

WINNER OF THE 2016 HOFFMAN PRIZE:

WESTERN (MIS)PERCEPTIONS OF TSAR IVAN IV VASILYEVICH THE
"TERRIBLE":
DEPICTIONS OF IVAN IV'S REIGN BY WESTERN WRITERS
FROM THE 16th TO THE 21st CENTURY ALONGSIDE 16th-CENTURY
WORKS OF WESTERN EUROPEAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

Author:
Albert C. Cavallaro

Faculty Sponsor:
Rachel Goldman,
Department of History

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the depictions of Ivan IV Vasilyevich the "Terrible" by his 16th century Western European coevals and modern western historians, while simultaneously situating Ivan's reign in the broader discourse of Western European political thought occurring during his lifetime. Utilizing a variety of sources, including: written reports from English travelers in the 16th century; a letter from King Sigismund of Poland to Elizabeth I in 1559; and Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince*, this paper shows how the written vilifications of Ivan are more a result of a long Western European tradition of "othering" Russian culture, and a reaction to Ivan's pursuit, and commencement, of the Livonian War, rather than being due to Ivan's actions exhibiting any significant divergence from that of contemporaneous Western European political thought. This paper is envisioned as an accompaniment and enlargement of the debate started by *Ivan the Terrible: Profiles in Power*, which shows Ivan's actions as being a product of the religious and political thought predominate in Muscovy during the 16th century.

INTRODUCTION

The reign of the Muscovite Tsar Ivan IV Vasilyevich, commonly known by the persistent English mistranslation of his epithet Groznyi as "Terrible", from 1547 to 1584 was immensely productive. Domestically, the tsar "issued a new law code, regulated and routinized military service, reformed procedures for taxation and local administration... built a system of state chancelleries staffed by full-time clerks"¹ and ordered "the first attempts to create a large-scale general map of Muscovy in its entirety"²; while, concurrently, engaging in the successful military expansion into, and subsequent conquering of, the Khanates of Kazan in 1552³, and Astrakhan in 1556: both 16th century remnants of Batu's Golden Horde, also known as the Kipchak Khanate, which conquered the embryonic Russian state of Kievan Rus'⁴ in 1240 and instituted a following period of Mongol dominion in the area that lasted until 1480⁵. However, not all of Ivan's exhibitions of bellicosity were greeted with success, with the twenty-five year long Livonian War, fought from 1558 to 1583 and engaging the Livonian Order, Denmark, Sweden and Poland-Lithuania in opposition to Muscovy, attesting to this. Despite an initial string of military victories in the early years, the Livonian War ultimately served only as a tax on Muscovite financial reserves and lives without resulting in any new territorial acquisitions or the supposed desideratum of achieving direct access to the Baltic Sea to develop overseas trade⁶. The Muscovite conquest of the Khanate of Sibir, and the corresponding expansion into the western Siberia, also began in the latter half of Ivan's reign, although this was more due to the private ventures of the Stroganov family and their famed employee, the Cossack adventurer Ermak, rather than a result of any specific policy of Ivan's.

OPRICHNINA AND ZEMSHCHINA

Despite these sundry events of Ivan's reign, it is his institution of the *oprichnina*, 1565-72, that dominates depictions of his rule by both his 16th century Western European coevals, and modern western historians. It was during this time when Ivan divided up his realm into two halves, the *oprichnina* and *zemshchina*⁷, that he concurrently assumed the power to "initiate treason trials at his own discretion, pass sentence himself, and determine the level of punishment,"⁸ and created the "special corps of *oprichniki*, who constituted the tsar's personal bodyguard."⁹ It was these nobles of the *oprichniki*, who were allowed to remain in territories of the *oprichnina*, that Ivan utilized in the investigation and prosecution of his perceived enemies. Correspondingly, the years 1565-1572 were characterized both by Ivan's increased use of political repression, involving the torturing and executing of numerous prominent boyars, as well as the forcible mass land resettlement of *zemschina* nobles from lands incorporated into the *oprichnina*; this generally involving a transition from hereditary estates to service tenure lands.

The 16th century focus on the *oprichnina* belies an attempt to portray Ivan as an overly and uniquely malevolent figure distinct from his Western European contemporaries. Despite a Russian folklore tradition in which Ivan's image is generally a sympathetic one¹⁰ as well as the known admiration of the later Russian tsar Peter the Great¹¹, whom western historians have looked significantly kinder on, this negative perception of Ivan as a sovereign malefactor and belief in his supposed distinction from that of his contemporaries has been largely maintained in modern historical works. Implicit in this process is the habitual translation of the tsar's appellation *Groznyi* as "Terrible" coloring his subsequent depiction; "Groznyi" is a far more ambiguous and positive term than this repeated English translation suggests, denoting "a complex and largely positive mixture of severity and awesome might, especially in battle."¹² A monarchical sobriquet of this sort was not a uniquely Russian occurrence as European monarchs in the 16th century were "praised for inspiring a combination of fear, admiration, and love in their subjects."¹³ Edmund Spenser's addressing of Queen Elizabeth I as "O dredd soverayne"¹⁴ in Book Three¹⁵ of the *Faerie Queene*, published in 1590 six years after Ivan's death, indicates the non-peculiarity of this phenomenon. This process of distinction is further evidenced in the current fashion of taking a psychoanalytic approach to Ivan's reign: this generally involving the casting of unflattering aspersions onto the state of Ivan's sanity during his rule.

IVAN AND THE WEST

This belief in Ivan's political and moral divergence from his Western European contemporaries, supposedly occurring due to the political repression pursued during the *oprichnina* period, lacks a historical basis in reality. While acknowledging that Europe was not a homogenous cultural entity during Ivan's reign, nor in the centuries preceding and following it, it is notable that the actions Ivan engaged in and the policies he endorsed during his reign possessed significant parallels with the writings of Western European political thinkers ranging from Italy, England and France throughout the 16th to the early 18th century; therefore aligning Ivan rather firmly alongside the broader discourse of contemporaneous 16th century Western European political thought. Thus, Ivan should be seen as isomorphic to, rather than divergent from, the political thought of his Western European coevals.

Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince* published in 1532, and James I's *The True Law of Free Monarchies; or, The Reciprocal and Mutual Duty Betwixt a Free King and His Natural Subjects* published in 1598 and 1601, both attest to this phenomenon; with Ivan's actions becoming justified, if not explicitly endorsed, in these authors' writings. Additionally, the writings of the French cleric Jacques-Benigne Bossuet's *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, published posthumously in 1709 after Bossuet's death in 1704, indicates that Ivan's reign and the actions followed therein continued to exert parallels with that of Western European political thought until, at least, the early 18th century.

With this suggested divergence lacking substantiation, the 16th century Western European writers' negative perception of Ivan is revealed as resulting not from any basis in

historical fact, but, instead, from a long-held Western European tradition of ‘othering’ Russian people and culture, occurring mainly due to religious differences and corresponding animosity between the Catholic and Orthodox faiths, as well as the growth of Western European anxiety over the development of Muscovy as a military power under Ivan: an anxiety specifically exacerbated by Ivan’s pursuit of the Livonian War. The consistent failure of subsequent historians to examine and challenge the claims of this faux historical narrative has allowed this 16th century misconception of Ivan to be largely maintained to the present.

Iurri Krizhanich, a Croatian pan-Slavist Catholic missionary who lived in the 17th century, noted a derogatory trend occurring in writings by Western Europeans concerning Russians in his *Politika* published in 1666.

“In short, when these authors write anything about Russia or any other Slavic people they write not history, but biting satire. They exaggerate our vices, inadequacies, and natural shortcomings, and wherever there is no sin to be found, they invent one. They also write false histories.”¹⁶

One writer specifically mentioned and condemned is Adam Olearius, who, in a 1647 publication, declared that Russians were “cruel and fit only for slavery.”¹⁷ This trend of hostility is likewise present in writings from the 16th century with Giles Fletcher, an English traveler who arrived in Muscovy in the late 1580’s during the reign of Ivan’s son Fedor, titling a chapter in his work *Of the Russe Commonwealth* “Of the doctrine of the Russe church, and what errors it holdeth.”¹⁸

As Fletcher’s chapter title indicates, religious differences between Russia and Western European states were inherent to the development of the Western European written vilifications of Russians. While Iurri Krizhanich blames the “Lutheran heresy”¹⁹ as primarily responsible, it is far more likely that this trend instead stems from inveterate religious animosity occurring after the Schism of 1054 between Orthodoxy and Catholicism.²⁰ Many scholars, however, while noting the heightened amount of hostility exhibited between the two churches’ respective clergies occurring after 1054, with one Orthodox monk in Kievan Rus’ in 1069 declaring Catholics to be “the most pagan and evil nation,”²¹ question to what extent lay peoples of the two churches were similarly affected. It is notable that “a Rus’ monk visiting the Holy Land around 1106-8 could be on perfectly amicable terms with its ‘Latin’ crusader rulers.”²²

Instead, the later date of the Fourth Crusade’s sack of Constantinople in 1204, “which shocked the Eastern Orthodox world”²³ is often seen as causing a more definitive break between these churches. Also implicated in the growing divisions occurring during this period is the changing attitude of the Papacy, who during the 13th century came to view “Rus as a mission territory to be won for the Church like a pagan land.”²⁴ An example of this is the violent attempted incursions into, and subjugation of, Kievan Rus’ by the German Catholic Livonian and Teutonic orders of knights in the thirteenth century; orders whose avowed goal was to conquer and convert the Eastern Orthodox to Catholicism.²⁵ The Russian practice, starting in the 15th century, of rebaptizing converts from the Roman Catholic Church “indicating that they were viewed as heretics rather than schismatics during this period,”²⁶ likewise shows the degeneration of relations between the two faiths.²⁷ This religious animosity exhibited by Muscovites towards Catholics is present in an account of Muscovy from 1476 by a Venetian ambassador²⁸ and in an account roughly half a century later by a German ambassador of the Holy Roman Empire.²⁹

Notwithstanding this religious divide and the trend of Western European written polemics subsequently inspired³⁰, Russia has exhibited connections to Western European states and culture throughout its history. While it is overly ambitious to speak of a unified Western European culture existing during the time of Kievan Rus’, this nascent Russian state existing from the late 9th to mid 13th centuries and characterized by nearly continuous internecine strife occurring due to issues of dynastic succession, possessed a number of economic, political, and cultural ties with states to the west of it. Thus, “more trade routes linked the lands of Rus’ with different parts of Western Europe than with Byzantium,”³¹ and “of the fifty-two known dynastic marriages in this period, forty of them are marriages with European kingdoms to the west.”³² An

example of this can be seen in the marriage of Vladimir Vsevolodovich Monomakh to Gytha "daughter of Harald of England (he who was killed at the Battle of Hastings in 1066)"³³ in the early 1070s. Additionally Kievan Rus' during the reign of the grand prince Iaroslav from 1024 to 1051,³⁴ who was, himself, married to a Swedish princess,³⁵ served as a sanctuary for the displaced nobility of various western states, including Norway, Hungary, and England.³⁶

These connections to states to the west were maintained under the following period of Mongol dominion from the 13th to 15th centuries, with the city of Novgorod maintaining "close economic ties to the West, particularly to the Hanseatic League"³⁷ during this time. Numismatics attests to this connection, with Novgorodian minted coins, from their start in the 1420s to the end of Novgorod's independence in the 1470s with its subjugation by Ivan III Vasilyevich to the growing Muscovite state, containing as their main element of design a depiction of a "kneeling horseman receiving the symbols of power from the hands of the patroness of Novgorod, St Sophia."³⁸ This image is "undoubtedly modelled(sic) on the traditional subject of Venetian coins, which depicted a kneeling Doge receiving symbols of power from the patron of Venice, St Mark." Additionally, in the latter half of the fifteenth century Italian architects and engineers were contracted for work in Muscovy,³⁹ and it is notable that the private apartments of Elena Glinskaia, which she inhabited with her son the future tsar Ivan IV, were built by a Milanese architect and possessed a "distinctly Renaissance appearance."⁴⁰ And, in the 18th and 19th centuries, arising from aftereffects of the Petrine reforms and the westernizing tendencies of following Russian potentates, the Russian Empire became inundated with that of Western European, mainly French, culture. This led to those at the Romanov court and the Russian upper class in general exhibiting more comfort speaking French instead of Russian: a condition subsequently mocked by the Russian poet Alexander Pushkin in his novel in verse *Eugene Onegin*. "And have they not the charming fools,/ Distorted sweetly all the rules/ of usage and pronunciation;/ While yet a foreign language slips/ with native glibness from their lips?"⁴¹

ENGLAND AND TROY, RUSSIA AND ROME

Keeping in mind these historic connections to Western European states, it is unsurprising to note their continued presence during the reign of Ivan, evidenced in the development of trade relations between England and Muscovy during this period leading to the establishment of the English Muscovy Company in 1555, and in the roughly coterminous 16th century theories of political legitimacy and ancestry possessed by both these states. Both theories stressed a self-alleged, although largely ahistorical, connection to the ancient Romans. Central to them was the respective popular conceptions in each state of London as Troynovant, or "new Troy," and Moscow as the "Third Rome".

The English theory, which may originate from the Roman occupation of Britain⁴² from 43-410 and was first popularized by Geoffrey of Monmouth in his *Historia Regum Britanniae* published in 1138, links the founding of Londinium and ancestry of the British people to Brute, an alleged great grandson of Aeneas: the famed protagonist of the *Aenied* who fled a burning Troy to, eventually, land in Italy and become the mythic founder of the Roman race. Via this claimed connection to Brute, the English became retroactive heirs to both the mythic civilization of Troy and the ancient civilization of Rome. This theory's currency in 16th century England is indicated by its presence in Edmund Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, specifically Book Three, "The Legend of Britomartis or Of Chastity" published in 1590. Here, Spenser repeatedly utilizes this link to Aeneas to establish the legitimacy and prestige of the then current reigning English monarch, Queen Elizabeth I. Two distinct passages in the work specifically reference this larger political theory: Merlin's recounting of the past, and foretelling of the future, of Britain to the chaste and correspondingly allegorically and literally heavily armored protagonist Britomart, and the knight Paridell's account of his own heritage.

In Merlin's discussion with Britomart in Canto III the wizard declares, "For from thy wombe a famous Progenee/ Shall spring, out of the auncient *Trojan* blood."⁴³ This line, followed by his additional statement that "Renowned kings, and sacred emperours,/ Thy fruitful Ofspring, shall from thee descend,"⁴⁴ establishes a chain of genetic linkage, contingent upon

Britomart's "wombe", from the "auncient *Trojan* blood" to the 16th century English, thereby granting a historical and mythical legitimacy to Queen Elizabeth I's rule.

Additionally, Paridell's speech in Canto VIII makes explicit reference to this larger political theory, stating "For noble Britons sprung from Trojans bold, And Troynovant was built of old Troyes ashes cold."⁴⁵ The works of Spenser's 16th century coeval, William Shakespeare, likewise indicates and reinforces this conflation between England and Rome through the playwright's constant utilizing of pivotal events of Roman history as a backdrop onto which he superimposed the anxieties and socio-political issues of his modern-day England.⁴⁶ This conflation is also evidenced in James I's terming of his parliamentary enemies as "tribunes of the people" in 1605.⁴⁷

Paralleling this is the 16th century Muscovite religious and political theory of the "Third Rome"; an idea first expressed in a letter sent by the monk Filofei to the Grand Prince Vasillii sometime between 1515 and 1521.

"The Apollinarian heresy caused the downfall of old Rome. The Turks used their axes to shatter the doors of the Second Rome, the city of Constantinople. Now [in Moscow], the Third Rome, the Holy Ecumenical Apostolic Church of your sovereign state shines brighter than the sun in the universal Orthodox Christian faith throughout the world."⁴⁸

This system of spiritual succession in which Moscow occupies the third and final stage, eventually developed into a coextensive belief in the ruling dynasty's genetic connection to Roman nobility; with Riurik, the legendary Viking founder of the Riukid dynasty, becoming allegedly "descended from a close relative of the Roman Caesar Octavian Augustus."⁴⁹ Thus the tsars became "the descendants of, and hence, rightful heirs to Roman heritage and greatness."⁵⁰ This eventually resulting in the Muscovite tsars referring to themselves as "descendants of Caser Augustus."⁵¹

However, regardless of these similarities between the English and Russian 16th century theories of political legitimacy, and their shared self-alleged Roman heritage, the 16th century Western Europeans who wrote of Ivan's rule established a near uniformly negative narrative, with English travelers, such as Jerome Horsey and Giles Fletcher, occupying a prominent place in this narrative's formation. Present in many of the written works created by Westerners during this period is not only outrage over Ivan's institution of the *oprichnina*, which Fletcher terms a "wicked and tyrannous practice,"⁵² but also a concurrent condemnation of Ivan's involvement in the Livonian War. The association between condemnations of Ivan and his involvement in the Livonian war is not coincident, with the latter being heavily implicated in the development of the former. Thus, in the late 18th century the Viennese scholar Gustav Treur "observed in an obscure publication that ... foreigners uniformly had entertained strong feelings of hostility towards Ivan because they felt threatened by the Russian invasion of Livonia."⁵³ A letter sent by King Sigismund of Poland to Queen Elizabeth I of England in 1559 affirms this relationship between the denigration of Ivan and the growth of military anxieties relating to Muscovy caused by the Livonian War. Composed by Sigismund after Poland's recent entry into the Livonian War in opposition to Muscovy earlier that year and the recent conclusion of trade relations between England and Muscovy in 1555, this letter frames Ivan as a potential military danger not only to Elizabeth and England but also to "all Christian and liberal nations."⁵⁴ He writes,

"The which as we have written afore, so we now write again to your Majesty that we know and feel of a surety, the Moscovite, enemy of all liberty under the heavens, daily to grow mightier by the increase of such things as be brought to the Narva...by means whereof he makes himself strong to vanquish all others...And we perfectly know your Majesty cannot be ignorant how great the cruelty is of the said enemy, of what force he is, what tyranny he uses on his subjects, and in what servile sort they be under him...Therefore we that know best, and border upon him, do admonish other Christian princes in time, that they do not betray their dignity, liberty, and life of them and their subjects to a most barbarous and cruel enemy, as we can no less do by the duty of a Christian prince. For now we do foresee, except other princes take this admonition, the Moscovite puffed up in pride with those things that be brought to the Narva,

and made more perfect in warlike affairs with engines of war and ships, will make assault this way on Christendom, to slay or make bound all that shall withstand him: which God defend."⁵⁵

Couched in religious fears in which Ivan is portrayed as an "enemy of all liberty under the heavens", Sigismund's work clearly reveals how the 16th century anxieties concerning the growing military power of the Muscovite state and involvement in the Livonian War and in this case, its development of economic interactions with England, was involved in the formation of written calumniation of the tsar.

The English traveler James Horsey, in his *Travels*, similarly presents Ivan as a religious threat to "Christendom"⁵⁶ due to his assault on Livonia, while, simultaneously, conflating his denigration of Ivan with a denigration of the Russian people as a whole.

"It was God that suffereth this wicked people who live, low, and wallow in the very height of their lust and wickedness of the crying sodomized sodomical sins be thus justly punished and plagued with the tyranny of so bloody a king."⁵⁷

Blatantly sensationalist, Horsey's narrative follows a confused time sequence that fails to at several distinct points to adhere to chronological order,⁵⁸ and several of the horrific tortures and murders he attributes to Ivan, upon examination are revealed to be mere fiction.⁵⁹

These early depictions of Tsar Ivan IV, despite their subjectivity and often lack of veracity, have remained influential in the formation of subsequent depictions of the 16th century tsar up to the modern period. An example of this is the practice of dividing up of Ivan's reign into "good" and "bad" halves present in current scholarly works.⁶⁰ This overly simplistic, and moralistic, division of Ivan's reign hails from the first biography of him written in 1584 by Paul Oderborn, a protestant pastor who lived in Lithuania.⁶¹

More so than simply providing a dichromatic framework for later generations of authors to adhere to, the 16th opprobrium directed against Ivan has accordingly affected the content of the later depictions as well. L.A. Owen's 2013 work *IVAN the Terrible: Product of Childhood Trauma (Medieval History Book)* indicates Ivan's continued vilification in modern sources, with, in the first paragraph alone, the words and phrases "malicious," "evil", "sadistic", "psychopathic behavior", and "mental state of depravity"⁶² being used in association with the tsar.

The prescription of mental illness onto Ivan, evidenced through Owen's word choice, is paralleled in far more academic works with the scholar Richard Hellie serving as one particular coryphaeus of this trend. Hellie's diagnosis of Ivan as mentally ill is evidenced in his terming the *oprichnina* a "madman's debauch,"⁶³ statement that "the sadism, debauchery, and sexual abuse institutionalized in the years 1565-1572 suggest erotomaniac expressions of paranoia,"⁶⁴ and declaration that by 1566 Ivan was 'totally insane.'⁶⁵ In a recently published essay on medieval Russian peasantry, in which Hellie for some unknown and unexplained reason begins by comparing Russian medieval peasants to "the American farmer,"⁶⁶ he consistently reiterates this connection between Ivan and mental illness with his every mention of the tsar, writing that "[p]aranoid Tsar Ivan the Terrible launched his psychotic *oprichnina* in 1565"⁶⁷ and referring to Ivan's reign itself as "psychotic."⁶⁸ Subjectivity in his account of Ivan can also be glimpsed in his terming of the *oprichiniki* as "Ivan's henchmen."⁶⁹ Occurring alongside this labeling of Ivan as insane is, in a manner reminiscent of Horsey, a concurrent denigration of the Russian people with Hellie stating, "These factors, combined with the impact of the smoky hut, contributed mightily in making the Russian the short-lived, lethargic, marginally productive, minimally creative (original) person he was,"⁷⁰ and that "[e]nserfment, especially as it descended into a slave-like condition, unquestionably would have been impossible without the fact that the Russians were accustomed to enslaving their own people."⁷¹ This second remark concerning the relationship of Russians to slavery possesses a clear parallel with that of the centuries earlier and already mentioned and quoted Adam Olearius who so angered Iurri Krizhanich in the 17th century.

Authors Nicholas V. Riasnovky and Mark D. Steinberg in *A History of Russia 8th edition* likewise utilize this psychoanalytic approach when discussing Ivan, writing that prior to his institution of the *oprichnina* "it became apparent to those who knew him that he had experienced another shattering psychological crisis."⁷² These authors also slip into increasingly subjective language throughout their discussion of Ivan's reign. "The young tsar, beneficially influenced by

his kind and attractive wife, worked with a small group of able and enlightened advisors, the Chosen Council..."⁷³ This slipping is significant as not only does it indicate the authors' setting up of the split of Ivan's reign into "good" and "bad" halves, but additionally because this statement occurs almost verbatim in the centuries earlier writings of Horsey. "He being young and riotous, she ruled him with admirable affability and wisdom, that with the prowess and courage of his princes, bishops, and council..."⁷⁴ The survival of this idea from a source that failed to maintain chronological order and could easily be termed largely fictive, bespeaks the lack of a critical approach taken to these early, and fairly biased, sources concerning Ivan's reign by modern scholars.

IVAN AND MACHIAVELLI

However, while Ivan's policies drew the ire of his Western European contemporaries and resulted in the establishment of a subjective and false narrative maintained to the present, these same policies simultaneously exhibited significant parallels with writings of contemporary Western European political thinkers. Prominent among these parallels are the continuities Ivan's reign possessed with Niccolò Machiavelli's *The Prince* published in 1532 when the tsar was two years old. Machiavelli, born in Florence in 1469, composed this treatise on statecraft when, after "coming under suspicion of conspiracy against the returned Medici"⁷⁵ in 1512, he was arrested, tortured, excluded from public life, and subsequently retired to his farm near San Casciano. Accordingly, this work which depicts successful methods for a prince to gain and maintain power and is dedicated to Giuliano de' Medici, can be seen as an attempt by Machiavelli to demonstrate his usefulness to the Medici family. However, this work quickly outgrew the specific conditions of its birth to exert an enduring effect on the development of Western European political thought: with Machiavelli becoming the "political teacher of Europe,"⁷⁶ providing "the core doctrines of 'reason of state' that became the basic political education of modern Europe."⁷⁷

And this seminal work in the history of Western European political thought possesses a number of broad parallels with the policies Ivan pursued. This is evident in Machiavelli's endorsement of brutal spectacles to appease the people, use of violence for the maintenance of the state, and militarization:⁷⁸ all practices Ivan engaged in. Additionally, Machiavelli's statement that "a wise prince must devise ways by which his citizens always and in all circumstances be dependent on him and his authority; and then, they will always be faithful to him,"⁷⁹ both explains and justifies Ivan's own policies, and the repressive measures he enacted, in pursuit of centralization.

Most significant, however, is the justification Machiavelli's work provides for Ivan's sack of Novgorod in 1570 during the height of the *oprichnina*. Novgorod, a prominent city in Muscovy in the sixteenth century, possessed a distinctive past as an independent republic. From the time of Kievan Rus' the town council, or *veche*, in Novgorod exhibited supreme control over the city deciding issues of taxation, war and peace, as well as electing the town's archbishop, and prince: with the position of prince in Novgorod being "in essence a hired official of the city with strictly circumscribed authority and prerogative."⁸⁰ Its history as an independent republic, of which modern scholars still debate if it was more democratic or oligarchic,⁸¹ came to an end when it was conquered by Ivan's grandfather Ivan III in 1471; with its complete subjugation to the growing Muscovite state occurring 1477-8, along with the removal of the bell calling the *veche* to session. However, during Ivan IV's rule Novgorod retained prominence as "the most important political and economic centre in the northwest, and the second largest city in Russia,"⁸² and preserved certain distinctive features in its political and military organization: with its governors possessing the right to "conduct relations independently with Sweden."⁸³

In January 1570, following alleged charges of treason concerning prominent residents of the city, Ivan and his *oprichniki* arrived and, over a six-week period, persecuted the town's denizens. The main victims were, "the boyars and nobles of the archbishop of Novgorod."⁸⁴ The tortures and executions were brutal, extensive, and often public with both immolations and drownings occurring. Children and wives of the accused often suffered alongside them. The

oprichniki additionally raided the trading quarter of the city and private homes of citizens for revenues, confiscated the property of the churches and monasteries of the city, and imposed a fine upon the Novgorodian clergy. With the population of Novgorod being 30,000 at the time of the attack, estimates for casualties by modern scholars range from 2,000 -3,000 to 10,000 -15,000.⁸⁵ James Horsey in his *Travels*, when discussing this event describes the “blood of seven hundred thousand men, women, and children,”⁸⁶ flowing down the town’s streets into the “stream of the river Volga.”⁸⁷ And, several centuries later, in 1987 modern historian Robert Crummey argued that the tsar’s brutal punitive expeditions against his supposedly treasonous subjects in Novgorod in 1570 “can best be explained in terms of paranoia triggered by his unhappy childhood and reinforced by alcohol abuse in later life.”⁸⁸ However, this incident that so horrified Horsey and caused Crummey to see Ivan as mentally ill, is explained and justified in Machiavelli’s *The Prince*. In the section “How cities or principalities which lived under their own laws should be administered after being conquered,”⁸⁹ Machiavelli espouses the necessity of devastating a formerly independent city in order to keep it subservient and loyal to one’s subsequent rule.

“Indeed, there is no surer way of keeping possession than by devastation. Whoever becomes the master of a city accustomed to freedom, and does not destroy it, may expect to be destroyed himself; because, when there is a rebellion such a city justifies itself by calling on the name of liberty and its ancient institution, never forgotten despite the passing of time and the benefits received from the new ruler.”⁹⁰

This injunction on the danger of possessing cities with a history of republicanism that are accordingly “accustomed to freedom” justifies Ivan’s attack on the denizens of Novgorod; a city which possessed this history. Thus Ivan’s actions in Novgorod, so condemned by sixteenth century and modern western writers are explained and justified by the writings of this exiled sixteenth century Florentine.

DIVINE RIGHT OF SOVEREIGNS

Ivan’s reign and actions are likewise justified by the writings of the contemporary Western European monarch James VI or I; who reigned on the Scottish throne from 1567 to 1625, becoming the monarch of England as well in 1603. In his work *The True Law of Free Monarchies; or, The Reciprocal and Mutual Duty Betwixt a Free King and His Natural Subjects* which was published in 1598 and in 1603 after his ascension to the English throne, James expresses his conception of a monarch’s power being descended from God; therefore giving the monarch both absolute power over his subjects and correspondingly no ability for his subjects to rebel. James writes, “the duty and allegiance of the people unto their lawful king, their obedience, I say, ought to be to him as to God’s lieutenant in earth, obeying his commands in all things... fearing him as their judge, loving him as their father, praying for his as their protector.”⁹¹ This line of reasoning, in which he elaborates on his conception of the monarch’s absolute power due to their link to God, leads to his denial of people possessing the right to rebel against their monarchs. Thus, James while discussing his belief that “wicked”⁹² kings are sent by God to punish the people, states “but that it is lawful to them to shake off that curse at their own hand, which God hath laid on them, that I deny and may do so justly.”⁹³ He takes up this point numerous times in the document later comparing an individual’s rebellion to their monarch both to patricide⁹⁴ as well as the chopping of the head of one’s own body.⁹⁵

These themes of divine right and absolute power of a king in James I’s writings are analogous to Ivan’s own writings to the renegade prince Kurbsky, with whom Ivan engaged in a mutually antagonistic exchange of epistles: in which Ivan constructed a defense of his reign justifying his actions with examples from the Old Testament⁹⁶ and European history.⁹⁷ Thus, in an epistle to Kurbsky Ivan too links a monarch’s rule to God stating, “Our God, Tripersonal...by whom tsars rule and the mighty make laws.”⁹⁸ And, in a similar fashion to James, he makes use of this connection to correspondingly declare rebellion against the rule of the monarch a sin unto

God. "Think on this and reflect, that he who rests power, resists God; and who resists God is called an apostate, which is the worst sin."⁹⁹

Both potentates further show disregard for the concept of outside power sources, in the form of their respective native nobilities, serving as a check on their rule. This is evident in James I's declaration that the parliament is "nothing else but the head court of the king and his vassals,"¹⁰⁰ and Ivan's sarcastic query to Kurbsky that, "is this then the sign of a leprous conscience to hold my kingdom in my hand and not to let my servants rule?"¹⁰¹ Thus, both Ivan and James possess aspirations for a 'Agapetus state,' a term Hellie uses to describe Muscovy during the reign of Ivan IV in which "the sovereign believed he was God's vicegerent on earth and most of his subjects concurred in that belief."¹⁰²

The contemporaneous 16th century French thinkers of Innocent Gentiliut, Jean Bodin, and Pierre de Belloy, similarly expressed belief in, albeit to varying degrees, the divine right and absolute rule of sovereigns.¹⁰³ And the writings of the French bishop Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, 1627-1704, indicate the survival of these parallels into at least the early 18th century: with his *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture* endorsing the notion of the divine right of monarchs and a monarch's absolute power. Starting his work by stating, "God is the king of kings,"¹⁰⁴ Bossuet's linkage between king and God,¹⁰⁵ nearly omnipresent in his work, and his corresponding belief in a monarch's absolute authority, develops into, despite numerous injunctions against a prince's use of violence,¹⁰⁶ a subsequent endorsement of a monarch's use of political repression; this serving to justify the type of sanguinary reign Ivan is generally associated with. Thus he writes, "He who does not want to obey the prince... is condemned irremissibly to death as an enemy of the public peace and human society,"¹⁰⁷ and that "his [the prince's] power must be such that no one can hope to escape him."¹⁰⁸ Bossuet additionally indicates that this political repression should be directed towards the monarch's own nobility writing that, "But in the end, the public peace obliges kings to keep everyone in a state of fear-the great still more than ordinary individuals because it is from the side of the great that the greatest troubles can come."¹⁰⁹

Adumbrated in Bossuet's elaboration on the royal right, indeed, prerogative to institute repression¹¹⁰, with a corresponding focus on the nobility while doing so, in an effort to maintain control over society and societal coherence lurks a veiled retrospective justification for the Ivan's centuries earlier institution of the *oprichnina*: in which the tsar subverted and divided the power of the nobles under him.

Bossuet, making clear his concept of a strong central authority as being one which can institute political repression, additionally ties the absence of this strong central authority to anarchy writing that if a prince is not scrupulously obeyed, "public order is overthrown, and there is no further unity, and in consequence, no further cooperation or peace in a state."¹¹¹ This statement is analogous to one Ivan makes in an epistle to prince Kurbsky, "For just as a woman cannot make up her mind [lit. set her wishes in order] - now she [decides] one way, now another-so is the rule of many in the kingdom: one made desires one thing, another desires another."¹¹² The sexist thought inherent in this reasoning additionally strikes a cord with the broader discourse of 16th century European thought in which "according to sixteenth-century physiological theory, which was influenced by Pythagoras, Aristotle, and Galen, women's bodies were in flux and their minds were, as a result, unstable."¹¹³

CONCLUSION

Thus neither in Ivan's use of political repression, nor in his desire for absolute power necessitating this repression, nor even in his sexism, was Ivan unique. The geographic and temporal distribution of Machiavelli, James I, and Bossuet, all of whom Ivan's reign exhibited multiple parallels with, across Western Europe and from the 16th to the 18th century indicates that Ivan, and his policies, can be situated firmly alongside that of the political thought present in Western Europe during his century as well as that of those immediately forthcoming. Ivan's image then, as one distinct from his contemporaries due to the sanguinary acts he engaged in, is a manufactured one; made by 16th century writers responding to a collision of religious and

military related anxieties, and maintained by modern historians due to their non-challenging of these early biased sources. While, it may be tempting to simply label modern historians' lack of a critical approach to Ivan's reign as mere incompetency, the political expediency which this misconception of Ivan provides in not only absolving Western European political thought from being implicated in the atrocities committed by Ivan, who can be seen as largely putting their own precepts into action, but also in setting up a model of an "evil" Russian ruler whom later Russian leaders, be they tsars or presidents, can be viewed as continuations of, should not be disregarded. Although much of the current animosity towards the Russian president Vladimir Putin by members of what is popularly deemed the "Western World"¹¹⁴ is due to the aftereffects of the Cold War and the widespread conflation of Russia and the Soviet Union in popular thought, it is interesting to note that Putin's modern day vilifications, via comparisons to Hitler by both prominent Western politicians and media sources¹¹⁵ as well as in groundless accusations of mental illness,¹¹⁶ show a striking similarity to the portrayals of Ivan in the 16th century and modern period. Ultimately, it is perhaps Ivan who provides the best defense for both himself, and all others who find themselves similar victims of overly negative one sided depictions, when he in a epistle to Kurbsky written in 1564 bespeaks the importance of context writing, "Is this then 'contrary to reason'- to live according to [the demands of] the present day?"¹¹⁷

This ignoring of context, which is the focus of Ivan's sarcastic lamentation, occurring through seeming bouts of possibly feigned historical amnesia regarding the Ivan's parallels with the writings of his Western European contemporaries, is the only means capable of allowing for this perception of Ivan as uniquely malevolent personage distinct from his contemporaries to survive. Thus, the phantasmagoric construction of Ivan evidenced in most western writings concerning the tsar reveals less about the historical personage it purports to represent than it does about the motivations and anxieties of those who created and maintain it to this day.

WORKS CITED AND ENDNOTES

"Angela Merkel Tells President Obama She is Concerned About Vladimir Putin's Mental Health," *Feelguide*, 3/ 3/ 2014. <http://www.feelguide.com/2014/03/03/angela-merkel-tells-president-obama-she-is-concerned-about-vladimir-putins-mental-health/>

Bakos, Adrianna E. "The Historical Reputation of Louis XI in Political theory and Polemic during the French Religious Wars," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 21, No. 1 (1990) 3-32

Beattie, Jason. "David Cameron Compares Vladimir Putin's Russia to Hitler's Germany Ahead of G20 Summit Showdown," 11/15/ 2014, <http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/david-cameron-compares-vladimir-putins-4631945>

Bogatyrev, Sergei. "Ivan IV (1533-1584)," *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume I: From Early Rus' to 1689*, edited Maureen Perrie, 240-263. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Bossuet, Jacques-Benigne *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*. Translated and Edited by Patrick Riley. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Contarini, Ambrosio. "Contarini's Impression of Muscovy in 1476" in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book, 850-1700/ Third Edition*, edited by Basil Dmytryshyn and translated by William Thomas and S.A. Roy, 237-243. Forth Worth TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1991.

Filofei, "Filofei's Concept of the 'Third Rome'", in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book, 850-1700/ Third Edition*, 259-260. edited by Basil Dmytryshyn and translated Basil Dmytryshyn, 259-260. Forth Worth TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1991.

A. CAVALLARO: (MIS)PERCEPTIONS OF TSAR IVAN IV

Fletcher, Giles. "Of the Russe Commonwealth," in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom: Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyagers*, edited by Lloyd E. Berry and Robert O. Crummey, 110-246. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Franklin, Simon. "Kievan Rus' (1015-1125) *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume I: From Early Rus' to 1689*," edited Maureen Perrie, 73-97. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Franks, Trent. "Prince Charles is Right; Similarities Between Putin and Hitler are Uncanny," *Fox News*, 5/23/2014, <http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2014/05/23/prince-charles-is-right-similarities-between-putin-and-hitler-are-uncanny.html>

Graham, Hugh. Introduction to R. *Ivan the Terrible*. ed. and translated by Hugh F. Graham. Gulf Breeze: Academic International Press, 1981

Richard Hellie. "The law," *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume I: From Early Rus' to 1689*," edited Maureen Perrie, 360-386. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006

Hellie, Richard. "The peasantry," *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume I: From Early Rus' to 1689*," edited Maureen Perrie, 213-297. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006

Herberstein, Sigismund von. "Herberstein's Observations of Muscovy" in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book, 850-1700/ Third Edition*, edited by Basil Dmytryshyn and translated R.H. Major, 261-275. Fort Worth TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1991.

Horsey, James. "Travels," " in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom: Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyagers*, edited by Lloyd E. Berry and Robert O. Crummey, 249-369. Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968.

Hugo, Victor. *The Last Day of a Condemned Man*. Translated by Geoff Woollen. London: Hesperus Press, 2002.

Ostrowski, Donald. "The growth of Muscovy (1462-1533)" *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume I: From Early Rus' to 1689*," edited Maureen Perrie, 213-239. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Ianin, V.L. "Medieval Novgorod." *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume I: From Early Rus' to 1689*," edited Maureen Perrie, 188-210. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

James I, "The True Law of Free Monarchies; or, The Reciprocal and Mutual Duty Betwixt a Free King and His Natural Subjects," 1598, *The Norton Anthology of English Literature: The Early 17th Century*, Accessed 13 May 2015, http://www.wwnorton.com/college/english/nael/17century/topic_3/truelaw.htm

Johnson, Paul. "Is Vladimir Putin Another Adolf Hitler," *Forbes*, 4/16/2014, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/currentevents/2014/04/16/is-vladimir-putin-another-adolf-hitler/>

Kivelson, Valerie. *Cartographies of Tsardom: The Land and its Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Russia*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.

Krizhanich, Iurii. *Russian Statcraft: The Politika of Iurii Krizhanich*. Translated and Edited by John M. Letiche and Basil Dmytryshyn. Basil Blackwell Inc, 1985.

Locker, Ray. "Pentagon 2008 Study Claims Putin has Asperger's Syndrome," *USA TODAY*, <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2015/02/04/putin-aspergers-syndrome-study-pentagon/22855927/>

Machiavelli, Niccolò. *The Prince*. Translated by George Bull. London: Penguin Books, 1999.

Olearius, Adam. *The Travels of Olearius in Seventeenth-Century Russia*, Translated and edited by Samuel H. Baron. Stanford CA: University of Stanford Press, 1967.

Owens, L.A. *IVAN the Terrible: Product of Childhood Trauma (Medieval History Books)* (Ophelia Madison Press, 2013) 1. PDF e-book.

Parker, R.B. Introduction to *The Tragedy of Coriolanus: Oxford World's Classics*. By William Shakespeare, edited by R.B. Parker Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Pavlov, Andrei and Maureen Perrie. *Ivan the Terrible: Profiles in Power*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited, 2003.

Perrie, Maureen. *The Image of Ivan the Terrible in Russian Folklore*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Pushkin, Alexander. *Eugene Onegin*. Translated by James E. Falen. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Raffensperger, Christian. *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World, 988-1146* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. and Mark D. Steinberg. *A History of Russia: Eighth Edition*, New York NY: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Rock, Stella. *Popular Religion in Russia: 'Double belief' and the making of an academic myth*. New York NY: Routledge, 2007.

Rucker, Philip. *Washington Post*, 3/5/2014, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/03/05/hillary-clinton-says-putins-action-are-like-what-hitler-did-back-in-the-30s/>

Seegal, Steven. *Mapping Europe's Borderlands: Russian Cartography in the Age of Empire*. Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Spenser, Edmund. *The Faerie Queene: Books Three and Four*, Edited by Dorothy Stephens. Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006.

Sigismund, Augustus. "A Letter from King Sigismund of Poland to Elizabeth I, 1559" in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book, 850-1700/ Third Edition*, edited by Basil Dmytryshyn, 299-301. Forth Worth TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1991.

Vasilyevich, Ivan and A.M. Kurbsky. *The Correspondence between Prince M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia 1564-1579*. Edited and translated with notes by J.L.I. Fennell Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955.

Vernadsky, George. *Kievan Russia*. New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1948.

Wesphalen, Timothy. "The West," in *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Russian Culture*, 2nd ed. Edited by Nicholas Rzhevsky, 94-112 Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2012.

¹ Valerie Kivelson, *Cartographies of Tsardom: The Land and its Meanings in Seventeenth-Century Russia*.

² Steven Seegal, *Mapping Europe's Borderlands: Russian Cartography in the Age of Empire* (Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012), 27.

³ Although, it took "another five years to establish Russian rule over the entire territory," Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, and Mark D. Steinberg, *A History of Russia: Eighth Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 144.

⁴ It should be noted that three modern European states can claim heritage from Keivan Rus': Belarus, Ukraine, and Russia.

⁵ However, authors Steinberg and Riasanovsky in their work, *A History of Russia: Eighth Edition*, declare that from 1380 to 1480 Mongol rule in the area can be characterized as "more or less nominal" Ibid., 60.

⁶ "The widely accepted view that the tsar began the war to gain access to the Baltic Sea derives from the Livonian and Polish sources. At the same time, there are no Muscovite sources corroborating the idea that the Muscovite authorities aspired to develop their own commercial and transport infrastructure in the Baltic region." Sergei Bogatyrev, "Ivan IV (1533-1584)," *The Cambridge History of Russia Volume I: From Early Rus' to 1689*, ed. Maureen Perrie (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 257.

⁷ Created in a decree made public in February 1565, the *oprichnina* was to be under the direct control of the tsar and contained the wealthier regions of Muscovy during this time indicated by its possession of the towns: Dvina, Kargopol', Velikii Ustyug, and Vologda. The *oprichnina* additionally "included all the most important regions for salt extraction (such as Staraya Russe and Soligalich) which in practice meant that it had a monopoly of trade in this important commodity." The *zemschnina*, meanwhile, was to be administered by the *zemshchina* boyar duma, although their actual administrative power was quite limited. "The decree required the boyars to report on all important matters, both military and civil, directly to the tsar. Thus the main reins of governance of the country as a whole...remained in Ivan's hands." Additionally, Ivan possessed the ability to, at his own discretion, incorporate lands other than those identified in the 1565 decree into the *oprichnina*. Andrei Pavlov and Maureen Perrie, *Ivan the Terrible* (Harlow: Pearson Education Limited, 2003) 109-110, Ibid., 111.

⁸ Ibid., 114.

⁹ Ibid., 112.

¹⁰ Maureen Perrie, *The Image of Ivan the Terrible in Russian Folklore* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 114.

¹¹ Riasanovsky, and Steinberg, *A History of Russia*, 216.

¹² Ibid., 141.

¹³ Dorothy Stephens., ed. *The Faerie Queene: Books Three and Four*, by Edmund Spenser. (Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 2006), footnote, 4.

¹⁴ Spenser, *The Faerie Queene*, 4.

¹⁵ Of an intended although never completed twelve.

¹⁶ Iurii Krizhanich, *Russian Statecraft: The Politika of Iurii Krizhanich*, translated and edited by John M. Letiche and Basil Dmytryshyn, (Basil Blackwell Inc, 1985), 122.

¹⁷ Adam Olearius, *The Travels of Olearius in Seventeenth-Century Russia*, translated and edited by Samuel H. Baron, (Stanford CA: University of Stanford Press, 1967), 147.

¹⁸ Giles Fletcher, "Of the Russe Commonwealth," in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom: Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyagers*, edited by Lloyd E. Berry and Robert O. Crummey, (Madison WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1968), 225.

¹⁹ Krizhanich, *Russian Statecraft: The Politika of Iurii Krizhanich*, 122.

²⁰ It must be acknowledged, however, that the Schism of 1054 should not be viewed as the ultimate origin of this animosity, but rather, itself, a product of already preexisting animosity between Orthodoxy and Catholicism. Scholar Stella Rock describes this early pre 1054 animosity between the two writing, “The Byzantine polemic against the Latins began in the second half of the ninth century, under Patriarch Photius. This period is significant not merely because of the so-called ‘Photian Schism,’ when Patriarch Photius excommunicated the Pope for the heretical insertion of the *filioque* clause into the Creed (and for supporting the deposed Patriarch Ignatius), but for the struggle for ownership of Eastern European souls. The race to cultivate these spiritually unploughed territories, while no doubt politically motivated, aggravated differences of theology and ritual as rival missionaries sought to convince the pagans of their own particular versions of the Truth.” Stella Rock, *Popular Religion in Russia: ‘Double belief’ and the making of an academic myth* (New York NY: Routledge, 2007) 62.

²¹ *The ‘Paterik’ of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, introd. and trans. by M. Heppell. (HLEUL 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), 213 quoted in Rock, *Popular Religion* 66.

²² Simon Franklin, “Kievan Rus’ (1015-1125)” *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 92.

²³ Rock, *Popular Religion*, 62.

²⁴ *Ibid.* 63

²⁵ Riasanovsky and Steinberg, *A History of Russia*, 74.

²⁶ Rock, *Popular Religion in Russia*, 64.

²⁷ Giles Fletcher notes the existence of this practice writing, “They rebaptize as many Christians (not being of the Greek church) as they convert to their Russe profession, because they are divided from the true church, which is the Greek, as they say,” “Of the Russe Commonwealth,” in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom: Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyagers*, 227.

²⁸ “They have a pope of their own, appointed by their sovereign, and hold ours in little esteem, saying that we are doomed to perdition.” Ambrosio Contarini, “Contarini’s Impression of Muscovy in 1476” in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book, 850-1700/ Third Edition*, ed. by Basil Dmytryshyn and trans. by William Thomas and S.A. Roy, (Forth Worth TX: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1991) 240.

²⁹ “The Moscovites boast that they are the only true Christians, and condemn us as deserters from the Primitive Church and from the old sacred institution.” Sigismund von Herberstein, “Herberstein’s Observations of Muscovy” in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book*, 268.

³⁰ A nineteenth century example of this trend can be seen in Victor Hugo’s *Life of a Condemned Man*. Here, in a work where Hugo attacks the practice of capital punishment, he also takes time to briefly refer to, and attack, Russia declaring that the state occupies the lowest rungs of the “ladder of civilization.” *The Last Day of a Condemned Man*, trans. by Geoff Woollen (London: Hesperus Press, 2002) 23.

³¹ Simon Franklin, “Kievan Rus’ (1015-1125)” *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 91.

³² Christian Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus’ in the Medieval World, 988-1146* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2012) 71. It should be noted, however, that much of the methodology of this work has been recently, and effectively, challenged by Dr. Roman K. Kovalev, in his article “Reimagining Kievan Rus’ in Unimagined Europe,” *Russian History* 42 (2015), 158-187.

³³ Simon Franklin, “Kievan Rus’ (1015-1125)” *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 91.

³⁴ However, he became the sole ruler of Kievan Rus’ only after the death of his brother Mstislav in 1036.

³⁵ It is of additional interest to note in that Iaroslav’s daughter Anna, married to the French king Henry I in 1051, took part in French governmental affairs after Henry’s death in 1060. George Vernadsky. *Kievan Russia*. (New Haven CT: Yale University Press, 1948), 342.

³⁶ Riasanovsky and Steinberg, *A History of Russia*, 32.

³⁷ Timothy Westphalen, “The West” *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Russian Culture, 2nd Edition*, ed. by Nicholas Rzhevsky. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) 97.

³⁸ V. L. Ianin, “Medieval Novgorod,” *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 204.

³⁹ “The Italian architect Aristotle Fioravanti was brought in by Ivan III to design and oversee the construction of the Dormition cathedral from 1475 to 1479. Italian architects Marco Ruffo and Pietro Antonio Solario designed and oversaw the construction of the Dormition cathedral from 1487 to 1491. In 1505, the cathedral of the Archangel Michael, designed by Alevisio Lamberti da Montagnana of Venice, was completed. The present crenellated walls and towers of the Moscow Kremlin also owe their design to Italians such as Solario and Antonio Friazin.” Donald Ostrowski, “The growth of Muscovy (1462-1533)” *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 233.

-
- ⁴⁰ Donald Ostrowski, “The growth of Muscovy (1462-1533)” *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 241.
- ⁴¹ Alexander Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin*, trans. James E. Folen (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 68.
- ⁴² Dorothy Stephens, ed. *The Faerie Queene: Books Three and Four*, by Spenser, footnote, 54.
- ⁴³ Spenser, *Faerie Queene*, 54.
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 181.
- ⁴⁶ The plays *Julius Caesar*, and *Coriolanus*, and the poem *Rape of Lucrece* attest to this phenomenon.
- ⁴⁷ William Shakespeare, *The Tragedy of Coriolanus: Oxford World’s Classics*, ed. R.B. Parker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 39.
- ⁴⁸ Filofei, “Filofei’s Concept of the ‘Third Rome’”, in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book, 850-1700/ Third Edition*, trans. Basil Dmytyshyn, 260.
- ⁴⁹ Basil Dmytyshyn, *Medieval Russia: A Source Book*, 259.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁵² Giles Fletcher, “Of the Russe Commonwealth,” 140.
- ⁵³ Hugh Graham, introduction to R. *Ivan the Terrible*. ed. and translated by Hugh F. Graham. (Gulf Breeze: Academic International Press, 1981), viii.
- ⁵⁴ Sigismund, “A Letter from King Sigismund of Poland to Elizabeth I, 1559” in *Medieval Russia: A Source Book*, 300.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁵⁶ Jerome Horsey, “Travels,” in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom: Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyagers*, 266.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 271.
- ⁵⁸ Berry and Peele’s footnotes throughout Horsey’s account make explicit this failure as they write “Horsey has confuses the sequence of events,” and “Horsey has further confused the sequence of events.” “Travels” in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom: Russia in the Accounts of Sixteenth Century English Voyagers*, footnotes, 268 & 276
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 278 & 284.
- ⁶⁰ While not using such the titles “Good” and “Bad”, Nicholas V. Riasnovky and Mark D. Steinberg in their *A History of Russia* adhere to this basic dichotomy in their presentation of Ivan’s reign. *A History of Russia*, 141-150.
- ⁶¹ Graham introduction to *Ivan the Terrible*, vii.
- ⁶² L. A. Owens, *IVAN the Terrible: Product of Childhood Trauma (Medieval History Books)* (Ophelia Madison Press, 2013) 1. PDF e-book.
- ⁶³ Richard Hellie, “In Search of Ivan the Terrible,” in S.F. Platonov, *Ivan the Terrible*, (Gulf Breeze, FL: Academic International Press, 1974) xxvii quoted in in Pavlov and Perrie. *Ivan the Terrible*, 2.
- ⁶⁴ Richard Hellie, “In Search of Ivan the Terrible,” xxvii quoted in Pavlov and Perrie. *Ivan the Terrible*, 3.
- ⁶⁵ Richard Hellie, “What Happened? How Did He Get Away With It? Ivan Groznyi’s Paranoia and the Problem of Institutional Restraints,” in Richard Hllie, ed., *Ivan the Terrible: a Quarcentenary Celebration of his Death (Russian History/Histoire Russe*, vol. 14, 1987), 209, quoted in Pavlov and Perrie. *Ivan the Terrible*, 3.
- ⁶⁶ This comparison is made further incomprehensible when one considers that not only do the two inhabit clearly different geographic terrains but time periods as well: with the “American farmer” Hellie describes no doubt not coming into existence until sometime after the establishment of the United States in the late 18th century, and, therefore, quite a bit of time after the period his essay purports to be concerned with. Richard Hellie, “The peasantry,” *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 286.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 293.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 295.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 293.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 291
- ⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 296.
- ⁷² Riasnovky and Steinberg, *A History of Russia* 148.
- ⁷³ Riasnovky and Steinberg, *A History of Russia* 142.

- ⁷⁴James Horsey, "Travels," in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom* 264.
- ⁷⁵Anthony Grafton, introduction to *The Prince* by Niccolò Machiavelli, trans. by George Bull. (London: Penguin Books, 1999) xx.
- ⁷⁶Ibid., xviii
- ⁷⁷Ibid.
- ⁷⁸"The brutality of this spectacle kept the people of the Romagna at once appeased and stupefied", "So it should be noted that when he seizes a state the new ruler must determine all the injuries he will need to inflict" "A prince, therefore, must have no other object or thought, nor acquire skill in anything, except war, its organization, and its discipline." Niccolò Machiavelli. *The Prince*, 25, 32 & 47.
- ⁷⁹Ibid., 35.
- ⁸⁰Nicholas V. Riasanovsky and Mark D. Steinberg, *A History of Russia* 73-4.
- ⁸¹Ibid., 76.
- ⁸²Pavlov and Perrie, *Ivan the Terrible* 148.
- ⁸³Ibid., 148.
- ⁸⁴Ibid., 150.
- ⁸⁵Ibid., 151.
- ⁸⁶Horsey, "Travels," in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom* 269.
- ⁸⁷Ibid. Horsey's account of this blood flowing into the river Volga is made improbable, not only by his vast overestimate of the amount of casualties, citing a number dramatically higher than the actual population of Novgorod in 1570, but also due to the fact that Novgorod is not actually situated on the Volga river. "Moreover, Novgorod is situated on the Volkhov River." Berry and Crummey, eds. "Travels," in *Rude & Barbarous Kingdom*, footnote, 269.
- ⁸⁸Robert O. Crummey, "New Wine in Old Bottles?: Ivan IV and Novgorod," in Hellie, ed. *Ivan the Terrible*, 68-72, quoted in Pavlov and Perrie, *Ivan the Terrible* 3.
- ⁸⁹Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*. 18.
- ⁹⁰Ibid.
- ⁹¹James I, "The True Law of Free Monarchies; or, The Reciprocal and Mutual Duty Betwixt a Free King and His Natural Subjects," 1598, *The Norton Anthology of English Literature: The Early 17th Century*, Accessed 13 May 2015, http://www.wwnorton.com/college/english/nael/17century/topic_3/truelaw.htm
- ⁹²Ibid.
- ⁹³Ibid.
- ⁹⁴Ibid.
- ⁹⁵Ibid.
- ⁹⁶"How is it that you have not reflected on this, that a tsar of such piety [i.e. David] showed his strength and wrath even against his weak servants," Ivan Vasilyevich to A.M. Kurbsky, 1564, in *The Correspondence between Prince M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia 1564-1579*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1955) 39.
- ⁹⁷"Recall to memory Constantine, mighty even amongst the tsars; how he killed his son, begotten by him, for the sake of his kingdom." Ibid.
- ⁹⁸Ivan to Kurbsky, 1564, in *The Correspondence*, 13.
- ⁹⁹Ibid., 19.
- ¹⁰⁰James I, "The True Law."
- ¹⁰¹Ivan to Kurbsky, 1564, in *The Correspondence*, 25.
- ¹⁰²Richard Hellie. "The law," *Cambridge History of Russia*, ed. Maureen Perrie, 378.
- ¹⁰³Adrianna E. Bakos, "The Historical Reputation of Louis XI in Political theory and Polemic during the French Religious Wars," *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 21, No. 1 (1990), 20.
- ¹⁰⁴Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, *Politics drawn from the Very Words of Holy Scripture*, trans. and ed. Patrick Riley (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 1.
- ¹⁰⁵His linking of God to kings develops into an eventual conflation between the two, "they are gods, and share in some way in divine independence." Ibid., 82.
- ¹⁰⁶Ibid., 72, 73, 76 & 79.
- ¹⁰⁷Ibid., 82.
- ¹⁰⁸Ibid., 81.
- ¹⁰⁹Ibid., 89.

¹¹⁰ Bossuet's justifying of a king's use of political repression leads to his prescription of quasi-mystical powers for the king to do so. "Thus God enables the prince to discover the most deep-laid plots. His eyes and hands are everywhere.... He even receives from God in the course of handling his affairs, a degree of penetration akin to the power of divination. Once he has penetrated intrigue his long arms seek out his enemies at the ends of the earth and uncover the in the deepest abysses. Against such power there is no refuge." *Ibid.*, 161.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 173.

¹¹² Ivan to Kurbsky, 1564, in *The Correspondence*, 61.

¹¹³ Dorothy Stephens, introduction to *The Faerie Queene: Books Three and Four*, by Spenser, xxv.

¹¹⁴ Western Europe, the United States, Britain, and Australia.

¹¹⁵ Paul Johnson, "Is Vladimir Putin Another Adolf Hitler," *Forbes*, 4/16/2014,

<http://www.forbes.com/sites/currentevents/2014/04/16/is-vladimir-putin-another-adolf-hitler/> . Trent

Franks, "Prince Charles is Right; Similarities Between Putin and Hitler are Uncanny," *Fox News*,

5/23/2014, [http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2014/05/23/prince-charles-is-right-similarities-between-putin-](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2014/05/23/prince-charles-is-right-similarities-between-putin-and-hitler-are-uncanny.html)

[and-hitler-are-uncanny.html](http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2014/05/23/prince-charles-is-right-similarities-between-putin-and-hitler-are-uncanny.html). Philip Rucker, *Washington Post*,

3/5/2014, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/03/05/hillary-clinton-says-putins-](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/03/05/hillary-clinton-says-putins-action-are-like-what-hitler-did-back-in-the-30s/)

[action-are-like-what-hitler-did-back-in-the-30s](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/03/05/hillary-clinton-says-putins-action-are-like-what-hitler-did-back-in-the-30s/)/Jason Beattie, "David Cameron Compares Vladimir Putin's

Russia to Hitler's Germany Ahead of G20 Summit Showdown," 11/15/ 2014,

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/david-cameron-compares-vladimir-putins-4631945>

¹¹⁶ Ray Locker, Pentagon 2008 Study Claims Putin has Asperger's Syndrome," *USA TODAY*,

[http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2015/02/04/putin-aspergers-syndrome-study-](http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2015/02/04/putin-aspergers-syndrome-study-pentagon/22855927/)

[pentagon/22855927/](http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2015/02/04/putin-aspergers-syndrome-study-pentagon/22855927/) "Angela Merkel Tells President Obama She is Concerned About Vladimir Putin's

Mental Health," *Feelguide*, 3/ 3/ 2014. [http://www.feelguide.com/2014/03/03/angela-merkel-tells-](http://www.feelguide.com/2014/03/03/angela-merkel-tells-president-obama-she-is-concerned-about-vladimir-putins-mental-health/)

[president-obama-she-is-concerned-about-vladimir-putins-mental-health/](http://www.feelguide.com/2014/03/03/angela-merkel-tells-president-obama-she-is-concerned-about-vladimir-putins-mental-health/)

¹¹⁷ Ivan to Kurbsky, 1564, in *The Correspondence*, 39.