Contents

Preface

The present volume is a product—or rather, an offshoot—of a five-year research project funded by the Academy of Finland and entitled *Images and Attributes of Enemies in Pre-Revolutionary Russia*. The idea of compiling a collection of articles was generated by the editors' wish to further explore and bring together contemporary research on perceptions, representations, and images of ethnic, religious, and social "others" in Muscovy and the Russian Empire. The human tendency to create and maintain categories is as topical as ever and examining the formation and maintenance of historical images allows us to understand some of the modern challenges in international and interethnic relations and their collective mental premises. As of Russia, its war in Ukraine can be seen as a consequence of not confronting and critically assessing the country's imperial and colonial legacies, a part of which are the ways it positions itself to its historical and contemporary "others".

Our international call for articles produced an interesting array of scholarly undertakings on the theme, from which we tried to choose a thematically and temporally coherent selection to be published as a volume. From the beginning, we were fully aware that producing any comprehensive presentation of such a multifaceted and complicated phenomenon was out of the question—especially as we wanted to cover a relatively long period. Many interesting and important topics were, therefore, left untouched, but we hope that the case studies in this

volume will inspire researchers to probe more deeply into the theme of historical "otherness" in Russia and examine the missing subjects in the future.

Like any edited volume, this is a result of relentless collective labors. We wish to express our warmest gratitude to all the authors for their contributions and patience, and especially to David Goldfrank, Michael Khodarkovsky, and Stephen M. Norris for kindly providing the thoughtful summaries that bring together the diverse topics of each section. Moreover, we want to thank Rupert Moreton and Ian Mac Eochagáin for their efforts in translating and editing the chapters, all the other devoted experts for their involvement in the editing work, and our colleagues for their explicit and implicit support for our project. Finally, we would like to express our gratitude to the Academy of Finland for making the preparation of the volume financially possible.

—Kati Parppei and Bulat Rakhimzianov

Introduction: Images, Otherness, and Images of the Others

Kati Parppei and Bulat Rakhimzianov

What Is an Image?

The Circassians hate us. We have forced them out of their free and spacious pasturelands; their auls are in ruins, whole tribes have been annihilated.—Friendship with the peaceful *Circassians is unreliable: they are always ready to aid their rebellious fellow tribesmen. The spirit of their wild chivalry has declined noticeably.—The dagger and the sword are parts of their body, and an infant begins to master them before he can prattle. For them killing is simple bodily motion.—What can one do with such a people?*[1]

In 1829, the Russian poet Alexander Pushkin (1799–1837) ventured to Arzrum (Erzurum) in eastern Turkey, as the war between Russia and the Ottoman Empire raged on. Without official permission to go abroad, he traveled through the Caucasus and made notes of what he saw and experienced, and the people(s) he encountered. His travel diary *A Journey to Arzrum* was published in 1836, along with the contemporary wave of travel stories and literature in Russia as well as elsewhere in Europe. However, already in 1822, Pushkin had published a poem *The Prisoner of the Caucasus*, presenting a romantic story of a

1 Alexander Pushkin, *A Journey to Arzrum*, trans. Birgitta Ingemanson (Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1974), 23–24.

Russian officer who is captured by Circassian tribesmen and saved by a beautiful Circassian woman. This poem has been said to have brought the Caucasus to the cultural horizon of Russian readers for the first time.[2]

Both of these works and their multilayered meanings have been studied and analyzed from many viewpoints.[3] For us, they offer a convenient starting point to shortly introduce the central concept of our book—the *image*. Pushkin's published texts on Caucasus were widely distributed and their influence on the general perceptions—that is, images—of the disputed frontier area and its peoples was significant. For example, the Circassians were represented as free, exotic, and enchanting people, as well as dangerous enemies needed to be controlled. This twofold imagery gave readers a chance to reflect on their own "Russianness" and the expansive Russian Empire (for further pondering on these themes, see the section "Images of the 'Others'").[4] On the other hand, compared to *The Prisoner of the Caucasus*, the travel diary offers a more cynical and even gritty imagery, presenting the Caucasus as a combat zone instead of a romantic Alpine resort and emphasizing the negative attributes of the Circassians and other Caucasian inhabitants at the expense of the idea of their "wild chivalry."[5] Thus, we can say that in *A Journey to Arzrum*, Pushkin challenged the already established collective images of Caucasus and Caucasians with new and at least partially contradictory ones.

It is said that "the image" is an ambiguous concept which describes a phenomenon that is equally ambiguous.[6] As is the case with all such concepts—for example, concepts of identity, tradition, and myth, just to mention a few—using them as methodological tools, let alone forming a theoretical framework for a study, requires these concepts to be defined in each context on each occasion.

This book's broad context is that of image studies, an interdisciplinary approach that is utilized, for example, in cognitive psychology, sociology,

---

2 Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 5.

3 See, for example, Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Susan Layton, "Nineteenth-Century Russian Mythologies of Caucasian Savagery," in *Russia's Orient. Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700–1917*, ed. Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 80–99. Monika Frenkel Greenleaf, "Pushkin's 'Journey to Arzrum': The Poet at the Border," *Slavic Review* 50, no. 4 (1991): 940–53; John Lyles, "Bloody Verses: Rereading 'Pushkin's Prisoner of the Caucasus," *Pushkin Review* 16 (2014): 233–54.

4 Layton, "Nineteenth-Century Russian Mythologies of Caucasian Savagery"; Hubertus F. Jahn, "'Us': Russians on Russianness," in *National Identity in Russian Culture: An Introduction*, ed. Simon Franklin and Emma Widdis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 53–73.

5 Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy*, 61–65.

6 David Ratz, "The Study of Historical Images," *Faravid* 31 (2007): 191.

international relations, literary studies, geography, and historical studies. In image studies, the image is understood less as a visual representation of a certain object and more as an abstract concept that refers to a perception formed of an object by the human mind encountering said object. Together, these "mental images"—or *schemas* to use the vocabulary of cognitive psychology—operating in the subconscious can be said to form the world view of a person.[7]

Images have crucial tasks in the human mind: they help to arrange new information and assist the person in navigating reality and making decisions. For example, certain preestablished categories of people help us make initial sense of the multitude of strangers we meet.[8] However, images formed in our mind never truly reflect the complexity of reality quite as it is. Images tend to be simplified models, lacking details and exact features; they can be said to represent reality almost as a map represents actual terrain, and they are similarly biased, with the viewpoint depending on the producer of the map or the owner of the image. Moreover, in the mental image formation process, new information can be said to be filtered through the person's previous images, emotions, experiences, and beliefs, which altogether create subjective and unique perceptions.[9]

Moreover, mental images once formed tend to be difficult to change, which is partly due to their subconscious nature; we are only rarely aware of our set of images, their function in our minds, or the influence they have on our everyday decisions. Generally, a person is more prone to receive and accept information that supports previously held images and to reject any information that contradicts established imagery. This phenomenon is close to the idea of confirmation bias in the field of media studies: the tendency to selectively think and notice what confirms one's beliefs and ignoring any information and details that challenge might challenge these beliefs.[10]

Despite their initial subjectivity, mental images also have a collective dimension, which, for example, interests cultural historians and literary researchers keen to utilize the approach of image studies. As members of a society or another group, people share certain perceptions, conceptions, and traditions. The existence of this immaterial cultural heritage also means there is

---

7 Ibid., 191–95.

8 Marja Vuorinen, Noora Kotilainen, and Aki-Mauri Huhtinen, eds., *Binaries in Battle—Representations of Division and Conflict* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), ix.

9 Ratz, "The Study of Historical Images": 200–202, 208; Olavi K. Fält, "Introduction," in *Looking at the Other. Historical Study of Images in Theory and Practice*, ed. Kari Alenius et al. (Oulu: Oulu University Press, 2002), 8.

10 Kenneth Boulding, *The Image* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1975), 8–9; Ratz, "The Study of Historical Images": 202–3, 215.

a sphere of shared images that overlaps or intertwines with our subjective ones. Furthermore, these collective or shared images do not appear from nowhere; rather, they are often intentionally formed and distributed by certain institutions that prioritize societal cohesion, such as the media or schooling system. For example, school textbooks have effectively distributed powerful and durable images of the shared national past in each country. It has been noted that the most persistent images are those formed in childhood, which emphasizes the role of schooling and other kinds of indoctrination aimed at children and young people in the formation of shared images.[11]

Creating, consolidating, and maintaining collective images often serves the interests of contemporary power structures. An examination of the most prominent shared images distributed by "official" institutions thus opens opportunities to study those structures and their motives at each given time (whilst the perceptions of the more marginal or subtle actors of society are apparently left aside).[12] This notion brings us to the main idea of image studies: instead of the images themselves, or the objects of which the images have been formed, the actual subject of research is the image's *producer*, and the processes of an image's production, consolidation, and maintenance.[13] According to Olavi K. Fält, the researcher may ask, "what an image is like, how we have formed a particular image of a certain thing, why we have this image, what purpose it serves, what changes have taken place in it, and what all this tells us of the creators of the image."[14]

Paradigmatically, historical image studies can be placed under the broad umbrella of cultural history with strong interdisciplinary connections; for example, the image as a concept is very close to the equally ambiguous concept of *representation* often discussed in cultural and media studies.[15] It can be seen as belonging to the study of the history of mentalities, or at least, overlapping

---

11 Boulding, *The Image*, 56, 68; Olavi K. Fält, "The Historical Study of Mental Images as a Form of Research into Cultural Confrontation," *Comparative Civilizations Review* 32, no. 32 (1995): 101.

12 Jan Nederveen Pieterse, "Image and Power," in *Alterity, Identity, Image. Selves and Others in Society and Scholarship*, ed. R. Corbey and J. Th. Leerssen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), 198. Fält, "Introduction," 11.

13 Nederveen Pieterse, "Image and Power," 200.

14 Fält, "Introduction," 9.

15 According to Stuart Hall, representation is the process by which meaning is produced and exchanged between members of a culture through the use of language, signs, and images which stand for or represent things (Stuart Hall, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* [London: Sage Publishing, 2003], 17–19). As such, it describes the basic idea of a shared image from a slightly different angle, emphasizing the audience and reception which—for obvious reasons—are mostly beyond the reach of historians.

seamlessly with it; both are occupied with the cultural models of the past. Also, the idea of mental images is very close to the concept of mental mapping which has been used, for example, in geography and behavioral science. Mental maps refer to socio-cultural constructions of spatiality formed in the human mind, and the idea has been found to be a useful theoretical and methodological tool for historians as well to analyze issues such as, for example, world views, colonial encounters, and the formation and dissolution of historical regions and realms.[16]

The sources used for applying an imagological approach can be very versatile. Essentially, any material that can be considered to have contributed to the formation and consolidation of a shared image of a certain issue in a certain society can be used for research. It may include diverse texts from medieval chronicles to newspapers, from textbooks and travel guides to plays, poetry, and folktales, as well as pictorial representations from icons to photographs, cartoons, caricatures, and animations. In tracing and analyzing the long-term development of a certain image, heterogenic source material may be used. Of course, this versatility of sources may bring with it certain problems when sorting the "layers" of image formation: for example, it may be impossible to determine whether an oral folktale has preceded a written version of a story, or vice versa.[17]

Despite the intriguing possibilities of the approach, a historian utilizing the imagological tool to study shared images must be aware of certain issues to avoid anachronistic pitfalls. For instance, we cannot examine truly *shared* images before the emergence of general literacy and mass media. In medieval cultures the producers and consumers of the images largely consisted of the same groups, mostly those with an ecclesiastical background in education and seamless connections with the contemporary power structures.[18] Of course, to some extent these "elite images"—and the messages they conveyed to support the contemporary politico-religious structures—were also distributed to larger

16 See, for example, Norbert Götz and Janne Holmén, "Introduction to the Theme Issue: 'Mental Maps: Geographical and Historical Perspectives,'" *Journal of Cultural Geography* 35, no. 2 (2018): 157–61.

17 Fält, "The Historical Study of Mental Images as a Form of Research into Cultural Confrontation": 101. For examples of the examination of long-term image formation, see Kati Parppei, *"The Oldest One in Russia": The Formation of the Historiographical Image of Valaam Monastery* (Leiden: Brill Publishing, 2011) and Kati Parppei, *The Battle of Kulikovo Refought—"The First National Feat"* (Leiden: Brill Publishing, 2017).

18 For a deeper understanding of the connections between the medieval power authorities, the ecclesiastical circles serving these authorities, and therefore the focus of texts produced by them, see, for example (concerning Muscovy): Edward Keenan, "Muscovy and Kazan, 1445–1552: A Study in Steppe Politics," PhD diss., (Harvard University, 1965).

groups of people in pictorial form such as frescoes and icons in churches. Furthermore, as the primary object of the imagological study is the producer of the image rather than its recipients, this restriction is neither crucial to nor does it compromise a successful research project; it only sets certain preconditions for it. Similarly, it is of secondary importance for an image researcher whether an image examined is "true" to the reality (as we have noted, they rarely are, or at least they only reflect one side of it).[19]

Another issue to keep in mind is the researcher's unavoidable subjectivity—something every historian acknowledges nowadays, no matter what their chosen theoretical and methodological approach may be. Yet operating with an unquestionably vague concept such as the image introduces further epistemological problems for consideration. As David Ratz argues, examining the mind and mentality of the people of the past inevitably produces subjective information: it can be said to be one more step removed from the objective reality when compared, for example, with "factual information" or "raw data" collected from historical documents. As researchers, we are products of our own time and we also represent another contemporary filter between the past and present, bringing to the research process our own personal images, perceptions, choices, and interpretations.[20] Being aware of these issues and taking them into account when planning and conducting research is essential for successful historical image research.

Images of "the Others"

One of the popular applications of the imagological approach has been studying images of *the Others*, "Otherness" being the other central concept in the title of this volume alongside the concept of the "image." Defining "them" in relation to one's own reference group, "us," has been an essential phase in the formation of so-called collective identities and societal cohesion in any given country or region, and as mentioned above, it is closely connected to the idea of mental maps and constructions of spatiality in the human mind. Perceptions of "the Others" (hetero-images) have often been pejorative in nature, equipping the representatives of "them" with negative and stereotypical features to emphasize

19 For the application of the imagological approach to medieval sources, see, for example, Mari Mäki-Petäys, "On the Applicability of Image Research to the Study of Medieval Hagiographies," in *Looking at the Other: Historical Study of Images in Theory and Practice*, ed. Kari Alenius et al. (Oulu: Oulu University Press, 2002), 89–103.

20 Ratz, "The Study of Historical Images": 197–98.

the positive attributes connected with the ideas of "us" (auto-images).[21] Typically, stereotyping is easily detected when "we" are defined by others, while we tend to consider our own perceptions of other groups as neutral and well founded.[22]

In times of conflict, perceptions and stereotypes of the other, as well as attempts to influence certain identification processes, tend to become more prominent and the dualistic approach to the qualities of "us" and "them" are more blatant and uncovered. The result is extremely negative and threatening images of the enemy—either external or internal—that are often deliberately produced and distributed for propaganda purposes. In the process, historical imagery is often combined with contemporary perceptions to lend authority and persuasion to a certain message. Ultimately, the process of enmification (the process of making someone into an enemy) can lead to the dehumanizing of the Other, sometimes concretized in comparing them to animals or even pests. This, in turn, allows for the elimination of that nonhuman Other, perceived as an ultimate threat to "Us."[23]

On the other hand, romanticizing and exoticizing the Other has contributed to further isolating them from "Us." It thus serves the purpose of self-definition for its part; being exotic and different is seen as a function of the Others.[24] Stereotypical images of the Others can also consist of seemingly contradictory qualities and attributes. For instance, an ethnic group or a nationality can be seen as poetic, romantic, or exotic in one context, and violent and threatening in

---

21 "Goodness, honesty, righteousness, purity, proper manners, hard work, right religion, high but not over–ripe culture and decency are the hallmarks of the Self, while the Other is accused of being evil, untruthful, crooked, impure, ill-mannered, lazy, superstitious, barbaric or decadent, and immoral. What is natural and normal, genuine and legitimate, are always 'our' qualities" (Marja Vuorinen, *Enemy Images in War Propaganda* [Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2012], 3). See also Joep Leerssen, "Imagology: History and Method," in *Imagology—the Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters: A Critical Survey*, ed. Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 27; Manfred Beller, "Perception, Image, Imagology," in *Imagology—the Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters: A Critical Survey*, ed. Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007), 4–7; Hercules Millas, "History Writing among the Greeks and Turks: Imagining the Self and the Other," in *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion, and Gender in National Histories*, ed. Stephen Berger and Chris Lorenz (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 494.

22 Vuorinen, *Enemy Images in War Propaganda*, ix.

23 Ibid., 3–5. See also Kati Parppei, "'This Battle Started Long Before Our Days. . .' The Historical and Political Context of the Russo-Turkish War in Russian Popular Publications, 1877–78," *Nationalities Papers* 49, no. 1 (2021): 162–79.

24 Dorothy M. Figueira, *The Exotic: A Decadent Quest* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994), 2.

another, as in the case of Pushkin's imagery of the Circassians described above.[25] This holds true, for example, also in the case of Finnish national stereotypes of Russians: on the one hand, Russians have been represented as the primary "hostile Other" in Finland's national narrative; on the other hand, Russian music, literature, and art have been culturally admired and revered, and certain "Slavic melancholy"—as expressed, for example, in Russian traditional songs much favored by Finns—is even eagerly embraced as a feature shared by both Finns and Russians.

Critical examination of "othering" and stereotyping as a psychological and cultural phenomenon was possible only after the idea of national characters as explanatory categories or models had been abandoned in scholarly discourse, which took place after the Second World War.[26] One of the pioneers and classics of the field is Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), which examines the images and conceptions of the "East" by the "West." According to Said, the "Orient" has helped to "define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience."[27] Robert Young has noted that Said was the first scholar to approach colonialism as a discourse of domination rather than as policies and practices of military rule, thus creating a starting point for a new paradigm for analyzing the colonial and imperial ideologies and their manifestations.[28] The immense legacy of *Orientalism* has indeed inspired a multitude of scholarly commentaries, critiques, and interpretations in the field of postcolonial studies.[29]

Said has been accused of over-simplification for delivering his persuasive message: for example, he did not clearly pinpoint the "Orient," and represented the equally vague "West" as an entity producing the Eurocentric view on the East (leaving "Orient" undefined was, according to Said himself, a deliberate choice).[30] This brings us to a central feature of image formation in relation to concepts. From a "European" point of view, the adjectives "Oriental" and "Eastern" are good examples of concepts which may evoke strong and meaningful (but equally vague) images in a European's mind, the vagueness feeding on the lack of firsthand experiences of actual cultures perceived as "Eastern." In the same way, the equally vague concepts such as "Western," or

25 Leerssen, "Imagology: History and Method," 29.
26 Ibid., 21.
27 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 1995), 1–2.
28 Robert Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2016), 383–84.
29 For a good overview on that legacy, see Daniel Martin Varisco, *Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007).
30 See, for example, Figueira, *The Exotic: A Decadent Quest*, 3; Said, *Orientalism*, 331.

"European," or "African" quite likely call forth stereotypical images in the recipients' minds, as do other demonyms referring to people living in a certain area, country, or place. The places and regions themselves may evoke intriguing images, or "geographical visions," which historically have often been connected to colonialist enterprises.[31]

It is indeed typical of image formation in general that physical or mental distance and a lack of familiarity produce blurred, coarse perceptions. Members of a distant group—or rather, people more or less arbitrarily perceived as members of the same group—may appear homogenic and their qualities stereotypical.[32] As Joep Leerssen argues, in reminding his readers of the intertextual nature of images that "whenever we encounter an individual instead of a national characterization, the primary sounding board is *not* to empirical reality but to an intertext, a sounding-board, of other related textual instances."[33] However, the more one meets members of a certain group in person, the more effectively the previous simplified and stereotypical image begins to disintegrate and is gradually replaced by more detailed, heterogenic perceptions.[34]

Notably, distance here does not necessarily refer to actual geographical remoteness, but any unfamiliarity resulting from lack of personal experiences and interaction with a certain group. Generally, it is this vagueness, coarseness, and initial "foreignness" that gives stereotypical shared images the potential to be developed into "enemy images" as described above. However, as could be seen in ethnic conflicts such as, for example, the Wars of Yugoslavia, historical enemy images can also be deliberately used by political actors to turn relatively peacefully coexisting ethnic and religious groups against each other and to launch a self-feeding circle of hatred and destruction.[35]

Recognizing blatant enemy images is straightforward—especially if one is aware of their existence in general—and it may also be relatively easy to detect and examine certain hetero-images in national narratives, such as those formed of the inhabitants of neighboring countries with whom there may be a long-shared history of conflict and violence (and also, sometimes, cooperation). However, national narratives as such have tended to exclude minorities and

31 Mark Bassin, *Imperial Visions: Nationalist Imagination and Geographical Expansion in the Russian Far East, 1840–1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 5–6.

32 See, for example, Nederveen Pieterse, "Image and Power," 196–202.

33 Leerssen, "Imagology: History and Method," 26.

34 Ratz, "The Study of Historical Images": 215

35 Duško Sekulić, Garth Massey, and Randy Hodson, "Ethnic Intolerance and Ethnic Conflict in the Dissolution of Yugoslavia," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 29, no. 5 (September 2006): 797–827.

marginal groups. Those ethnic, religious, cultural, or social minorities are—either explicitly or implicitly—labelled as "the Other" in relation to the majority, and they indeed may be as unfamiliar to the representatives of the latter as members of some geographically distant group. The concept of master-narrative is useful here; Thijs defines it as "an ideal typical 'narrative frame' whose pattern is repeated, reproduced and confirmed by highly diverse historical practices" and which dominates the representations of the national past.[36] This dominance of a coherent, established national historical narrative, which more often than not emphasizes the alleged unity of the nation based on shared language and descent, either gives the diverse ethnic and religious minorities of the area only a subordinate role or completely fails to notice them.[37]

Further, it is obvious that positions in relation to auto and hetero-images, as well as the majority-minority setting, fluctuate and oversimplification must always be avoided: every group represents "the Others" to another group, and even minorities have internal minorities of their own, to which their relationship is that of a majority. All the diverse and shifting perceptions have potentially contributed to a group's or individuals' self-positioning to the social reality of their time.[38] Nevertheless, a researcher must bear in mind that images do not reflect identities as such; instead, images constitute possible identifications either explicitly via auto images ("this is what we are like") or implicitly via hetero-images and negations ("that is what they are like [and we are not]"), or both.[39]

Fluctuating Images of the Others in the Russian Context

In post-Soviet Russia, the concept of multiethnicity has been addressed alongside the concept of "unity," for example, in presidential addresses. Both

36 Krijn Thijs, "The Metaphor of the Master: 'Narrative Hierarchy,' in National Historical Cultures of Europe," in *The Contested Nation: Ethnicity, Class, Religion and Gender in National Histories*, ed. Stephen Berger and Chris Lorenz (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 68–72.

37 Ibid., 69–74.

38 See, for example, Ernst van Alphen, "The Other Within," in *Alterity, Identity, Image. Selves and Others in Society and Scholarship*, ed. R. Corbey and J. Th. Leerssen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2011), 1–16; Kari Alenius, "The Images of Neighbours: Estonians and their Neighbours," in *Looking at the Other. Historical Study of Images in Theory and Practice*, ed. Kari Alenius et al. (Oulu: Oulu University Press, 2002), 53.

39 Leerssen, "Imagology: History and Method," 27.

are represented as unique historical features of Russia and premises of its contemporary and future success.[40] Behind these simplified idea(l)s, a certain complexity can be detected, namely concerning the heritage of the Soviet Union and the challenges of contemporary administration in maintaining cohesion and negotiating the relations between diverse groups (also reflected at the conceptual level, as in the meanings of the concepts *russkii* and *rossiiskii/rossianin*, both translated as "Russian," but the first referring to ethnic Russianness, the second to "civic" belonging).[41] These ideas also vaguely refer to the historical spectrum of the Soviet Union's multiethnic and multireligious relations, in the context of which reciprocal collective images of the external and internal others have been formed, established, changed, and utilized over centuries.

The medieval texts produced in the area of Rus' created and distributed quite exclusively "elite images," as noted above. Religion represented the most important dividing line: Orthodox Christians were contrasted to non-Christians or Christians of other denominations. Notably, this simplistic and dualistic imagery was transferred to national histories of Russia, in which the period from the thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries was depicted as a time of Russian survival under the "Tatar yoke" when Muscovites struggled to gain and later maintain their independence under ceaseless Tatar pressure. Such depictions are accurate to a certain extent but generally incomplete. In reality, the relations between ethnic and religious groups were much more complex,

---

40 See, for example, Vladimir Putin, "Poslanie federal'nomu sobraniiu Rossiiskoi federatsii," April 25, 2005, accessed June 2, 2022, http://kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/22931; Vladimir Putin, "Poslanie federal'nomu sobraniiu Rossiiskoi federatsii," April 26, 2007, accessed June 2, 2022, http://kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/24203; Dmitrii Medvedev, "Poslanie federal'nomu sobraniiu Rossiiskoi federatsii," November 5, 2008, accessed June 2, 2022, http://kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/1968; Vladimir Putin, "Poslanie federal'nomu sobraniiu Rossiiskoi federatsii," December 23, 2012, accessed June 2, 2022, http://kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/17118.

41 See, for example, Pål Kolstø, "The Ethnification of Russian Nationalism," in *The New Russian Nationalism: Imperialism, Ethnicity and Authoritarianism 2000–2015*, ed. Pål Kolstø and Helge Blakkisrud (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 18–45. Helge Blakkisrud, "Blurring the Boundary Between Civic and Ethnic: The Kremlin's New Approach to National Identity Under Putin's Third Term," in *The New Russian Nationalism: Imperialism, Ethnicity, and Authoritarianism 2000–2015*, ed. Pål Kolstø and Helge Blakkisrud (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 249–74. Despite of the eloquent political statements of alleged multiethnic harmony in contemporary Russia, in reality discrimination and "othering" take place in various strata of the society, such as labor market. Moreover, certain hierarchies exist in categorizing diverse groups; for example, people of Southern origin—from Central Asia and Caucasus—are treated with more suspicion than ethnic Russians or groups of European origin, such as Germans, Jews, or Ukrainians (see, for example, Alexey Bessudnov and Andrey Shcherbak, "Ethnic Discrimination in Multi-Ethnic Societies: Evidence from Russia," *European Sociological Review* 36, no. 1 [2020]: 104–20).

and the complexity increased with the ongoing expansion of the empire.[42] These relations tended more often towards realpolitik and pragmatic "partnerships of necessity," in which religious and national antagonism played no significant role.[43]

Moscow assuming the dominating position amongst the principalities of Rus' during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries was a prerequisite for Russia's expansionistic activities. The conquests of the multireligious and multiethnic khanate of Kazan (1552) and the city of Astrakhan (1556) were followed by the conquest of the khanate of Sibir in the 1580s, and during the following centuries, the expansive movement continued eastward across Siberia to the Far East, into the steppe, the northern Caucasus, and also westward to challenge Poland, Sweden, and the Ottoman Empire.[44] The motives for Russia's expansion, too, were largely pragmatic rather than ideological, and were related to the desire to access material resources and trade routes.[45]

This colonizing expansion brought numerous ethnic and religious groups under the administration of the Russian Empire, turning "external others" into internal minorities. The colonization of Russia was administered by the state rather than being a result of private initiative and interest. As part of its colonization project, the Russian empire established certain administrative tools, such as diverse institutions and agencies in order to bring the newly acquired frontier areas and their inhabitants under imperial control.[46] In addition to and overlapping with administrative practices, the representatives of the Russian Empire had to deal with mental and ideological issues relating to facing "otherness" and adapting their thinking to accommodate the ethnic and cultural diversity. Concerning Europe, Jan Nederveen Pieterse asserts that

---

42 For examples of the complexity of practical *Realpoltik* relations between ethnic and religious groups in the case of Muscovy, see, for example, Bulat Rakhimzianov, *Moskva i tatarskii mir: Sotrudnichestvo i protivostoianie v epokhu peremen, XV–XVI veka* (St Petersburg: Evraziia, 2016).

43 Edward Keenan, "Muscovy and Kazan: Some Introductory Remarks on the Patterns of Steppe Diplomacy," *Slavic Review* 24 (1967): 549, 557–58.

44 For general overview of the expansion in the context of the other developments of the Russian empire, see Nancy Shields Kollmann, *The Russian Empire 1450–1801* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) and Valerie A. Kivelson and Ronald Grigor Suny, *Russia's Empires* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

45 Bassin, *Imperial Visions: Nationalist Imagination and Geographical Expansion in the Russian Far East, 1840–1865*.

46 Dittmar Schorkowitz, "Was Russia a Colonial Empire?" in *Shifting Forms of Continental Colonialism*, ed. Dittmar Schorkowitz et al. (Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan Publishers 2019), 117–47.

> All the attributes assigned to non-European peoples have also and first been attributed to European peoples, in a gradually expanding circle from neighboring to further removed peoples. This applies to the entire complex of savagery, bestiality, promiscuity, incest, heathenism, cannibalism, and so forth.[47]

This holds true for Russia too and reveals the relativity of attributes linked to "Otherness"; the images of Russians in Western Europe from the fifteenth century specifically emphasized the qualities described in the quotation, and which were in turn variably applied to Russia's "Others."[48] Following the ongoing process of expansion, the attributes and degrees of belonging to certain diverse groups had to be renegotiated accordingly in the context of their assimilation and integration into the empire. One way to deal with the situation in the eighteenth century were the administrative attempts to classify and categorize the non-Russians according to partly overlapping political, economic and religious criteria.[49]

However, only with the formation of national identities during the nineteenth century did the negotiations of Russia's geopolitical position and "Russianness" begin in earnest, taking place primarily in relation to vague metonymies such as Europe and Asia, or West and East. The complexity and controversy related to the issue—which culminated in the formation of the two groups called Slavophiles and Westernizers in the nineteenth century—reflected the profound intricacy and relativity of the issue of "Otherness." This intricacy was manifested also, and perhaps primarily, on the grassroot level due to processes of acculturation and assimilation having taken place throughout the expansion. For instance, many Russians had Asian background themselves.[50]

Nevertheless, despite the shifting and blurred issues of belonging inside the Empire, in the case of external "Others" it was—and indeed, still is—sometimes useful to create and maintain the ideas of sharp division between "us" and "them." During the nineteenth century, increasing literacy and the

---

47 Nederveen Pieterse, "Image and Power," 198.

48 See, for example, David Schimmelpennick van der Oye, *Russian Orientalism in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 2–3; Michael Khodarkovsky, "Ignoble Savages and Unfaithful Subjects," in *Russia's Orient. Imperial Borderlands and Peoples, 1700–1917*, ed. Daniel R. Brower and Edward J. Lazzerini (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 10.

49 Khodarkovsky, "Ignoble Savages and Unfaithful Subjects," 21–22.

50 Schimmelpennick van der Oye, *Russian Orientalism in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration*, 9. See also Michael Khodarkovsky, "The Indigenous Elites and the Construction of Ethnic Identities in the North Caucasus," *Russian History* 35, no. 2: 129–38.

emergence of popular printed material such as newspapers, textbooks and *lubok*[51] pictures, and booklets allowed for the more effective distribution of ideas and perceptions, and ultimately led to the emergence of shared images and stereotypes. These were effectively used in war propaganda, for example, and reproduced and further consolidated in expressive pictorial forms such as caricatures.[52] The publishing activities were regulated by censorship, which sought to ensure that the printed material accorded with official views and promoted societal cohesion.

However, this imagined cohesion was challenged throughout the nineteenth century, culminating in the severe tensions between the autocratic administration and its subjects at the turn of the twentieth century, and ultimately contributed to the fall of the empire during the revolution in 1917. Once again, new internal and external enemy images had to be created and distributed for the consolidation of the inner cohesion of a society based on new policies, ideas, and doctrines.

This book combines the theoretical and methodological tools and premises briefly introduced in the previous sections with an array of case studies—diverse in scope and style—that together cover the timespan from the sixteenth to the beginning of the twentieth centuries; from the beginning of Ivan IV's coronation in 1547 to the revolution of 1917. This ambitious timespan allows for an examination of not only the formation of early stereotypical images but also their influence on the formation of new imagery. Moreover, this timespan also brings out the development from "elite images" to the shared images of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The first section, "Creating Prototypes," examines how fundamental ideas of otherness—as a counterpart to Russian Orthodox Christianity—found their textual and pictorial form in medieval and premodern Russia. This section contains chapters dealing with the results and consequences of the rule of certain epochal rulers like Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great.

The chapters of the second section, "Classifying the Internal Others," address themes related to the expanding empire and the perceptions of the ethnic and

---

51 *Lubok* covers the production of cheap, popular prints, the production of which increased during the nineteenth century. They were either illustrations with short texts or booklets. The subjects ranged from folktales to contemporary events such as ongoing wars.

52 See, for example, Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985); Stephen Norris, *A War of Images* (Cornell: Cornell University Press, 2006); Elena Vishlenkova, "Strategies of the Visual Construction of Russianness and Non-Russianness, 1800–1830," in *Defining Self: Essays on Emergent Identities in Russia Seventeenth to Nineteenth Century*, ed. M. Branch (Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2009).