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Für Sasha

Die Liebe ist langmütig und freundlich,
die Liebe eifert nicht, die Liebe treibt nicht Mutwillen,
sie bläht sich nicht auf,
sie verhält sich nicht ungehörig, sie sucht nicht das Ihre,
sie lässt sich nicht erbittern, sie rechnet das Böse nicht zu,
sie freut sich nicht über die Ungerechtigkeit, sie freut sich aber an der
Wahrheit;
sie erträgt alles, sie glaubt alles, sie hofft alles, sie duldet alles.
History, as they say, is both an art and a science. Yet, there are various ways to describe that divide. One such way is the description of H. Stuart Hughes – that is, the difference between identifying something and placing it within a chronological sequence, on the one hand, and understanding something by giving it meaning, on the other.¹ By »something« he meant events of the past. And by »meaning« he meant identifying its interconnectedness with other events of the past. In this sense, to have the narrative (the story telling) identify the interconnectedness represents the subjective art. The study of the sources themselves (Quellenkunde, istochnikovedenie, études de sources, fontology), labeling something accurately and focusing on the present and on the physical object that exists in the present represents a science because the findings can be tested, verified, or refuted by others. Yet, the split, as Hughes realized, is not so neat. During the last half century or so, narratology (narratologie), whose origins can be traced back to Russian Formalism of the early twentieth century, has taken its place as a scientific approach.² And there is much in fontology that lends itself to artistic idiosyncratic subjectivity.

Take Ihor Ševčenko’s study of the narrative behind The Fragments of Toparcha Gothicus, which the philologist Carl Benedict Hase (1780-1864) published in 1819. Toparcha Gothicus was presumably the earliest extant narrative source about early Rus’. Ševčenko argued and provided convincing evidence, in contrast, that it was an early nineteenth-century forgery, probably written by Hase himself, based in part on letters of a certain Mrs. Guthrie published in 1802 and possibly on an account of Napoleon’s ill-fated military expedition

² I have in mind, in particular the work of Hayden White, whose quadruple tetrad has been called a »bedrock of order.« White, Hayden: Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press 1971.
In doing so, Ševčenko contributed to the history of this text and thus allows us better to evaluate its value as a source for the events being described in it.

Much of the work of Edward L. Keenan was devoted to the history of particular texts, such as the *Kazan History*; the apocryphal correspondence attributed to Andrei Kurbskii and Ivan IV, the *History of the Grand Prince of Moscow*, the *Iarlyk* attributed to Ahmed Khan, the *Tale of Igor’s Campaign*, and so forth. In each case, as with Ševčenko’s work on *Toparcha Gothicus*, Keenan concluded that the text is not what it appears to be either because it was meant to deceive by the author or because historians have misunderstood what it was meant to be. Most of Keenan’s findings have been disputed by other scholars. Yet, because he provided the evidence and logical arguments on which he based his conclusions, his findings can be disputed on a scientific level rather than on a merely subjective like/dislike level.

The metahistorical narratological analysis of the Hayden White kind has tended to focus on historiographical narrative, with the analysis of narrative in sources reserved for literary analysis. Yet, sources such as annals (*letopisi*), hagiographies (*vitae*, *zhitiia*), tales (*povesti*), legends (*skazaniia*), orations (*slova*), and even prayers (*molitvy*) also lend themselves to narratological analyses. One can treat them both as primary source testimonies and as historiographical interpretations of the author.

Delving into the history of a text does not necessarily or even usually result in questioning the authenticity of the text. For example, Kevin Birmingham’s recent book *The Sinner and the Saint* provides an in-depth study of the events in the life of Fëdor Dostoevskii leading up to and including his writing of the novel *Crime and Punishment*, but Birmingham also examines, again in

---

depth, the events surrounding the convicted French murderer Lacenaire and the influence of the reporting of that case on Dostoevskii’s own work.\textsuperscript{5} Birmingham’s focus is on the interior meaning of the text qua text rather than on the external literary meaning. Here the text is what it appears to be and was intended to be taken as such.

Then there are the in-between cases where a text or cycle of texts where there is no question of the authorship but there is a question of what the author intended the text to be taken as. James Macpherson’s »translation« of the Ossian cycle falls into this category. Denounced as fraudulent at the time by the likes of Samuel Johnson and Walter Scott, and considered to be a forgery by the academic world, Ossian has seen attempts made in recent years by scholars to reassess the artistic value of what Macpherson created.\textsuperscript{6} His deception, the revivers argue, might have been only in that he claimed he was translating from a physical manuscript not freely interpreting the Celtic idiom of the Scottish Highlands.

Cornelia Soldat is in the tradition of testing a source qua source, and she has distinguished herself as a fontologist (istochnikoved), analyzing the so-called Testament of Ivan IV of 1572. She has also analyzed the relationship between German pamphlet literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth century and accounts of the reign of Ivan IV. Here she expands her purview to include the narrative of a historical source, the account of Heinrich von Staden on his time serving as a mercenary in the army of Ivan IV. Dr. Soldat’s present book focuses on an attempt to find new meaning in the identification of Staden’s narrative through its interconnectedness with other narrative sources. In doing so, she enriches our understanding of the text itself, as well as providing more information for us to evaluate its validity as a historical source. In that respect, she has fulfilled the criteria for historical study as both an art and a science.

Donald Ostrowski

Harvard University


Heinrich von Staden’s »Land and Government of Muscovy« is considered one of the most extraordinary sources on the Oprichnina, the reign of terror under Tsar Ivan IV (1530-1584), also known as Ivan the »Terrible«. Many publications refer to Staden’s text, and during the 20th century its reception has led to a reassessment of Ivan’s regime of terror. At the same time, no philological study has taken place since its publication in 1930, and analysis with respect to Staden’s 16th-century context has remained wanting.

This book presents a philological classification of Staden’s texts. It argues, on the basis of intratextual references, that Staden composed his text around 1578/9 against the background of the narratives of the Conquest of Mexico by Hernan Cortés. This is particularly evident in the plan for the conquest of Muscovy, which draws heavily on literary representations and contemporary courtly understandings of Cortés’ conquest of Mexico. Emperor Rudolf II, for example, for whom the Staden papers were originally intended, had grown up with the history of the conquests at the Spanish court. His uncle, King Philip II of Spain, had grown up with Cortés’s son Martín, who served as a page at his court.

Cortés’ Conquest of Mexico had already been shaped into a master colonial conquest narrative that became a template for conquest campaigns in the Spanish colonies in the Americas. Although, they never succeeded after the conquest of the Inca Empire along the same lines. However, a reading of the letters with the conquest of Muscovy plan accompanying them and produced at the court of Count of the Palatinate Georg Hans von Veldenz at Burg Lützelstein in the Vosges shows that the purpose of the conquest plan was to initiate military intervention in Livonia in the first place and a reconquista of this former part of the Empire that had been invaded by the Muscovites since 1558.
In his description of Muscovy, Staden reshapes this early modern European state to be an example of a barbarian empire as the American colonies were supposed to be. For this purpose, he essentially uses known and already published anti-Muscovite pamphlets as well as a letter of Albert Schlichting circulating in manuscript, which had been published in Latin translation by Alexander Guagnini in 1578 in his Sarmatiae Europeae Descriptio.

Using these sources and his own marginal and not necessarily coherent self-biography, Staden constructs Muscovy as a corrupt and unjust state, and thus establishes the initial justification for a *bellum iustum*. In his proposed plan, Staden maps Cortés’ scheme in Mexico onto an imagined occupation of all of Muscovy, of which the eventual goals include nothing less than pan-European colonization and the Christianization of the Russians. Indeed, the Muscovites were already Orthodox Christians, but Staden puts them on a par with barbarian pagans. To this end, this analysis demonstrates that the parallels Staden draws between Cortés and his own conquest plan, between Ivan IV and the Aztec ruler Montezuma, supplant even reality, as the most emblematic episode of the conquest of Mexico, the encounter between conqueror and to-be-conquered.

Contents:

1 Introduction
This chapter explains Alexander VI’s bull *Inter caetera* as the basis for colonial self-understanding by Europeans, which also resulted in the writing down of colonial processes. Starting with the patronage system in the Spanish royal court as well as the Reconquista of Spain by the Catholic Monarchs, it demonstrates how colonial patterns developed and continued in the conquests in the Americas.

2 The *bellum iustum*
This chapter shows how Cortés described the Aztec Empire and its ruler Montezuma in order to lay the groundwork for a *bellum iustum*, a just war. By attributing to Montezuma traditional actions of a tyrant, like injustice, cruelty, paganism, the latter becomes an unjust ruler. The conquest of Mexico becomes a liberation of oppressed peoples and their return to a Christian empire.
3 The Manuscript
This chapter describes the manuscript of the Staden papers. It shows which sources have been used for the description of Muscovy, which parts were originally written by Staden, and how he uses traditional examples published by Guagnini to position himself as a connoisseur of contemporary Muscovite history. A textual comparison between the description and Staden’s self-biography, shows that the self-biography is probably a memoir text with Staden’s own recollections written first and that afterwards, with recourse to Guagnini, the other texts, description, conquest plan, and supplication to the emperor, were written. It is also assumed that the secretaries of Palgrave Georg Hans von Veldenz, at whose court the papers were written, were heavily involved in this process.

4 The Conquest
This chapter analyzes the attack plan of Staden. Right at the beginning it is noticeable that the imperial forces will enter Moskoy via a secret passage. This is the first obvious parallel to Cortés’ conquest of Mexico, who also traveled to Tenochtitlan via a secret passage. As the story progresses, the conquest of Muscovy is described similarly to the conquest of Mexico, markets are described, places where treasures can be found, salt is mentioned, and finally the city of Muscovy is taken in a siege, like Tenochtitlan. Now Staden describes the possibilities that arise from the conquest of Moscovy and its incorporation into the Empire: the Muscovites are made Christians, the way to America is open, the Emperor can expand his Empire once around the world.

5 The Meeting
This chapter describes the initial event of the Conquest of Mexico, the Meeting between Cortés and Montezuma, an encounter resonant in Staden’s papers. Staden’s meetings with Grand Prince Ivan are structured similarly to the Meeting between Cortés and Montezuma. They serve to lend credibility to Staden and portray him as a confidant of Ivan who is suited to carry out a conquest of Muscovy because he knows Ivan and his rule intimately.

6 The Protagonists
In this chapter, I show the parallel spellings used to portray Staden and Cortés as colonial conquerors on the one hand, and Montezuma and Ivan as »natives« to be colonized. The description as well as the conquest of Muscovy here
follow the pattern familiar from Mexico and are therefore themselves a catchy master narrative.

7 The War
This chapter shows that the conquest plan had already been sent by Palgrave Georg Hans to rulers in the Empire and northern Europe six months before the rest of Staden's papers were written. Staden's writing here is only one of a multitude of writings intended to forge an alliance against the Muscovites in Livonia. The conquest plan is not to be read on the surface, but as a dissimulation. Georg Hans already considered Stefan Báthory's attack on Muscovy in the autumn of 1579 as the coming into force of his plan. He was not concerned with a conquest of Muscovy, but with a Reconquista of Livonia.

8 Conclusion
This chapter shows how strongly Muscovy was inscribed in Spanish colonial discourse in Staden's correspondence. This is the strength of the Staden papers, for his account holds as little factual reality as does Cortés' account of Mexico.