

“How Good People Live” (source studies of private life in Russia based on the materials of “spiritual affairs” of the 1660s–1670s)

Vyacheslav Kozlyakov
(Ryazan State University named for S.A. Yesenin, Russia)

DOI: 10.31857/S086956870014171-9

The anthropological turn of research in the humanities has caused historians to switch their attention to the plots of the history of private and everyday life, which remained unstudied for a long time in the shadow of the problems of power and society, revolutions, social and economic history. Attention to the private sphere of social life requires the study of features of the interaction of individuals and entire communities, social life, the relationship between rule and reality in secular and canon law.

The study of the history of private life in Russian science began in the 1990s under the influence of Bessmertnyi, which resulted in the establishment of the Center “History of Private and Everyday Life” of the Institute of General History of the Russian Academy of Sciences. In researchers’ articles published in the almanacs *Casus. The Individual and Unique in History* and *Odysseus. Man in History*, the methodological potential of the concept of private life was considered, the historiographic tradition in works on the European history of the Middle Ages and Modern Times was studied¹. However, the initial optimism associated with the possibilities of cultural anthropology has already passed, the problem of studying “private” and “everyday” life is becoming a subject for discussion, historians see possible limitations due to the nature and completeness of sources: “After all, the *description* of a certain story, especially a *single* case, cannot yet be called a full-fledged study of the history of everyday life”².

The theme of the history of private life in Russia in the 17th century is insufficiently studied, especially in comparison with similar materials on Western European history, and published works are usually not directly related to cultural anthropology.

© 2021, V.N. Kozlyakov

This article is a translation of: V.N. Kozlyakov. «How good people live» (source studies of private life in Russia based on the materials of the «spiritual affairs» of the 1660–1670s). *Rossiiskaia Istorii*. 2021. № 1. P. 26–36. DOI: 10.31857/S086956870013440-5.

¹ *Bessmertnyi Yu.L.* Chastnaia zhizn’: stereotipnoe i individual’noe [Private life: the stereotypical and the individual] // *Chelovek v krugu sem’i. Ocherki po istorii chastnoi zhizni v Evrope do nachala Novogo vremeni* [Man in the family circle. Essays on the history of private life in Europe before the modern times]. Moskva, 1996. P. 110–119. (In Russ.); *Repina L.P.* Vydelenie sfery chastnoi zhizni kak istoriograficheskaia i metodologicheskaiia problema [Allocation of the sphere of private life as a historiographic and methodological problem] // *Chelovek v krugu sem’i. Ocherki po istorii chastnoi zhizni v Evrope do nachala Novogo vremeni* [Man in the family circle. Essays on the history of private life in Europe before the modern times]. Moskva, 1996. P. 20–34. (In Russ.); *Repina L.P.* “Novaia istoricheskaiia nauka” i sotsial’naia istoriia [“New historical science” and social history]. Moskva, 2009. (In Russ.)

² *Togoeva O.I.* Istoriia prava i istoriia povsednevnosti: tochki peresecheniia [History of law and history of everyday life: intersection points] // *Odisei. Chelovek v istorii* [Odysseus. Man in history]. 2014. Issue 25. P. 360. (In Russ.)

Pushkareva's works are created within the framework of a gender approach; she studied the history of women from the time of Ancient Rus, based on narrative sources: literary and folklore artifacts, collections of sermons, texts of questionnaires for confessions, penances, and family correspondence. The main emphasis in Pushkareva's works is placed on various aspects of women's emotional experiences, and the private is opposed to the social³. Kosheleva drew attention to "casus" examples of Russian history, allowing them to be interpreted in the context of the study of private history⁴. Selin explored the everyday life of Novgorod society during the Time of Troubles using the well-preserved "Novgorod Occupation Archive" in Sweden⁵. Private archives and correspondence of the 17th century are traditionally studied, which also indirectly affect the concept of "everyday life"⁶. There is only one area where researchers have been able to move a little further in the study of private life — wedding "behavior", marriage rites, "church regulation" and the prehistory of metric accounting⁷. The historical experience of canon law, "housebuilding traditions", problems of marriage and divorce in Orthodoxy since the time of Ancient Rus and in Russia in the 16th—17th centuries were considered by Belyakova, Naydenova, Tsaturova⁸.

³ *Pushkareva N.L.* Chastnaia zhizn' russkoi zhenshchiny: nevesta, zhena, liubovnitsa [The private life of Russian woman: bride, wife, mistress]. Moskva, 1997. (In Russ.); *Pushkareva N.L.* Zhenshchiny Drevnei Rusi i Moskovskogo tsarstva X—XVII vv. [Women of Ancient Russia and Muscovy of the 10th-17th centuries]. Sankt-Peterburg, 2017. (In Russ.)

⁴ *Kosheleva O.E.* Pobeg voina [Escape of the warrior] // Kazus [Casus]. 1996. Moskva, 1997. P. 55—86. (In Russ.); *Kosheleva O.E.* Leto 1645 goda: smena lits na rossiiskom prestole [The summer of 1645: a change of persons on the Russian throne] // Kazus [Casus]. 1999. Moskva, 1999. P. 148—170. (In Russ.)

⁵ *Selin A.A.* Smuta na Severo-Zapade v nachale XVII veka. Ocherki iz zhizni novgorodskogo obshchestva [Troubles in the Northwest at the beginning of the 17th century. Essays from the life of Novgorod society]. Sankt-Peterburg, 2017. (In Russ.)

⁶ *Morozov B.N., Novokhatko O.V., Timoshina L.A.* Arkhiv gostei Pankrat'evykh XVII — nachala XVIII v. T. 1—2 [Archive of the Pankratyevs' guests of the 17th — early 18th centuries. Vol. 1—2]. Moskva, 2001—2007. (In Russ.); *Morozov B.N., Novokhatko O.V., Timoshina L.A.* Arkhiv stol'nika Andreia Il'icha Bezobrazova. Ch. 1—2 [Archive of stolnik Andrey Ilyich Bezobrazov. Parts 1—2]. Moskva, 2012—2013. (In Russ.); *Morozov B.N.* Chastnye arkhivy XVII v. Avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk [Private archives of the 17th century. Author's abstract of the Ph.D. thesis in History]. Moskva, 1984. (In Russ.); *Morozov B.N.* Iz istorii chastnykh arkhivov kuptsov i gorozhan XVII v. [From the history of private archives of merchants and townspeople of the 17th century]. // *Morozov B.N., Stefanovich P.S.* Roman Vilimovich v gostiakh u Petra Ignat'evicha: pskovskii arkhiv angliiskogo kuptsa 1680-kh godov [Roman Vilimovich visiting Pyotr Ignatievich: the Pskov archive of an English merchant of the 1680s]. Moskva, 2009. P. 153—164. (In Russ.); *Novokhatko O.V.* Rossiia. Chastnaia perepiska XVII veka [Russia. Private correspondence of the 17th century]. Moskva, 2018. (In Russ.)

⁷ *Bushnell J.* Bor'ba za nevestu. Krest'ianskie svad'by v Riazanskom uезде 1690-kh gg. [Struggle for the bride. Peasant weddings in the Ryazan district of the 1690s] // Russkii sbornik. Issledovaniia po istorii Rossii [Russian collection. Research on the history of Russia]. 2006. Issue II. P. 81—98. (In Russ.); *Pshenitsyn D.A., Cherkasova M.S.* Venechnye pamiati, poshliny i zapisnye knigi XVI—XVIII vv. [Wedding letters, fees and registration books of the 16th — 18th centuries] // Vestnik Ekaterinburgskoi dukhovnoi seminarii [Bulletin of the Yekaterinburg Theological Seminary], 2018, 3(23). P. 44—95. (In Russ.); *Pshenitsyn D.A., Cherkasova M.S.* O predystorii metriceskogo ucheta v Rossii (XVII — pervaiia polovina XVIII v.) [About the prehistory of metric accounting in Russia (17th — first half of the 18th century)] // Rossiiskaia istoriia [Russian History], 2019, no. 1. P. 86—102. (In Russ.); *Cherkasova M.S.* Severnaia Rus': istoriia surovogo kraia XIII—XVII vv. [Northern Rus: the history of the harsh land in the 13th-17th centuries]. Moskva, 2017. (In Russ.)

⁸ *Belyakova E.V., Belyakova N.A., Emchenko E.B.* Zhenshchina v pravoslavii. Tserkovnoe pravo i rossiiskaia praktika [Woman in Orthodoxy. Church law and Russian practice]. Moskva, 2011. P. 93—134. (In Russ.); *Naydenova L.P.* Mir russkogo cheloveka XVI—XVII vv. (Po Domostroiu i pamiatnikam prava) [The world of Russian man in the 16th-17th centuries (Domestic rules and monuments of law)]. Moskva,

This article is devoted to studying source problems of research on the private life based on the materials of the church court in Russia in the second half of the 17th century⁹. The registration books of the Judicial Prikaz of the Ryazan Bishop's House for the periods of 1665—1668 and 1675—1679 make it possible to refer to this topic. Manuscripts No. 13115 (hereinafter referred to as “I”) and 13105 (hereinafter referred to as “II”) entitled “Copies of petitions to the Ryazan Bishop. 18th century” are kept in the library of the State Archives of the Ryazan Region (SA RR). The books of the bishop's Judicial Prikaz were “hidden” from researchers for a long time due to the lack of a scientific description and incorrect titles in the inventory of the manuscript collection of the archive¹⁰. Meanwhile, at the end of the 18th — beginning of the 19th century, these manuscripts were used by Archimandrite Jerome (Alyakrinsky) when compiling the “Ryazan Memorials”, which is a collection of information on the history of the Russian Church and the Ryazan Eparchy from the acts, manuscripts, and printed sources, the work on which began after the well-known Synod's decree on sending chronicles in 1791.¹¹ In the early 20th century, registration books of the bishop's Judicial Prikaz became the subject of research of the Voronezh church historian Vvedenskii. He correctly assessed the significance and unique nature of the “three voluminous manuscripts (a total of more than 2,500 pages)” then kept in the collection of the Ryazan Theological Seminary, studied the history of their appearance in the seminary library from the collection of its teacher in the mid-19th century. Vvedenskii published a number of interesting documents in “Voronezh Antiquity” and “Proceedings of the Vladimir Provincial Scientific Archive Commission”¹².

2003. (In Russ.); *Tsaturova M.K.* Tri veka russkogo razvoda (XVI—XVIII veka) [Three centuries of Russian divorce (16th-18th centuries)]. Moskva, 2011. (In Russ.)

⁹ See: *Nikolai (Yarushevich), hieromonk.* Tserkovnyi sud v Rossii do izdaniia Sobornogo Ulozheniia Alekseia Mikhailovicha (1649 g.). (Opyt izucheniia vselenskikh i mestnykh nachal i ikh vzaimootnoshenii v drevne-russkom tserkovnom sude). Istoriko-kanonicheskoe issledovanie [Church court in Russia before the publication of the Cathedral Code of Alexei Mikhailovich (1649). (The experience of studying ecumenical and local principles and their relationship in the ancient Russian church court). Historical and canonical research]. Petrograd, 1917. (In Russ.); *Poloznev D.F.* Tserkovnyi sud v Rossii XVII veka [Church court in Russia of the 17th century // *Istoricheskii vestnik: nauchnyi zhurnal* [Historical Bulletin: Scientific Journal], 2002, 1(16). P. 117—133. (In Russ.) The entire issue of this edition of the Voronezh-Lipetsk Eparchy was devoted to modern research on the topic: “Church Court in the History of Russia” (see also the articles by Ya.N. Shchapov, E.V. Belyakova, E.B. Emchenko, L.P. Naydenova, S.L. Firov et al.), as well as the reprint of chapters of the classic work by Hieromonk Nikolai (Yarushevich). See also: *Ospennikov Yu.V., Gaydenko P.I.* Tserkovnyi sud na Rusi XI—XIV vekov. Istoricheskii i pravovoi aspekty [Church court in Russia in the 11th-14th centuries. Historical and legal aspects]. Sankt-Peterburg, 2020. (In Russ.)

¹⁰ SA RR, Library, No. 13115; No. 13105. See: *Sevastyanova, A.A.* Redkie rukopisnye knigi XVII—XIX vekov v Gosudarstvennom arkhive Riazanskoj oblasti [Rare handwritten books of the 17th — 19th centuries in the State Archive of the Ryazan Region] // *Vestnik Riazanskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. S.A. Esenina* [Bulletin of the Ryazan State University named for S. Yesenin], 2018, 3(60). P. 7—12. (In Russ.)

¹¹ *Jerome (Alyakrinsky), archimandrite.* Riazanskiye dostopamiatnosti, sobrannyye arhimandritom Ieronimom [Ryazan memorials collected by Archimandrite Jerome]. Ryazan, 1889. P. 91, 96. (In Russ.) For more details on the surviving sources on the history of the Ryazan and Murom eparchies, see: *Golovina N.V.* Istochniki po istorii Riazansko-Muromskoi episkopii XIV—XVII vv. Avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk [Sources on the history of the Ryazan-Murom episcopate of the 14th-17th centuries. Author's abstract of Ph.D. thesis in History]. Nizhny Novgorod, 2012. (In Russ.)

¹² *Vvedenskii S.N.* Materialy dlia istorii Voronezhskoi eparkhii (iz rukopisei Riazanskoj dukhovnoi seminarii) [Materials for the history of the Voronezh eparchy (from the manuscripts of the Ryazan Theological Seminary)] // *Voronezhskaja starina* [Voronezh Antiquity]. Issue 5. Voronezh, 1905. P. 126—135. (In Russ.); *Vvedenskii S.N.* Iz tserkovnoi stariny Muromskogo kraia (Materialy dlia istorii monastirei i prikhodov v gor. Murome i ego uезде, izvlechennyye iz rukopisei biblioteki Riazanskoj dukhovnoi semina-

Vvedenskii was going to write a separate work on the history of spiritual prikazes, based on the materials of the Ryazan manuscripts he discovered (the latest of them, written in the 1690s, has not yet been found). However, in the post-revolutionary period, he had to switch to the study of local history plots, and the “Academic Trial” of 1929—1930 made it impossible to continue his scientific activities¹³.

The problem of studying canon law of the 16th—17th centuries is associated with the well-known difficulties of source study. The canonical side and sources of Byzantine and Old Russian law, materials of church cathedrals were studied in detail in the historical-church literature of the 19th century. The works of Barsov on the spiritual court, connected with the attempt to carry out a “spiritual-judicial reform” in the 1870s, were of particular importance. However, the analysis of specific incidents of the church court is based primarily on materials from the Synodal period of the Russian Church in the 18th — early 20th centuries¹⁴. Good preservation of records in the bishops’ houses until the 17th century is rather an exception to the rule, while the materials of the church court are presented in the archives only by scattered sources¹⁵. Studying the funds of patriarchal prikazes and episcopal houses, researchers primarily turn to the sources on the history of the internal structure of church institutions¹⁶.

rii) [From church antiquity of the Murom region (Materials for the history of monasteries and parishes in the city of Murom and its district, extracted from the manuscripts of the library of the Ryazan Theological Seminary)] // Trudy Vladimirskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii [Proceedings of the Vladimir Scientific Archive Commission]. Book 11. Vladimir, 1910. P. 3—22. (In Russ.)

¹³ Sergeĭ Nikolaevich Vvedenskii (1867—1940): Biobibliograficheskii ukazatel’ [Sergeĭ Nikolaevich Vvedenskii (1867—1940): Bibliographic index]. Voronezh, 1997. (In Russ.)

¹⁴ Barsov T.V. O dukhovnom sude [On the spiritual court] // Khristianskoe chtenie [Christian Reading]. 1870. No. 9. P. 462—510; No. 10. P. 587—626. (In Russ.); Barsov T.V. O svetskikh fiskalakh i dukhovnykh inkvizitorakh [On secular fiscals and spiritual inquisitors] // Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia [Journal of the Ministry of Public Education]. 1878. February. Part CXC. P. 350—400. (In Russ.); Berdnikov I.S. Kratkii kurs tserkovnogo prava pravoslavnoi tserkvi [A short course in canon law of the Orthodox Church]. Kazan, 1903. P. 178—294. (In Russ.); Pavlov A.S. 50-ia glava Kormchei knigi kak istoricheskii i prakticheskii istochnik russkogo brachnogo prava [Chapter 50 of the Kormchaya Book as a historical and practical source of Russian marriage law]. Moskva, 1887. (In Russ.); Pavlov A.S. Kurs tserkovnogo prava [Canon law course]. Sergiev Posad, 1902. P. 394—440. (In Russ.); Suvorov N.S. Kurs tserkovnogo prava. T. 1 [Church law course. Vol. 1]. Yaroslavl, 1889. P. 303—369. (In Russ.); Sbornik pamiatnikov po istorii tserkovnogo prava, preimushchestvenno russkoi Tserkvi do epokhi Petra Velikogo [A collection of monuments on the history of canon law, mainly of the Russian Church before the era of Peter the Great]. Issue 2. Petrograd, 1914. (In Russ.)

¹⁵ Veryuzhskii V. Afanasii, arkhiepiskop Kholmogorskii: Ego zhizn’ i trudy v sviazi s istoriei Kholmogorskoj eparkhii [Afanasy, Archbishop of Kholmogory: his life and essays on the history of the Kholmogory eparchy]. Sankt-Peterburg, 1908. (In Russ.); Grekov B.D. Novgorodskii dom Sviatoi Sofii (opyt izucheniiia organizatsii i vnutrennikh otnoshenii krupnoi tserkovnoi votchiny) [Novgorod House of St. Sophia (experience of studying the organization and internal relations of a large church estate)]. Part I. Sankt-Peterburg, 1914. (In Russ.); Pokrovskii I.M. Kazanskii arkhieiereiskii dom, ego sredstva i shtaty preimushchestvenno do 1764 g. [Kazan bishop’s house, its funds and staff, mainly until 1764]. Kazan, 1906. (In Russ.); Soloviev N.A. Saraiskaia i Krutitskaia eparkhiiia [Sarai and Krutitskaya eparchies] // Chteniia v Imperatorskom Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete [Readings in the Imperial Society of Russian History and Antiquities at Moscow University]. Book 3. 1894. (In Russ.)

¹⁶ Ustinova I.A. Knigi patriarskhikh prikazov 1620—1649 gg. kak istoricheskii istochnik [Books of patriarchal prikazes of 1620—1649 as a historical source]. Moskva, 2011. (In Russ.); Ustinova I.A. Arkhivy russkikh arkhieiereiskikh domov XVII v.: K probleme izucheniiia [Archives of Russian episcopal houses of the 17th century: On the problem of studying] // Vspomogatel’nye i spetsial’nye nauki istorii v XX — nachale XXI v.: prizvanie, tvorchestvo, obshchestvennoe sluzhenie istorika. Moskva, 14—15 apreliia 2014 g. [Auxiliary and special sciences of history in the 20th — early 21st century: vocation, creativity, public service of a historian. Moscow, 14-15 April 2014]. Moskva, 2014. P. 385—387. (In Russ.); Bashnin N.V. “Biudzhēt” Vologodskogo arkhieiereiskogo doma sv. Sofii v pervoi treti XVII v. [“Budget” of the Vologda bishop’s

There are also known source study limitations concerning studying the parish life in the 16th — 17th centuries¹⁷.

No purposeful study of “spiritual affairs” of church court prikazes has been carried out so far. Although in the archival complexes of the bishops’ houses and in monastery archives, there are documents directly related to such court proceedings: petitions with requests to consider spiritual affairs, bishops’ instructions to conduct an investigation and confrontation, letters about resolved cases. Obviously, researchers are faced with the problem of representativeness of such materials: based on a few documents, it is very difficult to determine what it is: some kind of incident or a common situation?

Church life standards, the list of spiritual affairs, and the order of their consideration were determined by Stoglav of 1551¹⁸. It contained requirements for bishops to judge on their own, without entrusting the trial to other bishopric officials or abbots of monasteries, to conduct an investigation and confrontations, not to bring the consideration of cases to court and, if possible, not to base their judgment on the parties’ oath-taking. The prerogatives of church authorities to hold a court and rule in the church were also confirmed in the letters given to the bishops. For example, the letter of gratitude to the Ryazan Archbishop Anthony on 05 March 1623 read as follows:

house of St. Sofia in the first third of the 17th century] // Rossiiskaia istoriia [Russian History]. 2017. No. 5. P. 114–126. (In Russ.); *Gnevashev D.E.* Dvor Vologodskogo arkhiepiskopa v XVII v. [Courtyard of the Vologda Archbishop in the 17th century] // Regional’nye aspekty istoricheskogo puti pravoslavia: arkhivy, istochniki, metodologiya issledovani. Materialy mezhhregional’noi nauchnoi konferentsii. Vyp. 7: Istoricheskoe kraevedenie i arkhivy [Regional aspects of the historical path of Orthodoxy: archives, sources, research methodology. Materials of the interregional scientific conference. Issue 7: Regional studies through history and archives]. Vologda, 2001. P. 139–149. (In Russ.); *Matison A.V.* Prikaznaia elita Tverskogo arkhieiskogo doma (1675–1742) [Prikaz elite of the Tver bishop’s house (1675–1742)] // Vestnik PSTGU. Ser. II. Istoriia. Istoriia Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvi [Bulletin of PSTSU. Series II. History. History of the Russian Orthodox Church]. Issue 92. 2020. P. 61–64. (In Russ.); *Melnik A.G.* Rostovskii mitropolitichii dvor v XVII v. [Rostov Metropolitan Court in the 17th century] // Soobshcheniia Rostovskogo muzeia [Messages from the Rostov Museum]. Issue 1. 1991. P. 132–144. (In Russ.); *Nikulin I.*, priest. Struktura Tobol’skogo arkhieiskogo doma v 90-e gody XVII v. [The structure of the bishop’s house in Tobolsk in the 1890s] // Vestnik Ekaterinburgskoi dukhovnoi seminarii [Bulletin of the Yekaterinburg Theological Seminary]. Issue 2 (8). 2014. P. 120–138. (In Russ.); *Ustinova I.A.* Sluzhebnaia biografiia arkhieiskogo d’iaka Danily Ignat’eva: k voprosu o svetskom elemente v russkom tserkovnom upravlenii XVII v. [Official biography of bishop clerk Danila Ignatiev: on the secular element in the Russian church administration of the 17th century] // Trudy Instituta rossiiskoi istorii RAN [Proceedings of the Institute of Russian History, Russian Academy of Sciences]. Issue 12. Moscow, 2014. P. 83–92. (In Russ.); *Ustinova I.A., Shamina I.N.* Istoriia Vologodskogo arkhieiskogo doma: novye istochniki [History of the Vologda bishop’s house: new sources] // Rossiiskaia istoriia [Russian History]. 2019. No. 4. P. 223–231. (In Russ.); *Khariina N.S.* Tobol’skii arkhieiskii dom v XVII — 60-e gg. XVIII v. Avtoref. dis. ... kand. ist. nauk [Tobolsk bishop’s house in the 17th — 1760s. Author’s abstract of Ph.D. thesis in History]. Barnaul, 2012. (In Russ.); *Cherkasova M.S.* Arkhivy vologodskikh monastirei i tserkvei XV–XVII vv.: issledovanie i opyt rekonstruktsii [Archives of Vologda monasteries and churches of the 15th–17th centuries: research and reconstruction experience]. Vologda, 2012. P. 86–100. (In Russ.)

¹⁷ *Stefanovich P.S.* Prikhod i prikhodskoe dukhovenstvo v Rossii XVI–XVII vekakh [Parish and parish clergy in Russia in the 16th — 17th centuries]. Moskva, 2002. (In Russ.); *Shveikovskaya E.N.* Russkii krest’ianin v dome i mire: Severnaia derevnia kontsa XVI — nachala XVIII veka [Russian peasant at home and in the world: Northern village of the late 16th — early 18th century]. Moskva, 2012. (In Russ.)

¹⁸ Spiritual affairs were listed in Chapter 36 of Stoglav, repeating the “Charter of Church Judges” by Prince Vladimir (Stoglav [Stoglav] // Rossiiskoe zakonodatel’stvo X–XX vekov. V 9 t. T. 2. Zakonodatel’stvo perioda obrazovaniia i ukrepleniia Russkogo tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva [Russian legislation of the 10th–20th centuries. In 9 volumes. Vol. 2. Legislation of the period of formation and strengthening of the Russian centralized state]. Moskva, 1985. P. 336–337. (In Russ.) See also: *Emchenko, E.B.* Stoglav. Issledovanie i tekst [Stoglav. Research and text]. Moskva, 2000. (In Russ.)

“Archbishop Anthony was entrusted to keep records of archimandrites, abbots, monastery elders, servants, peasants, archpriests, priests, deacons *on all spiritual affairs* in the Ryazan archdiocese and all worldly people in towns, settlements, counties, and volosts, to judge *on spiritual cases* and in case of unrests or to transfer the right to judge to his clerks, *and except for spiritual cases, not to judge anybody* (italics supplied. — V.K.)”¹⁹. In all other cases, the hierarchical clerks and peasants were judged in the Grand Palace Prikaz.

With the creation of the Monasterial Prikaz according to the Council Code of 1649, the rules of the general court for clergy affairs changed (the subordination of clergy to the secular court provoked opposition from Patriarch Nikon), while the court for spiritual affairs remained under the jurisdiction of the patriarch and bishops²⁰. However, historically, there was a system, in which secular clerks in the bishops’ houses also participated in the consideration of spiritual affairs. The issue was resolved only under Patriarch Joachim at the church council in 1674/75, when the church court on spiritual affairs was transferred from the former tithetakers, bishop nobles, and boyars’ children to the church authorities: “Common people know nothing about spiritual matters”. In all bishops’ houses, “in prikazes”, a unified system was established “to have... judges of a spiritual rank”²¹.

The author of the article considered the surviving registration books of the Judicial Prikaz of the Ryazan Bishop’s Court of the 1660s—1670s. It should be emphasized that their peculiarity (noted by Vvedenskii) consists in conveying only a brief summary of the court materials. Most of the originals of the cases have been lost (with the exception of a few storage units deposited as part of the Murom Metropolitan Court in the Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA) — the documents are included in the fund of the Ryazan Solotchinsky Monastery stored in the RGADA)²².

¹⁹ Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, izdavaemaia Arkheograficheskoiu komissiei. T. II [Russian Historical Library, published by the Archaeographic Commission. Vol. II]. St. Petersburg, 1875. Clm. 423—424. (In Russ.)

²⁰ However, some common features of jurisdictions with the episcopal court were found after the inclusion in Chapter XXII of the Council Code (regulating the use of the death penalty) of Articles 25 and 26 on punishment for procuring and killing children born out of wedlock, borrowed from the Lithuanian Statute of 1588 (Sobornoe ulozhenie 1649 g. [Council Code of 1649]. Leningrad, 1987. P. 131, 391—392. (In Russ.)).

²¹ Akty, sobrannye v bibliotekakh i arkhivakh Rossiiskoi imperii Arkheograficheskoiu ekspeditsiei imperatorskoi Akademii nauk. T. IV [Acts collected in the libraries and archives of the Russian Empire by the Archaeographic Expedition of the Imperial Academy of Sciences. Vol. IV]. Sankt-Peterburg, 1836. No. 204. P. 261. (In Russ.); *Kaptev N.F.* Svetskie arkhiereiskie chinovniki v Drevnei Rusi [Secular bishop’s clerks in Ancient Rus]. Moskva, 1874. (In Russ.); *Lokhvitskii A.V.* Ocherk tserkovnoi administratsii v drevnei Rossii [Essay on church administration in Ancient Russia] // Russkii vestnik [Russian Bulletin]. Vol. 7. Book 2. 1857. P. 222—224. (In Russ.); *Nikolaevskii P.F.* Patriarshaia oblast’ i russkie eparkhii v XVII veke [Patriarchal region and Russian eparchies in the 17th century]. Sankt-Peterburg, 1888; *Perov I.F.* Eparkhial’nye uchrezhdeniia v russkoi tserkvi v XVI—XVII vv. [Eparchial institutions in the Russian church in the 16th — 17th centuries]. Ryazan, 1882. (In Russ.)

²² Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA), Fund 1433, Series 1, File 89. See: Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov. Putevoditel’. T. 3. Ch. 2 [Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts. Guide. Vol. 3. Part 2]. Moskva, 1997. P. 729—730. (In Russ.). See also: *Dobroklonsky, A.P.* Opisanie dokumentov Solotchinskogo monastiria [Description of the documents of the Solotchinsky Monastery] // Trudy Riazanskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii [Materials of the Ryazan Scientific Archive Commission]. Ryazan, 1888. Vol. 3. No. 1—7. P. 51—60, 84—91, 110—116, 137—143. (In Russ.)

Ryazan and Murom eparchy in the second half of the 17th century included two main centers — Pereslavl-Ryazansky and Murom — and had a vast territory²³. Among the petitioners, there are residents of many southeastern and southern counties of the Russian state — from Kashira and Kasimov to Voronezh and Tula²⁴. Especially many cases were considered with the participation of various categories of service people — boyars' children, reiters, dragoons, archers and regimental Cossacks in Pereslavl-Ryazansky, Shatsk, Ryazhsk, Tambov, Kozlov, Lebedyan, and Yelets. The correspondence between the bishop and the priest's elders, who solved simple cases locally and, if necessary, applied to the Judicial Prikaz of the Ryazan Bishop's House.

The circumstances of the place and time of the creation of registration books of the Judicial Prikaz of the Ryazan Bishop's House certainly have a direct impact on the content of the cases. The social structure of the population in these places differed from the rest of the Russian counties. In the territory of the Ryazan county, there were many possessions of the nobility and the monarchic court, Ryazan nobles and boyars' children, while in other counties, employed servants prevailed, there were many newcomers and recently resettled population: dragoons, Cossacks, fugitive peasants, "Lithuanian prisoners". Pereslavl-Ryazansky, Voronezh, and Tambov had direct routes of communication with the Don, therefore, a number of spiritual affairs are associated with the Don Cossacks. Besides, in the Ryazan and Murom eparchy there was the Shatsk Cherneev Monastery given to the Cossacks and the sergeant major of the Don Army "for constructing and being an eternal refuge", where the old and crippled Don Cossacks could be tonsured without contributions²⁵.

Most of the court and investigation materials on spiritual affairs are missing; many circumstances of certain incidents remain unknown. It is difficult to correctly assess the impact on the case consideration on the part of judges, the accused, or witnesses. Sometimes even the decision on the considered spiritual affairs remains unknown. Therefore, it becomes more important to fix in documents the various phenomena that disrupted the ordinary way of life, to study the attitude towards them in families, peasant and township communities, church parishes.

The admonition of the Ryazan Archbishop Hilarion, found in one of the "spiritual matters" and included in the title of the article — to live "as good people live"²⁶ — shows the "ideal" rules of that time. The court of the bishop's Spiritual Prikaz, on the contrary, dealt with distortions of the usual way of life, which, however, is also an important characteristic of private life in Russia in the 17th century. The purpose of the church court was both punishment and correction, the registration books have the following examples: when the calotte was given back to priests due to offenses performed, the bishop used to admonish — "Deserve the dignity of a priest, God will forgive you" (I, sheet 126). It is no coincidence that even in his "sacred writing", Metropolitan Hilarion recalled the following unresolved spiritual matters: "If a priest

²³ Istoriko-statisticheskoe opisaniye tserkvei i monastyrei Riazanskoj eparkhii, nyne sushchestvuiushchikh i uprazhdenennykh... T. 1—4 [Historical-statistical description of the churches and monasteries of the Ryazan eparchy, now existing and abolished... Vol. 1—4]. Zaraysk, 1884—1891. (In Russ.)

²⁴ In 1682, separate Tambov, Kozlovsk and Voronezh eparchies were created, therefore, "spiritual affairs" of the local population were brought to court by the new, first-appointed bishops (*Komolova, E.V.* Voronezhskaja eparkhiia v kontse XVII—XVIII vv.: obrazovanie, tserkovnaia organizatsiia, sotsial'no-politicheskie otnosheniia [Voronezh eparchy at the end of the 17th — 18th centuries: education, church organization, socio-political relations]. Voronezh, 2007. (In Russ.)).

²⁵ *Jerome (Alyakrinsky), archimandrite*. Op. cit. P. 83.

²⁶ SA RR, Library, No. 13115, sheet 293.

or deacon in our eparchy is banned from the service of God, according to the rules of the holy apostles and God-bearing father, and if common people are banned from the communion service in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and from entering the church, since we did not forgive them, since then they are transferred to the land of eternity: and all their sins have already been forgiven and allowed”²⁷.

A spiritual case used to begin with an appeal to the Judicial Bishops’ Prikaz in Pereslavl-Ryazansky, where under Archbishop Hilarion in 1665—1668, there lived a holy man Job, clerks Lev Terekhov and Afanasy Korotnev (I, sheet 335). Since 1675, in pursuance of the decisions of the church council, the Judicial Prikaz consisted only of the clergy: the archimandrite of the Spassky Monastery Joseph and the holy man Gedeon Gundorov “with his companions” (II, sheets 23, 167). In addition to investigating “spiritual matters”, the petitioners were people interested in solving various “private” matters, for example, dower records or making a will, in the long-time absence of a husband or wife. Priests, priest’s chiefs, who acted as local intermediaries with the church clergy and parishes of a small district, both in cities and villages, also had the right to appeal to the Judicial Prikaz.

Ryazan nobles and townspeople, clerks of large estates can be found among the petitioners. The information about all such appeals to the bishop’s Judicial Prikaz was recorded in registration books. When the hearing of the case was appointed, the bishops’ children, boyars, and other bailiffs were sent to bring the participants into the court. They received an execution letter, upon arrival at the venue they were instructed to organize an investigation, take manucaptions and deliver the defendants to Pereslavl-Ryazansky. The accused were kept in a prison in the bishop’s court, sometimes those under investigation were released on bail on condition of their further appearance in the Judicial Prikaz. Fines and fees for the trial went to the bishop’s Treasury Prikaz, the archbishop imposed a ban on the priests’ service (or returned them the right to conduct liturgy). In some cases, the bishop’s order was taken into account in the consideration of cases together with other courts — the patriarchal Judicial or Thuggish Prikazes.

For example, according to a letter from the patriarchal prikaz, an investigation was carried out about the tonsure of the holy man Herman, “who was a soldier in Matthew Krovkov’s regiment” in the Preobrazhensky Monastery of the Pronsky county (I, sheet 135). According to Patriarch Joachim’s letter sent to Kasimov on 14 October 1675, the priest of the Kasimov Kazan Church was questioned. In Moscow, they considered a denunciation of Kasimov voivode Konstantin Panov, who disrespectfully accepted the tsar’s letter of carts issued to the “industrialist” Ivan Turchenin (this happened when the voivode was visiting this priest): “Konstantin read the tsar’s letter while sitting down or threw it; and said that he was not afraid of anybody” (II, sheet 215).

Some people accused by the bishop’s court were sent for further investigation or punishment to voivode and guba offices (II, sheets 432, 454). In 1665, the Kozlovets Mark Yevfimov was “beaten with a whip mercilessly” “in front of the clerk’s office” on a charge of having an extramarital relationship with a serf (the woman was later released). In addition to public punishment, the priest’s headman and cathedral priest Rodion imposed on him the strictest church penance, even forbidding him to enter the church, which prompted the Kozlovsky servant’s appeal to Archbishop Hilarion. The Ryazan bishop removed unnecessary prohibitions from him and “ordered him to

²⁷ Jerome (Alyakrinsky), *archimandrite*. Op. cit. P. 93.

enter his house with all relics and let him into the church, and he, Mark, told him to fast all the years and come to his spiritual father for confession” (I, sheet 87).

A significant part of the bishop’s legal proceedings is devoted to spiritual affairs related to the problems of family, deviant behavior, and violence in gender relations: “he is not married and does not pray to God”, “he could not resist dower records”, “got married with the previous wife alive”, “beat his wife mercilessly”, “fornicated”, “kissed forcibly and grabbed women”, “lives a vicious life”, “gave birth to a baby out of wedlock”, “fourth husband”, “fourth wife”, “she divorced with the husband due to her adultery”, etc. Many cases involve quarrels between priests and deacons over their places of service, church income, and property. Common cases “on mugging and robbery” or property theft, where the plaintiffs or defendants were church people, can be found in registration books of the bishop’s Judicial Prikaz. The essence of many cases was clearly written down in the order “by ear”, which gives particular importance to documents that allow the “immersion” in the everyday life of Russia in the 17th century.

The study of registration books shows that the content of some cases was stated in the books openly, while in a number of cases there is one mention of a “spiritual matter” without accusation details. The ratio of such “closed” references clearly increased after 1675 in comparison with the previous time. Sometimes one gets the impression that it was about certain protection of “personal data” or trust only to the oral evidence court of the bishop’s clerks. It is most likely that this was a consequence of decisions of the church council of 1675 to transfer the execution of justice to the clergy.

The authors tried to determine what the phrase “spiritual affair” meant in registration books of the Judicial Prikaz. Below are examples of direct references to the content of spiritual affairs of secular and church people, in particular, in the registration books of 1665–1668. Archbishop Hilarion received petitions on “major spiritual affairs” about the “fourth husband” (I, sheet 16), the landowner widow, “who lives in adultery with a house serf” (I, fol. 23), the peasant and “his married mistress, with whom he lived illegally without prayer” (I, l. 246), “in adultery” (I, sheet 257). The verbal petition on a “spiritual affair” was considered in the bishop’s prikaz after the commotion on one of the streets of Pereslavl-Ryazansky on September 8, 1667. “At three o’clock in the morning”, a janitor locked in the cage “the prisoner’s wife, young Matryonka Nazaryeva” and a cook of the Spassky Monastery Vaska Petrov, who came to “fornicate with her”. By the way, the janitor was a “freed prisoner”, he began “to call a chanter Elisei Andreanov and other neighbors”, but the cook suspected of the spiritual affair “got out of the cage through the roof”. After that, all the participants in the night affair were interrogated and forced to write an explanatory letter (“*vzyali skazki za rukami*”), while the young woman was sent with a bailiff to the voivode’s assembly house: “It was ordered to reprimand her for that” (I, sheet 296). The above example reveals the adultery mentioned in Stoglav, which is one of the first cases of the church court.

The spiritual affairs considered by priests were primarily about violations of the rules of church weddings, for example, “she got married for the third time with her previous husbands alive” (I, sheet 13). In this case, the priests acted selfishly, hiding the income from wedding ceremonies that were meant for the bishop’s treasury, and thereby violating family law. While the church court was against the groundless abandonment of spouses, the life “without a wedding ceremony” or prayer (as for the second and third marriages), entering into the fourth and even the fifth marriage (such

case happened to a peasant woman in the village of Roslyai, Tambov district, the fiefdom of the “Annunciation Cathedral of the sovereign confessor Andrei Savinovich” (II, sheet 193). Departure from the canonical rules for wedding ceremonies in the church was also considered a “spiritual affair”, as with saying childbirth prayers when children were born out of wedlock. They complained about one of the priests that “he performed wedding ceremonies in huts and said prayers to widows and maidens in childbirth” (I, sheet 116).

The priests’ crimes, which aroused the discontent of church-goers, also became the reason for appealing to the bishop’s Spiritual Prikaz. On June 10, 1667, the priest’s elder sent a petition filed by the elder and peasants of the village of Sysoevo, Tambov district, against the priests Foma and Kirik “on spiritual affairs” (I, sheet 253). The petition described the conflict at the “common gathering”, where they accused each other: one was accused of cohabitation with his own daughter, the other — of fornication with goddaughters and disclosure of confessional sins “to the whole world”²⁸. According to the note in the registration book, the case was put off for a long time, the perpetrators of the conflict were brought to Pereslavl-Ryazansky. On February 14, 1668, Archbishop Hilarion, without even understanding the details of accusations, “took off calottes” from both priests and forbade them to serve in the church.

Disputes between the priests of one church were quite common, and when the enmity went too far, the last accusations of “spiritual affairs” were used. On October 19, 1675, the priest of the Nikolskaya church of Chegoldaevo village, Ryazhskaya tithe, Mikhail informed Metropolitan Joseph against the priest Ephraim: “The spiritual affair was related to a spell against bleeding gums found in Efremov’s prayer book”. According to Stoglav, this crime could be considered as “witchery” or “sorcery”²⁹. However, the decision of the church court turned out to be opposite to Mikhail’s expectations; on November 16, 1675, the metropolitan accused him, “because it was not possible to interrogate people in exile and give them faith” (II, sheet 223—223 cover).

The tendency to call the most serious crimes that attracted general attention “spiritual affairs” is noticeable. The difference in affairs can be seen especially clearly in the petition about “swearing *and* spiritual affairs” (I, sheet 295), where the conjunction “*and*” separates a simple affair from a more complex one. Although saying “swear words” on the adopted addition to Stoglav also referred to spiritual affairs, and the decision on them was made by the church court. For example, the Spiritual Prikaz dealt with a quarrel between two synodical deacons, Moses and Maxim, which happened in the Chamber of the Chrism “at the table” on the patronal feast of the Assumption Cathedral in Pereslavl-Ryazansky on August 15, 1675. The next day, one of the deacons “verbally” complained to Metropolitan Joseph to punish the offender

²⁸ See the examples of violation of the seal of confession in the 17th century: *Borisov V.E.* Taina ispovedi, protsedura sudoproizvodstva i povsednevnaia zhizn’ gosudarevykh masterovykh v otdel’no vziatom dele o semi rubliakh (1666 g.): publikatsiia i issledovanie [The seal of confession, the procedure of legal proceedings and the daily life of tsar’s artisans in a separate case of seven rubles (1666): publication and research] // *Sbornik statei i publikatsii, posviashchennyi Andreiu Alekseevichu Bulychevu: na 60-letie so dnia rozhdeniia i 35-letie nachala nauchnoi deiatel’nosti* [Collection of articles and publications dedicated to Andrey Alekseevich Bulychev: for the 60th anniversary of his birth and 35th anniversary of the beginning of his scientific activity]. Moskva, 2020. P. 17—36. (In Russ.)

²⁹ See: *Bulychev A.A.* Dva rozyska o “zagovornyykh” pis’makh vo vtoroi chetverti — seredine XVII stoletii (po materialam Razriadnogo prikaza) [Two searches about “conspiracy” letters in the second quarter — the middle of the 17th century (based on materials of the Razryadny Prikaz)] // *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury Instituta russkoi literatury RAN (Pushkinskii Dom)*. T. 64 [Materials of the Old Russian Literature Department of the Russian Literature Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Pushkin House)]. Vol. 64]. Sankt-Peterburg, 2016. P. 111—120. (In Russ.)

for insults: “He scolded Moses with all abusive words, called him an “aborigine”. Maxim also said that Moses a companion of a thief Stenka Razin and a traitor to the great sovereign” (II, sheet 167). The case was investigated by judges of the Spiritual Prikaz at the confrontation of the quarreling synodical deacons.

The times of the Razin movement were mentioned in the collective petition of the priests of different villages of the Kadom county to Metropolitan Joseph on June 23, 1675: “The priests living in your area are engaged in riots, stealing along with Cossack thieves, and their elder, the priest of Savvatma village Philip steals along with them. The priest Philip participated in riots and was on attacks, and he took part in many battles and supplied the guns”. In addition to the priest’s elder Philip, his brother-in-law Divey, who served in the same county and also participated in the affairs of Razin’s people, was also mentioned in the petition: “At that time he was a clerk, got on with Cossack thieves as an esaul, killed many statesmen and executed innocent people of all ranks. Now he is a priest”. In addition to these accusations, the collective petition of Kadom priests said as follows: “Some of the priests smoke tobacco” (II, sheets 113—114). The aforementioned priests, accused of participating in the Razin rebellion, were summoned for questioning to Pereslavl-Ryazansky, but after interrogating, they were sent home. Whether this case had any continuation is unknown.

In registration books of the episcopal Judicial Prikaz, there are also references to the beginning of the church dissent. Among the cases extracted by Vvedenskii for publication in “Voronezh Antiquity”, there is a characteristic incident of “white priests” Vasily and Kozma, accused of drunkenness and “outrages” by Hegumen Sergius from the Voronezh Uspensky Cathedral. In 1674/75, the Hegumen managed to receive a letter from the bishop, admonishing the priests. However, the essence of the conflict was that the priest Vasily wanted to establish a new church in the monastery parish by force (“*na usilok*”, Vvedenskii cites an incorrect reading of the phrase — “*na usklone*” (on the hillside)) and refused to pay “the fourth part in the church and common income”. Further, registration books of the Judicial Prikaz described a quarrel of Voronezh priests who spoke out against the new church order (the “method” of approving a sign of cross made with two fingers is noteworthy, according to the petition filed by Hegumen Sergius): “The priest Vasily does not follow the tsar’s decree and the letter, rarely visits the church, behaves outrageously along with the Troitsky priest Hilarion — they take other priests, who sang the Divine Liturgy in those days, with two fingers by the nose, crush them to blood and take violent actions against peasants”. The mention of the church service “of those days” is also not accidental; it is connected with the desire to strengthen the accusation by desecrating church clothes and vessels. Further, the petition describes the actions of the priest Vasily and “a few” townspeople — Fedot Anikeev, Nikita and Semyon Eliseevs, who “kept in touch” with “*roskolshiks*” (the word “*raskolnik*” has not been commonly used yet) for establishing a new church. Hegumen Sergius described in detail the differences in the services of the Old Believers who were still formally subordinate to the Ryazan Metropolitan Joseph: “Those *roskolshiks* Andrey, Deiko and Zenko Anosovs do not want to have their children baptized and listen to liturgical chants according to the newly corrected books. Their children are baptized in other parishes and villages according to old prayer books, and not according to the newly corrected ones. They make the sign of the cross with two fingers and say prayers in violation of the newly corrected prayer books. They do not take part in a cross procession near the city against the sun

to the east, and they, *raskolniki*, make many Orthodox peasants do what they do” (II, sheet 111)³⁰.

In registration books, there are cases that are of particular interest, since they make it possible to look differently at the traditional and, seemingly, already completely exhausted plots of the history of Russia in the second half of the 17th century. It is about serfdom and fugitive people, when escapes were viewed exclusively as manifestations of social discord or the so-called class struggle. Until now, other problems that arose when escaping from one place to another, of one spouse or the whole family remain completely in the background. On April 4, 1665, Matvey Yakovlev, the son of the Ryazan boyar Buzheninov, filed in the Judicial Prikaz a petition to Archbishop Hilarion about the birth of a child to his servant, the wife, whose husband ran away from his owner “a year ago”. All this gave reason to accuse her of “giving birth to a baby out of wedlock”. According to the materials of the bishop’s prikaz, a Nikolsky priest of Kiselevo village was ordered to “interrogate that woman seriously, who was the father to her child”. The petitioner’s accusations of the servant’s escape were also to be checked in confession: “When did her husband run away?” Although, according to the court decision, the judges did not raise any doubts about the matter: “Ask her about the child’s father and send her to clerks of the Judicial Prikaz” (I, sheet 155).

The registration books also mention the “detectives” who were in charge of temporary prikazes to search for fugitives at the local level. In November 1667, a fugitive peasant Filka Mikhailov from Izhevsky village was brought to Afanasy Sofonievich Zabolotsky to the “prikaz” in Pecherniki village “with *zhonka*” of the stolnik Vasily Yakovlevich Golokhvastov. The mention of a “*zhonka*” (not a wife) is not accidental, since the peasant married, while on the run, to the fugitive servant belonging to the Ryazan clerk Vasily Metyushnikov. The detective sent a note about this to the Judicial Prikaz of Spiritual Affairs in Pereslavl-Ryazansky in order to punish the priest of Top-tykov village, Kozlovsky County, who performed their wedding ceremony (I, sheet 336). In the materials of the Judicial Prikaz, there are also examples when fugitives fell into both economic and personal dependence, and the new owners enjoyed their complete lack of rights.

Thus, the materials of registration books of the bishop’s court in Russia in the 1660s—1670s give an idea of the many conflicts of private life, mainly known from the articles of church law monuments. An analysis of the cases preserved in the materials about spiritual affairs makes it possible to see the deep foundations of people’s everyday life, the models of their behavior in the analysis of family life collisions. Registration books contain compelling evidence of people’s actions to protect their honor and personal integrity. At the same time, it is not only about the privileged persons who belonged to the service class, but also about the affairs of those people who constituted the “silent majority” of the people at that time: parish clergy, serfs, servants, and Cossacks.

³⁰ See the document publication: *Vvedenskii S.N. Materialy dlia istorii Voronezhskoi eparkhii (iz rukopisei Riazanskoj dukhovnoi seminarii)* [Materials for the history of the Voronezh eparchy (from the manuscripts of the Ryazan Theological Seminary)] // *Voronezhskaia starina* [Voronezh Antiquity]. Issue 5. Voronezh, 1905. P. 131—132. (In Russ.)