An Ethnographic Perspective on the Presence of the Holy Fool in Late Imperial Russia

Ming-Hui Huang

The University Of Sheffield.

Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies
University of Sheffield

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
University of Sheffield, Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies

February 2015

Abstract

People living in this world carry a stigma; to a certain extent, this stigma remains for a period of time and exists in a kind of constructed space. Social stigma often emerges in the situation when visual experience helps to translate the stigma in favour of the stigmatiser. The eyes which observe the process of stigmatisation are in many ways a double-edged sword; it can slash the stigmatised with its judgemental perception, or cut through judgements to perceive a sacred vision of the person. The visibility of a certain distinctiveness can be emphasized as a divine gift which is beyond our general understanding or as a taboo which should be avoided for the benefit of social order. The holy fool in Russia bears a stigma which has been defined in various ways and has been explained as the condition when there is a necessity.

The aim of this thesis is to take the holy fool as a figure to examine the rule for distinction and to question the issue of different others in an atmosphere where every individual (bearing more or less a stigma) should have his/her right of survival. Abnormality may be a threat to the stability of system, but can be an alternative to new invention. Stigma happens in fluid and relative situations. In multinational Russia, an impulse to show emotional hostility to irrationality has been reduced to a certain level for the sake of adjusting one's political act upon non-Russian natives and further of evoking one's awareness of equality within the Empire. By discovering Chekhov's *Ward No. 6*, which was considered as being influenced by his journey to Sakhalin Island in 1890, rules for distinction seemed to be paralysed for a moment of reconsideration.

Acknowledgements

The initial idea of this subject was inspired by the autistic children I happened to work with for a research project at NCTU (Taiwan) in 2009. Thanks to all the participants and autistic children in the NSC project. In this empirical research, for the first time I was able to sense that the abnormal behaviour of an autistic child troubled other children less than the administrator who tended to set the rules for abnormal situation.

I would like to express my gratitude to both of my supervisors, Professor Craig Brandist and Susan E. Reid, who have provided guidance and points of reference. I am also grateful to Dr. Robert Collis and Dr. Oliver Johnson who have offered generous advice throughout.

Warm thanks go to Ms. Caroline Wordley and Claire Leavitt for help at Sheffield, to my honoured friends Liza Sautina, Hiroko and Walter Schiele, Matthias Emmert, Nicole Lee, Dr. b.q. Chen (陳碧瓊) and Ms. Tsai (蔡蓉茹) in libraries of Academia Sinica (Taiwan) who generously provided me with help and support.

Above all, I am indebted to my parents who have shown great patience and given their continual love and encouragement. Without their support, this thesis would not have achieved its aim of becoming the first step towards my future interest and career.

Contents

Abstract	**i**
Acknowledgements	**ii**
Contents	**iii**
A Note on Transliteration	**vi**
Introduction	**1**

- **Defining the Holy Fool**
- **Holy Fool as a Phenomenon of Cultural Studies**
- **Holy Fool amongst other Eccentric Individuals**
- **Approach and Sources**
- **The Historical Context: the Question of Modernity**
- **An Alternative to the Understanding of Different Others**
- **The Thesis**

Chapter 1	**43**
The Rule and its Application to the Perception of Abnormality	

- **Social Distinction and Categorisation**
- ***Defectology*: not less Developed, simply Different**
- **Social Stigma: Different only in Relative Position**
- **Science as a Method for Classification**
- **The "Looping Effect" of Stigmatisation**

Chapter 2	**65**
To Demystify and Pathologise the Holy Fool	

- **Shift of Status: Holy Fool under Medical Supervision**
- **Holy Fool as a Mentally ill Patient**

[Classified by Medical Science]

[Psychiatry and Physiology in Practice]

Chapter 3 **81**

Conceptualising the Holy Fool upon Encounters with Different Others

- **By Narrating the Experience of a Different Religious Practice**

  [Avvakum and Shaman]

  [The Empress and her Comedy of the 'Shaman']

- **By Making a Strange Encounter an Extension to Knowledge**

Chapter 4 **97**

Interpreting the Presence of Differentiation through Ethnographic Studies

- **Defining *Inorodtsy*, Defining Others**
- **Reasons for Developing Ethno-Culture**

  [Ethnographic Expedition by the Naval Ministry]

  [Policy-Making and Cultural Evolutionism]

- **A Study of 'Us': Orienalism in Russia**

  [Eastwards to Siberia: A Place of Experience]

  [Central Asia and Buddhism]

  [Interactive Construction on Categorisation]

- **The Question of Difference in Chekhov's Life and Writings**

  [The Influence of Romanticism]

  [A Journey to Sakhalin Island]

  ["Ward No. 6": A Vulnerable System of Distinction]

  [An Epilogue]

Conclusion 175

- **In Summary**
- **A Choice**

Bibliography 187

Glossary 219

A Note on Transliteration

The Library of Congress system will be used for the transliteration of Russian names, phrases and publication titles throughout the thesis. Exceptions will be made in the case of names that have become familiar in the English language, for example, F.M. Dostoevsky and L.N. Tolstoy.

Introduction

"I would rather become a holy fool; hopefully I shall be more blessed."[1]

- **A.S. Pushkin** in ***Boris Godunov*** (1825)

The holy fool (*iurodivyi*) is a label created to identify a man or a woman (*iurodivaia*) who represents an emblem of God's incarnation in the Orthodox hagiographic tradition and often comes to be regarded as an obscure figure in Russian culture. The phenomenon of holy foolishness (*iurodstvo*) is a term used to describe a circumstance in which art, literature, philosophy, sociology and other disciplines are involved in a discourse upon life surrounded and influenced by the stories or legends of the holy fool. Ever since they first appeared in ancient Russia, holy fools have occupied a privileged position in the context of religion, but also have had to contend with discrimination and marginalization because of their unusual position. For those orthodox advice-seekers, the eccentricity of the holy fool is related to mysterious genius, whereas abnormal behaviours as well as tattered clothing evoke fear amongst the people of the Russian peasantry and aristocracy who either displease or distrust the influence of the holy fool. In spite of the fact that many of Russia's well-known holy fools are brought home to readers through anecdotes, the value of textual evidence should not be underestimated as it provides clues that help reconstruct particular attributes that the holy fool once possessed and were remembered for. The holy fool has an impact in texts ranging from educated literature to satirical legends which impart knowledge and a message to the readers through a short-lived contradictory figure. Different literary figures that (re)produced the 'spectre'[2] of the Russian holy fool have been reshaped and transformed into several models through a gradual secularisation that took place in the nineteenth century Russia.

The holy fool is often described as a person who is scarcely clothed, disregards conventional hygiene, wears iron chains, endures cold and indulges in coarse manners. The holy fool, as the God's chosen one, and the crowd became a topical

[1] This quote is from A.S. Pushkin, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, x (Moscow and Leningrad, 1949), p.181. It is noteworthy that A.S. Pushkin described an episode in which the holy fool was taken as a figure with unfettered freedom. The persona of *Boris Godunov* clamoured for the right by saying the above statement.

[2] The word 'spectre' is used here for a double meaning of both the 'ghost' and the 'attributes' in the understanding of Jacques Derrida's *Spectres of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning & the New International* (1993).

question in various forms of art. The ecstasy of inspiration, creativity and spiritual insight is perceived by the populace as insanity and yet is characteristic of Romanticism. The Orthodox priest I. Kovalevskii (1862-1917) made his defensive statement about the holy fool:

> These renowned wanderers, inspired by an intense and passionate love of God, voluntarily not only renounced all the cosiness and benefits of earthly life, the advantages of social life, the people closest to them and their blood relatives, but even relinquish, with complete inner self-awareness, the very thing that distinguishes humans amongst live beings — reason — voluntarily assuming the appearance of madman and sometimes of a morally fallen person who knows neither decency nor sense of shame and sometimes permits himself seductive acts.[3]

The author's sympathy and interpretation of the holy fool has acquired the share of multiple resources and biographies which hover between reality and imagination. Nevertheless, the life of the holy fool was described in detail and promoted a sense of rational explanation. The crowd has created a fascination with and revulsion towards the 'abnormal person' whose ambivalent image provided an opportunity to challenge the logic of interpretation and representation. This account provides an insight into the particularity of situations which may contain conflicts of value. In discussion of the question about abnormality, writers tend to apply their creative imagination to the ambiguous nature of the mentally ill holy fool whose hidden nature or intuitive manner result from his simplicity and who inspires both possessive love and repugnance and is calling respectable values into question. All these are sources of fascination to creative thinkers, especially in the nineteenth century Russia. Such record is not an observation of mixture of unrealistic situations, but rather a mirror reflecting ambiguous attitude towards such a person and phenomenon.

Along with the historical changes, the figure and the phenomenon of holy foolishness have become understood in a negative sense by the Bolsheviks who were eager to identify the cunning and evil of the old empire in most its representations and to constitute new orders for the new Russia. Hence, Tolstoy was described by Lenin as a 'landowner playing the fool in Christ' (*pomeshchik iurodstvuiushchii vo Khriste*). Trotsky attacked Rozanov for his 'premeditated *iurodstvo*' and 'holy-foolish grimacing' (*iurodskoe krivlianie*). A. Gurvich criticised Platonov's 'Christian holy-foolish sorrow' because in his oeuvre

[3] Kovalevskii Ioann, *Podvig iurodstva* (Moscow: Lepta, 2000), p. 7.

Platonov used this image as a way of defamiliarising Stalinist ideology.[4] Judging from these statements, a person given attributes of holy foolishness bore a stigma of only a certain outdated characteristic, rather than a forbidden tradition which should be denied in Russian Soviet history. But it is not to suggest an unbroken historical continuity between the tsarist and Soviet Russia since there are massive changes of policy, orientation and ideology in the early Soviet history. The success of the 1917 revolution did, for a moment, give hope to the people who wanted to be released from the restraining order imposed by the tsarist regime and to establish rules and legal principles for the new social condition. However, the reality proved to be a drastically different story, especially when the events led to another developmental direction into the Stalin era. The stability of the Stalinist regime was based on the policies of coercion and also on a widespread voluntary commitment to its ideals and principles, although as Stephen Kotkin acknowledges this commitment was often dependent on a 'willingness to suspend disbelief.'[5] The distorting filter of the Soviet power has intensified the cultural standoff between the preservation and overthrow of the Russian tradition. The above fragmental events are not intended as evidence for supporting an idea that the early USSR celebrated national and cultural diversities, pioneered the study of disability and decriminalized homosexuality in the wake of the 1917 revolution. To unproblematically link all the above citations to Lenin's comment on Tolstoy, Trotsky's writing about the viciously anti-Semitic Rozanov or Gurvich's pro-Stalinist attack on Platonov is to elide both ideological and historical differences. Platonov's use of the holy foolish figures implied the fact that Stalin's Russia had reverted back to some of the same features of autocratic rule as in Tsarist times. The distortion of political language in Stalin's time also reminds one of the distortions of Christian dogma (applied to the phenomenon of holy foolishness) to suit state power. The complexities of the ambiguous attitude of the church and the state towards the understanding of the holy fool should be properly questioned rather than be reduced to vicious labels containing biased impression of political opponents.

---

[4] Oliver Ready, "The Myth of Vasilii Rozanov the 'Holy Fool' through the Twentieth Century", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 90, No. 1 (January 2012), pp. 45-46 (33-64). Reference to each case can be found separately in V.I. Lenin, *Sobranie sochinenii*, Vol. 15 (Moscow, 1920-1927), p. 180; L.Trotskii, *Literatura i revoliutsiia*, Vol. 1 (Moscow, 1926), pp. 30-31; A.A. Fadeev, 'Ob odnoi kulatskoi khronike', *Krasnaia nov'*, No. 5-6 (1931), pp. 206-209; and L.A. Ivanova, "Tvorchestvo A. Platonova v otsenke sovetskoi kritiki 20－30-kh godov", in *Tvorchestvo A. Platonova: stat'i i soobshcheniia*, ed. by V.P. Skobelev *et al*. (Voronezh: izd. Voronezhskogo universiteta, 1970; reprint Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1986), p. 185 (pp. 173-192).

[5] Stephen Kotkin, *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, c1995), p. 358.

It is believed that Soviet Russia took measures to eradicate the phenomenon of holy foolishness which persisted amongst the laity or outside the monastic community. By the middle of the twentieth century, the officials' regard for the people whose acts resembled those of the holy fool in the pre-Revolutionary Russia was not ambivalent. The voice of the holy fool was silenced. However, during the post-Soviet time, the evolution of the holy fool cult evoked nostalgia, leading to the growth of fiction devoted to this theme. Moreover, the ecclesiastical establishment was willing to accept the laity's verdict as to their sanctity under a local synod of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1988. The inclusion of Kseniia (c. 1719~1730 - c. 1803) of St. Petersburg and Simeon of Emesa evinces the establishment's acceptance of their path. More recently, holy fools such as Kseniia (1988), Father Ioann in Kronstadt (1990), Aleksei Voroshin (1993), Vasilii Kadomskii of Ryazan (1997) and Andrei Ogorodnikov from Simbirsk (1998) were accepted as local saints or canonised as new martyrs in each instance.[6] Although they look fascinating in the context of the post-Soviet religious ideology, life stories of those ancient or contemporary holy-foolish saints in detail are beyond my current project. What makes the holy fool important to our concern is the social and political intention of canonising the holy fool. As Kizenko argued in her study, the legend of the holy fool continued to be incorporated in vita of the Saints. Reasons for such an approach adopted by the hagiographers may be 'naïve monarchism, a calculated bid for hierarchical sympathy and the traditional subversive function of the holy fool with respect to the ruler, such as Nikolai of Pskov and Vasilii the Blessed standing up to Ivan IV.'[7] In this regard, although the holy fool has been a real person in some places of Russia since medieval times, he or she was taken as no more than a 'functional figure' in the eyes of anyone who recreated and represented certain miraculous happenings in different circumstances or for diversified purposes.

Characters bearing striking resemblance to the holy fool play important roles in modern Russian literature. Through multiple media devices, the archetypes of the holy fool gradually permeated every corner of the Russian society. A newly released novel testifies to the popularity of the mysterious figure in our times.[8]

---

[6] S.A. Ivanov, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, transl. by Simon Franklin (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 355-356.

[7] Nadieszda Kizenko, "Protectors of Women and the Lower Orders: Constructing Sainthood in Modern Russia" in *Orthodox Russia: Belief and Practice under the Tsars*, ed. By Valerie A. Kivelson and Robert H. Greene (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, c2003), p. 120 (pp. 105-124).

[8] Elena Kriukova, *Iurodivaia* (Moscow: EKSMO, 2011).

Kseniia, a canonised holy fool, is the heroine whose life and deed are reconstructed in modern fiction. The story recounts the tales of Kseniia's life and is written in contemporary form. Kseniia represents the pride of St. Petersburg and is thus brought back into our lives. The 'blessed' Kseniia, bridging the gap through troubled times, is depicted as a legendary figure to cure the sick, to give sermons in public and to present herself in hospitals or prisons. Stories of giving up belongings and showing compassion to others are highlighted to demonstrate Kseniia's uniqueness. The author of the novel, Elena Kriukova, described Kseniia as the burning torch held by Jesus Christ. The misery of her life may not be keenly comprehended by the readers, but the fate she was unable to escape, is taken as a gift by the readers that Kseniia would accept with joy. The history of Kseniia, like the vernacular fiction about Ivan the Fool which provides the eccentric and unusual facets of a holy fool's personality, would still be a source of wisdom being inherited from culture and tradition.

Leaving aside the novel written on the basis of an ancient tale, the paradigm suggested by the similar 'kind' is for the moment a matter of concern.[9] A more dynamic way of grasping the enigmatic cult in terms of framing and visual culture, would be through the filmic image which can produce 'a fluid relationship' between narrating a subject and narrating an object.[10] A prominent visual attempt has been made to get inside the mist of the holy foolishness and to reveal the flesh and bones of the phenomenon in Pavel Lungin's *The Island* (2006). Through an interaction with different pilgrims, the main character Father Anatolii demonstrated his ability to be clairvoyant, to heal the illness and to practice exorcism. The film dealt with the holy foolishness of post-Soviet Russian opinions and Father Anatolii's provocative actions in everyday existence in 1976, both of which endeavoured to embody the struggle for existence between the apparent rudeness of his demeanour and the paradoxical realities of his life. A principal theme of this film is the process by which the director negotiated with the audience the representation of the holy foolishness between the traditional Orthodox thinking

[9] According to Ian Hacking in his book *The Social Construction of What?*, the word 'kind' was first used as a freestanding noun in the philosophy of the sciences by William Whewell (1794-1866) and John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) in the nineteenth century. The author use it here to emphasise the principles of classification, the kind itself, which interacts with those classified. And vice versa, surely, it refers to the people who interact with the classification. See Hacking's "Madness: Biological or Constructed?" in *The Social Construction of What?* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999), pp. 100-124.

[10] Articles regarding the visual experience of interacting between eyes and objects, see Josh Cohen, *Spectacular Allegories: Postmodern American Writing and the Politics of Seeing* (London; Sterling, Va.: Pluto Press, 1998), p. 74.

and a post-Soviet cultural reinterpretation of it. Following the aesthetic success in the motion picture, the historical archives and literary texts of the Russian holy fool were also made into a documentary called *Iurodivye*, by the Russian Television and Broadcasting Company (*RTR Planeta*) in 2007. The film, uploaded on RuTube.ru, has been viewed more than fifty thousand times since then.[11] At any rate, it is worth looking at the visual interpretation of the origin, paradoxical development and the most distinctive aesthetic reasons for representing the holy fool in films. The illustration of the blessed man from static to dynamic approaches has provided yet another opportunity to the building of one's knowledge of these different kinds of individualities.

Defining the Holy Fool

In order to approach the historical environment of the holy fool, it is important to identify how the phenomenon of holy foolishness has been processed by different sources of inquiry throughout the time. There are methodological limitations in beginning with dictionary definitions. As described in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the holy fool is a form of radical Christianity that manifests itself under the mask of foolishness, yet holds the truth of the gospel, in the disguise of folly.[12] The *Oxford Dictionary* is in general agreement with the definition that the holy fool is 'a person who does not conform to social norms of behaviour.' Whether or not it was considered a deliberate choice, his/her mental disability was regarded as having a compensating divine blessing or inspiration.[13]

The *Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary* (1904) describes the holy fool as a person who appears to be a mad man *(vid bezumnovo cheloveka*) without being reasonable and does not feel shame of tempting behaviour (s*oblaznitel'nye deistviia*).[14] The *Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language* defines the holy fool as a madman (*bezumets*) who is believed to possess the divine gift of prophecy (*proritsanie*), while the holy foolishness is used to describe people considered nonsensical (*bessmyslennyi*) or someone displaying preposterous

[11] *Iurodivye* on http://rutube.ru/tracks/24957.html (last accessed 5 January 2015)
[12] "Christianity". (2011). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/115240/Christianity (last accessed 5 January 2015)
[13] "Holy fool". (April 2010) Oxford Dictionaries. http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/holy fool (last accessed 5 January 2015)
[14] "*Iurodivye*" in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona*, Vol. 81 (St. Petersburg, 1904), pp. 421-422.

(*nelepyi*) action.[15] It seems that there was a general agreement on the obvious characteristic of 'madness' (*bezumie* or *bezumstvo*) which was attributed to the holy fool. To search the etymology of the holy fool under the canonical Russian definition is, however, not a rewarding attempt in the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia. The index of the great volumes contains not a single entry of *iurodivyi* or *iurodstvo* and is not even mentioned under the subcategory of the word 'Orthodox' (*pravoslavie*).[16] Hence, one can hardly bridge the meaning of the holy foolishness in the pre-revolutionary time with the understanding of the same meaning in the then-contemporary era. Nevertheless, the accustomed definition aligns the holy fool with the phenomenon of holy foolishness, described first in the *vitae* of Byzantine as well as in the vindicatory writing of Russian theologians.

The phenomenon of holy foolishness has its roots in early Christian heritage of Byzantine religious culture. Dipping into the textual illustration of the *vitae* of the Byzantine saints, namely Isidora (4th c.), Alexis the Man of God (4th c.), Simeon of Emesa (7th c.) and Andrew of Constantinople (10th c.), Svitlana Kobets claimed that all are considered fools in Christ who live it as 'an ascetic exploit and [which] explicitly dwell on its practitioners' motivations for undertaking this feat.'[17] Considering the close relationship between the ancient Rus' and Byzantium in terms of religion, the phenomenon of holy foolishness is believed to have been a tradition passed down from Byzantine to Russian culture. This is a general argument that also has been supported by Per-Arne Bodin, who described holy foolishness as an important theme of the post-Soviet Russian culture in his monographs *Language, Canonization and Holy Foolishness: Studies in Post- soviet Russian Culture and the Orthodox Tradition* (2009). A similar return to the fully-fledged hagiographic apparatus was accomplished by the Russian scholar S.A. Ivanov. However, he argued that those Byzantine saints are purely literary fictions of certain timid holy fools, whose hagiographic portrayals were based on real-life characters (for example, St. Paul of Corinth and St. Grigentios).[18] Ivanov

---

[15] S. I. Ozhegov and N. Iu. Shvedova, *Tolkovyi slovar' russkovo iazyka* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia Akagemiia Nauk, 1999), p. 915.

[16] See *Bol'shaia Sovetskaia Entsiklopediia* (Moscow: OGIZ RSFSR, 1st ed., 1926-1947; Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe nauchnoe izdatel'stvo "BSE", 2nd ed., 1950-1958, Moscow: BSE, 3rd ed., 1969-1978). Refer to separate volumes of three different editions for the entry of *iurodivyi* or *iurodstvo* in Volume 65 of the first edition (ed. by Otto Schmidt, 1931); Volume 49 of the second edition (ed. by Boris Vvedenskii, 1957); and the third edition (ed. by Alexander Prokhorov) available online in 2001 through website http://www.rubricon.com/bse_1.asp (last accessed 5 January 2015)

[17] Svitlana Kobets, "The Russian Paradigm of *Jurodstvo* and Its Genesis in Novgorod", *Russian Literature*, XLVIII (2000), pp. 367-388.

[18] Details in chapter five "The 'Second Edition' of Holy Foolery" of S.A. Ivanov's book *Holy*

begins his study on the Russian type with a premise that 'there is almost no evidence of how holy foolery spread beyond Byzantium's borders.'[19] Hence, it should be accentuated that in Byzantium the spread of holy foolishness was limited. Although many scholars and theologians regard the Russian and the Byzantine paradigms of the holy fool as interchangeable[20], Russian holy foolishness is somehow considered different from its Byzantine equivalent.

The Russian tradition of holy foolishness has its hybrid features. It includes figures such as monks or nuns (Mikhail Klopskii, Pelagia Serebrenikova), laymen (Vasily Blazhennyi), ascetics (Isaakii Pechernik of Kiev) and others (Prokopii of Ustiug).[21] They are often the spiritual authority in the peasant village of the ancient Rus'. Although they were believed to be endowed with the wisdom necessary for the Russian Empire, it should be noted that there are elements of mystification in the social conduct of the holy fool. The record of their lives first appeared in the eleventh century and continued through to succeeding periods as diverse representations and traits to suit the needs of the ruling reign. In the sacred writings and saints' *Lives*, it was recorded that holy fools wore tatty and dirty clothes and were draped with heavy ironware, for example, chains or crosses over the back or around the waist. They were immune to the heat or cold and indecent in conduct and speech. They hurled a torrent of abuse, combined sometimes with cautionary predictions uttered in incoherent fragments, at the bustling crowds in neighbouring streets or in the marketplace.[22] Nevertheless, they occupied a relatively proper yet dubious status in the Russian tradition and even ascended to

---

Fools in Byzantium and Beyond, transl. by Simon Franklin (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 139-173.

[19] S.A. Ivanov, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, p. 244.

[20] Details about Kobets' quotation of Georgij Fedotov's statement in his book *Svjatye Drevnej Rusi (X-XVII st.)*, see Svitlana Kobets, "The Russian Paradigm of *Jurodstvo* and Its Genesis in Novgorod", *Russian Literature*, XLVIII (2000), p. 368.

[21] For resources on Klopskii, see Horace W. Dewey and Natalie Challis, "Disparate Images of Mikhail Klopskii", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Winter, 1983), pp. 649-656. Text of Isaakii may be found in Horace W. Dewey and Natalie Challis, "Divine Folly in Old Kievan Literature: The Tale of Isaac the Cave Dweller", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Autumn, 1978), pp. 255-264 and Svitlana Kobets, "Isaakii of the Kiev Caves Monastery: An Ascetic Feigning Madness or a Madman-Turned-Saint", *Holy Foolishness in Russia: New Perspectives*, ed. by Priscilla Hunt and Svitlana Kobets (Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, 2011), pp. 245-68. Prokopii's life appears in *Zhitiia Sviatykh na mesiats Iulii* (Kiev, 1885), pp. 94-104 and Svitlana Kobets, "The Russian Paradigm of *Jurodstvo* and its Genesis in Novgorod", *Russian Literature* XLVIII (2000), pp. 367-388.

[22] See general understanding of and impression on the holy fool and special characteristics of some renowned holy fools, such as Isaakii, Prokopii, Ustiuzhskii and Vasilii, in Ioann Kovalevskii's *Iurodstvo o Khriste i Khrista radi iurodibye vostochnoi i russkoi tserkvi*, 3rd edition (Moscow: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa Alekseia Dmitrievicha Stupina, 1902), pp. 1-14, 106-136, 163-274.

the ranks of the tsarist political power, the most notorious one considered to be G.Y. Rasputin (1869-1916) of Tsar Nicholas II. On the other hand, the Orthodox Church as well as the masses held an ambiguous stance to these figures that possessed a contradictory temperament. The holy fool was condemned at one point and condoned at another by the public. What interests me at this point is that responses and interpretations from the spectators, when they witnessed strange behaviour and peculiar attire of someone with obsolete accessories, presented an excellent scene for the study of observing the mutual interaction and significant exchange of meanings between the observer and the observed.

Holy Fool as a Phenomenon of Cultural Studies

Indeed, the phenomenon of holy foolishness has been the subject of numerous academic monographs. It has come to my notice that scholars have generally studied the Russian holy fool by turning to the origin and the subsequent development of the Byzantine (Orthodox) hagiographic culture.[23] The Russian scholarship focuses on tradition and vicissitudes of the holy fool's life especially within its own cultural history. Some of the early works, presented by I.G. Pryzhov[24] and I. Kovalevskii[25] showed how the scholars approached the figure on the basis of their interests and in different areas of study. One of the comprehensive studies of cultural significance regarding of the Russian holy fool was written by A.M. Panchenko and D.S. Likhachev. They collaborated on writing *World of Laughter of Ancient Russia* (*Smekhovoi mir drevnei Rusi*, 1976), which was partly dedicated to the memory of Bakhtin's monograph on reading Rabelais's literary works. The two authors contributed to the subject by adopting a writing style and methodological approach to present a comprehensive survey of laughter in ancient Russia with its ethnic and cultural traits, in particular its relationship to the elements of Russian social history as holy foolishness.

[23] G. P. Fedotov also tried to borrow some Greek hagiographic documents as fundamental principles upon which the Russian holy fool was understood and introduced with the religious sense of his paradoxical behaviour. Details about the text, see Georgii P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind Vol .2*, edited by John Meyendorff (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp.316-343.

[24] See individual project study in I. G. Pryzhov, *26 Moskovskikh prorokov, iurodivykh, dur i durakov i drugie trudy po russkoj istorii i etnografii* (Reprint of 1865. St. Petersburg: Ezro, and Moscow: Intrada, 1996).

[25] Refer to the monograph of I. Kovalevskii, *Iurodstvo o Khriste i Khrista radi iurodivye vostochnoi i russkoi tserkvi* (Moscow, 1902 and 1992).

In fact, Bakhtin did not pay much attention to the discussion of the holy fool and only slightly touched on its literary form while talking about 'the significant life in God' in the tradition concerning the *vita* of a saint.[26] In a small section of looking at the lives of the saints, did Bakhtin see holy foolishness as an exception to the ordinary saints and *vitae*. Holy foolishness, as he regarded, was '*individual* in character and is marked by an inherent element of anthropomachy' (*ibo iurodstvo individual'no i emu prisushch chelovekoborcheskii moment*).[27] The extreme hostility towards the judgment of other human beings marks a crucial difference of holy foolishness (from other kinds of monastic life) whose way of living was involved in a struggle and conflict with other people. Bakhtin used holy foolishness as a metaphor in his discussion about the problem of rhythm and its relation to the explanation of one's existence. He argued that 'being ashamed of rhythm and of form is the root of 'holy foolishness': proud solitude and resistance to the other; a self-consciousness that has passed all bounds and wants to draw an unbreakable circle around itself.'[28] Beyond that, Bakhtin did not develop the concept of *iurodstvo* any further.

In *World of Laughter of Ancient Russia*, Likhachev declared that examples of Bakhtin's vision of carnival as 'the world upside down' remain to be discovered in seventeenth-century Russian literature. The form of parodic and blasphemous inversions was constantly adopted where the flesh took the place of the spirit in the hierarchy of religious values.[29] In this particular instance, Likhachev's claim fails by definition to encompass some essential facets of the phase in the development of the Russian cultural community. To the contrary, Iu.M. Lotman (1922-1993) and B.A. Uspensky (1937-) argued that Bakhtinian carnival hardly existed in the period or culture which Likhachev discussed. They go on to claim that 'Russian medieval Orthodox culture is organized on [the principle of] the opposition between holiness and Satanism. Holiness excludes laughter.'[30]

---

[26] M.M. Bakhtin, "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity (ca. 1920-1923)" in *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, Ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, transl. by Vadim Liapunov and Kenneth Brostrom (Austin: University of Texas Press, c1990), pp. 185-187.

[27] Anthropomachy was meant to be the extreme hostility towards the judgment of another human being. Text quoted from *ibid*, p. 146 and 185-187.

[28] Quoted from M.M. Bakhtin, "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity (ca. 1920-1923)" in *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, Ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, transl. by Vadim Liapunov and Kenneth Brostrom (Austin: University of Texas Press, c1990), p. 120.

[29] D. S. Likhachev ed., *Istoriia russkoi literatury X-XMI vekov* (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1980), pp. 417-425.

[30] Iurii M. Lotman and Boris A. Uspensky, "Novye aspekty izucheniia kul'tury drevnei Rusi", *Voprosy literatury*, No. 3 (1977), pp. 153-54. Also read on-line at

According to Lotman and Uspensky, laughter in Russian culture was often perceived as satanic, the obliteration of the boundary between spectator and performer inspiring fear and fright in the audience.[31] Although the idea of true laughter in medieval Russian culture was differed between scholars, its accusatory tradition was carried on by the holy fools – a group of people who combined the features of folk actors and holy men. In Panchenko and Likhachev's research, the holy fool, as an outstanding type of fool, occupied a position in the worlds of reality and laughter. Their fooleries were read as if they contained implicit wisdom and criticism, as though consciously rejecting the order recognised by the secular world. In addition to demonstrating the ostensive traits of the Russian holy fool and his/her outlandish behaviours in public, Panchenko further addressed the position and attitude of the spectators who were attracted by the fools. When the 'normal' beholders imposed the humiliating, accusing words and conduct upon a holy fool, they were likewise inspired to ask, 'who is actually behaving foolishly?'

Holy foolishness was once a spectacle in medieval Russia. Unlike monks and hermits, holy fools required an audience to express their mode of living. It was also one of the few forms of social protest in the Old Russia: holy fools could criticise the tsar himself and were not usually punished for it.[32] Both Panchenko and Likhachev proposed that the holy fool be an image of social revolt, because the fool despises and neglects material life, thereby disclosing the evils of pleasure found within a society. However, as it is shown here, neither Panchenko nor Likhachev explored the popular representation of the holy fool by interpreting the temporary religious ecstasy, or the understanding of religious experience as related to the fool's mental state. Holy foolishness cannot be explained by saying that it delivered only the need for amusement and supplied an outlet for social rebellion. It would be a loss to discount the gift of prophecy, the ability to perform miracles and other forms of alleged contact with the supernatural. It might be difficult to prove whether these contacts were real or legendary. But the inspiration and perception of those possible connections could give access to the

---

http://dlib.eastview.com/browse/doc/12135800 (last accessed 5 January 2015)

[31] Iurii M. Lotman and Boris A. Uspensky, "Novye aspekty izucheniia kul'tury drevnei Rusi", *Voprosy literatury*, No. 3 (1977), p. 160. See also Alexandar Mihailovic, *Corporeal Words: Mikhail Bakhtin's Theology of Discourse* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, c1997), p. 188.

[32] One of the examples is Basil the Blessed (*Vasily Blazhenny* in Russian, ca. 1468 or 1469 - 1552 or 1557) who according to the record, rebuked Ivan the Terrible (reign between 1533 and 1584) for his indifference to the church, and for his ruthless behaviour towards the innocent. When Basil died, Tsar Ivan acted as pallbearer and carried his coffin to the cemetery. Basil was buried in St. Basil's Cathedral in Moscow, which was commissioned by Ivan and is named after the saint.

understanding of the people and of the social position they have occupied.

In a similar vein, S.A. Ivanov continued discussing the holy fool on the ground of the preceding discoveries and innovations in the English version of his book *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond* (2006). Ivanov claimed that the Russian tradition of holy foolishness started not with Prokopii of Ustiug (d. 1285 or 1303) as is generally understood, but with Isidor Tverdislov of Rostov (d. 1474 or 1484).[33] He spent much effort reinterpreting the holy fool in the historical development as a phenomenon, a conceptual or a hagiographic icon as well as perceiving the distinctions and generalizations amongst cases. Ivanov borrowed the monastic, ascetic and seclusive phenomenon of Western Christian history as basic examples which he used to survey the Russian holy fool. He concluded that under the social ideal of Christian sanctity, the immoral, controversial and unusual behaviour of the holy fool was transcended into decent and pious manners, as influenced by borrowed hagiographic models. Social conventions and values fine-tuned the ideas and knowledge of the crowds towards the holy fool. Judgements regarding of the holy fool varied depending on the historical period. In the study of Ivanov, the era of the seventeenth century was a watershed for the peers of holy fools when the Church Schism or the introduction of the medical institution by Peter the Great marked the transition of a type attributed originally to holy fools.[34] Except for the recognised impact of the western hagiography, it is however, a pity for Ivanov to exclude the comparison of the Russian holy fool with Siberian shaman, Taoist monk or Islamic saint, who might display similar traits and serve the same roles in eastern culture and society.

Scholars who only see the holy foolishness as a phenomenon of Byzantine heritage expose themselves to criticism of an incomplete account of the cultural studies. Upon writing about the history of the phenomenon of holy foolishness, one would welcome more analogy and discussion in a historical context. But unfortunately in Ivanov's analysis, there is no mention of the pre-Byzantine roots of such related movements as the Celtic tradition of the saintly seer[35], Islamic Sufism[36], or Siberian shamanism[37] which particularly resembles the Russian holy

[33] Details in chapter nine "Old Russian *Iurodstvo*" of S.A. Ivanov's book, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, pp. 244-284.

[34] Further details of the explanation, see chapter eleven "*Iurodstvo* in an Age of Transition" and chapter twelve "*Iurodstvo* Meets Modernity" of S.A. Ivanov's book, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, pp. 311-344 and 345-358.

[35] Neil Thomas, "The Celtic Wild Man Tradition and Geoffrey of Monmouth's Vita Merlini: Madness or Contemptus Mundi?" *Arthuriana*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Spring, 2000), pp. 27-42.

[36] See individual project study in René Guénon, *Insights into Islamic Esoterism and Taoism*, transl. by Henry D. Fohr (Hillsdale, N.Y.: Sophia Perennis, c2004); Toshihiko Izutsu, *Sufism and*

fool in a number of ways. Antinomian practices are not uncommon in human religious behaviour. All of these [seer / saint / fool] traditions appear under guises of different religious traditions. They are characterised by the same belief that social conventions hinder the quest for truth and that magical powers can be obtained through violations of moral codes. Holy fools appear in traditions of polytheistic Shamanism, Hinduism and Tantric Buddhism which are as different as the monotheistic religion of the West. Had Ivanov widened his scope, on the same scale as the Russian Empire had expanded its territory, the reader of his monograph would have gained a better perspective on what makes the Russian holy fool unique, or just as normal as other compeers.

The recent collection of writings, *Holy Foolishness in Russia: New Perspectives* (2011) and *Iurodivye v Russkoi kyl'ture: sbornik nauchnykh statei* (*Holy Fools in Russian Culture: Collected Essays*, 2013), are an attempt at providing knowledge about the holy foolishness compiled from different literary texts. However, none of the comprised articles adequately account for the dynamic and protean nature of this phenomenon. To recapitulate, scholarship tends to focus our attention on the holy fool in one of the following ways. That is as Helena Goscilo also argued: the holy fool is depicted as God's elect; as a clinically certifiable lunatic and as a cynical performer of manipulative, histrionic scenarios.[38] But, the phenomenon of holy foolishness should not be thought of as a stable trans-historical condition, but rather as a socially constructed idea with particular purposes and functions. While a semantic study indicates the ephemeral changes to and the social relevance of certain concepts, there is often a tacit sense of extrinsic conditions that bring about a shift in the definition. The social milieu provides conditions that force new meaning to be generated and to challenge the earlier conventional uses of it. For any culture, there is always a danger in choosing a single origin that accounts for the mutations of a phenomenon which can be interpreted in different ways and articulated in different historical phases.

To suggest however that the holy fool was a typical figure only in Byzantine context is an oversimplification of the issue. In studying the phenomenon of holy

---

Taoism: A Comparative Study of Key Philosophical Concepts (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984, c1983) and Sachiko Murata, *The Tao of Islam: A Sourcebook on Gender Relationships in Islamic Thought* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992).

[37] See Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, c1987).

[38] More details in her article "Madwomen without Attics: The Crazy Creatrix and the Procreative *Iurodivaia*", in Angela Brintlinger and Ilya Vinitsky (ed.), *Madness and the Mad in Russian Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), pp. 226-241.

foolishness, one needs not be limited by the concepts and models of the Orthodox Church, but may approach it from a variety of perspectives. Turning now to what may be considered 'alien' evidence and focusing on a particular personality, it should be mentioned that Ewa M. Thompson was one of the first to openly question the epistemological ground of the holy fool, thereby to draw attention to the subject and its relation to Eastern pagan beliefs. Her monograph, *Understanding Russia: The Holy Fool in Russian Culture* (1987) signalled a major shift in the focus of studies in this area. Thompson attempted to treat the holy fool of the Russian origin as if it was a socially constructed model, a viewpoint from which her cultural and sociological discussion of the Russian Orthodox reforms began. Throughout her book, Thompson engaged in a discussion of the holy foolishness by looking into religious diversity, eccentric behaviour, political inclination and even contemporary intellectual life and literary characteristics. The holy fool is a specific cultural and social phenomenon in the Russian civil society. Thompson held the general position that the holy fool could be traced back to the tradition of the hagiological veneration in eastern Christianity and proposed an alternative viewpoint for a debate.

According to Thompson, the Russian anthropologist Dmitrii Zelenin (1878-1954) was the first to suggest the conceivable existence of a link between the paranormal nervous state and shamanism on the one hand and holy foolishness on the other.[39] The image of the holy fool resembles a character from an oriental folk religion, particularly that of the shaman. Holy fools with shamanic features were legalized by the state religion, the Russian Orthodox Church and the method of which was to explain the figure as a sacred type of the eastern Christianity. In viewing a fusion of the shaman and the Christian, holy fools are found to be identified in folk literature as saints who were regarded as healers or warlocks by profession. A shaman, which in origin is a Tungus word referring to a healer, exorcist and fortune-teller, is defined in terms of the services he or she provided; in terms of the ritual tools, such as amulets, charms and incantations, they employed. The shamans performed their great power by establishing contact with spirits and by controlling them through the projection of their souls and flying into the spirit world.[40] Based on Thompson's analysis, it was in the trance-inducing dance and intonation of words where one could point to forms of behaviour in

[39] Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, pp. 110-112. Refer to D. Zélénine, *Le Culte des Idoles en Sibérie*, transl. by De G. Welter (Paris: Payot, 1952) for further details about his research on shamans and holy fools.

[40] James Forsyth, *A History of the Peoples of Siberia: Russia's North Asian Colony, 1581-1990* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 51-52.

which shamans engaged and holy fools re-enacted.[41] The evidence that Thompson used to support her arguments is found in nineteenth-century Russian journals and other publications as well as archives in the field of religion, medicine and anthropology. Her ultimate aim was to prove that the cultural phenomenon of holy foolishness was the most complete and vital demonstration in folk tradition and in the Orthodox religion of the dual belief in the Russian people's mind. The holy fool had a strong religious implication, but his/her relation to the Orthodox Church was unstable and ambiguous. Thompson interpreted the emergence and existence of the Russian holy fool as an indication of the strong influence of the folk tradition which was more pervasive than the Orthodox Church. The vague and lukewarm relationship between the Orthodox Church and the holy fool failed to stop the prevalence of the tradition of the holy fool, or to prevent it from becoming the main theme in the sacred stories of the Orthodox hagiology. Moreover, the ordinary fool in the Russian folklore was ironically adopted to strengthen the claim of the legal status of the holy fool in the Orthodox history.[42]

Clearly, Thompson intended to identify the holy fool, in no uncertain terms, with the shaman. Scholarly reviews praise Thompson's contention for her fascination.[43] However, it is only reasonable to assume that the Siberian shaman exerted an influence on the holy fool. It is true that the phenomenon of the insane, holy man is known in other religious traditions as well, although each differs slightly from the other. In the religious tradition of Zen Buddhism, 'holy madness' has been accepted by mentors and practised as a method to induce enlightenment. Techniques such as sudden shouts, physical beatings, paradoxical verbal responses and riddles are exhibited in order to discover the essence of the wisdom.[44] It also happens to some Sufi mystics who are known for their strange behaviour as well as for their heretical doctrine of identification with the divine.[45] Additionally, in Meir Shahar's study of the 'Crazy *Ji*' amongst the holy fools in Chinese Buddhism and Taoism, he argued that 'antinomian behaviour' was also performed by the Sufi

[41] Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, p. 109.
[42] Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, pp. 95-96.
[43] Reviewed by Nancy Shields Kollmann in *Slavic Review*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (Summer, 1988), pp. 320-321; Donald M. Fiene in *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 151-153; and Svitlana Kobets in *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, 50, 3/4 (Sep-Dec 2008), Academic Research Library, p. 492.
[44] See individual project study in Dennis G. Merzel, *Beyond Sanity and Madness: The Way of Zen Master Dogen* (Boston, Mass.: Charles E. Tuttle Co., c1994) and Kazuaki Tanahashi (ed.), *Enlightenment Unfolds: The Essential Teachings of Zen Master Dogen* (Boston, Mass.: Shambhala, 1999).
[45] Refer to the subject discussed in Krishna P. Bahadur, *Sufi Mysticism* (New Delhi: Ess Ess Publications, 1999) and D. S. Farrer, *Shadows of the Prophet: Martial Arts and Sufi Mysticism*, ed. by Gabriele Marranci, Bryan S. Turner (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2009).

masters drinking wine in breach of the Islamic law, by Sabbatai Zevi who transgressed Jewish law and by Pāśupatas who violated Hindu laws of purity and pollution. [46] Wherever the transgression of the accepted social norms was committed, it seemed to have created a thread for further investigation and thus the argument will be extended here. In spite of the shortage of evidence which directly links the holy fool's vitae to the pagan priest's endeavours, mutual reference for the existence of both deserves our attention to reflect on the 'infectious' perceptions (in agreement or the contrary) of these religious figures.

An interest in the holy fool, linking the mysterious exuberance of the pagan priest or shaman, is clearly an example of presenting a dynamic conception which can be regarded as being endemic to the experience of ethnic and cultural integration in the Russian Empire. By being ambiguous, the status of the holy fool and shaman affords to adopt a variety of faces. The mystery of the holy fool and shaman has been recognised and mentioned not only by the religious authority, but also by various scientific movements which were inspired to characterise their abnormal symptoms. Given the changing scientific and political conditions in Russia, the holy fool may be replaced by the image of the irredeemably brutish creature. Although the scholars spent efforts in finding the similitude of the behaviour and appearance between the holy fool and the shaman, the evidence of mutual imitation is indirect.

Recent scholarship has made us increasingly aware of the complex relations between the religious eccentric and the modern conception of autism. Horace W. Dewey, an expert in Slavonic history, has suggested that the Russian holy fool is a pre-historical type[47] which today would be labelled as autistic syndrome. Dewey took one of the famous Russian holy fools, Vasilii Blazhennyi (Basil the Blessed), as a figure for observation in order to discover the common traits shared between holy fools and autistic individuals. He declared that the holy fool fell under the classification of an autistic disorder and was judged by the following criteria: social immaturity or 'impairment', speech problems (or hardly speaking at all), unusual posture or gait, insensitivity to extremes of cold and heat and a tendency to smile or laugh for no apparent reason.[48] The similarities between holy fools and the modern

[46] Meir Shahar, *Crazy Ji: Chinese Religion and Popular Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univrsity Asia Center, 1998), p. 26.

[47] It means the time before the term of Autism was invented and introduced to Russia in 20th century.

[48] Quoted from N. Challice and H. W. Dewey, "The Blessed Fools of Old Russia", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, NS 22 (1974), pp.1-11. And also see Uta Frith, *Autism: Explaning the Enigma*, 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1989 and 2003), pp. 22-23.

diagnosis of autism seemed to be explicit. To give another example, Christine Trevett stated that the *Life* of Brother Juniper was a 'hagiographic representation of someone with Asperger's syndrome-like traits.' The Christian idea of the 'fool' as the 'holy fool' has been one particular category which different societies have used in 'describing a person with autistic traits.' The Christian 'holy fool' tradition sheds light on several ways in which 'moral and religious meanings have been attributed to persons and behaviours of those who are "different" and "foreign" from us.'[49]

Overall, the historical events and contemporary studies we have discussed so far are not in support of drawing a 'mathematical equation', a relation of which is tautologically true and the answer to which always stays the same. The phenomenon of the holy foolishness cannot be reduced to any sets of equations which show the isomorphic pattern of

Holy fool ≈ Shaman ≈ Man with autistic syndrome

The fact that comparative studies should have decided on how the story would end, suggests that any figure of all relative characteristics is a mystical object in process, the product of an unfinished experiment. Many of the arguments considered here clearly challenge any common perception of holy foolishness. But it is arguably the feature that explores its symbolic and social dynamic more successfully than those ideas which stigmatise the holy fool with a biased impression. Whether the figure appears in terms of the holy fool, the shaman or a person with autistic syndrome, the idea of investing 'irregularities' or 'abnormalities' with supernatural meaning, either good or evil, has crossed many cultures and contributed to building paradigms for us to understand, praise or censure different kinds of people. The parallel analysis as well as conclusion made by the specialists is surprising and inspiring. Nevertheless, it is not my intention to prove that any historical models of religious or political conducts have revealed an image of the holy fool. The tantalising hints of shamanism or autism and its relation to the Russian holy fool were insufficiently given in different areas of interest. But the idea of discovering the phenomenon of holy foolishness from various perspectives will, however, allow us to examine theories about the interplay of biological and social-environmental factors upon the uncommon disorder.

[49] Sentences cited from Christine Trevett. "Asperger's Syndrome and the Holy Fool: The Case of Brother Juniper", *Journal of Religion, Disability & Health*, Vol. 13, Issue 2 (Mar. 2009), pp. 129-150.

Holy Fool amongst other Eccentric Individuals

Similar to the case of the holy fool, the reality of abnormality continues to exist, persist, grow and change independently of how it has been reinterpreted by institutions in real or fictional life. The phenomenon of holy foolishness is an interesting topic for research which can engage a variety of debates over social attitudes towards the people of 'other origins' in the Russian Empire.

In Russia, disputes over binary oppositions in discourse provide an ideal scene for cultural observers to discover vibrant multicultural interaction and oscillation. Russian cultural life is a result of its history and the continuing cultural exchanges of people with the influences around them. The land and history of Russia is constructed of different geographical borders as well as time boundaries with opposing characteristics such as East/West, Traditional/Modern, Paganism/Orthodox, Tundra/Steppe and Nomad/Peasant. For this reason, it is productive to follow the dual nature of contradiction and coexistence and to choose the phenomenon of holy foolishness as our research concern. The question is posed from the observation of how the holy fool is understood and/or conceptualised in Russian society during the epoch when new concepts, such as religious diversity, decree enactment, pathological analysis, were introduced and Siberian Expedition was initiated. The holy fool, as a common figure of eccentricity in the Russian cultural history, embodies a perfect model for contemporary people to elaborate further about the mechanism of being stigmatised.

The shape and the appearance of the holy fool, as portrayed within the culture of Christian or Byzantine Saints, is an inadequate depiction. As was shown in the latest research, some of the performance and traits represented by the holy fool shared a remarkably similar heritage to those often categorised as pagan and which developed in a number of parallel ways. If the pluralist model has led to the emergence of a character like the holy fool, then it stands to reason that once the eccentric gains public attention and soon becomes less of a threat, he/she is incorporated into that society. The method of investigation proposed for examining this question is sociological, because the purpose is to discover how the notion of watching these stigmatised *abnormals*[50] have been constructed at the same time as changing social conditions. In addition to the general attitudes towards the holy fool

[50] The noun *abnormals* is adopted here, in contrast to the reference of Erving Goffman's usage of *normals*, for the purpose of "addressing those who do not depart negatively from the particular expectations at issue" and he shall call the *normals*. Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1986 [c1963]), p. 5.

in the context of religious discourse in Russian tradition or through the process of medicalisation, the project intends to question whether the category of interior *inorodtsy*, a term used to categorise non-Russian natives as 'aliens', serves as yet another kind of reference to the knowledge of reading the unconventional 'others' whilst the state was encouraged to adopt a scientific approach to the establishment of a modern nation. One of the concepts revealed in this thesis is that the chosen model for mixed contacts provides a social significance worthy of further examination. The holy fool is not only known as a contradictory figure with many centuries of evolution and transformation, it also survives today as a complex cultural resource in Russia. Thus, by focusing on the Russian holy fool, each chapter provides an interesting view on the complexities of working through an analytical framework which distinguishes the holy fool from the pathological individual.

I argue, in an atmosphere where various sources of knowledge and information, for example, ethnographic studies, were appreciated, the holy fool or figure of similar attribute was reconstructed for the understanding of difference. In nineteenth century Russia, different ways of thinking about others were discussed for the sake of accommodating and/or excluding people with disability or of different ethnicity. The eccentric manner and behaviour were recaptured by writers and painters who inflected the way in which abnormality was understood within the empire. The political trend of the era was also expository to see an understanding of holy foolishness altered across time and space. Through a series of analyses undertaken, it was reasonable to believe that the definition of the holy fool shifted along with the time and was not totally disadvantageous. An ethnographic 'experience' of the non-Russian native offered an alternative resource to explain the presence of the holy fool. It can be seen as the building up of a common, meaningful world that makes use of clues and guesses to bring forth a participatory presence, according to James Clifford, 'a sensitive contact with the world to be understood, a rapport with its people, a concreteness of perception.'[51] The observability of the non-Russian native, whose behaviour has its cultural polarity of conceiving a benevolent or evil form of conduct, is crucial to a change of perception of abnormality. It was noticed and detected by a moral vision with a scientific methodology and agenda in order to fill the gap and vacancy of knowledge. The ethnographic label suggests a characteristic attitude of participant

[51] James Clifford, "On Ethnographic Authority", *Representations*, No. 2 (Spring, 1983), p. 130.

observation on the social life of a defamiliarised cultural reality. The key element in ethnographic records is noticeable so as to be the supply of exotic alternatives.

In Russia**,** the holy fool was never taken as an entity in medical studies. However, in confining ourselves to the official notion of a Christian holy figure — a person whom the Church honours with an official cult, we shall be aware that the value of one's sanctity must inevitably be examined by a multitude of other disciplines. As the idea of insanity was gradually standardised within the institutional discourses under the forces of medical disciplines, the answer to a figure linked to the holy fool whose presence is proximate to 'nature' implies a developmental view of madness, deriving in part from the rise of the natural sciences in the extent and validity of the nineteenth century. We mean to refer to Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (1859) for these reasons.[52] Darwin claimed that 'more individuals are born than can possibly survive. A grain in the balance will determine which individual shall live and which shall die — which variety, or species shall increase in number and which shall decrease, or finally become extinct.'[53] The Darwinian idea of selection by the environment and struggle for existence remains doubtful, while certain oddities do survive despite the fact that natural selection would suggest their destiny of being extinguished. In fact, selection and medicine are never an act of nature, but 'biological techniques practiced deliberately and more or less rationally by man.'[54] But the problem still remains that the approach to making the distinction of a species or a social type is not sufficient in the process of evolution when a certain updated and definitive form is not yet established. That is, the definition of a transient normal type is grounded on the facts that relate to the past, but does not correspond to the conditions of the current situation.

It is true that we make distinctions every day. The concept stimulated by the ethnographic approach and attitude helped to provide a way of presenting the close proximity between different orders of life in which objects are classified into

---

[52] By 1864, Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* was translated in to Russian. See Janet Browne, *Charles Darwin. Vol. 2, The Power of Place* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2002), pp. 256-259. Also, I.P. Pavlov (1849-1936), a professor of physiology at the Military Medical Academy, once argued that 'Darwin's theory of natural selection endured a long period of apparent incongruity with important bodies of fact and significant lines of biological thought.' Quoted from David Joravsky, *Russian Psychology: A Critical History* (Oxford; New York: Blackwell, 1989), pp. 302-303.

[53] Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (London: Murray, 1859), p. 467.

[54] Georges Canguilhem, "The Normal and the Pathological", *A Vital Rationalist: Selected Writings from Georges Canguilhem*, ed. by Franҫois Delaporte; transl. by Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Zone Books, 1994), p. 129.

groups of individuals whose unity demonstrates the transient normalisation of their relations with the environment. Whether it is the holy fool or the non-Russian native whose behaviour and existence are not clearly separated from the general understanding of eccentricity, the romantic conception of relating abnormality to nature in which deviance is either not referred to or exhibits its supernatural cast, represents an ambiguous yet ideal type of idiotic figure. In our view, the presence of the non-Russian native indirectly prevents the holy fool from being incomprehensible or inaccessible. Neither the sacred figure of the holy fool nor the enigmatic symbol of the non-Russian native can be understood or fixed in a stable frame of reference. It is the instability of how we define a mentally defective person as a genius or an idiot that makes the 'selection' a concept of value, not an idea of statistical reality.

Abnormality in the ethnographic discourse of analysis of the nineteenth century Russia presented a particular 'ecological niche' which serves as a locus for the critique of the holy fool. Similar to Ian Hacking's metaphor of an ecological niche, the term is used to describe an environment in which a concatenation of diverse types of elements dwelt. A niche provides a stable home for certain types of manifestation of abnormality and for certain arrangements of symptoms which are central only at some times and in some places.[55] Along with the establishment of the clinical, ethnographic studies, the control of the administrative institution and the reproduction of artistic pieces, the social milieu as well as the public attitude of the epoch towards eccentricity are distinctively perceived. As far as the criterion of behaviour was concerned, which in the late nineteenth century was part of ethnographic discourse, people would have argued that the vast majority of 'non-Russian natives' were not born Russian by nature and were therefore in a sense abnormal. However, 'the logic in the classification rested on criteria broader than religious identity alone', which may have sufficed to turn 'an alien' into a Russian (a normal).[56] In this thesis, the non-Russian native serves as an example relevant to the understanding of the holy fool in nineteenth century Russia. Not only were both *iurodivyi* and *inorodets* categorised as abnormal or alien under certain rules of distinction, but also they were purposely alienated and defined by institutions endowed by political intention or ambition. In other words, the holy

[55] Ian Hacking is a philosopher and historian of science. See Hacking's discussion of a niche for mental illness in his book of *Mad Travelers: Reflections on the Reality of Transient Mental Illnesses* (Charlottesville, Va.: University Press of Virginia, 1998), pp. 31-50.

[56] Quoted from John W. Slocum, "Who, and When, Were the *Inorodtsy*? The Evolution of the Category of 'Aliens' in Imperial Russia", *Russian Review,* Vol. 57, No. 2 (April, 1998), p. 175 (pp. 173-190).

fool was estranged yet recognised as sacred by the Orthodox Church and the non-Russian native was excluded yet given special attention of control by the administration of the empire. And both the holy fool and non-Russian native were perceived through political views as exceptional. No rule was there to apply for making a sharp division between them and the normal ones. In each case, the pattern of upgrading or degradation could never be the same. However, in many cases, the oppositional actors used the 'rule of difference' in a broader or narrower sense to advance their claims for distinguishing themselves from each other.

During the time when the Russian educated elite posited a common national experience with their more humble compatriots, literary characters which embodied the spirit of the holy fool appeared to be momentous at least for the sake of punctuating some social problems and of reflecting on questions of the national controversy. In order to demonstrate the continuing relevance of the holy fool in the Russian culture, literary works were written to present holy fools as saintly protagonists. The holy fool, who is depicted as a person free and independent of the external authority, continued to play an important role typically in the Russian sense of understanding oneself amongst others. There will be no arbitrary attempt to judge the absolute predominance of one value system over another. However, if certain application of a method had been developed to create the conditions for the holy fool, we can still appreciate the value of certain manner and attitude towards the abnormal behaviour when such a social model was transcended from the ancient to the contemporary world. Although there is a chronological gap between the concepts of how a certain group of people is judged or stigmatised, it is not unusual for their paths to cross as the current examination will show. A stylised image of the past can become a creative element in the present. It is worth observing a society of educated elites, illiterate peasants, bureaucratic methods and growing concepts of civilisation and modern nation for the purpose of understanding abnormality. Furthermore, the stigmatisation of others and the labels which have been attributed to *abnormals* by a single and indisputable judgement, seem to have emanated from the past literary works which were additionally supported by other media of the time.

This observation is an example of the idea that every constructed scene with its resulting cultural legacy has unique binary contradictions and multicultural influences. The aim of this thesis is to draw a connection between the use of the concept of *inorodcheskoe obozrenie*[57] and its application to the question of

[57] The magazine of *inorodcheskoe obozrenie* was published by the Missionary Section of the

difference labelled by oppositional actors. This project offers a preliminary study of the situation that where the presence of the 'non-Russian natives' consolidated the existence of the holy fools by serving as oppositional or supplementary figures.

Approach and Sources

This thesis is not structured as a monograph dealing with the life of one or several holy fools at a specific time. The goal is not to provide an assessment of the research conducting an investigation on a surviving holy fool encountered on a field trip to Russia. Rather, the objective is to initiate a conceptual discourse about the question of abnormality in a society requiring the least differentiation through the study of the holy fool amongst the non-Russian natives of diverse habitus within the empire in the nineteenth century. The main concern of the thesis is to explore certain tendencies of ethnographic and oriental studies through an analysis of several original research works and secondary literature; to uncover the mechanisms by which scholars prepared the ground for balancing the conflicts between the pursuit of humanity and the maintenance of imperial interests; and to consider the problem of stigmata in the context of how abnormal individuals survive and make a living in a transformed social milieu. Over the course of this thesis the reader will acquaint himself with the phenomenon of holy foolishness from its multiform representations spreading from religious vita to popular prose and the novel. Whether the story of the holy fool is recorded in the archives of the church, in case of the history of asylums, or is created in folklore, for literary entertainment and in political allegory, the hero/heroine (the male and female holy fool) has been reproduced as a figure whose characteristics resemble the holy fool in the Russian tradition and whose visual attraction reflects on the concept of the abnormality in the era the authors live.

A variety of theoretical approaches to the question of normality and abnormality, offered by the Russian and Western scholars of different times, are

---

Kazan Spiritual Academy from 1912 through 1916 as a supplement to the journal of *Pravoslavnyi sobesednik*. The magazine was issued for the purpose of introducing the way of life and mores of the *inorodtsy* living in European Russia and Asiatic Russia. But it turned out to focus on the impact of Russian culture (and Russian Orthodoxy) amongst the people subject to the Tatar-Muslim sphere of influence. Here, I make use of the title to *obozret'* or to survey *inorodtsy* who became the object of research run by a spiritual organisation. The metaphorical linkage between sacred view and secular targets is a strategy of creating tension in definition.

employed throughout the project. In addition, several monographs and journal articles written by the literary ethnographers who conducted their expeditions in the remote Russia between 1855 and 1862 are given special attention. Of these materials, the reports published in the Naval Collection (*Morskoi sbornik*) between 1855 and 1862 proved to be a fascinating record of personal opinions, containing usage of new methods and concepts of studying people. These *komandirovtsy* (commissioned investigators) not only made their own comments but also underlined the facts that assimilation of divergence is never a simple task and respect for diversity is a must for an empire like Russia. These journals are taken from the National Library of Russia (RNB) in St. Petersburg. Other materials are supplemented by and juxtaposed to the published critical articles and theoretical contributions of the period taken from the Russian State Library (RGB) in Moscow. Although these combined sources are of little quantitative value, they provide an insight into the types of discussion that were in circulation within the field of scientific or philosophical research and reveal the attitudes of several intellectuals to the question of abnormality and diversity, which was for a time at the very heart of debates.

We use the term 'figure' to place the holy fool, both fictional and non-fictional, in a fluid situation where 'it' is taken as a model for an understanding of abnormality in the struggle for meaning and visibility in the world of normality. Just as John Saward pointed out, the figure of the holy fool is a distinctly 'social manifestation' which implies a figure who is 'in a society yet not of it, challenging its most basic assumptions … or its failure to live the gospel.'[58] We assume that the representation of the holy fool in the nineteenth century Russia was influenced by various new scientific disciplines, especially ethnography and Orientology, which formed new concepts and attitudes towards the non-Russian natives within the expanding empire and vice versa. In this regard, the holy fool, (in)directly remodelled by or referred to through different media, can be looked upon as a figure for purposes having less to do with revisions of national myth or reconstruction of social consensus than with a pursuit of civil inattention upon encounter with the 'abnormal others' in the society.

In Russian, there exists a number of writings by the wise and learned in praise of the holy foolishness. The tradition in literature or critical theory dedicated to foolishness appeared in masterpieces of A.S. Pushkin (1799-1837), F.M.

[58] John Saward, *Perfect Fools: Folly for Christ's Sake in Catholic and Orthodox Spirituality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 17.

Dostoevsky (1821-1881), L.N. Tolstoy (1828-1910), S.N. Bulgakov (1871-1944) and L.I. Shestov (1866-1938), to name but a few. Modes of representing the holy fool are influenced by multiple traditions of Orthodox self-fashioning and by epidemic flows of information and technology. Involving the holy fool in a reconsideration of morality and abnormality, the thesis reflects on a great combination of discussion that religion, medicine, science and literature could interweave to form a cultural memory or popular consciousness of some distinctive others to show an alternative of mutual understanding. When people saw the value of preserving the phenomenon of holy foolishness as one of the Russian cultural heritage, the holy fool became a figure of certain stereotype from hagiographies to fictions. Whether the holy fool was described in lives of canonised saints or in fantastic tales of apocryphal writings, the figure as such has become a unique type of fool: the sacred one. The popularity of the holy fool as a literary figure began to be built from the *zhitie* of Muscovite literati to the characters in a novel of our time. Before the confinement came to Russia, various purposes of recording and reproducing the images of the holy fool emerged into one archetype which was important later for literary expansion and philosophical reference of the nineteenth century Russian intellectuals. On the level of the reader's point of view, all these literary characters based on the holy fool's archetype share a great deal of the author's sympathy and concern about life and society. Through the figure of the holy fool a special national ethos was posited and an unconditional reverence for its spirituality was claimed.

Ever since the official endorsement of religious canonisation or ethnic categorisation from the dominant regime was enforced, practitioners in different spheres could have sensed the political force and demand the 'order' of things. The governmental intervention grew together with the development of social concepts which greatly soaked into the life of every individual. Ordinary citizens developed an ability to see different people and happenings as they were becoming and ought to be rather than as they statically were. On the one hand, the story of the holy fool, and ultimately the story of a stigmatised individual, underwent a relatively merciful process of historical change in Russia that has carried the notion of 'abnormality' on a different trajectory from that of its Western counterpart. On the other hand, the way in which the non-Russian natives could gain a kind of autonomy during the process of assimilation served as an open utilisation of the ideology on exceptional state which functioned as a vehicle for the stigmatised identities to define and promote themselves in a mixed-contact society. We will take different academic disciplines to discover the political

power that is employed to form a new concept of questioning what abnormality really means through the use of language.

The indeterminate nature of the holy fool and non-Russian native precluded the kind of concrete facts and figures that were required by the bureaucratic machines. Both *iurodivyi* and *inorodets* enjoyed a certain degree of freedom in their activities that frustrated the intentions of the policy makers. Through our analysis, both holy fool and non-Russian native stand as exemplars of certain tendencies reinterpreted in official or artistic articles which were not based on mythology but on a scientific analysis of their extraordinary forms of life. In the end, both figures as we have associated one with the other for a conceptual discussion could become phenomena that helped to legitimise the presence of every natural identity and provided a model for developing concepts of understanding abnormal others amongst the Russian educated and illiterate people. My approach to the phenomenon of holy foolishness facilitates an understanding of abnormality in both religion and science through polysemous ways, which include being self-reflective of my own (Asian-Chinese as people from the Orient) point of view and being trained under the Western way of examination. Such a sensibility begins with the process of looking at medical and social worlds — empirically knowing these worlds and being conscious of their effects on these types of specific figures. In this sense, the concept of 'normalising the abnormals' might prove problematic for the territory I intend to chart in methodological and analytical terms. I would like to use a concept that emerges from the ethnographic viewpoints in order to make sense of the theory and materials I venture into within the thesis, in part as a way of supporting future directions in the field.

The Historical Context: the Question of Modernity

"*Insanity is a part of the price we pay for civilisation.*"

- by **Edward Jarvis**[59], 1852

Sociologists, such as Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Talcott Parsons and Norbert Elias, took the conflicts of tradition versus modernity seriously as a matter of question for the evaluation of humanity. And the idea that modernisation inevitably and effectively demolishes cultural diversity lies at the heart of many anthropologists' endeavours, from Bronisław Malinowski to Margaret Mead and Claude Lévi-Strauss.[60]

Modern industry, one would agree, was probably far more powerful than any academic discipline in changing world views based entirely on positive science. From the 1880s onwards, industrialisation and urbanisation engendered far-reaching political and social changes in any country that severely challenged accepted norms, values, and identities. Although it may only be an episode of stage shows, the Opening Ceremonies of the London 2012 Summer Olympic Games demonstrated how significant the Industrial Revolution has been and how it has profoundly affected every aspect of our daily lives. When the Crystal Palace was built in 1851 for the International Exhibition in London, the scene exalted applied science to truth and perfection. Not only in England, but in lands as distant as Russia, the Crystal Palace was, for N.G. Chernyshevsky (1828-1889), a symbol of modernity which embodied new modes of freedom and happiness. For Dostoevsky, in his *Notes from Underground* (1864), the Crystal Palace symbolised everything that was ominous and threatening about modern life.

Was St. Petersburg a city of modernity in the 1860s?

Russia was once labelled as an 'anti-modern' state in which the basic triad of modern institutions, namely individualism, capitalism and democracy did not

[59] Edward Jarvis (1803-1884), an American psychiatrist, whose major contribution to the demography of mental dieses was the *Report on Insanity and Idiocy in Massachusetts* (1855), a model of accuracy, one of the key documents in the history of nineteenth century psychiatry.

[60] See individual project study in Bronisław Malinowski (1884-1942), *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea* (London: G. Routledge & Sons ; New York : E. P. Dutton, 1922); Margaret Mead (1901-1978), "Visual Anthropology in a Discipline of Words" in *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. by Paul Hockings (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1995), pp. 3-10; and Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908-2009), *Tristes Tropiques*, transl. by John Russell (New York: Atheneum, c1961).

exist. St. Petersburg was perceived by Lotman simultaneously as paradise and hell, as a utopia of the ideal city and the nefarious masquerade of the Russian Antichrist.[61] In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Petersburg was haunted by the myth that the city was built ex nihilo on Finnish swamps, on the banks of 'deserted waves', as Pushkin put it, where one could hardly see a fishing boat or a tiny hut of a 'miserable Finn.'[62] Yet, Petersburg is built under the ideal architectural plan of the Enlightenment, with the help of foreign architects and engineers and the slave labour of thousands of serfs. In the course of the eighteenth century, Petersburg became the capital and a symbol of a new official secular culture. Peter the Great and his successors made the city a birthplace of the Russian Academy of Science, the Russian public library, the theatre, the botanical garden and the school for children of non-noble origins, to name but a few. Leibniz and Christian Wolff, Voltaire and Diderot, Bentham and Herder all enjoyed imperial patronage. They were either translated, consulted, or even invited to Petersburg by a series of emperors and empresses, culminating in Catherine the Great, who commanded the foundation of a new secular culture and a new type of urban dweller.[63]

The 1860s are a watershed in Russian history. After Alexander II's edict of freeing the serfs on 19th February 1861, a new generation and style of intellectuals emerged such as the *raznochintsy,* the administrative term of describing the men whose origins and classes are different from that of the nobility and gentry. Men, as individuals, became noticeable independent unities. They were no longer invisible in the collective memory. The rise of public awareness gave an opportunity to mobilise and welcome the modern Russian spirit. Following the Great Reform, Russia's urban centres became entangled in the empire's economic, political, administrative and social transformation. Under the impact of rapid

[61] Iurii Lotman, "Simvolika Peterburga i problemy semiotiki goroda", *Semiotika goroda i gorodskoi kul'tury*, 18 (Peterburg, Trudy po znakovym sistema, 1984), pp. 30-45. Debate over the issue continues to the present day. In 1996, Mikhail Kuraev wrote the most devastating attack on the city, calling it superfluous and devilish, and advocating a return to the happy time of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich. See his book of *Puteshestvie iz Leningrada v Sankt-Peterburg: Putevye zametki* (St. Petersburg: BLITS, 1996). In the meantime, the scholar and professor of philosophy Moisei Kagan glorified the city as the hope of Russia's future and compared the foundation of St. Petersburg to the Christianisation of Russia, only this time it was the baptism of European secular Enlightenment. See project study in Moisei Kagan's book *Grad Petrov v istorii russkoi kul'tury* (Sankt-Peterburg: Slaviia, 1996).

[62] The Finnish legend reveals a similar version of the foundation of St. Petersburg. See project study in N.A. Sindalovsky, *Peterburgskii fol'klor* (Sankt-Peterburg: Maksima, 1994).

[63] Marshall Berman, *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (London: Verso, 1983), pp. 176-181.

industrial economic development of trade and migration, the country underwent what William Blackwell termed its 'first urban transformation.'[64]

It would be difficult to judge the impacts of modernisation upon the Russians, as the meaning of modernity would have to be complex, elusive and paradoxical in the Russian Empire. However, some remarkable features of modernity, which were produced in nineteenth century literature, can easily be perceived. They include the Little Man, the Superfluous Man, the Underground, the Vanguard, and the Crystal Palace. Different narratives as the innovations related above were an important mechanism in supporting the construction of modernity, as intellectuals, celebrities and politicians sought to establish and legitimise their agenda along with the modern category. What Marshall Berman tried to imply in his *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (1983) was that modernity is basically capitalism. Against this background, people entered into a quarrel of how best to live a life or implement a plan in the experience of modernity. In a new dimension of utilising textual imagery and unravelling social nuance from literary and architectural artefacts, Berman demonstrated how modern environments and experience revoked all boundaries of ideology and united the varieties of every individual. However, the unity is paradoxical. The modern life accompanied with industrial, political, economic and psychological reformation manifested itself with the problem of inner diversity. The process of industrialisation backed by repression was in principle a method of fighting against irregularities. Although individuals were set free by social and economic forces in modern culture, notions of irrationality, superstition and backwardness were no longer accepted unquestionably in the structures of emerging cultural society.

To see a new man living in a modern city was not immediately desired in Chernyshevsky's *What is to Be Done?* (1863). The emergence of industrialisation and the initial phase of capitalism engulfed lives without hesitation in the late nineteenth century. For this reason, intelligentsia was able to see the underdeveloped side of the country and to question the effect caused by the intensification of technological change and the rapid transition from rural to urban habitats. In order to construct rational and utilitarian facades of the power the tsar hoped to achieve, one has to subvert the antique religions that rulers still occasionally invoked to justify their rules. Paradoxically, when the Russian Empire was remodelling every aspect of people's lives infatuated with the

[64] William Blackwell, "Modernization and Urbanization in Russia: a Comparative View", *The City in Russian History*, ed. by Michael F. Hamm (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, c1976), pp. 291-330.

European orientation, (even in St. Petersburg, the most 'enlightened' city in Russia at the time), both the legendary female blessed fool, Kseniia and the mysterious sect, *skoptsy*, performing the whirling dance to reach the state of ecstasy still existed.[65]

Science, generally thought to be a practical tool for a prompt building of the modern society, represented a particular form of enlightenment. The passion for science was considered useful for helping and overcoming previous divisions and inequalities.[66] As Elizabeth A. Hachten indicated, 'science marked the path towards more thoroughgoing social and political change.'[67] According to specialists, reflecting on the disciplinary developments of knowledge in the nineteenth century, medicine and hygiene became one of the earliest of those applied sciences. Hygiene, in particular, was often regarded as a vital factor of direct contributions that 'science could make to the quality of human life.'[68] To an individual like the holy fool whose social status was still unstable, the shift in the field of medical and administrative practices on the identification of insanity was probably one of the most significant factors. Falling into a trance was a way to be mad, or to be diagnosed as a symptom of mental illness in the 1890s, such as was the case of the two-year sickness of the holy fool Isaakii in the world of Orthodoxy. The numerous quasi-clerical vitae of holy fools recorded in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were highly diverse. He or she could be a nun, city or village beggar, sorcerer or malinger.[69] During that period of time, the performance and functional pattern of the image of a sacred paradigm whose existence was vital to the regime, was challenged by the scientific model and its distinction between the normal and the abnormal. The science of medicine became a matter of debate. The medical evaluation was called upon to set the 'rules' of behaviour.

---

[65] *Skoptsy* or castrators, a sectarian of Russian popular religiosity; see Laura Engelstein, *Castration and the Heavenly Kingdom: A Russian Folktale* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999); George E. Munro, "The Petersburg of Catherine II: Official Enlightenment Versus Popular Cults", *Moscow and Petersburg: The City in Russian Culture*, ed. by Ian K. Lilly (Nottingham: Astra Press, 2002), pp. 49-64.

[66] H. T. Buckle, *History of Civilization in England*, 2 Vols. (New York: D. Appleton, 1875), Vol. 1, p. 658.

[67] Elizabeth A. Hachten, "In Service to Science and Society: Scientists and the Public in Late-Nineteenth-Century Russia", *Osiris*, 2nd Series, Vol. 17, No., Science and Civil Society (2002), pp. 171-209.

[68] Ibid, p. 191.

[69] S.A. Ivanov, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, p. 353.

An Alternative to the Understanding of Different Others

It should be noted that many 'neglected' people had crossed boundaries and became subject of themes which are called into question of otherness. Definition of groups or individuals who belong to the category of marginalisation is often uncertain in its sensitivity towards the complexity of positioning others in the social rank. Considering the question of socio-economic classification, the vagrant, slavery, beggar and poor are labelled as others. Moreover, dwarfs, asylum inmates, deaf and blind are excluded by the 'normal' people through judgement of one's physical or psychological disability.

This project provides an opportunity for a critique (albeit necessarily selective) of the holy fool whose symbolic characters are the foremost attractive to our discussion about the question of others in the Russian culture. Discourses on the holy fool demonstrated a great combination of several different elements. The holy fool is a person bearing an intellectual disability in modern clinical diagnosis, a figure endowed with supernatural and mysterious power in the religious context and a civilian of an undefined social state resulted from the conclusions of the power relations. In addition, the application of the holy fool in literature could amplify the figure itself and contribute to its dissemination to future generations of its reproductions. While some of the notions tend to present rather stereotypical vision of the holy fool, there is still an alternative concern to be voiced regarding our interest in applying the non-conventional others to our understanding of the holy foolishness.

Culture and life of the non-Russian natives are being constructed as distinct and different; however, a failure to identify and share such beliefs casts people as 'other' to authentic legalised citizens. By undertaking some reference to a particular form of indicating others in the ethnographic perspective, I would argue the identification and articulation of the imperial power relations serve to create yet revoke marginalisation. The indirect relation between the holy fool and non-Russian native is proposed as a reference to our understanding of the otherness and as an approach to contesting the structural explanations for abnormality. This is an attempt to lift the holy foolishness out of its traditional and isolated past of explanation into a much more dynamic and engaged phase of discussion, contributing to the question of stigmatisation.

In the late imperial period of Russian history, the Great Reforms of the 1860s marked the broadest attempt at social and economic renovation. It was the time when the Russian nationalist ideology emerged with the messianic vision of

Russia's role amongst other countries. After the repressive reign of Nicholas I (1825-1855) and the defeat in the Crimean War (1853-1856), the uncertainty and hope of rebuilding Russia and creating new paths towards its future led to an urge for contemporary intellectuals to engage in diverse layers of the society. It was the moment when all nations of the geographical Russia were reunified to recall the past glory of the Russian Empire. But who were the members of this big Russian family?

It was not until the Russian peasants in the late sixteenth century began moving into the far reaches of the northern Siberia that the educated Russians found their compatriots fairly different from what they have imagined previously. These compatriots spoke Siberian languages, ate raw meat, practised shamanism and were strange or 'alien', yet inseparable in the process of building a nation state. Surely, it was desirable and natural for the empire's 'foreigners' (*inozemtsy*) or 'aliens' (*inorodtsy*) to become Russians. With the establishment of the Russian ethnographical science in the nineteenth century, the manner of assimilating native people was routinely noted by some writers, historians, ethnographers and state officials. Based on this premise, it was argued that the Russian settlers readily befriended and accommodated 'alien elements' when they were surrounded by other ethnic groups. In other words, scholars nowadays tend to concur with the assumption that the Russian was blessed with an extreme sense of tolerance and affability when it came to interacting with the 'aliens.'[70]

What makes the above statement promising, in relation to the stigmatised holy fool, is that it underscores the value of variety for the construction of knowledge in reading other individuals as well as *abnormal*s and the openness for questioning the dichotomy of 'primitive' versus 'civilised.' When the empire aimed to expand the frontier of the Russian state, the literature on Siberian natives revealed a condition for the difference to coexist and to be comprehended. Geographical explorers, exiled ethnographers and missionaries of the Orthodox Church were the sources of information about the indigenous culture of northern and eastern Siberia when outmoded views of reporting on rural culture were in need of being adapted to the changing public taste. A large readership in Moscow and St. Petersburg was treated to evocative portrayals of multifarious Siberian characteristics, including the colourful ethnographic diversity of its native populations and its folk traditions.[71]

[70] A case study in the article of Willard Sunderland, "Russians into Iakuts? 'Going Native' and Problems of Russian National Identity in the Siberian North, 1870s-1914", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Winter, 1996), pp. 806-825.

[71] Mark Bassin, "The Russian Geographical Society, the 'Amur Epoch,' and the Great Siberian

Whether the expeditions were organised under the intention of bringing enlightenment and civilisation to the indigenous people, or with the political attempt to collect astronomical and topographical data, ethnographic discussion of the native peoples has since then been scientifically mapped and recorded.

Briefly, the ritual in honour of the 'pagan gods' was witnessed by the members of the Sibiriakov Expedition in Yakutia (1894-1896) which appeared in L.Y. Shternberg's (1861-1927) memo of his study of the indigenous peoples on Sakhalin Island. The heathenish religious cults were also in V.G. Bogoraz's (1865-1936) description of the Chukchi people in Siberia and demonstrated by S.M. Shirokogorov (1887-1939) in his Tungus research in the North-Eastern Asia. Missionaries such as N.Ia. Bichurin (1777-1853), P.I. Kafarov (1817-1878) and V.P. Vasil'ev (1818- 1900) could also be included in the study, with their devotion to the translation of some Chinese Buddhist classics and the knowledge about China and India, which has more or less shed light on the formerly mysterious oriental civilisation. As the historical anthropologist Greg Dening has remarked in reference to cross-cultural contact in the Pacific, the arena of cross-cultural encounter is a place where one could uncover 'the misreading of meanings, the transformation of meanings, the recognition of meanings' between disparate peoples and their views of the world.[72] All these events were fertile soil for the conceptual growth of an idea on institutionalising the study of the imperial people within Russia.

None of the cultural phenomena can be viewed and interpreted in isolation from its historical context. From the early years of the ancient Rus', holy fools were identified as men devoted to religious practice and from the eighteenth century they fell under the categories of clinical analysis and were integrated into the management of medical treatment. The holy fool and the holy foolishness were ambiguously defined as a person and an idea of a certain type of unruly behaviour, yet both could be appropriated and re-accentuated by a number of competing philosophical perspectives. A broader insight into the development of holy foolishness is required through a better understanding of its historical continuities and further its application to the contemporary question about abnormal others. I believe that ethnographic studies in Russia have the potential to develop a modest progress of disciplines that have been set for combating discrimination.

Expedition 1855-1863", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 73, No. 2 (Jun., 1983), pp. 240-256.

[72] Greg Dening, *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land: Marquesas, 1774-1880* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1980), p. 6.

A prejudicial view of a person who shows signs of something abnormal is often indicative of contempt when the social atmosphere concerning 'the question of difference' is not developed. It is shown at different times and on different occasions, holy fools were categorised as saints, madmen and patients throughout the cultural history of Russia. As proved in some of the cases, the Orthodox Church made an exception to the nomination of several holy fools as canonised saints. It is also evident in the records that the Russian peasants put their disabled family members and the holy fools into asylums as inmates, but not for any medical treatment but in order to prevent some damage or unexpected accidents during the harvest time. The case of Ivan Iakovlevich Koreisha (1783-1861) in the nineteenth century was yet another example of placing a holy fool to a confinement in a hospital as a patient for almost half a century. The ambiguous condition was not banned nor improved by the governing institutions. Nonetheless, it is the ambiguity and flexibility that make the holy fool an exception providing the fundamentals for questioning the rules for distinction in whatever the specialised discipline is.

The thesis intends to relate the holy fool to the non-Russian natives to propose a discussion on accommodating abnormality in a society claiming normality as a basic rule of stability. The holy fool and the non-Russian native share a few traits in common, considering their plight of stigma. First of all, both of them were defined and categorised by the rules of different institution (Orthodox Church and Ethnographic Division of the Imperial Russia). Although the status they occupied in each system of categorisation was slightly different from each other, the effects of discrimination (positive or negative) upon individuals are deeply ingrained in what it means to be abnormal. Secondly, the meaning attributed to their appearance and behaviour was liable to varying interpretations. Hence, the ruling reign made a concession to individual cases when exceptional manifestations occurred. Thirdly, as individuals in a state of exclusion in the cultural history of the Russian Empire, they both functioned as inseparable parts of an overall impression of a multinational country. Fourthly, they both represented a type of an unknown mystery which inspired people with an attempt to escape from the cruelty of the reality to seek a world of equality. Finally, because definitions of both figures were unstable and shifted throughout time in the Russian cultural history, they proposed a fair reconsideration of the manners we might develop upon an encounter of different others.

The Thesis

It is a sad truth that the scope of the public awareness is not equal to the speed of the emergence of new labels. When there is a gap of understanding, the status of minorities and social difference, the dealing of healthcare service and socio-political relations require a need for an informed debate. Throughout the thesis, I try to decode and make sense of the complex socio-scientific issues, including resources from the fields of the critical theory, pathological studies and concepts of ethnographic studies with regard to the studies of the holy fool and the non- Russian native in the question of abnormality.

The structure of this thesis is based around a number of significant themes with which my main argument is stated: that is, the multicultural atmosphere has slightly eased the plight of the alienated abnormal people. Stigma awaits all men in various concoctions and the interpretation of it has its fluidity. Re-examining the phenomenon of holy foolishness within a number of theoretical discussions, such as theology, medicine and ethnography, can be viewed as a starting point for further investigation into the invention of new rules for distinction. This thesis brings together a case study in Russia and several contemporary debates over relative issues offering valuable insights in solving the problem resulting from misunderstanding, to raise standards of acceptance and support and to decrease the experiences of discrimination towards the people of something different from the generally accepted norm.

In the chapters that follow, I will investigate how the holy fool has been viewed as an emerging figure against the religious background and in the secular and scientific categories by which the Russian culture, in its turn towards modernity and ethnicity, found a new way of organising itself.

Chapter one concerns with the modern theoretical enquiry that postulates a position of ‘social marginality’ as a frequent and dominant approach from which to understand the rules and regularities of an abnormal behaviour. From this perspective, my point of view along with the scholars of conceptual discussion of rules for distinction is a starting point from which to develop my research and to examine the potential validity of the theories in the case of the holy fool against the background of the empire comprised of different ethnic groups.

Chapter two surveys the cultural history of holy foolishness in Russia. The discourse explores the factors which explain why the history of the models and categories diverged under different kinds of texts — religious, political and

clinical, thus providing the background for an alternative analysis of ethnographic comprehension.

Chapter three is dedicated to the growth and spread of the encounter with 'others' from the ancient to the modern history of Russia. It suggests that a figure such as the holy fool reveals a complex pattern of interaction between lay piety and monastic beliefs, between popular literature and canonical scriptures. Although an understanding of oneself is sometimes better experienced through a comparative study of others, there inevitably can emerge prejudiced opinions and/or judgments upon interactions with other human beings in the name of civilisation. Still, we value the significance of persistent contacts with people and society of different cultures, because the meeting points are opportunities for an improvement on the biased perception of the unknown others.

Chapter four is the pivot of the thesis filled with analyses of the ethnographic experience of the nineteenth century. This chapter begins by investigating the role of central authority in the question of the non-Russian natives. In an ecological niche where the social impact of the non-Russian natives fine-tuned the norms and hierarchies defined for the special kind, the question arises of whether or not such a distinct environment generated an 'epidemic model' for those stigmatised who might have felt uneasy locating themselves in the existing order. As a writer of medical background and with ethnographic practice, Chekhov's *Journey to Sakhalin Island* and the *Ward No. 6* after his return to Moscow shed a new light on the relationship between the mysterious abnormal man and the social and political order in Russia. By discovering the literary language in the transmission of several irregular identities in extreme conditions, a careful consideration of the question of stigmatisation arises from therein.

Throughout the eighteenth century, several satirical journals meant to demonstrate how ludicrous and preposterous various superstitions were amongst the Russian peasants and non-Russian natives.[73] In the same way as all sciences could be ranked according to their usefulness, from 'useful' (*poleznye*) to 'stupid' (*glupye*)[74], many of the Northern and East-Siberian customs and traditions were found by travellers to be stupid (foolish, silly) or queer. This is the standard which made the principles of enlightenment meaningful. However, the 'stupidity' (*glupost'*) of the old way does not vanish, but on the contrary, [the way] of

[73] Rudolf Neuhäuser, *Towards the Romantic Age: Essays on Sentimental and Preromantic Literature in Russia* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1974), p. 47.
[74] V.N. Tatishchev, "Razgovor dvu priiatelei o pol'ze nauki i uchilishchakh", in *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1979), p. 93.

'foolishness' constantly increases (*umnozhaetsia durachestvo*).[75] Under the circumstances the way of seeing the various inadequacies of native life changed from 'stupid' to 'crude and materialistic', combining the praise for its simplicity, generosity and stoicism in the nineteenth century. With a close-up reliance for conveying emotion in ethnographic records, the co-existence of ambiguous attitude to and natural representation of the unknown others is a momentous feature for relaying a sharp contrast to the general understanding of the holy fool in the Russian culture.

***

Before I proceed, the terms for describing the holy fool need to be addressed. The word *iurodivyi* is understood and used in Russia to describe a madman (*bezumets*) who is believed to possess a divine gift of prophecy. The obsolete term *bezumnyi* (mad, crazy) further extends its inflection to apply to people who are deemed to be a *sumasshedshii* (madman, lunatic). Most scholars translate the word *iurodivyi* (cognate with *iurod* — a person with a birth defect) in a different way from describing the character as an 'idiot', 'religious idiot', 'pious ecstatic', 'saintly fool', 'crazy' and 'fanatic.'[76]

In Dostoevsky's novel *The Idiot*, Myshkin is portrayed as a fool for Christ's sake (*iurodivyi khrista radi*). The figure of the holy fool is reproduced to project an image of an epileptic idiot who embodies positive goodness. This is Dostoevsky's adoption and reinvention of the holy fool whose madness, otherness or folly is rebuilt under the title of the 'idiot.' The word 'idiot' is derived from the Greek *idiotes*, denoting a person lacking professional skills and knowledge, and the Latin *idiota*, an uneducated and ignorant person.[77] The Russian translation defines *idiot* as a person who is silly (*glupyi*) and foolish (*duratskii*). Interestingly, however, as

[75] V.F. Zuev, *Materialy po etnografii Sibiri XVIII veka (1771-1772)*, AN SSSR, Trudy Instituta etnografii im. N.N. Miklukho-Maklaia, Novaia seriia, Vol. 5 (Moscow-Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1947), p. 40. See also A.I. Andreev ed., "Opisaniia o zhizni i uprazhnenii obitaiushchikh v Turukhanskoi i Berezovskoi okrugakh raznogo roda iasachnykh inovertsev", *SE*, no. 1 (1947), p. 96 and 101.

[76] The examples are taken from Dostoevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov* eight characters in different context which are referred to as *iurodivye*. Translations adopted here are from the version of F. Dostoevskii, *The Brothers Karamazov*, transl. by Constance Garnett (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952 [29th printing, 1987]), pp. 72-77, 145, 57, 58, 256, 150 and 258.

[77] Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, entry for *ἰδιότης*.
Lewis & Short and Elem. Lewis, entry for the Latin *idiota*. http://www.lexilogos.com/index.htm (last accessed 5 January 2015)

discovered by Harriet Murav, who examined the dictionary published in 1881 and which was written by Vladimir Dal', the nineteenth-century ethnographer and lexicographer, the word 'idiot' described a person who was 'weak-minded' or a holy fool. Due to conflicting and changing meanings ascribed to the word idiot throughout the centuries, Murav makes claims as to why the figure with physical and mental deformity in Dostoevsky's novel was so fascinating and substantial, though the meaning given to the holy fool is not fixed to a standard explanation. One can agree with Murav's conclusion that 'holy foolishness is not a simple kind of sanctity but one that always foregrounds that which is problematic and confounds those who seek to categorise it.'[78]

In Jonathan Andrews's study of idiocy in early modern Britain, he discerns that idiocy was seen as a 'relatively fixed or constant deficiency, in distinction to madness, which was comprehended as a passing, changeable phase, punctuated often by intervals of sanity.' However, he also indicates that certain tensions between 'philosophical, legal, medical and institutional definitions of idiocy' can still be found in texts such as John Brydall's *Non Compos Mentis* (1700). Due to the frequent conflation of madness and idiocy which existed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, both terms were often used as synonyms for describing a type of madness. The description applied to the madman and the fool in literary texts in which, Andrews emphasized, they are 'two relatively interchangeable sides of the same equation, sharing the same stigmata.'[79] As scholars discovered, madness and idiocy were not categorically distinct until the nineteenth century. However, the semantic ambiguity of both terms seemed to be ignored in medial classifications and legal definitions where an identifiable category of both is required for making judgments for rights of property.[80] The shift in definition of both terms is still in progress and is also challenged by advocacy groups, for example, in America in Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990. Nevertheless, it seems that there is so far no adequate alternative to understand precisely the status of madness and idiocy or to make a distinction of both in the atmosphere of social, psychological, neurological and behavioural malady.

In Russia during the reign of Peter the Great, forms of 'abnormal' behaviour, which in written descriptions fell into the category of 'not intelligent' (*ne-umnost'*),

[78] Quoted from Harriet Murav, *Holy Foolishness: Dostoevsky's Novel and the Poetics of Cultural Critique* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992), pp. 71-98, especially 93.

[79] Cited from Jonathan Andrews, "Begging the Question of Idiocy: The Definition and Socio-Cultural Meaning of Idiocy in Early Modern Britain", *History of Psychiatry*, Vol. 9 (March 1998), pp. 65-95.

[80] For instance, the British Lunacy Acts of 1845, 1853 and 1890.

remain functional for precise medical classification. Fools or idiots were not categorically distinct as patients, but regarded as useless government subjects. The legitimated category designated a narrow spectrum along with the 'stupid' and the 'simple' to signify a person's blatant pragmatic ineffectiveness in everyday life. Terms, such as 'disturbed', 'possessed', 'dumb', 'insane' and those perceived in a completely different context of folk culture — behaviour of a shaman in frenzy or hysteria — continued to leave open the possibility of transforming philosophical, ethnographic and medical understanding of the *abnormals*.

As tsarist Russia moved into the nineteenth century (the Age of Science), the kind of 'madmen', which included God's fool, simpletons and those weak-minded from birth under the evaluation of Church and/or secular powers, were unable to escape from being treated as sentient beings with needs and desires. Although there remained the feeling that little could be done in terms of medical provision, various forms of abnormal behaviour were integrated into the new science which sought to classify and to legislate the methods of social control. Distinction between normal and abnormal behaviour became more or less obvious. Along with popular vocabulary of psychiatric notes circulated amongst the educated strata of the population, 'a classic holy fool was not an otherworldly person demonstrating some kind of Godly truth with his unusual actions, but was simply a dangerous madman (a patient) who was in need of special care.'[81] Madness (*bezumie* or *bezumstvo*) was generally defined in the nineteenth century dictionary as lunacy (*sumasshestvie*) in the first sense and the meaning of the second was extended to foolhardiness (*bezrassudstvo*); to specify wild and eccentric behaviours (*sumasbrodstvo*). It is noticeable that in the early nineteenth century *sumasshestvie* was the primary explanation of *bezumie* and *bezumstvo* and gradually the later *bezrassudstvo* was understood in a similar way to the meaning of *bezumstvo*. The *Dictionary of Russian Language*, published by the Academy of Science in 1895 gave equivalent definitions. Such everyday understanding of madness prevailed in the nineteenth century, as evidenced in this remarkable description by M. Gorky (1868-1936) in the 'Song of a Falcon' (*Pesnia o Sokole*, 1895),

Безумству храбрых поем мы славу!

Безумство храбрых - вот мудрость жизни!

[81] Lia Iangoulova, "The *Osvidetel'stvovanie* and *Ispytanie* of Insanity: Psychiatry in Tsarist Russia", transl. by Barbara Poston, in Angela Brintlinger and Ilya Vinitsky (ed.), *Madness and the Mad in Russian Culture*, p. 57.

We sing the praises of the brave's madness!

Madness of the brave is — the wisdom of life!

As an attempt to combat its original stigma, Gorky's tract was to compare madness with revolutionary ideas of daring (*derzaniia*), boldness (*smelost'*), and fearlessness (*besstrashie*). With the refinement of revolutionary tones by Gorky in the late nineteenth century the madness was yet distinguished from other forms of mental disorder.[82]

The terminology used to describe mental abnormalities is rich and varied. This is true in both English and Russian. Although the interpretation of the (holy) fool and the madman was applied in different situations, usage of both terms seemed to be interchangeable in the perception of psychiatric illness in the nineteenth century Russia. Generally, many of the commonly used expressions imply a point of view about the nature of insanity/mental illness. For this reason, I have opted to use 'fool', 'mad' and 'idiot' interchangeably to highlight different facets of the holy fool's personality in different time spaces, from ancient to the present. For example, in the case of novels on *iurodivyi*, I often found 'idiot' felicitous. However, for the description of the *iurodivyi* cult before and after the introduction of the modern clinics, the terms 'fool' and 'mad' seemed more appropriate.

Furthermore, the thesis is not trying to involve any debate over the gender issue. The popularity of the female holy fool, such as Kseniia of Petersburg, should not be underestimated when we look at the development of the holy foolishness in the Russian culture.[83] However, such an outstanding figure or concrete details about a female holy fool in hagiographies are rare. Hence, it is often the 'he' we use in the thesis to refer to a holy fool who is either under the discussion of a person being recorded in archives, or of a figure being represented in fictions or paintings. It is usually not the 'she' for an overall referent unless otherwise specified. The female holy fool is as important as the male one. 'He' is only a temporary pronoun

[82] Discussion about Gorky's adoption of *bezumstvo*, see K.D. Muratova, *M. Gor'kii v bor'be za razvitie sovetskoi literatury* (Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia Hauk SSSR, 1958), pp. 333-334. Also see definition of *bezumstvo* in *Tolkovyi slovap' russkogo iazyka*, Vol. 1 (Moscow, 1940); and *Slovap' sovremennogo literaturnogo iazyka*, Vol. 1 (Leningrad: Akademiia Hauk SSSR, 1948).

[83] Other female holy fools such as Pelageia, Paraskeva and Mariia Ivanovna of Diveevo were also famous amongst the Russian people. Details see Nadieszda Kizenko, "Protectors of Women and the Lower Orders: Constructing Sainthood in Modern Russia", in *Orthodox Russia: Belief and Practice under the Tsars*, ed. by Valerie A. Kivelson and Robert H. Greene (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, c2003), p. 111 (pp. 105-126).

for the majority of the Russian holy fools until the 'she' takes over the place in our future interest of study.

At any rate, all these terms stem from cultural producers whose purpose of usage is either to perpetuate stereotypes or to question and contest the received understandings of mental and physical disability in the perplexed relationship of semantics. I would avoid approaching the holy fool in a monological way where any dominant codification and delimitation may be involved. Hence, the 'foolery', 'mad', 'lunatic' and 'idiotic' are descriptions in thesauri with either mild or strong connotations that accord to the definitions by which I interchangeably describe the peers of the holy fool in this thesis.

This thesis contributes to those readings on the study of social classifications and pays special attention to the idea that all individuals are influenced by the classifications available to them in their culture, which in turn offer new ways for them to make a living and survive.[84] Based on this premise, abnormality should be understood as a new designation which provides new ways to be a person, rather than a pathological symptom that had not previously existed. To resonate with the labelling theory, the thesis describes how a social space dealing with the question of *abnormals* in the nineteenth century Russia created a new scenario of stigmatisation which enables us to re-examine the instable and conditioned mechanism that people apply to deal with 'others.'

[84] The idea is similar to Ian Hacking's argument on 'making up people' in the case study of, for example, multiple personality first appeared (or recorded) around 1875. See Ian Hacking, "Making Up People", in *Reconstructing Individualism: Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, ed. by Thomas C. Heller, Morton Sosna, and David E. Wellbery (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1986), pp. 222-236; and Ian Hacking, "The Making and Molding of Child Abuse", C*ritical Inquiry*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Winter, 1991), pp. 254-255 (pp. 253-288).

Chapter 1

The Rule and its Application to the Perception of Abnormality

Stigma emerges when the truth is blinded by ignorance. If it were not for modern medicine, patients with epileptic seizures would have still struggled against the negative social judgement and lived their life without having effective treatment. The illness can be cured through a sustained course of medication, but it undoubtedly leaves emotional and physical scars. Medical treatment is given to improve human health, not to identify any human being as disabled or abnormal. If there was neither mental institution nor rules for separating physical deformity from the healthy body, Dostoevsky's Prince Myshkin of *The Idiot* (1868-1869) who suffered from epilepsy would have been a 'positively good man.'[85] Myshkin's characteristics, such as innocence, sincerity, fearlessness, humility and lack of self-interest, have saved him from being accused as a deceiver. In *The Idiot*, Myshkin seemed to embody the extreme idealism of an individual. If Myshkin is to be portrayed as a holy fool, then his illness can be graced with the potentiality of universal transcendence. However, the eradication of 'difference' is impossible and the creation of stigmatisation is endless.

The holy fool, loved by the Russian people in the secular world, cannot escape from being defined, even if he is a prince and behaved like a gentle fool only for a certain time, in a certain place. Before we become engage in the discussion about and conceptualise the phenomenon of holy foolishness through an understanding of non-Russian natives, it is worth recounting some recent theories of stigma, pathology and abnormality in order to understand the process of being categorised as detached from normality and furthermore to reset ourselves to be able to reinterpret the figure being stigmatised. Theories from both Russian and Western scholars are equally valued in this chapter so as to provide a complete picture of how the notion of distinction and separation has developed since the late nineteenth century. The conversation is dialogic, rather than monologic. This chapter develops

[85] Dostoevsky once claimed in a letter to his niece Sonechka Ivanova on 13 January 1868 that *The Idiot* was devised as an attempt to 'portray the positively good man.' See Fyodor Dostoevsky, *Selected Letters of Fyodor Dostoevsky*, ed. Joseph Frank & David Goldstein, transl. Andrew MacAndrew (New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press, 1989), p. 269.

an analysis of contemporary debates over stigmatisation recognised under the perception of separation and comprehension.

Social Distinction and Categorisation

The question of Russia's identity between East and West in terms of ways of thinking or the 'two great principles of intelligent nature, imagination and reason' was posed by P.Ia. Chaadaev (1794-1856) who is regarded as one of the pioneers devoting himself to the search for the Russian national identity.[86] In the discussion of Russia's 'uncertainty' (*neopredelennoe*) in the consciousness of the historical identity, L.P. Karsavin declares that 'the Russian is afraid of sharp definitions and norms, vaguely sensing the limitation that is hidden in any definition.'[87] Frankly speaking, the statement above is an indefinite answer to an inevitable question of whether one is capable of defining others without bearing risks of falling into problems of discrimination. Nevertheless, while the word *opredelenie* (definition) seems to be problematic in the Russian tradition, Western thought positively embraces such 'definitions.'

Definition is given by a system of classification which develops and evolves in its own way against the social conditions. Scholars in Western societies are eager to embark upon the mission of decoding the abnormal mystery by building up a systematic analysis of the social interaction. As a discipline of science, Zygmunt Bauman (1925-) once said that sociology had set itself up as the 'critique of common sense' and that it had endeavoured to design frames for social life that could effectively consider any deviation and unauthorised forms of conduct which had been construed as 'manifestation of social dis-order.'[88] Sociology plays an important role in the modern society of normality. Enthusiasm for the idea of the sociological paradigm developed with the increasing concern not only about deviation of the individual subject, but also about the normal or pathological conditions of the social phenomena.

---

[86] P.Ia. Chaadaev, *Lettres philosophiques adressées à une dame, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis'ma*, ed. Z.A. Kamenskii et al., Vol. 1 (Moscow, 1991), pp. 93-95. For a discussion of Chaadaev as an initiator of these questions, see also Dale E. Peterson, "Civilizing the Race: Chaadaev and the Paradox of Eurocentric Nationalism", *Russian Review*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Oct., 1997), pp. 550-563.

[87] L.P. Karsavin, *Vostok, Zapad i Russkaia ideia*, in Karsavin's *Sochineniia*, comp. by S.S. Khoruzhii (Moscow, 1993), p. 215.

[88] Zygmunt Bauman, *Intimations of Postmodernity* (New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 114-148.

Developed on the methodology of previous scholars focusing on analyses of the social behaviour from different academic disciplines, the idea of 'social pathology' which was popular in the 1920s became dominant in the relative sphere and was designated by the terms of 'social problem' and 'social control' in the 1930s. Talcott Parsons (1902-1979), for instance, discussed deviant behaviour and the mechanisms of social control[89], while Robert Merton (1910-2003) dealt with the social problem concerning the aspect of social disorganisation and deviant behaviour.[90] The object of sociological commentary is formed through medical opinions on health and illness. As a declaration of intent, it is practical to identify the factors causing unsteadiness and imbalance in society. Moreover, it is an incessant activity of labelling the process and symptom as 'deviated' or 'socially disorganised.' When measured by the standards set by and for the better formatted disciplines, the features which are to be of great advantage to society are marked as 'functional' and ones which are deemed to violate the stable condition are degraded to 'dysfunctional.'

In fact, the viewpoints above cannot make a bid for the preference of a sociological commentary over the interpretations produced by the owners of experience and by other outside critics. The critical theory of relating social disorder to physiological disability in a metaphorical expression was bound to prove ineffective, because it was hardly likely that people would accept the rules of the distinction of healthy and pathological behaviour in the same way as people normally agree with the confirmation of a healthy state of the organism.[91] Hence, from then onwards, the resistance and question to such an academic trend has persisted since the 1940s. Thomas Szasz declared bluntly that it was itself a myth to adapt the metaphor of physical illness for the purpose of mental illness as well as sociological illness.

> (…) we have created the class called 'disease' or 'illness.' (…) In this way, at first slowly, but then at an increasingly rapid rate, many new members were added to the class called 'disease.' Hysteria, hypochondria, obsessions, compulsions, depression, schizophrenia, psychopathy, homosexuality — all these and many others thus became diseases. Soon, physicians and psychiatrists were joined by philosophers and journalists, lawyers and laymen,

[89] Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (London: Routledge, 1991 [1951]), pp. 249-320.
[90] Robert K. Merton, "Social Structure and Anomie", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 3, No. 5 (Oct., 1938), pp. 672-682.
[91] C. Wright Mills, "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Sep., 1943), pp. 165-180.

> in labelling any and every kind of human experience or behaviour in which they could detect or to which they could ascribe 'malfunctioning' or suffering as 'mental illness.' Divorce became an illness because it signalled the failure of marriage; bachelorhood, because it signalled the failure to marry; childlessness, because it signalled the failure to assume the parental role. All these things are now said to be a mental illness or the symptoms of such an illness.[92]

In the 1960s, it was debatable whether the detached medicalised model concealed a political aspect. What is functional? What is yet dysfunctional? What are the rules that are enforced? What kind of acts are regarded as deviation? The proper location for answers to such questions is inevitably situated within the political issue. Amongst the questions to be answered, the one most commonly noticed by observers is not exempt from the political struggle which occurred between social groups. The consequence of the conflict was presented in the choice of answers.[93]

***

Similar to the condition which demonstrates contradictory arguments over theories on social deviance, every decision to define one's physical or mental state as normal or abnormal always presents a struggle between choices. Naturally, every story of stigmatisation starts from the term that is applied to describe it and the definition of the concept that is provided to categorise it. On the question of the definition, we have here, for example, the fool who is a type of *abnormals*. Before we turn to focus mainly on the question of the Russian holy fool, it is worth recounting the culture of the fool in general, since it is pertinent to subsequent discussion of abnormality. Descriptions of the fool in literary discourses and folkloric ritual have varied since the Middle Ages.[94] The fool or the foolishness has been broadly used to describe a range of personality traits that cannot be adequately demonstrated by means of habitual modes of human behaviour. But in modern clinical treatment, expert psychiatric opinion allows the principle of

[92] Thomas S. Szasz, *The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of A Theory of Personal Conduct* (New York: Harper & Row, 1974 [1961]), pp. 40-41.

[93] Howard Brotz, "Functionalism and Dynamic Analysis", *European Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 2 (June 1961), pp. 170-179.

[94] According to the analysis, there were at least three different attitudes towards the fools in the medieval period. Details see Barbara Swain, *Fools and Folly During the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Norwood, Pa.: Norwood Editions, 1977), pp. 3-5.

negation to be enlarged where a series of forms of behaviour presented in the discourse of medical analysts and judged by the frequency, scale and impact of the behaviour are found to be against social norms. The labels are likewise given after evaluation, analysis and attribution of irrational behaviour through their interaction with *normal* people in a 'mixed-contact' society.[95]

The rough meanings as well as interpretation applied to different types of behaviour sometimes borrowed from each other to explain a general state of one's physical, mental defects and abnormalities. Having established this background, the characteristics of the fool, an important figure of the festive environment in the middle ages, inevitably changed to become symptoms of insanity by methods of the modern clinical treatment. Compared with the madman whose state of mind appears to be temporarily disordered, the case of the fool was regarded as being under the state of ignorance which was mental and intellectual in nature. Still, one could expect wisdom and truth to emerge from the fool, like lucid moments that momentarily broke into his/her eternal state of ignorance.[96]

Although descriptions of either the fool or madman are often applied to disgrace oneself, the specified attributes of both actually vary in 'civilised' society. The madman is not always the irrational individual who suffers from mental illness, but one who acts as insane. "He is mad!" The exclamatory sentence is conclusive and allows no further discussion. It determines the impossibility of integration and hence, drives them off from the territory and governance of the *normals*. On the other hand, people tend to be more tolerant and generous to the fool and his words and deeds. A metaphor compares the fool to a black hole which absorbs everything that comes near it and reflects nothing from within. If one day the fool suddenly speaks and his words reflect some truth or wisdom, the public might want to pay attention to him and value this being. It is this temperament of the fool that allows him to occupy a special place in the society. No matter what role the fool plays, for example as entertainer or a hero of a sarcastic drama, any conviction of saying "He is a fool" discloses the addressor's sigh of regret and reveals the feeling that nothing can be done to change the situation. However, people are attracted by the fools for reasons of mere interest, mercy, or compassion. Although there can be no simple reading of the fool, he is

[95] Erving Goffman identified specifically in the book the situation that the 'mixed contacts' is the moments when the stigmatised and normal are in the same 'social situation', that is, in one another's immediate physical presence, whether in a conversation-like encounter or in the mere co-presence of an unfocused gathering.

[96] Detailed reference is found in the on-line Oxford English Dictionary (http://www.oed.com/) (last accessed 5 January 2015)

still considered a figure under the concept of multiple and complex causes that arise at the intersection of the various social discourses. This situation creates a cultural landscape of the fool in human history.

The fool as a social type once was discussed and analysed by Orrin E. Klapp. The thrust of Klapp's argument is,

> The creation of a fool is accomplished by ascribing characteristics of the fool to a person through situations which 'make a fool' of somebody or popular definitions impute the character of a fool, that is, jokes and epithets.[97]

The fool is isolated from the circle of the *normal* people while he himself or his behaviour, which often makes him become either ridiculous or inappropriate, deviates from the ordinary track. Klapp concludes with three characteristics of identifying the aberrance of the fool from the *normals*: 'It is an extreme exaggeration or deficiency; it is evidence of weakness or irresponsibility; and it is an offense against propriety rather than against mores.'[98] The image of the fool is solidified by visual experience due to the ostensible physical features and the distinct behaviour, for example, awkward movement or unfocused eyes. Visual perception seemingly becomes a foremost and primary way for others to distinguish one's type of stigma. However, to see is not to believe. It is often the case that the fool becomes a flexible symbolic device situated between a different and sometimes competing discourse: medical, legal, religious, folkloric, educational and aesthetic.[99] The interaction therewith affects the result of one's impression upon the stigmatised and further, the emergence of classification and/or generalisation. The following discussion was indicative of a number of trends that were apparent concerning the question of abnormality in modern times. Theoretical thoughts, like arms manufacture, are treated as a valuable strategic resource that was withdrawn to the rear to continue supporting the main argument of this thesis.

---

[97] Orrin E. Klapp, "The Fool as a Social Type", *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Sep., 1949), pp. 157-162.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Martin Halliwell, *Images of Idiocy: The Idiot Figure in Modern Fiction and Film* (Aldershot, Hants; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, c2004), p. 2.

Defectology: not less Developed, simply Different

Considering the ordering principle to classify organisms, Darwin's theories of evolution of the species were influential amongst the ideological frameworks that shaped twentieth century thoughts. A neo-ethnological phase of British anthropology began when the psychologist/ethnologist William H.R. Rivers (1864-1922) announced his 'conversion' from evolution to diffusion in 1911. Other British anthropologists, under the influence of Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), were wont to attribute their own shift from evolutionism to a more holistic analysis of contemporary tribal groups.[100] Subsequent interests in evolutionism led to increasing debates on conceiving disability as pathology.

During the same time in early twentieth century, Russia underwent the process of developing its theory and method for defining people with disability. As a subject of study, pathology was not a choice for courses in Moscow University until 1849, when the subject began to be promoted under the inspiration of R.C. Virchow (1821-1902), a German pathologist and one of the most prominent figures in social medicine. What Virchow did for the medical world was to cast away the false idols of schools and to inculcate a true scientific method, whereby problems were to be isolated, approached, attacked and invested. Virchow's clue was to be an important factor in the development of Russian pathology and internal medicine.[101]

In addition to the subject of pathology, the word *defectology* was again a term borrowed from the contemporary German curative pedagogy which was introduced into the Russian language in 1912. What survived after a turbulent period of the revolution is that L.S. Vygotsky (1896-1934), a Soviet psychologist, contributed to the discipline and knowledge by providing a strong theoretical basis for continuing to treat the psychology and teaching of the handicapped as a single, unified field.[102] In the early Soviet period, Vygotsky developed many of his views from previous research, namely that of L. Lévy-Bruhl (1857-1939), E.R.

---

[100] George W. Stocking, Jr, *Victorian Anthropology*, p. 288.

[101] A.I. Polunin (1820-1888), professor and chair of pathological anatomy in Moscow University, who organised a course of twenty lectures on Virchow's cellular pathology and had drawing, copied from Virchow's book, hung up in his auditorium in the winter semester of 1859-1860. From 1851 to 1859 Polunin was editor and publisher of the *Moscow Physicians' Journal* (*Moskovskii vrachebnyi zhurnal*). It was here that Virchow's *Cellular Pathology* was first published in the Russian language. Cited from "Aleksei Ivanovich Polunin." The Great Soviet Encyclopedia, 3rd Edition. 1970-1979. The Gale Group, Inc. 20 Aug. 2012 http://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/Aleksei+Ivanovich+Polunin (last accessed 5 January 2015)

[102] William O. McCagg, "The Origins of Defectology", in *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*, ed. by William O. McCagg and Lewis Siegelbaum (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press, c1989), pp. 39-62.

Jaensch (1883-1940), S. Powers (1840-1904) and J. Piaget (1896-1980). As far as theories of cultural historical development were concerned, Vygotsky reviewed and criticised the purely associationistic approach to psychological growth where the latter is understood as a quantitative accumulation.

Vygotsky reviewed Lévy-Bruhl's theory in which the psychological structure of an individual is thought to be a direct function of the social structure to which he or she belongs. Interestingly, Vygotsky seemed to have grasped the essence for his research and practice relevant to contemporary special education.[103] Defectology (*Defectologia*), which literally means 'study of defect', refers to the study of children with disabilities such as: the hard of hearing and deaf (*surdo-pedagogika*); the visually impaired and blind *(tiflo-pedagogika*); children with mental retardation (*oligophreno-pedagogika*); and children with speech/language impairments (*logopedia*).[104] Vygotsky emphasized that the understanding of the disability should not be taken as a 'biological impairment having a psychological consequence', but as a 'socio-cultural developmental phenomenon.'[105] Vygotsky argued that a disability was perceived as 'abnormality' only when and if it was brought into the social context. The difference between a disability and his/her non-disabled peer was only quantitative. Vygotsky reminded us that a child whose development was impeded by a disability was not simply a child less developed than his peers; rather, he/she was developed 'differently.'[106]

Furthermore, the newly applied anthropology also moved in the direction of cultural psychology in the work of Vygotsky and A.R. Luria (1902-1977) who came under the influence of Darwin's theories of biological evolution. Direct ties to Darwinism are not so immediately evident in the case of Vygotsky and Luria. In some respects, they seem to be regarded as contributors of defending arguments for the existence of developmental historical stages of mental phenomena, such as how the mind develops from ape to primitive man then to cultural man. Reacting

[103] See B. Gindis, "Special Education in the Soviet Union: Problems and Perspectives", *The Journal of Special Education*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1986), pp. 379-384; and P. Evans, "Some Implication of Vygotsky's Work for Special Education", in *Charting the Agenda: Educational Activity After Vygotsky*, ed. by H. Daniels (London and New York, Routledge, 1993), pp. 30-45.

[104] L.S. Vygotsky, *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume II: The Fundamentals of Defectology (Abnormal Psychology and Learning Disabilities)*, ed. by R. W. Rieber and Aaron S. Carton (New York: Plenum Press, 1993), pp. 97-170.

[105] See B. Gindis, "Vygotsky's Vision: Reshaping the Practice of Special Education for the 21st Century", *Remedial and Special Education*, Vol. 20, No. 6 (1999), pp. 333-340.

[106] L.S. Vygotsky, *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume V: Child Psychology*, ed. by R. W. Rieber and Aaron S. Carton (New York: Plenum Press, 1998), pp. 187-318 and B. Gindis, Book review on *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume 2: The Fundamentals of Defectology (Abnormal Psychology and Learning Disabilities), American Journal on Mental Retardation*, Vol. 100, No. 2 (1994), pp. 214-216.

against their nineteenth century predecessors, Vygotsky and Luria present a cross-cultural approach where various ethnic groups of preliterate people are compared and given exclusive attention. The development of the behaviour of primitive people caught Vygotsky's attention. One of the major conclusions which came to Vygotsky in his study was that the difference between primitive and cultural people lies in their social development, not in their biological development. Vygotsky's modification of Lévy-Bruhl's viewpoint agreeing with the position held by R. Thurnwald (1869-1954) was that, 'primitive thought really only seems alogical' whereas 'in reality, it is completely logical from the viewpoint of primitive man himself.' Vygotsky makes it clear that existing data do not give any evidence of a truly different *organic type of human being*.[107]

Various ethnic groups in remote Soviet Central Asia were represented as yet another group for Vygotsky's observation in *Fundamentals of Defectology*. The semi-illiterate populations were still often misjudged as subjects to racist stereotyping, whereby some folk cultures were considered not as *different*, but *inferior*. Luria, as Vygotsky's student and colleague, made several expeditions in Central Asia to study cognitive capacities of 'natives' and found that all psychological processes are proved to have a historical character. The expeditionary experience functions as the basis and motivation for the concepts and ideas argued in his research. As a result of data analysis, Luria came to the conclusion that 'all the categories which we had become accustomed to think of as natural, in fact are social.'[108]

In a similar way, one of the themes which Vygotsky outlined against the theoretical perspective was to claim that human social and psychological processes are fundamentally shaped by 'cultural tools, acquisition of which extends one's mental capacities, making individuals the master of their own behaviour.'[109] During the Soviet era, the word *inorodtsy* was deprived of its legitimacy to be used by the party. In Soviet parlance, those people who used to be categorised as *inorodtsy* were grouped under a new term: *otstalye narody* or backwards peoples. The latter term is arguably just as condescending as *inorodtsy*, but it was entirely justified under the administrative standard for culture to liquidate illiteracy and

[107] L.S. Vygotsky and A.R. Luria, *Studies on the History of Behavior: Ape, Primitive Man, and Child*, ed. and transl. by V.I. Golod and Jane E. Knox (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993), pp. 87-92.

[108] Cited from Jane E. Know's introduction to L.S. Vygotsky and A.R. Luria, *Studies on the History of Behavior: Ape, Primitive Man, and Child*, p. 14-15.

[109] Quoted from "Vygotsky, Lev Semyonovich." Complete Dictionary of Scientific Biography. 2008. *Encyclopedia.com.* 16 Feb. 2014 (http://www.encyclopedia.com)

promote a uniform culture. ‘A distrustful, ironic and sometimes hostile attitude’ towards the non-modern class spread amongst Party circles and Soviet public discourses for many years after the 1917 Revolution.[110]

The episode in the Russian history of special education opens a new page in making use of the referent of the idea about disability. Together with a research and method applied for the people with a ‘defect’, special education received its attention in the Soviet Union where every child is of value and able to become a useful member of the society through education. The development of defectology implied a democratic sense of knowledge which has its historical background working on the minor and underprivileged members of the society in the pre-revolutionary Russia. Such a democratic attitude leads to the threshold of investigating the assumption of symbiosis through a conceptual discussion of the holy fool in a discourse on problems of the non-Russian natives in late imperial Russia. It is precisely in this cross-disciplinary discussion about the logic of symbiosis emerged from the specific social condition that allows the journey of those different others towards unbiased judgment and equal acknowledgement to be possible.

To find closer historical precedents or successive examples for Vygotsky’s approach to disability, it is necessary to step back from our subject and include other theorists to supply our need for knowledge of distinction prior to our analysis of the holy foolishness in the Russian culture. It is not to suggest that the following theories are closing discussions on normality or abnormality applied to our inquiry into the problem of holy foolishness. However, it is our attempt to treat those arguments as temporarily valid answers to the issue raised by the subject of our current concern which has evolved over many years. We do not only study the historical development of holy foolishness, but also want to learn from its legacy for a better understanding of the Russian culture which moderately speaking, develops under the influence of both Western and Eastern culture. Based on the premise that any cultural phenomenon should be explained in dialogical argumentation, it is reasonable to see a mixture of discussions (but necessarily selective) which may indicate a useful strategy to survive in an unpredictable

[110] Sheila Fitzpatrick, “Ascribing Class: The Construction of Social Identity in Soviet Russia”, *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (Dec., 1993), pp. 745-770. Also see William G. Rosenberg's comment that ‘for a brief historical moment, at least, dominant identities allowed the lines of social conflict to be very clearly drawn’ in his article “Identities, Power, and Social Interactions in Revolutionary Russia”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (spring, 1988), p. 27 [of 21-28].

environment and challenge the conservative perspective on any dogma rejecting cultural diversity through a series of comparative analyses.

Social Stigma: Different only in Relative Position

As Russia gradually moved towards a state of becoming a modern empire in the nineteenth century, ascription of the backward people (*otstalye*) is no longer separated from the social construction analyses. The policy of ascription combining social rules produced an offspring: stigma. Concerning the theory of social stigma, Erving Goffman (1922-1982) has presented us his compelling exploration of the 'social information' distributed from the 'spoiled identity.' On the very first page of his monograph *Stigma: Notes on the Management of a Spoiled Identity*, the Greeks who were the creators of the term *stigma* adopted branding as a visual aid to help distinguish and confirm whom normal people should avoid in public. Bearing the statement in mind, a moment of caution would be to avail. Stigma can be divided into several types. But Goffman explained that 'in all the various instances of stigma, the same sociological features are found.' That is to say, an individual who possesses a trait that stands out and thereby overshadows his other attributes creates an impression on people. 'He possesses a stigma, an undesired differentness from what we had anticipated.' One could use a specific term of stigma without giving thoughts to the original meaning behind it. Hence, Goffman remarked,

> We tend to impute a wide range of imperfections on the basis of the original one, and at the same time to impute some desirable but undesired attributes, often of a supernatural cast, such as a 'sixth sense', or an 'understanding.'[111]

Goffman's argument reminds us that all kinds of stigma terms appear only in the corresponding relationship. The stigma reveals itself with a given meaning only when it is placed in a relative position to an anticipated normal category. We, the *normals*, cannot, in fact find the category ascribed to normal people. Because the meaning of the *abnormal* varies, every single person has his path of stigmatisation.

[111] Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, c1963), pp. 15-16.

The game of branding and stigmatising humans is not a matter of elimination rounds for the participants. No one can cut loose or withdraw from this social situation. The mutual relations as well as interaction between the stigmatised self and its other (e.g. people, group, or institution) persist and provide the opportunity to normalise the *abnormal*. Being stigmatised in this mixed-contact society is inescapable. However, it is essential to understand the fact as Goffman has repeated earnestly,

> The normal and the stigmatised are not persons but rather perspectives. These are generated in social situations during mixed contacts by virtue of the unrealised norms that are likely to play upon the encounter.[112]

The moments when the normal and the abnormal enter one another's immediate presence invoke one of the most primal scenes of sociology. The causes and effects of stigma are inevitably confronted by both sides.

Science as a Method for Classification

The extent to which any scholars' appropriation of their experience and theories for the question of (ab)normality is considered reasonable in the discussion of holy foolishness is not without doubt. The chronological gap and spatial difference is complicated by a problematic contradiction. As part of our effort to create a dynamic and interactive thinking borrowed from a selective approach to social problems in different time and social milieu, we are, in effect, expected to show reality in the revolutionary development of a cultural phenomenon which carries with it historical connotations and helps us enter the realm of political consciousness in the construction of a better society. Hence, it is not inappropriate if we place a Russian traditional figure and discussion of its phenomenon under the global critical environment of the twentieth century, since a relative distant revaluation (in terms of time and space) of the phenomenon suggests an objective and alternative analysis. Just as we try to demonstrate in the following sections, we avoid analysing any situation under a monological discourse but agree with the idea that a variety of potential methods of definition offers alternatives of renovation in thinking and action. Hence, it is necessary to cross-examine different explanations of abnormality given in varying social contexts and complete our comprehension of the phenomenon in order to pave the road for its future analysis.

[112] Erving Goffman, *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, pp. 163-164.

Normality can be defined as representation of some typical characteristics that are average for a given group of people or under certain circumstances. Hence, the term 'normal' is fundamentally statistical and quantitative.[113] However, we could query: if abnormality, as it is universally understood and accepted, was to become a frequent phenomenon at a fixed stage of development, could we defend ourselves and say that normality is a commonplace? The problem is that 'normality', with its empirical generality, can sometimes be fraudulent if the rule of distinction is applied through the force of blind habit. Durkheim argued that 'everything which is normal is useful without being necessary; and it is untrue that everything which is useful is normal.'[114] The notion of utility does not fully answer the question of one's legal existence. But it is impossible to ignore it while a useful method is applied to define the normality after a series of analytical processes of demonstrating generality.

In 1895, Durkheim first published his book *The Rules of Sociological Method* and demanded that,

> The sociologist should assume the state of mind of physicists, chemists and physiologists when they venture into an as yet unexplored area of their scientific field. As the sociologist penetrates into the social world, he should be conscious that he is penetrating into the unknown.[115]

One of the "Rules for the Distinction of the Normal from the Pathological" became Durkheim's chapter title. He proposed the question whether it is possible for the science to distinguish the normal phenomena from the pathological ones. The solution to his concern depended on the conception of the role that science, and above all in the science that man has to play. Durkheim suggested the fact that 'science is stripped of all practical effectiveness and of any real justification for its existence' if science can only tell us a cause and effect relationship, but cannot lead us to the end of what we should pursue. The knowledge we acquire must serve us in our lives and rational sociology should not be limited by the constraints of mysticism.[116]

From the vantage point of looking into Durkheim's 'rules', his critical thought was confronted with a large array of statements respectively called functional analysis, a social problem or social control under the tradition of sociology. In the

---

[113] See "Normal" in *Gale Encyclopedia of Psychology*, 2001. *Encyclopedia.com.* 5 March 2014.
[114] Émile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, edited by Steven Lukes; transl. by W.D. Halls (New York: Free Press, 1982), p. 96.
[115] Émile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, p.37.
[116] Émile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, p. 85.

"Rules for the Distinction of the Normal from the Pathological", Durkheim's aim was to develop a medical analogy of health and illness by proposing vital questions by way of science whose role was relatively practical in social conditions. It may look surprising that the mission of a political man was described equally to a doctor's profession at the end of his discussion. On the contrary, what makes the thoughts conducive to go beyond the gap between theory and practice is to establish the rule of normality by using scientific methods from which any practical inference can be drawn accordingly. Hence, science and politics can be categorised under the same vocations. It is often the case that sociologists as well as politicians tend to present themselves as doctors. They start from an already-present society and concern themselves with individuals in the social habitat.

In the course of arriving at such an explanation, Durkheim also pointed out that it was 'impractical in sociology' to discriminate the pathological state under the auspices of the mortality rate. It has already been assumed that no appropriate measure was there to apply in order to determine the moment when a society was born and when it died. Some of the events in social life were declared pathological; at the same time they were considered to be harmful to the society. Although the effect of the occurrence may be deleterious, it could happen that the consequence was compensated and the advantages of it were not perceived.[117] Opinions differed due to the convictions of the person who judged it. For instance, some identified the vestiges of faith which survived amongst the collapse of religious beliefs as socially pathological, while others insisted that the absence of belief was a truly social sickness. Likewise, socialists saw the present economic organization as a social abnormality, whereas orthodox economists viewed the socialist tendencies, above all, as pathological.[118] Durkheim elaborated on the weakness and dilemma in definition given for distinguishing the normal from the pathological. However, he emphasized that one must be cautious about making no arbitrary distinction on the rules prematurely established by all kinds of metempirical biases.

In fact, the pattern survives in the case of educators, lecturers and social workers whose roles are to identify normality and uniformity. The logic of how the adoption of normality is evolved can be better grasped in terms of Michel Foucault's (1926-1984) *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*.

> We are in the society of the teacher-judge, the doctor-judge, the educator-judge, the 'social work'-judge; it is on them that the universal reign

[117] Émile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, p. 90.
[118] Émile Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, p. 91.

> of the normative is based; and each individual, wherever he may find himself, subjects to it his body, his gestures, his behaviour, his aptitudes, his achievements. The carceral network, in its compact or disseminated forms, with its system of insertion, distribution, surveillance, observation, has been the greatest support of normalizing power in modern society.[119]

Bound up with the development of the empirical sciences, Foucault argued that the disciplinary process itself, with its investigatory agenda of ascertaining facts and prescribing procedures, was an indispensable condition for the development of the 'activity of examination' in the human sciences.[120] In light of Foucault's treatment of prison and imprisonment, the crucial aspect of modern disciplinary procedure was facilitated under the arrangement, categorisation, analysis, distribution-administrative control deriving from mastery. Discipline organises an analytical space.[121] Like rules, disciplines contain the work of observation, differentiation, classification, judgment and documentation. Human bodies become the object of studying and knowledge. A gradual tendency to classify and categorise as a way to comprehend and apprehend is also evident amongst theoretical discourses in the nineteenth-century Russia's criminal justice system. The aim 1) to sort and classify; 2) to maintain accurate records; 3) to supervise and control the transport and distribution of convicts were conceived in the action of the Tiumén Forwarding Prison.[122]

On the other hand, in his *History of Madness* (2006 [1961])**,** Foucault observed public actions on mentally ill people and the methods used to define the normal and *abnormal* with reference to the modern pathological signifier, from which people manipulated the difference and contrast between self and others to the foreground. From the historical events presented by Foucault, one becomes aware that the identification of the mentally ill *abnormals* is based, to a larger extent, on the social conditions of an era in which certain concepts and ideas are created to understand a type of people and hence consolidate the position of the normal ones in relation to 'those special kind' of people. Therefore, as stated in Foucault's work, there was a time when 'madness is no longer the familiar

---

[119] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* (New York: Pantheon Books, c1977), p. 304.
[120] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, p. 305.
[121] Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, p. 143, 170, 198-199.
[122] George Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System*, Vol. 1 (New York: The Century Co., 1891 [2012]), pp. 74-102.

foreignness of the world; it is merely a commonplace spectacle for the foreign spectator; no longer a figure of the *cosmos*, but a characteristic of the *aevum*.'[123]

In the history of science and contemporary philosophy, Georges Canguilhem (1904-1995) brought about a significant shift on the studies of life sciences, on the formation of concepts within the historico-epistemological perspective. His focus was on the question of health and illness, of the normal and the pathological. Canguilhem recalled Alfred North Whitehead's (1861-1947) dictum to explain his teleological process. Biological pathology exists, but it contains no reference to physical, chemical or mechanical pathology. Thus, Canguilhem took the expression of Marie François Xavier Bichat (1771-1802) to further clarify this point. In other words, all the movements follow the rule of nature. Pathological mechanics or pathological physics do not actually exist. The collaboration of pathology and physical sciences could lead to a rectification of the concept that the 'natural type must be taken in the sense of normal type.' Hence, the only thing that determines the concept which Canguilhem would quest to achieve is that 'nature is the end point of a teleological process' for the understanding of medication and pathology.[124] The same idea shows through another of Canguilhem's statement: the state of any living thing in a given situation is, in general, always normal.

It could be admitted that no environment is normal, no structure is normal in itself. It is the relationship between the environment and the living entity that determines what is normal in both. Life establishes norms in itself. Hence, the normal is a universal category of life. Perhaps the essence of Canguilhem's point can also be grasped in Henri Bergson's (1859-1941) discourse.

> There is no such thing as disorder; rather, there are two orders, one of which is substituted for the other without our knowledge and to our dismay.[125]

We could apply the rule in a similar claim that there is no such thing as abnormality. It is not a state without norms, but is not governed by the norms which have previously been confirmed and accepted. The seeds planted by Canguilhem again came into full fruition in Goffman's work *Stigma*.

---

[123] Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, transl. by Richard Howard (London: Tavistock, 1965 and 1989 [1961]), p.28.

[124] Subtitle adopted by Georges Canguilhem in "The Normal and the Pathological", *A Vital Rationalist: Selected Writings from Georges Canguilhem*, ed. by Frąncois Delaporte; transl. by Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Zone Books, 1994), p. 344.

[125] Georges Canguilhem, "Normality and Normativity", *A Vital Rationalist: Selected Writings from Georges Canguilhem*, p. 351.

Life, as a process of constant defence and struggle, makes normality in biology become a concept of value, but not of statistics by medicalised diagnosis. This brings about the shift which Canguilhem did for the revaluation of the theoretical domain. That is, pathology is an objective analysis, which distinguishes normal conditions from pathological ones under the model of physio-scientific norms. Medicine and sociology do not exist within these norms; thus the terms 'normal and pathological' may not be recognised in science or statistics, whereas they are sometimes used in politics. In Canguilhem's view, the norm is not a static or peaceful concept, but dynamic and polemic. He repeated,

> The reason for the polemical final purpose and usage of the concept of norm must be sought, as far as we are concerned, in the essence of the normal-abnormal relationship.[126]

The strategy of categorizing social pathology has been elaborated in various forms since Durkheim. What are the values or burden we have inherited or cast off? In Raymond Aron's (1905-1983) analysis, Durkheim is purely a scientist and insists that the value of sociology lies only in its ability and ambition to improve social conditions. To scientifically make a distinction between the normal and the pathological is a vital factor for any defence of social reforms.[127] Durkheim's faith in reforms will be fraught with danger of diluting the specificity of interpretive strategy for health and illness. To make the point clear: the method for the analytical treatment becomes an illusion where the political model for the conflicts of value remains.

Durkheim strove to prove that the punishment for the criminal is neither for the sake of treatment, nor for the protection of society. Any desire from collective feelings to correct, to standardise, to normalise, to rationalise is a ritualised expression of maintaining the stability of the system. Deviation should not be regarded as genetically pathological when the identical appearance is constructed by the social interpretation. The new situation shapes its own demands. The insight of Durkheim's theoretical heritage therefore spawns new tasks for Talcott Parsons in the functional analysis of deviation and social control and for Mary Douglas, Kai Erikson and Howard Becker to find the moral values through the concept of pollution or defilement in the sacred life where the idea of impurity formulates a system of conception.[128]

---

[126] Georges Canguilhem, *The Normal and the Pathological*, pp. 239-240.

[127] Raymond Aron, *Main Currents in Sociological Thought, Vol.2: Durkheim, Pareto, Weber* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, c1999), pp. 11-112.

[128] See individual case study in Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of*

The "Looping Effect" of Stigmatisation

In fact, a lot of categories were ascribed to be socially constructed. There is reason to believe the process of categorisation cannot avoid political intervention. And it is indeed a truth as we can see some selected examples of grouping the people claimed to be 'members of the Russian family' into different 'kinds' of labels in different times.

Classification of the People within the Russian Empire (1776)

Russians and non-Christians [*inovertsy*] who pay the soul tax and provide recruits
Russians and non-Christians who pay taxes but do not provide recruits
Christians other than Russian Orthodox
All kinds of Cossacks and other military settlers
Bashkirs and other wild peoples who practice Islam
Kalmyks and other nomadic idol-worshippers

- *Considered as one of the earliest attempts at a political classification, M.M. Shcherbatov divided the people of the empire into six categories with consideration of their lifestyle, taxation, military service and religious affiliation.*[129]

Soslovie

Noble
Clergy
Townsman
Peasant

- *By the mid-nineteenth century, Russians were identified for the sake of defining their rights and obligations of different social groups towards the*

Pollution and Taboo (London: Routledge & K. Paul, 1966); Kai T. Erikson, *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: Wiley, 1966); and Howard S. Becker, *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: The Free Press, 1963).

[129] The classification of the late eighteen century Russian people was made by a Russian writer and historian - Prince Mikhail Shcherbatov in 1776. Cited from Michael Khodarkovsky, "The Conversion of Non-Christians in Early Modern Russia" in *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist Russia*, ed. by Robert P. Geraci and Michael Khodarkovsky (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 2001), p. 118. Also see the treatise of M.M. Shcherbatov, "Statistika v razsuzhdenii Rossii", in *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* (*ChOIDR*), book 3, pt. 11 (1859), p. 46.

state.[130]

<u>Entries of the Metropolitan Directories</u> (St. Petersburg and Moscow)

Noble

Merchant of the first guild

Honoured citizen

Service rank (such as privy counsellor and retired general)

Profession (for example, engineer and physician)

Persona (for instance, noble and dentist)

- *The intelligentsia and the industrial working class were scarcely acknowledged here.*[131]

Honestly speaking, it is not very effective to classify all the people who seem subjects of the human predicament. As Edwin M. Lemert once suggested, the number would be as high as one wanted to make it.[132] The holy fool, as one of our concerns in the thesis, was not identically categorised by the state institution. But the seeming privilege of not being classified does not free them from being socially constructed. Holy fools are read as legendary figures and praised as a religious phenomenon. However, they are also real people. All that is done for the sake of starting social construction is to raise consciousness.[133] The holy fool, as a special 'kind', must change the ways they experience themselves in the institution, or be led to evolve their behaviour under the condition in which they are so classified.

In a discussion of breaking through the constraint resulted from the rigid social classification, Ian Hacking proposed the idea of 'making up people' and 'looping effect' which he intended to demonstrate as new approaches to scientific classification. The framework of the research that Hacking designed contains five interactive elements which are meant to be the key players of the structural

[130] See Gregory L. Freeze, "The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm and Russian Social History", *American Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (Feb., 1986), pp. 11-36.

[131] See Sheila Fitzpatrick, "Ascribing Class: The Construction of Social Identity in Soviet Russia", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (Dec., 1993), pp. 745-770 and also «Vsia Moskva» - *adresnaia i spravochnaia kniga goroda Moskvy* and «Ves' Peterburg» - *telefonnyi annotirovannyi spravochnik goroda Sankt-Peterburg*, published annually or biannually from 1894 onwards by A.S. Suvorin (1834- 1912).

[132] Edwin M. Lemert, "Some Aspects of a General Theory of Sociopathic Behavior", *Proceedings of the Pacific Sociological Society*, Research Studies, State College of Washington, 16 (1948), pp. 23-24.

[133] Ian Hacking, *The Social Construction of What?*, p. 6.

mechanism. The identified five elements are: classification, people, institutions, knowledge and experts. This theoretical system allows for many other deviations, for example, committing suicide and crime to be taken into a new category of kind-making. This newly created designation of a kind made by scientific classification, which did not exist in earlier times, is the process of making-up people. Once a certain kind of label is established, 'making up people' follows. In the next stage of development, Hacking places greater emphasis on the dynamic interaction between name and things from which is derived the second idea of the 'looping effect.' The concept refers to the condition where those involved in making up people are now the 'target.' The process moves constantly and changes path accordingly with regard to nomenclatures' identified allegations and approaches. The model circulates and changes the original condition of naming the things. In the end, the knowledge of making kind is forced and encouraged to modify synchronically in a persistent looping sequence.

Both approaches are proposed here to examine our experimental target, the holy fool. Any definition imposed on the moving 'targets' will start the mechanism of looping and cause interaction and exchange of the meanings involving the definers. The recipients of the definition will then continue adjusting their position of being observed and labelled. The constant dynamic alteration of definition has given the holy fool an image different from when they were first defined. This is how the knowledge about the holy fool has been constructed and reconstructed for generations along with the changing social environment. What makes the interaction momentous in our discussion of the holy fool in relation to the ethnographic approach to the non-Russian natives in the nineteenth century Russia is that a certain value of the scientific knowledge balances the sense of inequality which emerged from the moment of making the distinction, upon the situation of the encounter. Hacking believes that every creation of a typical kind has its unique historical context, not a single stereotype can be applied to different stories. Under the various supports for the construction of what we 'confirm' as abnormal, the holy fool might possibly become an active agent in the process of changing values and rechanneling social identity along with the new approach. There is surely a long way to go, however, which time is consumingly worthy as well as efforts in making such a change for those being stigmatised.

***

Although these theorists and philosophers we have mentioned so far slightly think in dissimilar ways and discover the evidence in different cases, it appears that they have established a model of communicative relations and sought to capture the necessary requisites for reaching agreement on issue of social life. By viewing some of the social circumstances in which power and rules are subverted or reproduced, the communication between these scholars through theoretical statements functions as a form of social critique which could help in the conceptualisation of social and political problems. Those ideas being discussed inspire the current research to investigate the construction of abnormality/ stigmatisation and the rationale for consensus in these debates.

Overall, the anomaly should be treated as having resulted from the social forces that regulate and rectify its inadequacy, rather than rooted in nature. The fact that any normal type exists with the absence of the variant type leads to extermination or disappearance when the conditions for its existence alter. It is often the case in the aspect of evolution which along with the change of living circumstances, the form of divergence occupies all vacant places in the continuity of life.[134] Truly, any definition without deep insight into the problems can only intensify our prejudices and root us in our errors. The problem would end either with the feeling of despair or with an impulse of involving oneself in a rebellion. Freed from the practical dilemma, one must define the state of health on the principles of specific objectivity. In this respect, an anomaly under normality should be able to evolve into another normal type.

In brief, the above-mentioned rules and concepts are merely an exercise in intelligibility. In certain circumstances, social norms become methods which can be utilised to legitimatise one's decision on giving a definition to others. It was not cumbersome for an official administrator who controlled the power over definition to put 'relevant kinds' of abnormality into one basket. Categorisation of 'different kinds' often made one perceive them in a similar way. For instance, the mental hospital perfectly presents a micro-society where normal and abnormal people are bound to live and interact under systematised conditions. In discussing the model of an asylum, Goffman indicated that it is not the illness of the inmate himself, but the institution (the staff world) which helps to construct a patient's history of rectification treatment.[135] Seeing this plight, the patient's life is governed and

[134] Georges Canguilhem, *The Normal and the Pathological*, transl. by Carolyn R. Fawcett (New York: Zone Books, 1989), p. 263.
[135] Erving Goffman, *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1991 [1961]), pp. 360-366.

regulated according to a disciplinarian system which is designed for the management of a limited number of staff who cope with a large number of involuntary inmates. Analyses of an asylum determine the environment an organism experiences when living in a particular habitat and allow us to understand how those environmental conditions affect its existence.

It is not fair enough to consider the rules for differentiation as essentially linked to the effects of exclusion and rejection. Rather, they bring about the principal function of protection, preservation and reproduction in the present day society. It is this series of ideas, which are simultaneously positive, technical and political in the conception of normalisation, which we would like to apply historically to the domain of the holy fool in the Russian tradition. In Russian, a few words can be used to name the fool: *glupets*, *duren'* (through *durak* and *durachok*), *blazhennyi* and *iurodivyi*. In this thesis, we are going to discuss the *iurodivyi-blazhennyi* type of a fool who lived a life of 'making a deliberate effort to appear mad', but was in fact 'not mentally deranged.' [136] No major characteristics can be attributed to the holy fool, even though the phenomenon of it becomes an instance of repression in the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, it is true that a polemical text demanding normalisation cannot function sufficiently as a condition of its exercise. It is worth employing the conception of mechanisms and effects, which resulted from the introduction of scientific methods of medicine and ethnography; from the contact with non-Russian natives at points of building up the nation state and also from the artistic representation of the contemporary social reflection to explore the question of how the state of the holy fool becomes a unique factor of reading the stigmatised 'others' in the nineteenth century Russia, and vice versa.

[136] Quoted from Ewa M. Thompson, "The Archetype of the Fool in Russian Literature", *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Autumn, 1973), p. 246 (pp. 245-273).

Chapter 2

To Demystify and Pathologise the Holy Fool

Holy fools often acted indifferently to conventional morality and purposely evoked scandal in the public space. In this chapter, a study of the history and a critical review of accounts of the holy fool are presented to show that the name and status of such a figure is never fixed. The transformation in representation and perception of the holy fool in different times tests the theories we have discussed in previous chapter; each type of enacted stigma has a certain instability.

Shift of Status: Holy Fool under Medical Supervision

The holy fool bears a type of stigma in the Russian culture. The inceptive meaning of the holy fool in Cyrillic etymology referred to a man who was born with a mark, signifying that he would devote himself to divine service.[137] As is generally indicated in most discussions, the notion of the holy foolishness emerged and evolved from the religious culture of Byzantium. In the record of the Eastern Orthodox Christianity, the fool for Christ's sake (Russian *iurodivyi* or *iurodstvo vo Christe*, Greek *salos*) is a peculiar type of a canonical saint.[138] However, the semantic signification diversified between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries. The moral and religious purpose associated with the holy Christ, was attributed to the eccentric behaviour of the holy fool. From then onwards, the idea of 'Foolishness for Christ's sake' started to prevail and reached its climax in the sixteenth century. Just when the holy fool and his peers allied themselves to the Old Believer of the Russian Schism in the mid-seventeenth century, the reforming patriarch Nikon (1605-1681) attempted to revise certain vital liturgical texts and practices which were in favour of intensifying future persecution by Peter the Great for building a social institution. At this developmental stage, the holy fool had to disguise himself/herself alongside the change of the Russian urban scene.

[137] Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, pp. 10-11.

[138] Georgii Petrovich Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind Vol. 2, The Middle Ages: the Thirteenth to the Fifteenth Centuries*, edited by John Meyendorff (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), pp. 316-343.

Following a special canon of condemning 'pseudo-*iurodstvo*' issued by the Church Council in 1666-1667, new rules for making distinctions were invented and applied to every sort of holy foolishness. The nature of *iurodstvo* is described as below,

> Those … who repudiated the world and sought to scoff at the world and thus assume a holy fool's image, like Andrew and Symeon and other fools for God's sake, did not live and act the way today's [holy fools] do: for they did not seek the world's glory. Nor did they frequent the households and chambers of noble and distinguished people.[139]

Under the reign of Peter the Great, holy fools were not allowed to 'stand in God's churches'[140], but instead were arrested by the police. Evidence of holy fools in the eighteenth century was collected by the secret agents for the purpose of social security. The fantastic stories about holy foolishness were preserved in undisclosed archives, whilst clinics for the mentally ill began to crop up.

Speaking of the status shift, the holy fool has its own path of transformation. Angela Brintlinger once discussed its pattern in her editorial contribution to the book *Madness and the Mad in Russian Culture* (2007). As indicated in the book, the cultural role of the Russian holy fool had a variety of characteristics. Based on previous research, the holy fool was not just a part of daily culture, but was canonized as a saint in the Russian Orthodox Church as early as the thirteenth century. The holy fool, with no stigma attached, was once openly accepted by Ivan IV (1533-1584), better known as Ivan the Terrible, who occasionally wrote under the pseudonym of Parfenii the holy fool. Alongside the history's vicissitudes, the early tradition of holy foolishness has survived and became visible in both life and literature throughout the modern Russian history. However, treatment and categorisation applied to define the holy fool shifted when the first institutions for the mentally ill, the 'yellow houses' or *zheltye doma*, were erected from 1776 to 1779 (A.D.) by Catherine the Great. The predominance of the concept of religious madness started to decline and subsequently insanity defence became an accepted idea when the victory of reason in state policies took over the confessional strife that had ruled since the medieval times.[141] In Europe, confinement came to

---

[139] S.A. Ivanov, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, p. 342. For details about the Council's views on the holy fools and their relation to the noble people, see *Deianiia Moskovskikh Soborov 1666 i 1667 g.* (Moscow, 1893), fo. 28.

[140] S.A. Ivanov, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, pp. 346-347.

[141] David Lederer, *Madness, Religion and the State in Early Modern Europe: A Bavarian Beacon* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp.197-241.

dominate psycho-medical treatment in approximately the late eighteenth century. During the same time, medical treatment of mental disorders in Russia was similar to that in Europe where the Age of Reason was influential. It was generally thought that mentally ill people needed to be treated with a modern scientific approach. According to the records, in 1762 (A.D.), Tsar Peter III enforced a decree to achieve the purpose that 'mad people are not to be sent to a monastery, but rather to a special house, as is the case in foreign countries.' And just as Peter the Great could not tolerate the idleness — the holy fool being a non-contributing subject to the state — in his desire to build a modern nation-state, Catherine could not accept the antithesis of reason – insanity – as part of the Russian Enlightenment.[142] Without exception, the holy fool whom the government had every reason to consider as a type of case fell into this new system of categorisation which dealt with psychotic symptoms in the 'modern' Russian society. It is as true as Brintlinger has explained that,

> In the past, the mentally imbalanced were seen as part of the tradition of holy fools, or at any rate fell under the purview of the religious authorities. But by the mid-eighteenth century, even before any psychiatric hospitals had been established, the responsibility for the rational treatment of irrational patients was beginning to shift from the church to medicine, from the arena of superstition to that of science.[143]

Sharing the aim of 'making whole', religion and medicine are equally functional in their own spheres of application. However, critical voices within the Church reform began to articulate the need for a complete picture of (Western) civilization in which medicine had relatively occupied a rightful place from the late eighteenth century onwards in Russia. To sketch the evolution of the Russian medical administration, a glance at the course of the state medical control with its institutionalised formation, offers a picture of the available medical facilities and resources where people with mental disorders could resort to in the late modern Russia. The establishment of the Pharmacy Department (*aptekarskii prikaz*) under Tsar Mikhail (1613-1645) in 1620 consolidated the highly centralised system of medical organization in the area of public health.[144] Peter the Great reshuffled the

---

[142] Cited from Martin A. Miller, *Freud and the Bolsheviks: Psychoanalysis in Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union* (London: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 5-6.

[143] Angela Brintlinger and Ilya Vinitsky (ed.), *Madness and the Mad in Russian Culture*, p.8.

[144] The history of the *aptekarskii prikaz* and the pharmaceutical profession in the late nineteenth century Russia is discussed by Mary Schaeffer Conroy, *In Health and in Sickness: Pharmacy*,

Pharmacy Department into the Medical Chancellery (*Meditsinskaia Kantseliariia*) and his successors continued to rationalise and expand the legacy for the purpose of developing medical education and medical science within the empire. The first real hospital (1706) and medical school (1707) were subsequently established by Peter's *ukasy*. In the era of Catherine the Great, who was influenced by the spirit of German Cameralism (*Kameralwissenschaft*), the empress put public health on a broadened and civilian-oriented basis.[145] The Medical Chancellery was then replaced by the Medical Collegium (*Meditsinskaia Kollegiia*) in 1763. At the final stage of establishing the medical institutions, the Medical Council (*Meditsinskii Sovet*) and the Medical Department (*Meditsinskii Departament*) occupied a dominant position of governing all aspects of civilian medical administration in 1803 which lasted until 1917.[146] Despite chronic financial and personnel shortages of maintaining the institution, efforts and persistent developments in the field of medical science demonstrated a centralised system of medical organisation over the people in Russia.

The enforcement of the hygiene policy constituted for the control over the sanitary problems can sometimes extend it effectiveness metaphorically to the management of people with mental disability. From the end of the eighteenth century to the early nineteenth century, several mental asylums were built on the Russian land. Such a political act was interpreted as a fact that the bureaucrats and the church aimed to mobilise the society to change the impression as well as the attitude of ordinary people towards the holy fool from the feeling of embarrassment, ambiguity and curiosity to that of sympathy, contempt and distaste. However, under such a Western-oriented climate of the time, monasteries were still the only institutions with the facilities capable of accepting and dealing with the mentally impaired. The scene and the tradition of the holy fool in the provincial outskirts remained and coexisted with peasants whose daily life had not been changed for hundreds of years. In this context, it is reasonable to believe that any attempt to eradicate the religious roots in folk culture proved to be less effective. The establishment of the medical institutions strengthened the position of inducing social groups to change their views on the abnormal individuals.

Pharmacists, and the Pharmaceutical Industry in Late Imperial, Early Soviet Russia (Boulder, New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), especially chapter one.

[145] George Rosen, "Cameralism and the Concept of Medical Police", *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, Vol. 27(1) (1953), pp. 21-42.

[146] Details of the ministerial reforms in 1803 see Daniel T. Orlovsky, *The Limits of Reform: the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Imperial Russia, 1802-1881* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981).

However, at the same time, the movement towards the separation of the normal from the abnormal people also implied the unique and extraordinary social status of the chosen figure. The result was to make an awkward distinction and demarcation of the holy fool's place in the society.

As it has been noted, boundaries between the ideological domains of religion and science, when both enacted through medical practice, are formed due to reasons that have much to do with politics, nation-building, economics and other regimes of power. Until now, it has been evident that continuous modification as well as the construction of the explanation of the holy fools, is still in progress. Holy fools are audacious personalities in the face of an authoritative biomedical system, castigating Church and critical doubt of the public. As figures of power, holy fools arouse fascination and veneration as well as apprehension and distrust. These feelings are an indispensable element for people in a position to submit to the authority of the holy fool and to place themselves within the systems of knowledge and power that the holy fool represents.[147]

Holy Fool as a Mentally ill Patient

In the nineteenth century, holy fools who inhabited the same villages as Russian peasants seemed to make a tenuous connection with the Church doctrine or with the Christian moral code.[148] The knowledge of medical science departed from the religious conception of how the holy fool was generally understood by the people. Holy fools became controversial representatives and defenders of dogmatic principles whose 'defiant contempt of rationality' could not be accommodated within the developing empire. Holy fools as well as their canonised antecedents were placed outside the mainstream of social life and were no longer identical to the contemporary appearance.

The scenes of conflict proved to be a reality. Ivan I. Koreisha in the Preobrazhenskii Hospital of Moscow was a case in point and a fact that the holy fool was taken to the hospital and treated as a patient. Koreisha, a holy fool who

[147] Regarding the discussion of charismatic power in Russia, see Galina Lindquist, "The Culture of Charisma: Wielding Legitimacy in Contemporary Russian Healing", *Anthropology Today*, Vol. 17, Issue 2 (April, 2001), pp. 3-8.

[148] Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, p. 97. Conclusion was driven by her previous chapters which questioned the ambivalent relationship between holy fools and the church in Russia.

lived in the hospital for almost a half-century, was given respect and regarded as a spiritual adviser. According to N.N. Bazhenov, who was the director of the hospital for a period of time, many merchant families in Moscow would not embark upon any new endeavour without first consulting Koreisha. The press discussed Koreisha, whom N.V. Gogol reportedly travelled to meet in the hospital. Even after he died in the 1860s, the Russian intelligentsia continued to idealise figures similar to Koreisha's.[149]

[Classified by Medical Science]

Medical science has brought about new methods of health care and social control. More specifically, the introduction of the conception and management of the psycho-medical approach for patients with mental problems marked a momentous shift in the Russian cultural history. Apart from the primitive folk medicine, Russian medicine up to the time of N.I. Pirogov (1810-1881) was largely dominated by foreigners who were employed mainly in the services of the Army and Navy. According to W.M. von Richter, a medical historian of early Russia, primitive Russians had no medical aids, but had priests or hermits as true friends of the weak and helpless and further as secular healers.[150] Tsars and nobles, on the other hand, began to increase contacts with medical aids from the Western Europe. In 1357, Alexei, the Metropolitan of the Greek Church who had developed skills in ophthalmology, was summoned to Sarai to treat the eyes of a Tatar princess. It was also recorded that in 1485-1490, the physician Leo, a Venetian Jew, was put to death for failing to cure foot trouble of a Moscovite prince. In 1537, Hans Schlitte, a German living in Moscow, was authorised to assemble no less than 120 specialists of whom four were physicians, two were operating surgeons, eight were surgical dressers, eight were barber-surgeons and four were apothecaries. A similar case happened when Queen Elizabeth of England ordered in 1557 that two English physicians, Standish and Richard Elmes, were brought back with the Russian

[149] See Harriet Murav, *Holy Foolishness: Dostoevsky's Novel and the Poetics of Cultural Critique*, pp. 45-50; Julie V. Brown, "Societal Responses to Mental Disorders in Prerevolutionary Russia", in *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*, pp. 28-29; and also individual project study in N.N. Bazhenov, *Istoriia Moskovskogo dollgauza, nyne Moskovskoi gorodskoi Preobrazhenskoi bol'nitsy dlia dushevnobol'nykh* (Moscow, 1909).

[150] W.M. von Richter, *Geschichte der Medicin in Russland*, 3 Volumes (Moscow, 1813-1817). This is the earliest worthwhile source of the history of Russian medicine which is relatively authentic as to facts, dates and documentation down to the time of Catherine II. The substantial narratives is introduced in English in *The British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review*, XXX (London, 1862), pp. 285-305.

ambassador.[151] Regardless of how inexperienced these foreign technicians might have been, there was a steady, gradual and ever increasing infiltration of English, German, French and other foreign physicians into Russia from this time onwards. Following the pattern of medical developments in Western Europe, Russia caught up with the rest of the world prior to the advent of I.I. Metchnikov (1845-1916) and I.P. Pavlov (1849-1936).

Historical research may not easily seek a perfect place to locate mental disorders because the concepts and terminology applied differed throughout various historical epochs. The ancient history of psychiatry in Russia started firstly with the description and classification of mental illness in documents between the ninth and tenth centuries. As indicated, the mentally ill at that time were treated with herbs and curses by shamans and witch doctors.[152] After the introduction of Christianity into Russia, mental illness was regarded as God's punishment and the sufferers were taken care of by monks in the monasteries instead. As was discovered, there was sometimes an appeal to develop an idealised understanding of the mentally ill as holy — God's creation. Given that the Russian Orthodox Church declared principles of humane treatment and rehabilitative measures, some financial support for the 'holy fools' from the general public were not unusual.[153] During the medieval period, descriptions of mental illness were documented, but not scientifically categorised until the rise of practical concepts of psychiatry.

In order to build a new Russian Empire, several censuses were conducted by the Muscovite officials in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries for the purpose of collecting tax and recruiting labour. It was shown that under the reign of Peter the Great (1689-1725) the urban census identified a variety of terms, although not ideally precise, to designate the type of mental illness, such as 'weak-witted' (*maloumen*), 'simple-minded' (*prostoum*), 'out of mind' (*vne uma*) and 'poor of mind' (*umom plokh*). Although the census-takers regularly made a note of the mentally impaired and provided a specific characterisation of the disability, the meticulous and minute distinction of every kind (of the mentally impaired) was excluded.[154] But, when it came in under Catherine the Great, it was part of her

[151] Very handy sketches about the 'alien physicians in Russia' are those in "The Twelfth International Medical Congress (Moscow, 1897): Medicine. Past and Present, in Russia", *Supplement to the Lancet* (London: August 7, 1897), pp. 343-374.

[152] Refer to T.I. Iudin, *Ocherki istorii Otechestvennoi Psikhiatrii* (Moscow: Medgiz, 1951).

[153] See project study in D.D. *Fedotov, Ocherki po Istorii Otechestvennnoi Psikhiatrii* (Moscow: Meditsina, 1983).

[154] Relative research concerning the topic, where the fool is included in the category of the poor and disabled for analysis, see Daniel H. Kaiser, "The Poor and Disabled in Early Eighteenth-Century Russian Towns", *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Autumn, 1998),

programme of enlightenment to establish social service institutions, hospitals and homes for the people with mental problems. It was at this moment and for the 'idea of enlightenment' (*idei prosveshcheniia*) that the asylum was separated from the hospital, when the foundling asylum (1770), insane asylum (1776) were founded in St. Petersburg. As a result, people whose eccentricity has similar attributes to those of certain others were integrated into asylums which dictated almost every aspect of their lives. They were not allowed to freely wander around, but were taken care of and treated in the name of sanitary and hygienic purposes. Legends attributed to holy fools were ignored when clinics for the mentally ill began to pop up. *Iurodivye* cults were prohibited by medical institutions, which in their own terms had granted them neither position nor title. Holy fools came to be regarded as patients of general 'disorder' in the records of senior officials.[155]

According to Pierre Delooz's analysis of canonised sainthood in the Catholic Church, 'the behaviour of stylites or recluses, which today seems abnormal, could be taken in certain milieux as a sign of sanctity.'[156] However, in the era of science, behaviour which formerly might have been considered saintly, sinful or merely strange could only be examined under the diagnosis of a disease. The scientific study — the interpretation of behaviour in terms of normality — became one of the most important criteria during the nineteenth century. The radical change in the scientific movement was a gradual process towards a reduction of the importance ascribed to heredity and towards an attitude of regarding a mental disorder, of whatever kind or degree, as a representation of the relationship between an individual and the environment. The scientific psychology began to concern itself with mental disease caused by physiological problems. The mental illness, which previously had been considered as a matter of ethics and morality, was examined by 'scientific methods', notably statistics.

The cultural transformation in identification of the holy fool, sketched in the preceding section, can be better distilled in Foucault's introduction to Canguilhem's *The Normal and the Pathological*. Previously, an interest and ambition of studying the human body for the sake of a 'cure' were once enjoyed by science in the field of physiology, which examined the phenomena of life and

---

pp. 125-155.

[155] Cited from S.A. Ivanov, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, p. 351; and further details see A.S. Lavrov, "Iurodstvo i 'reguliarnoe gosudarstvo' (konets XVII-pervaia polovina XVIII v.)", *Trudy Otdela Drevnerusskoi Literatury* 52 (2001).

[156] Pierre Delooz, "Towards A Sociological Study of Canonized Sainthood in the Catholic Church", *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore, and History*, ed. by Stephen Wilson, pp. 189-216.

pathology dedicated to the analysis of disease. An effect of the gradual concern upon value judgment became an ever increasing phenomenon of separating the good from the evil. What happened, in Foucault's words, was that the pure and rigorous 'science of life' was developed by people such as Canguilhem who did not want to reduce the dimension of studying the paradoxical fact in life sciences. Many new insights or myths were brought to light under scientific processes by physical and chemical mechanisms and by the utilization of mathematical models. But life, death, disease, anomaly or deviation were never in themselves scientific problems. These were questions of morals or politics, not of science.[157] Similarly, the preservation, regulation, adaptation and reproduction of life were unlikely in themselves to become problems of medicine, although even the doctor who was the role model in Durkheim's context risked his own life or that of others. For both Canguilhem and Foucault, the questions could not go beyond politics. It is only now that we begin to understand to what extent life sciences are understood for the direct or indirect resolution of tensions between man and his surroundings. The environment, which includes the institution and authority of the personality (*avtoritet lichnosti*) of a doctor giving a treatment and his educative influence in therapy, transformed and regulated the perception of abnormality.

Following the ideas of Canguilhem, it is understood that normality, 'capable of tolerating infractions of the norm, of overcoming contradictions, of dealing with conflicts, of maintaining openness to possible future correction', is no doubt normativity or health.[158] On the contrary, any normality is deprived of normative elements if it is hostile to any variation and incapable of making change in itself and of adapting to new situations. The environment is per se volatile. Health is a living stratum, maintaining itself within forms and norms that allow for variation and deviation when the environmental conditions vary. Sickness is thus like a living form unable to tolerate change. A sick individual is trapped in the struggle with the environment. Recovery is not to return to an initial state, but to establish a new norm. Some psychological theories used self-preservation as an explanation to show how a sick individual avoids catastrophic reactions. However, for Canguilhem, self-preservation is not the most general characteristic of life, but a reduced and diminished one. In other words, 'health is creative – call it normative –

[157] Introduction by Michel Foucault in Georges Canguilhem's *The Normal and the Pathological*, p.17-18.

[158] See Monica Greco, "On the Art of Life: A Vitalist Reading of Medical Humanities", *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 56 (2008), pp. 23-45.

and is capable of confronting risks, of surviving catastrophe and of establishing a new order.'[159]

And yet the condition is less dramatic than it appears when viewed in the light of the conviction that only when a species is able to adapt to ambient conditions, the environment of normality is likely to lead to consequences both desirable and meaningful. We may retain our hope for the world to be constant and stable, but we may resign ourselves to the fact that the environment is never constant. In the human social environment there is evidence of habits, institutions or fashions having been changed or revoked like a streak of lightning. One may be easily tempted to play down similar tropes of the cosmic environment where the system of mechanical, physical and chemical constants is made of invariants, which it is not.

[Psychiatry and Physiology in Practice]

Standing on the threshold of the nineteenth century 'where the irritability of the fibres enjoys physiological and pathological fortunes', Foucault claimed that 'scientific psychiatry' becomes possible.[160] Nineteenth-century medical psychology was strongly oriented by physiology which was far from being romantic and was turned into a mechanistic discipline. In the field of psychiatry, the Russian did not turn its back to the rest of the world. As discovered in the Russian medical journals of the late nineteenth century, Russian doctors were aware of the medical developments in other countries, since they occasionally compared their clinical experiences to that in Europe. It was the case that in the journal *Medical Review* (*Meditsinskoe obozrenie*), edited biweekly from 1874 to 1907 by Dr. Vasily Sprimon, that we would notice the fluid relationship and connection between Russian medicine and foreign medical literature.[161] Moreover, Wilhelm Griesinger (1817-1868), the German pioneer psychiatrist, who published the reflex concept of the mind in the 1840s, was mentioned and referred to by Dr. A.U. Freze (1826-1884), director of the Kazan Hospital for the Insane (*Dom Umalishennykh, sumashedshii dom,* or *zheltyi dom*) and whose article was published in 1883 in the

[159] Georges Canguilhem, "Normality and Normativity" in *A Vital Rationalist: Selected Writings from Georges Canguilhem*, p. 355.
[160] Michel Foucault, *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, transl. by Richard Howard (London: Routledge, 2001, c1961), p. 150.
[161] Angela Brintlinger, "Writing about Madness: Russian Attitudes toward Psyche and Psychiatry, 1887-1907", in *Madness and the Mad in Russian Culture*, pp. 173-191.

Russian journal *Archive of Psychiatry and Neurology* (*Arkhiv psikhiatrii, nevrologii i sudebnoi psikhologii*).[162]

Despite frequent communication with the European scientists, is the Russian story of discovering mental problems different from those of the Western ones of the time? The experience of Russia is rather illuminating in David Joravsky's *Russian Psychology: A Critical History* (1989). I.M. Sechenov (1829-1905), the father of the Russian physiology and an admirer of Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) in philosophy and psychology, founded the Russian branch of the major trend in neurophysiology which became well-known in the West through Charles S. Sherrington's (1857- 1952) classic work on reciprocal functions of excitation and inhibition.[163] The models and classification of mental illnesses incorporated new findings and ideas with growing scientific grounding. Besides German influence on medical education, Russian psychiatry had its own independent national approach. For example, Verchatsky proposed in 1841 a descriptive classification which included mania, mania with excitement, periodic mania with agitation, hypochondria, melancholy, epilepsy with mania, epilepsy with dementia, dementia, and amentia. Following that, in 1843, Diadkovsky stressed five levels of nervous and mental illnesses and grouped disorders by using sensory functions and perception, cognition, volition and motor and energetic functioning.[164]

Unlike writers, the science and profession of psychiatry in Russia established its authority and came to be associated with the mentally private individual who was separated from the public world. As Julie V. Brown noted, psychiatrists of the nineteenth century Russia blamed forces associated with modernisation which exacerbated the impact of poverty, alcohol and superstition on people who were from the bottom of the social structure.[165] The line between 'social defence' and 'the right to be different' became turbid when it involved differences of expression and behaviour. Although the designers of the Russia's earliest modern asylums tried to make certain strategic changes in order to alter the general impression of the asylum, the populace still viewed the 'yellow houses' as a peculiar variety of

[162] A.U. Freze, "Vstuplenie v psikhiatriiu", *Arkhiv psikhiatrii, nevrologii i sudebnoi psikhologii*, No. 1 and 2 (Khar'kov, 1883), p.39. Freze was the first director of the Kazan' Reginal Asylum, one of Russia's earliest 'modern' mental institution in mid-nineteenth century.

[163] David Joravsky, *Russian Psychology: A Critical History* (Oxford; New York: Blackwell, 1989), p. xiii.

[164] Details see Helen Lavretsky, "The Russian Concept of Schizophrenia: A Review of the Literature", *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (1998), p. 539.

[165] Discussion over the issue see A. Dranitsyn, *O pomeshatel'stve, pri pervonachal'nom ego poiavlenii i lechenii ego vne zavedenii* (St. Petersburg, 1867), pp. 72-73.

prisons. And most likely the tsarist authorities incorporated asylums without hesitation into the broader network of 'police' institutions.[166]

Besides a concrete establishment of the government to control and for mentally ill patients to seek shelter from the difficult living conditions, intellectual discussion developed from an analysis of the mental problems was also of great importance. In Russia, there are two main schools of psychiatry for the prevention and treatment of mental disorder. The one in St. Petersburg (or so called the Leningrad school), led by V.M. Bekhterev (1857-1927), has shown interest in the theoretical aspect. Its aim was to identify psychiatry with organic neurology. Analogously, the influence of the work on conditioned reflexes and their inhibitions carried out by I.P. Pavlov (1849-1936) and his school, had shown its importance on the abandonment of psychology and the psychological approach in psychiatry. The proposed replacement of it was reflexology, which aimed to account for human behaviour without reference to consciousness. In the other school in Moscow, S.S. Korsakov (1853-1900), a formerly outstanding figure, claimed to have concentrated on the practical rather than the speculative side of psychiatry. His intention was to maintain very close contact with general medicine and other branches of State medicine. Descriptions of polyneurotic psychosis or alcoholic paraplegia, known as Korsakov's insanity, came to be a psychiatric out-patient clinic, which then became universal in Russian general hospitals.

Following Sechenov, Pavlov and Bekhterev identified themselves at the confused boundary between neurophysiologists and psychologists. As distinguished by Joravsky in his monograph of *Russian Psychology*, Pavlov devoted himself more to laboratory research and 'the language of facts', whereas Bekhterev was recognised as a speculative theorist. Although both of them were perceived as physiologists in Russia, they contested with each other in 'leading science to an explanation of mental function.' [167] In addition, P.I. Iakobii (1842-1913), a psychiatrist who spent several years in Western Europe, used plentiful sources to demonstrate that the institutionalisation of the insane was not built to purchase the humane treatment, but to 'class fear of the abstract madman.'

---

[166] Julie V. Brown, "Social Influences on Psychiatric Theory and Practice in Late Imperial Russia", *Health and Society in Revolutionary Russia*, ed. by Susan Gross Solomon and John F. Hutchinson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), pp. 27-44; "Psychiatrists and the State in Tsarist Russia", *Social Control and the State*, ed. by Stanley Cohen and Andrew Scull (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), pp. 267-286; and "Revolution and Psychosis: The Mixing of Science and Politics in Russian Psychiatric Medicine, 1905-13", *Russian Review*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Jul. 1987), pp. 283-302.

[167] David Joravsky, *Russian Psychology: A Critical History* (Oxford; New York: Blackwell, 1989), p. xiv.

People were frightened by the assumed violence, uncontrolled passions, and incomprehensible motivation that were attributed to mad people.[168] Cooperatively, the ruling classes supported the building of asylums for the sake of removing this threat of abnormal, assumingly uncontrolled and alien from the society. However, they were not aware that the preservation of the oddity was a necessity for any normal existence.

The psychiatric diagnosis and classification of mental disorders has always been a controversial issue throughout history. Classification, involving philosophical and theoretical approaches, represents a perspective of seeing, provides a general overview and reflects our way of considering the nature of mental disorders. In fact, the Russian government's role in the decision and justification of placing and removing a 'dangerous' madman away from the society was secondary. Rather, the utilization of asylums was determined by the peasantry who used the beds in 'yellow houses' in accordance with the survival needs and to maximise the advantage of using them for seasonal purposes. According to the data on total admissions to and discharges from mental institutions between 1880 and 1896, the psychiatric wards were completely overburdened especially during harvest time. The peasants were aware of the problem, yet unwilling to leave utterly incapacitated dependents unsupervised. Psychiatrists noticed the trend in a psychiatric hospital in Ryazan and recorded that,

> It is easy to envision how, on a torrid summer day when all the adult population of a village is in the fields, one of those 'holy fools' or 'idiots' who are to be found in almost every hamlet could very easily destroy the whole village as a result of smoking a cigarette in a hayloft, cooking kasha near a building, or merely playing with matches or a smouldering piece of wood.[169]

[168] See Julie Brown, "The Professionalization of Russian Psychiatry: 1857-1911", Ph.D dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1981, p. 265. See also P.I. Iakobii, *Osnovy administrativnoi psikhiatrii* (Orel: tip. Gub. Pravleniia, 1900); and M.A. Nekrasov, "Vzgliady P.I. Iakobiia na organizatsiiu psikhiatricheskoi nomoshchi v Rossii", *Psikhicheskoe Zdorov'e*, No. 6 (2008), pp. 69-71.

[169] Quote from Julie V. Brown, "Peasant Survival Strategies in Late Imperial Russia: The Social Uses of the Mental Hospital", *Social Problems*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Oct., 1987), pp. 311-329. See also N.N. Bazhenov, "O prizrenii i lechenii dushevno-bol'nykh v zemstvakh i v chastnosti o novoi riazanskoi psikhiatricheskoi bol'nitse", in *Trudy pervago s'ezda otechestvennykh psikhiatrov* (St. Petersburg, 1887), pp. 234-248.

The historical record of the holy fool is complex. During medieval times, the holy fool was regarded as sacred and throughout the early modern period of time, compassion and special consideration for the chosen man of the 'lucky unfortunate' (*Blazhennyi*, the blessed one) were urged upon the public. The mid-eighteenth century movement and intention to hospitalise the 'irrational patients' was a shift in the history of development. The transition was noticeable. Presumably, medical and legal discourses had a tendency to pursue very precise definitions which allowed selected individuals to interpret, control, discipline and even construct the body of another. In the nineteenth century, the holy fool who used to live with a reputation of saintliness and was notorious for occasional indecent behaviour became a subject to a medical evaluation. According to Harriet Murav's argument with conceding to Daniel Hack-Tuke's *Dictionary of Psychological Medicine* (1892), the recognition of distinguishing the holy fool from the madman evolved with a specialised medical determination from then onwards. The holy fool was no longer positioned under the medical conception of a normal condition, nor within a system of traditional charismatic authority. The external world changed, so did the conceptualization of madness upon the holy fool.[170]

***

Given this brief background, the evolutionary paradigm of the holy fool bearing stigmatisation under the modern diagnosis of a type of disorder would be widely recognised in a Foucauldian sense as yet another example of the modern state's project of social control. In the intellectual realm, the construction of being stigmatised attracted considerable interest from social scientists. From a sociological perspective, the discussion reveals its roots. During the course of evolution, the holy fool's eccentric behaviour became subject to pathological evaluation. All information that surrounded the distinction of the holy fool was given a specialised medical determination, which more or less turned out to ultimately have compared it with a certain notion of decorum.

The Russian scientific term for mental illness is *dushevnaia bolezn'*, illness of the soul or psyche. Debates over the issue crossed the boundary which was marked by various scientific disciplines. The enigmatic *russkaia dusha*, Russian

[170] Harriet Murav, *Holy Foolishness: Dostoevsky's Novel and the Poetics of Cultural Critique* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1992), pp. 44-45.

soul, shifts from the church to the medical profession, from literary texts to clinical notes. Russian physiologists and psychiatrists demonstrated the conflict between body and soul (brain and heart) which also mirrored the relationship between science and the arts (literature, religion, and art). In later imperial Russia, the representation of the holy fool gradually reflected concerns of national resonance, self-identification and a paradoxical relationship with social problems when the new elements of the mass media and publicity, of the scientific knowledge and of understanding different 'others' entered the process of saint-making.[171]

This brief history of developing views on the holy fool suggests a spectrum of different interpretations which put together, seems to form a coherent whole. That is, people of similar symptoms still indicated a moment of divine revelation. Traces of the older stereotype of the 'sacred' anomaly could be perceived and continued reflecting in doctors' diagnoses of their patients under psychological or pathological terms of descriptions. In light of this case, the holy fool is suitable in **Canguilhem's** biological explanation of a normative kind who is 'capable of confronting risks, of surviving catastrophe and of establishing a new order.' With the arrival of capitalism, the traditional customs of peasant life manifested themselves through a complex interaction of presumably 'backward' behaviour with the 'cultivated' practices of an urban lifestyle. It was in the subculture of peasants where the urban and rural elements were thoroughly intermixed. New cultural symbols were imbued with traditional meanings, whereas traditional forms received new contents. My argument with the above theoretical recommendations is provided to ask the question whether or not the aberrant holy fool was not so much a negative type and played an important role in that social condition. In the following chapters, we will provide an alternative approach and also an indirect reference to the knowledge of the non-Russian natives for an understanding of the holy fool in the nineteenth century Russia. Through our analysis, both social organisms (the holy fool and the non-Russian native) in that given condition can function as a biological innovation contributing to our knowledge of warranting classification.

[171] Nadieszda Kizenko, *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, c2000), pp. 3 and 281-285.

Chapter 3

Conceptualising the Holy Fool upon Encounters with Different Others

Against the background of the Orthodox canons or of the Western civilisation, the behaviour of the holy fool is taken as either exceptional or abnormal. According to Goffman, stigma appears and is only relative to a norm. Hence, it is suggested in this chapter that the abnormality of the holy fool is hardly a matter of disturbance if we treat it as a natural figure and place it amongst the people of various religions and ethnicities in Siberian Russia. Following on from the theories that have emerged in the discussion on the challenge of making a distinction between the normal and the pathological in the social context, I continue showing the condition in which the Russian holy fool as a model provides the case to either perpetuate or subvert the rules.

In this chapter, the emphasis will be placed on the formation of one's experience of a cross-cultural environment which involves literary representations of shamanism. Official discourse implicitly played an important part in setting both scenes as described afterwards, but it functioned as a backdrop for the main action, which took place during the Siberian exile or on royal stage. In tackling the image of and approach to shamanism for a discussion of an encounter with different others, the following cases possibly demonstrate the processes of adaptation and manipulation that were employed in a protracted struggle for presence and influence of every seemingly abnormal individual. While a number of figures bearing stigma of unfading mystery continued to captivate audience and generate diverse and animated responses, the shaman had been rendered prominent on an expedition to Siberia.

The shaman stood out as a figure whose manner and performance adhered to either a personal need for healing or to demands of the imperial policy on non-Russian natives. In my subsequent analysis, the shaman is re-evaluated and regarded as a distinctive individual in a discussion of a paradoxical ideology rather than an inhibited practitioner of a primitive religion. The presence of a shaman in the current context is by no means a typical religious cult but functions as an

exemplar of indicating a dilemma about categorisation that is common upon first encounter with others. Religion provided a means for the Siberian natives to come to terms with their sufferings. Physical pain and mental discomfort had to be cured by the pagan priests, combining the practice of medicine and magic. The perplexity and fear of death and the unknown could only be dispelled by carrying out a ceremony that put men's faith in natural spirits. Hence, for us to associate shamanism with preliminary discussion on meeting with those non-conventional Siberian 'others' of the imperial Russia was a useful strategy through which the living style of a religious person or group could be explained and comprehended.

Shamanism is one of the religious forms which provoke acrimonious debate on practices of divination or deceptiveness. For instance, it was in her field research and ethnographic study on old court records, N.A. Nikitina argued that Russian sorcerers were shamans in the era of paganism. Under the pressure of Christianity in the seventeenth century, they became in service to the dark forces and achieved their trance states by drinking alcohol.[172] It also seems evident in Dianne E. Farrell's discussion of woodcuts (*lubki*) of Baba Iaga folktales from the end of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century that the creature Baba Iaga was fighting against was either a shaman of the Finno-Ugric people of northern Russia or a Russian sorcerer who was trained in his calling by a shaman.[173] Given the clues provided in the *lubki* of Baba Iaga, the use of drum and rattles or masks is important in shamanism, rather than in the practice of east Slavic sorcerers. The divergences of critical opinion were a commonplace of the process of selection between disciplines applied to define and categorise. The polemics surrounding this ancient religion would frequently expand to take in much broader issue of its obscured tradition and psychological experience which were also questions that made the holy fool in the Orthodox Church attractive.

[172] One can see in Linda J. Ivanits, *Russian Folk Belief* (Armonk, N.Y.; London: M.E. Sharpe, c1989), p. 86, footnote 9, citing N.A. Nikitina, "K voprosu o russkikh koldunakh", *Sbornik Muzeia antropologii i etnografii*, Vol. 7 (Lenigrad: AN SSSR, 1928), pp. 299-325.

[173] Dianne E. Farrell, "Shamanic Elements in Some Early Eighteenth Century Russian Woodcuts", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 725-744.

By Narrating the Experience of a Different Religious Practice

As we have reviewed in the previous chapter, there is a conservative position on the idea that the features of the holy fool, as Thompson has proposed, is much closer to that of the Shaman rather than the Orthodox saints. In addition to the primitive Slavonic pagan customs, the introduction of shamanic ritual into Russia by means of commodity, trade or intermarriage with neighbouring Turks and Finns promoted an alien fool culture to social and religious concerns. Thompson examined the typical appearance of the holy fool, such as the style of dress, accessories (especially the preference for iron chains), nakedness or coverings with animal fur and blood and finally the conduct of transient ecstasy to support her theory. Her theory indicated that the holy fool was the key factor in smoothing the conflict that may have been created between Shamanism and Christian religions and thus demonstrated a peculiar type of religious devotion amongst the Russian people.[174] In summary, Thompson's monograph investigated the process of shaping and constructing the culture of holy foolishness by comparing the contrasts and resemblances amongst different religions, by indicating the establishment of asylums and the emergence of a classification system for such distinctive fools in Russia. Thompson ends with an intention to show that without standard measures for defining a mental illness, psychiatric symptoms are identified with political interference.

The comparison that Thompson adopted for her analysis is still not clear to us whether or not the holy fool performed like a shaman in trance states. It is also not certain whether the holy foolishness is a model of evolution (from the Byzantine culture) or an outcome of emulating another religious cult (of Shamanism). But regardless of how it has been called, entitled, labelled and compared to, the holy fool is valid for a project of various debates that were expressed as a struggle for the definition of many parameters, between which strangeness was theorised for social control and comprehension of differences. As already mentioned in previous chapters, scholars from different research perspective proposed that the shaman of Siberian primitive religion, the holy fool in Russian Orthodox culture and the child with modern autism are three types of *abnormal*, resembling each other in character and social behaviours. They, as individuals or groups, stand in front of us like a series of tableaux. Based on former research of each 'abnormal' topic, an acceptable explanation of their mutual connection perhaps lies in the different times and places where diverse portrayals originated. I will not continue

[174] Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, p. 123.

the list of such comparison, but extend the scope of the problem for a conceptual discussion in this and the subsequent chapter.

Boundaries define territory where people build up their prejudice against the meaning and the approach of non-traditional or uncommon origins. Everything that is included is the product of historical events, social forces and ideology. The following discussion demonstrates that the boundaries, which often have a vicious distinction and vulnerable separation from one another, may be obliterated by individuals and societies to ward off contradictions and conflicts from both within and without. Both cases present a scene where figures of different cultural backgrounds and social groups are juxtaposed in one setting of either a real life or an artistic production. There may be a feeling of shock, unease or amusement upon an encounter with strange figures or events. But a certain concession of recording, interpreting, producing and understanding shamanism resulted from the social condition and political compromise generates space for reconsideration of what difference really means. As an experience of cultural encounter evoking visual impact on the change in one's perception of abnormality, the reason why we give special emphasis to shamanism is not simply because Thompson has argued the concrete influence of shamanism on the tradition of holy foolishness. The hypothesis of associating the holy fool with the shaman is insufficient, yet such an idea inspires us to make a reflexive turn for better understanding the non-conventional others. Although the Siberian setting brings the holy fool apart from the depictions in the Orthodox tradition, our comparative analysis is elevated to a broader discussion on symbiosis reflecting the mechanism of interaction between different cultural identities in one nation state. The shaman, as an exotic figure, suitably functions as a thread for further research on questions of distinction and definition.

[Avvakum and Shaman]

No survey, however brief, of the holy fool would be complete without mention of the archpriest Avvakum (1620?-1682) who was taken to be one of the most famous instances when talking about the holy fool in the political sphere.[175] Avvakum, a prominent leader who performed the resistance to the reforms introduced by Patriarch Nikon in the seventeenth century, was regarded as the first Old Believer. In the section of a discussion of the "Holy Foolishness as

[175] S.A. Ivanov, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, p. 335.

Social Protest" (*Iurodstvo kak obshchestvennyi protest*), Panchenko also mentioned the holy-foolish behaviour of Avvakum during his interrogation by the church authorities.[176] In the second half of the seventeenth century, the Old Believers and their circle had shown an interest in exploiting the image of the holy fool for their own purpose. Avvakum's autobiographical vita, accomplished by himself between 1669 and 1672 and which, according to the textological studies of N.S. Demkova[177] was edited in three separate volumes in 1672, 1673 and 1675, detailed and revealed his everyday comportment and reports of miraculous cures. We will pay special attention to an occasion when Avvakum and his family were in the Siberian exile by Nikon's order between 1653 and 1664.

Avvakum was in Tobol'sk, the administrative centre for Siberia and then taken on to the east to reach the Lena river. On this long journey they stopped over in Yeniseisk, visited the western regions of Dauria, crossed the Samanskii Rapids near Angara River and then settled with Afanasii Pashkov's troop (d. 1664), a military commander in the service of the tsar for collecting tribute and discovering arable lands, valuable metals and new routes into China. During his plight in this remote area, Avvakum tells us that three or four lunatics (*beshannye*) were brought into his place. Once by chance, he encountered two widows, Maria and Sofia, who were house servants of Pashkov. Avvakum saw them as if they possessed 'an unclean spirit.' It was the devil who made the women 'beat themselves and scream.'[178] To our surprise, it was not uncommon that the peasant wizard and the sorcerer were ever mentioned in the conversation between Avvakum and whoever he came across during his exile.

Another shamanic ceremony was witnessed and described by Avvakum. For the ambition of expanding the territory or consolidating Russian control, Pashkov ordered his son Eremei, to enter into the Mongolian land of the living. The expeditionary force included Cossacks and several natives of Siberia. Before they departed, Pashkov 'made a native Shamanise (*shamanit'*)' in order to tell the fortune for the mission. The native, assigned to perform shamanic ritual, was regarded as a peasant sorcerer in Avvakum's eyes. To his astonishment, Avvakum wrote,

---

[176] A.M. Panchenko, "Iurodstvo kak obshchestvennyi protest" in *Smekh v drevnei Rusi*, ed. by D.S. Likhachev, A.M. Panchenko and N.V. Ponyrko (Leningrad: NAUKA, 1984), pp. 126-128.

[177] Kenneth N. Brostrom, *Archpriest Avvakum: The Life Written by Himself* (Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, University of Michigan, c1979), pp. 30-31.

[178] Kenneth N. Brostrom, *Archpriest Avvakum: The Life Written by Himself*, p. 65.

> And that evening this peasant sorcerer brought out a live ram close to my shelter and started conjuring over it, twisting it this way and that, and he twisted its head off and tossed it aside. Then he started galloping around and dancing and summoning devils, and after considerable shouting he slammed himself against the ground and foam ran out of his mouth. The devils were crushing him, but he asked them, "Will the expedition be successful?" And the devils said, "You will come back with a great victory and with much wealth." The leaders were happy and rejoicing. All the people were saying, "We'll come back rich!"[179]

Avvakum's remark on the shaman, likely the first such description on record, was accurately substantiated by the later descriptions of the Siberian shamans who exercised their power as priests, healers and prophets.

Avvakum's testimony is momentous because it demonstrates and reinforces some points. Noticeably, the shamanised native is not equivalent to those women who were *klikushi* – the women suffered from 'a nervous disorder' which caused hysterical seizures, screams and convulsions. The madwomen could be cured and 'become whole in body and mind', whereas the shaman was beyond treatment. However, acts of both events were regarded as devilish. Paradoxically, all these descriptions were made by Avvakum, who either regarded himself as a saint when writing his own *vita*; or as a political holy fool while relating to Old Believers during the church schism. Nonetheless, it is evident that Avvakum met with shaman and knew about it in the same way as we understand it today. It is obvious in Avvakum's *Life* that unusual cases of possession could be healed by extraordinary exorcism or intercession. Naming Avvakum a holy fool and the native shaman is only a mechanical reaction whenever the dramatised scene recurs. Any potential imitation existing between them is not my concern. What makes it significant is the space and social condition which mark their coexistence in front of us. It is a momentous occasion when the holy fool and shaman bear a close parallel to each other without engaging into conflicts. One can sense a great tension, yet an ordinary encounter which happens particularly in Russia (Siberia) recurrently.

[179] Quote from Kenneth N. Brostrom, *Archpriest Avvakum: The Life Written by Himself*, p. 71.

[The Empress and her Comedy of the 'Shaman']

A century later, the shamanic ritual was performed on stage before nobles and startled the audience with its motions and sounds. It was an era when mystical beliefs were distrusted by the sovereign. Such a paradoxical coexistence was an issue for the 'enlightened' monarch. It had to struggle to defend the empire from charges of being uncivilised and backward. As research has discovered, criticism and opposition were depicted in a play, *The Siberian Shaman*, written by Catherine the Great and premiered in 1786 at the Hermitage Theatre.

According to O'Malley, Catherine dramatically and implicitly questioned the forms of Freemasonry, introduced to Russia during the 1730s, along with references to alchemy, theosophy and shamanism in the play *The Siberian Shaman*. In the comedy, Catherine, who played a dual role as the playwright and the Empress, regarded shamanism not only as a symbol of a fool and an impostor, but also as a 'dangerously infectious form of insubordination' of her reign.[180] In principle, the unstable nature of the mystical belief system espoused by the Masons is considered to be anathematic to the Enlightenment sensibilities of the Empress.[181] However, in some of the dramatic scenes the person in the trance has the appearance of one undergoing a mystical experience. On this level, Amban-Lai's (name of the shaman) label of being an exotic import from Siberia is less an ethnographic definition than a social allegory which implies the charlatan or deceiver that can be easily found in St. Petersburg. Despite her obvious distaste for the shamanic character, Catherine depicts the shaman not as a fool, but as worldly erudite.

In Catherine's comedy, it is the Bobins' who brought the shaman with them from Siberia to St. Petersburg. Following an explanation of Amban-Lai's unusual life experience, different characters in the comedy expressed their own views on this Siberian shaman.[182] Sanov says 'many wondrous things are being said about him! … and so he's a good healer (*on lechit' gorazd*)!' Kromov also believes that

[180] Lurana D. O'Malley, "The Monarch and the Mystic: Catherine the Great's Strategy of Audience Enlightenment in *the Siberian Shaman*", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Summer, 1997), pp. 224-242.

[181] Stephen L. Baehr, "The Masonic Component in the Eighteenth-Century Russian Literature", *Russian Literature in the Age of Catherine the Great: A Collection of Essay*s, ed. by A.G. Cross (Oxford: Willem A. Meeuws, 1976), p. 124.

[182] The following page references in square brackets are translated from the original Russian text via the website http://az.lib.ru/e/ekaterina_w/text_0240oldorfo.shtml (last accessed 12 January 2015) and also with reference to O'Malley's translation of *The Siberian Shaman*. Full text with her introduction of two Catherine's plays, see Catherine II, *Two Comedies by Catherine the Great, Empress of Russia: Oh, These Times and The Siberian Shaman*, ed. by Lurana Donnels O'Malley (Amsterdam: Harwood Academic, 1998).

‘some describe him as a wise man (*iako mudrets*).’ [Act I, Scene 4] On the other hand, people like Mavra would say ‘He feigns a great deal … a great deal … (*mnogo pritvoriaetcia*).’ Prokofii continues to state that ‘an illness comes over him … In fact, we would say … it’s madness (*sumasshestvie*).’ Nevertheless, Bragin has confidence in saying ‘but I’ve heard just the opposite — that he is extraordinarily wise (*budto umen neobychaino*).’ [Act I, Scene 12]

In the second act of *The Siberian Shaman*, the scene starts with the shaman performing his stage action — atypically without dialogue,

> The stage presents the Shaman’s chambers in the Bobin house. Lai, dressed in a short caftan or in a dressing gown, is sewing boots; having sewed several, he puts on Shamanic clothes and sits motionless on a chair with a rapt visage; before him or near him stands a table with an open book; several minutes have been past… [Act II, Scene 2]

The scene ends neither with any successive actions of the shaman, nor further dialogue. This abrupt manner leads to the astonishment of Bobin’s visiting friends by saying ‘What a crazy man (*Sumasshedshii chelovek*)!’ (Kromov); ‘He almost knocked us down (*Vsekh sshib bylo s nog*).’ (Sidor Drobin); ‘In many ways, he acts just like village man in hysterics (*na derevenskikh klikush*).’ (Judged by Bragin); and ‘I am amazed! I don’t know what to think.’ (Sanov). [Act II, Scene 3] To our surprise, many depicted elements of the trance state are accurate to actual shamanic practice,

> Lai enters gravely with a rapt visage, holding a shamanic kettledrum (*litavru shamanskuiu*) in his hands. He strikes in intermittently at first, then quickens his steps and the blows and runs around Sidor Drobin, singing uu uu uu uu, producing a sound like the howling of a storm. […] Lai continues his running around them all, shaking and frightening them, hopping and singing o o o o o o o, i i i i i i i i, eh eh eh eh eh eh eh eh, a a a a a a a a. Then he runs straight up to the chair, where he falls as if unconscious (*budto bez pamiati*). [Act II, Scene 4]

Catherine’s depiction of the shaman Amban-Lai indirectly shows her familiarity with ethnographic or anthropological details about real shamanic rituals and practices. In the age of Encyclopaedists, an era in which all knowledge was being catalogued, printed and disseminated, the ‘*Schamans*’ were briefly, but succinctly explained under the Enlightenment perspective,

> It's the name that the inhabitants of Siberia give to impostors, who serve the functions of priests, jugglers, sorcerers, and physicians. These shamans claim to have credence over the devil, whom they consult to know the future, to cure the illness, and to play tricks which appear to be supernatural to an ignorant and superstitious people; for this they use tambourines which they hit with force, while dancing and turning with a surprising rapidity; when they have made themselves insane from the strength of the contortions and from fatigue, they claim that the devil manifests himself to them when he is in the mood. Sometimes the ceremony finishes by feigning to pierce themselves with a knife, which intensifies the astonishment and the respect of the foolish spectators. These contortions are ordinarily preceded by the sacrifice of a dog or of a horse, which they eat while drinking a good many brandies and the comedy finishes by giving money to the shaman, who prides himself on his disinterestedness no more than other impostors of the same sort.[183]

In the encyclopaedia which was full of trusted points of reference, shamanism presents a connotation that abnormality must be included for the sake of providing information about different subjects and defining what normality is. In any case, it is evident that the shamanic dance continued to perform its irrationality against the background of the Russian 'progressive setting' on stage and in reality.

The above-mentioned stories and stage play are examples which help to understand the value of a mixed-cultural society in the experience of encounter, through the process of comprehension and the approach to representing such an occasion with or without political purposes. By discovering a century-long representation of shamanism in different manuscripts can we see the leap of describing it from a narrative in religious context to a reapplication for political purposes. The process of transformation of knowledge on shamanism provides us with significant sense to the question of holy foolishness. The task before us is not to define the role of the holy fool in the pagan cult of shamanism amongst Siberian natives, neither to relate the shaman to the holy fool. Within this bewildering variety of paranormal acts, a parallel between the shaman and the holy fool can only be singled out as directly relevant to understanding their behaviour of antinomy — pathologised miracle healers. The holy fool's abnormality was treated by some physicians as if it were an 'ordinary mental illness.' Applying the same diagnosis to the shaman's ecstatic trances, S.M.

[183] Denis Diderot and Jean Lerond d'Alembert, eds. *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire Raisonné des Sciences, des Arts et des Métiers*, 35 volumes (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1966 [Paris, 1751-1780]), Vol. 14, p. 759.

Shirokogorov (1887-1939) the Russian anthropologist, would also state that in so far as the beginning of shamanic practice is concerned, the shamans are subject to an 'intentional psychomental condition' which, when observed in the European complex, cannot be regarded as absolutely normal.[184] However, both holy fool and shaman are not mentally ill according to the perception of their peoples, or under a different social condition. The above mentioned studies and cases underscore that the phenomenon of holy foolishness or shamanism never occurred in isolation, but was always embedded in wider systems of thought and practice. Looking for a counterpart of the figure or phenomenon in other cultures can be risky in an atmosphere when the claim for uniqueness is superior to the idea of generality. Nevertheless, a linkage between any two forms of individuals in whatever the context is shows only an approach of better understanding oneself through each other.

By Making a Strange Encounter an Extension to Knowledge

Contact is the first step in making the understanding possible. When the idea of colonization came to be a fact in the Russian history of the 1800s, the force for the positive transformation and progress was gathered to begin the forward motion. Mobility undoubtedly played an important role in Russian peasant social life. To state concisely, peasants often travelled to nearby villages to visit neighbours or relatives, to attend church ceremonies, or to buy and trade at *volost'* fairs. Furthermore, they occasionally departed for seasonal work (*otkhod*), or went on religious pilgrimages which might cover hundreds or thousands of versts. Various purposes for a 'movement' (*dvizheniia*) during which the peasants had contacts with itinerant traders, troops on manoeuvre, *stranniki*, gypsies and other 'wanderers', undoubtedly facilitated the spread of information and contributed to what peasants knew and thought about the world beyond their own village.[185]

---

[184] Details see S.M. Shirokogoroff, *Psychomental Complex of the Tungus* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1935), pp. 174, 304-305.

[185] Cited from Willard Sunderland, "An Empire of Peasants: Empire-Building, interethnic Interaction, and Ethnic Stereotyping in the Rural World of the Russian Empire, 1800-1850s", in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, p. 176 (pp. 174-198). Also see M.M. Gromyko, "Kul'tura russkogo krest'ianstva xviii-xix kak predmet istoricheskogo issledovaniia", *Istoriia SSSR*, No. 3 (1987), pp. 41 and 45-51; M. M. Gromyko, "Traditional Norms of Behavior and Forms of Interaction of Nineteenth-century Russian Peasants", *Anthropology & Archeology of Eurasia*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 1991), pp. 72-82.

Particularly in the state of movement, encounters with *stranniki* were probably more frequent than with holy fools for the Russian peasants. A commonly sensed familiarity towards *strannik* or *strannichestvo* was often indicated by a preliminary impression of a stranger or a foreigner, which connects to the meaning of the Old Church Slavonic word *strannyi*. In biblio-legal terms, the state of wandering (*stranstvovanie*) was gradually distinguished as a goal in its own right. A rich nuance of meaning can be ascribed to *strannik* and *strannichestvo* which are translated as pilgrim and pilgrimage within the concept of the Roman Catholic Church. Unlike the conventional pilgrimage termed *palomnichestvo* in Russian, the subject of *strannichestvo* is more often described as an outsider and foreigner. In this sense, the implicit idea in the language describing these eschatological types of piety and devotion was and is the notion of the 'other.' Definitions of the word *strannik* proved to be certain types of terminology whose vernacular helps us to understand values and social attitudes of the past. Pål Kolstø, in an article on Tolstoy and his relation to the *Strannik* tradition in the Russian culture, listed a more widespread adoption of the Russian *strannik* as a symbolic way of thinking and acting. In reviewing what it was to be a *strannichestvo*, it has been suggested that Grigorii Trubetskoi provided a much more comprehensive exclusion of the *strannik* than the earlier one based on a particular schema (such as a deviant or oddity in society). He said,

> "*Strannichestvo*" — this is a form of folk-religiosity especially characteristic of the Russians. In religion, the Russian feels more of a *strannik* than a settled dweller on this earth. He cares little for the externalities that earthly realities have to offer. For him, this world is one of evil and tribulation. He searches for God's Truth (*Pravda*), through prayer, asceticism, and renunciation.[186]

Nevertheless, Nikolai Berdiaev also aroused particular interest from 'spiritual *stranniki*' who embody the characteristic of the unique phenomenon of *strannichestvo* in Russia.[187] These may offer a better approach forward than concern directed at stigmatised labelling.

The ethnographer S. Maksimov as well recognised a considerable variety amongst Russian *stranniki* by categorising them according to their willingness or

---

[186] Quoted from Pål Kolstø, "'For Here We Do Not Have An Enduring City': Tolstoy and The *Strannik* Tradition in Russian Culture", *The Russian Review*, Vol. 69, Issue 1 (January 2010), p. 122 (pp. 119-134). Also see Grigorii Trubetskoi, *Krasnaia Rossiia i sviataia Rus'* (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1931), p. 20.

[187] Nikolai Berdiaev, *Russkaia ideia: osnovnye problemy russkoi mysli XIX veka i nachala XX veka* (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1971 [1946]), p. 199.

unwillingness to wander around.[188] Judging from Maksimov's estimation of the pilgrimages travelling to the Monastery of the Caves in Kiev in the 1860s, *strannichestvo* seemed to be a mass movement in the nineteenth century Russia. Therefore, the situation of wandering was not so much a matter of public concern for a certain period of time. Only when the *stranniki* were not in the position for long enough to be within the vision of the state and Church authorities, was their disordered behaviour thus concerned. Just as the German church historian Hans-Dieter Döpmann has indicated that '*stranniki* were seen as an untidy, undesirable and disturbing element who, with their restless behaviour and freedom from worldly cares and responsibilities, called into question the existing structures of society.'[189]

Accepting strange behaviours as a part of social characters in terms of religious experience, Russian peasants are experienced at adjusting themselves whenever the encounter happened. In the early Muscovite period, it was evident from the Russian chronicle as well as from other foreign scribes that with the advent of Christianity an image of the non-Christian 'other' was constructed along with the expanding frontier.[190] In the north-western sector of the Mongol Empire, the Khans of the Golden Horde (1219-1502, also known as the *Ulus of Jochi* or the *Kipchak Khanate*) ambitiously spread out their forces in sequence and conquered Rus' and Eastern Europe the military fortress of the empire, the capital Sarai (Astrakhan in Russia today) by the Volga river. Between the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Prince or Grand Duke of Rus', who arrived in Sarai to express political allegiance or a request for commercial trades, was seemingly able to have contacts with the envoy of the Roman Pope or Egyptian and Persian merchants.[191] Yet another historical event recorded in the *Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles* (*Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei*), was when Prince Michael of Chernigov (1185-1246) travelled to the Golden Horde of Batu Khan (ca.1205-1255) to receive the patent (*yarlik*), which was an official confirmation of his right to rule his domain.[192] He was unwilling to follow the Mongolian custom

[188] Sergei Maksimov, *Brodiachaia Rus' Khrista radi* (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, bol'shaia pod''iacheskaia, d. No. 39, 1877), pp. 271-285.
[189] Hans-Dieter Döpmann, *Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Berlin: Union, 1981), p. 167.
[190] Michael Khodarkovsky, "'Ignoble Savages and Unfaithful Subjects': Constructing Non-Christian Identities in Early Modern Russia", *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, ed. by Brower, Daniel R. and Lazzerini, Edward J. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), pp. 9-26.
[191] David MacKenzie and Michael W. Curran, *A History of Russia, the Soviet Union, and Beyond* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., 6th edition, 2001), pp. 77-93 and 122-134.
[192] Janet Martin, *Medieval Russia 980-1584* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp.

ordered by the Khan, that one has to pass through a row of fires and stone idols for the ritual of purification. In the end, he suffered martyrdom with bitter joy.[193]

Considering the early relationship between ancient Rus' and Far Eastern Asia, a Soviet scholar M.I. Sladkovsky mentioned in his book, *The Russian history of the commercial and economical relationship with China (until 1917)* (1974), that the first occasion for the Russians and the Chinese to meet each other was possibly at the time during the Mongolian governance. According to his explanation and with reference to the official records of Yuan dynasty (1271-1368), the Mongols delivered prisoners of war to Beijing, China as frontier guards for the capital. In addition, the royal and official visitors from Rus' to the great camp of the Khan could have learned the hearsay about China and managed to have had contacts with the Chinese who served under the Mongolian Empire. Another example was the stance of the Prince of Novgorod, Alexander Nevsky's (1220-1263) relationship with the Mongols. Alexander visited the capital of the Mongolian Empire, the Karakorum, in 1247 (A.D.) to solicit for political acknowledgement. In 1263 (A.D.) he departed for the Golden Horde for the second time to request for Russia's exemption from being recruited to fight beside the Mongolian army in its wars with other people. Based on Sladkovsky's argument, we have a reasonably accurate idea of how the goods of Chinese silk and brocade made their way into Kievan Rus' through merchants from Central Asia.[194] These oriental products became popular throughout Russian cities in the thirteenth and fourteenth century. Although the tangent contact with these Chinese commodities was irregular for the Russian people, it could be suggested that ancient Rus' had an indefinite understanding of the Chinese people, geography and culture through these commercial acts.[195] Charles J. Halperin, a specialist in early and medieval Russian history, also suggested to readers to look beyond the fact that many Russians were presumably familiar with the Tatar language and the geographic overview of the Golden Horde's lands.[196] The Tatars, an ethnicity of the Russian Empire, as an abstraction

147-151.

[193] Also see Michael Cherniavsky, "Khan or Basileus: An Aspect of Russian Mediaeval Political Theory", *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1959), pp. 465-466.

[194] See individual project study in Luce Boulnois, *Silk Road: Monks, Warriors & Merchants*, transl. by Helen Loveday (Hong Kong: Odyssey; New York: Norton, c2004).

[195] Discussed in M. I. Sladkovsky, *The Russian History of the commercial and economical relationship with China (until 1917)*, transl. by Su Feng-Lin 宿丰林, (Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2008). The book of its Russian version is M. I. Sladkovsky, *Istoriia torgovo-ekonomicheskikh otnoshenii narodov Rossii s Kitaem (do 1917 g.)* (Moscow: Nauka, Institut Dal'nego Vostoka AN SSSR, 1974).

[196] Charles J. Halperin, "Know Thy Enemy: Medieval Russian Familiarity with the Mongols of the Golden Horde", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Vol. 30 (1982), pp. 161-175.

were loathed on principle, but to the Russian elite their Tatar counterparts were far from being nameless, faceless enemies. To a certain degree, Russian aristocrats were possibly more acquainted with the higher levels of Mongol society than with the Russian peasantry.[197]

In the years of romantic nationalism of the Russian Empire, people of different cultural background were not eligible, because they were not pure Russian in terms of language, faith, kasha and songs. It seems reasonable when N.A. Polevoi talks about Ermak, who said to the Siberians that there was no Russian heart beating in their chests. People of other origins were still being represented in terms of what they were not or what they did not care about, but the negative meaning of certain absence was reversed.[198] As Russia moved towards a modern state, the situation altered the way the peasants met with other people who were of different cultural habitus. In fact, it is not unusual to have those alien elements of Siberia in the capital of the Russian Empire. For instance, the Buryats, who practised shamanism then later Tibetan Buddhism, had frequent contacts with tsarist Russia. At the beginning of the nineteenth century a Russian scientist Rehmann invited a Buryat *lama*, Sultim Tseden, to St. Petersburg for the purpose of introducing Tibetan medicine to the West. In 1899, the thirteenth Dalai Lama's emissary, Agvan Dorzhiev (1854-1938) came to St. Petersburg and was allowed to build a Buddhist temple in the outskirts of the capital. It is reasonable to assume that Dorzhiev was plausible to have an encounter with Nicholas Roerich, as well as other renowned orientalists and some Russian elites such as Sergei Ol'denburg, Fedor Shcherbatskoi and Prince Esper Ukhtomsky.[199]

Already at the early stage of the empire, there was an acknowledgement since Muscovite times that cultural difference and policy decisions proved difficult to apprehend. With the conquest of Turkestan in the 1860s and 1870s, an impelling movement behind the administrative system of the tsarist forces over the region intended to invigorate the tsarist regime to re-examine its concepts of non-Russian native. In spite of the Mongolian heritage that was a crucial point for discussion about the Turkestan inhabitants and their belief in Islam, a minor uprising led by a Sufi religious elder also spread hostility towards the Russian colonizers and caused

---

[197] Charles J. Halperin, *Russia and the Golden Horde: The Mongol Impact on Medieval Russian History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, c1985), pp.105-106.

[198] N.A. Polevoi, *Ermak Timofeich, ili Volga i Sibir'* (St. Petersburg, 1845), p.110. See also Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North*, pp. 77-80.

[199] See individual project study in John Snelling, *Buddhism in Russia: The Story of Agvan Dorzhiev, Lhasa's emissary to the Tsar* (Shaftesbury, Dorset, [U. K.]; Rockport, Mass.: Element, 1993).

panic amongst Russian officials. It is noticeable that the Governor-General C. Dukhovskoi was forced to reconsider the policy of 'disregard' (*politika ignorirovaniia*) of Islam initiated by K. Kaufman after his arrival in the province after the suppression of the Andijan uprising (1898). Under his leadership, new principles of religious policy were formulated in the region: 1) to deprive the local clergy of the dependence from foreign and Russian centres of Islam; 2) to reduce the impact of Sufism on the spiritual life of the Muslims of Turkestan; 3) to forbid any possible use of the endowment funds for anti-government propaganda and finally 4) to introduce the European origin into the programs of the Muslim schools.[200] Regardless of how academicians or the government in Russia attempted to establish a programme in oriental languages and cultures of central Asia, a radical shift in attitudes towards the non-Russian natives appeared during the era of aggressive penetration of the East. Images of the peoples from Central Asia, the Kazakh Steppe and the Caucasus appeared frequently during the time when Russia competed with Turkey for control and influence over the region, including the Balkans. As Jeffrey Brooks noted, it was in the 1870s that images of the non-Russian natives were portrayed with mystery and ambiguity in the magazine of *Niva* or *Budil'nik*, because published media 'resist attempts to fix the meaning and leave wide scope for different responses by different viewers.'[201]

***

To be sure, the knowledge of others and of their cultural performance which was previously unfamiliar or locally prohibited, continued to develop and accumulate its meaning and usage as appropriate across the vast Russian land. It is worth noting here that when the source of ideological difference has been located within the matrix of productive relationship, the attempts to organise and pattern the divergence upon a cultural phenomenon look very challenging yet stimulating. There is no denying that broad generalisations can serve a useful purpose in the characterisation and conceptualisation of the essence of an overall trend in the cultural evolution of a people and of several nations with close cultural ties.

[200] See "Vsepoddaneishii doklad Turkestanskogo general-gubernatora generala ot infanterii Dukhovskogo: Islam v Turkestane" in *Musul'manskaia Sredniaia Aziia. Traditsionalizm i XX vek.* (Moscow: Institutom Afriki RAN, 2004), pp. 241-261.

[201] Jeffrey Brooks, "The Russian Nation Imagined: The Peoples of Russia as Seen in Popular Imagery, 1860s–1890s", *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (Spring, 2010), pp. 548-549 (pp.535-557).

However, any condensed phrase or label can also risk oversimplification or distortion of the complex historical reality they were designed to capture. To remedy this inadequacy and take a model for examination, we will continue showing that the cross-cultural encounter and/or integration could have provided different clues to understanding the process of constructing the value system which defines the abnormal figure such as the holy fool in the Russian society.

The Mongols as well as other ethnic groups of northern Asia, for the most part, provided the medium or particular adaptation in the guise of which certain new ideas and forms of life beyond the territory reached the Russian North. Thompson's bold assumptions, based on the historical documents she used for reference, indicated that the Eastern Slavs could long have had the opportunity to see or of being told about the shaman in the state of ecstasy or their supernatural abilities of healing and divination while trading with the Siberian Turkic people. Besides battles, commercial acts also encouraged the occurrence of multicultural contacts. It seems that the lack of sufficient ancient records prevents continuous exploration of the evidence shown that the pagan customs and culture of the Turkics, Scythians, Sogdians and Mongolians, integrated with features of Chinese culture have appeared in the lives of the Slavs. It is not my intention to only demonstrate a series of figures, cases and occasions which may obfuscate the main issue of my research concern. On the contrary, this chapter can be seen as the preparation for the following discussion on studies of the non-Russian natives in the late nineteenth century. The subsequent argument is raised in order to apply an ethnographic approach to an understanding of the holy fool. The non- conventional figures in various religions or of different cultures mentioned above were taken as medium or message carriers whose social roles impressed the followers with an ability to cope with calamities and to overcome difficulties. The mysterious component of the prominent figure is attractive and thus can suitably be taken as a starting point for a further question about the decision on making distinction. The presence and performance of every religious cult prove to be noticeable and are worthy of attention prior to our inquiries into the problem of the Siberian natives. I will discuss in the next chapter that it is not a question about the resemblance between the holy fool and the shaman, but a discovery of perception through understanding a larger group of people who gives us hints on how to deal with question of abnormality which then forms and affects the interpretation of holy foolishness.

Chapter 4

Interpreting the Presence of Differentiation through Ethnographic Studies

The knowledge and understanding of others is severely limited if only by chance does the encounter with different people and cultures happen. A gradual divide emerged as scholars in ethnographic studies began to challenge the established hegemony of their older colleagues. As a scientific method, ethnographic study and its analysis supply a different grasp of the holy fool and its compeers whose archetype can be reinterpreted in the sense that it is not the mutation of the normal kind but the variation of the general type. The larger the space it generates for the multiple coexistence, the better the understanding it shows for making absolute judgements. Ethnographic studies on 'people of other origins' have been encouraged to start a movement towards a scientific approach to 'other' people and away from an imaginative or expressive utterance towards different races and cultures. Approaching the experience with the traditional figure such as the holy fool through ethnographic study of the non-Russian native, can help us learn more about different perception of abnormal others and the situation of mixed-contacts which we encounter in the organisation of everyday life.

Holy Fools and non-Russian natives are subjects of current observation in the paratactic context which implies a system of coordination rather than subordination. In an atmosphere where the 'study of different others' provided a new approach of interpretation, the meaning given to the holy fool and the non-Russian native has gradually been distilled in order to achieve greater and more moderate clarity. On the one hand, the holy fool has become more than just an exception of a religious figure in the Orthodox tradition, but a source of inspiration for anyone who sought for an alternative of solving the social and/or political problem. The concept generated from the protection for the religious eccentric who is endowed with the wisdom necessary for the ruling reign is heavily moulded by the social attitude which thereupon implies a political influence. On the other hand, the popular imagination of those heretical non-Russian natives can be perceived in this chapter as new direction for the question of being different or

abnormal than the historical and literary holy fool once were treated in the name of civilisation. Hence, what needs to be examined subsequently is whether the underlying premise which diversified cultures of the 'Russian' Far East (*Dal'nii Vostok Rossii*) present, will confirm that the social atmosphere towards the uncivilised native could have shaped an ideology that supports and constructs a particular status of the Russian holy fool.

Russian ethnography (*etnografiia*) was a broad field of inquiry which comprised of a wide range of professional disciplines, namely geography, archaeology, physical anthropology and linguistics. It shared certain similarities with European social or cultural anthropology, but was dissimilar to Russian anthropology which was a relatively narrower field, focusing on physical anthropology.[202] As a science of *narodnost'*, an ethnographic survey was commissioned by the members of the Ethnographic Division of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society and focused on 'a combination of language and other ethnographic traits, including those elements of material and spiritual culture that were expressions of a people's *byt*.'[203] Towards the end of the nineteenth century, part of the ethnographers who favoured the progress and enlightenment and who were interested in gathering knowledge of the people, called for a change to their academic roles and helped formulate and produce the 'All Russian Census' of 1897. The 1897 Census, as the first modern population census, identified the citizens of the empire according to the *soslovie* (noble, clergy, merchant, townsman and peasant). But as for the question about *narodnost'*, the Central Statistical Administration used the categories of native language and confessional group (*veroispovedanie*) to compile a list about the people of the empire.[204] Regardless of how this formula had been criticised by members of the Ethnographic Division, the selection and organisation of 'kinds', in terms of language, religion or ethnicity, determined a new world order along with the evolving regional tradition.[205]

There are many 'kinds', which can be similar or different. As clinics for the mentally ill began to appear, the holy fool symbolised a kind of madness under the supervision of general disorder. Dressed in unusual and strange garments and

---

[202] *Soviet and Western Anthropology*, ed. by Ernest Gellner (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1980), pp. x-xi.

[203] Cited from Francine Hirsch, *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, c2005), p. 39.

[204] On the 1897 census see David W. Darrow, "Census as a Technology of Empire," *Ab Imperio*, no. 4 (2002): 145-176.

[205] Nelson Goodman, *Ways of Worldmaking* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, c1978), especially pp.7-16. Kinds are the core of Goodman's philosophy. Goodman's 'kind-making' had a lot to say about kinds, classes, sorts, and types.

aimless shouting at crowds seems, when one comes to think of it, such a natural way to be insane. What interests me here, is to read the holy fool as a concept resulting from multiple causes that arise especially at the intersection of various ethnographic discourses. Conflicting opinions have shown that the holy fool never became fully assimilated into a monologic perception. As a distinctive yet ambiguous figure, the holy fool can be perceived as *inorodets* (the alien) in the Orthodox Church. This is similar to that of the indigenous people (the real and legal *inorodets*) who were recognised as 'others' in the Russian Empire if we are to draw metaphorical parallels of the situation. By conceptualising an 'alien' in scientific terms or ethnographic notes, the public and the bureaucrat can go on to problematise the physical depiction of eccentric figures in future discussion.

A central aim of this chapter is to interpose ethnographic research itself into the experience that has involved observation, contact and records of imperial ethnics. Many classical filed sources were recorded amongst Siberian peoples (settlers or natives). It is to suggest that perhaps 'understanding the non-Russian natives' implies a different kind of engagement with knowledge that is typical for religious or medical forms of science precisely because it simultaneously suggests an experiential notion of concept, combined with a strong ethics and morality that defines those different 'others.' Without an ethnographic counterweight, our perception slips quickly into biased reductionism and romantic exoticising of homogeneous others. Ethnographic writings, trained and influenced by scientific disciplines, offer an important supplementary by underscoring the connections of aboriginal practices to national and transnational contexts. Notes and diaries of ethnographers were also subject to scrutiny.

Defining Inorodtsy, Defining Others

Once questions of classification were raised and answered, people would possibly overlook or ignore the claims of other problems, especially those which manifested themselves in the inconsistency between old and new elements. Consequently, the perception of any unusual type continued to bear the stigmata of someone's memory of an old stereotype associated with the idea of religion and the genetic relation which somehow institutionalised concepts to myth, art, literature and philosophy.

The definition of *inorodtsy* evolved over the course of the nineteenth century along with Russia's eastward expansion and encounter with native peoples including Finno-Ugric, Samoedic, Turkic, Tungusic, Mongolian and Palosiberian language groups.[206] As far as the Russian state was concerned, an *inorodets*, a person 'of other origin' (*ino* = other, *rod* = birth, origin), was generally supposed to become more like a Russian who in fact, associated *inorodets* with a referent who is a 'congenital and apparently perennial outsider.'[207] The rules applied to define people by their 'ways of life' (sedentary or nomadic) were insufficient to function as the essential criterion of differentiation between Russians and non-Russian natives on the eastern frontier. For the sake of creating a new mode of categorisation for the population, the administration demanded a more discriminating classification. One of the reforms for Siberian Russia was completed by M.M. Speranskii (1772-1893) who included the legal 'Regulation on the Management of the non-Russian Aliens' (*Ustav ob upravlenii inorodtsev*) in 1822.[208] When the influx of the population was brought about by conquests in Central Asia and the Far East, the list of peoples initially recognised as *inorodtsy* was enlarged from three to thirteen categories.[209] And subsequently, the shift of conceptualising non-Russian natives and their ethnic difference in terms of language rather than religion began in the first decade of the twentieth century. In brief, the identification of members of a specific local clan was for the purpose of taxation and juridical affairs. From an administrative perspective, the ethnic purpose was insignificant when all were defined as natural subjects (*prirodnye poddannye*). On the contrary, the classification of being a non-Russian native revealed itself as particularly problematic and provoked a fair amount of complaints from the natives themselves.

Inorodtsy were increasingly termed to designate all non-Russian natives after the defeat by Japan in the 1904-1905 war. From then onwards, the concept of the word *inorodtsy* has 'lost its original significance' and 'fallen prey to nationalism.'[210] On the threshold of the twentieth century, the Russian

---

[206] Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North*, pp. 2-3.

[207] Quoted from Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North*, p. 53.

[208] *Ustav ob upravlenii inorodtsev* can be found in *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii*, Vol. 38, No. 29126 (St. Petersburg, 1830). For an overview of Speranskii's Siberian reforms see Marc Raeff, *Siberia and the Reforms of 1822* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1956), pp. 7-8, 39-85; especially chapter three "Laying the Groundwork for the Transformation of Siberia".

[209] See "Inorodtsy" in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona*, Vol. 25 (St. Petersburg, 1894), pp. 224-225.

[210] Andreas Kappeler, *La Russie, Empire Multiethnique*, transl. by Guy Imart (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1994), p. 150.

environment itself was transformed by the Russo-Japanese war and the revolutionary events of 1905 and 1906. Frustration of the military defeat and humiliation of a European power at the hands of an Asian one was unprecedented in modern history. Possibly in response to the losses in Manchuria and partly under pressure from losing protection from the Siberian ethnic groups, N.A. Bobrovnikov, heir to the directorship of the Kazan Teachers' Seminary, proposed a serious attempt to open a school comprised of Asian languages in Kazan. Bobrovnikov was convinced that 'it is extremely important to have the Mongolian tribes (e.g. Buriats) and also the Turkic tribes with us in the war with China.'[211] It is perceivable that for Bobrovnikov, Manchuria became a new threat to the empire and having the native masses of Central Asia to be on the Russian side was never an easy task. Except for policy of educational reform amongst the non-Russian natives, missionaries also had to face a new challenge. The edict of religious tolerance of April 17 1905 offered an opportunity to enhance the power and prestige of the 'East.' Officially, the edict granted the right to convert freely only from one Christian faith or denomination to another. But it turned out to have given the chance to those dissident forces which caused an unmitigated disaster with regard to Islam and other minority religions. In the eyes of Church elites, the increase in conversions to Islam might become influential amongst the Chuvash and the Finnic non-Russians of the region through a new organised Tatar social network.

In order to complete the mission of bringing enlightenment to the non-Christian natives, scholars were sent to frontiers of the empire and employed different media and methods of propaganda to achieve their goals. One of the active publications run by the Kazan Theological Academy, was the weekly newspaper *Tserkovno-obshchestvennaia zhizn'* (Church-Social Life). In Robert P. Geraci's study, the position of the *Church-Social Life* was 'quite liberal in writing about everything that involved the democratisation and localisation of church governance and the church's great autonomy.' "Questions about the *inorodtsy*" was one of the topics discussed therein. As a result of discussion, it is very often the case that some Russians in Kazan were more conscious of their admiration of certain aspects of Tatar society. It was argued by Geraci that the Muslim question made a compelling church reform movement in Kazan.[212] Moreover, people were

[211] Robert P. Geraci, *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 2001), pp. 266-267.

[212] See his discussion on "The Missionaries Respond: The East as Mirror" in Robert P. Geraci, *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia*, pp. 296-301.

inclined to contribute the consequence to the understanding of other non-Russian natives in more sociological and anthropological, rather than moral and theological terms. Being famous for his method of making non-Russian agents to a large extent responsible for the work of assimilating their own peoples into Russian life, the missionary-orientologist N.I. Il'minskii (1822-1891) saw the non-Russian natives not only as inferior, but also 'superior to Russians.' Through Il'minskii oxymoronic phrases of naming 'our *inorodtsy*' and 'the Russian [*russkie*] *inorodtsy*' can one understand why he seemed not to have wanted the *inorodtsy* to give up their original identity. This is because the non-Russian natives provided a window to an ideally yet still essentially Russian world in their innocence of exemplary behaviour.[213]

In the discussion of *inorodtsy*, the most politically prominent contention was made by a once Siberian exile, L.Ia Shternberg, whose ethnographic career spanned the late imperial Russia and early Soviet eras. He claims that,

> The term *inorodtsy* is understood in the language of the government and the nationalist press in a double sense — a political sense and a technical-juridical sense. In the political and most important meaning of this word, the basic indication of non-Russianness (*inorodchestvo*) is language. Only the population (*naselenie*) who speaks the Great-Russian dialect has the privilege to the title of the Russian people (*russkii narod*). Not race, not even religion nor political loyalty plays an essential role. Poles, being of Slavic blood, speaking in a Slavic dialect, are nonetheless considered *inorodtsy*. Georgians, although Orthodox, nevertheless remain *inorodtsy*. Even Ukrainians, native blood brothers of the Great Russians, are similarly Orthodox like the latter, but have the audacity to speak in their own Little Russian dialect, although they are so close to the Great Russians, do not cease from being regarded in many aspects as having the status of *inorodtsy* (*polozhenie inorodtsev*). Baltic Germans, renowned for their loyalty, similarly remain *inorodtsy*, just like the 'rebel' Poles. But Russian sectarians (*russkie sektanty*), even the most furious enemies of Orthodoxy, the most suspicious in the eyes of the government for their social doctrines, but preserving the Russian speech, remain immutably in the role of the real *russkii narod*. And it is well known to all that a serious

[213] See his discussion on "Il'minskii's System and Russia's Own Aliens" in Robert P. Geraci, *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia*, pp. 71-76.

political reality, a whole complex of political relations of enormous importance lies behind this classification.[214]

According to Shternberg, *inorodtsy* can be divided into two groups. The first was the people who dwelt in regions far from the central land (such as Turkestan) and who could enjoy relative economic and cultural independence until the new imperial policy on colonisation came into effect. Such a case also applied to the Buriats. On the contrary, the second group of the non-Russian natives was described by Shternberg as people who lived interspersed with Russians on the territory which has been incorporated into the empire long ago (for example, the Volga region). Shternberg argued that these non-Russian natives revealed their economic concerns similar to those of the Russian peasantry and did not see the 'land question' as a matter of colonial oppression.[215] In Shternberg's view, race, religion and political loyalty never became primary markers of Russianness. Even Russian sectarians, who spoke Russian, were members of the real 'Russian people.' However, as we have seen elsewhere, in spite of the attestations of missionaries and others, it was no longer acknowledged (if it ever had been) that speaking Russian fluently and being Orthodox were sufficient to make one Russian, although these components were still considered necessary. It is evident in the case of N.F. Katanov (1862-1922) who was of a race of Turkic-speaking people called the Abakan or Minusinsk Tatars. Katanov's prominence in Turkology during much of the Russian Turkologist V.V. Bartol'd's (1869-1930) career has caught the attention of those who had predominant ways of seeing the Muslim and who could never imagine the presence of a non-Russian native in the Russian Academy. As an example of the efficacy of Russification, Katanov was never able to pass as an ethnic Russian.[216]

In fact, early officials of the expanding Russian Empire paid little or no attention to the cultural differences and ethnic peculiarities of their new national subjects. The formula of conquest, such as subjugation, administrative integration (*sliianie*) and conversion to Orthodox Christianity proved to be a long and arduous process. Drawn to Enlightenment theories of society, it becomes

---

[214] L. Shternberg, "*Inorodtsy. Obshchii obzor*", in *Formy natsional'nogo dvizheniia v sovremennykh gosudarstvakh*, ed. by A.I. Kastelianskii (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1910), p. 531. Text can be read from *Elektronnaia biblioteka "Nauchnoe Nasledie Rossii"*. http://www.e-nasledie.ru/ras/view/publication/browser.html?clear=true&perspective=popup&id=43870022 (last accessed 12 January 2015)

[215] L. Shternberg, "*Inorodtsy: Obshchii obzor*", pp. 538, 540, and 546.

[216] Robert P. Geraci, *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia*, chapter nine on "Nikolai F. Katanov: *Inorodets* in the Russian Academy", pp. 309-341.

necessary to conceive from ethnography, not as the experience and interpretation of a circumscribed 'other' reality, but rather as a 'constructive negotiation involving at least conscious, yet politically significant subjects.'[217] For Franz Boas (1858-1942), who planned and directed the famous Jesup North Pacific Expedition (1897-1902), linguistics is also one of the instructive fields of inquiry in ethnological phenomena and plays an important role in the situation of meeting others as well as in the perception of any difference from between individuals. However, in Boas' analysis of a systematic categorisation developed for the study of the languages of Europe and Western Asia, it was not unusual to notice that a self-centred viewpoint remained a dominant tradition in the name of scientific classification. The very Eurocentric opinion on the study of exotic languages was criticised by Boas who tried to avoid any linguistic prejudice upon foreign languages.[218]

The Eurocentric expression of judgment seemed aloof, distant and fixed. The canon, like every cultural production, was institutionalised for the sake of conveying the dominant social order. However, the authorised recognition of a general social condition should not overshadow the uncommon people or diversified cultural phenomenon. Facing the Eurocentric canons, Boas kept reminding that we should turn our attention to multiculturalism rather than confine ourselves within an academic environment of normalisation. Boas' appreciation of any unknown languages of different ethnic groups encourages us to find an objective approach to the question of abnormality. One should always be careful with any misinterpretation due to the restrictions set for an ordinary concession to our own semantic patterns. Various types of people should not be reduced by classification to a monologic feature which only shows a single and general perception of 'others.' Boas' inquiry into every cultural phenomenon of different traditions warned that our understanding of foreign materials inherited and modified by pre-existing ideas, might be distorted if we only interpret the practices of other cultures in a conservative light. The main idea was to represent a counter-tradition not by rejecting or denying its simplicity, but by recasting it as an alternative departure for creativity. Every individual identity, including the holy fool (an abnormality in religion) and the non-Russian native (an abnormality in ethnicity), has its own way and tendency to choose how its image can be portrayed

[217] James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, c1988), p. 41.
[218] Roman Jakobson and Franz Boas, "Franz Boas' Approach to Language", *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Oct., 1944), pp. 188-195.

and its mind can be conveyed. The value system is only 'sufficiently reliable' when a terminological need of culture or a more generalised form of thinking is called to help passing through the crisis of self-identification. The full implication of Boas' discovery suggests that distinctiveness can be blinded by general rules implying a similar line of development. Differentiation should not be regarded as backward or defective, but valuable to the formation of a new type. The insights and method of Boas on the study of individual cultures would be brought by V.G. Bogoraz (1865-1936) and Shternberg to advance the study of Russian non-Russian natives and their culture and be restructured in new languages.

Fieldwork is worthy of our attention to regard it as a composition of language events. Language, as in Bakhtin's eyes, 'lies on the borderline between oneself and the other. The word in language is half someone else's.' He argues that 'there are no "neutral" words and forms — words and forms can belong to "no one"; language has been completely taken over, shot through with intentions and accents.'[219] Similar to Shternberg's critique of *inorodtsy*, Bakhtin urged a rethinking of language in terms of specific discursive situations. The words of ethnographic writing should not be limited by a structure, containing a monological and authoritative statement about, or interpretation of an abstracted textualised reality. The language of ethnography is, like all language in Bakhtin's view, embodied through with 'every individual consciousness living in it', and functions as 'a concrete heteroglossic conception of the world.'[220] It is not to say that the textual form of the ethnography should be a literal dialogue. Rather, like observing an individual case, an alternative way of representing this discursive complexity is to see the overall course of the research as an ongoing negotiation, a place where 'a carnivalesque arena of diversity' can be accommodated.[221]

In practice, 'the ethnography and the novel have recourse to indirect style at different levels of abstraction.'[222] We may never be certain whether or not the ethnographic writer portrays what natives think, because the ability of the fieldworker to perceive indigenous minds is not always certain. It often happens that ethnographers desist from ascribing beliefs, feelings and thoughts to individuals and attribute subjective states to cultures. Nevertheless, ethnography is

---

[219] M. M. Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel" in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, ed. by Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, c1981), p. 293.
[220] *Ibid*.
[221] Here I use Bakhtin's analysis of the 'polyphonic' novel for my adoption of the dialogic interplay of voice in ethnography.
[222] As suggested in James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, p. 47.

composed of discourses whose textual form is to represent cultural facts. To quote Roland Barthes, if a text is 'a tissue of quotations drawn from innumerable centres of culture', then 'a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination.'[223] With oriental questioning of colonial styles of presentation, the expansion of literacy and ethnographic consciousness and new possibilities for reading (and as well for writing) cultural descriptions are emerging.[224]

***

Neither non-Russian natives nor holy fools were stable entities, either in theory or practice. The phenomenon of both was, nevertheless, cast into lines of stories which gave birth to (as we only mention here) an extensional representation of the tradition of holy foolishness. As the tastes, attitudes and politics of readership and bureaucracy developed and transformed over decades, so too did both experience a process of evolution and development. The holy fool is a type of figure, belonging to one of the religious cultures. The phenomenon of holy foolishness must be banned; however, the holy fool whose way of life and mores were distinct from the general Russian population, appeared contradictory to the ranks of aliens. A brief outline of D.I. Chizhevskii's (1894-1977) discussion in his *Russian Intellectual History* was about the usual sequence in the growth of popularity of holy fools which is evident in the following description. At the early stage, popular veneration of holy fools was motivated by pagan customs; then the resistance of the Church to defend moral principles arose. Finally came Church acceptance of folk customs and elevation of pagan superstition to Christian sainthood.[225] Undoubtedly, debate over the issue concerning the problem of the holy fool continues throughout Russian history. Evidence can be seen in many periodicals of the nineteenth century where holy fools are literarily presented as behavioural models with unquestionable achievement of Christian virtue, but in reality behave like people who are deprived of any sense of decency and shame.

---

[223] Roland Barthes, "The Death of the Author" in *Image, Music, Text*, essays selected and transl. by Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang, c1977), pp. 146 and 148.

[224] James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, p. 53.

[225] Discussion of the problem can be seen in chapter 3 "Holy fools and the Church: an ambivalent relationship" of Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, pp. 51-96. Also see Dmitrij Tschizewskij (or Dmitrii Chizhevskii), *Russian Intellectual History*, transl. by John C. Osborne, ed. by Martin P. Rice (Ann Arbor: Ardis, c1978), p 106.

My interest lies in looking at the closing metaphor which serves to shed light on the perception of the holy fools, the most *inorodtsy* and/or *inorodcheskie tely* of the Orthodox tradition, together with 'all the permutation of meaning and role' attached to the newly invented term *inorodtsy*. Regardless of linguistic identity or religious choice, the changing conceptions of 'otherness' which are applied to the understanding of the non-Russian natives as 'natural subjects' under the juridical sense and/or allegorically medical fables, became an alternative reference to holy fools whose murky utterances, incoherent phrases and seemly provocative acts may not be considered as the most 'foreign elements in the "body politic" of the Russian Empire.'

Reasons for Developing Ethno-Culture

From the eighteenth to the mid-nineteenth century, ethnography gradually became a sort of scientific framework for the study of linguistic, physical and cultural characteristics of 'uncivilised' people. Both ethnologists (*Etnografy*) and folklorists (*Fol'kloristy*) observed the peasants in Ukraine and Belarus, or other tribes of Siberia to better understand their ways of life. Works on the study of folk religion are, for instance, designated to reveal an essential part of the dependence of religious beliefs of a people on their social existence. As far as the variety of the beliefs and religious rituals is concerned, what unifies Russian scholars in terms of their method and approach is the fact that the main structure and spirit of the polytheistic ceremony was a continuous type of ancient rites.[226] Frequently, 'the way of life' is portrayed by generalising and contrasting data recorded by different investigators. In these accounts, ethnographic study (as a normative ideal and a locally specific set of practices) offers an analytical framework for comparison, as if the encounter with the 'other' on vast Russian terrain always presupposes the need for an engagement with the anthropological and political sciences which first and foremost derives from a modern, Western viewpoint.

Throughout the centuries, holy foolishness was understood as a label for a certain figure whose behaviour was beyond the rules of his own religious tradition, far removed from the scientific establishment of his time and yet who was revered for his power of healing or prophecy. The characteristic of such a person is so peculiar that eccentric traits similar to the rich gallery of Russian holy fools are

[226] E. E. Levkievskaia, *Mify russkovo naroda* (Moscow: Astrel', AST, 2000), pp. 11-12.

manifested by different dimensions of the problem about which people have chosen to discuss. Hence, oracle, shaman, mentally ill person, non-Russian natives were arguably men with something different about themselves and whose physical, mental and social 'insufficiency' were stigmata indicating one's state of marginality or abnormality. The development of ethnography in the late nineteenth century Russia must be reviewed here for the purpose of understanding how an attitude towards eccentricity may have changed. Due to the expansion of the imperial territory eastwards beyond the Urals and towards the Pacific coast, the archetype of a figure such as the holy fool perhaps changes from religious mysterious cult to symbol of extreme development through a mixture of nationalism and romanticism.

The Asian Museum in St. Petersburg, established in 1818, was the first institution of the Academy of Sciences and devoted specifically to the East.[227] The collection includes ancient coins, Islamic manuscripts, Buddhist xylographs and East Asian objects of art. It is understood that the romantic fashion for the exotic Asia/East began to receive its institutional expression in museums and later at exhibitions that displayed the national identity in its most visual representation. In the wake of the presence of Russia at the Crystal Palace Exhibition of 1851 in London, a successful example of such an experience in the public sphere was at the 'Moscow Society of Friends of Natural History, Anthropology and Ethnography (OLEAE)' museum in 1872. The Moscow exposition demonstrated, as Wendy Salmond argues, the 'collision of tradition and modernity' and was accompanied by 'an unprecedented revival and reassessment of native Russian traditions.' Such 'vernacular revivals' were an effort to claim the Russian version of cultural identity and of a distinct national past.[228] Visitors were attracted by the private and state sponsored exhibition. Significantly, the books as well as fiction served as media, involving the dissemination of knowledge of science in order to encourage a variety of civic groups to create, dramatise and conventionalise versions of those national images.

[227] S.F. Ol'denburg, *Aziatskii Muzei Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk, 1818-1918* (Petrograd: Rossiiskaia Gosudarstvennaia Akademicheskaia Tipografiia, 1919). Other resources regarding the Asian Museum can be found on the website of the Russian Academy of Sciences via the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts
http://www.orientalstudies.ru/rus/index.php?id=3012&option=content&task=view
(last accessed 12 January 2015)

[228] Wendy R. Salmond, *Arts and Crafts in Late Imperial Russia: Reviving the Kustar Art Industries, 1870-1917* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 1-4.

As a result of the Emancipation Reform of 1861 and followed by the advancement of urbanisation and industrialisation, Russian ethnographers seized the moment and started recording the peasant culture as well as traditions of minority populations central to the social transformations that had changed their way of life.[229] Counting the geographical explorers of Siberia as earlier practitioners of ethnography, *bytopisanie* (writing about way of life, or customs) and *etnografiia* (the Russianised Greek equivalent of *bytopisanie*) developed from the soil of Russian history. Despite the lack of formal institutional recognition, *bytopisanie* and folklorists as well as Western literature and scholarship helped to develop a systematic study in which specialised disciplines emerged out of an earlier undifferentiated moral philosophy. The interest and study in traditional Russian folklore can be traced back to the publication of a collection of folksongs entitled *Narodnaia Pesnia* by N.A. Lvov (1751-1803) and I. Prach (d. 1818). P.V. Kireevskii (1808-1856) and the poet N.M. Iazykov (1803-1846) were systematically meant to collect folklore songs in the 1830s and were then followed by A.I. Dal (1801-1856) who collected Russian tales and proverbs. Finally, A.N. Afanas'ev (1826-1871) compiled Dal's collection into an anthology in the style of Jacob Grimm between 1855 and 1864. It is worth noting that in some of the tales which A.N. Afanas'ev collected from the Russian folktales, the fool Ivanushka (*Ivanushka-durachok*) was depicted less as a positive figure than a person whose moral character is indifferent and negative. The fool Ivanushka was not an offshoot of the social perception which could be extended to the archetype of the holy fool. On the contrary, the fool Ivanushka was presented as a coward who happened to put other's life in danger.[230]

Convincingly, ethnography was a well-established scientific framework for the study of the Russian native way of life, language and culture in the late 1840s.[231] Without having a department of ethnography in any Russian university, the Ethnographic Division of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society was the only officially recognised ethnographic centre in the empire. Preservation of Russian tales was at the peak of its popularity and was solidified within the Imperial Russian Geographical Society in 1896 for the purpose of preserving

[229] Robert P. Geraci, "Ethnography and Local Society after Emancipation" in *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia*, pp. 167-169.

[230] *Ivanushka-durachok* in *Narodnie russkie skazki A.N. Afanas'eva v trekh tomakh*, Vol. 3 (Moscow: Nauka, 1985), pp. 126-128.

[231] S.A. Tokarev, "Vklad russkikh uchenykh v mirovuiu etnograficheskuiu nauku", *Ocherki istorii russkoi etnografii, fol'kloristiki i antropologii*, I: vol. XXX (Moscow, 1956), pp. 5-29, for the comparisons of ethnographic institutionalisation in Germany (1828), France (1839), and England (1843).

folktales and publishing them in the journal *Zhivaia Starina* (Living Antiquities). 'The study of the people' became a cause, mixing with 'archival history, ethnographic collections and pure adventurism' for the sake of building national self-fashioning.[232]

[Ethnographic Expedition by the Naval Ministry]

As indicated in the previous chapter, the particular connection between shamanic customs of the non-Russian native and unusual conduct of the holy fool, as initially proposed by the Russian anthropologist, Dmitrii Zelenin, has been noted and followed up by other Soviet scholars. But only a few people were able to access or read what scholars wrote in the anthropological journals and books during the nineteenth century. Thus, those articles hardly generated any new perception amongst the public. Nevertheless, another channel of the similar vein, known as literary ethnography, has given rise to much discussion.[233] As early as 1855, eight writers known as *komandirovtsy* (commissioned investigators) set off on a trip to gather information about people's life (*narodnii byt*) in rural districts of Russia. This unusual ethnographic expedition, whose reports were published in the Naval Collection (*Morskoi sbornik*) between 1855 and 1862, was sponsored by the Naval Ministry. The minister, the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich (1827-1892) was aware of the importance as well as the power that ethnography should have been taken as a means to gather information and to involve members of the educated public in government reform. Meanwhile, the ethnographic reports should have been widely distributed amongst the people at large and be promoted to create civic-mindedness of the Russians.[234]

The official journal of the Naval Ministry became an unseen instrument for broadening the discussion between 'government and society' and about renovation and reform in Russia.[235] The idea can perhaps be better understood as components of that 'toolkit' of engaged theory recommended by Michel Foucault and Gilles

---

[232] Alexander Etkind, "Whirling with the Other: Russian Populism and Religious Sects", *Russian Review*, Vol. 62, No. 4 (Oct., 2003), pp. 565-588 and Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), p. 75. Slezkine noted that in the 1850s the Russian elite turned its romantic interests from the exotic peoples to the local peasant.

[233] Details in Catherine B. Clay, "Russian Ethnographers in the Service of Empire, 1856-1862", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Spring, 1995), pp. 45-61.

[234] Catherine B. Clay, "Ethos and Empire: The Ethnographic Expedition of the Imperial Russian Naval Ministry, 1855- 1862" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1989), p. 12.

[235] W. Bruce Lincoln, *The Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 1990), p. 46.

Deleuze: 'The notion of theory as a toolkit means 1) the theory to be constructed is not a system but an instrument, a *logic* of the specificity of power relations and the struggles around them; 2) that this investigation can only be carried out step by step on the basis of reflection (which will necessarily be historical in some of it aspects) on given situations.'[236] The experience from popular writers as a means for producing knowledge from an intense engagement not only sustains a new literary readership of the journal, but also provides the empire with a new approach to the people. In each of their works, the commissioned writers drew on various sources of information about popular life in remote areas and interpreted them differently.

The initiation of literary ethnographic work was launched in 1855 under the request of the Imperial Russian Naval Minister. The aim of the investigative commission was to include young writers to record the way of Russian people's life on their field trip to the rural area. Truth (*istinnost'*) or authenticity of the expedition report was the essence of the writer's artistic expression. Eight literary ethnographers coming from various social backgrounds conducted their expedition and gave different images of Russian borderland between 1855 and 1862. They, including A.S. Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii, G. P. Danilevskii, N. Filippov, M.L. Mikhailov, A.N. Ostrovskii, A.F. Pisemskii, A. A. Potekhin and S.V. Maksimov, applied their professional skills in the field by making detailed notes and descriptions on various aspects of popular life. Those productive creations included sketches of folk mores or manners, articles on social issues and graphic records of provincial life.

While one may argue much over the approach and the appraisal of the literary ethnographers' interpretation of what they witnessed in remote and exotic tribes, most readers are startled by this new comprehension and are impressed with the fidelity of the report. According to Catherine B. Clay's research, such ethnographic reports were not limited to members of the Imperial Russian Geographical Society (IRGO), but disseminated widely with the achievement of the subscription rates of almost six thousand.[237] It is apparent that the writers occupied a place where knowledge frames were mediated. They built up the relationship between people of Siberia and readers in Petersburg. Reports on

---

[236] Michel Foucault, *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. and transl. by Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books, c1980), p. 145; and Michel Foucault, "Intellectuals and Power" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, transl. by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977), p. 208.

[237] Catherine B. Clay, "Russian Ethnographers in the Service of Empire, 1856-1862", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Spring, 1995), p. 53.

various religious sects, nature veneration and shamanism were presented in front of the recipients. Both moderate and strict measures to improve the backwardness of Russia were suggested in favour of the establishment of a modern state. What may be considered as one of the positive results is that the writers as ethnographers shared their comprehension as well as their ability to depict the life and customs of the non-Russian native within the circle of intellectuals and the public. Hence, at the heart of this vision was the assumption that encounters with the non-Russian 'aliens' in the fields seemed to leave open the possibility for the treatment and handling of the problem about *abnormal* amongst the educated and the normal people who indirectly received information from these journal texts.

In order to bring the countryside to the urban reading public, the ethnographic reports had to be formulated under a specific form and style. Owing to the reason that it was a government-sponsored journal, the guidance on the writing was settled through official agendas, interests and needs. I.S. Turgenev's (1818-1883) *Hunting Sketches* (Zapiski okhotnika, 1848-1852) served as a model for the literary ethnographers who mediated the concepts between the capital and province to reveal the 'deep multi-faceted humanity of the Russian peasant', yet expressed their opinions in the course of the writing. The investigators frequently adjusted their perspectives in most texts to satisfy the rules of social equality.[238] Besides, I.A. Goncharov's (1812-1891) *The Frigate Pallada* (1853) was also an example for the literary ethnographers to generalise about the experience of imperial diversity. Between 1852 and 1854, Goncharov, as secretary to Admiral E.V. Putiatin (1804-1883), returned from his round-the-world trip by way of Siberia where he had felt a sense of 'otherness.' He had a full realisation of being an alien in the fieldwork, 'a man of culture' in the Siberian backwoods.[239]

Amongst the eight ethnographic writers, the youngest S.V. Maksimov (1831-1901) was commissioned owing to his interest in philology and folklore as well as his previous experience of studying the *narod*.[240] His research area was in the far North near the city of Arkhangelsk Oblast and the White Sea. Having the risk of being regarded as a government spy, Maksimov overcame suspicious eyes

[238] Anthony G. Netting, *Russian Liberalism: The Years of Promise, 1842-1855*, Ph.D. Dissertation, (Columbia University, 1976), p. 175; and Catherine B. Clay, "Russian Ethnographers in the Service of Empire, 1856-1862", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Spring, 1995), pp. 45-61.

[239] I. A. Goncharov, *Fregat "Pallada"* in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vols. 5-6 (Moscow: "Pravda", 1952). See the English version in *The Frigate Pallada* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1987), p. 565.

[240] Latest publication of S.V. Maksimov's works in *Sobranie sochinenii v 7-mi tomakh* (Moscow: Knigovek, 2010).

and managed to talk with the locals, who were Old Believers (*Starovery*, also known as *Raskol'niki*). For instance, Maksimov described how Prince V.V. Golitsyn (1643-1714) who seemed to be a *raskol'nik* according to folklore and monastery archives, was remembered well by the people of the Mezen River during his exile to the far north. A description of the Prince was an implication of demonstrating the special attitude of the nineteenth century educated Russian towards the *narod* of Finno-Ugric peoples. It is said that,

> Prince Golitsyn liked to walk from Pinega to the Krasnogorodskii Monastery and sat in the village for a while, watching the round dances (*khorovody*) and taught peasant girls to sing Moscow songs which in fact, are spreading from the Tuzem and are heard even now in any one of eight villages which are between the city (of Pinega) and the monastery.[241]

It was the sympathetic character of the Prince who knew of the progress and science and at the same time, was willing to learn about traditional Russian secular culture which marked the essence of the empire. As he proceeded to record what he had learned from popular culture of harbour life, Maksimov pointed out that a cultural 'clash' (*stolknovenie*) between the Russian nationality and that of the 'others' (*chuzhezemnye*) was the main reason that caused the chaos and disorder in the harbour city. By watching the 'multi-coloured' (*raznotsvetnye*) and 'diverse' (*raznoobraznye*) groups of reapers (*zhnetsy*), a living image of Peter the Great (*obraz Petra*) arose. However, 'you stop yourself with memories of him in such a wide and noisy degree.'[242] This is one of the scenes that Maksimov brought to the educated elite by demonstrating in what way the *narod* maintained the traditional customs in order to remember their past.

During the experience in remote areas, images on diversity of religious cultures were also depicted by the writer's veneration of his own and other cultural histories. For instance, it was in A.S. Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii's (1817-1875) reports which showed the coexistence of various religious communities: Orthodox Malo-Russians, Old Ritual Great Russians, Jews, German Catholic, Menonite colonies and Tatar settlements near the lower Dnieper area.[243] From what he discovered, Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii indicated that we had become accustomed to calling all people of the old ritual, without exception, *raskol'niki* regardless of how confused the understanding about different sects existing amongst us was. Thus,

---

[241] S. Maksimov, *God na severe*, 3rd edition (St. Petersburg, 1871), pp. 588-590.
[242] S. Maksimov, *God na severe*, 3rd edition (St. Petersburg, 1871), p. 615.
[243] A.S. Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii, "Poezdka na Dnieprovskye Porogi i na Zaporozhe", *Morskoi sbornik* XXVII, no. 9 (1857), neof., p. 26.

Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii suggested that, 'if a system of tolerance would be followed, some kind of unity to the *raskol* would be possible.'[244] Although the ideology of bringing some kind of unity to diverse faiths and peoples lagged behind reality, a report of various forms of paganism took on new life in ethnographic notes along with the new policy of including diverse social groups (like the *raznochintsy*) in the social services.

***

In the even surrounding of literary ethnography, the imperial government was attempting to increase the diversity of possible interpretation but not to elevate each work as a symbolic object. As was just discussed, the task of knowing different others in remote areas of the Russian Empire provided a solution to the paradox of people whose social position shifts between notions of definition. Holy fools were regarded in a long tradition of popular orthodox veneration as spiritual lay figures that were known and revered for their renunciation of the world and for their fusion of the insane and inane. When the Russian Orthodox Church became more centralised and gradually dominant in every aspect of spiritual life, the Church authorities inevitably began to compile systematic information on unofficial saints and their miraculous relics which in their eyes, were against the imperial norms on Orthodox religious life.

Major disorders and immoral conduct, such as the tradition of *klikushestvo* and holy foolishness, were rarely reported in the prosecution of any politicised duties. The comprehensive survey of unauthorised religious observances was made according to the ukase, to investigate 'false miracles', 'all sorts of shameful customs involving holy icons', 'unattested dead bodies … revered as the true, holy relics of saints', 'hysterical women and sham holy fools.'[245] Thus, assembling data on the popular laity was not a new job; rather it recommenced with a new attitude towards the collected materials in the early nineteenth century. As a result of seemingly incomplete data, the Church authorities were aware of a sharp increase in religious dissension. They managed to adopt measures to respond to the

[244] A.S. Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii, "Poezdka po nizov'iam Dniepra. (Prodolzhenie). (Levyi bereg) V. ot Kamenka do Aleshek", *Morskoi sbornik* XLIV, no. 11 (1859), neof., pp. 47-50.

[245] Eve Levin, "False Miracles and Unattested Dead Bodies: Investigations into Popular Cults in Early Modern Russia", *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views from China, Russia, and the West*, ed. by James D. Tracy and Marguerite Ragnow (Cambridge, U.K.; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 270 (pp. 253-283).

canonisation of the venerated holy fool or pilgrim requested by the believers and therefore reaffirmed miraculous events with relative tolerance.[246]

It was argued that actions of recording these irregular religious services performed by the parish church were exercises on observation and description prior to the introduction of ethnographic studies. Given the result that data on diverse religious practices was reliable, the written records were crucial for the Church authorities to make decisions and have control over religious services in different places. Similar to the purpose which the Church sought to achieve in the area of religious practice, investigation of all people within the Russian Empire was a measure to keep everything in order. Regardless of how different it could be for ethnographers to proceed with their concerns about people of various origins, it is better that they could thoroughly ponder over the question from a diversified perspective against social background before making judgment. It is not true that the accommodation of a variety of human types was a policy accompanied with a decision on concession of some points. An impulse of discovering others in ethnographic ways reflected a growing sense of the need to bring the 'abnormal identity' into imperial society rather than to drive it away. Although the primary intention was obviously political, the science of ethnography constituted an inadvertent kind of 'secularising' discourse, the reconfiguration of which corresponded to a fundamental shift in theology and in arguing a necessary exclusion of certain religious dissent.

The impression given by the holy fool for the comprehension of the public did not end on the page of the hagiographical descriptions or the ethnographic field trip collections. The holy fool transcended its physical parameters and came to serve as a complex of a different conceptual system, a flexible epistemological structure through which modern adopters investigated and made sense of their world. As the phenomenon of holy foolishness spread its trans-disciplinary form of inquiry without maintaining its traditional shape, a niche wherein heterogeneous materials coexisted could be observed for new understanding without having to solve the problem of continuity. The cognitive status of the regeneration which contained the implicit idea of holy foolishness started to undergo a new challenge.

[246] Gregory L. Freeze, "Institutionalizing Piety: The Church and Popular Religion, 1750-1850", in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, pp. 231-237 (pp. 210-249).

[Policy-Making and Cultural Evolutionism]

In fact, the first two chairmen of the Ethnographic Division in the Geographical Society, Karl von Baer and Nikolai Nadezhdin (1804-1856), differed in their opinions of how the study of people could be formulated as a scientific field and then offer the further role of nationality to be played in science. From an intellectual point of view, Russian ethnography was developed under the influence of two distinct branches of German *Romantische Naturphilosophie* at the early stage.[247] One of the traditions was advocated by the empiricist, who rejected 'any attempt to rely on metaphysical explanations of the natural world.'[248] Unlike the impenetrable boundary between the world of 'things in themselves' and empirical knowledge, the other tradition, influenced by the philosophy of Schelling, emphasized that only through an act of 'intellectual intuition' the fundamental structure of the natural world became manifest. It was by means of such speculative leaps that the diversity of mankind was explained.[249] Nevertheless, ethnic identity commonly resulted in a fundamental disenchantment with the gap between promises and reality of integration in late imperial Russia. The evidence is shown by Simon Dubnov (1860-1941) who argued that 'assimilationists and proponents of the *Haskalah*[250] within the Russian state had wrongly denied the existence of Jewish nationhood and had foolhardily attempted to trade Jewish national rights for civic equality.'[251] Following the hint provided for us by the Jewish

[247] *Romantische Naturphilosophie*, the philosophy of nature developed at the time of the founding of German Romanticism. It is particularly associated with the philosophical work of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. See "Romanticism." Dictionary of American History. 2003. *Encyclopedia.com.* 14 Feb. 2014 (http://www.encyclopedia.com) and Andrew Bowie, *Schelling and Modern European Philosophy: An Introduction* (London; New York: Routledge, 1993), see especially the chapter of "The Hermeneutics of Nature", pp. 30-44.

[248] Timothy Lenoir, "The Göttingen School and the Development of Transcendental Naturphilosophie in the Romantic Era", *Studies in the History of Biology*, Vol.5 (1981), pp. 143-149 (pp.111-205); and John H. Zammito, "The Lenoir Thesis Revisited: Blumenbach and Kant", *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science, Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences,* Vol. 43, Issue 1 (March 2012), pp. 120-132.

[249] Timothy Lenoir, "The Göttingen School and the Development of Transcendental Naturphilosophie in the Romantic Era", *Studies in the History of Biology*, p. 113. See also Nathaniel Knight, "Science, Empire, and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845-1855" in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. by Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, c1998), pp. 120-121 (pp. 108-141).

[250] *Haskalah* is the Jewish Enlightenment. It was a movement which 'advocated adopting enlightenment values, pressing for better integration into European society, and increasing education in secular studies, Hebrew language, and Jewish history amongst European Jews in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.' (Cited from Sinkoff, Nancy. "Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment)" Europe, 1450 to 1789: Encyclopedia of the Early Modern World. 2004. *Encyclopedia.com.* 17 Feb. 2014, http://www.encyclopedia.com).

[251] Simon Rabinovitch, "Positivism, Populism and Politic: The Intellectual Foundations of Jewish Ethnography in Late Imperial Russia", *Ab Imperio. Studies of New Imperial History and Nationalism in the Post-Soviet Space*, Issue 3 (2005), p. 242 (pp. 227-256).

community in the late nineteenth century, it is more likely that the integration policy of minorities was not as successful as many others had expected.

During the time when the peasant question was the utmost social issue, the reformers and radicals of the period between 1850 and 1890 contributed more to the framework for speculation about the development of ethnographic theory and the ethics of commitment. Ethnography in Russia was inevitably associated with Shternberg. One may trace its growth in the rigorous requirements for fieldwork that Shternberg demanded of his students in the Faculty of Ethnography, which was first founded in 1918 at the Institute of Geography in Leningrad University. As a senior curator of Russia's only museum of general anthropology, the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, between 1901 and 1927, and as the last anthropology editor of the main Russian encyclopaedia *Brockhaus and Efron*, Shternberg's research originated as a response to a scientific challenge within a particular religious and political milieu.

Deriving from his political background in populism, Shternberg's concern with ethnography was to defend it as a unified science of the development of human culture from which he conceived that all mankind were able to find creative solutions to problems posed by their condition of existence. In Sergei Kan's monograph, *Lev Shternberg: Anthropologist, Russian Socialist, Jewish Activist* (2009), Shternberg is regarded as a Russian ethnologist, yet is identified as an anthropologist, a socialist (a member of the People's Will [*Narodnaia Volia*] and later as a sympathizer of the Party of Socialist Revolutionaries) and Jewish activist (active member of liberal Jewish political and scholarly organisations). The most remarkable aspect of Shternberg's account was his life in the field amongst the indigenous peoples of Sakhalin, the discovery of which was an unintended outcome of his exile. While continuing his career in ethnography, Shternberg apparently came across the conflicts between the evolutionist Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography itself. Although he did not escape the variants of cultural evolutionism, Shternberg would not follow them accordingly since evolution is not uniform and all differences in culture resulted from transient factors.

It would be an interesting prospect to see how Shternberg, a Jewish scholar, on behalf of Russian ethnography and Jewish activism, applied his method of ethnographical hegemony to a people (like himself) that was not formally 'primitive', but was comparable to those officially 'primitive' peoples of Russia. In other words, a careful consideration of Shternberg's social condition or personal identity could help to better understand the constitution of his 'other' and his

selection of discourse in the imperial context. Evidently, it is not a simple task when Sergei Kan demonstrates Shternberg's loyalty to his Jewish roots, but is absent from discussing further about Shternberg as a subaltern figure in his ethnographic career.[252] To summarise Shternberg's legacy, Gagen-Torn concludes:

> His scientific research was aimed at grounding ethical truths, which had to be understood to carry on the struggle for freedom and equal rights of all humanity. He considered that any investigation of a people's culture should assist them to become part of a single human family, to find their place in a single developing humanity.[253]

Ethnography, which saw the blossoming of the concept of *narodnost'* from the 1840s onwards, was above all a science of a specialised field. It was in this context that N.I. Nadezhdin in 1846 offered a model of cataloguing and describing the features of *narodnost'* which seemed to lend the potential of its methodological rigor to an attempt to trace the affinities of all the various peoples of the empire and if possible to reduce their present diversity to a primitive harmony.[254] There was, however, a personal or even ideological difference contained within the cultural idea. For instance, two major works, A.N. Pypin's (1833-1904) study in the history of Russian ethnography[255] and N.N. Kharuzin's (1865-1900) university textbook on the subject of ethnography[256] were, in many respects, similar. While Pypin had Slavophile potential under the ethos of service to the *narod*, Kharuzin was in a sense more relativistic than the conception of looking to science to reveal not just the secrets of nature, but also the path of human progress.[257]

---

[252] Sergei Kan, *Lev Shternberg: Anthropologist, Russian Socialist, Jewish Activist* (Lincoln, [Neb.]; London: University of Nebraska Press, c2009). See also reviews on the book by Marina Mogilner in *Slavic Review*, Vol. 69, No. 3 (Fall 2010), pp. 768-769; and by Jeffrey W. Jones in *Ethnohistory*, Vol. 57, No. 3 (Summer 2010), pp. 478-479.

[253] N.I. Gagen-Torn's (1900-1986) discussion on 'Ten Commandments of the ethnographer (by L.Ia. Shternberg)' [*Desiat' zapovedei etnografa (no* L.Ia. Shternbergu*)*] in her article "Leningradskaia etnograficheskaia shkola v dvadtsatye gody (u istokov sovetskoi etnografii)", *Sovetskaia Etnografiia*, No. 2 (1971), p. 142-143 (pp. 134-145). Also see Vladimir Plotkin and Jovan E. Howe, "The Unknown Tradition: Continuity and Innovation in Soviet Ethnography", *Dialectical Anthropology*, Vol. 9. Issue 1-4 (June 1985), p. 270 (pp. 257-312).

[254] Nathaniel Knight, "Science, Empire, and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845- 1855", *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. by Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, c1998), pp. 108-142.

[255] A.N. Pypin, *Istoriia russkoi etnografii,* 4 vols. (St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich, 1890-1893).

[256] N.N. Kharuzin, *Etnografiia: Lektsii chitannye v Imperatorskom moskovskom universitete*, nos. 1-4 (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaia tipografiia, 1901-1905).

[257] Nathaniel Knight, "Nikolai Kharuzin and the Quest for a Universal Human Science:

At one level, some of the anthropological approaches to race that emerged in Britain in the 1850s shaped Russian ethnography in the late nineteenth century. Edward B. Tylor's (1832-1917) cultural-evolutionary theories influenced Russian ethnographers' ideas about the stage of cultural development.[258] Tylor investigated mythology, magic and primitive mentality under the impact of the Darwinian revolution. Together with Herbert Spencer (1820- 1903), Tylor guided the first ethnographers and ethnologists, who collected a vast amount of factual material on the questions of the morals, beliefs, institutions and languages of primitive people. Being preoccupied with linguistics, Tylor had also by the winter of 1860 'got some knowledge' of Russian and subsequently spent time in St. Petersburg collaborating with members of the Ethnographic Division in the 1880s. According to Stocking, Tylor's *Research* may be regarded as an attempt to solve the old ethnological problem in a new temporal context, using evidence derived from the 'history of the complex whole which we call Civilisation.' It is widely assumed that the very *telos* of evolutionary thinking, speaking to the inferiority of non-European peoples, appeared as early as in Tylor's *Primitive Culture* (1871).[259]

Undoubtedly, evolutionism offered an explanation, a doctrine of European ascendance, for those who sought to unite all peoples of the empire under one ideological concept. Applying evolutionist concepts in his own scholarship, Kharuzin arrived at a twofold definition of the field,

> Ethnography (…) is the science which, in studying the way of life of individual tribes and peoples, strives to search out the laws in accordance with which the development of mankind advances at the lower stages of culture.[260]

Evolutionist thinking was not unknown, but appeared to have been used rarely in Russia by the 1890s. Scholars, like D.N. Anuchin (1843-1923) took a cautious approach in applying evolutionist ideas to Russian ethnography. He insisted that 'meaningful comparative analysis could begin only when sufficient empirical

---

Anthropological Evolutionism and the Russian Ethnographic Tradition, 1885-1900", *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 9, No.1 (Winter 2008), p. 84 (pp. 83-111).

[258] On his influence in Russia see L.Ia. Shternberg, "Sovremennaia etnologiia: Noveishie uspekhi, nauchnye techeniia i metody", *Etnografiia*, no. 1-2 (1926), pp. 15-43.

[259] George W. Stocking, Jr, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan, c1987), pp. 157-159.

[260] N.N. Kharuzin, *Etnografiia: Lektsii chitannye v Imperatorskom moskovskom universitete*, p. 37. Texts quoted from Nathaniel Knight, "Nikolai Kharuzin and the Quest for a Universal Human Science: Anthropological Evolutionism and the Russian Ethnographic Tradition, 1885-1900", pp. 85-86.

evidence had been assembled.'[261] In addition, as A.I. Pershits (1923-2007) reminds us, besides the tradition of classical evolutionism, one should recognise that 'the unity' of the world historical process is determined not merely by the nature of sociological laws, but also by contacts between various groups of mankind which steadily increase in the course of historical development.'[262] For Kharuzin's case, his two monographs on dwellings amongst the Finnish peoples and Turkic and Mongol nomads within the Russian Empire relied largely on historical data and direct ethnographic evidence and were accomplished under Anuchin's influence of the field as *narodovedenie*, the study of people. Although Kharuzin's inclination of the evolutionary scheme and unsystematic manner of writing were heavily criticised by the young ethnographer A.N. Maksimov (1872-1941), his attempts to impart a conditional explanatory mechanism to the living experience laid the ground for the future of ethnography.

The historical-ethnographic activity was scrambled to help in the creation of a cultural perspective for a secular interpretation of people's life, both in improving the historiographical corpus for later scholars and in serving as a source of cultural inspiration for generations of Russian writers. Whether it was built under the romantic nationalist aura of science or gradually came to reflect a conception of the influential evolutionism in the 1880s, ethnography in Russia involved the production of representing the *narod* with hardly any biased discussion. A high proportion of references to works published in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries highlighted both the specific historical character of pre-revolutionary ethnography and the nature of the intellectual transition in which Russian-Soviet ethnography began. Extensive research on the peasantry of Russia, the Ukraine and Belorussia was carried out prior to 1917. It is arguable that Russian ethnography was never confined to the study of only exotic foreigners and 'primitive'. By taking this into account, Stephen P. Dunn, a long-time observer of Russian ethnography has discovered that most of the early Russian ethnographers see the primitive peoples with a more nearly equal footing than did their Western counterparts.'[263]

---

[261] D. Anuchin, "O zadachakh russkoi etnografii", *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, no. 1 (1889), pp. 1-35. Texts quoted from Nathaniel Knight, "Nikolai Kharuzin and the Quest for a Universal Human Science: Anthropological Evolutionism and the Russian Ethnographic Tradition, 1885-1900", p. 97.

[262] A.I. Pershits, "Ethnographic Reconstruction of the History of Primitive Society" in *Soviet and Western Anthropology*, ed. by Ernest Gellner (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1980), p. 89.

[263] Stephen P. Dunn, *Introduction to Soviet Ethnography*, ed. by Stephen P. Dunn and Ethel Dunn, Vol. 1 (Berkeley, Calif.: Highgate Road Social Science Research Station, 1974), p. 2.

***

As a scientific method, ethnographic description played a dual role with regard to the understanding of the holy fool. Those scholars, who were not eager to place their objects in any kind of universal hierarchy of race or nation, signalled out a position of accepting the objects as they were and of understanding their way of life with a minimum of arbitrary judgment. The ideas for and suggestions to government's policy on non-Russian natives were gradually institutionalised as rules of practice which implied a shift in acknowledging the individuality together with a careful consideration for the union of the empire amongst the dominant rank of society. Although it may not suggest a general cultural attitude of Russians as a whole, ethnographic observations reflect not only scientific values, but also provide a comprehensive orientation for readers to broaden their vision of universal history of mankind. As professional ethnographers began to map out the complex world of human beings, individuals began to compile historical statistical descriptions of their normal or abnormal activities. Similar to the state of non-Russian natives in the empire, holy fools should not be seen as a degenerative form of human development or savagery for the sake of civilisation or imperial purpose.

A Study of 'Us': Orientalism in Russia

Russian perception and attitude towards the primordial encounters with the sedentary populations of the ancient *Rus'* or with the nomadic peoples of the vast prairie on the eastern frontiers were largely influenced by views of Asia coming from the West in the early period after Peter the Great and more strikingly during the reign of Catherine the Great. In fact, 'Russia's natural kinship with Asiatic peoples and its corresponding distance from the civilisation of the European West' have always been exercises for the revival of Eurasianism.[264] The question of 'what Asia is' poses a wide spectrum of opinions which cannot be reduced from the object of an inquiry to some 'unified' others. In fact, 'Asia' in the multiple

[264] Mark Bassin's review of the *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration* by David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye in *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 84, No. 1 (March 2012), pp. 270-272.

conception of Russia encompassed places such as the Caucasus, Volga and Ural river regions, Siberia, or China, India and other countries of the Far East.[265] As Susan Layton has discovered, 'Asia' became a term for overlapping usage in the cultural spheres of Pushkin's time.

When we look towards the East, a recollection of Edward Said's influential work *Orientalism* (1978) is often used to formulate the idea which functions to create and marginalise the knowledge of different 'others.' Developing Foucault's theories of the 'interlocking nature of power and knowledge', Said, whose position is relatively eclectic, agrees with Foucault that 'systems of representations are deeply influenced by the systems of power within which they originate.'[266] Hence, to Said, the various Western representations of the Orient, both scholarly and popular, were 'all-pervasive in a sense that they prevented the Orient from describing itself.'[267] Nevertheless, Said's concept of orientalism has been criticised. Part of a quotation from Marx's conclusions was misused and deemed 'unethical', 'too-restricted' and simply 'pre-determined.' [268] Said's explication of discourse in orientalism strives to escape the enmeshed structures of political and socioeconomic dominance which Foucault conceptualised with power and proposes a theory of 'dynamic exchange' between individual writers or texts and the complex processes of empire-building with which they interact.[269] Despite the variety of cognition and interpretation, Said's idea of colonial knowledge production continues to hold considerable sway amongst academics and has been subject to penetrating critiques.

In comparison with Britain, France and the United States, whose ideological distancing of the 'Orient' was an elaborate justification for stigmatising an enemy of different religious origin, Russia had a more pressing need to maintain its own status and establish a relationship of superiority by defining the East as inferior yet symbiotic. And for not being able to entirely shake off the 'Eastern' aspect of the Russian identity, the academy of oriental studies (*vostokovedenie*) built up its

---

[265] Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy*, pp. 71-72.

[266] Choi Chatterjee, "Transnational Romance, Terror, and Heroism: Russia in American Popular Fiction, 1860-1917", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (Jul., 2008), pp. 756-757 (pp.753-777).

[267] James Clifford, "On Orientalism", in *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, pp. 225-276; and also Valerie Kennedy, *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford; Malden, Mass.: Polity Press, 2000), especially the chapter of "Orientalism", pp.14-48.

[268] Irfan Habib, "In Defence of Orientalism: Critical Notes on Edward Said", *Social Scientist*, Vol. 33, No. 1/2 (Jan. - Feb., 2005), pp. 40-46.

[269] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1979 [c1978]), pp. 14-15, 23-24.

own research, textual analysis and made a substantial contribution to the archive of information about the peoples and cultures on the southern and eastern borderlands of the empire.

Given that the word 'Orientalist' has acquired a negative connotation since the publication of Said's *Orientalism*, 'Orientologist' is relatively appropriate for the Russian peers and the later is, in many ways, 'a product of the intellectual and political environment' in which the Orientologists lived and worked.[270] Without having discussed the case in Russia, Said's critique of Western Orientology was to a significant extent based on that of an Egyptian Marxist, Anwar Abdel-Malek, in an earlier article "Orientalism in Crisis" (1963).[271] The latter's first citation on the general history of traditional orientalism contained V.V. Bartol'd's publication of *Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii* (Leningrad, 1925) and the entry for '*Vostokovedenie*' in the second edition of the *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia*, published in 1951.[272] For many in the nineteenth century, Said wrote that 'the Orient was a place of pilgrimage' and 'an exotic yet especially attractive reality' which encouraged the exploration and exploitation of the alien others.[273] In view of the manifold contacts with Asians over the centuries, Russia is in the position of a different situation that is situated in Said's examples. As a matter of fact, the Russian state came under the influence of both the West and the East by virtue of its geography. Russian Orientology, according to Bartol'd, appeared to have its origins dating back to Peter the Great and became the same kind of 'Western' discipline as other academic fields regardless of having the strongest cultural ties to the East.[274] In the early nineteenth century, the western European influence was intensified alongside the growing national consciousness and the gradual replacement of foreigners by Russians in the various scientific and educational institutions. As Bartol'd observed, the study of eastern cultures and

[270] Vera Tolz, *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 5.

[271] Anwar Abdel-Malek, "Orientalism in Crisis", *Diogenes*, Vol. 11, No. 44 (Dec. 1963), pp. 103-140.

[272] Vera Tolz, "European, National, and (anti-) Imperial: The Formation of Academic Oriental Studies in Late Tsarist and Early Soviet Russia", *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 9, No.1 (2008), pp. 53-81.

[273] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, pp. 168 and 170. See David Spurr, *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration* (Durham: Duke University Press, c1993), especially pp. 13-27 ("Surveillance: Under Western Eyes") and 61-75 ("Classification: The Order of Nations") for a general aspect of idealising the colonial subject and see specific applications to the problem in Russia in Adeeb Khalid, Nathaniel Knight, and Maria Todorova in "Ex tempore: Orientalism and Russia", *Kritika*, Vol. 1 (Fall, 2000), pp. 691-727.

[274] V.V. Bartol'd, 'Vostok i russkaia nauka ', in his *Sochineniia*, vol. 9 (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), pp. 534-545.

languages became noteworthy in Russia as one of the western sciences, yet did not flourish until the state perceived a vested interest in utilising the field for political ambitions.[275]

Said once stated, the drawing of a boundary between 'us' and 'them' always carries a plethora of 'suppositions, associations and fictions' about foreign people.[276] Unlike in Britain or France, the Russian intellectuals produced knowledge and practices of the Orient which were directed at their own people, rather than projected onto the body from overseas. A number of different dimensions of Russian Orientology were developed especially in the nineteenth century. In the light of Said's implication of the importance of the Orient, we can sense that one would appreciate 'the role of nationalism and the goals of nation-building' in order to understand the ways in which Europe had engaged with the Orient.[277] What is different in terms of ideology and practice between Russia and the West is that Russia's 'own Orient' is not the negative connotation with which it has often been associated, following the publication of Said's *Orientalism*. In fact, many orientologists, including V.R. Rozen (1849- 1908), the founding father of modern Russian Oriental Studies, defined and insisted that Russian scholars had to study Russia's 'own Orient.'

Members of the academic Orientologist in St. Petersburg, which was founded by Rozen in the 1890s, were conscious of the political and cultural constructs that were applied in the usage of the 'East' and the 'West.' Amongst them, Bartol'd, who was trained in Arabic and Islamic studies, conducted pioneering research in the origins and changed the concepts of the East-West dichotomy, which is awkwardly based on 'ignorance and conceit' of European popular mythology. In terms of his field of specialisation, Bartol'd argued that the relationship between Russia and the Muslim world was different. The overwhelmingly negative descriptions of the Mongols were redressed by Bartol'd who valued the stability of the Mongol period which brought 'political and cultural advancement.'[278] Far from being 'self-evident categories', for Bartol'd or any other of Rozen's disciples, definitions of East and West, Europe and Asia, were subject to change when the historical events sought to advance. Preoccupied with the history of constructing geographical, political and cultural boundaries between East and West, Bartol'd's

[275] V.V. Bartol'd, 'Vostok i russkaia nauka', in his *Sochineniia*, vol. 9 (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), pp. 536-538.
[276] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, pp. 54-55.
[277] Vera Tolz, "Orientalism, Nationalism, and Ethnic Diversity in Late Imperial Russia", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Mar., 2005), p. 129 (pp. 127-150).
[278] *Ibid*, p. 59.

methodologies were in terms of Tolz's discussion, 'strikingly similar to those of contemporary scholars who deconstruct categories and phenomena popularly perceived as natural, static and homogenous.'[279] One the one hand, Bartol'd demonstrated how Christian prejudices against and hostility towards Islam continued to have an impact on Oriental Studies in Europe well into the nineteenth century. On the other hand, Bartol'd also said that the government's imprudent attitude towards scholarship and Russia's cultural backwardness explained the limited achievements of Russian Orientology, although geographical advantages were in favour of Russia, rather than Western Europe.[280]

In modern times, the engagement of Russian specialists with the applicability of Said's idea to Russia has been limited.[281] Scholars may differ in their opinions to the question they pose about the complicity of the Oriental Studies in Russian imperialism, but the attitude of different groups of 'experts', including academic Orientalists, Christian missionaries and government officials, must be explained differently against their educational background which leads to their ultimate position towards the 'natives' and their relationship with the government.[282] Nevertheless, in the words of Alexander Morrison, what really matters is 'the degree to which the worlds of scholarship and colonial rule were interpenetrating.'[283] As we wanted to suggest here is that the vital theoretical issue raised by *Orientalism* was its concerns about the status of all forms of thought and its re-application to dealing with the non-Russian native. Without denying the close relationship between European Oriental studies and imperialism, the goals of nation-building were pursued by the Russian Orientalists to foster a sense of community and unity amongst all the population of the Russian Empire. Any potential division between the dominant Russian and the indigenous

---

[279] *Ibid*, p. 51. According to Tolz, Bartol'd's findings can be compared with those of Martin W. Lewis and Kären E. Wigen in *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, c1997), especially pp. 47-103 (chapter two "The Spatial Constructs of Orient and Occident, East and West" and chapter three "The Cultural Constructs of Orient and Occident, East and West").

[280] V.V. Bartol'd, "Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii", in his *Sochineniia*, vol. 9 (Moscow: Nauka, 1977), pp. 197-482.

[281] Adeeb Khalid, "Russian History and the Debate over Orientalism"; and Nathaniel Knight, "On Russian Orientalism: A Response to Adeeb Khalid", *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (Fall, 2000), pp. 691-699 and 701-715. Also see the chapter title of "Early Lermontov and Oriental Machismo" and "Little Orientalizers" in Susan Layton's *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy* (Cambridge; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 133-155 and 153-174.

[282] Cited from Vera Tolz, "Orientalism, Nationalism, and Ethnic Diversity in Late Imperial Russia", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Mar., 2005), pp. 127-150.

[283] Alexander Morrison, "Applied Orientalism' in British India and Tsarist Turkestan", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Jul., 2009), p. 636 (pp. 619-647).

non-Russian was ideally not to be seen in a united situation. However, a contradictory debate over the integration and assimilation of the indigenous people was also proposed by Il'minskii who was regarded as the well-known 'educator' of the 'native.'[284] The Il'minskii system was developed against the background of when the state officials as well as church hierarchs decided to strengthen the Christian faith amongst the 'internal aliens.' The main point of the Il'minskii system was to teach the non-Russian natives to be on the right path of Christianity by using their own language and through native instructors. The Il'minskii method of instruction marked a vital shift in attitudes towards the 'aliens', but it was also vigorously debated especially by those whose works related to Muslims in the late 1860s.

[Eastwards to Siberia: A Place of Experience]

The Orient itself is a projection, a metaphorical stage affixed to the European consciousness on which a rich cast of characters — pharaohs, sphinxes, geniis on flying carpets, sultans with their harems — embody the exoticism, the mystery and the danger of the east.[285] The orientalism is both 'a product of and a precondition for European imperialism.'[286] Applying the paradigm of Said's orientalism to see the question of others in Russia, even after the reforms of Peter the Great, the inclination of the tsarist regime to become a civilised western nation was incomplete and disputable. On the contrary, when Russian scholars turned to the east, it was often with a 'sharp awareness of their own supposed backwardness and inferiority' in the face of the civilised Britain, France and Germany.[287] It was turned out differently that in Russia the study of the east was the study of Russia itself.

Seymour Becker once states that 'cultural assimilation in the East was considered much less urgent than in the western borderland (of Russia), where

[284] Scholars at the Kazan Theological Academy and Il'minskii's pedagogical approach to missions based on the use of native languages and personnel to retain communities that already were nominally Christian can be seen in Robert P. Geraci, *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press, 2001), especially chapter two on "Nikolai I. Il'minskii and the Renaissance of Russian Orthodox Missions", pp. 47-85.

[285] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978), p. 63.

[286] Sanjay Kumar Pandey, "Asia in the Debate on Russian Identity", *International Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (October 2007), p. 324 (pp. 317-337).

[287] Nathaniel Knight, "Grigor'ev in Orenburg, 1851-1862: Russian Orientalism in the Service of Empire", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (Spring, 2000), p. 77 (pp. 74-100).

minority nationalism had challenged Russian control.'[288] Although the Russian conquest was presented retrospectively as a legitimatising superiority over fanatical Islam, the battle experience itself catalysed the revival of certain traditional values and saw the impossibility of ignoring Islam for good. The Russian observers of Islamic inhabitants on the western frontier presented an appropriate example for further development of extensive study on orientalism. However, were the eastern regions of Siberia a tranquil place without conflicts?

'Siberia' was once a name which referred to the Tatar khanate of *Sibir* (in the area around Tobolsk) in the sixteenth century which by the mid-1600s had incorporated the entire expanse from the Urals to the Pacific.[289] The 'imaginative geography' of Siberia was constructed and represented in terms of categories and attributes which were meaningful to those who consider using the unique differences in the images of the Russian east for their own purpose. For instance, Siberia was no more than a wild and primeval land of past colonial glory in the aristocrat's eye, but on the other hand it was the home of a democratic and egalitarian society for the reformers and political opponents. Siberia became a prototype for the Russian nationalists to imagine the motherland as a whole under the atmosphere of European civilisation. Even today, Siberia continues to be regarded as the repository of valuable resources for the benefit of economic growth.[290] Siberia is like a blank canvas for writers and observers who wish to inscribe their interpretations and visions from their cultural background.

The Irkutsk writer N.C. Shchukin (1792-1883) marvelled at his native Siberia as a place of joy. At the beginning of his novel *A Settler: A Siberian Tale* (*Posel'shchik: Sibirskaia povest'*, 1834) he described that,

> Siberia is an Asian country; there everything is unique, and although people are the same everywhere, they act in accordance with different reasons, in a different sphere, on a different scale, with a different mentality and guided by different notions of what is acceptable. What is plausible in Europe will not have any truthfulness in Siberia and therefore events happening [in Siberia] seem to be outside of the European range of activities (*krug deistvii*).[291]

---

[288] Seymour Becker, "The Muslim East in Nineteenth-Century Russian Popular Historiography", *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 5, Issue 3-4 (1986), pp. 26-27 and 44 (pp. 25-47).

[289] *Sibir'* in *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, 3rd Edition (1970-1979). via http://slovari.yandex.ru/ (last accessed 12 January 2015).

[290] Mark Bassin, "Inventing Siberia: Visions of the Russian East in the Early Nineteenth Century", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 96, No. 3 (Jun., 1991), pp. 763-794.

[291] Galya Diment, "Exiled *from* Siberia: The Construction of Siberian Experience by Early-Nineteenth-Century Irkutsk Writers" in *Between Heaven and Hell: The Myth of Siberia in*

His literal version of Siberia was neither a wild nor an uncivilised one. Hence, Shchukin continued putting emphasis upon the untouched quality of the landscape in the novel by saying,

> My dear countrymen! Do not offend a beautiful land with an unfair judgment, do not be strangers — it is your land, and in it live kind and even thoughtful (*mysliashchie*) people. They speak the same language you hear on the banks of the Neva or Volga.[292]

Siberia was a land of innocence for romantic reasons, according to the opinion of some writers. It would be superfluous to argue over the point of whose description is more close to the real world of Siberia. As James R. Gibson concluded in his discussion of the 'paradoxical perception of Siberia', people of different backgrounds had different views of Siberia and each was valid for reasons because they simply 'reflected the rights, values and goals of its beholder.'[293]

In order to systematise the sporadic studies of Asia, Kazan was granted to initiate an institution of higher learning about Orientology in 1805. After the Kazan school pioneered its study on the community of Tatar and Mongolian and potentially revealed its interests in the Islamic East, St. Petersburg's orientologists caught the eyes of those who favoured the new approach of studying Asia from 1855 onwards. The subject of interest as well as the curriculum for undergraduates were designed using a different approach. Whether or not Orientology was given attention due to the reason of geopolitics and regional population combination, influence of the Western equivalent, or diplomatic issue with a neighbouring country, the emphasis on its own oriental mission differed throughout time. Schimmelpenninck Van der Oye argued that the members of Kazan University's Oriental Department tended to regard their principal duty to be training interpreters and other government officials, whereas professors in St. Petersburg's oriental faculty favoured more scholarly aims. However, he also indicates a few exceptions which cannot basically be assigned to either group.[294] Nevertheless, it is no doubt that the value of establishing professional institutions was to sustain, continue and develop oriental studies for a closer understanding of the Asian East.

Russian Culture, ed. By Galya Diment and Yuri Slezkine (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), p. 60.

[292] *Ibid*, p. 50.

[293] James R. Gibson, "Paradoxical Perceptions of Siberia: Patrician and Plebeian Images up to the Mid-1800s" in *Between Heaven and Hell: The Myth of Siberia in Russian Culture*, p. 89.

[294] David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind From Peter the Great to the Emigration* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), p. 175.

In late imperial Russia, the theory of colonialism was 'an evocative field' for imagining the nation and the empire.[295] Eastern regions were vast and were home to varying climates, landscape and a wide range of different people.[296] Rural literacy increased largely in the 1890s for the purpose of the state and society, administrative decrees were printed as well as articles, maps and a variety of information pamphlets for the growing scale of resettlement (*pereselenie*) to Eastern Siberia. Both positive and negative comments in the publication were mentioned. But the idea of seeing the resettlement as a challenging yet potentially rewarding enterprise was often conveyed whether it was written by populists or *Zemstvo*, the elective district council in Russia between 1864 and 1917. The 'handbooks' for the settlement areas aimed to provide everything settlers needed to know, which noticeably included information about the local natives. In general, the manuals tended not to present territories and peoples who 'professed a different faith and spoke different languages' in ways that made them seem 'hostile, threatening, or even exotic.'[297] It is reasonable to assume that the administrative officers inclined to clear all doubts of the possible challenges in communication with Russian Siberians by describing them as something that settlers needed to be aware of. Judging from settlers' narratives and descriptions, natives, non-Slavic, and/or non-Orthodox people were neutral amongst the settlers and their 'other' neighbours. Although the recognition of religious/cultural difference sometimes led to practical descriptions of prejudices, knowledge of justifying or explaining Siberian 'others' hardly implied hostility in that specific condition of the late nineteenth century Russia.[298]

***

[295] Willard Sunderland, "The 'Colonization Question': Visions of Colonization in Late Imperial Russia", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Neue Folge, Bd. 48, H. 2 (2000), pp. 210-232.

[296] Willard Sunderland, "Peasant Pioneering: Russian Peasant Settlers Describe Colonization and the Eastern Frontier, 1880s-1910s", *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Summer, 2001), pp. 895-922.

[297] References to describe the size and diversity of eastern provinces and peoples in the manuals, see V.V. Dashkevich, *Pereselenie v Sibir': s 7 risunkami i kartoiu Sibiri* (St. Petersburg: tipografiia A.S. Suvorina, 1912), pp. 3, 27-28; and David Moon, "Peasant Migration and the Settlement of Russia's Frontiers, 1550–1897", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec., 1997), pp. 859-893.

[298] Willard Sunderland, "Peasant Pioneering: Russian Peasant Settlers Describe Colonization and the Eastern Frontier, 1880s-1910s", *Journal of Social History*, pp. 895-922.

What is important at this point for us to rediscover the issue of the holy foolishness is that the change in attitude towards people of different faith, extreme behaviours and stigmatised appearance was a positive result which could be regarded as influenced by studies of people of diverse social and cultural origins in the nineteenth century Russia. The dichotomy between western-oriented Russians and the culturally distant (and objectified) 'other' always prompted feelings of shock, revulsion and pity amongst the Church and tsarist administrators in the first place. Along with the processes by which the imperial Russian state extended its military presence and colonial administration eastwards into Siberia, distinctions emerged between ethnicity when economics and religion began to identify itself as supplementary to the rules for distinction. The search for the Romantic *narodnost'*, which was influenced by the Europeans' endeavour to discover the spirit of one's history and identity, was not an adequate path for the Russians. Ancient hagiography and chronicles may offer implicit reference to the idea of collective humanity. However, as the imperial 'state' of Russia grew with the diversity of 'nations' in the context of ethnicity, what made Russia a whole (empire) was the sense of identifying others through the process of acknowledging differences. The myth of homogeneity, a tendency to eliminate all cultural and ethnic differences, was not possible or practical in the Russian Empire which was supposed to associate different people.[299]

[Central Asia and Buddhism]

Struggling to pave the road towards its orient (beyond the western imagination of the near East), Russia built up and fostered its connection with the Far East Asia at the turn of the twentieth century. Convinced that religion and language were primary reasons to be differentiated from others, Buddhism and sinology began to receive attention. The infatuation with Buddhism probably reached its solid culmination when a Buddhist temple was erected in 1915 in St. Petersburg, a city associated with Christian practice and as a symbol of modernity. The construction committee for the Buddhist temple was held by A.L. Dorzhiev (1854-1938) in 1909 and the attendants included some prestigious European orientalists and artists: V.V. Radlov, S.F. Ol'denburg, E.E. Ukhtomsky, G.V. Baranovsky, V.P. Schneider, N.K.

[299] Alain de Benoist, "The Idea of Empire", *Telos*, Issue 98-99 (Winter 1993 / Spring 1994), pp. 81-98. http://www.gornahoor.net/library/IdeaOfEmpire.pdf (last accessed 12 January 2015). Empire, as Alain de Benoist argued, differ from nation-states with respect to the degree of homogenisation they aim to achieve.

Roerich, V.L. Kotvich, A.D. Rudnev and F.I. Shcherbatskoi. Hence, it is fair to say that the Buddhist temple was built with 'European methods and materials.'[300]

The story that has come to surround the Buriat Lama Agvan Dorzhiev's phenomenon may be a good starting point to see how Buddhism functioned in the life of European Russians, as Snelling argued that due to the 'distinct similarities' between the Orthodox Church and Buddhism, the former provided fertile soil for the spread of the latter in Russia. The visual impact generated a new perception which was either in a fury of protest as an insult to Christ, or simply showed great enthusiasm to support a monastic complex containing accommodation for monks and educational facilities in addition to areas reserved for Buddhist rites and practice.[301] St. Petersburg saw the emergence of the Buddhist community under the auspices of the Oriental Institute of Imperial Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In fact, the tradition of academic studies on the presence of ethnic Buddhism within the empire was built on an interest that had already arisen when the valiant pioneers had a serendipitous encounter with Mongolians and Tibetans on their way to Central Asia.

At the centre of this developing process stands N.I. Bichurin (1777-1853), later known as Father Hyacinth, an erudite figure whose linguistic talents made him accompany the Ninth Ecclesiastical Mission to Beijing. From 1808 onwards, Father Hyacinth spent the next fourteen years in China. Upon his return to St. Petersburg, Father Hyacinth published a series of books about China and Inner Asia, the result of which was an astonishing rich body of works that anticipated several prosperous aspects of the history, folklore and literature about Tibet, Mongolia and China. As a scholar rather than as a religious servant, he found himself in the midst of intellectual enthusiasm which furnished the visitors of St. Petersburg salons with a broad knowledge of some vital philosophical trends that construct the ethos of the Middle Kingdom (China). A.S. Pushkin (1799-1837) was one of the most prominent figures who established a close friendship with Father Hyacinth.[302] Although one commentator noted that Father Hyacinth's philosophy revealed more or less an attempt to 'idealise the Middle Kingdom as the apotheosis of reason', a

[300] John Snelling, *Buddhism in Russia: The Story of Agvan Dorzhiev, Lhasa's Emissary to the Tsar* (Shaftesbury, Dorset, [U. K.]; Rockport, Mass.: Element, 1993), pp. 136-137.
[301] *Ibid*, pp. xi-xii and 140.
[302] M.P. Alekseev, "Pushkin i Kitai" in *A.S. Pushkin i Sibir'* (Moscow-Irkutsk: Vostsiboblgiz, 1937), pp. 108-145. Available via http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=64oyn6D22YQ%3d&tabid=10396 (last accessed 12 January 2015).

combination of works produced at the early stage in the process of the Russian study of China seemed, in Bartol'd's eyes, to have 'surpassed Western Europe.'[303]

Apart from this kind of orientologist characterised initially by his missionary purpose, the Oriental faculty in St. Petersburg University also devoted itself to works on the East. In Russia, systematic study of Buddhism begins with I.P. Minaev (1840-1890), who was the founder of the Russian School of Indian Studies. Minaev strived to present a comprehensive history of Buddhism and its cultural and historical influence on the peoples of the East. His research on the chronology and relation of the canonical works of Buddhism, the *Mahayana* and the *Hinayana*, had a significant impact on the development of international Buddhology.[304] To mention another representative figure, V.P. Vasil'ev (1818- 1900), having finished his thesis "On the Foundation of Buddhist Philosophy" in 1839, was immersed in sociology and politics that severely shaped his works which were developed the coming year. Following his analysis of defining the real East to be China, India and Siberia, Vasil'ev declared with a post-Romantic tone that 'we are at the dawn of the age when the separation (between the East and West) will vanish. One does not have to be a seer or a great philosopher to make this prediction. We just have to abandon our common preconceptions.'[305] Succeeding members at the Oriental faculty, such as S.F. Oldenburg, were encouraged to engage on the frontier of Buddhist research which included the contribution to the tremendous edition of the *Bibliotheca Buddhica* in 1897. Oldenburg still maintained components of his philosophical training that rendered his idea about the legends and folklore of Buddhism identical to those of his teacher Vasil'ev.

Meanwhile, after his study of the religious system of the Tungus, S.M. Shirokogorov argued that shamanism was a relatively late phenomenon stimulated by the spread of Buddhism. Shirokogorov had claimed that the shaman was a term referring to persons of both sexes 'who have mastered spirits, who at their will can introduce these spirits into themselves and use their power over the spirits in their own interests, particularly helping other people, who suffer from the spirit.'[306] Nowadays a re-evaluation of the similarities between shamanism and Buddhism was not uncommon. For instance, Holger Kalweit argued that the shaman

[303] David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration*, pp. 148 and 150.
[304] Minaev, I.P. in *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, 3rd Edition (1970-1979). (through http://slovari.yandex.ru/, last accessed 15 January 2015)
[305] David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, *Russian Orientalism*, p. 180.
[306] S.M. Shirokogoroff, *Psychomental Complex of the Tungus* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, 1935), p. 269.

'experiences existential unity – the *Samadhi* of the Hindus or what Western spiritualists and mystics call enlightenment, illumination, *unio mystica*.'[307] Gary Doore additionally indicated that 'shamans, yogis and Buddhists alike are accessing the same state of consciousness.'[308] The practitioners of both religions may indeed involve similar processes and aims in order to cultivate their own religious sensitivity and thoughts. However, shamanism and Buddhism seem appear to be different for a moment when people further question the experience and function of each practice in a different state or from multiple dimensions.[309]

Regardless of Shirokogorov's hypothesis which might not suitably be applied to all the ethnic groups in Siberia, he was in a position to see ecstatic experience to be 'basic to the human condition' and what changed through history was 'the interpretation and valuation of it.' [310] The above case also explains why Thompson's claims (of viewing the shaman and holy fool as equivalent) should undergo multiple comparisons between different situations in order to prove that which possesses both identical states. Nonetheless, what makes certain comparison so profound is because the rule for mapping and distinguishing the shamanic, the Buddhist and holy-foolish state reflects a kind of instability which encourages a breakthrough in solid prejudice. In his ethnological discussion of the Ural-Altaic cultures and languages, Shirokogorov pointed out that it might be awkward to say: 'the variations of cultural and physical phenomena in man take place in certain human groups which exist as units', because these units in the process of classification may not be recognised as existing or functioning.[311] In the words of Shirokogorov, all human activity which results in the complex cultural phenomena is nothing but 'a complex form of biological adaptation.' [312] Although the psycho-mental behaviour of living organisms is different, their nature of adapting themselves to the existing outer world remains the same. Language, said Shirokogorov, should not be taken as the only basis for the 'differentiation of

[307] Holger Kalweit, *Dreamtime and Inner Space: the World of the Shaman* (Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, 1988), p. 236.
[308] Gary Doore, *Shaman's Path: Healing, Personal Growth and Empowerment* (Boston: Shambhala; distributed by Random House, 1988), p. 223.
[309] Roger Walsh, "Phenomenological Mapping and Comparisons of Shamanic, Buddhist, Yogic, and Schizophrenic Experiences", *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 739-769.
[310] C. Humphrey, "Theories of North Asian Shamanism" in *Soviet and Western Anthropology*, ed. by Ernest Gellner (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co., 1980), p. 245.
[311] S. M. Shirokogoroff, *Ethnological and Linguistical Aspects of the Ural-Altaic Hypothesis* (Oosterhout, Netherlands: Anthropological Publications, 1970 [1931]), p. 8.
[312] *Ibid*, p. 29.

ethnoses.' 'Every conception of a phenomenon is never static, but dynamic.'[313] According to this hypothesis, it is also true that we cannot regard the holy foolishness solely as religious, psychic, physiological, social or economic phenomenon if we acknowledge that the holy fool is a type of living organism. The social function of the holy fool, living in an organised society, remains complex. Without doubts, the individual acts of the holy fool are still monitored and moderated by society through forms of morality, religion, science or art and further re-interpreted by people who make use of the meaning for flexible purposes.

F.I. Shcherbatskoi (or Stcherbatsky, 1866-1942) is also one of the prominent figures in the sphere of Buddhist studies. Unlike his European contemporaries whose studies of the East were based on epistemological foundations laid by the Romantic theories of comparative civilisation, Shcherbatskoi embarked on intensive studies of Buddhism which explicitly demonstrated his tendency to recognise India's contribution to science and rationalism. Romantic fascination or colonial exploitation was of no interest to Shcherbatskoi. Inspired by I.P. Minaev and V.P. Vasil'ev, Shcherbatskoi synthesised his ethnographic observations of contemporaneous religious practices of India in 1910 with his analyses of the 'Buddhist logic' in modern terminology and offered a vigorous philosophical defence of it. Together with Ol'denburg and Bartol'd, Shcherbatskoi intensified the significance of Oriental Studies in early twentieth-century Russia by discovering the Indian mind for the purpose of understanding Indian thought.

Starting from his first article on the subject, *Logic in Ancient India* (1902), Shcherbatskoi criticised those scholars who saw the tradition following the Western path as a universal and natural process, while all others paths of development were uncivilised and 'pathological.' In fact, both positive and negative conceptions of India (its people and culture) shared the same reductionist presumption that India was a homogenous whole and had not changed since the dawn of time. The process of describing an 'other' as something different cannot avoid relating to the emergence of inequality. What makes Shcherbatskoi's approach to Indian philosophy (and all other Russian scholars' to their oriental studies) relevant to our concern here is his awareness of not holding prejudice against others. Grounded in his analysis of *The Doctrine of the Buddha* (1932), Shcherbatskoi demonstrated that classification is everywhere in Buddhist theory for the 'formation of an individual life in the different realms of existence.'[314] In his discussion of eternity,

[313] *Ibid*, p. 13.
[314] Th. Stcherbatsky, "The Doctrine of the Buddha", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African*

Shcherbatskoi argued that 'life in paradise is of enormous duration, but it is not eternity. Real eternity is absence of change, and that means absence of life. Eternity means extinction (*nirodha*) of all energies (*saṃskāras*), entropy.'[315]

What interests me is that life is, as suggested, subject to change in whatever the space is. Living a life is not only for the sake of eternity where there exists only one type of life. It reminds us of those theories proposed by Durkheim and Canguilheim that abnormality should be regarded as normativity which leads life not towards extinction, but creativity. Eternity or normality may be the ideal of a better condition and a society one aims to pursue. Nevertheless, in Shcherbatskoi's opinion, a life is 'non-eternal, changing, living, causally produced elements.'[316] Without taking away the various fable of supernatural powers or ecstatic states which are prevalent in most Indian philosophical systems, Shcherbatskoi laid out a collection and organisation of facts presented by societies of different types in the mist of Oriental fantasy. Just as Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya indicated in his introduction to the *Papers of Th. Stcherbatsky* (1969), it is clear from Shcherbatskoi's conception of East-West differences and his approach to Indian philosophy in general, that the growing strength of the democratic movement in Russian which presaged the October Revolution, was predestined by the specific climate of broad sympathy for the oppressed peoples of the East.[317] In the spirit of justice, neither individual nor ethnic nation should be determined inferior by any cultural or biological judgment.

When Shcherbatskoi devoted himself to the study of Buddhism, he must have encountered these faith-intoxicated individuals who walked around naked or roamed the streets just like the holy fool did in Russia. At the moment of being in mixed-cultural contacts, various types of individuals denoting different minds and personalities of a life might as well connote similar qualities and attitudes towards a peculiar way of life in the meantime. In Tibetan Buddhism, the eccentric lamas (*gurus*) introduced several unusual methods to their disciples who were led to become enlightened. Also, the mad lamas (*smyonpa*) were on the path to their rejection of monastic tradition, ecclesiastical hierarchy and societal conventions.[318]

Studies, Vol. 6 (1932), p. 876 (pp. 867-896).

[315] *Ibid*, p. 894.

[316] *Ibid*, p. 895.

[317] Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya's introduction in *Papers of Th. Stcherbatsky*, ed. by Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya, transl. by Harish C. Gupta (Indian Studies: Past & Present, 1969), p. xxiii (pp. i-xxiv).

[318] On Tibetan or Vajray Ana Buddhism, see Geoffrey Samuel, *Civilized Shamans: Buddhism in Tibetan Societies* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1993), especially "Introduction: Shamanic and Clerical Buddhism", pp. 3-23 and Laurence Austine Waddell,

In fact, there are figures of the *avadhuta* (‘a man who has cast off all concerns’ in Sanskrit), *mast* (the numskull in Hindi) and *baul* (the ‘mad’ and ‘confused’ religious eccentrics in Bengali) of Hinduism whose behaviour is either detached from the normal situation, or suggests psychotic disturbance.[319] It is possible but less evident to prove that the classic and eccentric figures of Buddhism came from the Orient and has had influence upon the Russian peasant’s life ever since the Mongol conquered Kievan Rus'. However, it is right to believe that Shcherbatskoi who was brought up with the memory of holy foolishness, should be able to absorb the knowledge of Buddhism and would not reject the irrational figures and deny their abilities to show the reality of life being formulated by social rules. The awareness of and the philosophical features absorbed in Buddhism should have added a new dimension to one’s perception of the holy fool archetype. When chances and purposes of meeting ‘people of other origins’ increased in frequency in the late nineteenth century, it was also important for the Russian to understand the religious life which was an inseparable part of the non-Russian native’s daily life. Amongst the non-Christian religions, Buddhism has its significance in the understanding of the treasure and wisdom under the cover of one’s foolishness and madness.

***

At this point, adherence to (or preference for) specific traditions (Byzantium or Shamanism) did not help to define the social identity of any exotic figure, such as the holy fool, in Russian history. While ethnic identity became an important clue to the understanding of individual behaviour in a multi-national country such as Russia, it is, however, not the only factor. The term ‘social identity’, as discussed by Ward Goodenough, provided a means for grasping the plural and situational nature of self-identity, of which ethnicity and gender are only small parts. Goodenough defines social identity as ‘an aspect of self that makes a difference in how one’s rights and duties are distributed to specific others.’ Thus, it is understood that different actions and identities can be considered appropriate

Tibetan Buddhism: with its Mystic Cults, Symbolism and Mythology, and in its Relation to Indian Buddhism (New York: Dover, 1972 [1895]), especially pp. 387-419.

[319] For examples of the practice of crazy wisdom in non-Christian religions, see Georg Feuerstein, *Holy Madness: The Shock Tactics and Radical Teachings of Crazy-Wise Adepts, Holy Fools and Rascal Gurus* (New York: Paragon House, 1991), pp. 14-53.

even in polarised contexts, particularly when there is contact between different cultures.[320]

The previous discussion of religious beliefs and actions should be viewed as evidence of core values which are in a constant process of adaptation. With colonisation came a Christian drive amongst the Siberian native in Russia, such evidence can be seen in various places. For instance, Khanty shamanism was syncretic, adopting St. Nicholas as its shamanic spirit helper.[321] The borrowed model is imbued with vibrant symbolic meanings, the significance of which is a result of the ability of a society to learn and respect multiple social identities. It is very likely that man is, to a marked degree, what his surroundings have made him and it is no less true that he struggles to shape those surroundings within a space which shall accommodate him in his expectation of how he would like everything to be.

It makes no difference whether the concern over Buddhism or the subject for discussion of Shamanism and Islam is known to everyone. What matters the most is that the political environment as well as the academic circle which regulates one's perception of how one defines the Orient presented a dynamic process and affected the probability in human thinking. The Russian Orientologists might see the objects of their study from a sympathetic viewpoint which was 'not an uncommon occupational hazard.'[322] Although the study of the East in an academic institution was rather small in comparison with other disciplinary sections, for example, law or natural science, the group of orientologists accommodated a range of scholarly approaches and launched critical engagements with other expertise in folklore, linguistics, literature and philosophy. One of the most eminent products of this trend can probably be seen in literary works composed by the individual who personally experienced the movement or invented the plot and metaphor based on the shift in the social consciousness of people who are different from us.

---

[320] Ward H. Goodenough, "Rethinking 'Status' and 'Role': Toward a General Model of the Cultural Organization of Social Relationships", in *The Relevance of Models for Social Anthropology*, ed. by Michael Banton (London: Tavistock Publications, 1965), p. 3. Goodenough does not apply his social identity theory to any example of cultural contacts. But he does concern with individual who has a multi-cultural background, see Ward H. Goodenough, *Culture, Language, and Society* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Benjamin/Cummings Pub. Co., c1981), especially chapter six "Culture, Individual, and Society", pp. 97-110.

[321] Marjorie Mandelstam Balzer, "Behind Shamanism: Changing Voices of Siberian Khanty Cosmology and Politics", *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 24, Issue 12 (1987), p.1090 (pp. 1085-1093).

[322] Nathaniel Knight, "Grigor'ev in Orenburg, 1851-1862: Russian Orientalism in the Service of Empire", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (Spring, 2000), p. 97 fn. 84.

After a long discussion of how Orientalism diversely developed in Russia, we must stress again the nucleus of why it becomes relevant to our understanding of the holy fool, people with an abnormality. At the initial stage for the preparation of the formal canonisation procedures, theologists embark on a search for similarities and connections between stories of holy fools in Russian literature and the Byzantine descriptions of those non-Russian holy fools, for example, Bessarion (the Egyptian), Seraphion (the Sindonites), Isidora (the Tabennisi), and Symeon, Thomas, Andrew (of Byzantine). It is common to see that theologists tend to ascertain the validity of Russian holy fools with regard to the tradition of Christianity. As a result, liturgical life in its very traditional form juxtaposes a Byzantine heritage with Russian national and popular culture. The evidence has not been supportive enough to claim that certain unusual mortification was handed down to the Russian holy fool from the legendary and historical *saloi*, who were popular in numerous depictions of an obscure monastic order. However, for scholars like Kovalevskii and Kuznetsov, ascetic stories from Byzantium and those countries of the near East (Egypt, Jerusalem) were roots for theologists to defend heredity from the Orthodox Christian tradition.[323]

Russia was no exception. When Kievan Rus' adopted Christianity in 988, the eastern European geographic area was incorporated into the Eastern Christian culture of the Byzantine Empire — a state which claimed itself to be a continuation of the Roman Empire and took upon the mission to incorporate every domain of the inhabited earth. By means of different agents and media, Orthodoxy as a preserver of tradition was introduced into Russia. However, the dependence on the Church in Constantinople, the home of the ecumenical patriarch, diminished when the church in Moscow declared its independence from the control of Constantinople in 1589. In fact, ever since the fall of Constantinople in 1453, the idea of Moscow as the 'Third Rome' and the 'New Israel', the one true heir to pristine Christianity and its defender against Western heresy, was developed.[324] Nevertheless, although Russians readily considered themselves to be the authentic heirs to the fragments of bone and hair which constituted the relics of the former saints of the Byzantine Empire and Western European, they preferred their own

[323] Individual hagiographic projects included both I. Kovalevskii, *Iurodstvo o Khriste i Khriste radi iurodivye Vostochnoi i Russkoi Tserkvi* (Moscow: izdanie knigoprodavtsa Alekceia Dmitrievicha Stupina, 1902 [1895]) and A. Kuznetsov, *Iurodstvo i stolpnichestvo: religiozno-psikhologicheskoe issledovanie* (Spb.: Tip. V.D. Smirnova, 1913).

[324] On this traditional view, see Daniel B. Rowland, "Moscow-The Third Rome or the New Israel?", *Russian Review*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Oct., 1996), pp. 591-614.

saints to 'manifest complete uncorrupted bodies.'[325] Church Slavonic borrowed the Greek word *salos* from which its own terminology *ourod*, *ourodiv*, *iurodivyi* further developed. However, as Thomson discovered, the lack of rationalist elements in the texts translated into Church Slavonic was sometimes formulated as the 'intellectual silence' of medieval Russia. The heritage of classical philosophy and theology did not become a part of Russian culture until the eighteenth century, an argument which supports the explanation of Russian cultural history in general.[326] In view of previous studies which suggested Byzantine origins, holy fools were given varying degrees of privilege and forms of performance to behave obscenely at different times, yet continued sharing Christian memory therewith.

It is argued here that the inclusion of the orientologist perception is to advance a multiple construction of ideology in which the heterogeneity of erratic cultural behaviour is not simplified into homogenous categories. Group boundaries informed by Orientology served not only to integrate holy fools into hierarchies of multi-national society, but also to integrate disparate individuals of different communities into a transformable structure that shaped interaction both before and after assimilation of other non-Russian natives in Russia. Applying Said's *Orientalism* to the question of holy fools and its connection to the non-Russian natives is one way of demonstrating the fact that the ability to classify others makes orientalisation an exercise of power, the form of which is linked to the monopolisation of resources and group conflicts in several ways. Orientologist explanations of the holy fool, whether produced by Christians or by other religious sects, were often explicitly produced for consumption of abnormality, often in unrestricted forms of specific demands for change. By representing the holy fool as a complex entity within a solid east/west dichotomy, Russia provides an open field for a discussion of the decision to transform a person from being abnormal to being usual, thus normal.

As we have discussed so far, the holy fool should be considered as a complex phenomenon of Russian characteristics emerging from its connection to diverse people through the attempt of transgressing national and cultural boundaries, rather

[325] Gail Lenhoff, "The Notion of 'Uncorrupted Relics' in Early Russian Culture" in *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs*, Vol. 1 (Slavic Cultures in the Middle Ages), ed. by Boris Gasparov and Olga Raevsky-Hughes (Berkeley; Oxford: University of California Press, 1993), pp. 252-275.

[326] Francis J. Thomson, *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Mediaeval Russia* (Aldershot: Ashgate, c1999). The book is comprised of several Thomson's collected essays. The article "The Corpus of Slavonic Translations available in Muscovy. The Cause of Old Russia's Intellectual Silence and a Contributory Factor to Muscovite Cultural Autarky" was first published in *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs I: Slavic Cultures in the Middle Ages*, ed. B. Gasparov and O. Raevsky-Hughes (Berkeley, CA: California Slavic Studies 16, 1993), pp. 179-214.

than to a Christian institution. Tensions between different modes of thought are evident in the text, particularly with regard to the 'roots' which surround the holy fool's hidden past and the attempts to explain the enigma of his abnormality. Whether they are paradoxical prophets in the Old Testament, God's chosen men in Christianity (borrowed from the Jewish prophet), the Cynic of the ancient Greek, or the Egyptian Hermits, the 'East' (Middle Eastern and Hellenic attitude towards insanity) seems to offer a space for Western Europe to rationalise a diverse development of Christian virtue. However, the idea of the East in the tradition of western countries in general was only valid at a certain place and would be an awkward method in excuse of the biased judgment if we replaced ourselves in the Russian conditions. Because influence and translation coming from the eastern part of Europe, in relation to Russia's geographical position are not strictly those of the 'East.' The notion of a multinational, but Christian empire is still a common sense shared by the Church and the secular state in Russia. The 'East' means something more than simply the world which the western Europeans often refer to. The Russian story of erratic holy fools shall be described from the vantage point of making it specific for the question of stigmatising the abnormality. As the meaning of the 'East' grew with the expansion in the Russian Empire, the change of the 'East' certainly affected the knowledge of the people who tried to decode the holy fool.

[Interactive Construction on Categorisation]

'Different things differentiate themselves through what they have in common', said Aristotle. Aristotle proposed a solution to the classic definition by genus and differentia by the 'method of division.'[327] Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002) noted in his *Distinction* (1984) that different fractions of the dominant class distinguished themselves through that which made them members of the class as a whole. However, any description of one's life — the style — only constitutes a valid empirical verification. Bourdieu suggested that it was necessary to look back on the unities that were brought to light by the method which seemed best suited to draw out the immanent structures of their homogeneous conditions without imposing any presuppositions which could be constructed on the basis of the principles of division. This was a process of transformation, reproduced by the socially constituted schemes of perception and assessment to the practice,

[327] Cohen, S. Marc, "Aristotle's Metaphysics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2012 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (ed.), http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/aristotle-metaphysics/ (last accessed 15 January 2015)

constituting one's distinctiveness through social conditions.[328] In short, groups are separated by systems of differences.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Russia was in a period of accelerating rates of sudden 'economic growth, extensive exploration, colonial conquest, as well as settlement of open spaces, railway-building on the continental scale and expansion of international trade.'[329] Growing attention on the ethnic study of Siberian non-Russian natives was a result of political thrust of building a national state, but at the same time it had its influence on the process of incorporating values from the primary culture. It was the acculturation, resulting from the impact of one dominant culture onto another, the concept of which allowed impacts to flow in at least two directions.[330] It can also be understood here in terms of Bourdieu's theories that the shape of any social space is defined by the points of view within the space in which every individual holds to conserve or transform the principle of classification for the sake of his or her survival.[331] That is, Bourdieu expected that every human being was able to structure his or her life and living conditions creatively. A person may deviate from the present classifiable judgements, whereas a person can restructure the living conditions for his own good. Although the habitus, defined by Bourdieu as a product of history is based on experiences, it is subject to constant transition which modifies the outdated habitus. The most crucial thing to note is that persistent interaction between the space of certain conditions and the habitus of a certain group makes it possible for any concepts to flood in and hence creates minor niches for diversity to accommodate.

It was an incomplete argument that Thompson explicitly connected the shaman with the holy fool and suggested that having a period of unconsciousness was the core phenomenon. The shamanic séance has been variously portrayed, depending on the cultural context of the séance and the perspectives of observers. Materials on traditional religious legends boosted a degree of creative explanation which became the source of questioning and interpreting the unusual individuals

---

[328] Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, transl. by Richard Nice (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984 [1979]), pp. 257-267.

[329] David J. M. Hooson, "The Development of Geography in Pre-Soviet Russia", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 58, Issue 2 (June 1968), pp. 250-272.

[330] A. Irving Hallowell, *Culture and Experience* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1955), pp. 310-344. Also see individual project study in Amado M. Padilla (ed.), A*cculturation, Theory, Models, and Some New Findings* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1980) and Melville J. Herskovits, *Acculturation: The Study of Culture Contact* (Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith, 1958).

[331] Pierre Bourdieu's discussion on "The Social Space and its Transformations" and "The Habitus and the Space of Life-Styles" in *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, pp. 99-168 and 169-225.

against the observer's intellectual and cultural backgrounds. We will not repeat the similarity shared by the holy fool and the shaman that Thompson discussed concerning the perspective of dressing, accessories, insensitivity to coldness, and performing acts. On the contrary, it is the distinct space embellished by various cultural events in the ethnographic sphere of identity that strengthen the visibility of 'reasonable madness.' Emerging ethnography and its extensional application to the study of the non-Russian natives were parts of the social structure in which a (new) type of abnormal behaviour was able to locate itself in the (new) world of understanding. Apart from ethnography, every form and content (of religion, medicine, nationalism and art) in which communication takes place is the practical operator of the transmutation of space into distinct and distinctive niches, and of continuous distributions into discontinuous oppositions.

As previously discussed, Koreisha, one of the renowned 'fools for Christ's sake' in Moscow of the nineteenth century, was psychiatrically diagnosed to be suffering from 'dementia' (*dementsiia* or *slaboumie*) upon entering the hospital in 1817. As far as the medical authority was concerned, one began to speak of latent dementia. These kinds of patients did not have seizures of any of the ordinary sorts. Instead, there would be some unusual events in the troubled person's life. For example, if the event involved some sort of disorientation, perhaps amounting to ecstasy, this would be compared to the trance states of other non-Christian religions. If it was to confirm an underlying condition of 'dementia', an abrupt manner of ecstasy might fit into the picture of a figure given sacred description. If any individuals are equally acknowledged by their ability to perform (or imitate, as in Mircea Eliade's discussion[332]) ecstasy, it is argued that, regardless of their belonging to different religions, decisions of stigmatising the 'non-normals' are made by consideration of their ethnic origins and through interpretation (negative or positive) of how different literature has been discussed or identically embroidered. In our study, the vibrant interpretation of the non-Russian natives demonstrated the fluidity of stigmatisation of the abnormals, the category of which the holy fool was physically included in, but dogmatically excluded from.

It is the (social) condition of (re)presenting different models of 'naming' the ethnic others that integrates the various elements of linguistic differentiation, resource competition, political struggle, decent principles, religious values and

[332] Mircea Eliade, *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*, transl. by Willard R. Trask (N. Y.: Pantheon Books, c1964), p. 198-200.

underlying psychological needs into a coherent whole of the Russian spirit.[333] *Ino-rodtsy* (people of 'other' origins), as well as their religious practice was an additional ('other') reference to 'our' attention of watching the holy fool, a figure of yet an 'other' normal (or abnormal) type. In our discussion of Russian ethnicity, boundaries are subject to alteration and our choice of definition is socially oriented. Benedict Anderson has stressed the importance attributed to ethnic naming of subject peoples by European colonial administrators and to the impact of ethnic classification on the emergence of national identity amongst these peoples. The ethnic labels are used in censuses, maps and museums to separate the populations into recognisable groups. This is an architecture, in Anderson's words, for the colonial state to imagine its domination — the nature of the human beings it ruled, the geography of its domain and the legitimacy of its ancestry.[334]

The naming of peoples became a major project of the nineteenth century ethnographers in the Russian Empire.[335] On this basis, the need to explore points of contact or encounters with the people's imagined empire or their reality is important for the colonial experience. Whether it is a cultural or political encounter, the moment is inherently unequal. Although Iu.M. Lotman suggested that the boundary between two cultures resembled a 'zone of cultural bilingualism', communication remains occurring in the colonial context and in conditions of what he calls 'semiotic inequality.'[336] It is clear that those who held the instrument of power are the controllers of the terms in which the communication took place. There is no doubt that the Russian state had its political power and constructed images and identities of its non-Christian subjects. Growing interest in the political, economic and religious classification of the non-Russian natives was an initiation of ensuring their loyalty and of developing 'a set of uniform policies' to incorporate the new territories and people into the

[333] Discussion about the varied foci of Western ethnicity theories, see individual project study in Abner Cohen ed., *Urban Ethnicity* (London; New York: Tavistock, 1974); George De Vos and Lola Romanucci-Ross ed., *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982) and Howard Giles, *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations* (London; New York: Academic Press, 1977).

[334] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London; New York: Verso, 2006 [1983]), p. 168, and see especially chapter ten for 'Census, Map, Museum'.

[335] Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini ed., *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), p. xv.

[336] Iurii Lotman, *Struktura dialoga kak printsip raboty semioticheskogo mekhanizma* (Tartu, 1987), pp. 10-12.

empire.[337] However, the official power often diminished when it reached the many borders or distant zones where reports of missionaries and ethnographers were fundamentally relied on. People, like Shternberg and Bogoraz, were another example of practitioners whose exile to Sakhalin and Chukotka defined the fledgling discipline of Russian ethnography in ways which set it apart from its counterparts in Western Europe.[338]

The holy fool is never the subject or of any categories for ethnographic science, a discipline of writing or the representation of 'otherness.' Being recorded in the hagiography or even canonised by the Orthodox Church, the Russian holy fool became an 'inseparable' member of 'us.' As a country with a rich variety of nomadic and migratory traditions, many of the 'travelling folk' (*guliashchie liudi*) played a prominent role at the 'point' where Russia met the 'others.'[339] As a coherent emphasis in Goffman's *Stigma*, the term stigma should be defined as a language of relationships, not attributes. Thompson's argument is valid only if the hypothesis is: the holy fool and shaman are of a similar kind, but given a different title in a different time, culture and discourse. In any case, it is only an approach of understanding the conditions that one could attribute the startling variety in the world's many human societies, not to innate racial differences, but rather to a unilinear series of identifiable features. The common representative code of social practice does not prove cultural similarity. The key point here is, as Franz Boas argued in 1887, that civilisation is 'not something absolute', but rather is 'relative' and 'our ideas and conceptions are true only so far as our civilisation goes.'[340] One culture was neither better nor worse than another. Hence, each society has its own internal logic and consistency of developing along a unique trajectory. The best way to understand a culture is not to make 'invidious comparisons to Western civilisation', but rather to see how the 'social, religious, agricultural and industrial life of any people had grown out of their relationship to nature.'[341] In keeping with Boas' critique of cultural evolution, Bethold Laufer

---

[337] Michael Khodarkovsky, "Not by Word Alone: Missionary Policies and Religious Conversion in Early Modern Russia", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 38, Issue 2 (April, 1996), pp. 267-293.

[338] Bruce Grant, "Empire and Savagery: The Politics of Primitivism in Late Imperial Russia" in *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, p. 293.

[339] Alan Wood, "Russia's 'Wild East': Exile, Vagrancy and Crime in Nineteenth-Century Siberia", in *The History of Siberia: From Russian Conquest to Revolution*, Ed. by Alan Wood (London; New York: Routledge, 1991), pp.117-139.

[340] Wm. H. Dall and Franz Boas, "Museums of Ethnology and Their Classification", *Science*, Vol. 9, No. 228 (Jun. 17, 1887), pp. 587-589.

[341] Douglas Cole, *Franz Boas: The Early Years, 1859-1906* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre; Seattle: University of Washington Press, c1999), p. 132; and Carl N. Degler, *In Search of Human*

(1874-1934) was able to demonstrate on his journey to China between 1901 and 1904 that human societies evolved along multiple trajectories. Besides Laufer's positive experience with the Chinese, John Haddad stated that, China inspired the cultural evolutionists to be aware that 'the complexity of its culture precluded their efforts to credibly consign it to a state of either savagery or barbarism.'[342] The shape of an individual or cultural entity is structured by a series of interpretations through visual contact at specific moment against the historical background. It is a permanent process during which dynamic exchange of meaning for an identification of self and others in current society cannot be reduced to a single notion. Multiplicity makes the presence of every organism reasonable and accessible. Through an examination on 'ethnographic language of relationships' with the non-Russian natives, the holy fool can be understood via intense debates regarding his/her personal position, represented in fictionalised form, along with thoroughgoing crises of the conscience. Hence, the most notorious and embarrassing is the most collective for the stigmatised individual's true situation, made of the features that visual members of his category present in a reachable well-rounded version.

***

Reading between the lines contributed by the hagiographers, the holy fool was considered the ideal of freedom from care and that of freedom from possessions. Both were dominant leitmotivs of the saint's biography. If the biographer's accounts of the holy fool's ideals and popularity were reliable, his refusal to compromise orthodox standards in regard to material renunciations should have been explained indifferently or at least not totally by the religious traditions. As the canonical label was rather outdated, the holy fool undressed himself and stood behind the curtain of the ethnographical stage, on whose centre was meant to show the primitive form of every natural man within the empire.

Direct evidence to compare the holy fool with the non-Russian native is, to the best of my knowledge, nonexistent. However, stigma given to the holy fool may not

Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 67.

[342] John Haddad, " 'To Inculcate Respect for the Chinese.' Berthold Laufer, Franz Boas, and the Chinese Exhibits at the American Museum of Natural History, 1899-1912", *Anthropos*, Bd. 101, H. 1. (2006), p. 135 (pp. 123-144).

be strange in the discussion of the non-Russian natives and may perhaps be unique in its reliance on a systematic structure of distinction for its representational power, yet not so specific in its effect on the self. To build this argument, I again draw on Goffman's classic work, *Stigma* to compare social life to theatrical performance, in which individuals (including performers and audience) present or project carefully crafted selves to each other after a series of backstage preparation. A dramatic allegory is performed in literature where holy fools and non-Russian natives stood in imperial Russia. Standing in the inner realm of a stage play, the holy fool was accorded an orientation to be invisible, but life went on still. The man with decisive power (the playwright, the producer / the ethno-recorder, the tsarist authority) might share a single piece of information of similar interest concerning the inner events of the play and know what will prove to be involved in the happenings and how these happenings will turn out. Therefore, the problem of holy fools and its relation to the development of imperialism and nationalism can be brought about by discussion of ethnographic diversity.

What unifies holy fools and non-Russian natives, in keeping with each style of living on the inner and outer stage, is the concern of those different from 'us.' What interests me is the member of the audience in their capacity as onlookers. The audience (people of every rank of social status) were given specific information which was stated relative to the inner and outer events of the drama. Hence, it is understandable how the audience projected a certain image of backstage stories on the current stage production since the fabricated theme aimed to show the uniqueness of the set where abnormality was conditionally practised. In order to obtain this result, holy fools and non-Russian natives must have strong enough attractive elements to catch the attention of the audience. Depending on the policy of the organiser (the state) or the preference of the audience (people's need), one stereotype might overshadow the other under certain circumstances, or a new type subsequently evolved. It is by reference to this interactional dynamic that one can explain not only why the stigma of the holy fool was able to shape the identity of an 'alien' amongst specific groups of those non-Russian natives, but also how it shifted between groups and then how the resulting need to present an alternative self to the world mediated between twin impulses to include and change groups of difference amongst 'us' in Russia. Impacts of ideological changes on the production of ideas and actions may not be direct. However, to accompany the study of Orientology, both holy fools and non-Russian natives were subjects which the Russian wanted not to eliminate, but rather retain in a neutralised and marginalised form. Distaste for Eurocentric perception of the people like holy fools

and non-Russian natives encouraged the scholars to see discourses within the sphere of Orientology as sources of ultimate knowledge of inequality.

The importance of this theatrical metaphor is that the memory of each stage production is temporal, yet not replaceable. Every act is only measurable, comparable and analytical on the condition when the audience subscribe for their own purpose. The phenomenon of holy foolishness might be taboo for public discussion and became invisible or a minor role on the stage of the nineteenth century Russia. The holy fool was still remembered in the scene where the non-Russian natives of ethnographic studies played the role. Knowledge of the holy fool generated compassion for the non-Russian natives. A study of non-Russian natives suggested an attitude of tolerance towards diversity. Ethnographic discipline, built on different forces of influence, offered an alternative way of reconsidering holy fools who were taxed with irrationality in the previous understanding stage of ab/normality.

In the discussion of a baptised Chuvash peasant, Iakov Osipov, the description of and sympathy for a non-Russian native had reflected the stereotyped understanding of the holy fool. In brief, in 1846 an event happened in a province of Kazan where Osipov was accused of threatening to kill the tsar. In the end, the case was closed without giving sentence upon him. It was argued that Osipov saved his life from death, because he was a Chuvash and had internalised a pattern of behaviour that the Russian thought about the Chuvash. What interest me are the points raised for the defence of Osipov's harmless guilt. In the Kazan' archive, the case investigator had documented that Osipov had 'spoken out of ignorance ……'[343] The impression of a dull-witted non-Russian native who was too naïve and too simple-minded (*prostodushnyi*) to commit any serious crime was mentioned and highlighted in the passage. Generally speaking, there was no way of survival if anyone attempted to utter a threat against the tsar. But, during the episode in the history of the Russian holy foolishness, the relationship between Ivan the terrible and Nikola of Pskov was an exception.[344] Making threats against Ivan was acceptable, not only because Ivan was often condemned, but also because it was an outspoken criticism from Nikola the fool, a man who was generally regarded as 'simple-minded.' Osipov's words against the tsar were suspected, yet

[343] Willard Sunderland, "An Empire of Peasants: Empire-Building, interethnic Interaction, and Ethnic Stereotyping in the Rural World of the Russian Empire, 1800-1850s", in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, p. 187.

[344] The story and relationship therewith can be seen in S.A. Ivanov's book, *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, pp. 291-299.

forgivable as a result of his ignorance and stupidity; a sense of specific response to the Russian image of the Chuvash and the holy fool.

The evidence is either indirect or not clear about whether or not the knowledge of the legendary Nikola had influenced upon the decision made for Osipov's case. However, the comparison implies the value of Russian culture derived from the problematic discourse of the holy foolishness. What makes the paradoxical attitude towards people performing simple and foolish acts a reality is due to the fact that Russia is an empire of a variety of ethnic peoples and of multiple impacts coming from the East and West. The rules that define must undergo a proper examination of applicability to the people and situation. As Russia sought for modernity and advancement, primitive and wild forms of life still survived. When Russia urged to become a state of rationality, the mystical figure, such as the holy fool, was still inexplicable. The paradigm of ethnography as a description of various identities gave the Russian society an elaborate and rationalized structure with the functional specialisation to fabricate a science around the notion of differentiation. Truly, the quantitative and qualitative changes in attitude towards the phenomenon of the holy fool had its limitations, especially when the holy fool became a rarity in the real world. However, it is important to note that the configuration of holy foolishness still attracted attention in the literary sphere, even though its role in reality steadily declined. Whether in praise or criticism, selective application of the stereotype characterised by the holy fool has given birth to new traditions. In the nineteenth century Russian novels, holy fools or figures of a similar type were developed as a cultural theme and motif. It is important to note that deviant characters therein were not an extreme manner from the European standard of dress and behaviour; rather they remained identical to the figures presenting the elements of Muscovite culture. Thus, the critical issue that follows is whether and how the scientific knowledge of ethnography — armed with new ambitions and administrative tools — supports the comprehension of holy fools in literary works.

The Question of Difference in Chekhov's Life and Writings

Every piece of work must have contributed its part, ephemeral or permanent, in building up the perception of the epoch and on the meaning of the 'eccentricity' of the era. This is no doubt a valuable cultural legacy for the mixed-contact society of our time. The holy fool as a real phenomenon, as a particular subject of our concern, unintentionally appeared and disappeared in Russian history and leapt out into the purview of crowds in literary novels containing philosophical thoughts. The wave of factual depiction nourished the earlier concept of foolishness. The evolving construction of the notion was like a shoot springing to life with support from all kinds of media which proved the undeniable existence of irrationality in modern times. If certain rules for distinction between normality and abnormality have been established due to those multiple reasons as we have discussed, it is also important to know how people were gradually influenced or even motivated by these new rules. In contrast with the limited circulation of works of medical or ethnographic studies, the figure of something unusual in literature has an effective description. Through published novels, new ways of portraying the figure and its compeers with an emphasis on their abnormal characteristics could permeate through the people and be reproduced for extensive discussion.

In Russian literature, the simplicity and naiveté of one's characteristics were emphasized by the authors who saw the extraordinary eccentricity and hence rendered their protagonists so unique and yet unsuited to their surroundings. While the notorious vulgarity can repulse the readers, a kind of primitive philosophical sincerity underlies the monumental stupidity of such a figure. Literature contributed to the development of a tradition which helped in bridging the gap between the public and the heroes in text through a series of figurative icons who were beyond the moralities of normal life. Manifestations of the divine figure in the nineteenth century Russian literature and culture have a moment of drawing attention to the abnormal person him/herself and how the environment has affected them. Regardless of the influence of the journey to Sakhalin in his later literary works, A. Chekhov's (1860-1904) travels throughout Siberia as pilgrim or perpetual wanderer already converged meaningfully with the tradition of certain faithful devotion. Chekhov's attitude towards and perspective on primitive forms of life within the empire not only transmit a set of ideas clothed in metaphors and allegories, but also make an implicit claim about his position in questioning presumptuous judgments.

Chekhov's experience on Sakhalin Island and his literary creation afterwards are selectively discussed not simply because of the coincidence that Chekhov departed for the Island in 1890 when Shternberg was in exile and also conducted his research on the non-Russian natives of the Island. In my opinion, Chekhov's journey to the Far East and his reapplication of the same in literary works are examples, suitable for a study of abnormality from different scientific perspectives and worth being taken to re-examine the rules for distinction. As we have noticed, the holy fool had undergone a series of transformation in identification, from saints to patients. We have also tried to identify the holy fool and the phenomenon of the same through the concepts that emerged from within the discussion of different others in the context of ethnographic studies of the nineteenth century Russia. Combining all three disciplines of knowledge, namely religious, clinic and ethnographic experience, Chekhov is right in the centre of our concern and worth further discovering. Medicine and religion were seen as metaphors, grounded in the fundamental recognition of binary opposition, through which Chekhov was able to handle and question both in one piece of work. It was after the journey to Sakhalin, Chekhov himself and his literary works demonstrated a marvellous combination of knowledge which is compatible with the argument we have been holding to support the presence of both the holy fool and the non-Russian native within the Empire. Before we start, a brief review of the connection between Chekhov's medical background and literature is interesting to discuss in its own right.

Chekhov's biography occupied a prominent position in his writing of different protagonists from a variety of social classes. In fact, Chekhov spent his early career in the field of medicine where he served as a *Zemstvo* doctor, struggling against famine, cholera and rigid administrations. Then, he would not soften his critiques which on the whole were not in line with the norms of effective science for sensitivity and humanity. Not to mention Chekhov's interview with more than ten thousand prisoners on the island of Sakhalin and his collection of epidemiological data on cards for every individual he encountered, which were in many respects outstanding. John Coope regarded Chekhov by drawing close connections between his identities of three different fields of works: a clinician, a playwright and story writer and a moral philosopher.[345] His exquisite writing skills came from his deep understanding of science. Perhaps

[345] John Coope, *Doctor Chekhov: A Study in Literature and Medicine* (Chale, Isle of Wight: Cross, 1997) and also Julian Tudor Hart, Review: *Doctor Chekhov: A Study in Literature & Medicine* by John Coope, *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, Vol. 315, No. 7117 (Nov. 8, 1997), p. 1243.

more significantly, his account brings to life the personality of the rural poor and is convinced of great worth for a reunification of art and science. Endowed with a love for a literary career, Jack Coulehan suggests by studying the significant role of doctors in many of Chekhov's stories and plays that, 'Chekhov […] retired from "normal" practice in 1889, he pursued his medical identity at the expense of his writing career — by providing free care to the country folk near Melikhovo, […] and engaging regularly in public health initiatives.'[346] A number of significant works in relation to our discussion of a stigmatised person and classification of different 'others' were produced after his journey to Sakhalin. The accuracy to descriptions of diseases or symptom was accompanied with his critiques of and sympathy for depravity and degradation.

[The Influence of Romanticism]

During the early years of the nineteenth century before Chekhov started his career, the aura of history that surrounded the 'Golden Era' of Russian literature and art was permeated with Romanticism which also had major impacts on science and politics. The Romanticism is a trend of concept which involves nationalist claims bolstered by J.G. Herder's (1744-1803) notion of the *Volk* and J.J. Rousseau's (1712-1778) valorisation of the savage, further distributed and popularised by world travellers such as Louis Antoine de Bougainville (1729-1811) and James Cook (1728-1779). However, the question of Russian Romantics cannot be seen solely as a rediscovery of the national heritage, or merely as reiterating Russian incivility or heathenism through its adoption of analogous West-European currents. M. Gorky once proclaimed that 'Myth is invention (...) Romanticism is at the basis of myth and is highly beneficial in that it tends to provoke a revolutionary attitude to reality, an attitude that changes the world in practical way.'[347] Although the above term was made to show Gorky's optimistic attitude towards the next natural stage in the evolution of Russian literature on Socialist Realism, the implication was the same; 'invention' in imagery extracted from the sum of a given reality was, to a certain extent, the freedom of expression in the spheres of cultural production and often replaced with different forms of art apparatus. Hence, it would

[346] Jack Coulehan (ed.), *Chekhov's Doctors: A Collection of Chekhov's Medical Tales* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, c2003), p. xv.

[347] Maxim Gorky, "Soviet Literature", 1934, Marxist Internet Archive: http://www.marxists.org/archive/gorky-maxim/1934/soviet-literature.htm (last accessed 15 January 2015).

be a simplification to imagine that Russian Romanticism operated according to a clearly defined set of principles.

Elements of Romanticism and its special historical mission in European literary trends have been present since a 1761 French novel of Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *La Nouvelle Héloïse*. It was in the nineteenth century that the theme of German and French Romantics became obsessional for Russian writers. For instance, I.V. Kireevskii (1806-1856) was one of the Slavophiles whose picture of 'ancient Russian life' could find a corresponding idea in the writings of the early nineteenth century German Romantic conservatives.[348] These early nineteenth century and subsequent discussions and debates over the alternative sources of wisdom in the Orient often revolved specifically around the interpretation of some earlier episodes of Russian history in the process of elaborating what might be regarded as Russian oriental roots. As Schimmelpenninck argued, through the war, travel or service in those eastern regions, the prominent writers of the day familiarised their 'special affinity with Asia.' A.S. Pushkin's southern poems of Caucasus in the early 1820s 'popularise Asian themes in the Russian reader's imagination' about literary Orientalism.[349] St. Petersburg's readers thus shared the European fascination for Oriental poems. Another example was posed by the poet P.V. Shumakher (1817-1891), who spent a year in government service in Siberia during the mid-1830s. An unusual image in Shumakher's 'poetic formula of Siberia' encouraged a motif in the literature of Russian Romanticism in the 1820s and 1830s. Similar evidence can also be found in Kondratii Ryleev's (1795-1826) epic poem *Voinarovskii* (1825), which is dedicated to the Ukrainian hero Andrei Voinarovskii who was exiled to eastern Siberia. The literary portrayals of Siberia with multifarious characteristics were created to 'make Russians aware of the exotic and unappreciated wonders' within their own empire.[350]

Inspired by the romantic nationalism of Herder, members of the Ethnographic Division who were interested in investigating the recent 'explosion of nationalism', seriously considered the inquiry into the phenomena and life of the people in Asiatic Russia as subject matter.[351] Ethnographer like Nadezhdin

---

[348] Andrzej Walicki, *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*, transl. by Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989 [c1975]), p. 166 fn.

[349] David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind From Peter the Great to the Emigration*, pp. 62-63.

[350] Discussion about both authors can be seen in Mark Bassin, "Inventing Siberia: Visions of the Russian East in the Early Nineteenth Century", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 96, No. 3 (Jun., 1991), pp. 772-774 and 782.

[351] William A. Wilson, "Herder, Folklore and Romantic Nationalism", *The Journal of Popular*

was primarily interested in the Russian peasantry. But other members of the Ethnographic Division subsequently adopted a similar approach to study the non-Russian natives. As far as institutional continuity is concerned, virtually all the important social theories of the early nineteenth century, Westerners (*zapadniki*) as well as Slavophiles (*slavianofily*), 'had philosophical or ethnographical interests.'[352] Explanation of questions of Asia or the Orient depends on the appropriation which serves the needs as well as the preference of the observing writers and their compatriot readers. As noticed by Susan Layton, it was this 'native realm's cultural heterogeneity' that gave Russian romantics a stake in enhancing Asia.[353] Semi-Asian Russia creates many meeting places where writers and amateurs can interact and where public readership can not only satisfy its curiosity about the East, but also develop the capacity for its consciousness of national difference in relation to the Europe. On that basis, a different principle of social structure in Russia evolved together with a correspondingly different world of literature.

Whether or not Pushkin's story *The Prisoner of the Caucasus* (*Kavkazskii plennik*, 1820-1821) was a production under the classification of Romanticism, it is obvious that new Romantic sensibility contributed to the composition of literary works, such as the disillusioned hero and an exotic setting, which was inseparable from the legend and tale.[354] Another example can be seen in the novel of N.M. Zagoskin's *Iurii Miloslavskii ili Russkie v 1612 godu* (1829), which was a popular form of Russian Romanticism. Mitia, the holy fool, played an important role as an advisor and symbol of spirit in a battle between Muscovy and Polish-Lithuania. In the story Mitia appeared with the following description,

> The door opened. A barefoot middle-aged man, with dishevelled hair and beard, clad in rags, belted in a rope suddenly found himself in the middle of the room. In spite of his tattered clothes and strange manner, you can now guess that he is not crazy (ne sumasshedshii). His eyes were shining with wisdom

---

Culture, Vol. 6, Issue 4 (1973), pp. 819-835.

[352] Vladimir Plotkin and Jovan E. Howe, "The Unknown Tradition: Continuity and Innovation in Soviet Ethnography", *Dialectical Anthropology*, Vo. 9, Issue 1-4 (June, 1985), pp. 257-312. See also James H. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), p. 324.

[353] Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy* (Cambridge; New York, NY Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 75.

[354] Paul Debreczeny, "The Reception of Pushkin's Poetic Works in the 1820s: A Study of the Critic's Role", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Sep., 1969), pp. 397-398 (394-415).

(blistali umom) and his fine-looking face expressed extraordinary gentleness and peace of mind (neobyknovennaia krotostʹ i spokoistvie dushi).[355]

Regardless of the mystical composition of the story, the benefit for the nation was raised by Mitia the holy fool, at least in the middle of the plot. In a massive variety of subjects against the background of ethnographic orientation in the service of presenting the Russian spirits, the idea of eccentric holy fools was embodied in an understanding of the 'alien' people whose existence was a fact, whose land was a place of romantic adventure and whose way of life was read both for entertainment and enlightenment. The allegorical undercurrent of the lyric hero was a projection of feelings engaged with the untamed surroundings in which the capacity to leap at the opportunity for breaking the restrictions of social and political judgments shifted from the holy fool to the exotic non-Russian natives. As a result of the visual impact from the nature and wilderness, expressions of admiration for purity and morality exemplified a potential change of attitude towards the non-Russian natives whose life became a new source of inspiration for exercising the pattern which peasant culture once assigned to the holy fool.[356]

Based on the discussion of Romanticism, one would notice that the hybrid influence of western philosophers helped to develop radical ideas in the minds of *raznochintsy* in the 1860s and also reinforced the concepts of improving the social condition of the Russian people. In the 1870s and 1880s, writers of all persuasions went in search of 'live pictures of popular existence.'[357] Some of the activities extended to the wandering aliens of the north; however, it was often the case that the revolutionary exiles were the activists who 'made a virtue of necessity by turning their involuntary hosts into the privileged subjects of a new science.'[358] The concept of primitive cultural history was initiated not only by those who criticised Peter's decision to modernise Russia, but also by the emergence of Romanticism in Russia. Debates over the denunciations of 'the order of things' and the rejection of the 'taste of the era's conservatives' were intensified by the contrast between the Slavophiles and the Westerners in Russia. In addition, the Populist also expressed great interest in the Russian peasants under the influence of the emerging idea of

[355] Source from *Khudozhestvennaia literature* (Moscow, 1983), Lib.ru: "Классика"; http://az.lib.ru/z/zagoskin_m_n/text_0020.shtml (last accessed 15 January 2015)

[356] Dmitrii Chizhevskii, *On Romanticism in Slavic Literature*, Transl. by D.S. Worth ('s-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957), pp. 29-35.

[357] Mark Bassin, "The Russian Geographical Society, the 'Amur Epoch,' and the Great Siberian Expedition 1855-1863", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 73, No. 2 (Jun., 1983), p. 252.

[358] Yuri Slezkine, *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North*, p. 124.

the commune as a manifestation of socialist tendencies. According to Thompson, the dialectic of holy foolishness together with the expansion of German Romantic philosophy helped the Populists 'to shape their thinking about themselves and about Russian society.'[359] Similar to the characteristic of the holy fool, the non-Russian native seemed to be indifferent to material possessions and to the legalities which were in contrast to their daily needs and living conditions. It was the time when the ambience created by the holy fool and other primitive forms of life became a source of inspiration to bring about freedom and a reform of society amongst educated people.

***

The phenomenon of the holy fool was not unknown in the nineteenth century; however, it was interpreted in various ways against the historical background. As an individual who never conformed to existing criteria, the holy fool was adopted from theology to the aesthetic sphere for the purpose of intensifying the paradoxical trivialities in real society. To mention Bakhtin again, we see how he discovered the novelistic representation of pathology chosen by Dostoevsky in *Notes from Underground* (1864) to be the key to many interpretations of 'the fool for Christ', a point of which has been raised since. He argued,

> In its attitude to the other person it strives to be deliberately inelegant to 'spite' him and his tastes in all respects. But this discourse takes the same position even in regard to the speaker himself, for one's attitude towards oneself is inextricably interwoven with one's attitude towards another. Thus discourse is pointedly cynical, calculatedly cynical, yet also anguished. It strives to play the holy fool, for holy-foolishness is indeed a sort of form, a sort of aestheticism – but as it were, in reverse.[360]

Following this pattern, scholars, such as S.I. Malen'kikh were able to develop their theories of connecting the phenomenon of holy foolishness and postmodernism[361]

---

[359] Ewa M. Thompson, *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture*, p. 167.

[360] Mikhail Bakhtin, "Discourse in Dostoevsky" in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and transl. by Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), p. 231.

[361] The cultural production of difference is taken here as defining feature of post-modernity. See individual project study in Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), especially pp. 260-278. It is the ability to turn culture into a productive resource that is seen as marking the Western social condition as different today than it was in an era of modernity.

through the idea of simulacra as proposed by Jean Baudrillard. Malen'kikh explained that,

> In a situation where the ideas of God, the Church and faith are profaned, *iurodstvo* is a means of attaining the sacred (*forma obreteniia sakral'novo*). In the world of simulacra, it is so impossibly difficult to find reality that it becomes necessary to overcome all generally accepted norms, conventions and even morals in order to acquire a 'taste of life', a sense of reality. It would certainly be wrong to say that the fool for Christ in the full meaning of the word as understood in ancient Rus' is at the centre of contemporary art, but we can find certain of his traits in the hero of today's art, a person who has fallen away from the overall system and consciously or unconsciously violated behavioural and moral norms (*narushaiushchii normy povedeniia, morali*). The holy fool evokes laughter, horror and disgust (*smekh, uzhas, omerzenie*). Contemporary art now focuses on the aesthetics of ugliness, and writers turn to what evokes horror and revulsion.[362]

Whether or not succeeding generations of literature attempts to reposition the holy foolishness between art and reality, the paradox that characterises the holy fool serves to reflect a common problem which one may encounter when touching reality without maintaining a cautious attitude. Nevertheless, the holy foolishness was adopted as a literary style for writers who utilised the narrative technique to question and find truth in the inner structure of the Russian Empire.

Upon reviewing the above-mentioned academic practices in theories, one may sense a mixture of ways in which recent writers have invoked the term of holy foolishness. In fact, the holy foolishness is precisely that — a form that can be filled with different kinds of content as we have been trying to demonstrate so far. What matters the most is not the foolish behaviour as such, but the state of mind, which we shall maintain for every potentiality of understanding. Between the age-old holy fools and modern writers, there is clearly both continuity and rupture. It would be misleading to say that anyone would take over a form and fill it with his or her own content. On the contrary, some evidence suggests that disciples influenced by such a tradition wanted to rescue from it what was regarded as its valuable spiritual content. It appears that in the holy fool writers or theorists were

[362] S.I. Malen'kikh, "Popytka iurodstva kaka odna iz strategii sovremennoi kul'tury", *Religiia i nravstvennost' v cekuliarnom mire*. Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii. 28-30 noiabria 2001 goda. Sankt-Peterburg (SPb: Sankt-Peterburgskoe filosofskoe obshchestvo, 2001), pp. 54-56. *Anthropologiia*, http://anthropology.ru/ru/texts/malenk/secular_13.html#top (last accessed 15 January 2015)

able to lay an entire reserve of cherished thoughts, marginal notes and *bons mots* before the public which they had been collecting for several years. The method is to identify specificity and provide sufficient information for the readers who are able to interpret the story, but leave the narrative as open as possible. Hence, the readers are allowed some freedom to relate the story to their own particular experience and circumstances. Apart from the implicit value system in Christianity, the holy foolishness in literature gave a hint about a tendency to address the question of how all established values, which had evolved from medical treatment and scientific categorisation, have been called into question and of how the phenomenon has survived, yet transformed into its new context.

The Romantic writers presented a forceful expression of imagination and idiosyncrasy to galvanise interest in a mad genius whose unique ontological position cannot be explained simply in terms of the biological degeneration of its organism from the norm. An interest in extraordinary events and people who behave in an unusual way was a reflection of Chekhov's autobiographical traits and medical concern, linking the creative exuberance of the nineteenth-century Romanticism to the more complex devotional exercise of considering the social problems. The presence of abnormality is truly one of the interpretative keys to Russian culture. A search for both reality and meaning and also the ambivalence with all that is fascinating can be perceived notably in the life and works of Chekhov in the late nineteenth century. To describe the protagonist in the question of difference allowed Chekhov to add cultural and spiritual depth of his own to a certain degree where a desire for social reform was conveyed through the literary image. The traditional code of the holy foolishness was still discernible, but its type moved from the world of sainthood into a private world of language and philosophy. Characters of 'holy foolishness' can be remodelled into any kind of identity, perfectly in relation to or not with Christ. In an atmosphere propelled by pressure and forces which varied in purpose, skill, intensity and duration, the combination of ideology and transition of looking upon the holy fool as a cultural phenomenon to the analysis of literary texts, especially in relation to Chekhov's background and experience, is thus worth discussing.

[A Journey to Sakhalin Island]

By the 1860s, ethnography had developed out of the literary and scholarly-scientific traditions in Russia as a premier science. It was on the first Russian Ethnographic Exposition in Moscow in 1867 that its president expressed his

concern for the experience in various spheres of productive activity and suggested a quest for sources of future ways of life in the empire by saying 'the study of our native land' was 'a necessity for every educated Russian.'[363] In order to complete the map of the empire, understanding those unknown regions had to be commissioned by ethnographical fieldwork in Asiatic Russia. We may not be certain what inspired Chekhov to make his way to Sakhalin. But Tsar Alexander II was at the exhibition, proclaiming his support for this imperial ethnographic crusade.

Chekhov's adventurous 1890 journey of crossing Siberia to Sakhalin Island puzzled his friends in Moscow as to why he would impose such a dangerous and ill-advised trip upon himself at the height of his career. No matter how he went out of altruism ('In our time a few things are being done for the sick, but nothing at all for the prisoners'); to enlist public consciousness ('I'm sorry I'm not sentimental or I'd say that we ought to make pilgrimages to places like Sakhalin, the way the Turks go to Mecca'); or to supplicate anomie ('Granted, I may get nothing out of it, but there are sure to be two or three days that I will remember with rapture and bitterness')[364], it was rather a significant response to his goal of making the exile system visible and producing a body of knowledge about it.

It is 'not ours' (net nasha)[365] when Chekhov spoke of morality in Sakhalin. As an intellectual in the wilderness, Chekhov found himself to have travelled to 'the end of the world' (konets sveta). [45] While he was drifting down the Amur River, Chekhov suddenly felt that he was,

> 'not in Russia (ne v Rossii), but somewhere in Patagonia or Texas … not in the nature of Russia. It seemed to me that our warehouse is totally alien (chuzhd) to the indigenous people of Amur and that Pushkin and Gogol understood nothing

[363] *Vserossiiskaia etnograficheskaia vystavka* (Moscow, 1867), p. 40. See also Daniel Brower, "Islam and Ethnicity: Russia Colonial Policy in Turkestan" in *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, ed. by Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), p. 123; and M.M. Kerimova, "Vystavka «Slaviane Evropy i narody Rossii» (k 140-letiiu pervoi Vserossiiskoi etnograficheskoi vystavki 1867 g.)", *Atnograficheskoe obozrenie Online* (Jan. 2008), pp. 1-18. http://journal.iea.ras.ru/online (last accessed 15 January 2015)

[364] These three Chekhov quotations are from James McConkey, *To A Distant Island* (New York: E.P. Dutton, c1984), p. 15.

[365] Page references in square brackets are from Anton Chekhov, *Ostrov Sakhalin (Iz putevykh zapisok)*, in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*. *Sochineniia*, Vols. 14-15 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1978), pp. 42-43. The English version has been published in two separate editions under the title *The Island: A Journey to Sakhalin*, transl. by Luba and Michael Terpak (New York: Washington Square Press, 1967); and *A Journey to Sakhalin*, transl. by Brian Reeve (Cambridge: Ian Faulkner, 1993). Unless otherwise specified, all the translation are mine.

since our tedious history does not include here, and we, as migrants from Russia, are in fact foreigners (inostrantsy).' [42-43]

A similar narrative occurs whenever peoples from the exotic Orient come into a historical or ethnographic space that has been defined by the Western standard of evaluation. Passing through town after town inhabited by people 'who manufactured clouds, boredom, wet fences and garbage'[366], Chekhov portrayed the Ainos and Gilyak as noble and wondrous people. They were 'a wonderful and cheerful people … always intelligent, gentle, and naively attentive', yet also 'dirty and repulsive creatures.' [174, 176 and 218-221] Contrary to his first impression about the people and his geographical perception of marginality as being in the other world, Chekhov complained that 'it is impossible to learn anything definite.' [90] Convicts and settlers were 'indistinguishable one from the other' (*nichem ne otlichaiutsia*). [229] The penal colony reflects the fact of indistinguishability. Both the classificatory ambition of the disciplinary process and Chekhov's eagerness about differentiation were scattered in this labyrinth of indistinguishability. The feeling of being lost in the pre-existing 'faulty' data and the 'reliable' material on Sakhalin Island was so strong that Chekhov could not help saying 'difference (cultural or otherwise) is tenuous and distinction-making as a mode of knowing has been totally abandoned.'[367]

Chekhov's writing on the journey to Sakhalin may not be seen as a proper research method or failed to reproduce the real fact that took place on Sakhalin Island; it is still intense fieldwork which emerged as a privileged sanctioned source of data about 'exotic peoples' living on the other side of the world. Probably because of his awareness of the incompleteness of his knowledge, Chekhov grasped the sense of specific occurrences and development and stepped back to situate these meanings in his literary production. Given that his medical background had made him a trained observer, the literary style of representing different 'others' was taken to be the overall course of the research as an ongoing negotiation. A liberal attitude derived from scientific ethnography, which was a relatively sympathetic and systematic method of study applied to understand Siberia and its people (who lived in exile or not) and was evident through Chekhov's own terms of expression. Chekhov's obsessive inclusion of data produced only densely contextualised monographs on certain institutions. The result is visible in his writing about the Gilyak and Ainos. Apart from the first

[366] Robert Payne's "Introduction" in Chekhov, *The Island: A Journey to Sakhalin*, p. xxi.
[367] Cathy Popkin, "Chekhov as Ethnographer: Epistemological Crisis on Sakhalin Island", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Spring, 1992), p. 44 (pp. 36-51).

attention given to the poor quality of their unhealthy and hygienic arrangements, Chekhov offered a moderate description of the Gilyak to the public.[368] He wrote,

> Writers give varying accounts of the Gilyaks' character, but all agree on one thing — that they are not a warlike race, they do not like quarrels or fights, and they get along peacefully with their neighbours. They have always treated the arrival of new people with suspicion, with apprehension about their future, but have met them every time amiably, without the slightest protest and the worst thing they would do would be to tell lies at people's arrival, painting Sakhalin in gloomy colours and thinking by so doing to frighten foreigners away from the island. (…) They tell lies only when trading or talking to a suspicious and, in their opinion, dangerous person, but, before telling a lie, they exchange glances with each other, in an utterly childlike manner. [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 189-190]

Whether or not Chekhov's sincere expression has anything to do with the romantic notion of confession, 'to Russify the Sakhalin Gilyaks' seems to be unnecessary in his eyes. [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 192] Seen in this light, the image of Ainos that Chekhov recorded was gently staged in front of the readership, however, with more details in the reflection of his way of seeing and remarking,

> The Ainos are dark, like Gypsies; they have large bushy beards, moustaches and black hair; their eyes are dark, expressive and gentle. They are of medium height and powerful build, with facial features which are large and somewhat coarse, but in which, the seaman V. Rimsky-Korsakov puts it: 'There is neither trace of Mongol flatness, nor of the slant eyes of the Chinese.' It is considered that the bearded Ainos look very similar to European Russian peasants. Indeed, when an Aino is dressed up in his robe, he looks a bit like our *chuyka* and when tightens up his belt, he does take on a similarity to a merchant's coachman. [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 228-229]

In this text, a similar attraction between Ainos and the Russian peasants would evoke a sense of closeness, yet an ambiguous attitude tied to the approach of something both common and unusual can be regarded as an obliteration of the boundaries.

> The Aino's body (…) has startled travellers, who on their return home have described the Ainos as hirsute (…) their broad beards have caused the

[368] Page references in the following square brackets are from Anton Chekhov, *A Journey to Sakhalin*, transl. by Brian Reeve (Cambridge: Ian Faulkner, 1993). Unless otherwise specified, all the translation are from Reeve's edition of translation.

> ethnographers great difficulty; to this very day science has still not found a real place for the Ainos in the racial system. [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 229]

The sense of indistinguishability again catches our attention. The assumption of human connectedness is general, but it reveals the problem that essential grounds of human similarity are unstable. Chekhov's statement reminds us that if the contingent differences of culture upon encounter are unquestioned, a certain deeper reality in the psychic realm of automatic writings would have lost its significance for presenting the fact that 'self' and 'others' can be gathered in a 'stable narrative coherence.'[369] Chekhov drew on his experiences for an imagination of the Ainos by saying,

> These days an Aino — usually bare-headed and bare-footed and wearing shorts cut off above the knee — who happens to meet you on the road will bow to you, gazing up at you amiably, but sadly and unhealthily, like a failure who was out of luck. The Aino looks as if he would like to apologise for the fact that, although his beard has grown long, he has still not made a career for himself. [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 229]

Chekhov did not attempt to use Ainos symbolically, as negative 'others' against whom he defined as a truly Russian subject. On the contrary, Chekhov would agree to say,

> There is a general agreement that this race is gentle, modest, good-natured, trusting, communicative and courteous, respects property, is courageous in the hunt and, to use the expression of Dr. Rollen, a travelling-companion of La Pérouse; they 'might even be said to be cultured and intelligent.' Their customary qualities consist of unselfishness, openness and a belief in friendship and generosity. (…) 'Such genuinely rare qualities, for the possession of which they are indebted not to any elevated education, but to nature alone, have aroused in me the sensation, that I consider this race the best of all others that have hitherto been known to me.' A. Rudanovsky writes: 'A more peaceable and modest population than the one we met in the southern part of Sakhalin cannot exist.' [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 230-231]

On the other hand, it is not clear whether Chekhov intended to show his ironic position within the cultural description of the non-Russian natives. Unlike the Gilyaks and Ainos, those exiled Russian peasants were forced to be banned or

[369] James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, p. 173.

degraded to a certain position that would sublimate the purity of the non-Russian natives into an ideal of uncorrupted unity. It was in "Yegor's story" (Chapter 6) of Chekhov's *A Journey to Sakhalin* that an image of the holy fool was recaptured for the question of abnormality,

> The convict Yegor (…) barefoot (…) and gave the impression of an awkward and lumbering person, as they say, a 'clodhopper' with an ingenuous and, at first sight, rather silly face and with a broad mouth like a turbot. (…) He could not sit around without work for a single minute and found it everywhere, wherever he went. He would be talking to you, but his eyes would be searching round to see if there was anything to clear up or repair. He sleeps two or three hours a day, because there is nowhere for him to sleep. On holidays and days off he usually stands at a crossroads somewhere, dressed in a jacket over a red shirt, his stomach stuck out and feet apart. He calls this 'taking a stroll.' [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 123]

In fact, it was a real case that a fugitive masqueraded as a holy fool for the purpose of preventing his facial brands and the scars left by the knout or lash from being noticed by the people.[370] However, Chekhov's depiction of a foolish convict peasant was so real that we are to believe that the protagonists of his masterpiece after his journey to Sakhalin Island were not composed of elements drawn from fantasy.

In parallel to his adventure to Sakhalin, boundaries that separate those different others from us become not so distinct for the purpose of unity. Whether or not Chekhov's departure for Sakhalin was because he needed 'new material as a stimulus to his imagination'[371], the primitive people as well as their societies on the island were increasingly available as aesthetic and scientific resources. It is this ethnographic experience which contributed to a style of cultural evaluation, the redistribution of value-judgment on categories such as ritual, custom, hygiene and so forth. The experiences in ethnographic writing surveyed in Chekhov's 'notes' (*zapiski*) cannot be seen in terms of a systematic analysis of colonial representation. However, it presents a classic dilemma of turning 'unruly experience' into an 'authoritative written account.' Cultural interpretations of

---

[370] Abby M. Schrader, "Branding the Exile as 'Other': Corporal Punishment and the Construction of Boundaries in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Russia", in *Russian Modernity: Politics, Knowledge, Practices*, ed. by David L. Hoffmann and Yanni Kotsonis (Hampshire: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), p. 28 (pp. 19-40).

[371] "Introduction" of Anton Chekhov, *A Journey to Sakhalin*, p. 4.

ethnography are enmeshed in writing, a translation of experience into textual form.[372]

Chekhov inevitably disclosed his crisis and uncertainty in a condition of assembling the empire's most unconventional constituents. Chekhov's journey to Sakhalin would be seen as a result of 'nothing but statistics'; however, it might well also have provided an indication of how the experience on 'devil's island' could be applied in literary works on which Chekhov was working following his return to Moscow. Artistic creation may conditionally transcend space and time. Chekhov's personal experience and facts which he selected and gathered from their original occasions are given enduring value in a new literary arrangement. Every appropriation of episodes in Chekhov's short stories implies a specific temporal position and form of historical narration. For understanding different ways of life dispersed in a context of nationality and modernity, Chekhov's literary works after the journey were equal in aesthetic and moral value to the greatest western masterpieces of the era. His task in following literary creation seemingly aimed to dismantle the arbitrary discourse, to expose the oppressive system, to break the received ideas and static images.

["Ward No. 6": A Vulnerable System of Distinction]

In the spring and summer of 1890, the year when he departed for Sakhalin, Chekhov published *From Siberia* (*Iz Sibiri*) in the newspaper *Novoe Vremia*. Apart from the landscape, people of different social groups in particular seemed to fascinate him. A close reading of some passages from the story, in the context of their resources, casts a variety of sketches of Russian settlers, miserable convicts and life of a peasant family. Amongst them was an imbecile (*durachok*) whose dull eyes and incoherent sounds tempted us to think of him as the Russian holy fool. Chekhov wrote down his impression when he stayed over with the peasant, Andrey, in Krasny Yar,

> An imbecile in a caftan torn to shreds, barefoot, soaked through from the rain, is lugging firewood and pails of water into the entrance hall. He constantly glances into the chamber at me; he shows his unkempt, dishevelled head, mutters something, moos like a calf, and back he goes. Looking at his wet

[372] James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*, p. 25.

face and unblinking eyes and listening to his voice, anybody would think that they would soon start raving, too.[373]

On a humanistic level, as expressed by the narrator, the appearance and the behaviour of the 'imbecile' seemed to be 'delirious' (*bredit'*), yet not to have incurred any fear to a member of society.[374]

It was in Siberia where things might get worse (*khuzhe budet*)[375] and people could not precisely distinguish one from another for his/her pathological symptoms or charismatic attractions just like Chekhov's claim on his experience of Sakhalin Island. Although the wave of the nineteenth century ethnographic study, including the Victorian anthropologists who were socio-cultural evolutionists, was to demonstrate potentially that the group being described was less civilised than the one doing the description[376], most of the Russian ethnographers in the mid-nineteenth century performed the task of showing what made the Russian people unique. Apart from the hierarchical yet descriptive analyses, which were concerned more with data on life and custom of the non-Russian natives, readers to whom Chekhov revealed his perception through his stories may also learn public opinions and problems raised for the social acceptance of the 'abnormality.'

External and internal factors probably contributed to the impression and to the writing by which Chekhov conveyed meticulous details about protagonist's physical appearance, psychological condition and visible commitment to surroundings that lead us to consider the issue involving change of an attitude towards classification of a religious, medical and ethnographical holy case. Using the resources from *Iz Sibiri*, Chekhov presented a debate over distinction between the superior culture of a ferryman (whose nickname was Brains) and the inferior one of a homesick Tatar (nameless) in another short story *In Exile* (*V ssylke*, 1892). The young Tatar with his pale, sorrowful and sickly face is regarded naïve and 'foolish' in the eyes of other ferrymen working by the river bank. The Tatar was poor, cold, hungry, fearful and laughed at by his peers. In contrast to Brains

---

[373] Anton Chekhov, *A Journey to Sakhalin*, transl. by Brian Reeve (Cambridge: Ian Faulkner, 1993), p.47.

[374] A.P. Chekhov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v tridtsati tomakh*, Vol. 1 (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), p. 21.

[375] *Ibid*, p. 8.

[376] See individual project study in Adam Kuper, *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of An Illusion* (London; New York: Routledge, 1988); George W. Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan, c1987) and compare to Johannes Fabian, *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press, c2002).

who mocks the ordinary human desire for happiness, Chekhov's Tatar is never a person who is 'not alive' (*ne zhivoi*), or only a 'stone clay' (*kamen', glina*).[377]

Chekhov's *Ward No. 6* (*Palata No. 6*, 1892) demonstrated a similar vocabulary as well as the same interest in the life within the institution of psychiatry after his return from Sakhalin. It may well be the case that Chekhov instinctively correlates the functional system of psychiatric hospitals with that of the prison, since the *Ward No. 6* was written at a time when Chekhov was still heavily influenced by the impression of those days on the Island. Thomas G. Winner would argue that Chekhov was breaking away from his previous style of writing and seemed to publish his stories of a predominately philosophical character which 'bear witness to his desperate search for a coherent worldview' after his journey to Sakhalin in 1890.[378] Damir Mirković also agreed that in Chekhov's *Ward No. 6*, the story has an equal value to real and alive fieldwork data.[379] In fact, Chekhov did share his experience of the nervous illness when he discussed about the medical service provided for the exiles. He wrote,

> As I have mentioned already, the mentally ill are not accommodated separately on Sakhalin. During my visit, some of them were quartered in the settlement of Korsakovsk together with syphilitics, and, so I was told, one of them had actually become infected with syphilis, while others, living at liberty, laboured on an even footing with the healthy, cohabited, escaped and were tried. I personally met a fair number of lunatics in the posts and settlements. [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 354]

Amongst them, a man called Vetryakov, was given specific notice on his 'vacant and imbecilic expression' and illogical conversation with others. Vetryakov was diagnosed to be a lunatic, suffering paranoia. However, Chekhov also indicated paradoxically that a 'fairly precise diagnosis' for this kind of people is required. It is because 'they are assumed to be healthy' while accomplishing their work. [*A Journey to Sakhalin*, 355]

---

[377] A.P. Chekhov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem v tridtsati tomakh*, Vol. 8, p. 50.

[378] Thomas G. Winner, "Čexov's Ward No. 6 and Tolstoyan Ethics", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (Winter, 1959), p. 324 (pp. 321-334). See also Andrew R. Durkin, "Chekhov's Response to Dostoevskii: The Case of "Ward Six"", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring, 1981), pp. 49-59.

[379] Damir Mirković, "Anton Pavlovich Chekhov and the Modern Sociology of Deviance", *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (March 1976), p. 71 (pp. 66-72).

For this reason, *Ward No. 6* can be read as a critique of social categorisation from which no one can escape. Both Dr. Ragin and the inmate Ivan Gromov are being used by Chekhov to pass judgment on the rules for distinction. On the basis of unfailing realism and clarity of vision, Chekhov provided a criticism of the weak state of psychiatry, a criticism notable also for its human sympathy for anyone who ended up in a similar situation. It is arguable that both Ragin and Gromov are 'modern holy fools' encountered in a psychiatric institution — a symbol of rationalist modernity.[380] In Chekhov's description, Gromov is a kind of person whose speech is,[381]

> (…) confused and febrile, like the ramblings of a man in a delirium, is impetuous and not always intelligible, but there is something in his words and inflexions that betrays quite extraordinary goodness. When he speaks, you become aware of both the madman and the man in him (*v nem symasshedshevo i cheloveka*). It is difficult to put his mad ravings down on paper. He speaks of human meanness, of coercion trampling upon justice, of the beautiful life that will one day come on earth, of the barred windows that remind him every moment of the stupidity and cruelty of the oppressors (*o typosti i zhestkosti nasil'nikov*). [71-72]

Written soon after his return from Sakhalin, Chekhov demonstrated here an indirect influence of his ethnographic experience of an alien reality which was not something akin to a mystical apprehension, but the faithful reflection of another actuality which was often concealed from us for the sake of mundane civilisation. What makes the story significant in relation to our main concern is the unstable concept or system of distinction. By showing the philosophical opposition between Gromov and Ragin, Chekhov condemned a society rip for judgment. In Ragin's eyes,

> Prejudices (*predrassudki*) and all sorts of foul and abominable things which one came across in life were necessary, for in the course of time they were converted into something useful (*putnoe*), just as manure was converted into

[380] Philip Gorski's article "Holy Fools in Russian Literature" (*published in the February 2006 issue of Sourozh, journal of the Russian Orthodox Church in Great Britain*), http://www.incommunion.org/2007/02/02/holy-fools-in-russian-literature/ (last accessed 15 January 2015)

[381] Page references in square brackets are from *Biblioteka mirovoi novelly: Anton Pavlovich Chekhov*, ed. by N.V. Bannikov and L.S. Kaliuzhnaia (Moscow: Zvonnitsa-MG, 1997), pp. 68-125. Unless otherwise specified, all the translation are mine. Henceforth page numbers refer to this text.

> fertile black earth. There was nothing good on earth that had not originally had something vile (*gadosti*) in it. [81]

Ragin was said to be a religious young man (*nabozhen*) and to have thought of taking holy orders (*gotovil sebia k dukhovnoi kar'ere*). [79] Although he considered the best thing to do was to 'discharge the patients and close down the hospital', he still lacked 'the strength of character and the confidence in his own right to assert himself.' [81] Ragin remained faithful to see,

> Psychiatry, with its modern classification of ailments, methods of diagnosis and treatment — compared with what it used to be was a gigantic achievement. No longer was cold water poured over the heads of lunatics, nor were they any longer put into strait-jackets; they were treated like human beings, and even had theatrical performances and dances organised for them, so the newspaper reported. [90]

Each manifestation of behaviour recorded in clinical experience is regarded as a sign of pathology and taken by Ragin to be a comprehensible act, yet not so reasonable and sane against the social orders. On the contrary, Gromov totally denied the function of the whole system by saying:

> Yes, I am ill. But surely there are scores of madmen, hundreds, walking about unmolested, simply because in your ignorance (*nevezhestvo*) you are incapable of distinguishing them from healthy people! (…) Where is the logic? [93]

It is worth pondering over Ragin' response to Gromov's heckling,

> I am afraid morality and logic have nothing to do with it. It is all a matter of chance (*Vse zavisit ot sluchaia*). [93]

In fact, Ragin happened to get the 'chance' to be an inmate of Ward no. 6 in the end of the story. It is suffice to say that Chekhov's story draws attention to the way in which abnormality is recognised, defined and managed in a social context. It is those with the power to stigmatise who construct the entity of mental illness. Ironically, when the stigmatiser switches the position with the stigmatised, those with privilege have no expectation of trapping themselves in the situation similar to the people being labelled.

It is true that, after the journey to Sakhalin Island, Chekhov was able to approach his philosophical view of the issue from the standpoint of being totally experienced with the medical treatment and to apply his method through

ethnographical analysis which was then transformed into a story accessible to the public. Generalisation shall not be the excuse of leaving no space for anyone who has the 'divine' element. It is only a matter of the way how one would see it and be seen upon encounter with those 'others', who are different from us. Chekhov pointed to the importance of one's ideology and the social atmosphere in defining worth against the prevailing attitude towards psychiatric abnormality and recalled his observation of the people in exile, in the extreme social conditions he witnessed on the journey to Sakhalin. When the social context shifts from the exiled colony to the metropolitan, the foolishness of any individual which resulted from genetics or the social environment is so designated as an unusual identity which can be replaced in the public consciousness by the more artistic and formal style of the fool.

It is not to suggest that Chekhov's literary reproduction after his journey to Sakhalin reflected popular responses to the question of indistinction. But those ides between lines can be seen as individual interpretations revealing a wide divergence of opinions. Chekhov's personal experience on Sakhalin Island was embodied by his fictional characters in *Ward No. 6*, which dealt with an individual set apart from the rest of society by a mark of intellectual distinction — often manifested in alienation or in some extreme case a form of madness — who somehow exceeds the bounds of normal human existence. This is possibly the legacy of the Romantic ideal emerged in the early nineteenth century through the work of German philosophers such as Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) and Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), who attempted to challenge what they saw as the excessive rationalism of the eighteen-century Enlightenment period. Through a kind of aesthetic catharsis, a new concept appeared to inform the promotion of the individual who stood in opposition to the theory of rationalism which regarded reason as the primary source and test of knowledge and justification. To what extent the idea about what abnormality was in Chekhov's story constituted through a manipulation of the writer by the state (including the policy and institution) or the manipulation of the state by the writer is a question with no straight forward answer. However, there are significant changes in the way Chekhov strived to give his foolish and sometimes mad characters a form composed of his personal experience which was not only approachable, but also meaningful to the contemporary of the nineteenth century. Clearly, Chekhov recognised those (holy) fools who behave madly as a distinct presence in and as a marker of Russian culture. Seemingly, Chekhov was adamant that his readers also recognised the significance of the Russian (holy) fool in the question where the political

motivation for distinction is doubtful. The idea that what we read might influence our social and emotional skills is not new. The latest study, published in the journal *Science*, found that after reading literary fiction, as opposed to popular fiction or serious nonfiction, 'people performed better on tests measuring empathy, social perception and emotional intelligence — skills that come in especially handy when one is trying to read the body language of others or gauge what they might be thinking.'[382] Although the study suggested only a quantifiable effect from reading literature for a few minutes, it implied that readers gain social skills from exploring literary characters. Hence, we could expect that Chekhov's literary fiction must have 'left more to the imagination, encouraging readers to make inferences about characters' and at least be sensitive to 'emotional nuance and complexity.'[383]

***

This chapter is informed by and helps to develop the findings of the research conducted by ethnographers and orientologists in imperial Russia. Their experience and from which the activists theorised on their attitude towards 'people of other origins' helps to re-interpret the life of the holy fool. Following this pattern, I showed that the method of allocating the non-Russian natives can lead to dispositions that either perpetuate or subvert those rules made to keep those abnormal with or away from us.

Russian ethnographers were not alienated from the public perception of their production. Besides scholars of theoretical analysis, the activists in ethnographic practice were from different social background (as writers, missionaries, political exiles and doctors). Their approach to and reproduction of the question arising from their experience with ethnic groups across the Russian Empire must have been influenced by their professional trainings and have revealed the public concerns as the activists themselves were members of the society and closely connected with it. My attention to explore a new perception of holy foolishness through ideas that were emerged from ethnographic practices was focused on notions of what and how to make biased judgment invalid. Boundaries must be eliminated when the Russian Empire aimed to expand its territory. Holding a relative equal standpoint on human

[382] David Comer Kidd and Emanuele Castano, "Reading Literary Fiction Improves Theory of Mind", *Science*, Vol. 342, No. 6156 (18 October 2013), pp. 377-380.
[383] Pam Belluk's article of "For Better Social Skills, Scientists Recommend a Little Chekhov" on *The New York Times* as of 04/10/2013 (http://nyti.ms/1as98nk, last accessed 14 February 2014).

beings, ethnography was indicative of inclusion, with which the figure such as holy fool was able to locate itself in society regardless of how the conditions might change. The study of ethnic groups of diverse origins was not a call for a rehabilitation of esoteric knowledge of holy foolishness. Under the influence of Romanticism, its intention to recreate a holistic knowledge of the world and to present the conception of the harmony between humanity and nature was appreciated in the understanding of holy foolishness. Through ethnography, one of the fields capable of fusing objective data and philosophical background, the phenomenon of holy foolishness offers the chance to rethink and reveal humanity's place in the world.

It is reasonable to see that the sacredness of the holy fool expressed itself not only in a specific methodology, but also in the functions and goals attributed to the discipline that is employed for the understanding of the Russian spirit — a moment of contradiction and coexistence. Hence, like the modern sciences, holy fools are reinterpreted in the context of the non-Russian natives for an additional observation of a specific object of research, yet they do not lose their tie with ontological knowledge on the religious level as esotericism, on the scientific level as backwardness or on the political level as introspection. It is not suggested here that the seemingly old-fashioned holy fools has its direct link to the uncivilised non-Russian natives. Rather, both are organic part of and institutionalised by the Russian Empire, especially when one subscribes to Russian nationalism's classic clichés of building hopes on Holy Russia.

Analyses of Chekhov's journey to Sakhalin and of his stories after the journey reveal an inversion of the conventions of the traditional Oriental paradigm. That is, the supposedly exotic world of Sakhalin Island or condition of abnormal mentality which lies beyond our general understanding emerges as relatively tame and reasonable. The experience, as well as those stories happened in Russian border towns, rather than somewhere exotic in a foreign country, a space fraught with strangeness, incomprehensibility and otherness. Physical or mental abnormalities were not purposely emphasized in association with distance and otherness in Chekhov's stories, as those protagonists lived in Russia or spoke Russian. Dehumanization of the other was once characteristic of travel and adventure literature; however, it was rendered problematic against the nature of the Russian Empire. Owing to the indeterminate borders, the contiguous nature of its expansion and the generic anthropological condition of people living on the geographical and

social margins of the Russian Empire, the distinction between the self and the other, the normal and the abnormal is often difficult to perceive.

Similar to Vygotsky's argument, the abnormal individual, such as the holy fool or the non-Russian native, is allegorically presented in the work of Chekhov as a culturally translatable object that cannot be accurately defined as 'different', but can be described 'in familiar terms with relative ease.'[384] But acquaintance does not make its diversity banal. Nevertheless, one must bear in mind, as James Staples suggested, that a focus on stigma in particular, by way of reducing a vast range of different social explanations and processes into one 'catch-all explanation', has meant that the intricacies of each particular experience have been overlooked.[385] On this point, both Chekhov and Vygotsky play the same role in the transformation of paying great attention to 'facts', rather than to names through different approaches of understanding and representation.

Whether it was the peasant imbecile or the innocent non-Russian natives, they were relocated directly into the late nineteenth century concepts of abnormality, combining art and science. However, they were called and defined against the social background in which their self-interest and appetite revealed none of the manipulative features. In the stories of Chekhov, the protagonist and his stigma bearing foolish and mad elements appear paradox, as uncertainties, having multiple perspectives, with hints of something unexplained, together creating a sense of feeling engaged by the figurative expression on the question of being different. Presumably, his (Chekhov or the hero of the stories) casting off the general values of status in favour of equality, prompted a transient image of the holy fool whose irrationality is a reminder of the established order of things. Whatever the figures in literature is a *iurodivyi-strannik* in potential or an actual one in disguise, the authors weaves the protagonists' characteristics devoted to the irrational principle into the life of all levels of intelligence and variety of life's circumstances. In Chekhov's story, the reader was invited to see a deeper metaphor of its own contemporary reality. The mix of medical and ethnographic discourse generated a continuity of experience which demonstrated a dilemma of differentiation and the heterogeneous flow of the Russian culture.

---

[384] Similar to the idea in Valeria Sobol, "The Uncanny Frontier of Russian Identity: Travel, Ethnography, and Empire in Lermontov's "Taman"", *Russian Review*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (January, 2011), pp. 65-79.

[385] James Staples, *Peculiar People, Amazing Lives: Leprosy, Social Exclusion, and Community Making in South India* (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2007), p. 19.

[An Epilogue]

The science of ethnography, which accompanies the Romantic literary imagination and theoretical debates over the issue of the Orient, was no less a manifestation of modernist fascination than with people of different origins or living conditions. Russian intellectuals took part in activities under the banner of ethnology and ethnography, which can be treated as both independent and popular academic disciplines equivalent to the same as in the West, but only in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. By taking part in the famous Jesup North Pacific Expedition led by Franz Boas, people like Bogoraz and Shternberg were encouraged to think about some of the deepest problems within government policy towards the indigenous peoples and their languages. The expedition nourished the new academic discipline, ethnology, whose motto before the 1917 revolution were 'pragmatism' and 'descriptive' fieldwork.[386] Their handling of such issues was still influential in the 1920s.[387]

As Nikolai Vakhtin declared from his 'inside perspective', Russian ethnology was developed on the idea that humankind is born equal and fraternal, regardless of its place on the 'ladder of civilisation.' Other scholars of the time, such as N.M. Pokrovskii and N.Ia. Marr, also emphasized similar ideas that 'the necessity, value and advantages of giving equal support to all cultures and all languages must have been taken into account during the language policy movement in the 1920s.'[388] However, Russian ethnological thinking with its ambition of demonstrating the universal character of human culture was suspended by 1934 when Stalin announced that the principle enemy was local nationalism. As Craig Brandist discovered, the violence of Stalin's method brought a 'sharp downturn in the fortunes of unorthodox intellectuals' in the Soviet Union.[389]

---

[386] Yuri Slezkine, "Sovetskaia etnografiia v nokdaune: 1928-1938", *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, Vol. 2 (1993), p. 114 (pp. 113-125); and also Peter Schweitzer's doctoral dissertation on *Siberia and Anthropology: National Tradition and Transmational Moments in the History of Research* (Habilitationsschrift. Eingereicht an der Human- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen, Fakultät der Universität Wien, 2001).

[387] On Soviet national and language policy, see Vladimir Alpatov, "Obshchestvennoe soznanie i iazykovaia politika s SSSR (20e-40e gody" in *Iazyk v kontekste Obshchestvennogo razvitiia* (Moscow: Academy of Science, 1994), pp. 29-46; Brian D. Silver, "The Status of National Minority Languages in Soviet Education: An Assessment of Recent Changes", *Soviet Studies*, Vol. 26, Iss. 1 (1974), pp. 28-40; and Isabbelle Kreindler, "The Non-Russian Languages and the Challenge of Russian: The Eastern versus the Western Tradition" in *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages: Their Past, Present, and Future*, ed. by Isabelle T. Kreindler (Berlin, New York: Mouton, c1985), pp. 345-368.

[388] Nikolai Vakhtin, "Transformations in Siberian Anthropology: An Insider's Perspective" in *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*, ed. by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar (Oxford, UK; New York: Berg, 2006), p. 52 (pp. 49-68).

[389] Craig Brandist, *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics* (London: Pluto Press,

Before Russian ethnography and ethnology began its hibernation during the Soviet period, the value of both disciplines was to diminish (ethnic) boundaries between people. Similar to the question we have invoked to see the holy fool in relation to the non-Russian natives, it is often impossible to tell where the boundaries lay, if they existed at all, in a space of cultural contacts. It was in this situation which the disordered becoming sacred was in tandem with the new artistry. On this point do we suggest that depiction of the holy fools is useful for understanding the mythical quality immanent in the Russian's imagery of the non-Russian natives at the time of the expansion towards the East. In the meantime, an understanding of the non-Russian natives during the late imperial Russia generates a concept of accepting different others as who they are for better comprehension of the eccentric holy fools.

2002), p. 9.

Conclusion

The world's societies are so interconnected that no cultural system can function independently. Upon encounter, it is unavoidable that one has to take a position. Taking a position means, in a positive way, becoming involved in the mechanisms through which identity (of self and the other) is articulated in encounters with and representations of cultural difference. As encounters happen, there should be no sovereign scientific method or ethical stance applied to guarantee the authenticity of every single identity. Any stereotype of understanding should be considered as a negotiated and continuing process.

For better or worse, the building of one's stigma presents a process of how people develop their value systems upon a chosen object. Communication between the observer and the observed is dynamic. Heterogeneity exists for the purpose of inquiry of various possibilities, rather than that of launching a massive campaign against it. There should be, as Virginia Price said, 'no ultimate conscience or universal moral principle to provide a regulating influence on the process and outcome of human endeavours.'[390] A set of characteristics attributable to a person from different perspectives does not intend to degrade him/her of being impersonal or sub-personal. On the contrary, the name given to every kind of personal condition should be understood as a fundamental orientation towards the world where such a person lives and is perceived. That is to say, a complex of personality traits is understood as a type of identity pattern which is defined by individuals in their relation to and interaction with others. A certain behavioural syndrome (that is correlated with specific figures whose status remains ambiguous) can be easily categorised as a typology of personality and sometimes as a threat to normality and social stability. In order to improve the rather slow accumulation of information and generalisation in an empirical finding of a certain behavioural type, a comparative and coherent conceptual model of such a type grounded separately in religious understanding, contemporary clinical experience or ethnographic analysis is conducive to a better clarification of such a condition.

The holy fool has long been regarded as a figure that repudiates the established orders and cultivates naiveté through bizarre behaviours which are sometimes 'a

[390] See Virginia Ann Price, *Type A Behavior Pattern: A Model for Research and Practice* (New York: Academic Press, 1982), pp. 41-53.

defining mark of Christian perfection.'[391] Whilst Russian writings of the nineteenth century gradually developed into discernible themes and characters, the stereotype of the holy fool grew to be a character of different literary and historical currents that could be either a divine or secular image. Based on real-life stories, a figure resembling the holy fool yet bearing no mark indicating the sainthood was recreated by observers who fabricated it for religious authoritarian movement, documented it for clinical diagnosis or invented it for a pretext of social problems along with its history of development. The holy fool provides a powerful metaphor for us to explore a society whose attention to the 'difference' of individuals generates a vast dimension to think of the problem of our modern inability to properly distinguish an abnormal person from other normal ones. As history advanced on its track, the concept of the holy fool must have evolved beyond its initial perception in the context of religion. The transformation of any deeply-rooted impression of the holy fool implied the value of certain public awareness. The influence is mutual and interactive. On the one hand, tradition of the holy foolishness has significantly added to the knowledge of popular movements of religious dissent and to the interpretation of different others. On the other hand, scientific studies about people of diversified origins elsewhere in Siberia provide a stimulating conceptual vehicle on which to revisit the scene generated by the holy fool in Russia.

Any social event was ultimately caused by the environment and was relatively defined. The decision as to whether a given act is appropriate or inappropriate must often necessarily be 'a lay decision', simply because we have no technical mapping of the various behavioural subcultures in our society, let alone the standards of conduct prevailing in each of them.[392] Diagnostic decisions, concerning improper behaviour except for extreme symptoms, can become ethnocentric and occasionally tend to be political. We may not precisely identify the fact of how the holy fool has manipulated and modified his environment to his taste or (dis-)advantage. However, it is possible to see him or figure as such, in a condition (whether constructed or not) where the non-Russian natives function to produce comparable and practical paths of understanding. In a multinational empire where the social milieu reflects more or less the complexity in itself, a new type of evolution becomes possible. The holy fool is not a new kind of species, but becomes a cultural phenomenon which occurs in a new world where its experiences

[391] See Dana Heller and Elena Volkova, "The Holy Fool in Russian and American Culture: A Dialogue", *American Studies International*, Vol. 41, No. 1/2, Post Soviet American Studies (February, 2003), pp. 152-178.

[392] Erving Goffman, *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, 1991 [1961]), p. 363.

are re-described and re-categorised.[393] It is unlikely that the structural evolution of these persons will be made apparent only through one interpretation, such as in terms of religious saints or clinic patients. There must be a reason for one's existence, a condition supported by various social forces. The struggle between different viewpoints held by the people and influenced by their relation to cultural evolvement still persists, each side with polar positions needs a neutral place to disarm and rest their initiative and minute motives. Alternatively, the 'field' is open to drive our attention to the ethnographic approach. Truly, ethnography is incapable of providing a complete answer to such phenomena; nevertheless, it can be a specific area of observation which brings us back to the holy fools who can be explained by objective criteria as another different 'kind' (of people or groups) and have their distinct field of communication. Whether or not the clinical approach, including psychological analysis, identified saintly religious figures or revolutionary spirits as pathological and mad, those whose expression is the 'renunciation of the order of the world' should not simply be confined as a patient or victim of disturbed backgrounds with inherited traits of immorality and insanity. An analysis of the holy fool in the opinions of (ab)normal others could also require elucidation of the roles which people attribute to the non-Russian natives within the Russian Empire.

A critical suspension of judgment on the people with abnormality is impossible. Whether or not it is a positive or negative evaluation, the formation of certain stigmata becomes unquestionable along with the judging process. In the intelligentsia's sensitivity to the idea that mental abnormality may presage real wisdom, hints of a traditional image of the holy fool are found in some nineteenth century Russian novels. Literary representations focus on the organic process by asserting the way in which holy foolishness can be understood as a socially meaningful practice which is in some ways, analogous to an ethnographic study of other primitive tribesmen. As a result, the unambiguous boundaries between the self and others in every context of discussion allow us to engage in a meaningful action and observe its effects upon the world of the majority of the 'normals.' Ian Hacking retraced the labelling theory and claimed that 'deviance is not something inherent in behaviour, but an outcome of how individuals or their behaviours are

[393] A similar parallel can be seen in Hacking's discussion about Malayan latah and French Fugue. See Ian Hacking, *Mad Travelers: Reflections on the Reality of Transient Mental Illnesses* (Charlottesville, Va.: University Press of Virginia, 1998), pp. 51-79. However, as he has emphasized, a study of one kind may illuminate many others, but it will serve only as a guide for understanding a group of kinds, not be understood as a model for all kinds. See Ian Hacking, *The Social Construction of What?* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1999), p. 131.

labelled.'[394] The Russian holy fool, who has not yet been tagged by any modern psycho-medical terms, used to roam around the northern steppe and in the forest as well as in the cities and religious sites. He may be granted a state of embodying a characteristic type of various cultural infiltrations. The specific image of him, provided for interpretation, is constructed by the social situation that surrounds him. Even under the definition of the current social value which has its own history of complicated evolution and transformation, it is suggested that the one with mental disability is classified on the basis of 'socially valued behaviours' which are contingent upon his/her 'level of intellectual functioning.'[395] Since the process of being stigmatized is inevitable, the nineteenth century Russia released a fresh perspective which was crucial for labelling and for solidifying rules at the transitional moment.

Before concluding, it is the moment to deconstruct the word 'abnormal.' The 'normal' added with a prefix 'ab-' becomes different from its original shape. In our view, the *abnormal* is not beyond the border which is drawn by the *normal*. On the contrary, it is within the territory of the *abnormal* where the *normal* inhabits, just as the architecture and semantics of the word itself demonstrates and as Erving Goffman has implied in his *Stigma*. Thus, the humble contribution of the current project is to present the case of the Russian holy fool for consideration: what kind of society do we need or shall we create for a 'different other' to coexist? There may not be a model answer. However, one can always learn from others to prevent mistakes.

In Summary

This thesis has shown that there remains a persistent struggle over the issue raised by the history, meaning and legacy of the holy foolishness. It was also understood that within the struggle there existed a number of obstacles to a moderate approach to objectively understanding diverse motives and properly applying the rules to define the holy fool as a figure in a state of exception. What was conceived in the context of understanding the holy fool as another normal type

[394] Ian Hacking, "Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: Between Discourse in the Abstract and Face-to-Face Interaction", *Economy and Society*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (August 2004), pp. 277-302.
[395] Mary L. Manion and Hank A. Bersani, "Mental Retardation as a Western Sociological Construct: A Cross-cultural Analysis", *Disability & Society*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1987), p. 236.

was subject to a dilution of concept which was formed by an enduring stereotype of abnormality constructed by political intervention. Giorgio Agamben considered that 'life is both inside and outside the juridical order' and the threshold of which is the place of sovereignty. It happens that the sovereign renews this threshold of indistinction between outside and inside, exclusion and inclusion, *nomos* and *physis*, in which life is originally excepted from the law.[396] Borrowing the idea from Agamben's discussion about the (un)relation between the life and law, the symbiosis under the sovereignty and other institutions (including an individual who controls the power of discourse) which decide one's state of living is a thread of further argument that extends to the present discussion about rationalising the presence of abnormality. In Russia, the partakers of the setting modified by the tradition of the holy fools and the knowledge of the non-Russian natives were able to make sense of any individual whose ambiguous identity could be regarded as an exemplar of sovereign status through political announcement (by the Orthodox Church or the government administration) and simultaneously as the embodiment of a 'bare life' which reminded of his/her condition as if in a 'state of exception.' It is under this circumstance that we see the possibility of embracing other 'expression of life' and further engage in a discussion about the meaning of diversity. In the name of civilisation, both holy fool and non-Russian native share an identical path of being treated as someone different, yet understood independently as organism of reasonable existence. My point in affirming a 'different expression of life' was to give it a presence and value. By examining the concept of symbiosis that we saw in the studies of the holy fools together with a discovery of the non-Russian natives' legal identity in the late nineteenth century, it was argued that there was a movement towards a rethink of the mechanism through which the question of 'a life (not) worth living' was emerged.

No individual can escape from the rules by which he is so classified. However, as we can see the Russian holy fool is an example living in a zone or state where the rules for strict division cease to apply as a result of mercy or political strategy. It was not to suggest that the holy fool can be interpreted as a model in an exceptional condition in Agamben's theory. Rather, it was in the 'zone of anomie' where the life of the holy fool was released from the literal application of the norm. What makes the law suspended in the 'zone of anomie' is the reason that the law fails to bring well-being to all men and hence the power of the same is revoked. In my study, I argued that a specific method for and study of the non-Russian natives

[396] Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, transl. by Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1998), p. 27.

constructed a condition (a temporary space of anomie) within which the suspended rules reasoned out the presence of the holy fool. No such rules can perfectly be applied to suffice the explanation of one's (non-)existence. And it becomes complicated when the political power tends to function in opposite direction for the sake of imperial benefit. Through a variety of discourses in ethnographic or orientalist studies emphasizing the necessity of one's existence, every single identity (normal or abnormal) without being able to escape from the social norms can still survive between two extreme forces of order and disorder.

Although the holy fool and non-Russian native are of different categories in social status, political motivations for actions on both figures are not dissimilar. In brief, the inclusion and acceptance of their controversial identities and acts were considered to be strategic methods of convincing the 'minority' to appreciate support from the authority. The method was to relocate both of them in a zone where a special mechanism of the rules was applied to accommodate all kinds of individuals and in which the tsarist administration was able to assign political roles to each of them for demonstrating the Russian Empire as a civilised state without eliminating the peculiar individuality. Thus, I am convinced that both holy fool and non-Russian native resonated with equal charge to the state of exception in the discussion of political intervention in the management of social orders. In each value system designed independently for the holy fool and the non-Russian native, it was obvious to notice that the definition of their social status was not fixed to a single category. Therefore, it can be understood that certain general rules are not applicable in this identified situation. Only through a sovereign power (from the Church or the imperial government) can an exceptional model of survival be established for each condition which has a potential for political integration of diversified living organisms. For those individuals or groups involved in this process, a contrast to the civilised development seemed to be settled by political compromise. It is this concession to the spark of inspiration with which this thesis was expected to illuminate the idea of social construction that provided the theoretical basis for the development of the image of the abnormal others within the empire in the late nineteenth century. Nevertheless, the rules were seemingly suspended, but not the political forces. The possibility of breaking through the simulation of protection from the governance against biological innovation is another subject worth further investigation. In brief, what we do upon encounter of a different people, group or situation is to firstly minimise the sense of prejudice by way of learning the facts behind the claims. Then, it is an important step to adjust ourselves thereto by discovering the conditions which form the social atmosphere

and by questioning the political aims that have been encouraged for the sake of unity. Finally, it is a hope that we may respect the life experience of every specific individual and support them with education for dignity of life.

In defining any single individual bearing a stigma, it often comes with judgement and then a sort of term thereupon. Calling it a social construction is not a proper method of analysis without doubts. Similar to Hacking's argument, the scope of constructing is too broad to be useful; it comes to mean simply 'the concept of' which can be attached to absolutely anything. Assessing whether one person is more rational or advanced than the other at some particular skill is one kind of thought and may in some cases be empirically verifiable. Defining the case to be a holy fool or a non-Russian native is a chosen characteristic for those who utilise it to form the mutual awareness and political bonding between themselves and others within a status group. The thesis was to clarify their (the holy fool and non-Russian native) position and possible connection transformed in the artistic works of Chekhov from a different perspective of disciplines. By modifying our position on resources, we do not aspire to absolute truth, rather to the closest approximation the evidence bears. It is assumed that abnormality is a permanent historical fixture, that all societies could have recognised a 'similar kind' in the same human type. But the idea of any classification that defines groups of the human species is itself contemporary. Holy fools may be socially disabled in an institution or context claiming modernity and rationality, but not necessarily backwards in some other concurrent situation, accommodating ethnic variety.

At any given historical moment, the holy fool seemed to be a separate natural kind when the non-Russian native took the priority over the issue of how to make the aliens more Russian, in other words, more faithful in Orthodoxy and civilised within the empire. Both the holy fool and non-Russian native are, in fact, no longer a natural kind, but a historically contingent type of a minority's self- representation which bears a recent historical stereotype. Chekhov, who was concerned with Russian society, has explicitly pointed out through his experience of the journey to Sakhalin Island that stigma of any potential (sacred or profane) disability is a current and temporary manifestation of the social world, urging us to seek the fact which shall be determined by various historically interchangeable kinds (for example, divine and ethnic). What was significant in our studies of the holy fool is the responsibility to negotiate a way round the alternative of deconstruction, to cope with doubts about our feeling for abnormality and to objectively account for it. None of the theories or disciplines can sufficiently be a dominant view of

knowledge which evolves to determine the boundaries of different species upon encounter. There is no fit method for distinction while values are given a different shape of the same event according to the position where the judgement is procured. It was in Russia that the variety of notions explained for the stigmatised identity reinforced the idea that the negative stereotype should have concealed within itself a much deeper and more fundamental philosophy of mutual understanding. In ethnographic studies, a derogated and demonised person in medical or religious context, such as the holy fool, prophet and crazy monk, was simply an object of interest for scholars in the cultural-historical perspective. The academic aim was not to judge the level of one's civilisation, but to study the obscure tendencies of their tradition and social significance in certain circumstances. The practice in ethnography is not only an overvalued source for the knowledge of the holy fool, but also a supportive argument for an understanding of the 'alien other' in general. Together with the debate over the process of assimilation, individuals bearing unfamiliar social characteristics enter into the mechanism of transformation in class identification. I would not call it a progress of improvement, while each statement for explaining a 'personality type' even under the same field of disciplines has its epidemic meaning. There should not be any preoccupied perception of relating it to any dogmatic images or patterns of speech. Rather, it would be better to acknowledge that the interpretation is taken as fluid by crossing the boundary of definition.

The thesis is partly a review of and response to a debate over a certain group of people whose image in the growing concept of rationality and nationality has been through a series of transformations and has become specific in Chekhov's stories after his return from Sakhalin Island. Although the thesis directly focuses on the development of ethnographic experience during the late imperial Russia, the idea of civil inattention to abnormality as a method of uniting many 'others' gives both the holy fool and non-Russian native a place on which to stand and to move on their path towards equality. It is true that one must look beneath recent data in order to reach the earliest data. Providing such a perspective is an extremely daunting task and a short study like this can only hope to lead the way to its threshold and present certain major scenes. The study of ethnic diversity for the question of otherness provides a fertile soil for breeding views and acts upon the holy fool which allow us to be released from the restrictions and to see the world with free will.

To follow the developmental path to civilisation, people with intellectual disability became 'less of a threat and more of a challenge of governance.'[397] Similar to the idea that formulated Vygotsky's medico-pedagogical discourse on defectology in the early twentieth century, the difference between the civilised and the uncivilised man was education. The education of an individual whose physical or mental disorder transgresses the bounds of reason, aims at the stimulation of his or her relation with the social world. Meanwhile, the education also helps the majority of the normal people to gain knowledge about the relatively abnormal minority in a sense of equality and to mediate the conflicts resulted from misunderstandings or misinterpretations. With the help of education, the formation of new norms and rules in our modern society becomes associated with a constant remapping of notions of difference, through social institutions as well as discourses that produce knowledge.

A Choice

It was the hope that this project contributed to a broader understanding of the holy fool not as a degraded individual to shy away from, but a natural subject of equal rights. It provided an example through which a number of phenomena had been explored, including the mechanisms of the imperial policy on ethnicity, the systems of the government control over people of different origins, the manifestation of the social problem derived from the new rules for categorisation and the reproduction of the theme in Chekhov's literature. It also considered an area that had received less attraction, for instance the application of the Buddhology to the question of difference. An unusual figure is probably fortunate in a condition where the rule for distinction between normality and abnormality is suspended for exceptional state. However, the state of exception is not a condition of power vacuum without any political intervention. A space of neither including or excluding norms for classification is a place temporarily fraught with certain ideas and forces which have not yet grown to become a common law.

Concerning the institutional corrections and innovations introduced for establishing the social order, Foucault re-examined the history of contemporary neo-liberalism in his discussion of biopolitics. Foucault developed his

[397] See Murray K. Simpson, "From Savage to Citizen: Education, Colonialism and Idiocy", *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 28, No. 5 (Sep., 2007), pp. 561-574.

understanding of the institutional framework following Louis Rougier's statement which was regarded to be the general principle of the neo-liberalism. Rougier said, 'to be liberal … is to be essentially progressive in the sense of a constant adaptation of the legal order to scientific discoveries, to the progress of economic organization and technique, to changes in the structure of society and to the requirements of contemporary consciousness.'[398] The role of the state government is to control yet create a total condition in which all civilians are able to carry out forms of self-management in daily life. Rules are made through social habitus, religious prescription, ethics, corporative regulation and law. As Foucault said, 'the rule of law' is opposed to the police state in which 'there is no difference of kind, origin, validity and consequently of effect.'[399] As far as Foucault is concerned, 'the rule of law' in neo-liberalism generates an advanced and open system to enforce the law and policy which function as a better approach to helping the 'assisted population', including the elder, disabled and mentally ill persons. The knowledge derived from interaction with the stigmatised individual, can help all human beings appeal to ordinary justice against the public authority. Alternatively, we may expect that the neo-liberalism emphasizing the rational element in 'the rule of law', knowledge, discourse and subjectivity, connects our life to the form of biopolitics and leads the way towards an ultimate horizon of political aspirations to equality.

Truly, every human being should be treated equally even though he or she is detached from what is usually taken to be the normal course of a human life. Both the holy fool and non-Russian native were simultaneously involved in the construction of the other in the formation of a special Russian situation. To cross-examine the correlation of both figures, I want to deconstruct the word structure or the social label of both which is the product of a specific cultural legacy. Regardless of their etymologies and meanings adopted for multiple usages, I intended to see the holy fool (*iu<u>rod</u>ivyi*) and non-Russian alien (*ino<u>rod</u>ets*) as a 'kind' of people (the root *rod-* of both words) who is of 'different' types (the prefix *ino-* of *inorodets*) and sometimes tagged with 'negative' impression (*iu-* of *iurodivyi* as a privative prefix). Strictly speaking, the holy fool and non-Russian native do not share similar attributes in terms of appearance or behaviour. But the process of each becoming an object for observation and taking part in field of simulated subjectivity is alike and valuable for an understanding of the political

[398] Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*, ed. by Michel Senellart, transl. by Graham Burchell (Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), pp. 161-162.
[399] *Ibid*, p. 168.

mechanism through which life of every stigmatised person is manifested, controlled and possibly expected to change its pattern of existence.

Bibliography

❖ **Books**

Agafonov, Nikolai. (2005) *Neprikaiannoe iurodstvo prostykh istorii* (CPb.: Bibλιοπολισ).

Agamben, Giorgio. (2005) *State of Exception*, transl. by Kevin Attell (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Agamben, Giorgio. (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, transl. by Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press).

Alekseev, M.P. (1937) "Pushkin i Kitai" in *A.S. Pushkin i Sibir'* (Moscow-Irkutsk: Vostsiboblgiz), pp. 108-145.

Aleksii. (1913 [2000]) *Iurodstvo i stolpnichestvo: Religioz.-psikhol., mor. i sotsial. issled* (Moscow: Podvor'ia Sviato-Troitskoi Sergievoi Lavry).

Alpatov, Vladimir. (1994) "Obshchestvennoe soznanie i iazykovaia politika s SSSR (20e-40e gody" in *Iazyk v kontekste Obshchestvennogo razvitiia* (Moscow: Academy of Science), pp. 29-46.

Anderson, Benedict. (2006 [1983]) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London; New York: Verso).

Aron, Raymond. (c1999) *Main Currents in Sociological Thought, Vol.2: Durkheim, Pareto, Weber* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers).

Bahadur, Krishna P. (1999) *Sufi Mysticism* (New Delhi: Ess Ess Publications).

Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1981 [1937-1938, 1973]) "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel", in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays*, ed. by Michael Holquiat, transl. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 84-258.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1981 [1934-1935]) "Discourse in the Novel", in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays*, ed. by Michael Holquiat, transl. by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 259-422.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. (c1990 [ca. 1920-1923]) "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity" in *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*, Ed. by Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, transl. by Vadim Liapunov and Kenneth Brostrom (Austin: University of Texas Press), pp. 4-256.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1984) "Discourse in Dostoevsky" in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and transl. by Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), pp. 181-269.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. (1984 [1965]) *Rabelais and his World*, transl. by Hélène Iswolsky (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Balzer, Marjorie Mandelstam (ed.). (c1995) *Culture Incarnate: Native Anthropology from Russia* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe).

Balzer, Marjorie Mandelstam (ed.). (c1997) *Shamanic Worlds: Rituals and Lore of Siberia and Central Asia* (Armonk, N.Y.: North Castle Books).

Balzer, Marjorie Mandelstam (ed.). (c1990) *Shamanism: Soviet Studies of Traditional Religion in Siberia and Central Asia* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe).

Barthes, Roland. (c1977) *Image, Music, Text*, transl. by Stephen Heath (New York: Hill and Wang).

Bartol'd, V.V. (1977) 'Istoriia izucheniia Vostoka v Evrope i Rossii' and 'Vostok i russkaia nauka ', in his *Sochineniia*, vol. 9 (Moscow: Nauka), pp. 197-482 and 534-545.

Bauman, Zygmunt. (1992) *Intimations of Postmodernity* (New York: Routledge).

Bazhenov, N.N. (1909) *Istoriia Moskovskogo dollgauza, nyne Moskovskoi gorodskoi Preobrazhenskoi bol'nitsy dlia dushevnobol'nykh* (Moscow).

Bazhenov, N.N. (1887) "O prizrenii i lechenii dushevno-bol'nykh v zemstvakh i v chastnosti o novoi riazanskoi psikhiatricheskoi bol'nitse", in *Trudy pervago s'ezda otechestvennykh psikhiatrov* (St. Petersburg), pp. 234-248.

Becker, Howard S. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: The Free Press).

Berdiaev, Nikolai. (1971 [1946]) *Russkaia ideia: osnovnye problemy russkoi mysli XIX veka i nachala XX veka* (Paris: YMCA-Press).

Berman, Marshall. (1983) *All That is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (London: Verso).

Blackwell, William. (c1976) "Modernization and Urbanization in Russia: a Comparative View", *The City in Russian History*, ed. by Michael F. Hamm (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky), pp. 291-330

Blakesley, Rosalind P. and Reid, Susan E. (ed.). (c2007) *Russian Art and the West: A Century of Dialogue in Painting, Architecture, and the Decorative Arts* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press).

Billington, James H. (1966) *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture* (New York: Vintage Books).

Bodin, Per-Arne. (2009) *Language, Canonization and Holy Foolishness: Studies in Postsoviet Russian Culture and the Orthodox Tradition* (Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis).

Bogoras, Waldemar. (1907) *The Chukchee*, Part II. The Jesup North Pacific Expedition, Vol. 7, American Museum of Natural History (Leiden: E. J. Brill; New York: G. E. Stechert).

Bogoraz, Vladimir Germanovich. (1927) *Drevnie pereseleniia narodov v severnoi Evrazii i v Amerike* (Leningrad).

Bogoraz, Vladimir Germanovich. (2010) *Chukchi. Religiia* (Moscow: URSS sor.).

Boulnois, Luce. (c2004) *Silk Road: Monks, Warriors & Merchants*, transl. by Helen Loveday (Hong Kong: Odyssey; New York: Norton).

Bourdieu, Pierre. (2000 [1984]) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, transl. by Richard Nice (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

Bova, Russell (ed.). (c2003) *Russia and Western Civilization: Cultural and Historical Encounters* (Armonk, N.Y.; London: M.E. Sharpe).

Brandist, Craig. (2002) *The Bakhtin Circle: Philosophy, Culture and Politics* (London: Pluto Press).

Brintlinger, Angela and Vinitsky, Ilya (ed.). (2007) *Madness and the Mad in Russian Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).

Brooks, Jeffrey (c1985) *When Russia Learned to Read: Literacy and Popular Literature, 1861-1917* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press).

Brostrom, Kenneth N. (c1979) *Archpriest Avvakum: The Life Written by Himself* (Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, University of Michigan).

Brower, Daniel R. and Lazzerini, Edward J. (ed.). (1997) *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Brown, Julie V. (1990) “Social Influences on Psychiatric Theory and Practice in Late Imperial Russia”, *Health and Society in Revolutionary Russia*, ed. by Susan Gross Solomon and John F. Hutchinson (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), pp. 27-44.

Brown, Julie V. (c1989) “Societal Responses to Mental Disorders in Prerevolutionary Russia” in *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*, ed. by William O. McCagg and Lewis Siegelbaum (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press), pp. 13-38.

Brown, Julie V. (1983) “Psychiatrists and the State in Tsarist Russia”, *Social Control and the State*, ed. by Stanley Cohen and Andrew Scull (New York: St. Martin's Press), pp. 267-286.

Brown, Julie V. (1981) *The Professionalization of Russian Psychiatry: 1857-1911*, Ph.D dissertation (University of Pennsylvania).

Browne, Janet. (2002) *Charles Darwin. Vol. 2, The Power of Place* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Buckle, H. T. (1875) *History of Civilization in England*, 2 Vols. (New York: D. Appleton).

Caner, Daniel. (2002) *Wandering, Begging Monks: Spiritual Authority and the Promotion of Monasticism in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Calif.; London: University of California Press).

Canguilhem, Georges. (1989 [1966,1978]) *The Normal and the Pathological*, translated by Carolyn R. Fawcett (New York: Zone Books).

Canguilhem, Georges. (1994) *A Vital Rationalist: Selected Writings from Georges Canguilhem*, ed. by François Delaporte; transl. by Arthur Goldhammer (New York: Zone Books).

Chaadaev, P.Ia. (1991) *Lettres philosophiques adressées à une dame, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis’ma*, ed. Z.A. Kamenskii et al., Vol. 1 (Moscow).

Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad. (ed.) (1969) *Papers of Th. Stcherbatsky*, transl. by Harish C. Gupta (Indian Studies: Past & Present).

Chekhov, Anton. (1978) *Ostrov Sakhalin (Iz putevykh zapisok)*, in *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*. *Sochineniia*, Vols. 14-15 (Moscow: Izdatel’stvo “Nauka”).

(*English version*)

Chekhov, Anton. (1967) *The Island: A Journey to Sakhalin*, transl. by Luba and Michael Terpak (New York: Washington Square Press).

Chekhov, Anton. (1993) *A Journey to Sakhalin*, transl. by Brian Reeve (Cambridge: Ian Faulkner).

Chizhevskii, Dmitrii. (1957) *On Romanticism in Slavic Literature*, Transl. by D.S. Worth ('s-Gravenhage: Mouton).

Clay, Catherine. (1989) *Ethos and Empire: The Ethnographic Expedition of the Imperial Russian Naval Ministry, 1855-1862*, Ph.D. Dissertation (University of Oregon).

Clifford, James. (c1988) *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Cohen, Abner. (ed.) (1974) *Urban Ethnicity* (London; New York: Tavistock).

Cohen, Josh. (1998) *Spectacular Allegories: Postmodern American Writing and the Politics of Seeing* (London; Sterling, Va.: Pluto Press).

Cole, Douglas. (c1999) *Franz Boas: The Early Years, 1859-1906* (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre; Seattle: University of Washington Press).

Conroy, M. Schaeffer. (1994) *In Health and in Sickness: Pharmacy, Pharmacists, and the Pharmaceutical Industry in Late Imperial, Early Soviet Russia* (Boulder, New York: Columbia University Press).

Coope, John. (1997) *Doctor Chekhov: A Study in Literature and Medicine* (Chale, Isle of Wight: Cross).

Coulehan, Jack. (ed.) (c2003) *Chekhov's Doctors: A Collection of Chekhov's Medical Tales* (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press).

Cross, A.G. (1976) *Russian Literature in the Age of Catherine the Great: A Collection of Essay*s (Oxford: Willem A. Meeuws).

Czaplicka, M. A. (1914) *Aboriginal Siberia: A Study in Social Anthropology* (Oxford: Clarendon press).

Darwin, Charles. (1859) *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* (London: Murray).

Dashkevich, V.V. (1912) *Pereselenie v Sibir': s 7 risunkami i kartoiu Sibiri* (St. Petersburg: tipografiia A.S. Suvorina).

Degler, Carl N. (1991) *In Search of Human Nature: The Decline and Revival of Darwinism in American Social Thought* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Dening, Greg. (1980) *Islands and Beaches: Discourse on a Silent Land: Marquesas, 1774-1880* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press).

Diment, Galya and Slezkine, Yuri (ed.). (1993) *Between Heaven and Hell: the Myth of Siberia in Russian Culture* (New York: St. Martin's Press).

Doore, Gary. (1988) *Shaman's Path: Healing, Personal Growth and Empowerment* (Boston: Shambhala; distributed by Random House).

Douglas, Mary. (1966) *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge & K. Paul).

Döpmann, Hans-Dieter. (1981) *Die Russische Orthodoxe Kirche in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Berlin: Union).

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. (1989) *Selected Letters of Fyodor Dostoevsky*, ed. Joseph Frank & David Goldstein, transl. Andrew MacAndrew (New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press).

Dranitsyn, A. (1867) *O pomeshatel'stve, pri pervonachal'nom ego poiavlenii i lechenii ego vne zavedenii* (St. Petersburg).

Dunn, Stephen P. (1974) *Introduction to Soviet Ethnography*, ed. by Stephen P. Dunn and Ethel Dunn, 2 Vols. (Berkeley, Calif.: Highgate Road Social Science Research Station).

Durkheim, Émile. (1982 [1895]) *The Rules of Sociological Method*, edited by Steven Lukes; transl. by W.D. Halls (New York: Free Press).

Efimova, Alla and Manovich, Lev (ed. and transl.). (1993) *Tekstura: Russian Essays on Visual Culture* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press).

Eliade, Mircea. (c1964) *Shamanism: Archaic Techniques of Ecstasy*, transl. by Willard R. Trask (N. Y.: Pantheon Books).

Engelstein, Laura. (1999) *Castration and the Heavenly Kingdom: A Russian Folktale* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press).

Erikson, Kai T. (1966) *Wayward Puritans: A Study in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: Wiley).

Evans, P. (1993) "Some Implication of Vygotsky's Work for Special Education", in *Charting the Agenda: Educational Activity After Vygotsky*, ed. by H. Daniels (London and New York, Routledge), pp. 30-45.

Fabian, Johannes. (c2002) *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes Its Object* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Farrer, D. S. (2009) *Shadows of the Prophet: Martial Arts and Sufi Mysticism*, ed. by Gabriele Marranci, Bryan S. Turner (Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands).

Fedotov, D.D. (1983) *Ocherki po Istorii Otechestvennnoi Psikhiatrii* (Moscow: Meditsina).

Fedotov, Georgii Petrovich. (1966) *The Russian Religious Mind Vol.1 and 2*, edited by John Meyendorff (Cambridge, Mass.; Oxford: Harvard University Press: Oxford University Press).

Feuerstein, Georg. (1991) *Holy Madness: The Shock Tactics and Radical Teachings of Crazy-Wise Adepts, Holy Fools and Rascal Gurus* (New York: Paragon House).

Flaherty, Gloria. (c1992) *Shamanism and the Eighteenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Florovskii, G. V. (1981) *Puti russkogo bogosloviia* (Paris: YMCA Press).

Forsyth, James. (1992) *A History of the Peoples of Siberia: Russia's North Asian Colony, 1581-1990* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press).

Foucault, Michel. (1965 and 1989 [1961]) *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason*, transl. by Richard Howard (London: Tavistock/Routledge).

Foucault, Michel. (c1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Pantheon Books).

Foucault, Michel. (1977) *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. by Donald F. Bouchard, transl. by Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press).

Foucault, Michel. (c1980) *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*, ed. and transl. by Colin Gordon (New York: Pantheon Books).

Foucault, Michel. (1999 and 2003) A*bnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975*, ed. by Valerio Marchetti and Antonella Salomoni; English series editor, Arnold I. Davidson; transl. by Graham Burchell (New York: Picador).

Foucault, Michel. (2006 [1961]) *History of Madness*, transl. by Jonathan Murphy (London; New York: Routledge).

Foucault, Michel. (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-79*, ed. by Michel Senellart, transl. by Graham Burchell (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Foucault, Michel. (c2011) *Madness: The Invention of an Idea* (New York: Harper Perennial).

Frierson, Cathy A. (1993) *Peasant Icons: Representations of Rural People in late Nineteenth Century Russia* (New York: Oxford University Press).

Frith, Uta. (1989 and 2003) *Autism: Explaining the Enigma* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing).

Gellner, Ernest (ed.). (1980) *Soviet and Western Anthropology* (London: Gerald Duckworth & Co.).

Geraci, Robert P. (2001) *Window on the East: National and Imperial Identities in Late Tsarist Russia* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press).

Giles, Howard. (1977) *Language, Ethnicity, and Intergroup Relations* (London; New York: Academic Press).

Goodenough, Ward H. (c1981) *Culture, Language, and Society* (Menlo Park, Calif.: Benjamin/Cummings Pub. Co.).

Goodman, Nelson. (c1978) *Ways of Worldmaking* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing).

Goffman, Erving. (1991 [1961]) *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates* (Garden City, New York: Anchor Books).

Goffman, Erving. (1963) *Behavior in Public Places: Notes on the Social Organization of Gatherings* (Reissue edition, New York: Free Press of Glencoe).

Goffman, Erving. (c1963) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall).

Goncharov, I. A. (1952) *Fregat "Pallada"*. In *Sobranie sochinenii*, vols. 5-6 (Moscow: "Pravda").

Gray, Rosalind. (2000) *Russian Genre Painting in the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Guénon, René. (c2004) *Insights into Islamic Esoterism and Taoism*, transl. by Henry D. Fohr (Hillsdale, N.Y.: Sophia Perennis).

Hacking, Ian. (2002) *Historical Ontology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Hacking, Ian. (1999) *The Social Construction of What* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Hacking, Ian. (1998) *Mad Travelers: Reflections on the Reality of Transient Mental Illnesses* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia).

Hacking, Ian. (c1995) *Rewriting the Soul: Multiple Personality and the Sciences of Memory* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Hacking, Ian. (1986) "Making Up People", in *Reconstructing Individualism: Autonomy, Individuality, and the Self in Western Thought*, ed. by Thomas C. Heller, Morton Sosna, and David E. Wellbery (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press), pp. 222-236.

Halliwell, Martin. (c2004) *Images of Idiocy: The Idiot Figure in Modern Fiction and Film* (Aldershot, Hants; Burlington, VT: Ashgate).

Hallowell, A. Irving. (1955) *Culture and Experience* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Halperin, Charles J. (c1985) *Russia and the Golden Horde: The Mongol Impact on Medieval Russian History* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Hayden, Brian. (c2003) *Shamans, Sorcerers, and Saints: A Prehistory of Religion* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books).

Heretz, Leonid. (2008) *Russia on the Eve of Modernity: Popular Religion and Traditional Culture under the Last Tsars* (Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press).

Herskovits, Melville J. (1958) *Acculturation: The Study of Culture Contact* (Gloucester, Mass.: P. Smith).

Hirsch, Francine. (c2005) *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union* (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press).

Houston, Rab and Frith, Uta. (2000) *Autism in History: the Case of Hugh Blair of Borgue* (Oxford [England]; Malden, MA: Blackwell).

Humphrey, Caroline. (1996) *Shamans and Elders: Experience, Knowledge and Power Among the Daur Mongols* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Hunt, Priscilla and Kobets, Svitlana (ed.) (2011) *Holy Foolishness in Russia: New Perspectives* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers).

Iakobii, P.I. (1900) *Osnovy administrativnoi psikhiatrii* (Orel: tip. Gub. Pravleniia).

Isaacson, Rupert. (2010) *The Horse Boy: A Memoir of Healing* (New York: Back Bay Books).

Iudin, T.I. (1951) *Ocherki istorii Otechestvennoi Psikhiatrii* (Moscow: Medgiz).

Iukhimenko, E.M. (ed.) (2013) *Iurodivye v Russkoi kyl'ture: sbornik nauchnykh statei* (Moscow: The State Historical Museum).

Ivanits, Linda J. (c1989) *Russian Folk Belief* (Armonk, N.Y.; London: M.E. Sharpe).

Ivanov S. A. (2006) *Holy Fools in Byzantium and Beyond*, transl. By Simon Franklin (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Ivanov, S. A. (1999) *Vizantiia mezhdu Zapadom i Vostokom: Opyt istoricheskoi kharakteristiki* (SPb.: Aleteiia).

Ivanov, V. V. (1997) *Iurodivyi v narodnoi kul'ture Russkovo Severa* (Petrozavodsk: Muzei-zapovednik «Kizhi»).

Ivanushka-durachok in *Narodnie russkie skazki A.N. Afanas'eva v trekh tomakh*, Vol. 3 (1985) (Moscow: Nauka).

Izutsu, Toshihiko. (c1983) *Sufism and Taoism: A Comparative Study of Key Philosophical Concepts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

Jackson, David. (2006) *The Wanderers and Critical Realism in Nineteenth-Century Russian Painting* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

Jameson, Fredric. (1991) *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Joravsky, David. (1989) *Russian Psychology: A Critical History* (Oxford; New York: Blackwell).

Kagan, Moisei. (1996) *Grad Petrov v istorii russkoi kul'tury* (Sankt-Peterburg: Slaviia).

Kalganov, Andrei. (2006) *Shaman vseia Rusi* (SPb.: Krylov).

Kalweit, Holger. (1988) *Dreamtime and Inner Space: the World of the Shaman* (Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications).

Kan, Sergei A. (2009) *Lev Shternberg: Anthropologist, Russian Socialist, Jewish Activist* (Lincoln; London: University of Nebraska Press).

Kanner, Leo. (1964) *A History of the Care and Study of the Mentally Retarded* (Springfield, IL: Charles Thomas).

Kennedy, Valerie. (2000) *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction* (Oxford; Malden, Mass.: Polity Press).

Kappeler, Andreas. (1994) *La Russie, Empire Multiethnique*, transl. by Guy Imart (Paris: Institut d'études slaves).

Karsavin, L.P. (1993) *Vostok, Zapad i Russkaia ideia*, in Karsavin's *Sochineniia*, comp. by S.S. Khoruzhii (Moscow).

Kharuzin, N.N. (1901-1905) *Etnografiia: Lektsii chitannye v Imperatorskom moskovskom universitete*, nos. 1-4 (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaia tipografiia).

Khodarkovsky, Michael. (2001) "The Conversion of Non-Christians in Early Modern Russia" in *Of Religion and Empire: Missions, Conversion, and Tolerance in Tsarist Russia*, ed. by Robert P. Geraci and Michael Khodarkovsky (Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press), pp. 115-143.

Khodarkovsky, Michael. (1997) "'Ignoble Savages and Unfaithful Subjects': Constructing Non-Christian Identities in Early Modern Russia", *Russia's Orient: Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700-1917*, ed. by Brower, Daniel R. and Lazzerini, Edward J. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), pp. 9-26.

Kizenko, Nadieszda. (c2003) "Protectors of Women and the Lower Orders: Constructing Sainthood in Modern Russia" in *Orthodox Russia: Belief and Practice under the Tsars*, ed. By Valerie A. Kivelson and Robert H. Greene (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press), pp. 105-124.

Kizenko, Nadieszda. (c2000) *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press).

Kleinman, Arthur. (c1980) *Patients and Healers in the Context of Culture: An Exploration of the Borderland between Anthropology, Medicine, and Psychiatry* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Kleinman, Arthur. (c1995) *Writing at the Margin: Discourse between Anthropology and Medicine* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Knight, Nathaniel. (2000) "Ethnicity, Nationality and the Masses: *Narodnost'* and Modernity in Imperial Russia", *Russian Modernity: Politics, Knowledge, Practices*, ed. by David L. Hoffmann and Yanni Kotsonis (Hampshire: Macmillan; New York: St. Martin's Press), pp. 41-66.

Knight, Nathaniel. (c1998) "Science, Empire, and Nationality: Ethnography in the Russian Geographical Society, 1845-1855", *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. by Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), pp. 108-142.

Knight, Nathaniel. (1995) *Constructing the Science of Nationality: Ethnography in Mid-Nineteenth Century Russia*, Ph.D. Dissertation (Columbia University).

Konchin, Evgraf Vasil'evich. (2009) *Vsiudu zhizn'. Etiudy o khudozhnikakh kruga i vremeni N. A. Iarochenko* (Moscow; Kislovodsk: Izdatel'stvo Kislovodskovo gumanitarno-tekhnicheskovo institute).

Kotkin, Stephen. (c1995) *Magnetic Mountain: Stalinism as a Civilization* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Kovalevskii, Ioann. (1902) *Iurodstvo o Khriste i Khrista radi iurodibye vostochnoi i russkoi tserkvi*, 3rd edition (Moscow: Izdanie knigoprodavtsa Alekseia Dmitrievicha Stupina).

Kovalevskii, Ioann. (2000) *Podvig iurodstva* (Moscow: Lepta).

Kreindler, Isabbelle. (c1985) “The Non-Russian Languages and the Challenge of Russian: The Eastern versus the Western Tradition” in *Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Soviet National Languages: Their Past, Present, and Future*, ed. by Isabelle T. Kreindler (Berlin, New York: Mouton), pp. 345-368.

Kriukova, Elena. (2011) *Iurodivaia* (Moscow: EKSMO).

Kuper, Adam. (1988) *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of An Illusion* (London; New York: Routledge).

Kuraev, Mikhail. (1996) *Puteshestvie iz Leningrada v Sankt-Peterburg: Putevye zametki* (St. Petersburg: BLITS).

Kuznetsov, A. (1913) *Iurodstvo i stolpnichestvo: religiozno-psikhologicheskoe issledovanie* (Spb.: Tip. V.D. Smirnova).

Layton, Susan. (1994) *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy* (Cambridge; New York, NY Cambridge University Press).

Lederer, David. (2006) *Madness, Religion and the State in Early Modern Europe: A Bavarian Beacon* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press).

Lehmann, Jennifer M. (1993) *Deconstructing Durkheim: A Post-post Structuralist Critique* (London; New York: Routledge).

Lenhoff, Gail. (1993) “The Notion of ‘Uncorrupted Relics’ in Early Russian Culture” in *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs*, Vol. 1 (Slavic Cultures in the Middle Ages), ed. by Boris Gasparov and Olga Raevsky-Hughes (Berkeley; Oxford: University of California Press), pp. 252-275.

Levkievskaia, E. E. (2000) *Mify russkovo naroda* (M.: Astrel’, AST).

Levin, Eve. (2004) “False Miracles and Unattested Dead Bodies: Investigations into Popular Cults in Early Modern Russia”, *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views from China, Russia, and the West*, ed. by James D. Tracy and Marguerite Ragnow (Cambridge, U.K.; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press), pp. 253-283.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. (c1961) *Tristes Tropiques*, transl. by John Russell (New York: Atheneum).

Lewis, Martin W. and Wigen, Kären E. (c1997) *The Myth of Continents: A Critique of Metageography* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Likhachev, D. S., Panchenko, A. M. and Ponyrko, N. V. (1984) *Smekh v drevnei Rusi* (Leningrad: Nauka).

Likhachev, D. S. (ed.) (1980) *Istoriia russkoi literatury X-XMI vekov* (Moscow: Prosveshchenie).

Likhachev, D. S. and Panchenko, A.M. (1976) *"Smekhovoi mir" drevnei Rusi* (Leningrad: Nauka).

Lincoln, W. Bruce. (1990) *The Great Reforms: Autocracy, Bureaucracy, and the Politics of Change in Imperial Russia* (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press).

Lotman , Iurii M. (1990) *Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture*, transl. Ann Shukman (London: I.B. Tauris).

Lotman, Iurii. (1987) *Struktura dialoga kak printsip raboty semioticheskogo mekhanizma* (Tartu).

Lotman, Iurii M., Ginsburg, Lidiia Ia. and Uspenskii, Boris A. (1985) *The Semiotics of Russian Cultural History*, ed. Alexander D. Nakhimovsky and Alice Stone Nakhimovsky (Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press).

MacKenzie, David and Curran, Michael W. (2001) *A History of Russia, the Soviet Union, and Beyond* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co, 6th edition).

Maksimov, S.V. (2010) *Sobranie sochinenii v 7-mi tomakh* (Moscow: Knigovek).

Maksimov, S. (1877) *Brodiachaia Rus' Khrista radi* (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, bol'shaia pod''iacheskaia, d. No. 39).

Maksimov, S. (1871) *God na severe*, 3rd edition (St. Petersburg).

Malen'kikh, S.I. (2001) "Popytka iurodstva kaka odna iz strategii sovremennoi kul'tury", *Religiia i nravstvennost' v cekuliarnom mire*. Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii. 28-30 noiabria 2001 goda. Sankt-Peterburg (SPb: Sankt-Peterburgskoe filosofskoe obshchestvo), pp. 54-56.

Malinowski, Bronisław. (1922) *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea* (London: G. Routledge & Sons; New York: E. P. Dutton).

Martin, Janet. (1996) *Medieval Russia 980-1584* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

McCagg, William O. (c1989) "The Origins of Defectology", in *The Disabled in the Soviet Union: Past and Present, Theory and Practice*, ed. by William O. McCagg and Lewis Siegelbaum (Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press), pp. 39-62.

McConkey, James. (c1984) *To A Distant Island* (New York: E.P. Dutton)

McDonagh, Patrick. (2008) I*diocy: A Cultural History* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press).

Mead, Margaret. (1995) “Visual Anthropology in a Discipline of Words” in *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, ed. by Paul Hockings (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter), pp. 3-10.

Merzel, Dennis G. (c1994) *Beyond Sanity and Madness: The Way of Zen Master Dogen* (Boston, Mass.: Charles E. Tuttle Co.).

Mihailovic, Alexandar. (c1997) *Corporeal Words: Mikhail Bakhtin's Theology of Discourse* (Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press).

Miller, Martin A. (c1998) *Freud and the Bolsheviks: Psychoanalysis in Imperial Russia and the Soviet Union* (New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press).

Montiglio, Silvia. (2005) *Wandering in the Ancient Greek Culture* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Moskaliuk, Marina Valentinovna. (2008) *Russkaia zhivopic' vtoroi poloviny XIX veka: ideal i real'nost’* (Krasnoiarsk: Krasnoiarskii kraevoi nauch.-uchebnyi tsentr kfdrov kul'tury).

Munro, George E. (2002) “The Petersburg of Catherine II: Official Enlightenment Versus Popular Cults” in *Moscow and Petersburg: The City in Russian Culture*, ed. by Ian K. Lilly (Nottingham: Astra Press), pp. 49-64.

Murata, Sachiko. (1992) *The Tao of Islam: A Sourcebook on Gender Relationships in Islamic Thought* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Muratova, K.D. (1958) *M. Gor'kii v bor'be za razvitie sovetskoi literatury* (Moscow-Leningrad: Akademiia Hauk SSSR).

Murav, Harriet. (1992) *Holy Foolishness: Dostoevsky’s Novel and the Poetics of Cultural Critique* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press).

Nedospasova, Tat’iana Andreevna. (1997) *Russkoe iurodstvo XI-XVI vekov* (Moscow).

Netting, Anthony G. (1976) *Russian Liberalism: The Years of Promise, 1842-1855*, Ph.D. Dissertation (Columbia University).

Neuhäuser, Rudolf (1974) *Towards the Romantic Age: Essays on Sentimental and Preromantic Literature in Russia* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

Newman, Fred and Holzman, Lois (1993) *Lev Vygotsky: Revolutionary Scientist* (London; New York: Routledge).

Ng, Vivien W. (1990) *Madness in Late Imperial China: From Illness to Deviance* (Norman, Okla.; London: University of Oklahoma Press).

Nikitina, N.A. (1928) “K voprosu o russkikh koldunakh”, *Sbornik Muzeia antropologii i etnografii*, Vol. 7 (Lenigrad: AN SSSR), pp. 299-325.

Ol'denburg, S.F. (1919) *Aziatskii Muzei Rossiiskoi Akademii nauk, 1818-1918* (Petrograd: Rossiiskaia Gosudarstvennaia Akademicheskaia Tipografiia).

O'Malley, Lurana Donnels (transl.). (1998) *Two Comedies by Catherine the Great, Empress of Russia: Oh, These Times! and The Siberian Shaman* (Amsterdam: Overseas Publishers Association under the Harwood Academic Publisher).

Orlovsky, Daniel T. (1981) *The Limits of Reform: the Ministry of Internal Affairs in Imperial Russia, 1802-1881* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Padilla, Amado M. (ed.) (1980) A*cculturation, Theory, Models, and Some New Findings* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press).

Parsons, Talcott. (1991 [1951]) *The Social System* (London: Routledge).

Price, Virginia Ann. (1982) *Type A Behavior Pattern: A Model for Research and Practice* (New York: Academic Press).

Propp, V. IA. (1976) *Problemy komizma i smekha* (Moscow: Iskusstvo).

Pryzhov, I. G. (1996) *26 Moskovskikh prorokov, iurodivykh, dur i durakov i drugie trudy po russkoj istorii i etnografii* (Reprint of 1865. St. Petersburg: Ezro, and Moscow: Intrada).

Pypin, A.N. (1890-1893) *Istoriia russkoi etnografii*, 4 vols. (St. Petersburg: M. M. Stasiulevich).

Raeff, Marc. (1956) *Siberia and the Reforms of 1822* (Seattle: University of Washington Press).

Riabinin, Iurii Valer'evich. (2007) *Russkoe iurodstvo* (Moscow: RIPOL klassik).

Richter, W.M. (1813-1817) *Geschichte der Medicin in Russland*, 3 Volumes (Moscow).

Rostova, Natal’ia Nikolaevna. (2008) *Chelovek obratnoi perspektivy: filosofsko-antropologicheskoe issledovanie fenomena iurodstva Khrista radi*, avtoreferat gis. Ph.D. Thesis (Moscow).

Rouget, Gilbert. (1985) *Music and Trance: A Theory of the Relations between Music and Possession*, transl. by Brunhilde Biebuyck (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Said, Edward W. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Said, Edward W. (1979 [c1978]) *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage).

Salmond, Wendy R. (1996) *Arts and Crafts in Late Imperial Russia: Reviving the Kustar Art Industries, 1870-1917* (New York: Cambridge University Press).

Samuel, Geoffrey. (1993) *Civilized Shamans: Buddhism in Tibetan Societies* (Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press).

Sanders, Thomas (ed.). (c1999) *Historiography of Imperial Russia: the Profession and Writing of History in A Multinational State* (Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe).

Saward, John. (1980) *Perfect Fools: Folly for Christ's Sake in Catholic and Orthodox Spirituality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schweitzer, Peter. (2001) *Siberia and Anthropology: National Tradition and Transmational Moments in the History of Research*, Ph.D. dissertation (Habilitationsschrift. Eingereicht an der Human- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen, Fakultät der Universität Wien).

Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, David. (2010) *Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Séguin, Edward. (1866) *Idiocy: And Its Treatment by the Physiological Method* (New York: William Wood & Co.).

Shahar, Meir. (1998) *Crazy Ji: Chinese Religion and Popular Literature* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center).

Shirokogoroff, S. M. (1973) *Social Organization of the Manchus: A Study of the Manchu Clan Organization* (New York: AMS Press).

Shirokogoroff, S. M. (1970 [1931]) *Ethnological and Linguistical Aspects of the Ural-Altaic Hypothesis* (Oosterhout, Netherlands: Anthropological Publications).

Shirokogoroff, S. M. (1968) *Anthropology of Northern China* (Oosterhout N.H., Netherlands: Anthropological Publications).

Shirokogoroff, S. M. (1935) *Psychomental Complex of the Tungus* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner).

Shirokogoroff, S. M. (1929) *Social Organization of the Northern Tungus: with Introductory Chapters Concerning Geographical Distribution and History of these Groups* (Shanghai, China: The Commercial press, limited).

Shternberg, L. I. (1910) "*Inorodtsy. Obshchii obzor*", in *Formy natsional'nogo dvizheniia v sovremennykh gosudarstvakh*, ed. by A.I. Kastelianskii (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za).

Shternberg, L. I. (1908) *Materialy po izucheniiu giliatskovo iazyka u fol'klora* (St. Petersburg tip. imp. Akad. nauk.).

Siikala, Anna-Leena. (1978) *The Rite Technique of the Siberian Shaman* (Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia: Akateeminen kitjakauppa jakaja).

Simons, Greg. (2005) *The Russian Orthodox Church and its Role in Cultural Production* (Stockholm: Wiksell International).

Sindalovsky, N.A. (1994) *Peterburgskii fol'klor* (Sankt-Peterburg: Maksima).

Sladkovsky, M. I. (1974) *Istoriia torgovo-ekonomicheskikh otnoshenii narodov Rossii s Kitaem (do 1917 g.)* (Moscow: Nauka, Institut Dal'nego Vostoka AN SSSR).

Slezkine, Yuri. (1994) *Arctic Mirrors: Russia and the Small Peoples of the North* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

Snelling, John. (1993) *Buddhism in Russia: The Story of Agvan Dorzhiev, Lhasa's emissary to the Tsar* (Shaftesbury, Dorset, [U. K.]; Rockport, Mass.: Element).

Sokolov, Y. M. (1950) *Russian Folklore*, transl. by Catherine Ruth Smith (New York: The Macmillan company).

Soloviev, Vladimir. (2007) *Enemies from the East? : V. S. Soloviev on paganism, Asian civilizations, and Islam*, ed. and transl. by Vladimir Wozniuk (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

Spurr, David. (c1993) *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing, and Imperial Administration* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Staples, James. (2007) *Peculiar People, Amazing Lives: Leprosy, Social Exclusion, and Community Making in South India* (New Delhi: Orient Longman).

Stavrou, Theofanis George (ed.). (c1983) *Art and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Russia* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Stites, Richard. (c2005) *Serfdom, Society, and the Arts in Imperial Russia: The Pleasure and the Power* (New Haven; London: Yale University Press).

Stocking, George W., Jr. (c1995) *After Tylor: British Social Anthropology, 1888-1951* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press).

Stocking, George W., Jr. (c1987) *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillan).

Stocking, George W., Jr. (c1968) *Race, Culture, and Evolution: Essays in the History of Anthropology* (New York: Free Press).

Sunderland, Willard. (1998) “An Empire of Peasants: Empire-Building, interethnic Interaction, and Ethnic Stereotyping in the Rural World of the Russian Empire, 1800-1850s” in *Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire*, ed. by Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), pp. 174-198.

Swain, Barbara. (1977) *Fools and Folly during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Norwood, Pa.: Norwood Editions).

Swift, Mark Stanley. (c2004) *Biblical Subtexts and Religious Themes in Works of Anton Chekhov* (New York: P. Lang).

Szasz, Thomas S. (1974 [1961]) *The Myth of Mental Illness: Foundations of A Theory of Personal Conduct* (New York: Harper & Row).

Tanahashi, Kazuaki (ed.) (1999) *Enlightenment Unfolds: The Essential Teachings of Zen Master Dogen* (Boston, Mass.: Shambhala).

Thompson, Ewa M. (c1987) *Understanding Russia: the Holy Fool in Russian Culture* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America).

Thomson, Francis J. (c1999) *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Mediaeval Russia* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Tokarev, S.A. “Vklad russkikh uchenykh v mirovuiu etnograficheskuiu nauku”, *Ocherki istorii russkoi etnografii, fol’kloristiki i antropologii*, I: vol. XXX (Moscow, 1956), pp. 5-29

Tolz, Vera. (2011) *Russia's Own Orient: The Politics of Identity and Oriental Studies in the Late Imperial and Early Soviet Periods* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press).

Tracy, James D. and Ragnow, Marguerite. (ed.) (2004) *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views from China, Russia, and the West* (Cambridge, U.K.; New York, N.Y.: Cambridge University Press).

Tremain, Shelley Lynn. (ed.) (2005) *Foucault and the Government of Disability* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Trubetskoi, Grigorii. (1931) *Krasnaia Rossiia i sviataia Rus'* (Paris:YMCA-Press).

Tschizewskij, Dmitrij. (c1978) *Russian Intellectual History*, transl. by John C. Osborne, ed. by Martin P. Rice (Ann Arbor: Ardis).

Üstün, T.B. (c2010) “Classification of Mental Disorders”, *Epidemiology and Demography in Public Health*, ed. by Japhet Killewo (Amsterdam [The Netherlands]; Boston, Mass.: Academic Press/Elsevier), pp. 44-50.

Vakhtin, Nikolai. (2006) “Transformations in Siberian Anthropology: An Insider’s Perspective” in *World Anthropologies: Disciplinary Transformations within Systems of Power*, ed. by Gustavo Lins Ribeiro and Arturo Escobar (Oxford, UK; New York: Berg), pp. 49-68.

Vasil'ev, Vasilii Pavlovich. (1857-1869) *Buddizm, ego dogmaty, istoriia i literature* (St. Petersburg tip. imp. Akad. nauk.).

Vasil'ev, Vasilii Pavlovich. (1873) *Religii Vostoka konfutsianstvo, buddizm, daosizm* (St. Petersburg tip. Balasheva).

Venturi, Franco. (2001) *Roots of Revolution: A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in 19th Century Russia*, translated from the Italian by Francis Haskell (London: Phoenix Press).

Vos, George De and Romanucci-Ross, Lola. (ed.) (1982) *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

“Vsepoddaneishii doklad Turkestanskogo general-gubernatora generala ot infanterii Dukhovskogo: Islam v Turkestane” (2004) in *Musul'manskaia Sredniaia Aziia. Traditsionalizm i XX vek.* (Moscow: Institutom Afriki RAN), pp. 241-261.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1993) *The Collected Works of L. S. Vygotsky, Volume II: The Fundamentals of Defectology (Abnormal Psychology and Learning Disabilities)* and *Volume V: Child Psychology*, ed. by R. W. Rieber and Aaron S. Carton (New York: Plenum Press).

Vygotsky, L.S. and Luria, A.R. (1993) *Studies on the History of Behavior: Ape, Primitive Man, and Child*, ed. and transl. by V.I. Golod and Jane E. Knox (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962) *Thought and language*, ed. and transl. by Eugenia Hanfmann and Gertrude Vakar (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, Massachusetts Institute of Technology).

Waddell, Laurence Austine. (1972 [1895]) *Tibetan Buddhism: with its Mystic Cults, Symbolism and Mythology, and in its Relation to Indian Buddhism* (New York: Dover).

Walicki, Andrzej. (1989 [c1975]) *The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*, transl. by Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press).

Welsford, Enid. (1966) *The Fool: His Social and Literary History* (Gloucester (Mass.): Peter Smith).

Wilson, Stephen. (ed.) (1983) *Saints and Their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Wood, Alan. (ed.) (1991) *The History of Siberia: from Russian Conquest to Revolution* (London; New York: Routledge).

Wright, David and Digby, Anne. (ed.) (1996) *From Idiocy to Mental Deficiency: Historical Perspectives on People with Learning Disabilities* (London; New York: Routledge).

Zélénine, D. (1952) *Le Culte des Idoles en Sibérie*, transl. by De G. Welter (Paris: Payot).

Zguta, Russell. (1978) *Russian Minstrels: A History of the Skomorokhi* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press).

Znamenski, Andrei A. (ed.) (2004) *Shamanism: Critical Concepts in Sociology* (London; New York: Routledge).

Znamenski, Andrei A. (c2003) *Shamanism in Siberia: Russian Records of Indigenous Spirituality* (Dordrecht; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers).

Znamenski, Andrei A. (1999) *Shamanism and Christianity: Native Encounters with Russian Orthodox Missions in Siberia and Alaska, 1820-1917* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press).

Zuev, V.F. (1947) *Materialy po etnografii Sibiri XVIII veka (1771-1772)*, AN SSSR, Trudy Instituta etnografii im. N.N. Miklukho-Maklaia, Novaia seriia, Vol. 5 (Moscow-Leningrad: AN SSSR).

❖ Journal Articles

Abdel-Malek, Anwar. “Orientalism in Crisis”, *Diogenes*, Vol. 11, No. 44 (Dec. 1963), pp. 103-140.

Adlam, Carol. “Realist Aesthetics in Nineteenth-Century Russian Art Writing”, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 83, No. 4 (Oct., 2005), pp. 638-663.

Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii, A.S. (1859) “Poezdka po nizov’iam Dniepra. (Prodolzhenie). (Levyi bereg) V. ot Kamenka do Aleshek”, *Morskoi sbornik* XLIV, no. 11, neof..

Afanas'ev-Chuzhbinskii, A.S. (1857) “Poezdka na Dnieprovskye Porogi i na Zaporozhe” in *Morskoi sbornik* XXVII, no. 9, neof..

Andreev A.I. (ed.) “Opisaniia o zhizni i uprazhnenii obitaiushchikh v

Turukhanskoi i Berezovskoi okrugakh raznogo roda iasachnykh inovertsev", *SE*, no. 1 (1947), pp. 84-103.

Andrews, Jonathan. "Begging the Question of Idiocy: The Definition and Socio-Cultural Meaning of Idiocy in Early Modern Britain", *History of Psychiatry*, Vol. 9 (March 1998), pp. 65-95.

Anuchin, D. "O zadachakh russkoi etnografii", *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, no. 1 (1889), pp. 1-35.

Atkinson, Jane Monnig. "Shamanisms Today", *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 21 (1992), pp. 307-330.

Balzer, Marjorie Mandelstam. "Behind Shamanism: Changing Voices of Siberian Khanty Cosmology and Politics", *Social Science & Medicine*, Vol. 24, Issue 12 (1987), pp. 1085-1093.

Balzer, Marjorie Mandelstam. "Rituals of Gender Identity: Markers of Siberian Khanty Ethnicity, Status, and Belief", *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 83, No. 4 (Dec., 1981), pp. 850-867.

Bassin, Mark. "Inventing Siberia: Visions of the Russian East in the Early Nineteenth Century", *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 96, No. 3 (Jun., 1991), pp. 763-794.

Bassin, Mark. "The Russian Geographical Society, the 'Amur Epoch,' and the Great Siberian Expedition 1855-1863", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 73, No. 2 (Jun., 1983), pp. 240-256.

Bassin, Mark. "The Russian Geographical Society, the 'Amur Epoch,' and the Great Siberian Expedition 1855-1863", *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 73, No. 2 (Jun., 1983), pp.240-256.

Becker, Seymour. "The Muslim East in Nineteenth-Century Russian Popular Historiography", *Central Asian Survey*, Vol. 5, Issue 3-4 (1986), pp. 25-47.

Benoist, Alain de. "The Idea of Empire", *Telos*, Issue 98-99 (Winter 1993 / Spring 1994), pp. 81-98.

Boyer, L. Bryce. "Shamans: To Set the Record Straight", *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 71, No. 2 (April 1969), pp. 307-309.

Brooks, Jeffrey. "The Russian Nation Imagined: The Peoples of Russia as Seen in Popular Imagery, 1860s–1890s", *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (Spring, 2010), pp. 535-557.

Brotz, Howard. "Functionalism and Dynamic Analysis", *European Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 2 (June 1961), pp. 170-179.

Brown, Julie V. “Peasant Survival Strategies in Late Imperial Russia: The Social Uses of the Mental Hospital”, *Social Problems*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Oct., 1987), pp. 311-329.

Brown, Julie V. “Revolution and Psychosis: The Mixing of Science and Politics in Russian Psychiatric Medicine, 1905-13”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (Jul. 1987), pp. 283-302.

Chatterjee, Choi. “Transnational Romance, Terror, and Heroism: Russia in American Popular Fiction, 1860-1917”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (Jul., 2008), pp. 753-777.

Cherniavsky, Michael. “Khan or Basileus: An Aspect of Russian Mediaeval Political Theory”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1959), pp. 459-476.

Chriss, James J. “Habermas, Goffman, and Communicative Action: Implications for Professional Practice”, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Aug., 1995), pp. 545-565.

Clay, Catherine B. “Russian Ethnographers in the Service of Empire, 1856-1862”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (Spring, 1995), pp. 45-61.

Clifford, James. “On Ethnographic Authority”, *Representations*, No. 2 (Spring, 1983), pp. 118-146.

Cooper, Rachel. “Why Hacking is Wrong about Human Kinds”, *British Journal for the Philosophy Science*, Vol. 55, No. 1 (2004), pp. 73-85.

Dall Wm. H. and Boas, Franz. “Museums of Ethnology and Their Classification”, *Science* , Vol. 9, No. 228 (Jun. 17, 1887), pp. 587-589.

Darrow, David W. “Census as a Technology of Empire,” *Ab Imperio*, no. 4 (2002): 145-176.

Debreczeny, Paul. “The Reception of Pushkin's Poetic Works in the 1820s: A Study of the Critic's Role”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Sep., 1969), pp. 394-415.

Devereux, George. “Shamans as Neurotics”, *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 63, No. 5 (Oct. 1961), pp. 1088-1090.

Dewey, Horace W. “Some Perceptions of Mental Disorder In Pre-Petrine Russia”, *Medical History*, Vol. 31 (1987), pp. 84-99.

Dewey, Horace W. and Challis, Natalie. “Disparate Images of Mikhail Klopskii”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 42, No. 4 (Winter, 1983), pp. 649-656.

Dewey, Horace W. and Challis, Natalie. “Divine Folly in Old Kievan Literature:

The Tale of Isaac the Cave Dweller", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Autumn, 1978), pp. 255-264.

Dewey, Horace W. "The Blessed Fools of Old Russia", *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, NS 22 (1974), pp.1-11.

Dianina, Katia. "The Feuilleton: An Everyday Guide to Public Culture in the Age of the Great Reforms", *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 47, No. 2 (Summer, 2003), pp. 187-210.

Duncan, Peter J. S. "Contemporary Russian Identity Between East and West", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 48, No.1 (2005), pp. 277-294.

Durkin, Andrew R. "Chekhov's Response to Dostoevskii: The Case of "Ward Six"", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Spring, 1981), pp. 49-59.

Elfimov, Alexei. "The State of the Discipline in Russia: Interviews with Russian Anthropologists", *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 99, No. 4 (Dec., 1997), pp. 775-785.

Etkind, Alexander "Whirling with the Other: Russian Populism and Religious Sects", *Russian Review*, Vol. 62, No. 4 (Oct., 2003), pp. 565-588.

Farrell, Dianne E. "Shamanic Elements in Some Early Eighteenth Century Russian Woodcuts", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 725-744.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. "Ascribing Class: The Construction of Social Identity in Soviet Russia", *The Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 65, No. 4 (Dec., 1993), pp. 745-770.

Freeze, Gregory L. "The *Soslovie* (Estate) Paradigm and Russian Social History", *American Historical Review*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (Feb., 1986), pp. 11-36.

Gagen-Torn, N.I. "Leningradskaia etnograficheskaia shkola v dvadtsatye gody (u istokov sovetskoi etnografii)", *Sovetskaia Etnografiia*, No. 2 (1971), pp. 134-145.

Geraci, Robert. "Ethnic Minorities, Anthropology, and Russian National Identity on Trial: The Multan Case, 1892-96", *Russian Review*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (Oct., 2000), pp. 530-554.

Gindis, B. "Vygotsky's Vision: Reshaping the Practice of Special Education for the 21st Century", *Remedial and Special Education*, Vol. 20, No. 6 (1999), pp. 333-340.

Gindis, B. "Special Education in the Soviet Union: Problems and Perspectives", *The Journal of Special Education*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (1986), pp. 379-384.

Goffman, Erving. “Felicity's Condition”, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (Jul., 1983), pp. 1-53.

Goffman, Erving. “Embarrassment and Social Organization”, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 62, No. 3 (Nov., 1956), pp. 264-27.

Greco, Monica. On the Art of Life: A Vitalist Reading of Medical Humanities, *The Sociological Review*, Vol. 56 (2008), pp. 23-45.

Grillaert, Nel. “Orthodoxy Regained: the Theological Subtext in Dostoevskij’s ‘Dream Of A Ridiculous Man’”, *Russian Literature*, LXII (2007), pp. 155-173.

Gromyko, M. M. “Traditional Norms of Behavior and Forms of Interaction of Nineteenth-century Russian Peasants”, *Anthropology & Archeology of Eurasia*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 1991), pp. 72-82.

Gromyko, M.M. “Kul’tura russkogo krest’ianstva xviii-xix kak predmet istoricheskogo issledovaniia”, *Istoriia SSSR*, No. 3 (1987), pp. 39-60.

Habib, Irfan. “In Defence of Orientalism: Critical Notes on Edward Said”, *Social Scientist*, Vol. 33, No. 1/2 (Jan. - Feb., 2005), pp. 40-46.

Hachten, Elizabeth A. “In Service to Science and Society: Scientists and the Public in Late-Nineteenth-Century Russia”, *Osiris*, 2nd Series, Vol. 17, No., Science and Civil Society (2002), pp. 171-209.

Hacking, Ian. “Kinds of People: Moving Targets”, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 151:285-318, (2007).

Hacking, Ian. “Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: Between Discourse in the Abstract and Face-to-Face Interaction”, *Economy and Society*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (August 2004), pp. 277-302.

Hacking, Ian. “The Making and Molding of Child Abuse”, C*ritical Inquiry*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Winter, 1991), pp. 253-288.

Hacking, Ian. “Michel Foucault's Immature Science”, *Noûs*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Mar., 1979), pp. 39-51.

Hacking, Ian. “All Kinds of Possibility”, *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 84, No. 3 (Jul., 1975), pp. 321-337.

Haddad, John. “‘To Inculcate Respect for the Chinese.’ Berthold Laufer, Franz Boas, and the Chinese Exhibits at the American Museum of Natural History, 1899-1912”, *Anthropos*, Bd. 101, H. 1. (2006), pp. 123-144.

Halperin, Charles J. “The Ideology of Silence: Prejudice and Pragmatism on the Medieval Religious Frontier”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 26, No. 3 (Jul., 1984), pp. 442-466.

Halperin, Charles J. “Russia in the Mongol Empire in Comparative Perspective”, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies,* Vol. 43, No. 1 (Jun., 1983), pp. 239-261.

Halperin, Charles J. “Know Thy Enemy: Medieval Russian Familiarity with the Mongols of the Golden Horde”, *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Vol. 30 (1982), pp. 161-175.

Handelman, Don. “The Development of a Washo Shaman”, *Ethnology,* Vol. 6, No. 4 (Oct. 1967), pp. 444-464.

Heller, Dana and Volkova, Elena. “The Holy Fool in Russian and American Culture: A Dialogue”, *American Studies International,* Vol. 41, No. 1/2, Post Soviet American Studies (February, 2003), pp. 152-178.

Hilton, Alison. “The Exhibition of Experiments in St. Petersburg and the Independent Sketch”, *The Art Bulletin*, Vol. 70, No. 4 (Dec., 1988), pp. 677-698.

Hooson, David J. M. “The Development of Geography in Pre-Soviet Russia”, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 58, Issue 2 (June 1968), pp. 250-272.

Hunt, Priscilla. “Ivan IV's Personal Mythology of Kingship”, *Slavic Review,* Vol. 52, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 769-809.

Jakobson, Roman and Boas, Franz. “Franz Boas' Approach to Language”, *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (Oct., 1944), pp. 188-195.

Kaiser, Daniel H. “The Poor and Disabled in Early Eighteenth-Century Russian Towns”, *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Autumn, 1998), pp. 125-155.

Kerimova, M.M. “Vystavka «Slaviane Evropy i narody Rossii» (k 140-letiiu pervoi Vserossiiskoi etnograficheskoi vystavki 1867 g.)”, *Atnograficheskoe obozrenie Online* (Jan. 2008), pp. 1-18.

Khalid, Adeeb. “Russian History and the Debate over Orientalism”, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (Fall, 2000), pp. 691-699.

Khalid, Adeeb; Knight, Nathaniel and Todorova, Maria. "Ex tempore: Orientalism and Russia", *Kritika*, Vol. 1 (Fall, 2000), pp. 691-727.

Khodarkovsky, Michael. “Not by Word Alone: Missionary Policies and Religious Conversion in Early Modern Russia”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 38, Issue 2 (April, 1996), pp 267-293.

Klapp, Orrin E. “The Fool as a Social Type”, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Sep., 1949), pp. 157-162.

Knight, Nathaniel. “Nikolai Kharuzin and the Quest for a Universal Human Science: Anthropological Evolutionism and the Russian Ethnographic Tradition, 1885-1900”, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 9, No.1 (Winter 2008), pp. 83-111.

Knight, Nathaniel. “On Russian Orientalism: A Response to Adeeb Khalid”, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (Fall, 2000), pp. 701-715.

Knight, Nathaniel. “Grigor'ev in Orenburg, 1851-1862: Russian Orientalism in the Service of Empire”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (Spring, 2000), pp. 74-100.

Kobets, Svitlana. “The Russian Paradigm of *Jurodstvo* and Its Genesis in Novgorod”, *Russian Literature*, XLVIII (2000), pp. 367-388.

Kolstø, Pål. “‘For Here We Do Not Have An Enduring City’: Tolstoy And The *Strannik* Tradition in Russian Culture”, *The Russian Review*, Vol. 69, Issue 1 (January 2010), pp. 119-134.

Krippner, Stanley. “Shamanism, Personal Mythology, and Behavior Change”, *International Journal of Psychosomatics*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (1987), pp. 22-27.

Lavretsky, Helen. “The Russian Concept of Schizophrenia: A Review of the Literature”, *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (1998), pp. 537-557.

Lemert, Edwin M. “Some Aspects of a General Theory of Sociopathic Behavior”, *Proceedings of the Pacific Sociological Society*, Research Studies, State College of Washington, 16 (1948), pp. 23-29.

Lenoir, Timothy. “The Göttingen School and the Development of Transcendental Naturphilosophie in the Romantic Era”, *Studies in the History of Biology*, Vol.5 (1981), pp. 111-205.

Lindquist, Galina. “The Culture of Charisma: Wielding Legitimacy in Contemporary Russian Healing”, *Anthropology Toda*y, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Apr., 2001), pp. 3-8.

Lotman, Iurii. “Simvolika Peterburga i problemy semiotiki goroda”, *Semiotika goroda i gorodskoi kul'tury*, 18 (Peterburg, Trudy po znakovym sistema, 1984), pp. 30-45.

Lotman, Iurii M. and Uspenskii, Boris A. “Novye aspekty izucheniia kul’tury drevnei Rusi”, *Voprosy literatury*, No. 3 (1977), pp. 148-166.

Mackenzie, David. “Kaufman of Turkestan: An Assessment of His

Administration 1867-1881", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (Jun., 1967), pp. 265-285.

Makhrov, Alexey. "The Pioneers of Russian Art Criticism: Between State and Public Opinion, 1804-1855", *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 81, No. 4 (Oct., 2003), pp. 614-633.

Manion, Mary L. and Bersani, Hank A. "Mental Retardation as a Western Sociological Construct: A Cross-cultural Analysis", *Disability & Society*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1987), pp. 231-245.

McCannon, John. "Passageways to Wisdom: Nicholas Roerich, the Dramas of Maurice Maeterlinck, and Symbols of Spiritual Enlightenment", *Russian Review*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (Jul., 2004), pp. 449-478.

Merton, Robert K. "Social Structure and Anomie", *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 3, No. 5 (Oct., 1938), pp. 672-682.

Mikhailovskii, V. M. and Wardrop, Oliver. "Shamanism in Siberia and European Russia, Being the Second Part of 'Shamanstvo'", *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 24 (1895), pp. 62-100, 126-158.

Mills, C. Wright. "The Professional Ideology of Social Pathologists", *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (Sep., 1943), pp. 165-180.

Mirković, Damir. "Anton Pavlovich Chekhov and the Modern Sociology of Deviance", *Canadian Slavonic Papers*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (March 1976), pp. 66-72.

Moon, David. "Peasant Migration and the Settlement of Russia's Frontiers, 1550–1897", *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec., 1997), pp. 859-893.

Morrison, Alexander. "Applied Orientalism' in British India and Tsarist Turkestan", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Jul., 2009), pp. 619-647.

Murav, Harriet. "The Case against Andrei Siniavskii: The Letter and the Law", *Russian Review*, Vol. 53, No. 4 (Oct., 1994), pp. 549-560.

Nakayama, Ken. "James J. Gibson – An Appreciation", *Psychological Review*, Vol. 101, No. 2 (1994), pp. 329-335.

Nekrasov, M.A. "Vzgliady P.I. Iakobiia na organizatsiiu psikhiatricheskoi nomoshchi v Rossii", *Psikhicheskoe Zdorov'e*, No. 6 (2008), pp. 69-71.

Noll, Richard. "Shamanism and Schizophrenia: A State-Specific Approach to the 'Schizophrenia Metaphor' of Shamanic States", *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 10,

No. 3 (August 1983), pp. 443-459.

O'Malley, Lurana D. “The Monarch and the Mystic: Catherine the Great's Strategy of Audience Enlightenment in the Siberian Shaman”, *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (Summer, 1997), pp. 224-242.

Pandey, Sanjay Kumar. “Asia in the Debate on Russian Identity”, *International Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (October 2007), pp. 317-337.

Peterson, Dale E. “Civilizing the Race: Chaadaev and the Paradox of Eurocentric Nationalism”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 56, No. 4 (Oct., 1997), pp. 550-563.

Plotkin, Vladimir and E. Howe, Jovan. “The Unknown Tradition: Continuity and Innovation in Soviet Ethnography”, *Dialectical Anthropology*, Vol. 9. Issue 1-4 (June 1985), pp. 257-312.

Popkin, Cathy. “Chekhov as Ethnographer: Epistemological Crisis on Sakhalin Island”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Spring, 1992), pp. 36-51.

Rabinovitch, Simon. “Positivism, Populism and Politic: The Intellectual Foundations of Jewish Ethnography in Late Imperial Russia”, *Ab Imperio. Studies of New Imperial History and Nationalism in the Post-Soviet Space*, Issue 3 (2005), pp. 227-256.

Ready, Oliver. “The Myth of Vasilii Rozanov the ‘Holy Fool’ through the Twentieth Century”, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 90, No. 1 (January 2012), pp. 33-64.

Rivkin-Fish, Michele. “Anthropology, Demography, and the Search for a Critical Analysis of Fertility: Insightsfrom Russia”, *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 105, No. 2 (Jun., 2003), pp. 289-301.

Rosen, George. “Cameralism and the Concept of Medical Police”, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, Vol. 27(1) (1953), pp. 21-42.

Rosenberg, William G. “Identities, Power, and Social Interactions in Revolutionary Russia”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 21-28.

Rowland, Daniel B. “Moscow-The Third Rome or the New Israel?”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Oct., 1996), pp. 591-614.

Ryan, W. F. “The Witchcraft Hysteria in Early Modern Europe: Was Russia an Exception?”, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 76, No. 1 (Jan., 1998), pp. 49-84.

Salmond, Wendy. “A Matter of Give and Take: Peasant Crafts and Their Revival in Late Imperial Russia”, *Design Issues*, Vol. 13, No. 1, Designing the Modern

Experience, 1885-1945 (Spring, 1997), pp. 5-14.

Schnittker, Jason and John, Andrea. “Enduring Stigma: The Long-Term Effects of Incarceration on Health”, *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Jun., 2007), pp. 115-130.

Shcherbatov, M.M. “Statistika v razsuzhdenii Rossii”, in *Chteniia v Obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete* (*ChOIDR*), book 3, pt. 11 (1859), p. 46.

Shternberg, L.Ia. “Sovremennaia etnologiia: Noveishie uspekhi, nauchnye techeniia i metody”, *Etnografiia*, no. 1-2 (1926), pp. 15-43.

Silver, Brian D. “The Status of National Minority Languages in Soviet Education: An Assessment of Recent Changes”, *Soviet Studies*, Vol. 26, Iss. 1 (1974), pp. 28-40

Silverman, Julian. “Shamans and Acute Schizophrenia”, *American Anthropologist*, Vol. 69, No. 1 (Feb. 1967), pp. 21-31.

Simpson, Murray K. “From Savage to Citizen: Education, Colonialism and Idiocy”, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 28, No. 5 (Sep., 2007), pp. 561-574.

Slezkine, Yuri. “N. Ia. Marr and the National Origins of Soviet Ethnogenetics”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Winter, 1996), pp. 826-862.

Slezkine, Yuri. “Sovetskaia etnografiia v nokdaune: 1928-1938”, *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, Vol. 2 (1993), pp. 113-125.

Slocum, John W. “Who, and When, Were the Inorodtsy? The Evolution of the Category of ‘Aliens’ in Imperial Russia”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 57, No. 2 (April, 1998), pp. 173-190.

Smith-Lovin, Lynn. “The Strength of Weak Identities: Social Structural Sources of Self, Situation and Emotional Experience”, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, Vol. 70, No. 2 (Jun., 2007), pp. 106-124.

Sobol, Valeria. “The Uncanny Frontier of Russian Identity: Travel, Ethnography, and Empire in Lermontov's "Taman"”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (January, 2011), pp. 65-79.

Stcherbatsky, Th. “The Doctrine of the Buddha”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, Vol. 6 (1932), pp. 867-896.

Sunderland, Willard. “Peasant Pioneering: Russian Peasant Settlers Describe Colonization and the Eastern Frontier, 1880s-1910s”, *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Summer, 2001), pp. 895-922.

Sunderland, Willard. “The ‘Colonization Question’: Visions of Colonization in Late Imperial Russia”, *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, Neue Folge, Bd. 48, H. 2 (2000), pp. 210-232.

Sunderland, Willard. “Russians into Iakuts? ‘Going Native’ and Problems of Russian National Identity in the Siberian North, 1870s-1914”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (Winter, 1996), pp. 806-825.

Wilson, William A. “Herder, Folklore and Romantic Nationalism”, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol. 6, Issue 4 (1973), pp. 819-835.

Takakura, Hiroki. “Indigenous Intellectuals and Suppressed Russian Anthropology: Sakha Ethnography from the End of the Nineteenth Century to the 1930s”, *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 47, No. 6 (December 2006), pp. 1009-1016.

Tatishchev, V.N. “Razgovor dvu priiatelei o pol'ze nauki i uchilishchakh”, in *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1979), pp. 51-133.

Tolz, Vera. “European, National, and (anti-) Imperial: The Formation of Academic Oriental Studies in Late Tsarist and Early Soviet Russia”, *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, Vol. 9, No.1 (2008), pp. 53-81.

Tolz, Vera. “Orientalism, Nationalism, and Ethnic Diversity in Late Imperial Russia”, *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 48, No.1 (2005), pp. 127-150.

Thomas, Neil. “The Celtic Wild Man Tradition and Geoffrey of Monmouth's Vita Merlini: Madness or Contemptus Mundi?" *Arthuriana*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Spring, 2000), pp. 27-42.

Thompson, Ewa M. “The Archetype of the Fool in Russian Literature”, *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne des Slavistes*, Vol. 15, No. 3 (Autumn, 1973), pp. 245-273.

Trevett, Christine. “Asperger's Syndrome and the Holy Fool: The Case of Brother Juniper”, *Journal of Religion, Disability & Health*, Vol. 13, No. 2 (2009), pp. 129-150.

Valkenier, Elizabeth Kridl. “Politics in Russian Art: The Case of Repin”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (Jan., 1978), pp. 14-29.

Valkenier, Elizabeth Kridl. “The Peredvizhniki and the Spirit of the 1860s”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Jul., 1975), pp. 247-265.

Walsh, Roger. “Phenomenological Mapping and Comparisons of Shamanic, Buddhist, Yogic, and Schizophrenic Experiences”, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 739-769.

Wilson, William A. “Herder, Folklore and Romantic Nationalism”, *The Journal of Popular Culture*, Vol. 6, Issue 4 (1973), pp. 819-835.

Winner, Thomas G. “Čexov's Ward No. 6 and Tolstoyan Ethics”, *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 4 (Winter, 1959), pp. 321-334.

Whitehead, Claire “Anton Chekhov's *The Black Monk*: An Example of the Fantastic?”, *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 85, No. 4 (Oct., 2007), pp. 601-628.

Zammito, John H. “The Lenoir thesis revisited: Blumenbach and Kant”, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science, Part C: Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, Vol. 43, Issue 1 (March 2012), pp. 120-132.

Zguta, Russell. “Witchcraft and Medicine in Pre-Petrine Russia”, *Russian Review*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (Oct., 1978), pp. 438-448.

Zguta, Russell. “The Pagan Priests of Early Russia: Some New Insights”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Jun., 1974), pp. 259-266.

Zguta, Russell. “Skomorokhi: The Russian Minstrel-Entertainers”, *Slavic Review*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Jun., 1972), pp. 297-313.

Zorin, Andrey and Monnier, Nicole. “Ideology, Semiotics, and Clifford Geertz: Some Russian Reflections”, *History and Theory*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Feb., 2001), pp. 57-73.

Glossary

Russian (in transliteration)	English (in translation)	
aptekarskii prikaz	Pharmacy Department	established under Tsar Mikhail (1613-1645) in 1620 to consolidate the highly centralised system of medical organization in the area of public health
beshannyi	rabid	used by Avvakum; behave in a sense of violence, fury and madness
besstrashie	fearlessness	
bezumie *bezumstvo*	madness (the behaviour)	generally defined in the nineteenth-century dictionary as lunacy (*sumasshestvie*) in the first sense, and extends the meaning of the second as foolhardiness (*bezrassudstvo*) to specify the wild and extravagant behaviours (*sumasbrodstvo*)
blazhennyi	the blessed one; or the lucky unfortunate	
byt	way of life	a concept covering all aspects of daily life from tools and household implements to customary law and rituals
bytopisanie	(terminology)	means ‘writing about way of life, or customs’
byvshii	former people	(in the 1920) known as one set of groups, whose members derived their class identity from social or service status under the old regime
chudak	eccentric	
chuzhezemnyi	foreign (people)	

Dal'nii Vostok Rossii	Russian Far East	Russian part of the Far East, i.e., the extreme east parts of Russia, between Lake Baikal in Eastern Siberia and the Pacific Ocean
defektologia	defectology	literally means 'study of defect', refers to the study of children with disability such as: the hard of hearing and deaf (*surdo-pedagogika*); the visually impaired and blind *(tiflo- pedagogika*); children with mental retardation (*oligophreno- pedagogika*); and speech/language impaired children (*logopedia*)
dementsiia	dementia	an illness that affects one's brain and memory; equivalent to *slaboumie* for feeble-minded
derzaniia	daring	
dushevnaia bolezn'	mental illness.	a term for illness of the soul or psyche
dvizheniia	movement	
Etnograf	ethnologist	
Etnografiia	Ethnography	Russianised Greek equivalent of *bytopisanie*
Fol'klorist	folklorist	
glupyi *glupost'* (noun)	silly	
guliashchie liudi (plural)	the travelling folk	
inorodets *inorodtsy* (plural)	non-Russian alien	a person 'of other origin' (*ino* = other, *rod* = birth, origin) who was generally supposed to become more like a Russian, who in fact associated *inorodets* with a referent who is 'congenital and apparently perennial outsider'

inoverets *inovertsy* (plural)	adherence to different faith; non-Christian	classification made by Russian writer and historian Prince Mikhail Shcherbatov in 1776
inozemets *inozemtsy* (plural)	foreigner	
iurodivyi *iurodstvo*	holy fool; the person holy foolishness; the phenomenon	described in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the holy fool is a form of radical Christianity that manifests itself under the mask of foolishness, yet holds the truth of the gospel, in the disguise of folly. The *Oxford Dictionaries* are in general agreement with the definitions that the holy fool is 'a person who does not conform to social norms of behaviour'. The *Explanatory Dictionary of Russian Language* defines *iurodivyi* to mean a madman (*bezumets*), believed to possess divine gift of prophecy (*proritsanie*), while its noun *iurodstvo* is used to describe foolishness (*bessmyslennyi*) and ridiculous (*nelepyi*) action
Kamlanie	the shaman séance	
klikushestvo *klikusha* *klikushi* (plural)	hysteria Female hysteria	a term to describe that woman suffered from a nervous disorder which causes hysterical seizures, screams, and convulsions (adopted by V.G. Bogoraz in his research of Kolyma district in north-eastern Siberia)
Komandirovtsy (plural)	commissioned investigators	a specific usage to describe an ethnographic expedition was commissioned by eight writers (as *komandirovtsy*) between 1855 and 1862
lubok	1) strip of bast	

lubki (plural)	2) cheap popular print and literature	
maloumen	weak-witted	used to identify a variety of terms, but not ideally precise, to designate type of mental illness during the urban census of Peter the Great (1689-1725)
Meditsinskaia Kantseliariia	Medical Chancellery	Peter the Great reshuffled the Pharmacy Department into the *Meditsinskaia Kantseliariia* successively.
Meditsinskaia Kollegiia	Medical Collegium	The Medical Chancellery was then replaced by the *Meditsinskaia Kollegiia* in 1763.
Meditsinskii Sovet	Medical Council	The *Meditsinskii Sovet* and the *Meditsinskii Departament* occupied a dominant position of governing all aspects of civilian medical administration in 1803; and lasted until 1917.
Meditsinskii Departament	Medical Department	
Mir iskusstva	the World of Art	an artistic group founded in 1898 by some Petersburg intellectuals who had broad and varied interests in literature, music and theatre, but explore the tradition through their own style in paintings
Morskoi sbornik	Naval Collection	
muzhik	Russian peasant	a Russian peasant of the Imperial Russia before 1917; the term connotes a certain degree of poverty, as most *muzhiks* were serfs before the Emancipation Reform of 1861.
narodnaia pesnia	folksong	
narodnaia stsena	popular life	a genre painting which the *Peredvizhniki* used to demonstrate social spirit and idea

		of the Russian people’s life
narodnii byt	people’s life	
narodnost'	nationality; national character	
narodovedenie	the study of people	
neopredelennoe	uncertainty, vagueness	(used by Chaadaev)
ne-umnost'	not sensible	
Novoe Vremia		a Russian newspaper published in St. Petersburg from 1868 to 1917
opredelenie	definition	
otkhod	departure	the Russian pre- and post Civil War phenomenon of the seasonal departure of peasants to the cities in search of work
otstalyi	backward	in a sense of lagging
palomnichestvo	pilgrimage	the conventional term of pilgrimage in Russian language; typically, it is a journey to a shrine or other location of importance to a person's beliefs and faith
Peredvizhniki	The Wanderers	a group of Russian realist artists in late nineteenth century
pereselenie	resettlement	resettlement to Eastern Siberia
poleznyi	useful	
prirodnyi poddannyi *prirodnye poddannye* (plural)	natural subject	a legal term
prostodushnyi	simple-minded	
prostoum	simple-minded	
prosveshchenie	enlightenment	
Raskol'nik	schismatic	
raznochinets	generation and	an administrative term of describing the

raznochintsy (plural)	style of an intellectual	man who does not fit the traditional scale of rank
raznoobraznyi	diverse	(people)
raznotsvetnyi	multi-coloured	(people)
russkaia dusha	Russian soul	
shaman	shaman	native Siberian 'holy man', witch-doctor, soothsayer and healer; an exponent of 'shamanism', the religion of most aboriginal Siberian peoples
skopets *skoptsy* (plural)	castrator	a sectarian of Russian popular religiosity; details see Laura Engelstein, *Castration and the Heavenly Kingdom: A Russian Folktale* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1999).
sliianie	merging	especially for concern of ethnicity
soslovie	social estate	first and foremost a legal category that defines and individual's rights and obligation to the state
starets	holy counselor	
Starover	Old Believer	a name given to the schismatic group that separated from the Russian Orthodox Church at the time of the great religious schism that occurred in the seventeenth century during the reign of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich (cited from G. Douglas Nicoll, "Old Believers," *The Modern Encyclopedia of Russian and Soviet History*, vol. 25, pp. 228-237.)
strannik	strange person; eccentricity	a person with strange behaviour, especially refers to the religious pilgrim
strannichestvo	pilgrimage	

stranstvovanie	the state of wandering	
umom plokh	weak of mind	
veroispovedanie	confessional group	the Central Statistical Administration used the categories of native language and confessional group (*veroispovedanie*) to compile a list of the empire's *narodnost'*
volkhov *volkhvy* (plural)	pagan priest	refers to the paganish monks, sorcerer, astrologer or magician in ancient Slavonic culture.
volost'		The smallest administrative division of tsarist Russia
vne uma	out of one's mind	
vospitanie	education	
vostokovedenie	oriental studies	
Zemstvo	(terminology)	an organ of rural local government established in Russia during the reforms of Alexander II; not introduced into Siberia until 1917
zheltyi dom *zheltye doma* (plural)	yellow house	an institution for the mentally ill or the hospital for the insane; erected during 1776 to 1779
zhitie	biography	as in life of Saints
zhnets	reaper	