faith. It was a clear sign of progress. In some way this process was similar to the European renaissance of the Reformation. However, unlike the European Protestantism and the following reforms of Catholicism, which were generated by the spiritual demands of the emerging bourgeoisie, the Russian religious movement, including both adherents of Patriarch Nikon and the Old Believers, was totally medieval phenomenon. Florovsky writes «that Kostomarov was right when noted that the split had been deeply connected with the old days but it had been a phenomenon of a new life. According to Kostomarov, that was the paradox of the church Split. The schism was a dream about the old Russia, a kind of a sadness about the unrealized and already unrealizable dream» [10, p. 94]. The growing state and serf-owning oppression plunged most of the traditional peasant Russia of the 18th century into a «Lethargy». Rare attempts of people to implement the dreams of freedom resulted in the Cossacks robbery and, according to A.S. Pushkin, «senseless and merciless» rebellion of Pugachev. All these phenomena were dominated by a desire to destruct. There was no constructive program. In the economy and life traditional patriarchal-archaic forms with sacralization of extensive technologies of «grandfathers», which did not change fundamentally from the 10th-13th centuries, stiffened. This was done unlike what was happening in the life of the common people in the West of Europe in the earlier New Times.

Above this medieval foundation similar to the underwater iceberg, there was a small but clearly visible part of westernized absolute monarchy and emerging educated elite society that was represented by aristocracy, nobility, bureaucracy and rarely people of art and science.

«Triumphs» of Peter I as a symbol of a new world outlook

We will focus on a new world view concept, which was initiated by the state and produced by service class people. It entered the 18th century with a large number of medieval habits, one of which was to get the truth not from books or school, but to perceive it with eyes and ears. Therefore, during the time of Peter the Great, praise and panegyrics and especially public theatrical performances which were organized by the authorities on the occasion of their victories played a huge role.

Most of these performances called «Triumphs» presented to the public entirely new stories, allegories and symbols, taken from European literature, architecture and painting. As a result, all the intellectual-mental, ethical-esthetic, religious-philosophical and political developments of the Renaissance, the Baroque and the Enlightenment came to Russia simultaneously.

In the public space of the cities there was a place for the Sabbat of the All-Drunk Council (a mixture of Western farce and indecent anti-clerical satire of Russian buffoons), and carnival processions in the spirit of ancient Rome with fireworks and triumphal arches.

Familiar to Europe images of ancient Greek and Roman Gods, ancient heroes became a part of state offensive propaganda with important ideological overtones. Such things changed the mentality of nobility and townspeople.

For example, let's look at the first Triumph of Peter the Great. It was organized in Moscow on September 30, 1696 in honor of the seizure of Azov. From 9am till the darkness troops were marching through the capital's streets. Soldiers were moving among captive Turks. «The feats of the commanders, General and Admiral Lefort and General Shein, the feats of «the great captain» Peter I were celebrated. ... The Colonel Chambers was at the head of the Semyonov regiment, General Patrick Gordon was at the head of his troops. Behind them the regiment of archers were marching. Austrian and Brandenburg engineers, as well as Franz Timmerman with his shipbuilders and carpenters participated the procession» [1, p. 348].

American historian Richard S. Wortman underlines the importance of allegorical images and inscriptions that decorated the Arc de Triomphe. Strong baroque figures of Hercules and Mars with the inscriptions «With the Hercules' bravery» and «With the Mars' bravery» stroke the eye. Thus Hercules and Mars symbolized Western metaphors of monarch-hero, monarch-God … [12, p. 68-69]». A quote from the Gospel of Luke «A doer deserves the reward», placed on the pediment of the Arch, was written not under the icon, but under the image of ancient winged Victory with a laurel wreath. There were also inscriptions about Roman emperor Constantine, but he was presented not as a defender of Christianity, as Russian monks-scribes liked to present the previous Moscow monarchs. On the golden tapestries Constantine became an allegory of Tsar Peter I, glorifying him as a monarch-warrior, who returned like a Roman emperor with a victory and celebrated his triumph over unholy Tsar Maxentius of Rome (allegorical embodiment of the Ottoman sultan) [12, p. 69].

On the roof of Triumphal Arch there was a figure of Andrei Andreevich Vinius, the son of the Dutchman Andrew Vinius, the creator of the first iron-making European manufacture in Russia (Tula) in 1632, who ultimately joined the Orthodox church and Russian citizenship. Vinius Junior was a Duma (Council of the boyars) clerk and chief postmaster of Russia. At Triumph, he delivered his own panegyric.

Генерал, адмирал! Морских всех сил глава,
Пришёл, узрел, победил прегордого врага,

Мужеством командора турок вскоре поражён,
Премногих же орудий и запасов си лишён,
Сражением жестоким бусурманы побеждены,
Корысти их отбиты, корабли запалены [12, p. 68].

Se*mantic translation:*

General, Admiral! Marine all the forces of the head,
He came, saw, conquered the enemy enemy,
The courage of the commander defeated the Turks,
They are deprived of many tools and stocks
The battle of the cruel Busurmanas was defeated,
Their greed is repulsed, the ships are sunk

As we can see, Peter I was indirectly compared to Julius Caesar in the panegyric of Vinius through the words «Veni, vidi, vici». The words "I came, I saw, I conquered" were also placed on the Arch in three places.

In honor of the capture of Azov there were huge fireworks. Russian and foreign Musicians were playing on drums, European military music was heard.

In the future such Triumphs, but even more magnificent and long-lasting, became a common thing. But that was different from the old bell-rings and the procession of the clergy with icons. However, the sound of bells did not disappear, but in the Orthodox churches like in Europe in honor of the king and his merits panegyrics were also delivered. They had the same meaning as the verses of Andrew Vinius, but they were much more instructive and perfect. In terms of panegyrics there were no equal to Theophan Prokopovich, a rare in the spiritual environment supporter of all innovations of Peter I. However, other church bishops (the so-called «Latinists»), who supported the renewal and some development of the Russian Orthodox Church in the European style, did not fall behind Prokopovich in the number of panegyrics. Their ideological opponents, the conservatives of the «Grecophiles», were removed from the church management after 1700.

With the introduction of years from the birth of Christ on a Julian calendar (1700), the beginning of the new year was moved from September,1 to January,1. And according to the royal decree, New Year had to be celebrated cheerfully with Christmas trees, fireworks, treats. So, New year became as important as Christmas day.

Western European fashion for clothing and hairstyle played a great role in the process of Westernization of Russia. Since Peter I made decisions alone, perhaps, his spontaneous act could lead to new changes. In August 1698, he returned from the Great embassy to Europe and personally cut off the beard of Alexei Semyonovich Shein who suppressed the archers rebellion of 1698. This last representative of the ancient boyar family got the highest and unknown in Russia military rank generalissimo for the seizure of Azov in 1696. Later, according to the tsar's decree, all service class people as

well as townspeople were forced to shave the beard, despite the fact that people in Russia had never done it before.

In the 17th century in Russia for smoking of tobacco relied on the death penalty. Now smoking, borrowed by Russians from Western Europe has become the common practice.

In February 1699, the tsar cut the skirts of old Russian dress of his nobles during the consecration of a luxurious palace built in the style of European baroque in the German Quarter near Yauza (the river of the Moscow River) for the old friend and the teacher of Peter I - Franz Lefort. Later, in Kitay-gorod (the second ring of fortifications in Moscow) and near the Chudov Monastery in the Kremlin, advertisements were posted obliging people in Moscow and other cities and noblemen everywhere to wear German and Hungarian caftans. In the capital, where the first reform concerning the change of the old Russian dress to the Polish caftan (but with the prohibition of the German costume) was introduced by Tsar Feodor III Alekseevich, the elder brother of Peter the Great, the innovation was accepted calmly. Quite different was the reaction in the small towns. In Astrakhan, where the rebel against the increasing taxes and abuse of power took place, people called out «For Beard and Russian Dress!».

The defeat of the rebels in Astrakhan, as well as other numerous riots of the epoch, were publicly condemned by church.

«The Kuranty», the first kind of newspaper in the 17th century, read only for the tsar and the boyars, was replaced in 1703 by the European newspaper «Vedomosti» that had a huge circulation of 2,000 copies. The American scientist R. Pipes gives the following assessment of its role: «This newspaper made a great contribution to the Russian cultural life and marked the most important constitutional innovation, because thus Peter the Great put an end to the Moscow tradition of dealing with domestic and foreign news as with state secret» [7, p. 173].

How had all these innovations changed the mentality of the Russian population after the death of the initiator?

Usually when it comes to the death of the Emperor Peter I, we remember the funeral speech of Theophan Prokopovich: «What happened? Russians, what have we come to? What can we see? What are we doing? We are burying Peter the Great ... But his strength and glory are with us. Russia will keep all he has done. Russia is a nightmare for the enemies, and it will continue to be a nightmare; Russia is glorious, and Russia cannot stop to be glorious. He has left us spiritual, civil and military improvements» [6, p. 552].

However, in the folklore sources, in addition to folk tales about Peter is the Antichrist and cry of the new recruit about his heavy share, we find monuments that are related in spirit to the burial Panegyric of Prokopovich. They come from the people's soldier's mass, brought up by Peter's "military regulations", their own military exploits and "Triumphs" in their honor. In Russia, the ratio of the army to the population was 3 times higher than in Western Europe. There were 1 soldier per 100 inhabitants [15, p. 100]

Let us give an example of a «soldier's song», made up with an ideology that was witnessed in the public presentations of the era. The publishers called the song «The Death of Peter I». It begins with a story about the last hours of the emperor's life.

Под одеялечком лежит удалой добрый молодец,
Удал добрый молодец, наш православный царь.
Православный царь Пётр Алексеевич.
Перед ним стоят все князья-бояре,
Все старшие фельдмаршалы:
«Тебе, видно, худо можется,
Худо можется конец ближится.
На кого ты своё царство приказываешь,
На кого ты своё государство отказываешь?
Кому у нас будет сенат судить,
Кому у нас владеть каменной Москвой,
Каменной Москвой, всей Россиею?»

А возговорил наш батюшка православный царь,
Православный царь Пётр Алексеевич:
«Сенат судить вам, князьям-боярам,
Каменна Москва и Россия вся — моей государыне».

Услыхала государыня,
Из палат идёт, сама вопит:
«О ты гой еси, мой мил-сердечный друг,
Православный царь Пётр Алексеевич!...

The following part of this sad ballad takes us to the funeral of the tsar.

Ах ты батюшко светел месяц.
Что ты светишь не по старому,
Не по старому и не по-прежнему.
Всё ты прячешься за облаки,
Закрываешься тучей тёмною.
Что у нас было на Святой Руси,
В Петербурге в славном городе,
Во соборе Петропавловском, что у правого у крылоса.

У гробницы государевой,
Молодой солдат на часах стоял,
Стоючи, он призадумался,
Призадумавшись, он плакать стал,

И он плачет, что река льётся,
Возрыдает, что ручьи текут,
Возрыдаючи, он вымолвил:
«Ах ты матушка сыра земля,
Раступися ты на все стороны,
Ты раскройся, гробова доска,
Развернися ты, золота парча,
И ты встань, проснись, православный царь.
Посмотри сударь, на свою гвардию,
Посмотри на всю армию,
Уже все полки во строю стоят
…
Дожидаются они полковника,
Что полковника преображенского,
Капитана бомбардирского» [4, p. 312].

Semantic *translation:*

Under the blanket lies a good fellow,
Daring good fellow, our Orthodox king.
The Orthodox Tsar Peter Alexeyevich.
In front of him are all the boyar princes,
All senior field marshals:
«You seem to feel bad,
Your end is approaching.
On whom you leave your kingdom,
To whom do you convey your state?
Who will appoint our Senate,
Who will own stone Moscow,
Stone Moscow, the whole of Russia?»
And our Orthodox king said,
Orthodox Tsar Peter Alekseevich:
«In the Senate you, the boyars- princes, will judge,
Stone Moscow and all of Russia departs to my empress!»
The Empress heard,
She goes from the chambers, she screams:
Oh, my dear dear friend,
The Orthodox Tsar Peter Alekseevich! …

The following part of this sad ballad takes us to the funeral of the tsar.

Oh, you're a father bright moon.
That you do not shine in the old way,

Not according to the old and not as before.
You're all hiding behind the clouds,
You close the dark cloud.
What we had in Holy Russia,
In St. Petersburg in a glorious city,
In the Cathedral of Peter and Paul, that at the right wing.

At the tomb of the sovereign,
The young soldier stood on the clock,
Standing still, he pondered,
After thinking, he began to cry,
And he cries that the river is pouring,
He sobs that the streams flow,
Crying, he uttered:
«Oh, you are the mother of cheese earth,
You stepped on all sides,
You open up, a coffin board,
Turn around you, brocade gold,
And you rise, wake up, Orthodox king.
Look sir, at your guard,
Look at the whole army,
Already all the regiments in the ranks are
...
They wait for the colonel,
That Colonel Transfiguration[2],
The captain of the bombardier».

In spite of the naive and traditional for folklore form, the events of January 1725, including the official explanation of the reason of the emperor's death were quite clearly expressed. The emperor chose the heir in 1724 when his second wife Ekaterina Alekseevna was crowned. We can notice a respect for the higher military ranks (the boyar princes, senior field marshals) who conducted the affairs of the Senate. At the same time, there is a veiled but absolutely understandable assessment of the role of Peter I. It is obvious that the educational side of Peter's decrees, triumphs and panegyrics impressed the author or the authors of that song, although the images taken from the ancient myths were strange for the soldiers.

The army of Peter I became a part of the westernized Russian absolutism not just because of form and principles of organization, but also because of its spirit and mentality. Tsar Peter I became one of its main military and state symbols. The latter can be illustrated by the comparison of folk songs about the hard life of the early 18th century.

[2] Colonel Transfiguration (полковник преображенский) - in the XVII-XIX century a synonym for the Russian Tsar.

with the soldier's songs of the time of Peter I. The first ones are full of sorrow while the latter are full of positive assessments of the reforms.

«Agent of the Reform of Peter I» Theophan Prokopovich and the church question

If we talk about the people of the Modern period of history, who turned out to be significant figures of the beginning of the 18th century, then it is necessary to look at Theophan Prokopovich known as the indisputable "genius of panegyric". He, although being a monk, was more than anyone else corresponded to the royal conception of the ideal subject of new and, as the tsar considered, European Russia.

The figure of Theophan was a kind of a new man that was formed under the influence of both Europe and Peter's Russia. He was a son of a merchant from Smolensk, he was an orphan. His uncle, the rector of Kiev Theological Academy, brought him up. Theophan had his uncle's surname, and while being a monk took his name. Pokopovich junior got the best of all possible in Russia of the 17th century spiritual education, graduated from the Kiev Theological Academy. At the age of 19 he moved to Europe, visited three German universities, declared himself a Uniate (supporter of the union of the Catholic and Orthodox Churches) and stayed in Rome at the Jesuit College of The Holy Athanasius (1701-1704). This institution was known for good education and trained the Uniate missionaries from the Greeks and Slavs. (The College of St. Athanasius was known by its graduate, the Croatian Yuri Krizhanich,who was in many respects a "forerunner" of Peter's reforms, one of the "fathers" of pan-Slavism, who came to Russia of his own free will to glorify Alexei Mikhailovich, the tsar of that single power with which Krizhanich connected the unification of all Slavs and the liberation of them both from the Turks and from the Germans.) In Rome, Prokopovich's flexible mind drew the attention of Pope Clement XI, who wanted to him to stay In Rome, but Theophan remained faithful to the Motherland. Moreover ,Prokopovich did not become a fan of Catholic theology. The Protestant interpretation of the Holy Gospel was closer to him [11, p. 315-326].

However, Theophan returned to Kiev in 1704, and declared his adherence to Orthodoxy. He taught poetics, rhetoric, philosophy and theology in the Kiev Academy. He was a fan of Hobbes, Descartes, Bacon and European science in general. He fought for the opening of secular schools and created one at his own for the orphans who were on his own expense. In addition to reading, writing and arithmetic, he taught the basics of various sciences, and had dance and secular European etiquette teachers at school.

Peter I noticed Theophan in the summer of 1709 after the latter delivered his famous panegyric in Kiev on the occasion of the Poltava victory. During the Prut campaign of 1711, Prokopovich already accompanied the tsar. Later he became the head of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy. In 1716 he moved to St. Petersburg to be near the tsar. June 2, 1618 he became the Bishop of Pskov and Narva, the head of the clergy of St.

Petersburg Province, and at the same time the head of the informal "scientific squad of Peter I". With the help of Theophan, Peter I worked out and conducted one of his most important and at the same time disputed sociocultural transformations known as church reform.

From our point of view, the problem of the Russian church, consisted of its two features. The inner one was connected with the inertness of the clergy, that resulted in no adequate response to the development of society. External one was the desire of the Moscow tsars to subordinate the church to their state interests.

By the beginning of the 18th century. the tendency to subordinate the church was not already new. The first attempts to do it, however unsuccessfully, had been made in the middle - the second half of the 14th century by the Grand Dukes of Moscow Simeon the Proud (1340-1353) and Dimitry Donskoy (1359-1389). Real progress in this process took place after the refusal of Basil II of the Dark (with interruptions, 1425-1462) to recognize the Florentine Union of 1439 and after the introduction of autocephaly, followed by the split from the Orthodox (not Uniate) The Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople that lasted till the middle of the 16th century.

This schism, which neither church nor secular historians like to write about, led to the "nationalization" of the Russian Orthodox Church, its temporary disappearance from the official hierarchy of the universal Orthodox community. As a result, the Russian autocephaly found itself one on one with the gaining power patrimonial state of the second half of the 15th and 16th centuries. Ivan the Terrible Ivan (1533-1584) already himself appointed the metropolitans. Moreover, the story with Philip Kolychev showed us that the issue of their life and death was also decided by the Tsar. The Monk Prikaz (the highest central judicial organ for the clergy) of the middle of the 17th century, that controlled the revenues of the church, and the collapse of Nikon after his quarrel with Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich already demonstrated that a symphony of the tsarist and patriarchal authorities is like a soloist and a musician who had to play along.

Peter began his church reform with the ban on the choice of a new patriarch after the death of Patriarch Adrian (October 15, 1700), and ended with the publication of the Manifesto on the Establishment of the Spiritual Collegium on February 5, 1721. The latter was opened on February 25, 1721 and was more often called the Holy Governing Synod. The staff of Synod consisted of both spiritual and secular people, but they were all appointed by the Tsar and swore allegiance to him. The work of the Synod was controlled by the monarch's secular chief prosecutor (обер-прокурор – *ober-prokuror*).

That is how Peter I completed the long process of church subordination to the state. The decrees of Peter III (1762) and Catherine II (1764) on the secularization of church lands became the finishing touch of this process.

Since 1718 Prokopovich became the main government publicist, apologist of absolute power, editor and author of many texts of decrees and all laws concerning the church. He wrote «The Story about Power and Honor of the Tsar» (1718), the foreword to the «Sea Charter» (1719), «The Laudatory Story about the Russian Fleet»,

«The Manifesto on the Establishment of the Spiritual Collegium», «Spiritual order» and «Oath for the Members of the Holy Synod» (all written in 1721), «A Brief Guide for Preachers» and «Declaration of Monasticism» (1724), «The First Teaching of the Youth». These works were among the fundamentally important acts of the supreme power, which Prokopovich was related to. One of the most important acts was the «Truth of the Monarch's Will in Determining the Successor of the Power»[3], which Theophan created to prove the legitimacy and validity of the «Charter of Succession to the throne» of 1722.

Moreover, Prokopovich advocated for the development of primarily secular not spiritual education in Russia, advised the Tsar to invite European scientists and create with their help the Russian Academy of Sciences, that was realised already after Peter's death in 1725 but according to his decree of 28 January 1724. It was Prokopovich who was the first «European» theoretician of secular poetry and rhetoric (books «Poetics», 1705, «Rhetoric», 1707). He became the tutor of the first Russian classic poet Antiochus Cantemir, who was the predecessor of Russian literary classicism in general, represented in the writings of Tredikovsky, Lomonosov and Sumarokov [5, p. 364-365; 8, p. 73-93]. By the way, Prokopovich would play a crucial role in the life of young Mikhail Lomonosov in the 1730s. The Moscow Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy enrolled only the children of clergy and nobles. Lomonosov pretended to be the nobleman's son, but the deception was revealed. He had to be severely punished. What is more, such deception could entail a terrible prohibition to continue the education. But the case was under Prokopovich's consideration, and he forgave Mikhail and blessed him for the further education.

Theophan's religious and philosophical views were closer to Protestantism ideas. This fact led to latent or obvious enmity towards him by the higher hierarchs of the Russian clergy, including both supporters of Byzantine Orthodox culture – the «greekophiles» who had been removed from the church leadership by Peter I and the «Latinists» headed by Stephen Yavorsky, locum of the patriarch from 1701 to 1721.

The «latinistes» were not against political and military reforms of Peter I. Like Theophan, they delivered panegyrics about the victories of Russia. Students of the Moscow Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy made up with scenarios and created scenery for the «Triumphs». Since 1700 Stefan Yavorsky, Metropolitan of Ryazan and Protector of the Academy, began to invite teachers from the Kiev Academy and changed the main language in school education from Greek to Latin. That was done at the insistence of Peter I... Kiev teachers brought to Russia the Roman symbolics and baroque imagery that Peter I used to create his new «imperial style [12, p. 75]».

But most of the supporters of the Catholic culture were opponents of Prokopovich's views on the "correct" relationship between church and government.

---

[3] Правда воли монаршей. СПб., 1722.
Pravda voli monarshej. SPb., 1722.
Truth of the Monarch's Will in Determining the Successor of the Power. Saint-Petersburg, 1722. URL:http://imwerden.de/pdf/feofan_prokopovich_pravda_voli_monarshej_1722.pdf (In Russian)

One of the most famous theologians of the twentieth century Georgii Florovsky writes: «Theophan Prokopovich (1681-1736) was a terrible person. Even his appearance had something ominous. He was a typical mercenary and adventurer ... It would be right to call him a businessman, not an activist. One of the historians cleverly called him «an agent of the Peter's reforms». However, Theophan was faithful to Peter I, there was almost no adulation in their relations, and Theophan was engaged in reforms with enthusiasm ... His glorified story about the Tsar's funeral reflected the real grief , not just a fear. It seemed that Theophan was sincere only in this loyalty to Peter I, as the Reformer and the hero [10, p. 122]». And many clerics of that time would surely agree with him.

The majority of secular historians saw the figure of Theophan Prokopovich in a different way, although they did not veil many of the gloomy aspects of his personality. But they appeared later in 1725-1736, when the Vice-President of the Synod Theophan having lost his faithful patron Peter the Great had to fight for his position as a head of the Spiritual Collegium against the background of denunciations about his heretics. He was merciless to the opponents, who had the same qualities, but were less smart, as the case of Markell Radyshevsky showed us [14].

Florovsky, as well as Stefan Yavorsky or Markell Radyshevsky disliked Theophan not only because they suspected him in «Lutheran heretics». They were strong opponents of Theophan's refusal to recognize the clergy as a special stratum among regular state servants.

Both Theofan and Peter I understood that it was necessary to modernize the church life, because otherwise a complete transition of people from medieval spirituality to the spiritual life of the New Age was impossible [3, p.43-46]. Another question is whether they have chosen the right form of reform? We are not going to judge how much Stefan Yavorsky and his supporters understood the need for the modernization of the Russian Orthodox Church (a kind of analogue of the Reformation and further reform in the Catholic Church, which allowed both Western confessions to maintain independence and high authority among the public and the state). «Grekofiles» (supporters of Byzantine Orthodox culture) to which the majority of the Russian clergy belonged did not understand this necessity, sharing the position of Patriarch Joachim (1674-1690), the author of the famous «Testament», addressed to Tsars Ivan V and Peter I with the call to expel all heterodox Christians from Russia, break down their Lutheran Churchs and to stop hiring Western specialists and thereby save the Orthodox souls from Western temptation [13, p. 488].

Peter I did not waste time having discussions with the clergy. He simply broke down the institution of the patriarchate, which interfered with his reforms. But at the same time he destroyed the very possibility of modernizing the church. The Reform of Synod completed the long process of subordination of the Russian Church to the Russian state. The clergy turned into civil servants on the religious and ideological issues. Moreover, they played the role of secret agents of political investigation. The decrees of Peter I, and in particular the «Spiritual regulations» abolished the secrecy of shrift, if it concerned a political crime.

The aim of the «Spiritual regulations» was to preserve the purity of Orthodoxy using education and science as the main means. Prokopovich advised: «... if we look closer through the history, we will see the worst in the time of bad education...[4]». According to the «Spiritual regulations» Old Believers were considered as an ignorance and had to be eradicated.

The claims of the best part of the Orthodox clergy of the twentieth century to Theophan were not connected with the propaganda of secular science. They had more in common with the following idea. «The magnification of the royal power and the proof of its absoluteness are the main ideas of Theophan. We can find his comprehensive ideas on this issue in the «Truth of the Monarch's Will»[5]. It is obvious that Peter I could give the arguments of his power to the clergy even without the postulates of Prokopovich. «It is rumored that the Tsar, attending the meeting of church hierarchs, discovered their desire to have a patriarch. Peter took the Spiritual Regulations out of his pocket and confidently said the following: «You ask for a patriarch, – here's a spiritual patriarch. With these word he took a dirk, hit the table and, speaking to the dissatisfied, added: "For all dissatisfied here is a patriarch of steel!» [6, p. 439]. In the Spiritual Regulations, the same thought is expressed in other words «Monarchs are autocrats, and God tells to obey them; monarchs have their advisers in order to prevent the unruly people from slandering ....[6]».

Florovsky finds out Prokopovich's views in the Western ideas: «Theophan stuck to the typical doctrine of the century, shared the ideas of Puffendorf, Grotius, Hobbes. They were ideologists of the era of Peter I .... Theofan almost believed in the absoluteness of the state. There is only «POWER», and there is absolutely no special spiritual power. It is very easy to find out the similarity of the Russian Regulations to those «regulations» or «church statutes» («Kirchenordnungen»), which had been formed after the Reformation in different princedoms for the newly established local Consistories. According to Florovsky, «The Reforms of Peter I led to the domination of the Protestant church ... the Russian Church turned out to be at risk. Since that time the clergy in Russia became a «frightened stratum». Partly it was pushed to the bottom of the social ladder. And at the top of it everybody kept ambiguous silence. The best ones turned out to be locked in themselves, since there was no other way for them in the 18th century. So one of the most important consequences of the reforms was the paralysis of the clergy. And in the future the Russian church continued to develop under this double inhibition - an administrative order and an internal fright» [10, p. 119-122].

It is difficult not to agree with such point of view. In Russia, in the spiritual life of both of the clergy and common people of the entire 18th century the main thing of

---

[4] Духовный регламент.
Duxovny`j reglament. Spiritual regulations. URL: https://knigogid.ru/books/36288-duhovnyy-reglament-1721-god/toread (In Russian)

[5] Правда воли монаршей. СПб., 1722.
Pravda voli monarshej. SPb., 1722.

[6] Духовный регламент.
Duxovny`j reglament. Spiritual regulations. URL: https://knigogid.ru/books/36288-duhovnyy-reglament-1721-god/toread (In Russian)

Western Protestantism known as the spirit of capitalism was absent. As for the «Spiritual Regulations» of the Protestant countries (the German «police states», as Florovsky writes), they formalized, but did not subordinate religious life to the state, which sharply differed them from the realities of the Synod reform in Russia.

References

1. Bogoslovskii M.M. *Petr I materialy dlia biografii* [Peter the First. Materials for biography]. Leningrad, Gospolitizdat Publ., 1940. Vol. 1. 435 p. (In Russian).
2. Buranok O.M. Feofan Prokopovich i V.K. Trediakovskii: preemstvennost literaturnykh traditsii [Feofan Prokopovich and VK Trediakovsky: Continuity of Literary Traditions]. *V.K. Trediakovskii i russkaia literatura* [V.K. Trediakovsky and Russian Literature]. Ed. by A.S. Kurilov. Moscow, IMLI Publ., 2005. Pp. 73-93. (In Russian).
3. Vinter E. Feofan Prokopovich i nachalo russkogo prosveshcheniia [Feofan Prokopovich and the beginning of the Russian Enlightenment]. *XVIII vek. rol i znachenie literatury XVIII veka v istorii russkoi kultury* [XVIII century. The role and importance of the literature of the XVIII century in the history of Russian culture]. Moscow, Leningrad, Institut russkoi literatury (pushkinskii dom) RAN Publ., 1966. Pp. 43-46. (In Russian).
4. *Istoricheskie pesni i ballady* [Historical songs and ballads]. Moscow, Sovremennik Publ., 1991. 765 p. (In Russian).
5. *Istoriia vsemirnoi literatury* [History of World Literature]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1988. Vol. 5. 348 p. (In Russian).
6. Pavlenko N.I. *Istoriia Petra Velikogo* [History of Peter the Great]. Moscow, Veche Publ., 2006. 576 p. (In Russian).
7. Pipes R. *Russia under the old regime.* Penguin Publ., 1997. 384 p. (Russ. ed.: Paips R. Rossiia pri starom rezhime. Moscow, Nezavisimaya Gazeta Publ., 1993. 424 p.)
8. Pigarev K.V., Fridlender G.M. Feofan Prokopovich. *Istoriia vsemirnoi literatury* [History of World Literature]. Moscow, Nauka Publ., 1988. Vol. 5. Pp. 363-365. (In Russian).
9. *Complete Collection Of Laws Of The Russian Empire.* Vol. V (1713-1719). No. 2789. (In Russian).
10. *Prot. Georgii Florovskii. Puti russkogo bogosloviia* [Ways of Russian theology]. Moscow, Institute of Russian Civilization Publ., 2009. 848 p. (In Russian).
11. Tikhomirov F.A. Ideia absoliutizma boga i protestantskii skholastizm v bogoslovii feofana prokopovicha [The idea of God's absolutism and Protestant scholasticism in Theophan Prokopovich's theology]. *Khristianskoe chtenie* [Christian reading], 1884, no. 9-10, pp. 315-326. (In Russian).
12. Uortman R.S. *Stsenarii vlasti. mify i tseremonii russkoi monarkhii* [Scenarios of power. Myths and ceremonies of the Russian monarchy]. Vol. 1. Ot petra velikogo do smerti Nikolaia I [From Peter the Great to the death of Nicholas I]. Moscow, OGI Publ., 2004. 605 p. (In Russian).
13. Chernikova T.V. *Protsess evropeizatsii v rossii vo vtoroi polovine XV-XVII vv.* [The process of Europeanization in in the second half of the XV-XVII centuries]. Phd diss. Moscow, 2014. Vol. II. 941 p. (In Russian).
14. Chistovich I.A. *Feofan Prokopovich i ego vremia* [Theophanes Prokopovich and his time]. St. Petersburg, Imp. akad. Nauk Publ., 1868. 762 p. (In Russian).
15. Clark G. *The seventeenth Century.* Oxford Publ., 1947. 461 p.
16. Jones R.E. *The Emancipation of the Russia Nobility,* 1762-1785. Princeton Publ., 1973. 80 p.
17. Meehan-Waters B. *The muscovite Noble Origins of the Russian in the Generalitet of 1730. Cahiers de monde russe et sovetique.* V. XII. № 1-2. Pp. 33-34.
18. Pipes R. E. *Russia Under the Old Regime.* Penguin Books Publ., 1995. 361 p.
19. Wortman R.S. *Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy. V. I. From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I.* Princeton NJ Publ., 2006. 512 p.
20. D`Encausse H.C. *La Russie inachevée.* Fayard Publ., 2000. 285 p.

About author:

Tatiana V. Chernikova – Doctor of Sciences (Historical Sciences), Professor of Department of world and national history at MGIMO-University. E-mail: Tchernikova1961@mail.ru.

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ НОВОГО МИРОВОЗЗРЕНИЯ В РОССИИ В ХОДЕ ВЕСТЕРНИЗАЦИИ ПРИ ПЕТРЕ I

Т.В. Черникова
DOI 10.24833/2071-8160-2018-2-59-7-25

Московский государственный институт международных отношений (университет) МИД России

Царствование Петра I парадоксально сочетало в себе как апогей могущества старого патримониального государства, так и ускоренную вестернизацию страны. В статье кратко анализируются ряд факторов, укрепивших государственную патриархальную систему, в частности Указ о единонаследии 1714 года и расширение крепостного права из-за появления новых категорий крепостных. В значительной степени статья посвящена изучению ускоренной вестернизации при Петре Великом, которая привела к ограничению патримониального образа жизни в России.

В статье основное внимание уделяется становлению нового мировоззрения, различных форм, посредством которых происходило формирование новых социальных структур, культуры, системы власти и жизни в целом. Публикация панегириков в честь монарха и его политики, публичное празднование военных побед (организация так называемых «триумфов») и церковные реформы внесли большой вклад в формирование нового мировоззрения. Одной из ярких фигур, иллюстрирующих этот процесс, является Феофан Прокопович.

В первой четверти XVIII века вестернизация в Россию пришла непосредственно из Западной Европы. Она устранила препятствия для общения между русскими и иностранцами, развенчала старый церковный постулат о том, что все западные христиане были «еретиками», проложила путь к началу внутренней модернизации, а также к трагической судьбе социально-культурного раскола в России между высшими образованными социальными слоями и большей частью русского населения, которая осталась в Средние века.

Ключевые слова: Реформы Петра Великого, государственная патримониальная структура, вестернизация, Указ о единонаследии, расширение крепостного права, панегирики, «триумфы», церковная реформа, Феофан Прокопович, начало социокультурного раскола.

Список литературы

1. Богословский М.М. Петр I. Материалы для биографии. Л.: Госполитиздат, 1940. Т. I. 435 с.
2. Буранок О.М. Феофан Прокопович и В.К. Тредиаковский: преемственность литературных традиций // В.К.Тредиаковский и русская литература / Под ред. А.С. Курилова. М.: ИМЛИ, 2005. С. 73-93.
3. Винтер Э. Феофан Прокопович и начало русского Просвещения // XVIII век. Роль и значение литературы XVIII века в истории русской культуры. М.; Л.: Институт русской литературы (Пушкинский Дом) РАН, 1966. С. 43-46.
4. Исторические песни и баллады. М.: Современник, 1991. 765 с.
5. История всемирной литературы. М.: Наука, 1988. Т. 5. 348 с.

6. Павленко Н.И. История Петра Великого. М.: Вече, 2006. 576 с.
7. Пайпс Р. Россия при старом режиме. М.: Независимая газета, 1993. 424 с.
8. Пигарев К.В., Фридлендер Г.М. Феофан Прокопович // История всемирной литературы. М.: Наука, 1988. Т. 5. С. 363-365.
9. ПСЗ. Т. V (1713-1719). № 2789.
10. Прот. Георгий Флоровский. Пути русского богословия. М.: Институт русской цивилизации, 2009. 848 с.
11. Тихомиров Ф.А. Идея абсолютизма Бога и протестантский схоластизм в богословии Феофана Прокоповича // Христианское чтение. 1884. № 9-10. С. 315-326.
12. Уортман Р.С. Сценарии власти. Мифы и церемонии русской монархии. Т. 1. От Петра Великого до смерти Николая I. М.: ОГИ, 2004. 605 с.
13. Черникова Т.В. Процесс европеизации в России во второй половине XV-XVII вв. Дис. на соиск. ст. д.и.н. М., 2014. Т. II. 941 с.
14. Чистович И.А. Феофан Прокопович и его время. СПб.: Тип. Имп. Акад. наук, 1868. 762 с.
15. Clark G. The seventeenth Century. Oxford, 1947. 461 p.
16. Jones R.E. The Emancipation of the Russia Nobility, 1762-1785. Princeton, 1973. 80 p.
17. Meehan-Waters B. The muscovite Noble Origins of the Russian in the Generalitet of 1730. Cahiers de monde russe et sovetique. V. XII. № 1-2. Pp. 33-34.
18. Pipes R. E. Russia Under the Old Regime. Penguin Books, 1995. 361 p.
19. Wortman R.S. Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy. V. I. From Peter the Great to the Death of Nicholas I. Princeton NJ, 2006. 512 p.
20. D`Encausse H.C. La Russie inachevée. Fayard, 2000. 285 p.

Об авторе:

Черникова Татьяна Васильевна – д.и.н., профессор кафедры всемирной и отечественной истории МГИМО МИД Российской Федерации.
E-mail: Tchernikova1961@mail.ru.