The Reign of Ivan the Terrible: From "Patrimonial State" to "Composite Monarchy"

T.I. Lipich, V.V. Penskoy, V.V. Lipich and T.M. Penskaya
Belgorod State University, Preobrazhenskaya Street 17, 308000 Belgorod, Russia

Abstract: The study touches upon a new and original point of view on the problems of the evolution of different ways in the Russian State management in the late 15-16th centuries that were determined by the evolution of the Russian statehood itself and by social institutions connected with it. On the basis of the "patrimonial" and "composite" concepts the researchers (Pipes and Elliott) suggest to look at the state machinery development of Russia. They also suggest to look at the administrative and managerial aspects related to the Russian state from another point of view. Researchers hypothesize that the Ivan the terrible epoch had a kind of great "revolution" with unexpected and unpredictable consequences for initiators. That "revolution" was connected with the necessity to develop the customary administrative practice the state was engaged into during that time. The administrative practice was appropriate to the patrimonial state structure but it stopped to accord with time interests during the transformation to the composite state structure. During that transformation the small-numbered but relatively modern and effective state machine started to research together with enough traditional and archaism local administration machinery. Herewith the administrative practice both in central and remote places was quite differ and in order to pull them together and to make the management easier some steps were undertaken. The truth of these steps will be learnt more detailed but the management transformations consequences of the mid-16th century let us state that this "rapprochement" became successful enough and at the same time it promoted the ending of the "patrimonial" state and pushed the process of the "composite" state transformation on.

Key words: Russia, the 16th century, Ivan the terrible, bureaucracy, administrative and managerial practice, laws, Zemstvo

INTRODUCTION

Long, more than semi-centennial reign of Ivan IV (1533-1584) made the whole era in the history of Russia. Just right after Yanov we are to speak about some kind of "revolution" which was made by Ivan as his transformations affected practically all spheres of life and activity of the Russian state and society of that time. However, we will not put negative sense in this term as it was made by the mentioned historian as there are all bases to assume that the general direction of policy of the first Russian tsar corresponded (with local, Russian specifics) to the all European trend on forming the states of early modern times. The last differed from friable, unconsolidated medieval monarchies by greater unity, stability and the strong central power.

The quickly developing bureaucracy and administrative and managerial practices served as basis for this unity and stability, differing from those that were accepted earlier. However, these practices had accurately expressed "national" specifics caused by formation features and the subsequent evolution of the early Modern times monarchy. Curious were the practices of the end of the 15-16th centuries inherent in state mechanism of the Russian state; they are represented as subject to the analysis of feature administrative traditions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In modern historical literature the point of view according to which the Moscow state (so we for convenience will call Russia prior to Peter I's transformations at the beginning of the 18th century) represented a rather archaic, primitive (including development of bureaucratic practices), "Patrimonial State" is quite widespread. Popularity of this point of view (in particular in modern Russia and first of all in pseudo-historical community) in many respects is connected with the sensational book of the American researcher Pipes (1974).

The known grain of truth in this concept, of course, is present. However, we should not forget that if actually

---

Corresponding Author: T.I. Lipich, Belgorod State University, Preobrazhenskaya Street 17, 308000 Belgorod, Russia

Moscow principality of a specific era was one of many big and small principalities of Northeast Russia and could be considered as typical "patrimonial state", we cannot say this about the power which was created by Ivan III and his son Vasily and the grandson Ivan continued. What was suitable for managing small principality (territorially and populationally) (at the end of the 14th century the population of the Moscow principality by our calculations, made about 250-300 thousand people) was not suitable for managing the ever growing state. Need of improving traditional administrative practices was more than obvious if to take into account the "collecting" process feature of Russian lands under the power of the Moscow grand dukes. In due time French historian Mousnier characterizing political condition of Western Europe in the 16th century, noted that the states of that time "appear as a conglomerate of territorial communities, provinces, the self-coping pays, municipalities, rural communities and corporate structures, for example, orders... of the official case, universities, guilds...".

The Russian state of Ivan IV predecessors' times represented such conglomerate, some kind of "scrappy blanket" ("the composite monarchy", according to. Elliott (1992) from territories with the different level of social and economic and political development with different traditions and customs (including administrative and legal spheres). Ivan IV had a task of continuing the research of the predecessors on improving the states inherent in this type of administrative practices.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

During the conducted research we came to conclusions, a little unexpected and uncommon for the dominating historical discourse. First of all, we concluded that preservation of "scrappiness" (or "compositness") (Schneider, 1992) of the Russian state was caused not only by the circumstances which had to a certain extent subjective character. Long ago one of the radical differences of Russia from Western Europe was noticed. Solovyov in a common manner pointed to that circumstance that "the nature for Western Europe for its people was mother for Eastern Europe for the people which were fated to research here, the stepmother..." (Savosichev, 2015). Poverty of the Russian state (in comparison with its Western European contemporaries) imposed essential restrictions for its inquiries. Moscow physically was unable to afford numerous (relatively of course) and branched bureaucratic apparatus (even to find the necessary number of the educated people who are appropriately preparedand there was a problem).

However, it was impossible to do without services of professional managers andin the process of the functions complication (at first external andthen internal) carried out by the state, the question of how to solve the problems growing day by day connected with management of the growing territory became ever sharper. And seemingly, a solution was found.

On one hand, according to Krom in a subsoil of the developing Moscow bureaucratic apparatus were developed various ways "unloading" from "black", routine administrative activity, including the special office receptions allowing, according to the historian, to save time, strength and paper of the unnumerous mandatives (the last calculations by Savositchev (2015) show that in the middle of the 16th century at the same time about fifty clerks, apart from scribes, researched in the Moscow.

However, moch more importatnt than notorious office receptionswas another matter. M.M. Krom among other ways of decrease in daily loading noted the established practice of administrative functions partial transferring on local administrative structures was common. The researcher did not develop this thesis further, so we will try to do it for him.

The 15 years ago Russian historian Y.G. Alekseev in one of his researchs offered the original concept of genesis and subsequent evolution of the Russian state of the end of 12th beginning of the 18th centuries which he suggested to call the "land-serving state". The essence of this concept, according to the historian was that "a real basis of this state were the land-serving relations and communal institutes penetrating all system of life of Russia...". And, developing this thought , academician N.N. Pokrovsky noted that "the system of power (in the Russian state of that era T.L., V.P., V. L., T.P.) was based not only on the concept of "state" but on two concepts "state" and "society" on the thought-over system of not only straight lines but also feedback between them. The central government of that time was not able to reach each individual; executing the functions, it had to lean on these primary social communities (country and city communities, noble corporations "cities" and so forth. T.L., V.P., V. L., T.P.). But it automatically meant the serious rights of such organisms, their considerable role in political system of all country...".

It is easy to notice that such approach to forming the relations system between the center and provinces in general corresponded to that which can be observed at the same time in Western Europe. J. Elliott characterizing such approach noted that the royalty, establishing military control in lands, at the same time built the new structures (we noted T.L., V.P., V. L., T.P.) over the old ones. At the same time it actively used various informal,

non-bureaucratic ways and methods of management (for example, patronage) to achieve and keep loyalty of old administrative and political elite (Elliott, 1992). Moreover, within this political policy Black noted the royalty officially declaring the commitment to "old times". Therefore, any attempts to replace old structures with new caused obvious disapproval "below" and a certain resistance "from above" andthe central power, being afraid to destroy the fragile consensus reached by big efforts, tried to avoid sharp turns of an internal political course. Serious changes were result as a rule, of acute socio-political crisis and violation of "normal" interaction of the center and provinces (Black, 2004).

Addressing the management experience of the state built by Ivan III and his successor Vasily III, it is easy to notice that all above-noted features can easily be established on the Russian materials. So, Ivan III in negotiations with Novgorod "gospody" (nobility) accurately and unambiguously motivated the position with the appeal to tradition to "the old times". Revision of the reached agreements for example, showed that in the Novgorod case and in Smolensk (reign of Vasily III), it was caused by attempts of part of the Novgorod and Smolensk elite "to change" results of these two "lands" accession to Moscow and to violate the arrangements concluded at the same time with grand dukes. In the same way the arrest of the Novgorod-Seversk land prince Vasily Shemyachich by warrant of Vasily III which caused condemnation of the grand duke's actions from a number of influential church figures andrepresentatives of the Moscow aristocracy was caused by suspicions the land prince contacted with the grand Lithuanian duke Sigismund I.

Considering all these circumstances, it is possible to say with confidence that the control system in Russian state at the end of 15th 1st half of the 16th centuries was built on the basis of interaction of "center" and "lands" andthis interaction was based on two "partners" of this interaction competence spheres division. In our opinion, it found the reflection in a standard formula from documents of that era "on the own cause and on the cause gosudarsky and territorial". A little modernizing the stated by Krom, we will note that by the middle of the 16th century there was a characteristic administrative practice. Its essence was that "high politics" or "cause monarchic" (the cause of sovereigh) (T.L., V.P., V. L., T.P.) had an exclusive prerogative of the sovereign and the Boyar Duma (Seigniorial Duma). "Cause territorial" (the cause of land) fell within the scope of local, "territorial" self-government (local self-government) which at the heart leaned on local administrative practices and legal custom in a word, on old ways and habitual "old times".

In a word, state machinery of the Russian state in the middle of the 16th century and the administrative practices corresponding to it, in general reflected "composite" (J. Elliott) character of the Russian statehood for that moment. Also it is possible to state with confidence that by this time the transition from notorious "Patrimonial State" to "Composite Monarchy" which lasted not less than two centuries, in general, came to end. But why in general? We believe that this incompleteness was connected with preservation on local, "territorial", level the appealing to "old times" administrative practices. It was impossible to refuse them, in our opinion, so far for two main reasons. First, it was interfered by already mentioned poverty of the Russian state (that did not allow to increase the number of bureaucratic apparatus and the administrative resource corresponding to its sizes). Another the central power showed the desire to keep "old times" as the guarantor of political and social stability in society (that was especially actual in the late forties the 50th of the 16th century at sunset of boyar's government in the the 2nd half of the 30-40th of the 16th century).

At the same time the coexistence of several administrative practices inevitably had to create additional difficulties in a country government, especially taking into account the process of progressing bureaucratization and growth of the central administrative personnel in breadth and depth. Ivan the terrible's era-time when the Moscow mandative system (the system of prikazes) finishes process of the formation and finding the characteristic shape and habitual lines (in the next nearly one and a half centuries the change was of quantitative but not qualitative character). At the same time it, possessed a certain independence and autonomy in relation to the sovereign power in the person of the sovereign and the Seigniorial Duma (The Counsil of boyars). Plus, it gained the essential political weight and influence (as it was noted with obvious displeasure by contemporaries supporters of the dear "old times", for example, by prince Kurbsky and his confidants. In a sense the capital mandative bureaucracy gained self-sufficing and self-sufficient character. And no wonder taking into account its high, developed by long-term practice, professionalism and organizational and administrative skills (really, boyars and okolnitchies which nominally come and leave, then as clerks (diaks) and in particular scribes (poddiaks), remain and pull on themselves all daily administrative work).

And here against these rather perfect central administrative apparatus with its rational approach to the organization of local management, "territorial" administrative structures which was activity based on the taken roots century custom looked rather archaically if not to say primitively. And did not the central power,

institutionalizing a territorial self-government, giving it the status of "partner", a sorabotnik within that "land serving" states-promote (did the bureaucracy not start this?) the rapprochement and certain unification of administrative practices in the center and on places? Let us quote the modern researcher of Ivan the Terrible's times territorial self-government issues Bovykin. He noted that "prevention of crime and the organization of fight against its most socially dangerous manifestations-robberies, administration of law, apportioning and collecting taxes were extremely difficult matters of domestic policy. As it appeared, only local self-government, represented by the bodies allocated with the corresponding status and invested by trust as ruling elite and "simple commoners" were capable to resolve these issues effectively in the Russian state of the 16th century....". Agree that issues which were resolved by a territorial self-government could not be solved successfully without mutual understanding with the central power andthe mutual understanding problem in that case gains special sharpness-both the center and"lands" have to talk in one "language" clear to both parties, research by uniform rules.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion, we consider that in the light of this assumption the statement of other Russian researcher V.A. Arakcheev looks absolutely different as well as V.V. Bovykin's investigating the questions connected with history of local self-government of the 16th century. He noted that "the complexes of acts of territorial document flow which remained till our time demonstrate first of all penetration of state machinery into the depth of territorial worlds whose efforts were bureaucratized and put under control and account (T.L., V.P., V. L., T.P.)...". In this case we speak of practices development (on initiative and under pressure "from above") of certain

general rules and "regulations" allowing to coordinate research (any in that case is about rapprochement administrative, up to similar office receptions) on different levels of "land-serving" state. The curious thing is that during the Distemper era in particular at the stage ending it, when, in essence, the central administrative agencies ceased to work, "territorial" administrative structures undertook their functions and coped with the problem of restoring the state which rose before them. Could the former "lands" which did not have the corresponding experience of the solution of difficult administrative matters and talking in different "languages" make it? Such assumption seems improbable. Therefore, the Distemper indirectly validated the internal political course chosen by Ivan IV at the beginning of his reign and viability of the administrative land practices structures he created. From here follows yet other consequence "Patrimonial State" finally became the past as well as "Composite Monarchy" began to undergo changes towards unification and leveling of local differences.

REFERENCES

Black, J., 2004. Kings, Nobles and Commoners: States and Societies in Early Modern Europe: A Revisionist History. I.B. Tauris, London, New York, Pages: 198.

Elliott, J.H., 1992. A Europe of composite monarchies: Past & Present, No. 137. The Cultural and Political Construction of Europe, November, 1992, pp: 48-71.

Pipes, R., 1974. Russia Under Old Regime. Scribner, New York Pages: 360.

Savosichev, A.Y., 2015. Dyaks and scribes of the XIV-XVI centuries: Origin and social communications. Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Historical Sciences Orel.

Schneider, R.A., 1992. Crown and Capitoulat: Municipal Government in Toulouse 1500-1789. In: Cities and Social Change in Early Modern France, Benedict, P. (Ed.). Routledge, London, New York, pp: 191-216.