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Abstract
This article discusses the reasons for the increased interest in the figure of Catherine II in Russian cinema of the 2010s. These films recreate the principles of gynecocracy in the period of Catherine's reign. The analysis of TV series Catherine (2014–2016) and The Great (2015) aims to answer the question about the ideological and psychological meaning of such ‘retrohistory’ and its connection with the political concerns of the present. This study also considers these series within the cinematographic tradition of the twentieth century and the context provided by the memoirs of the eighteenth century. The conclusion is made that contemporary Russian historical cinema has lost its escapist function as well as its interest in depicting the emotional culture of the Catherinian era. Cinematic representations of the past are thus characterized by the following features: use of the past to legitimize the present; aesthetic empathy; ‘Russification’ of the German princess as a source of Russian national pride; gender self-presentation and projection of certain psychological complexes on the representation of Catherine in order to enhance the film's appeal to the female audience.
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1. Introduction

The era of Catherine II marked the culmination of Russian gynecocracy of the eighteenth century. The term ‘gynecocracy’ was introduced by Charles Masson, who wrote Secret Memoirs of the Court of St. Petersburg, where he described the cultural and historical situation of the Catherinian era as a time of undivided and all-embracing power of women [1]. This led Russian historian N.L.Pushkareva to characterize the period of Russian history that started with the death of Peter I and ended with the ascension to the throne of Emperor Paul as the period of “Russian matriarchy” [2]. The paradox of the gynecocratic myth in Russia was that the empress had to possess what was commonly regarded as male qualities, that is, to be androgynous. Russian philosopher
Ivan Ilyin wrote that “the Eternal Feminine and the Eternal Masculine both find their manifestation and reach the desired balance in the Russian woman” [3]. German Princess Sophie Auguste of Anhalt-Zerbst was not Russian by origin, but she became a perfect embodiment of the angrogyny principle during her reign: what she accomplished can be described as the appropriation of male roles and power by women, as British sociologist and folklore specialist Victor Turner put it [4].

Catherine’s reign, however, was far from being entirely trouble free. V. Proskurnina traced how the representations of Catherine evolved in the context of political strategies and literary symbolism of the eighteenth century, for example, in the 1860s the prevailing image was that of the ‘Amazon on the throne’ while in the 1880s and the early 1890s it was replaced by that of the ‘dying coquette’ [5]. To this we can add that in the 1860s–1880s Catherine was also often portrayed as Minerva and Felitsa (these images originate from Mikhail Lomonosov’s and Gavrili Derzhavin’s odes). The former representation was based on the comparison of Catherine to the goddess of wisdom and the latter emphasized her role as a woman in power.

Since cinema is one of the most visually expressive forms of art, which has a considerable ethical and aesthetic potential impact on the viewer, it is particularly interesting to analyze representations of Catherine II in Russian TV series of the 2010s and to explore the reasons for ‘Catherine craze’ in Russian cinema by comparing the contemporary representations of the Russian empress with those in the twentieth-century cinema, both Russian and international.

2. Materials and Methods

This study focuses on two large-scale Russian TV series, which illustrate the ‘return’ of Catherine II to Russian cinematographic space: Catherine (Ekaterina) (2014–2016) and The Great (Velikaya) (2015). We are also going to consider the following twentieth-century films for a more general cinematographic context of our research problem: The Scarlet Empress (1934), Captain’s Daughter (1958), Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka (1961), The Royal Hunt (1990), and Viva Gardes-Marines! (1991). The main literary source we use is the three versions of Catherine’s diary notes (Zapiski) she wrote at the age of 25, 42 and 63. The research methodology comprises a set of methods including gender studies methods, genetic, historical-functional, cultural-historical and historical-psychological methods.
3. Discussion

In the Russian twentieth century cinematographic tradition, the onomomyth of Minerva is masterly recreated in the image of Catherine the Great (played by Zoya Vasilkova) in *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka* directed by Alexander Rou. Catherine in the film is shown in all her magnificence and splendour: she smiles when a naive Ukrainian youth asks her to give him her slippers (*cherevichki*) for his beloved one. She thus represents a classic image of a ruler looking with benevolence and condescension on her subjects. The topic of Catherine's personal evolution was first raised in one of the most successful Russian film projects of the twentieth century – *Viva Gardes-Marines!* directed by Svetlana Druzhinina (1991). In this film, Kristina Orbakaite stars as charming, smart and crafty Fike, young Princess Sophie of Anhalt-Zerbst, looking as if she has just stepped out of a portrait by French painter Louis Caravaque.

Erosion of the state-imperial consciousness in the second half of the eighteenth century, among other things, manifested itself in the severe criticism directed against Empress Catherine. This criticism was mostly targeted at her voluptuousness, exaggerated by critics to almost mythical proportions. Charles Masson, whom we mentioned previously, compared Catherine to the priestesses of Cybele, Isis and Ceres, for whom “a man was often no more than...a tool of pleasure” [1], and criticized the institution of favouritism in Russia and its ‘harem-like’ forms.

The legend about Catherine’s lascivious and depraved lifestyle played a significant role in her cinematographic representations in the twentieth century. This tradition was started by the famous Hollywood film *The Scarlet Empress* starring Marlene Dietrich. In post-Soviet Russia, this tradition was continued by the film *The Royal Hunt* (1990), employing a variety of satirical devices to portray the aging empress (played by Svetlana Kryuchkova). Catherine in this film is emphatically off-putting: she is shown as a domineering woman of extreme voluptuousness.

TV series *Catherine*, starring Marina Alexandrova, was originally meant to be a trilogy with the parts entitled *Beginning*, *Ascent* and *Impostors*. The first part of the trilogy won the TEFI and the Golden Eagle Award.

The first remarkable feature that attracts attention while watching this film is the directors’ intention to draw the Catherinian era closer to the modern audience, both visually and verbally. Therefore, characters in *Catherine* do not wear wigs and Count Shuvalov, one of the most elegant nobles of Elizabeth’s court, appears scruffy and unshaven on the screen. Such approach, however, is detrimental to the film’s ability to recreate the cultural and historical atmosphere of the eighteenth century, unimaginable
without wigs and other fashionable accessories such as fans, patches, snuff boxes, not to mention the famous red talons. Eduard Fuchs rightfully called costumes of the Gallant Epoch the “livery of sin”, pointing out that the “costume is the form that the spirit imparts to the body according to the taste of time” [6]. The ‘modernized’ appearance of the key characters is supplemented with their modern turn of phrase: for instance, Grand Duke Petr Fedorovich (future Peter III) calls Catherine ‘a crazy bitch’, while the Empress herself tells her nephew to ‘shut up’. The same applies to the characters’ behavior and manners, which do not conform to the eighteenth-century etiquette. For instance, the film includes a scene in which Catherine faints after enraged Grand Duke Petr Fedorovich throws a vase at her. When Count Alexey Bestuzhev, a powerful chancellor, is arrested and is told that he is now out of the Empress’s favour, he is knocked to the ground, beaten and kicked, apparently in order to get this message across faster.

The second significant aspect of the series is that it abandons the tradition of depicting the Elizabethan period as a carefree epoch with all the usual attributes such as joyful masquerades, playful inversion of gender roles, minuets, fireworks accompanied by the music of Araja and Valeriani and the sumptuous Elizabethan Baroque created by the genius of Bartolomeo Rastrelli. On the contrary, the series portray Russia as an extremely brutal and criminal place. No sooner had Catherine arrived in Russia than she was poisoned by L’Estocq, the physician of Empress Elizabeth, who wanted Russia to be ruled by the French princess. Once he disposed of the assassins he had hired to kill Catherine, he himself was exposed, branded and executed. According to the film, all these events happened in 1744 while in reality L’Estocq fell from grace only in 1748 and lived until his death in 1767. The film is riddled with all kinds of torture, including the rack (doeba), and nobody seems to be entirely impervious to this danger. Even Catherine’s mother, a German duchess, is threatened with torture and execution by Empress Elizabeth for her alleged correspondence with the king of Prussia Frederick. Violent and bloody scenes in the Secret Chancery are interspersed with scenes in royal chambers, thus creating an impression that eighteenth-century Russia was all about torture, denunciations and spy hysteria. Such representation of Russia creates an interesting ironic contrast with the words of a famous nineteenth-century Russian historian Vasily Klyuchevsky, who wrote that “never was the life so easy in Russia and no other reign until 1762 left such pleasant memories” [7].

The third important aspect of the series The Great is its authors’ apparent intention to demonstrate that only this kind of Russia was able to resist the hostile actions of European states, in particular Prussia, which had launched against Russia the next Drang
nach Osten. Thus, modern Russian state ideology is projected onto the eighteenth-century history, which becomes particularly evident if we look at the figure of brutal Chancellor Bestuzhev played by Vladimir Menshov, who proclaims: “Russia will have no friends! Russia has grown out of this!” It should be noted that the first part of the trilogy was released in 2014, when rumours were already in the air that Russia was about to face the sanctions for the annexation of the Crimea, thus fuelling the patriotic ardor of the film. Russian guardsmen during the Seven Years’ War drink to the victory of the Russian arms, toasting to the death of Prussia and King Frederick. The King himself is ready to fight back and dreams of nothing less than exterminating the whole Romanov dynasty, including his admirer Grand Duke Petr Fedorovich, which is supposed to convince the viewer that ruthlessness is essential for the survival of Russia amongst the enemies in the eighteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries alike.

What role is reserved for Empress Catherine in this story? The message the series seeks to convey is as follows: it is really hard for a woman to be a ruler, a good ruler in particular.

The psychological complexes such as the Cinderella complex and the Little Mermaid syndrome are projected simultaneously onto Catherine’s story, thus turning her into a recognizable character of conventional melodramas for women. A naive young girl comes to a strange country and, despite people’s hostility towards her, she manages to win them over and, after many trials and tribulations, she finally earns herself a place in the sun. For this, however, she has to sacrifice her heart, which is gradually covered with copper, but in the end, Catherine becomes a legend in her own lifetime, a larger-than-life figure close to the mythologized image of the Russian Minerva and Semiramis of the North.

The interpretation of historical events in the light of the Cinderella complex leads the directors to depict Empress Elizabeth as a kind of evil step-mother. Empress Elizabeth, known for her joie de vivre, masterly played by Yulia Aug, is presented as a sinister character, shocking the audience with her cruel attitude both in politics (the story of the baby tsar Ivan Antonovich) and in private life. She persistently finds ways to humiliate the young Grand Duchess: after the latter arrives in Russia, she is immediately prohibited from speaking any language, except Russian, which seems particularly surprising since in this period the Russian royal court was starting to embrace the French language. Not only does Elizabeth force Catherine to go through the humiliating procedure of virginity testing twice, she also deprives the younger woman of her name Frederika and under pain of imprisonment forbids her to even remember about her German origin. The Empress keeps threatening Catherine with imprisonment and monastery confinement.
and for two years (!) does not allow her to see her son Paul. This contradicts the third version of Catherine’s memoir, which mentions that she could not see her baby for the first forty days after giving birth.

At the same time Catherine in the series becomes a classic example of the Little Mermaid Syndrome as she is obsessed with love and is ready to sacrifice everything for the sake of love. She is infatuated with her second cousin Petr Fedorovich and is dreaming of becoming the first in 500 years princess Anhalt-Zerbst to marry for love. According to the series, it was the search for her male hero that was Catherine’s main occupation in life: the role of her love interest is successively played by Polish Count Ponyatovsky, then by Orlov and Potemkin. In reality, however, for Empress Catherine, who became known in history as Catherine the Great, love always went hand in hand with state affairs and ambitious plans. Therefore, her first favourites – Grigory Orlov and Grigory Potemkin – appear not only in the journals of the royal court but also in Russian history books. In the TV series, however, love scenes prevail over those showing Catherine’s actual engagement in state affairs and her legislative activity. When we see Catherine played by Marina Alexandrova, it is hard to believe that she could be the author of Instruction (Nakaz), highly praised by Alexander Pushkin, that she could be corresponding on philosophical matters with Voltaire as well as take professional interest in history and journalism, write comedies, tragedies, and fairy tales. Even though on her second day of marriage Catherine exclaims ‘I love reading!’, it is but a faint echo of the popular myth of Catherine the ardent bibliophile. In this series, we are more likely to see Empress Elizabeth with a quill pen in her hand than Grand Duchess Catherine with a book.

Catherine’s role in fostering Enlightenment in Russia is rendered insignificant by the thunder of Russia’s military triumphs, which becomes particularly noticeable in the second part of the trilogy Catherine. Ascent, where the Empress is being torn apart between Orlov and Potemkin while the reports of the multiplying victories at the theatre of the Russo-Turkish war keep arriving.

On the whole, it is a series meant for family viewing as it provides useful guidelines for women on how to survive near the throne, how to get the throne and how to retain it. There is a remarkable scene in the film, where young Catherine is choosing a name under which she would like to go down in history books, saying: ‘I will be Catherine the Clever’ or ‘Catherine the Faithful’.

The character played by Alexandrova bears little resemblance to the historical Catherine the Great. In the 12th episode of the first part of the trilogy she suddenly transforms from a nervous young woman, with her hair loose, in a night gown wandering through the
corridors of the Winter Palace, into a flamboyant empress, who steps onto the Russian throne with an inscrutable face, unburdened by the heavy crown jewels. This story just seems too far-fetched to be taken seriously. Marina Alexandrova starring as Catherine appears, however, to be perfectly comfortable with this inconsistency: speaking of the gender-related aspect of power, she draws a comparison between the principles of male and female rule: “If a country is ruled by a king, the crown bears heavily on his head, but if a country is ruled by a queen, it is her heart that the crown bears onto” [8], and this is precisely the point the series seems to be making.

The series The Great, starring Yulia Snigir, provides its own response to the message of the earlier series. Yulia Snigir went to great lengths to prepare for this role: she read Catherine’s memoirs and historical literature, including the book by French historian Henri Troyat Catherine the Great. The filmmakers hired a consultant from the Hermitage; many props were specially made for the film, including fans, the chess, the globe, and tin soldiers.

Thus, the series aims not only to show the audience the authentic looking scenery and costumes of the period but also recreate the spirit of this epoch of ‘the pen and the sword’. In the series, characters are shown playing baccara, chess, and game of graces; they hunt, spin intrigues, go to war, join the Masonic lodge, and read. Unlike the series Catherine, in The Great, the Empress can often be seen holding a book or heard mentioning the names of Voltaire, de Marivaux, Montesquieu, and Swift. The language the characters speak is close to the standard language of the eighteenth century, with the only exception of Empress Elizabeth, whose emphatically colloquial speech is supposed to be a sign of her ‘low’ origin – her mother was a Lithuanian peasant woman Marta Skavronska, who later became Russian Empress Catherine I.

In an attempt to construct a ‘psychologically truthful’ portrait of Catherine and her epoch, the filmmakers based the plot of the series on the third version of her Notes, written for her son Paul and for his descendants. In this version of the memoirs Catherine makes her views quite clear as she intends to demonstrate the inability of her husband Peter III to rule Russia; she also justifies his untimely and violent death by pointing to a certain tragic flaw in his personality. This argument also serves to demonstrate that her own ascension to the throne resulted naturally from her views and choices, which gradually transformed into the philosophy of ideal governance.

Second, the series explicitly postulates the ‘monarchist idea’, which is all but absent from the series Catherine, in which one of the most discussed topics is the heir being born by the Empress from Sergey Saltykov – “a secret of tsarist autocracy uncovered”, as Soviet historian Natan Eidelman put it [9]. Catherine herself wrote about this quite
openly in the first version of her notes addressed to Count Stanislav Ponyatovsky [10]. In the third version of her notes, however, she only hints at this fact, following the ‘sapienti sat’ principle [11]. *The Great* makes it clear that Catherine did not have an affair with Saltykov and that she fought off all his advances by insistently repeating that she was ‘married’, despite all the efforts of Empress Elizabeth to bring them together.

Third, the growing role of religion in Russian contemporary public life has certainly affected the series, in which the religious discourse has a strong presence, in contrast with the earlier film and Catherine’s own memoirs. *The Great* makes a point of showing that Catherine became the Russian ‘mother empress’ by adopting Orthodox culture. Catherine starts to learn about Russian culture after attending an Orthodox service, which produces a deep impression on her. Her acquaintance with the guardsmen and Count Orlov takes place at Easter, when she gives the guardsmen a Holstein bull as an Easter gift. In later episodes, Chancellor Bestuzhev presents Catherine an Easter egg and an icon of St. Catherine as a sign of his trust and good feelings towards her.

Fourth, the prevailing discourse in the series is undoubtedly that of patriotism and Russiacentrism, which was to a greater extent characteristic of the second part of Catherine’s reign, in 1770–1780s, the period when the country reached the pinnacle of prestige and influence on the international arena. Thus, the series provides a glimpse into this anticipated future. All the positive characters, despite their intrigues and clashes of interests, are unconditional patriots of Russia. Empress Elizabeth promises to find money for the war with Prussia even if she has to sell all her dresses, diamonds and go begging on the church porch.

Thus, the trajectory of Catherine II in the film leads her from being a German princess to becoming a grand duchess and ending up as a Russian empress. What the series keeps silent about is a well-known historical fact that throughout her 18 years of life in Russia as a grand duchess, Catherine was explicitly pro-Prussian, which for a long time helped her find common ground with Petr Fedorovich. In the second version of her *Notes* of 1771, she carefully describes her clashes with Empress Elizabeth over her contacts with King Frederick. This fact obviously does not fit into the interpretations of Catherine’s life offered by the Russian patriotic TV series of the mid-2010s.

The film’s patriotic message involves hatred and contempt for Russia’s enemies, which is the fifth significant characteristic of the film. The main adversary of Russia and the Russians are the Prussians. Petr Fedorovich is the main object of the guardsmen’s hatred and derision, and they even call him “Holstein abomination”. In the series, Petr Fedorovich appears as an ideologist of Eurocentrism and peace with Prussia. His ‘European dream’ is expressed in somewhat ambiguous terms of ‘enlightenment’ and
‘freedom’, which the peace with King Frederick would supposedly bring. Therefore, the criticism of the views and rhetoric of Petr Fedorovich in the film is actually targeted at the values of European liberalism in general. All the positive characters in the film, on the contrary, associate enlightenment with Russian national culture and science embodied by the famous Russian poet Mikhail Lomonosov.

The ‘Russian spirit’ in the film is embodied by guardsmen Orlov (who had a real-life prototype Count Grigory Orlov) and Zalessky (fictional character), who loathe anything related to ‘Holstein-Prussian spirit’. This antagonism is most vividly revealed in the scene of ‘culinary patriotism’, where they deal with the ‘German’ gift of sausages and pork presented to them for Easter by Petr Fedorovich. Even before the war with Prussia, the Russian guardsmen keep saying: “The Germans are a pest, it’s like being under the yoke of Biron” and ask Zalessky to entertain them on the holy day of Easter by ‘showing Prussian Petrushka’ puppet, shouting ‘russisch Schwein’ and marching ‘ein-zwein, ein-zwein’.

Therefore, Catherine’s main goal in the series is to become ‘Russian’. Her way of exploring the Russian soul is illustrated with two parallel scenes when she first sees Russian people walking barefoot and kissing each other and when she finally steps barefoot on the snow herself (a fictional scene). The quintessence of this Russian spirit in the film is embodied by Zalessky and Orlov, officers, who are fearlessly loyal to Catherine and who put her to the throne, turning her into the Russian ‘mother empress’.

4. Conclusion

What makes Catherine II and her time so attractive for contemporary Russian cinema?

One of the reasons is that this epoch is associated with stability and grandeur, even though it is no more than a commonly shared stereotype: in fact, the Catherinian era was the age of impostors, peasant wars and intense subjugation of the peasants. However, as it often happens, what is remembered most easily is the patriotic myth about the ‘golden age’ disseminated by mass culture to legitimate the present, which is one of the key cultural trends of modernity.

Second, the Catherinian epoch is known as a ‘costume’ period, characterized by fanciful and ornamental male and female fashion, which is what makes it so aesthetically appealing to modern audiences. The military jacket turned into a source of aesthetic empathy in the Napoleonic era. Therefore, the Catherinian era was the last pre-revolutionary period characterized by fascination with the civil costume.
Third, the plot focusing on Catherine's life story seems particularly flattering to the mass Russian audience: Catherine was a German princess who could realize her personal ambitions and potential only after coming to Russia. If she had stayed in her small county of Anhalt-Zerbst, would she have come to be known as ‘Minerva’ and ‘Semiramis’?

Fourth, the twists and turns of Catherine's private life, the gender component in her representations make her particularly suitable as a character for women's TV shows, attracting hundreds and thousands female viewers. Catherine was a female ruler, who rose above the public opinion as she governed Russia for 34 years and took on young favorites, the last one of whom, Platon Zubov, was 33 years her younger. Psychologization in the representation of Catherine is taken to the extreme in these films, especially in the series The Great. Thus, the Soviet tradition of depicting her as a symbol of hateful autocracy, devoid of any feelings, was all but abandoned. There is a striking contrast between the contemporary series and the Soviet film Captain’s Daughter directed by V.Kaplunovsky, showing the Empress as an impersonal state function: the audience sees only the frills of her luxurious dress and her hand holding the signed order.

Unlike other historical ‘pen and sword’ films, such as the films starring Jean Marais or the above-mentioned Russian films about Gardes-Marines starring Dmitry Kharatyan and Sergey Zhigunov, the contemporary TV series about Catherine do not present the past as some kind of escapist utopia. Films about Catherine the Great aim to incite neither of the two types of nostalgia described by Svetlana Boym [12]. These series don’t treat the Catherinian era as some kind of lost ‘golden age’ and they don’t make us regret that we cannot revive this epoch by reconstructing, step by step, it’s cultural and historical atmosphere and mentality. The films about the eighteenth century appear to have lost the emotional and ethical code which previously performed a didactic function. The death of Peter III in Catherine is portrayed as a shockingly cynical cold-blooded murder. Even the worst enemy of Catherine the Great in the eighteenth century could not have imagined such a scene. The audience of the twenty-first century will have to adapt to this new cinematographic reality, conceptualized by the directors of both films as an anticipation of the arrival of new Russian gynecocracy.
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