Beyond Medieval Europe

THE RISE AND DEMISE OF THE MYTH OF THE RUS' LAND

by

CHARLES J. HALPERIN

ARC HUMANITIES PRESS

BEYOND MEDIEVAL EUROPE

Further Information and Publications

www.arc-humanities.org/our-series/arc/bme/

THE RISE AND DEMISE OF THE MYTH OF THE RUS' LAND

by
CHARLES J. HALPERIN

ARC HUMANITIES PRESS

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN (Hardback): 9781802700114
ISBN (Paperback): 9781802700572
e-ISBN (PDF): 9781802700565

www.arc-humanities.org
Printed and bound in the UK (by CPI Group [UK] Ltd), USA (by Bookmasters), and elsewhere using print-on-demand technology.

CONTENTS

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I FIRST BECAME interested in the myth of the Rus' Land when writing my doctoral dissertation on early Muscovite thought. Although Russia and the Mongols and then Ivan the Terrible became my primary research interests, periodically I explored additional aspects of the topic. Discussing my latest article on the Rus' Land in Ukraine, Serhii Plokhy suggested that I publish all the articles together, which inspired the current book. I hope he is not disappointed in the result. *The Rise and Demise of the Myth of the Rus' Land* is not a facsimile reprint of my articles. I have tried here to integrate this material, published over a long period in a wide variety of venues, into a coherent, consistent, and credible synthesis. I have deleted duplications and added material. I have restructured the presentation by moving material from one chapter to another. Occasionally I indicate my changes of opinion from my earlier published views. Cross-chapter references should assist the reader to see the "big picture." This book is hardly comprehensive, but I hope that it sheds new light upon the development of the myth of the Rus' Land and its cognate terms and inspires other historians to pursue this theme.

Material from the following articles has been utilized with the kind permission of their publishers: "The Concept of the Russian Land from the Ninth to the Fourteenth Century," *Russian History* 2, no. 1 (1975): 29–38, Brill, originally a paper at the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies Convention, New York City, 19 April 1973; "Tverian Political Thought in the Fifteenth Century," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 18, no. 3 (July-September, 1977): 267–73 and "Novgorod and the 'Novgorodian Land'," *Cahiers du monde russe* 40, no. 3 (July-September, 1999): 345–64, École des Hautes études en sciences sociales, Paris; "The Concept of the *ruskaia zemlia* and Medieval National Consciousness from the Tenth to the Fifteenth Centuries," *Nationalities Papers* 8, no. 2 (Spring 1980): 75–86, Cambridge University Press, originally a paper at the American Historical Association Convention, San Francisco, December 29, 1978; "Ivan IV and the *russkaia zemlia*" in Charles J. Halperin, *Ivan IV and Muscovy* (Bloomington: Slavica, 2020), 329–40 and "Pskov and the Pskov Land" in Halperin, *Ivan IV and Muscovy* (Bloomington: Slavica, 2020), 309–28, Slavica Publishers; and "The Absent Rus' Land and Bohdan Khmelnytsky," *East/West: Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 7, no. 2 (2020): 99–115, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. "Alexander Nevskii and the Suzdalian Land," is based upon a paper circulated at the conference "Alexander Nevskii: the Person, the Epoch, and Historical Memory," St. Petersburg, May 25–27, 2021.

I wish to thank the staffs of the Slavic Reference Service, University of Illinois at Urbana–Champaign Library, and Inter-Library Loan, Document Delivery Service, Herman G. Wells Library, Indiana University, Bloomington for their assistance.

I have previously erroneously translated "*russkaia zemlia*" for the Kievan (Kyivan) period as the "Russian Land." Because the East Slavs had not yet divided up into Ukrainians, Belarusians, and Russians, technically *russkaia zemlia* should be translated as the "East Slavic Land." The translation "Russian" represents Great Russian chauvinism toward the Kievan inheritance. In an effort to finesse that prejudice, some scholars

invented a hybrid anglicization of *Rus'* as an adjective, the "Rus'ian Land." I find both "East Slavic Land" and "Rus'ian Land" artificial, and awkward. I prefer to lose the grammar but keep the content by translating it as the "Rus' Land," despite the fact that "Rus'" is not an adjective. I am not alone in such usage. Of course, *russkii* referring to the Muscovite grand principality and later tsardom from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century could legitimately be translated as "Russian," but that would entail employing two translations of the phrase, "Rus' Land" for the Kievan and Mongol periods as well as for early modern Ukraine, and "Russian Land" for early modern Muscovy. Because I am trying to emphasize the evolution of a single myth I have for that reason preferred to use only a single form. For simplicity's sake I will disregard variant medieval spellings such as *ruskaia* and variants such as *rustaia* and use only the normative spelling. I have previously too often used other noun place names as adjectives when preceding "land," for example, the "Novgorod Land." To accentuate the uniqueness of the Rus' Land I have now standardized all cognate terms using adjectival forms, ergo the "Novgorodian Land."

Following then common usage I also referred to the Rus' dynasty as the Riurikids, descendants of the mythical "founder" of Rus' the Varangian Riurik. In deference to recent research primarily by Christian Raffensperger,[1] I have instead identified the dynasty as Volodimerovichi (Volydymyrovichi), descendants of the historical Grand Prince of Kiev and later Saint Vladimir.

Although I argue that some "land" phrases were no more than phrases, not concepts or myths, I have sometimes in the past used lower-case "land" to distinguish, for example, the "Novgorodian Land" from the "Novgorodian land." Here I wish to emphasize the technical and grammatical uniformity of the "land"-terminology system, so I have uniformly capitalized "land" even when discussing purely descriptive phrases. I have also as much as possible avoided putting "land"-terms in quotation marks unless they are included in quotations with additional words to avoid their distracting effect upon the reader.

---

1 For example, Christian Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe: Rus' in the Medieval World, 988–1146* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012) and Raffensperger, *The Kingdom of Rus'* (Kalamazoo: Arc Humanities Press, 2017). See also Donald Ostrowski, "Was There a Riurikid Dynasty in Early Rus'?" *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 52, no. 1 (March 2018): 30–49.

INTRODUCTION

MICHAEL CHERNIAVSKY WROTE that references to the Rus' Land were too fragmentary to constitute a myth. The phrase never even acquired a permanent epithet such as "illumined" (*svetlaia*), which was attached to it only intermittently. A myth required greater rationalization and utilization. "One might say that there was…a myth of the ruler, but not of the land, of the country and people as a whole. If anything the myth of the ruler was created at the expense of the myth of the 'land.'"[1] I would contend that the Rus' Land did refer to a country and a people, but the country was defined as the territory ruled by a Volodimerovich prince and the people were defined as the residents of that territory. Therefore, the Rus' Land served overwhelmingly to elevate the status of the ruler,[2] not the country or the people, but it was still a myth, a myth of the Rus'/Volodimerovichi princely dynasty. To be a "land" a political entity had to have a Rus' dynastic line. Moreover, the Rus' Land did undergo rationalization and rather frequent utilization. Russian nationalist historiography erred in projecting adherence to the myth beyond the elite to the "people," for which we have no evidence, and in mistaking the myth of the Rus' Land for a Romantic nationalist reality, as if in all periods the Rus' Land meant "Russia."[3] This book treats the "Rus' Land" as a technical term, an historical and political myth that united the elite around the ruler. Connecting a ruler to the myth of the Rus' Land legitimized him.

Because the evolution of the myth of the Rus' Land can best be understood within the context of the system of "land" names of countries, this study will pay considerable attention to alternative "land" terminology. Some of these phrases rose to the level of concepts, even myths, but others did not. Why they did not tells us something about the nature of the "land"-name system and manifests the unique elevated status of the Rus' Land. Consequently, in order to clarify the meaning of the myth of the Rus' Land, I will devote much space to sources which did not refer to the Rus' Land. Genre of source, geographic location, and political conjunction all influenced who could or could not invoke the Rus' Land.

Chapter 1 analyzes the origins of the "land"-nomenclature system and the changing meanings of the myth from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries. The myth probably arose

---

1 Michael Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), 104–5, esp. 105n15.

2 There is only one case where the myth of the Rus' Land was utilized to criticize a ruler, in thirteenth-century Galicia. See below. Otherwise Cherniavsky was correct that the Rus' Land (unlike Holy Rus') did not serve as the intellectual foundation for opposition to the ruler.

3 See for example Iu. G. Alekseev, "Istoricheskaia kontseptsiia russkoi zemli i politicheskaia doktrina tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva," in *Genezis i razvitie feodalizma v Rossii: problemy ideologii i kul'tury: mezhvuzovskii sbornik k 80-letiiu V. V. Mavrodina* (Leningrad: LGU, 1987), 140–54, who refers to the uninterrupted continuity of the Rus' Land from Kievan times through the reign of Muscovite Grand Prince Ivan III.

in pre-Christian Rus' and retained a pagan meaning after the adoption of Christianity as the state religion in the late tenth century. Geographically it underwent three phases, from denoting the Dnieper (Dnipro) River valley to applying to all the East Slavic lands under Rus' princes and then exclusively to the northeast.

Chapter 2, for the same period, rejects any notion that the Rus' Land reflected national consciousness, not a priori from the absence of anything remotely resembling a Rus' "nation" at the time, but from its malleable non-ethnic usage.

Chapter 3 examines an alternative "land" myth, the "Tverian Land," expressed in a mid-fifteenth-century Tverian source, which had to be utilized because by this time the Muscovite principality has essentially usurped the myth of the Rus' Land as its exclusive property.

Chapter 4 describes occurrences of the phrase the Novgorodian Land and explains its failure to rise to the level of myth by the absence of a Novgorodian Rus' princely line. After Novgorod's annexation by Muscovy even sources of Novgorodian provenance and local patriotism propagated the myth of the Rus' Land.

Chapter 5 examines the Suzdalian Land, a phrase that could have or should have risen to the level of myth because there were resident Volodimirovich princes but did not, probably because of the overlap of the grand principality of Vladimir with the Suzdalian Land and competing terms such as the Rostovian Land and Vladimirian Land. The Suzdalian Land disappeared in contemporary usage when Muscovy imposed its identity as the Rus' Land on the grand principality of Vladimir.

Chapter 6 analyzes the non-myth Pskovian Land, whose evolution matched that of the Novgorodian Land because of the lack of a native Volodimerovich dynasty in Pskov during the period of Pskov's independence as well as after Muscovy's acquisition of Pskov, when, again, the Rus' Land myth intruded into local sources.

Chapter 7 addresses how the creation of a Muscovite tsardom with Ivan IV's coronation as tsar in 1547 affected usage of the term, which could and perhaps should have been replaced by the Rus' Tsardom. Nevertheless, the myth of the Rus' Land survived and even flourished. However, even though Muscovy now encompassed virtually all "ethnic" Russian territories, the myth of the Rus' Land still did not acquire a national meaning. The inhabitants of the Rus' Land were Russian not because they were ethnically Russian but because they lived in regions ruled by the ruler of the Rus' Land. During the Time of Troubles at the turn of the seventeenth century Muscovy temporarily lost its princely line, and the myth of the Rus' Land went out of usage, never to be restored by the non-Volodimerovich Romanovs.

Chapter 8 analyzes an overlooked phrase that for obvious reasons might have been expected to play a more prominent role in Muscovite thought, the Muscovite Land. Of course, the "land" name system generated the phrase, but it never acquired any conceptual or mythic relevance in large part because Muscovy's domination of the myth of the Rus' Land made it superfluous.

Chapter 9 turns to what became the Ukraine and Belarus from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries. In the thirteenth century chronicles from Galicia and Volhynia called Galicia–Volhynia the Rus' Land. They also employed the myth of the Rus' Land to criticize Grand Prince Daniil for surrendering to the Mongols, a unique anti-

princely instance in medieval and early modern East-Slavic history. Poland annexed Galicia after the extinction of its princely line, but the principality retained its identity as the Rus' Land as a province of the Crown of Poland. Curiously during Ivan IV's reign, despite Muscovy's self-proclaimed monopolization of the myth of the Rus' Land, Ivan IV in correspondence with the king of Poland acknowledged the latter's rule over the Rus' Land, meaning Galicia. In Belarus the term Rus' Land survived in a variety of sometimes contradictory geographic definitions, but Bohdan Khmelnytsky's Cossack state did not invoke the Rus' Land, perhaps in part because it had no Rus' princely line.

Therefore, by the second half of the seventeenth century, neither Muscovy nor Ukraine claimed to be the Rus' Land. The myth possessed only historical meaning until it was rediscovered and anachronistically turned into an expression of patriotic Russian nationalist sentiment by Imperial Russian historiography.

Chapter 1

THE RUS' LAND (TENTH TO FIFTEENTH CENTURIES)

THE HISTORY OF Old Rus' literature, academician Dmitrii Sergeevich Likhachev observed, is the history of the Rus' Land (*russkaia zemlia*).[1] For the type of sources which he had in mind Likhacev was undoubtedly correct: the myth of the Rus' Land does, to an unusual extent, dominate Old Rus' literature. It is the oldest and most frequently used term for the first Rus' state in Kiev. It achieved an enviable longevity, surviving as a description of Muscovy into the seventeenth century. Surprisingly, however, the myth of the Rus' Land itself has been the subject of little scholarly investigation.[2] This chapter will analyze the development of the myth of the Rus' Land from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries.

Insufficient attention has been attached to the precise form of the phrase, the Rus' Land, despite the fact that scholars almost unconsciously create comparable "land" terminology for regions not so designated in the sources.[3] Why should the Kievan state have been called a "land" (*zemlia*)? This nomenclature is far from accidental or unconscious. Despite the existence of alternative, and seemingly more appropriate terms, the *Tale of Bygone Years* (*Povest' vremennykh let*) does not call the Kievan polity the Rus' country (*strana*), the Rus' state (*gosudarstvo*), the Rus' principality (*kniazhenie*), or the Rus' fatherland (*otechestvo*).[4] Similarly, the *Tale of Bygone Years* calls all states "lands," even when more accurate terms were utilized in other, usually later, Rus' sources.[5]

---

1 D. S. Likhachev, "Zadonshchina," *Literaturnaia ucheba* 3 (1941): 87–100 at 94.

2 Horace G. Lunt, "What the Rus' Primary Chronicle tells us about the origin of the Slavs and Slavic writing," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 19 (1995): 335–57 at 335.

3 For example, P. P. Tolochko entitled his article "Kievskaia zemlia" in *Drevnerusskie kniazhestva, X–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975), 5–56, although he noted that the contemporary sources referred to the Dnieper River valley as the Rus' Land. The phrase "Kievan Land" did occur much later, for example, in *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* [hereafter *PSRL*], vol. 4 (St. Petersburg, 1848), *sub anno* (hereafter "s.a.") 6992 (1482): 134 (Academic manuscript of the Novgorod IV Chronicle). It was just as anachronistic for Tolochko to mention the Kievshchina (Tolochko, "Kievskaia zemlia," especially 5–7). Similarly, P. V. Alekseev justified the name of his monograph, *Polotskaia zemlia (Ocherki istorii severnoi Belorusii) v IX–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966), on the basis of a single chronicle reference to the "Polotskian Land" (5); cf. *PSRL*, 1, s.a. 6626 (1128): 299.

4 The Kievan chronicler was so obsessed with the origin of the "Rus' Land" that he provides two dates of origin: 852 and 862. See *Povest' vremennykh let* [hereafter *PVL*, and vol. 1 is intended unless specified], vol. 1, *Tekst i perevod*, ed. V. P. Adrianova-Peretts (Moscow: Nauka, 1950), 17, 18. *Russkaia strana* occurs twice (*PVL*, 35, 39); these are rarities. I have not been able to locate any usage of the words *otechestvo* or *gosudarstvo* in *PVL*, although they do occur in other Kievan texts. *Kniazhenie* is used (*PVL*, 135) to mean "princely reign" rather than "principality"; in any event it does not occur with the adjective "Rus'."

5 *PVL*, 11, 12, *Ugorskaia zemlia*, but never the later form *Ugorskoe korolevstvo*; *Gretskaia zemlia*

In short, we are dealing with a uniform system of nomenclature of states, one probably based upon a projection of the grammatical form of the native term, which calls Rus' a "land." Whatever the significance of this precise terminology, a point to which much of this chapter will be devoted, it is at least reasonably certain that this system of nomenclature is unique in the European context. I have not been able to locate analogous terms of equal importance or similar systems of equal consistency and longevity in the sources of any other medieval people, Slavic or non-Slavic.[6] The Rus' system of "land"-names did not result from Scandinavian influence.[7] The uniqueness of the Kievan term is confirmed, albeit indirectly, by the fact that by and large in the Kievan period, or even thereafter, basically the term did not translate. The most common terms for Rus' were, for example, the Latin *Rus*, the Greek *Rhosias* or *Ros*, or the French *Rousie*, which did not reproduce the specific form of the Rus' term.[8] Therefore, the myth of the Rus'

(27, 116, 246), never the later de rigueur *Grecheskoe tsarstvo*. *PVL* is, I have a feeling, far more rigorous in its use of "land"-terms than the twelfth-century chronicles because it is closer to the roots of this system of nomenclature. Other examples in the *PVL*: Bulgarian Land (19, 23 [which should be "tsardom"; see next footnote], Polish Land (98, 101, 116, 176); Slovenian Land (12, 14), the former meaning Novgorod, the latter Slovenia in present day Hungary, and Derevlian (40), Polovtsian (160), Muromian and Rostovian Lands (168).

6 For an alternative but undocumented view, cf. A. V. Soloviev, "Le dit de la ruine de la terre russe," *Byzantion* 23 (1952): 105–28 at 125, and numerous other articles by Soloviev. Those specialists I have consulted have been unable to locate, for example, the phrase *terra Franciae*, which Soloviev invokes as an analogue. Soloviev is fundamentally correct that there seems to have been a common Slavic "land"-state system, but its development in each Slavic state differs: The "Czech Land" is used in Cosmas of Prague but was superceded by the concepts of the Crown and Kingdom (*corona* and *regnum*); see any edition or translation of Cosmas of Prague, *Chronicle of Bohemia*. The earliest Polish chronicle does not use a phrase like the "Polish Land"; see any edition or translation of Gallus Anonymus, *Deeds of the Princes of the Poles*. Bulgarian sources refer exclusively to the "Bulgarian *tsarstvo*"; see G. A. Il'inskii, *Gramoty bolgarskikh tsarei* (Moscow: Sinodal'naia, 1911). Serbian sources do refer to the "Serbian and Dalmatian Land" but use other terms, such as kingdom, indiscriminately: see any edition of Danilo, *Zivoty kraljeva i arhiepiskopa srpskih*. Obviously there is no pattern to this aspect of nomenclature: the evolution of the terms differs among the Czechs and Poles, whose earliest chronicles are in Latin, and in the South Slavs between the Serbs and Bulgars.

7 It is true that medieval Scandinavian sources (in the "old" versions of Icelandic, Swedish, Norse, and Danish plus perhaps German, Anglo-Saxon and perhaps other languages) commonly used geographic-political names which included land/long/la, but the names of the three Scandinavian states had other forms: Danmark (Denmark), Svithjob/Svithjoth (Sweden, sometimes Scythia), and Noregr (Norway), and the East-Slavic area of the Rus' was Gardarik. Therefore, despite innumerable terms such as Serkland (Land of Islam), Grekland (Greek Land), and of course Iceland, Finland, Gotland, Greenland, Vinland/Wineland, etc., the medieval Scandinavians do not seem to have had a *system* of politicized land-names. See the numerous quotations from sources in Omeljan Pritsak, *The Origins of Rus'*, vol. 1: *Old Scandinavian Sources Other Than the Sagas* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1981).

8 Alexandre V. Soloviev, *Le nom byzantin de la Russie* (Den Haag: Mouton, 1957), 16–19, and numerous other articles, although Soloviev does not always point out that the terms are not literal translations of the "Rus' Land." There were exceptions, though, mostly from the post Kievan-period. Obolensky has even located a Greek equivalent, *ge Rosike* (Apollinaris of Laodicea, *Iiterpretario in Psaltem*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne, Patrologia Graeca 33, col. 1412, as quoted in Obolensky in

Land seems to have carried some particular intellectual baggage the nuances of which were not understood and hence not translated by the neighbours of Rus'. Where can we turn to try to uncover what those connotations of the myth were?

It is best to begin with the geographic dimension of the myth of the Rus' Land, partly because here at least there is some relevant and cogent scholarship. Arsenii Nasonov showed that the original meaning of the Rus' Land in geographic terms was that triangle of territory bounded by Kiev, Chernigov (Chernihiv), and Pereiaslavl'. As the area under the sovereignty of the Kievan dynasty expanded in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, newly acquired territories were "incorporated" into the Rus' Land, until eventually the patrimony (*otchina*) of the Volodimerovichi encompassed all East Slavdom.[9]

At the same time the Rus' Land retained its earlier meaning of the Kievan triangle, so that twelfth-century chroniclers record princes from Vladimir–Suzdal' in the Northeast, Novgorod in the North, and Galicia–Volhynia in the Southwest, among others, as going to the Rus' Land when Kiev is meant.[10] How the tension between these two sets of geographic coordinates of the Rus' Land was resolved is best demonstrated in the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* (*Slovo o polku Igoreve*), the lay epic "commemorating" the defeat of Prince Igor' Sviatoslavovich of Novgorod-Seversk, in the Chernigov region, by the Polovtsy in 1186.[11] Igor' and his retinue fight for the Rus' Land in the narrow sense of the term, that

---

Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De administrando Imperio*, 2 vols. (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks, 1967), 2:20: commentary on *terra Russiae*, 7; see below on *terra Russiae* for Galicia.

9 Arsenii Nikolaevich Nasonov, *"Russkaia zemlia" i obrazovanie territorii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva* (Moscow: Nauka, 1951). Nasonov's conclusion was accepted by B. A. Rybakov, "Drevnye Rusi," *Sovetskaia arkheologiiia* 17 (1953): 23–104 at 33–39; L. V. Cherepnin, "Istoricheskie usloviia formirovaniia russkoi natsional'nosti do kontsa XV veka," in *Voprosy formirovaniia russkoi narodnosti i natsii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1958), 7–105 at 20–21, 61–62; M. N. Tikhomirov, "Proiskhozhdenie nazvaniia 'Rusi' i 'Russkaia zemlia'," *Sovetskoe etnografiia* 6–7 (1947): 60–80 at 61–62, and M. I. Artamonov, *Istoriia Khazar* (Leningrad: Gosudarstveni Ermitazh, 1962), 289–90, among others. The opponents, who contend that the broader meaning of all East-Slavdom is older, include: D. S. Likhachev, commentary in *PVL*, 2:204, 239–42, although cf. 312; and A. V. Soloviev, "Natsional'noe samosoznanie v russkom proshlom," in *Russkaia kul'tura* (Iz Ob'edineniia russkikh organizatsii, "Dnia russkoi kul'tury," Belgrade, 1925), 25–51 at 29ff. Henryk Paszkiewicz rejects both positions; see below. Partially the question is one of emphasis: *PVL* contains two tenth-century Rus'–Byzantine treaties which define the Rus' Land as "Kiev, Chernigov, Pereiaslavl' and others (*i prochie*)" (*PVL*, 25, 36). Henry Paszkiewicz, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 33–38 concludes that it is impossible to determine which meaning came first. He dates the ideological origins of the myth to the eleventh century.

10 The evidence is conveniently summarized in Rybakov, "Drevnye Rusi."

11 The authenticity of the *Slovo o polku Igoreve* is too vast a topic to be addressed here; originally I suggested that of necessity I had to assume that it is genuine. Now, after the later publication of A. A. Zimin's repressed monograph and Edward L. Keenan's monograph which argued against authenticity, I feel safe in vouching for the authenticity of the text, which is the scholarly consensus. See Charles J. Halperin, "Authentic? Not authentic? Not authentic, again! Edward L. Keenan, *Josef Dobrovsky and the Origins of the* Igor' Tale," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 54, no. 4 (2006): 556–71; Norman W. Ingham, "Historians and Textology," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 8, no. 4 (Fall 2007): 831–37, and Ingham, "The *Igor' Tale* and the Origins of

is, Kiev and Chernigov, the seats respectively of his suzerain and godfather Grand Prince Sviatoslav, and his brother Iaroslav.[12] Yet the author of the *Lay* appeals to the princes of Vladimir–Suzdal', Galicia–Volhynia, and other principalities to come to the assistance of Igor', implying that loyalty to the Rus' Land extends to those princes as well. However, the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* never names the other principalities, as if to emphasize that the link between the two geographic definitions of the Rus' Land is the dynasty itself: the Rus' Land is wherever a Volodimerovich prince rules.[13]

In the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* the Rus' warriors are called the grandsons of Dazhbog, the winds are called the sons of Strizhbog, invoking the pagan Slavic pantheon. Iaroslavna, the wife of Igor', appeals to the sun, moon, rivers, stars, winds, and other forces of nature to save her husband. Iaroslavna's lament is pure animistic paganism.[14] The rare Christian elements in the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* are irrelevant.[15] But if the *Lay* is rightly considered a pagan epic, then what of the concept of the polity for which Igor' and his retinue fight, to which the entire Volodimerovich clan owes its allegiance, the central motif of the text, the Rus' Land? Could the myth of the Rus' Land itself have pagan overtones?

In a posthumous article Vasilii Komarovich uncovered a princely pagan cult of the clan (*kul't roda*) in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Princes never canonized by the Rus's Orthodox Church are invoked in battle; each prince received both a Christian and a princely, in other words pagan, name; rites continued to be held at the graves of the founders of the princely clan (*rodonachal'niki*) Oleg and Ol'ga[16] (this is the same name, as Komarovich notes); a custom of shearing princes when they came of age was continued. Komarovich also relates this cult of the princely clan to the cult in Rus' of Moist Mother Earth (*mat' syra zemlia*), the Rus' variant of the universal myth of Mother Earth. For example, the soul of a dead prince reposed in the earth until his name was given to

---

Conspiracy Theory," *Russian History* 44, no. 2–3 (June 2017): 135–49. For a convenient text see N. K. Gudzii, *Khrestomatiia po drevnei russkoi literatury*, 7th ed. (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo, 1962), 58–71.

12 A. N. Robinson, "'Russkaia zemlia' v "Slove o polku Igoreve," *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury* 31 (1976): 123–36 at 124 wrote that the historical content of the Rus' Land was insufficiently studied in the *Lay of the Host of Igor'*.

13 I am indebted for this interpretation of the *Slovo o polku Igoreve* to Michael Cherniavsky's later published article from the James Schuyler Lectures at the Johns Hopkins University, chapter 5, "Russia," in *National Consciousness, History and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Orest Ranum (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975), 118–43.

14 V. V. Sapunov, "Iaroslavna i drevnerusskoe iazychestvo," in *Slovo o polku Igoreve—pamiatnik XII veka* (Moscow: Nauka 1962), 321–29, where the archeological evidence is also considered.

15 Harvey Goldblatt and Riccardo Picchio, "Toward a Critical Edition of the *Igor' Tale*," *Russica Romana* 2 (1995): 25–64 and "Old Approaches and New Perspectives: Once Again on the Religious Significance of the *Slovo o polku Igoreve*," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 28, no. 1–4 (2006): 129–54 argue otherwise.

16 On Ol'ga as a pagan priestess before her conversion to Christianity see Roman Kovalev, "Grand Princess Ol'ga Shows the Bird: Her 'Christian Falcon' Emblem," *Russian History* 39 (2012): 460–517.

a newborn prince. That soul came out of the earth and entered the body of the infant on the spot where it was born. Typically, a church was erected in honour of the occasion.[17]

The princely dynasticism of the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* takes on new meaning in light of Komarovich's article. Moist Mother Earth, even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was still considered the defender of the clan way-of-life (*rodovaia zhizn'*) and clan religion in ecclesiastical folk-poems (*dukhovnye stikhi*).[18] The word for "earth" in the Mother Earth cult and the word for "land" in the "Rus' Land" are one and the same, *zemlia*. Surely a latent connection between the two cannot be ruled out.[19] Our conceptual framework is completed by some strikingly original work on the concept of Rus' by Paul Bushkovitch. Employing linguistic analysis, Bushkovitch perceptively uncovered a logical system of nomenclature of peoples in the *Tale of Bygone Years* which entwined grammar and social-political evolution. The only group of the neighbours of Rus' whose names have the same grammatical form (feminine singular collective noun, like Chud' or Ves') as the word *Rus'* are the Finno-Ugric peoples, the most "primitive" tribes of the region. Since the East Slavs had long ago surpassed that stage of social evolution, it is likely that the word *Rus'* was retained because it was a pagan sacral term.[20]

Applying Bushkovitch's conclusion we see that Komarovich's cult of the clan might actually have been the cult of the *Rus'*, which was probably the primal sacral name for the princely clan (*rod*) of the Kievan dynasty.[21] The name of the sacral clan later became attached to the entire people, as is suggested by the legend recorded in Byzantine, Arab, Polish, and Persian sources that the *Rus'* were the descendants of an eponymous ancestor, *Rus/Ros/Rusa*.[22] The omission of the legend from the *Tale of Bygone Years* does not impugn this interpretation: the Kievan chronicler had his own version of the origins of the *Rus'*, the Normanist theory. The diversity in time and space of the sources preserving the ancestor legend lends credence to the view that the neighbours of Rus' were repeating something they had heard from the Rus', rather than merely fantasizing.

---

17 V. L. Komarovich, "Kul't roda i zemli v kniazheskoi srede XI–XII vv.," *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury* 16 (1960): 84–104.

18 G. Fedotov, "Mat'-zemlia—K religioznoi kosmologii russkogo naroda," *Put'* 46 (1935): 3–18.

19 Noticed *en passant* but not discussed in any depth by James Billington, *The Icon and the Axe* (New York: Knopf, 1966), 20.

20 Paul Bushkovitch, "*Rus'* in the Ethnic Nomenclature of the *Povest' vremennykh let*," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 12, no. 3 (July-September 1971): 296–306.

21 Is this not what "we are from the Rus' *rod*" means, the dynasty of Rus'? See *PVL*, s.a. 907, 25; s.a. 945, 34, the Rus'–Byzantine treaties. Could not the "grandsons of Dazhbog" in the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* be the dynasty itself?

22 Simeon Magister, *Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byantinae*, 50 vols. (Bonn, 1828–1897), 13:149–50, and Ibn Fadlan cited in A. Garkavy, *Skazaniia musul'manskikh pisatelei o slavianskikh i russkikh* (St. Petersburg, 1870), 73, both quoted in A. V. Soloviev, "Rusichi i Rusovichi," in *Slovo o polku Igoreve—pamiatnik XII veka*, 176–99 at 282; *Kronika Wielkopolska*, Monumenta Poloniae Historia, 2:468 and B. A. Rybakov, "K voprosu o roli khazarskogo kaganstva v istorii Rusi," *Sovetskaia arkheologiia* 18 (1953): 128–50 at 134, both quoted in Henryk Paszkiewicz, *The Making of the Russian Nation* (London: Greenwood, 1963), 77, 144n203.

The myth of the Rus' Land, as the evidence of the tenth-century Rus'–Byzantine treaties proves, pre-dates the Christianization of Kievan Rus'.[23] The Rus' Land constituted, then, the first Rus' conception of political society.[24] It personified the pagan patrimony of the sacral clan of Rus' of the Kievan dynasty. It was neither a tribal (ethnic) nor a statist conception of a realm but a dynastic construct.[25] Despite the official conversion of Rus' to Christianity, this pagan typos of the Rus' Land survived and was manifested in the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* several centuries later.

With the official baptism of Rus' under St. Vladimir the myth of the Rus' Land almost immediately acquired what became its dominant aspect, a Christian one. The *Tale of Bygone Years*, in a prayer at the conclusion of the "Tale of the Baptism of Vladimir," reads: "Blessed is our Lord Jesus Christ who loves his new people, the Rus' Land, and illuminates them with holy baptism."[26] In the early eleventh-century *Lives of Saints Boris and Gleb*, the first Rus' saints, the princely martyrs die for the Rus' Land and become its defenders and intercessors with God. In this cult of the princely-saints, ably elucidated by Cherniavsky, the Rus' Land is hallowed by the blood of Boris and Gleb just as the prototypic *Terra Sancta*, Palestine, was hallowed by the blood of Jesus. Here we see a *translatio* to the newly-Christianized Rus' Land of the model Christian Holy Land. As in the concept of the pagan sacral Rus' Land, the supreme importance of the ruler-myth remains self-evident.[27]

Within the Kievan period, therefore, the myth of the Rus' Land already exhibited considerable vitality and flexibility. Indeed, its malleability was probably one source of its power, since it was able to draw upon the well-springs of both pagan and Christian sacredness. In a sense, I originally proposed, this quality of the myth represents the raising of the Rus' "dual-religion" (*dvoeverie*, the retention and mixture of pagan motifs with the newer Christian religion) to the level of ideology. Just as the Rus' princes were sacred both as clan ancestors and Christian saints, so also the Rus' Land was a "holy land" in both pagan and Christian belief. Subsequent research by Eve Levin and Stella Rock has convincingly demonstrated that "dual-religion" did not mean the mixture of pagan and Christian practices and beliefs.[28] However, the dual religious nature of the myth of the Rus' Land remains credible.

---

23 This assertion, admittedly, rests upon the assumption that the surviving Slavonic translation of the treaties from the original Greek dates to the tenth century.

24 *PVL*, 27–35. Nasonov speculates that the first Rus' Land was that territory around Kiev under Khazar domination, suggesting the possibility that the earliest connotations of the term were steppe-Turkic. However, nomadic polities defined themselves by people, not territory.

25 Serhii Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 38.

26 *PVL*, 82.

27 Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 5–43.

28 Eve Levin, "*Dvorverie* and Popular Religion," in *Seeking God. The Recovery of Religious Identity in Orthodox Russia, Ukraine, and Georgia*, ed. Stephen K. Batalden (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University Press, 1993), 31–52; Stella Rock, *Popular Religion in Russia. "Double Belief" and the Making of an Academic Myth* (London: Routledge, 2007).

On the eve of the Mongol conquest of Rus' the myth of the Rus' Land carried two geographic meanings, either the area of Kiev in the narrow sense or all East Slavdom in the broad sense, as well as two religious meanings. How were these various and complex elements of the myth affected by that conquest?

The major statement of the reaction of Rus' to the Mongol conquest is the *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land* (*Slovo o pogibeli russkoi zemi*), only a fragment of which survives. It is hardly surprising that in response to the pagan Mongols it is the Christian Rus' Land which is invoked: "Thou, Rus' Kand, art rich in wealth and the Orthodox Christian faith." The Rus' Land is blessed by "ecclesiastical houses" (*domy tserkovnye*), monasteries or churches, and illumined by the Christian faith (*svetlorusskaia zemlia*).[29] Faced with disaster, the Rus' fell back on their Christian identity.

But which Rus', in Kiev or the Northeast? Debate continues over whether the *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land* was written in Kiev after the Mongol sack of that city in 1240 or earlier in the Northeast after the campaign of 1237–1238.[30] The geographic conception of the Rus' Land in the *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land* seems to be the broader one, but given the fragmentary nature of the extant text the precise object of loyalty of the work is difficult to establish. Let us look at other sources for the century after the Mongol conquest in the Northeast and try to put the *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land* into a wider context.

For the thirteenth century we can examine the *Laurentian Chronicle* (*Lavrent'evskia letopis'*) copied in 1377 in Suzdal', which covers the period up to 1305. This can be supplemented by entries from the late fifteenth-century *Simeonov Chronicle* (*Simeonovskaia letopis'*), which preserved what might have been chronicle-writing from the fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries.[31]

The *Laurentian* and the other chronicles record that in 1249 the Mongol khan gave Aleksandr Nevskii "Kiev and the whole Rus' Land," and Aleksandr's brother Andrei the city of Vladimir.[32] Clearly Vladimir–Suzdal' Rus' in the Northeast was not included in the "whole Rus' Land." That is, I believe, the last time that the *Laurentian Chronicle* refers to the Rus' Land, but the other chronicles did utilize it after 1249. In 1283 Maksim is sent from Constantinople to be Metropolitan over "the whole Rus'

---

29 Text in Iu. K. Begunov, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII v. Slovo o pogibeli russkoi zemli* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965),182–84.

30 For full bibliography see Begunov, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII v*.

31 I had previously relied upon the *Trinity Chronicle* (*Troitskaia letopis'*), which purportedly dates to 1408. However, the manuscript discovered by N. Karamzin had not been published when it perished in the Moscow fire of 1812. M. Priselkov attempted to reconstruct its text, partly on the basis of a small number of extracts transcribed by Karamzin but mostly by inference. See M. D. Priselkov, *Troitskaia letopis'. Rekonstruktsiia teksta* (Moscow: Nauka, 1950). However, I later concluded that a reconstruction could not be treated as a text (see Charles J. Halperin, "Text and Textology: Salmina's Dating of the 'Chronicle Tales' about Dmitry Donskoy," *Slavonic and East European Review* 79, no. 2 (April 2001): 248–63). I have now replaced citations to the *Trinity Chronicle* with references to the *Simeonov Chronicle*.

32 *Lavrent'evskaia letopis'* in *PSRL*, 1 (Moscow: Vostochnoi literatury, 1962), col. 472; *Simeonovskaia letopis'* in *PSRL*, 18 (St. Petersburg: Aleksandrov, 1913), 69.

Land."[33] This is ambiguous: the Kievan see remained unified, and Maksim passed through Kiev, but he spent all his time thereafter in the Northeast. In 1293 the Tatars raided Vladimir, Suzdal', Murom, Pereiaslavl', Kolomna, Moscow, Mozhaisk, Volok, and other cities, all of them in the Northeast. The Tatars did much harm to the Rus' Land—the beginnings of a *translatio* of the narrow concept of the geographical Rus' Land from the Kievan area to the Northeast.[34] The *translatio* was completed by 1328 when there was "peace in the Rus' Land" at the accession to the grand principality of Vladimir of Ivan Kalita of Moscow and in 1340 when Ivan Kalita was mourned on his death by "all the Muscovite men…and the whole Rus' Land."[35] By 1340 the *translatio* of the Rus' Land to the Muscovite principality itself, or at the very least to the Northeast, was a *fait accompli*.

According to Serhii Plokhy, because the narrow geographic definition of the Rus' Land remained alive even in the thirteenth century, the chronicler divided other Rus' territories into "lands": the Smolenskian Land, Polatskian Land, Suzdalian Land, Novgorodian Land, and so forth, which replaced the original apportionment of Rus' among tribes but did not rest upon the tribal divisions. Chroniclers in Galicia–Volhynia in the southwest, Novgorod in the north, and Vladimir–Suzdal' "knew" that those regions did not belong to the Rus' Land.[36] This conclusion is too categorical. First, it overlooks the inconsistent application of the myth of the Rus' Land in its broadest sense to these regions. Second, it homogenizes a multitude of terms with disparate histories. Each "land" concept had its own history which merits separate examination.[37] Finally, Plokhy's formulation does not do justice to his own astute observation that at different times the principalities of Galicia–Volhynia and Vladimir–Suzdal' claimed that their principalities constituted the Rus' Land,[38] so what their chroniclers "knew" was malleable.

During the transitional period of this *translatio* (ca. 1240–ca. 1340) with increasing frequency the chronicles employed the term the Suzdalian Land (*Suzdal'skaia zemlia*) to mean the Northeast. With the definitive *translatio* of the Rus' Land to the Northeast by 1340, the concept of the Suzdalian Land vanished from the *Simeonov Chronicle* and in its place the term the Rus' Land was consistently used to mean the Northeast.

Therefore, I deem it unlikely that the *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land*, which continues that myth, was written in the Northeast. If it were, then as an attempted *translatio* it died stillborn, to mix a metaphor, or it was a hundred years premature. Probably the *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land* was written in Kiev in 1240 as the swan song, for the time being, of the myth of the Rus' Land.[39]

---

33 *PSRL*, 1, col. 586, records only that he went to Suzdal'; *PSRL*, 18:79, that he went to the Rus' Land.

34 *PSRL*, 1, col. 483, is missing several folios which might have included this entry; *PSRL*, 18:82.

35 *PSRL*, 18:90, 93.

36 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 39, 40.

37 Of course, analysis of each of these "land"-terms fell outside the focus of Plokhy's impressive monograph.

38 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 53.

39 In the Hypatian Chronicle, the "militia commander" (*tysiatskii* or "thousand-man") Danilo tells

The myth of the Rus' Land did not disappear for long. In the second half of the fourteenth century it underwent a major renaissance in Northeast Russia, and specifically in Moscow. The *Simeonov Chronicle* uses the term to mean exclusively the Northeast, in particular the grand principality of Vladimir.[40] Since in this period the Vladimir grand principality became an extension of the Moscow house, implicitly the myth of the Rus' Land would become associated with Moscow, but Muscovite ideologues consciously, consistently, and ultimately successfully sought to relegate utilization of the myth of the Rus' Land to a monopoly of Moscow. I have discussed the appearance of the myth of the Rus' Land in detail in the various "chronicle tales" (*letopisnye povesti*) from this period elsewhere, including narratives about Mamai, Tokhtamsh, Timur, the Battle on the River Vorskla, and Edigei, demonstrating that in every case the Rus' Land means Moscow.[41] Here we can confine ourselves to two of the best-known literary works from the end of the fourteenth century to explore the aspects of the myth of the Rus' Land which they retain.[42]

The epic *Zadonshchina* (*Battle Beyond the Don River*) usually attributed to Sofonii of Riazan',[43] was written to praise Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi of Moscow for his defeat of the Tatar emir Mamai at Kulikovo Field in 1380.[44] The literary model of the *Zadonshchina* was the *Lay of the Host of Igor'*, and the question immediately must be posed: Did the *Zadonshchina* retain the pagan aspect of the Rus' Land from the *Lay of the Host of Igor'*? The almost universal opinion of scholarship has been that it did not: In the *Zadonshchina* the Rus' fight "for the Rus' Land and the Christian faith." Obviously the *translatio* of the Rus' Land to the Muscovite principality is fundamental to the text, even though this has not been sufficiently appreciated. A significant exception is Plokhy, who concludes that all the literary monuments of the Kuliiovo cycle "reflect the transformation of the notion of the Rus' Land from the common patrimony of the Kyivan princes to the exclusive patrimony of the princes of Moscow" and who fully appreciates that the

---

Batu after the sack of Kiev: "Vidi bo zemliu gibnuiushchuiu rus'kuiu" (see the perishing Rus' Land) and the *Tale of the Sack of Kiev* in the Hypatian Chronicle uses the phrase the Rus' Land more than once. It strikes me that this confirms the interpretation of the *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land* presented here. See *Ipat'evskaia letopis'* in *PSRL*, 2 (Moscow: Vostochnoi literatury 1962), cols. 784, 786, 787, 788.

40 e.g., *PSRL*, 18:100, s.a. 1358, the Rus' Land is called the patrimony of Grand Prince Ivan Ivanovich; 142, s.a. 1393 St. Sergius is called a teacher and preacher "over the whole Rus' Land."

41 Charles J. Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar: The Emergence of Muscovite Ideology, 1380–1408," *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 23 (1976): 7–103.

42 The dating of these texts remains contested, but at the latest they convey Muscovite conceptions of the myth of the Rus' Land from the middle to the second half of the fifteenth century.

43 Almost without fail in earlier publications I distorted the name of the putative author of the *Zadonshchina* as Sofronii.

44 The dating and textology of the *Zadonshchina* cannot be discussed in detail here. I am in agreement with the conclusions of A. V. Soloviev, "Avtor 'Zadonshchiny' i ego politicheskie idei," *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury* 14 (1958): 183–97, though not always for the stated reasons. The six manuscripts of the *Zadonshchina* were published in V. P. Adrianova-Peretts, "Zadonshchina. Opyt rekonstruktsii avtorskogo teksta," *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury* 6 (1948): 223–55.

myth of the Rus' Land was an "historically, politically and legally loaded term."[45] However, I believe that the Christian veneer of the *Zadonshchina*, while stronger than in the *Lay of the Host of Igor'*, is still, nevertheless, extraneous. The strongest evidence of Christianity is the refrain itself; otherwise, the only Christian motifs are the cliché contrast of "Christians"/"pagans" (*khrestiane*/*poganye*), a reference to Boris and Gleb, and one to Peresvet, a monk-warrior sent by St. Sergius to aid the Muscovites. But the ethos of the *Zadonshchina* is essentially martial and chivalric, and the appeal of Peresvet—"It is better that we fall in battle than become slaves to these infidels"—is uplifting, but hardly religious. Characteristically, for example, there are almost no prayers in the *Zadonshchina*.

That the Rus' Land and the Christian faith were not only not identical, but were mutually exclusive in the *Zadonshchina*, that the *Zadonshchina* was perceived as at least a less-than-adequately religious text (to be sure, "secular" does not mean "pagan") can best be demonstrated by comparing it to another member of the Kulikovo cycle, the *Narration of the Battle with Mamai* (*Skazanie o Mamaevom poboishche*).[46] The *Narration* is a highly religious depiction of the battle, replete with constant prayers, miracles, and religious symbolism. Over one hundred manuscripts of the *Narration* are extant, compared to a paltry six of the *Zadonshchina*, a difference of such magnitude that it cannot be attributed solely to the vagaries of manuscript survival. The concrete textological evidence of the rewriting of episodes from the *Zadonshchina* for inclusion in the *Narration* is significant. In every case the latter version is more religious than the former. For example, the *Narration* adds to an invocation of Vladimir that he baptized the Rus' Land, and to one of Boris and Gleb that they were holy martyrs and passion-sufferers. Peresvet now pronounces a prayer before going into battle. The Ol'gerdovichi, Orthodox Christian Lithuanian princes fighting for Moscow, fight in the *Zadonshchina* for "the Rus' Land, the Christian faith and Grand Prince Dmitrii Ivanovich," but in the *Narration* they fight only for the faith and their sovereign prince, never for the Rus' Land.[47] In fact no one in the *Narration* fights for the Rus' Land except in rare interpolations from the *Zadonshchina*. Otherwise, the myth of the Rus' Land is almost censored from the characteristic refrain of the *Zadonshchina*. This pattern of editing of excerpts from the *Zadonshchina* by the unknown but much more religious author of the *Narration* corroborates the conclusion that the *Zadonshchina*, and the Rus' Land in the *Zadonshchina*, were viewed by Muscovite book-men as, if not pagan or secular, not religious enough.

---

45 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 74, 84.

46 I agree with the dating of *Narration of the Battle with Mamai* by I. B. Grekov, "O pervnonachal'nom variante 'Skazaniia o Mamaevom poboishche'," *Sovetskoe slavianovedenie* 6 (1970): 27–36, although Grekov fails to consider many possible objections to this dating. Quotations from the Basic Redaction (*Osnovnaia redaktsiia*) published in *Povesti o Kulikovskoi bitvy*, ed. M. N. Tikhomirov et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1959), 43–76.

47 Cf. the *Zadonshchina* in Adrianova-Peretts, "Zadonshchina. Opyt," 225, 234, 229, 226 with the *Skazanie* in *Povesti o Kulikovskoi bitvy*, ed. Tikhomirov et al., 50, 57, 69, 58–60.

If the pagan layer of the myth of the Rus' Land continued in its typically epic form in the *Zadonshchina*, then the Christian layer was manifested in the *Life of Dmitrii Donskoi*.[48] In the *Life* Dmitrii Donskoi is Tsar of the Rus' Land, which is his patrimony. This hagiographic portrait of Dmitrii has been aptly summarized by Cherniavsky as that of a monk-tsar, but the text is also the apotheosis of the *translatio* of the Rus' Land in its Christian variant from Kiev to Moscow.

In the eleventh century Metropolitan Ilarion wrote in his *Sermon on Law and Grace*:

> The Roman Land with voices of praise, praises Peter and Paul, through whom Rome came to believe in Jesus Christ as the son of God; Asia and Edessa and Patmos praise John the Evangelist, India Thomas, Egypt Mark. Every country and every city and every people honor and glorifies its teacher who taught them the Orthodox Faith. And we praise… Volodimer, the grandson of Igor' of old, son of the glorious Sviatoslav. These ruled in their own time…not in some feeble or unknown land, but in the Rus' [Land], which is known and renowned to the ends of the earth (*zemli*).[49]

Note that the Rus' Land received plaudits from the universal "land," the earth itself.

The author of the *Life*, probably Epiphanius the Wise, adapted that passage to read:

> The Roman Land praises Peter and Paul, the Asian Land John the Evangelist, the Indian Land the apostle Thomas, the Land of Jerusalem the brother of the lord Jacob, Andrew the First-Called is praised by the *Pomor'e* [Black Sea Coast] and tsar Constantine by the Greek Land, while Vladimir is praised by Kiev and its neighbouring towns (*Kiev s okrestnym gradami*); you, however, Grand Prince Dmitrii Ivanovich, are praised by the whole Rus' Land.[50]

The author of the *Life of Dmitrii Donskoi* made stylistic changes that heightened the syntactic parallelism and increased the number of saints praised. More than that, he deprived St. Vladimir of his supplicant, the Rus' Land, in order to "reassign" it to praise Dmitrii Donksoi. The author demonstrates explicit consciousness of the *translatio* of the Rus' Land. He knew not only what the original Rus' Land was, that is, Kiev and its surrounding towns, but also what the new Rus' Land is, the patrimony of the Moscow house. This is precisely the rationalization we would expect of a political myth.

The *Life of Dmitrii Donskoi*, better than any other text, illustrates the success of Muscovite ideologues of the end of the fourteenth century in subsuming the myth of the Rus' Land to the myth of the Muscovite ruler, in this case the monk-tsar.[51] By the middle of the fifteenth century the identification of the Muscovite grand principality with the Rus'

---

48 For dating see A. V. Soloviev, "Epifanii Premudryi kak avtor 'Slova o zhitii i prestavlenii velikogo kniazia Dmitriia Ivanovicha, tsar'ia Rus'kago'," *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury* 17 (1961): 85–106. The best interpretation of the contribution of the *Life* to the ruler cult is Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 25–28. The best text is *Novgorodskaia chetvertaia letopis'* in *PSRL*, 4 (Leningrad, 1925), 351–66.

49 Gudzii, *Khrestomatiia po drevnei russkoi literatury*, 31–32.

50 Translation simplified from Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 28n63.

51 The myth of Holy Russia, which arose as an anti-statist ideology in the seventeenth century, suffered the same fate; it was later coopted by the regime and subordinated to the ruler-myth. See Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 101–27.

Land manifested itself not only in literary texts[52] but even in coinage, an official expression of state ideology. Some coins described Grand Prince Vasilii II as "sovereign of the entire Rus' Land" (*ospodar' vseia russkoi zemli*),[53] an inscription that did not become normative on Muscovite coinage. The myth of the Rus' Land had become inseparable from the myth of the Muscovite prince. In the late fourteenth century the myth of the Rus' Land still possessed sufficient flexibility to permit authors to project its final successful shift in space, and that it still functioned on both is religious levels, pagan and Christian.

52 The *Muscovite Chronicle Compilation of the End of the Fifteenth Century*, typically, records that God saved the Rus' Land from Khan Akhmat in 1480–1481, the "Stand on the Ugra River" that supposedly marked the end of the "Tatar Yoke." *Moskovskii letopisnyi svod kontsa XV veka* in *PSRL*, 25 (Moscow: Nauka, 1949), 328.

53 Gustave Alef, "The Political Significance of the Inscriptions on Muscovite Coinage in the Reign of Vasilii II," *Speculum* 34, no. 1 (January 1959): 1–19 at 6.

Chapter 2

THE RUS' LAND AND NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS*

ANY SOCIETY SUFFICIENTLY cohesive to evolve even the most rudimentary political structure will also as a matter of course develop a set of shared myths about the nature of that society and a justification of its political structure. Scholars usually ascribe the word "ideology" only to a set of values which is highly abstract, rational, and articulated in the form of theoretical treatises, so that in the modern period liberalism or Marxism are considered ideologies. Surely one of the most influential ideologies historians have studied is nationalism. Although an easy definition of nationalism would have to be an over-simplification, nevertheless for our purposes we can label as nationalism the belief that all social classes within a given society or people share a common set of values which distinguishes them from other societies or peoples. Whether the concept of nationalism is to be confined to nineteenth-century romantic nationalism is a controversial point.[1] Equally controversial is the tendency, or at least temptation, to project "national consciousness" back in history, modernizing earlier sets of values and identities.[2] It is all the more problematic to analyze mass attitudes from periods of history in which we have little if any evidence about the overwhelming majority of the population that speaks to the issue of political consciousness, such as voting behaviour or popular opinion polls.

There is no question but that the earliest East Slavic states possessed some kind of political consciousness expressed in largely undefined myths. The delicate task of the historian is to analyze without overanalyzing those terms as they appear in the sources. The risks of reading too much into the meaning of such myths available to us will be readily apparent from this discussion. The ubiquitous myth of the Rus' Land did embody some of the highest values of medieval Rus', but the asserted conclusion that it manifested national consciousness, the nationalism of a nation, the unity of the Rus' people (*narod*) and the Fatherland, for the Kievan period of the *drevnerusskaia narodnost'* (East Slavic people)[3] and subsequently in the Northeast the *velikorusskaia/russkaia narodnost'* (Great Russian/Russian people) should not be accepted without critical analysis.

***** Because this chapter reexamines many of the texts discussed in the previous chapter but from a different perspective, a certain amount of repetition has proven unavoidable.

1 See Michael Cherniavsky's review of Hans Rogger's *National Consciousness in Eighteenth-Century Russia* in the *American Historical Review* 66, no. 4 (July 1961): 1041–42.

2 See Cherniavsky, "Russia," 118–43.

3 We need not consider the Soviet distinction between a "people" (*narod*) and a "nationality" (*natsional'nost'*), let alone "nation" (*natsiia*). US historians and sociologists often prefer to speak of "ethnic groups" to avoid these terminological problems.

Supporters of this conception make allowances for the importance of Christianity in the Rus' Land and for the occasional "political" manipulation of the term by the elite, but it is insisted that the national meaning remained unsullied in the consciousness of the patriotic masses.[4] However, all modern ideologies rest on myths, so there is nothing incongruous in exploring the possibility that the Rus' Land embodied national consciousness.

However, this chapter will argue that such vocabulary is excessive and anachronistic, that there is little or no evidence in the extant written sources to support such contentions, and, furthermore, that attributing such a meaning to the concept necessarily diverts scholarly concern away from its actual and intended content. Usage of the myth of the Rus' Land from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries[5] argues against the assertion that it reflects national consciousness.

In a seminal monograph, as already mentioned, Nasonov demonstrated that during the Kievan period the Rus' Land carried two geographic meanings. In its older and narrower sense the Rus' Land encompassed only the original Dnieper River basin, the heartland of the Kievan dynasty, a triangle formed by the cities of Kiev, Chernigov, and Pereiaslavl'. As the dynasty expanded its power, additional territories were incorporated into the Rus' Land, until, at its height, the phrase covered all regions governed by members of the Volodimerovich house. By the twelfth century, however, both meanings were operative.[6] The adaptability of the geographic coordinates of the Rus' Land established by Nasonov suggests precisely that the myth was primarily and essentially not territorial but political, the state ruled by the Kievan dynasty. Nasonov's conclusion has not been universally accepted, but even his critics usually admit that in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries the Rus' Land had two sets of geographic boundaries.[7]

---

4 For example, A. V. Soloviev, "Natsional'noe samosoznanie v russkom proshlom," 25–51: S. A. Bugoslavskii, "Russkaia zemlia v literature Kievskoi Rusi, XI–XIII vv," *Uchenye zapiski MGU* 118 (1946), Trudy kafedry russkoi literatury 2, 3–26; D. S. Likhachev, *Natsional'noe samosoznanie drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Nauka, 1945); Tikhomirov, "Proiskhozhdenie nazvanii 'Rusi' i 'Russkaia zemlia'," 60–80; Cherepnin, "Istoricheskie usloviia," 7–105, one of the most nuanced and most theoretical Soviet discussions in this theme; D. S. Likhachev, *Russkie letopisi i ikh kul'turno-istoricheskoe znachenie* (Moscow: Nauka, 1947), especially 35–172, 289–330; Likhachev, "Nekotorye voprosy ideologii feodalov v literature XI–XIII v.," *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury* 10 (1954): 76–91; Likhachev, *Kul'tura Rusi vremeni Andreia Rubleva i Epifaniia Premudrogo (konets XIV–nachalo XV v.)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1962). Even the maverick I. B. Grekov implicitly subscribes to this view of the Rus' Land: I. B. Grekov, *Vostochnaia Evropa i upadok Zolotoi Ordy (na rubezhe XIV–XV vv.)* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975), 311–487.

5 Objections to treating the Rus' Land as an expression of national consciousness up to the fifteenth century apply equally to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

6 Nasonov was hardly the first historian to observe this pattern. Certainly Mykhailo Hrushevsky noticed it, although he did not distinguish between Rus' and the Rus' Land in all cases. Rather, Nasonov developed systematically and definitively what had only been noticed *en passant* in previous scholarship.

7 Various twelfth- and thirteenth-century chronicle entries use the concept of the Rus' Land in intriguing ways, often open to different interpretations. On the entry s.a. 1206 that Novgorod has superiority in the Rus' Land (*PSRL*, 1, col. 422) see Iu. A. Limonov, *Letopisanie Vladimiro-suzdal'skoi Rusi* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1967), 135–36 and A. E. Presniakov, *Obrazovanie velikorusskogo gosudarstva* (Petrograd: Bashmakov, 1918), 41–42. Cf. the entry s.a. 1216 in the *Suzdal' Chronicle*

Given the political, dynastic context of the usage of the Rus' Land entailed by Nasonov's analysis, it is quite expected that the term is pervasive in texts associated with the Kievan princes, especially the chronicle, the *Tale of Bygone Years*;[8] the Kievan law code, the *Rus' Law* (*Russkaia pravda*);[9] and even the "church statute" of Vladimir granting a tithe to the Kievan church.[10]

The conversion of Vladimir to Christianity laid the basis for the Christianization of the Rus' Land. As epitomized in the vitae of Boris and Gleb in Cherniavsky's aforementioned brilliant discussion, the Rus' Land is the new *Terra Sancta*, sanctified by the blood of the princely martyrs just as Palestine was blessed by Jesus.[11] Given the role of the princes in the dissemination of the new religion and the highly politicized aura of the cult of Boris and Gleb in particular, this religious meaning of the Rus' Land could not really contradict the dynastic one. The Christian connotations of the Rus' Land come to the fore in the *Paterikon* of the Kievan Crypt Laura Monastery (*Pecherskaia lavra*),[12] and in the *Sermon on Law and Grace* (*Slovo o zakoni i blagodati*) of Metropolitan Ilarion.[13]

Two points will conclude our discussion of the Kievan period. In the *Lay of the Host of Igor'* the most convincing explanation is once again Cherniavsky's: Igor' fights for the Rus' Land in its narrower, Kievan meaning, but the author of the *Tale* appeals to all princes to assist Igor', implying—but no more—that loyalty to the Rus' Land is a biological function of the Volodimerovichi,[14] the dynastic nexus originally identified by Nasonov. Secondly, none of the ideological works associated with the twelfth-century northeastern Prince Andrei Bogoliubskii ever uses the concept of the Rus' Land,[15] a point to which I will return.

(*Suzdal'skaia letopis'*) in a manuscript from the late fifteenth century (*PSRL*, 1, col. 495): the whole Rus' Land (*vsia russkaia zemlia*) includes the Galician, Kievan, Smolenskian, Chernigovian, Novgorodian, and Riazanian Lands. On this passage see below, chapter 5. I do not always agree with the explications of these chronicle entries in Likhachev, "Nekotorye voprosy," 84–85.

8 *PVL*, 1:9, 17, 18, 82, 90–96, 126, 164–65, 170–77, 174–75. A full analysis of the references to the Rus' Land in *PVL* correlated with textological schemas of the text such as Shakhmatov's might prove very revealing.

9 *Pamiatniki russkogo prava* [hereafter *PRP*], 1 (Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1952), 79. Cf. Commentary, 94.

10 Ia. N. Shchapov, ed., *Drevnerusskie kniazheskie ustavy XI–XV vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1967), and subsequent variants. Curiously but probably insignificantly the Rus' Land does not appear in the Church Statute of Iaroslav.

11 Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 5–43. Stephen Maczko, "Boris and Gleb: Saintly Princes or Princely Saints?" *Russian History* 2, no. 1 (1975): 68–80 identified a pagan layer of the cult of Boris and Gleb in the earliest expressions of their martyrdom.

12 See Index, *Das Paterikon des Kiever Höhlenklosters*, ed. D. Abramovich and D. Tschižewskij (Munich: Eidos, 1964), s.v. *Ruskaia zemlia*.

13 Ludolf Müller, *Die Werke des Metropoliten Ilarion* (Munich: Fink, 1964), 70–71. The Christian ethos of the sermon is marred by Ilarion's attribution to Vladimir of the Khazar title *kagan*, which was definitely not Christian.

14 Cherniavsky, "Russia," 119, and Robinson, "Russkaia zemlia," 123–36.

15 This is implicit in Ellen S. Hurwitz, "Andrei Bogoliubskii: An Image of the Prince," *Russian History*

The *Tale of the Destruction of the Rus' Land* written about the Mongol conquest, contains the broad geographic meaning of the Rus' Land in its Christian dress, but for the following century the contemporary chronicles usually refer to the northeast as the Suzdalian Land. The earliest redaction of Nevskii's *vita* refers only to the Suzdalian Land, as does the earliest redaction of the *vita* of Metropolitan Petr, who was buried in Moscow. By the middle of the fourteenth century the myth of the Rus' Land had reemerged, but geographically it no longer refers either to the Kievan triangle or to all of the territory of the former Kievan state. Its new content territorially was in the northeast, and later Muscovy.

The decades between the battle of Kulikovo Field in 1380 and the middle of the fifteenth century witness the coöptation and monopolization of the myth of the Rus' Land by Muscovite ideologues, the fusion of the Rus' Land with the Muscovite dynastic line and patrimony. In the epic the *Zadonschhina*, Dmitrii Donskoi fights for the Rus' Land of Moscow, Serpukhov and Kolomna, without assistance from Novgorod[16] and despite the (unmentioned) alliance of Oleg of Riazan' with Emir Mamai of the Juchid ulus (later called the Golden Horde), although the Riazanian Land is mentioned as if it were separate from the Rus' Land.[17] In the various tales of the sack of Moscow by Khan Tokhtamysh in 1382 the object of Tokhtamysh's attack is said to be the Rus' Land despite the collaboration with his forces of the Suzdalian princes, and Vasilii I of Moscow is warned by some anonymous "advocates of the Rus' Land" (*pobornitsy russkoi zemli*).[18] In the tales of Temir-Aksak (Timur, Tamerlane) of 1395, Temir-Aksak is recorded as wanting to destroy the Rus' Land, whose autocrat is Vasilii I and whose capital is Moscow.[19] The descriptions of the disastrous defeat of Vytautus, Grand Duke of Lithuania, by the Tatars at the battle on the Vorskla River in 1399, attribute to Vytautus the desire to rule the Rus' Land, and Novgorod and Pskov. Since Vytautus's rule already extended to Volhynia and Kiev, plus Smolensk, his sphere of influence to Riazan' and Tver', by the process of elimination the Rus' Land here is Moscow and its dependencies.[20] Similarly s.a. 1408 Emir Edigei besieges Moscow wishing to attack the Rus' Land.[21] By the same token the

---

2, no. 1 (1975): 39–52; Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij: The Man and the Myth* (Florence: Licosa, 1980).

16 Despite S. N. Azbelev, "Skazanie o pomoshchi novgorodtsev Dmitriiu Donskomu," *Russkii fol'klor* 13 (1972): 77–102.

17 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 9–22. The *Tale of the Destruction of Riazan' by Batu* (*Povest' o razorenii Riazani Batyem*) about the Mongol conquest of 1237, dated because of anachronisms to some time in the fourteenth century (see Charles J. Halperin, *The Tatar Yoke: The Image of the Mongols in Medieval Russia* (Bloomington: Slavica, 2009), 37–42), ambiguously juxtaposes the "Riazanian Land" and the "Rus' Land"; I infer that the former constituted a region of the latter. See *Voinskie povesti drevnei Rusi*, ed. V. P. Adrianova-Peretts (Moscow: Nauka, 1949), 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15 (from the Volokolamsk copy of the sixteenth century; the later Chronograph Copy of 1599 contains no innovations on this subject).

18 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 44–48.

19 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 48–52.

20 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 52–53.

21 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 53–57.

vita of Saint Sergius of Radonezh recounts the saint's (fictitious) blessing of Dmitrii Donskoi, ruler of the Rus' Land, in defending the Rus' Land in 1380.[22]

The definitive *translatio* of the myth of the Rus' Land by Muscovite ideologues is contained in the so-called *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi (*Slovo o zhitii i prestavlenii velikogo kniazia Dmitriia Ivanovicha, tsaria rus'kago*), Here the identification of Moscow and the Rus' Land reaches its zenith: Vladimir baptized the Rus' Land, Metropolitan Petr is the defender of the Rus' Land, Ivan Kalita, the first Muscovite grand prince, is the "gatherer of the Rus' Land" (*sobiratel' russkoi zemli*), and Dmitrii Donskoi is tsar of the Rus' Land, his patrimony. In a paraphrase of Ilarion, recounted above, Vladimir is praised by "Kiev and surrounding cities" (which is incongruous given that he baptized the Rus' Land!) and Dmitrii Donskoi is lauded by the Rus' Land.[23]

By the middle of the fifteenth century all the various strands of the ideology of the Rus' Land come together in the Muscovite tales of the Council of Florence, in which the patrimony of Vasilii II, the Rus' Land, alone remains uncontaminated by the insidious apostasy of Isidore and the Greeks who agree to recognize the pope as their superior. The Rus' Land alone preserves true Orthodoxy.[24]

A second negative example merits notice. In the most ambitious ideological text issuing from Tver' in the middle of the fifteenth century, the monk Foma in his laud of Boris Aleksandrovich in gingerly fashion avoids the term the Rus' Land as much as possible, in its stead attributing to Boris rule over the God-protected Tverian Land (discussed below).

It is relevant to observe here that the relationship of Novgorod to the Rus' Land seems to be ambiguous. It has been asserted that the Novgorodian sources of the Kievan period do not refer to Novgorod as part of the Rus' Land,[25] although references in Novgorodian and other chronicles, in both political and religious contexts, later sometimes imply at least Novgorodian affiliation with the Rus' Land.[26] It is perhaps Novgorodian reluctance to recognize any northeastern grand prince as ruler of the Rus' Land which explains the absence of the term in Novgorodian treaties with the grand princes until 1456, discussed below. Or this reticence may reflect a reaction against the nonlegal, more ideological or more pretentious element of the myth, since it is equally conspicuous by its absence in Muscovite grand princely wills. Even the Muscovite accounts of the subordination of Novgorod in 1471, while vaguely alluding to the Rus' Land, do not seem to accuse the Novgorodians of "treason" to the Rus' Land, although the Novgorodians are guilty of apostasy, arrogance, violating tradition, and disloyalty to the grand prince.[27]

---

22 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 70.

23 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 69–78.

24 Michael Cherniavsky, "The Reception of the Council of Florence in Moscow," *Church History* 24, no. 4 (December 1955): 347–59.

25 A. S. L'vov, *Leksika "Povesti o vremennykh let"* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975), 179–82.

26 For example, *Novgorodskaia pervaia letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov*, ed. A. N. Nasonov [hereafter *NPL*] (Moscow: Nauka, 1950), 33 s.a. 1169, 89 s.a. 1270, 374 s.a. 1376.

27 *PSRL*, 25:284ff.

We have seen that the concept of the Rus' Land operated as a dominant political myth in Rus' from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries in a variety of separate, if interconnected, ways. Possessing both dynastic and religious overtones, the Rus' Land seems to have been most flexible in its geographic boundaries, alternating in the Kievan period between narrow and broad meanings, and then shifting in toto to the northeast, where it came to be synonymous with the Muscovite grand principality. Can we infer from the pattern of usage sketched here that the myth reflects national consciousness? A number of considerations need to be taken into account.

First, unlike in my original discussion of this question, I do not think that the religious element can impugn the argument that the myth of the Rus' Land in the Kievan period represents popular (*narodnyi*) attitudes at all. At that time the overwhelming majority of the population remained pagan. To judge from the written and archeological evidence, I suspect that this would remain the case until at least the fourteenth century, when the archeological evidence of paganism finally disappears from the countryside. I know of no proponent of the view that the Rus' Land is Christian *and* national who has ever perceived, let alone rationalized, this glaring contradiction.[28] However, if the myth of the Rus' Land contained both pagan and Christian layers then the non-Christian population might have subscribed to it. The powerful connection between national identities and religious affiliation need not have existed in a recently converted country. At the same time, to follow Paszkiewicz in interpreting the wider meaning of the Rus' Land as exclusively ecclesiastical, the confines of the metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' (*Kiev i vseia Rusi*), still seems unwarranted.[29] It would be difficult to reconcile such a view with the declaration of the pagan Turkic Berendei of loyalty to the Rus' Land s.a. 1154,[30] and with the ambivalence of the relationship between Novgorod and the Rus' Land.[31] No one has ever explained why and how Turkic nomads could belong to the Rus' "nation."

Secondly, to correlate usage of the Rus' Land and patriotism might seem to suggest that princes whose ideological expressions do not utilize the Rus' Land were "unpatriotic," a position on the twelfth century which dates from Vasilii Kliuchevskii at least.[32] Such an interpretation of the works associated with Andrei Bogoliubskii and Boris Aleksandrovich strikes me as distorted, in part because we do not really know very much

28 This criticism does not apply to Cherniavsky, who conceives of the Rus' Land as Christian but denies the existence of true national consciousness in Rus'/Muscovy until the seventeenth century.

29 Henryk Paszkiewicz, *The Origin of Russia* (London: Allen & Urwin, 1954), especially 3–25, and Paszkiewicz, *The Making of the Russian Nation*, 51–55, 74–76, 204ff. Paszkiewicz's idiosyncratic interpretation has found little if any support among specialists.

30 *PSRL*, 1, col. 345.

31 Ironically Novgorod's exclusion from the Rus' Land is clearest during the Kievan period when its ecclesiastical dependence on Kiev was strongest. There is more evidence of Novgorodian affiliation with the Rus' Land when its archbishop was resisting Muscovite ecclesiastical influence via the metropolitan in Vladimir and then Moscow in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

32 Might not this line of reasoning explain Kliuchevskii's distorted image of Andrei Bogoliubskii as a narrow-minded petty *votchinnik* (patrimonial landowner)? See V. O. Kliuchevskii, *Kurs russkoi istorii*, 8 vols. (Moscow: Politicheskaia literatura, 1956), 1:190–205, 316–34.

about "provincialism" and "separatism" in the Kievan and appanage periods. Although we cannot establish with any certainty why Andrei Bogoliubskii did not invoke the Rus' Land,[33] the Tverian case is crystal clear. By the time Foma composed his work, the Muscovite stranglehold on the myth of the Rus' Land was simply too strong to break. Patriotism and national consciousness are irrelevant considerations in both instances.

The ideological constraints on Tver' stand out when viewed through the prism of Muscovite ideological success. Likhachev, above all, has argued that the revival of the concept of the Rus' Land in the northeast, especially Muscovy, during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, constitutes not only a renaissance of Kievan historical tradition, but also a resurgence of national consciousness following a period of feudal decentralization. This is to confuse ideological pretension with patriotism. The Rus' Land was a source of political and historical legitimacy, and Muscovite usage of it is best characterized as manipulative. Significantly, the Lithuanian, admittedly Orthodox, Olgerdovichi princes fight for the Rus' Land in the *Zadonshchina* as vassals of Dmitrii Donskoi. That Muscovite sources identified its own interests with the Rus' Land does not require us to accept such self-serving claims at face value. Not even all of the northeast is meant by the Rus' Land in Muscovite texts, let alone all of Kievan Rus',[34] simply the Muscovite principality. Despite the obvious fact that the Rus' Land has this territorial meaning during this period,[35] the tendency has been to substitute modern patriotic verbiage for historical analysis in evaluating it. The *translatio* of the Rus' Land to Muscovy remains largely unappreciated in scholarship.

Soviet scholars no less than post-Soviet Russian nationalist scholars were aware that all of the texts in which the Rus' Land appears represent the articulated point of view of the elite, whether lay or ecclesiastic, and therefore are tainted by the class interests of the feudal ruling class. Nevertheless, ostensibly these texts also convey popular attitudes, admittedly when it served the elite's purpose to do so, from which it is legitimate to infer national devotion to the Rus' Land. I am prepared to admit, theoretically, that elite-serving texts might embody popular attitudes, and in particular that the *Tale of Bygone Years* contains material probably of oral, folkloric, and perhaps popular origin, although oral folklore need not all have originated in the masses rather than as the lore of the elite itself. But in any event no such passage, to my knowledge, ever invokes the Rus' Land, and I do not see how to discover the object of popular patriotism in the absence of evidence. Relying on the "pure" folkloric evidence, the most obvious alternative, will not suffice here. By the time the *byliny*[36] were written down the object of loyalty

33 Bogoliubskii's ideology was constructed out of Kievan building blocks, if only to neutralize Kiev's status, such as a *translatio* of the Icon of the Virgin and its protection from Kiev (originally from Constantinople, of course) to Vladimir-on-the-Kliazma. But given the geographic malleability of the concept of the Rus' Land, it is a mystery why Bogoliubskii's ideologues did not attempt to translate the myth of the Rus' Land to the Northeast, as the Muscovites later succeeded in doing.

34 Charles J. Halperin, "Kiev and Moscow: An Aspect of Early Muscovite Thought," *Russian History* 7, no. 3 (1980): 312–21.

35 See the Index to *PSRL*, 25:443, s.v. *russkaia zemlia*.

36 This begs the enormously complicated and not definitively resolved methodological and

in them is Holy Rus' (*Sviataia Rus'*), long after the Kievan and even Mongol period, in the seventeenth century.[37] It would be foolish speculation to guess what term preceded it in the epic cycle.[38] The data at our disposal speak only to the question of elite political consciousness of the Rus' Land, not popular consciousness.[39]

And there can scarcely be any doubt that the Rus' Land does embody elite political consciousness, indeed patriotism. For a myth to be worth manipulating—and I do not believe it credible that medieval ideologues were wasting their time—it first of all has to exist in the minds of an intended audience, it has to constitute a shared object of value by a given social group. Clearly the Rus' Land was such a myth, and remained so well beyond the period under discussion here. The most effective proof I would adduce of the genuine adherence of the elite to the myth of the Rus' Land is two previously unmentioned texts. The Abbot (*igumen*) Daniel in the early twelfth century lit a candle at the Holy Sepulcher in Palestine in honour of the entire Rus' Land.[40] In the middle of the fifteenth century the Tverian merchant Afanasii Nikitin, in his travelogue to India, projected his anguished patriotic homesickness, compounded of religious and secular sentiments, on the Rus' Land,[41] and this at a time when the Tverian political establishment had to defer to Muscovite monopolization of that myth. These two authors had no institutional or political axe to grind, unlike the other texts adduced above, and therefore they constitute the most telling exceptions to the rule that the myth of the Rus' Land was an ideological football from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries. I think that these two cases illustrate why the myth would be utilized to enhance the prestige and status of a princely house.

---

conceptual problems of the social origin of the *byliny*, either folk or elite: Felix J. Oinas, "The Problem of the Aristocratic Origin of the *Byliny*," *Slavic Review* 30, no. 3 (September 1971): 513–22.

37 This dating depends upon Cherniavsky's argument that the phrase is an interpolation in Kurbsky's *History*. If Kurbsky's *History* originated in the seventeenth century, then it is still true. See Michael Cherniavsky, "Holy Russia: A Study in the History of an Idea," *American Historical Review* 63, no. 4 (April 1958): 617–37 and Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 101–27.

38 While the emotional attachments of the "folk" to a particular territory and its features such as Mother Volga need not be denied, most often no political identity is assigned to that geographic zone, hence the impossibility of interpreting such terminology as evidence of political or national consciousness.

39 Dimitar Angelov, "Patriotism in Medieval Bulgaria (9th–14th centuries)," *Bulgarian Historical Review* 4, no. 2 (1976): 22–45 is a nuanced exposition of a related problem which is slightly more sophisticated but still consistent with Soviet scholarship on the problem of the Rus' Land. Angelov proposes to evaluate the patriotism of the masses on the basis of behaviour, that is, heroic defence versus foreign invaders. However, discriminating between patriotism and self-defence is not easy. Since such activity is inarticulate, in any event the ideological object of whatever patriotism is present cannot be identified.

40 Abbot Daniil, *Wallfahrstbericht—Khozhenie*, ed. K. D. Seeman (1864; repr. Munich: Fink, 1970), 1, 128 (cited passage).

41 *Khozhenie za tri moria Afanasiia Nikitina 1466–1472 goda* (Moscow: Nauka, 1948), *passim* both text and accompanying articles and commentary. With some trepidation I am accepting here the translation of a key passage—the Rus' Land is just, except for its boyars—from the original "Turkic"; see text, 25, commentary, 188–89n282.

Although I would not deny the existence of notions of "ethnicity" among all medieval East Slavs, nevertheless I should like to suggest that the one sense in which the Rus' Land is never used is precisely ethnic. Contrasts between the Rus' Land and the Greek Land (*Grecheskaia xemlia*, or later more accurately *Grecheskoe tsarstvo*, Greek Empire), the Byzantine Empire, do not constitute an ethnic distinction but a political, statist one. After all, the Byzantine Empire, however Greek in language and culture, was abundantly multi-ethnic, and it is beyond credulity that visitors from Kievan Rus' would not have observed the diverse population elements in Constantinople, to which they in fact contributed. Thinking about the social groups whose adherence to the Rus' Land is known—merchants, clerics, nobles, princes—we should not be too disturbed to see no ethnic connotation to the term.[42] The clergy included Greeks as well as South Slavs; merchants certainly dealt with resident foreign merchants—Jews, Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, and others—although whether they belonged to the East Slavic merchantry is moot; princely retinues were of amazingly—or not so amazingly—diverse ethnic origins, Turkic, Scandinavian, and Slavic;[43] and the "masses" of the population of Kievan and Muscovite Rus' with which the elite dealt, as unruly taxpayers, obstreperous subjects, or undisciplined congregants, surely included sizable Finno-Ugric elements. The Rus' Land to which Berendei and Olgerdovichi could pledge loyalty was hardly ethnic.

It is not merely that ascribing national consciousness to the myth of the Rus' Land during the tenth to fifteenth centuries is at best dubious and unproven, if not unprovable. Rather, by relegating the actual employment of the term in our elite sources to secondary importance as the misuse of a hypothesized, unattested, and itself near-mythical medieval nationalism, this misconception obscures the actual content of the myth and seriously inhibits scholarly investigation of its complex evolution. It is because so many scholars have so blithely assumed that the meaning of the Rus' Land was obviously "nationalist" that so little serious research about its real significance has been done.

---

42 The Rus' Land could function as a social term, as in "the Rus' Land rejoiced," meaning that the *people* living in the Rus' Land rejoiced, but that does not entail that those "people" belonged to a single "nation," and in any event in such cases the actual reference is not to all the people, the people of all social classes, but to the elite.

43 On the object of the loyalty of the Muscovite service classes see S. B. Veselovskii, *Issledovaniia po istorii klassa sluzhilykh zemlevladel'tsev* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 474–75.

Chapter 3

THE TVERIAN LAND

THE *POKHVAL'NOE SLOVO* (word of praise) to Grand Prince Boris Aleksandrovich of Tver' attributed to the monk Foma has, since its discovery and publication in 1908,[1] attracted the attention of specialists both in Old Rus' literature and in medieval Rus' political thought. Despite some disagreements over its composition,[2] dating,[3] and authorship,[4] the consensus of scholarly opinion interprets the text as a reflection of Tverian political pretensions in the middle of the fifteenth century during the reign of Boris Aleksandrovich. This Tverian grand prince, who was alive at the time of Foma's writing, exercised unexpected influence in northeastern Rus' because a prolonged dynastic war in Muscovy weakened Vasilii II's power.

---

1 *Inoka Fomy Slovo pokhval'noe o blagovernom velikom kniaze Borise Aleksandroviche*, ed. N. P Likhachev (St. Petersburg: Aleksandrov, 1908). Likhachev's "Introduction" is on pages i–xl, the text 1–55. Hereafter "*Slovo*" refers to the text, and "Likhachev" in the notes to his "Introduction."

2 A. A. Shakhmatov, *Otzyv ob izdanii N. P. Likhacheva, Inoka Fomy Slovo pokhval'noe o blagovernom velikom kniaze Borise Aleksandroviche* (St. Petersburg: Aleksandrov, 1909), 6–11 maintained despite Likhachev that the *Slovo* was really six separate lauds (*slova*); Ia. S. Lur'e, "Rol' Tveri v sozdanii russkogo natsional'nogo gosudarstva," *Uchenye zapiski LGU* 36, seriia istoricheskikh nauk, no. 3 (1939): 85–109 at 88, countered that even if the sections were written at different times, the entire work was compiled at one time, hence the *Slovo* was one work. Also see V. A. Kuchkin, *Povest' o Mikhaile Tverskom* (Moscow: Nauka, 1974), 267–68.

3 Likhachev, liv: 1453 before news of the fall of Constantinople or the death of Dmitrii Shemiaka could reach Tver'; except for Shakhmatov, *Otzyv*, 11–13, that separate *slova* were written between 1446 and 1453, Likhachev's dating is usually accepted: e g., Dmitrij Čiževskij, *History of Russian Literature from the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque* (Den Haag: Mouton, 1962), 187 and M. A. Il'in, "Tverskaia literatura XV veka kak istoricheskii istochnik," *Trudy istoriko-arkhivnogo instituta* (Moscow) 3 (1947): 18–68 at 18.

4 There are no grounds for identifying the monk Foma with the Tverian envoy to Florence, the boyar Foma, since the monk refers to the boyar in the third person and indicates that he used the latter's written account and oral report of the council in writing the *Slovo*; moreover, no monk would retain his lay name after being shorn. See Likhachev, lv; Shakhmatov, *Otzyv*, 14; Il'in, "Tverskaia literatura," 20–21. Werner Philipp, "Ein Anonymus von Tverer Publizistik im 15 Jahrhundert," in *Festschrift für Dmytro Čiževskij zum 60 Geburtstag*, ed. Max Vasmer, Veroffentlichungen der Slavisches Seminar an der Freie Universität Berlin 6 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1954), 3–33, makes a serious case that the manuscript attribution of authorship to the monk Foma might be faulty. Wladimir Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe o velikom kniaze Borise Aleksandroviche*: est-il une source historique?" in *Essays in Honor of A.A. Zimin*, ed. Daniel Clarke Waugh (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1985), 379–403 at 379n1 refers to the author as Pseudo-Foma (Pseudo-Thomas) because the attribution of the text is late. Solely for convenience I refer to the author as Foma without the qualification of quotation marks or use of "Pseudo-Foma" as a euphemism.

The *Slovo* includes a description of the participation—really, as we shall see, only the reception—of the envoy of Boris Aleksandrovich, the boyar Foma,[5] at the Council of Ferrara–Florence. At this council the Byzantine Church agreed to an ecclesiastical union with the papacy in a vain attempt to secure military assistance which might have enabled Constantinople to resist the Ottoman onslaught. Foma attributes a variety of Byzantine imperial titles and epithets in a number of different combinations to Boris; these include *tsar'* (= basileus), *samoderzhets* (autocrat = avtokrator), and *gosudar'* (sovereign). Foma declares Boris to be worthy of an imperial crown (21, 28) as well as equalling or exceeding in his glory and piety such Byzantine emperors as Constantine the Great and Justinian. From these passages scholars have invariably concluded that Tver' aspired to be the new heir of the Byzantine Empire in much the same way as Moscow later did with the doctrine of Moscow-the Third Rome. Ostensibly the apostasy of the Greeks at the Council of Florence compromised them in the eyes of the religiously rigorous and politically ambitious Tverians.[6] The evidence does suggest that Foma's *Slovo* may have been a source of the epistles of the Pskov monk Filofei, who articulated the Third Rome theory.

This interpretation of the Byzantine content of the *Slovo* seems excessive. Passing remarks on the timidity of this Tverian account of the Council of Florence compared to the Muscovite versions[7] or on the lesser degree of success of Tver' in taking advantage of the situation than Moscow[8] only begin to suggest why. The contrast between the Tverian and Muscovite attitudes toward the Byzantines is much stronger than that. Foma never accuses the Greeks of apostasy. He describes only the correspondence preceding the council between Emperor John Paleologus and Boris,[9] and the lavish reception of the boyar Foma by the Byzantine Emperor, the Patriarch, the Pope, and numer-

---

5 Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe*," 390n61 proposes that the boyar Foma represented all Rus' princes, not just Boris Aleksandrovich.

6 Likhachev, lx; N. K. Gudzii, *Istoriia drevnei russkoi literatury*, 7th ed. (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1966), 308; Philipp, "Ein Anonymus," 4–7; *Istoriia russkoi literatury* (by Shambinago), 10 vols. in 13 (Moscow: Nauka, 1941–54), 2/1:249; Il'in, "Tverskaia literatura," 29; Lur'e, "Rol' Tveri," 91–93 (*pace* Lur'e, that there was really some formal coronation of Boris Aleksandrovich as emperor seems unwarranted); 109; Čiževskij, *History*, 188 agrees but adds that Boris was also considered the equal of the khans (*tsari*). Foma (37) narrates the visit of an envoy of the son of Timur (Temir-Aksak in the Rus' sources, or Tamerlane) from far-off Herat to Tver', to which Boris's fame had spread, bringing rich gifts. Timur's son Shavruk is called one of the *nevernye tsari* (literally: tsars of the unbelievers), as distinguished from the *vernye tsari* (believing tsars, Orthodox Christian tsars, i.e., Byzantine). Foma does not label Shavruk a Tatar, but the explicitness of the religious differences among tsars is atypical of the middle of the fifteenth century. See Halperin, "The Russian Land and The Russian Tsar," 48–52. The historicity of the diplomatic relations between Tver' and Herat does not strain credulity, as the voyage of the Tverian merchant Afanasii Nikitin to India indicates Rus' familiarity with that part of the world.

7 Likhachev, lv.

8 Il'in, "Tverskaia literatura," 21, 19, on the contradictions in the attitude of Boris toward the Council as conveyed by Foma.

9 Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe*," legitimately denies that this letter can be accepted as authentic, which I should have explicitly noted in my original article. I did not intend to imply its authenticity.

ous metropolitans. Each praises the Tverian Grand Prince highly. The theological discussions, the putative coercion of the truly Orthodox clerics to sign the agreement of church union, the apostasy of the Greeks: of all this, recorded in detail in the Muscovite accounts, there is not a word in the *Slovo*. How, after all, could the flattering rhetoric of the reception appeal to Tverian sensibilities were it pronounced by heretic Latins and apostate Greeks? Foma's treatment of the Council of Florence seems designed to obscure its ecclesiastical denouement in order to enhance its ceremonial. The envoy Foma left Florence without signing the agreement of church union, which Tver' did not recognize,[10] but the monk Foma's *Slovo* passes over these facts in silence.

On the other hand, the *Slovo* seems to be consistent with Muscovite reluctance to confront the alleged apostasy of the Greeks until well after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks in 1453, after Foma had written the *Slovo*, in fact until the schism in the Kievan metropolitanate between rival Uniate and anti-Uniate metropolitans in 1461.[11] If this is the case, then the use of Byzantine imperial vocabulary in the *Slovo* should be understood in a different context than has previously been proposed, one that does not challenge Byzantine legitimacy directly, The ascription of Byzantine titulature to Boris would merely further illustrate the typically medieval Rus' ambivalent need to usurp and compulsion to acknowledge Byzantine imperial theory, to invoke Cherniavsky's succinct and penetrating formulation of this complex relationship.[12] Alternatively, it might also constitute an application of a more "domesticated" imperial theory, the doctrine of the monk Akindin of Tver' of the early fourteenth century, that the grand prince is tsar in his own land. This precept is, of course, identical to the western medieval theory that *Rex est imperator in regno suo* (The king is emperor in his own realm). Akindin might have influenced Foma directly, or indirectly through one of Foma's frequently mentioned sources, the so-called *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi.[13] Without denying the seriousness of the imperial ideology of the *Slovo*—Boris Aleksandrovich is called tsar seven times, autocrat ten[14]—nevertheless the text belongs more to the pre-Florentine period of medieval Rus' utilization of Byzantine imperial ideology than to the post-Florentine.

---

10 Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe*," 20–21.

11 Cf. Ihor Ševčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence," *Church History* 24, no. 4 (December 1955): 306–9 and Gustave Alef, "Muscovy and the Council of Florence," *Slavic Review* 20, no. 3 (October 1961): 389–401. Neither mentions Foma's *Slovo*.

12 Michael Cherniavsky, "Khan or Basileus: An Aspect of Russian Medieval Political Theory," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 20, no. 4 (December 1959): 459–76.

13 Philipp, "Ein Anonymus," 6; Il'in, "Tverskaia literatura," 30; Gudzii, *Istoriia*, 308; *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 242, 249, even for those who regard the Donskoi *vita* as dating from the 1440s. Unfortunately, these passing remarks do not constitute a full textological analysis of the proposed connection between the two works. On both Akindin and the *vita* of Donskoi see Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 69–78.

14 Lur'e, "Rol' Tveri," 89. I should qualify my sweeping statement (Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 72) on the uniqueness of the Donskoi *vita* as an affirmation of pre-Florentine Imperial literature in light of the *Slovo*, which I had not taken sufficiently into account. Foma's work survived only in a defective manuscript from the second half of the sixteenth century, in the hands of Old Believers. One usually sees Muscovite "censorship" in the text's unlucky fate (Gudzii, *Istoriia*, 310).

The modesty of Tverian Byzantine aspirations in the *Slovo* is of a piece with the level of ambition in Rus' politics that it exhibits. Scholars have also interpreted the *Slovo* as an expression of Tverian aspirations to political preeminence, if not domination, in northeastern Rus', to "national" "all-Russian" (*obshchrusskii*) prestige as the centre for the unification of the single "Rus' Land."[15] The evidence of the text on this point bears close scrutiny.[16]

The very first page of the *Slovo* announces that Grand Prince Boris Aleksandrovich brought joy to the Tverian Land (*Tferskaia zemlia*), that he was given by God to the Tverian Land to strengthen it, that all lands praise the sovereign and defender of the Tverian Land, Boris (1). The entire Tverian Land (*vsia Tverskaia zemlia*) rejoices in having such a God-given ruler (2).

A letter from the Byzantine Emperor addresses Grand Prince Boris Aleksandrovich as ruler of the whole Tverian realm (*vsea derzhavy Tferskoi*) (4).[17] However, in greeting the envoy Foma at Florence John Paleologus now speaks of Boris as given by God to the Rus' Land (*russkaia zemlia*) (6). The patriarch declares that the fame of Boris Aleksandrovich flows from the Greek Land to the Rus' Land (6), and various metropolitans declare that there is no grand prince in Rus' comparable to Boris (6, 7 twice) whose piety and mercy receive praise in the Rus' Land as they do in Constantinople and in the monasteries on the Holy Mountain (Mt. Athos) (8).

Foma laments that the whole world is not a part of "this land promised by God" (10). The Rus' grand princes hear of and envy the imperial rule of Boris in "this land promised by God" (*v Bogom obetovannom toi zemli tsarstvuiushcha*; *ta zemlia* = this land) (11).

Boris merits lauding above all other Rus' grand princes for his church-building activities (12); no one else is like him in Rus' (13) (a much-repeated phrase in the text); he rules the "entire Tverian realm" (15). In a paraphrase of the famous words of Metropolitan Ilarion of Kiev, Constantinople praises Constantine, Kiev praises Saint Vladimir, and the Tverian Land praises Aleksandr (Mikhailovich), while Boris has exceeded all three in his virtues (15–16).[18]

Obviously, Muscovites and Muscovite texts were more fortunate, politically and ideologically; the Muscovites conquered Tver' in 1485 and the Donskoi *vita* entered into the chronicle tradition. Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe*," 394 qualifies my usage of the concept of "pre-Florentine" imperial literature. The title of Vodoff's article asks whether the *Slovo pokhval'noe* was an "historical source" (in his article he also uses the phrase "historical text"), by which Vodoff meant a reliable, accurate source, one that can be taken literally. I did not take the source "literally" (Vodoff notes that I impugned its mention of a coronation: Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe*," 394n82) but I believe that "inaccurate" ideological texts are valuable "historical sources" on the mentality and culture of their authors and audiences.

15 Especially Lur'e, "Rol' Tveri," 89, 101, and its reflections, such as in Il'in, "Tverskaia literatura," 3, 28, and Gudzii, *Istoriia*, 308.

16 I will give page references in line in parentheses.

17 The word "land" (*zemlia*) was interpolated on the flap of the page, which is both ungrammatical and superfluous. Likhachev, iv n2. Because such phrasing with "land" does not appear in surviving diplomatic documents, Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe*," 389 concludes that the text of the letter in the *Slovo pokhval'noe* was not authentic diplomatic correspondence.

18 Vodoff, "Le *Slovo pokhval'noe*," 393, especially 393n72, rightly criticizes my (and other scholars') omission of mention that Shakhmatov first accused Foma of plagiarizing this passage from Ilarion.

Boris responds with effective military measures to defend the Tverian regime (*Tferskaia vlast'*) against the intrusion of the boyar Kolychev, who came "from the boundaries of Moscow" (*ot predel moskovskikh*) (16). Boris refers to the "Grand Principality of Tver'" (*velikoe kniazhenie Tferskoe*) as the throne of his father (24). He defends the Tverian Land against King Casimir of Poland, returning afterward to his patrimony, the Tverian Grand Principality (36). In an attempt to woo his support in the Muscovite civil war,[19] Prince Dmitrii Shemiaka accuses Vasilii II (Shemiaka's uncle and rival in the Muscovite dynastic wars) of having betrayed both his (Shemiaka's) patrimony and that of Boris, the Tverian Grand Principality, to the Tatars (41), but despite this accusation Boris sends word of his support to the blinded and imprisoned Vasilii II. This information reaches the "Muscovite Land" (*moskovskaia zemlia*) (42). With the strong and implicitly crucial help of Boris, Vasilii II is restored to the Grand Principality of Vladimir (*velikoe kniazhenie Vladimirskoe*) (52).

On the defective final page of the *Slovo*, Foma yet again acclaims Boris as the builder of the Tverian Land, whose scepter (*skipetr'*) he wields (55).

Iakov Lur'e suggests that "this land promised by God," "this land," of which Boris is tsar, is the Rus' Land, because Tver' is not mentioned in several passages which precede these two intriguing phrases. However, neither is the Rus' Land mentioned in the run-up to these assertions, unless one goes pretty far back. It would be easy to conclude that the antecedent of the relative pronoun is so ambiguous as to be unidentifiable. Clearly the numerous references to grand princes in Rus', of whom Boris is the most pious and powerful, are directed against the Grand Princes of Moscow,[20] although the latter too are carefully accorded their grand-princely titles. Yet one wonders how significant it is that the sentences linking Boris Aleksandrovich and the Rus' Land are concentrated in one compact section of the *Slovo* and all are put into the mouths of the Greeks. Despite Lur'e, specific invocations of the Rus' Land in the *Slovo* are rare and dwarfed two-to-one by appeals to the Tverian Land (approximately seven to three). Foma seems to use the phrase the Rus' Land only as a synonym for Rus', which is not always the case. There is no implication that Boris is the only grand prince in Rus'; obviously quite the contrary, he is only the *primus intra pares* among the Rus' grand princes. Therefore, the Rus' Land does not mean the area which Boris rules at all, but all of northeastern Rus'. The patrimony of Boris Aleksandrovich is the Tverian Grand Principality, and logically the Tverian Land, not the Rus' Land. What Boris rules is, without question, the Tverian Land, and the entire text lends credence to the inescapable conclusion that it is the Tverian Land which is the "land promised by God".[21] What does this deceptively simple conclusion entail?

---

19 Foma presents an idealized account of Boris Aleksandrovich's somewhat duplicitous role in the Muscovite civil wars; see L. V. Cherepnin, *Russkie feodal'nye arkhivy XIV–XV vv.*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Nauka, 1948–1951), 1:322, 326–27, and Lur'e, "Rol' Tver," 98–102, despite Il'in, 'Tverskaia literatura," 27.

20 First noted by Likhachev, xvi.

21 Several scholars seem to make this point, but without carrying it to its necessary and logical conclusion: Philipp, "Ein Anonymus," 37; Čiževskij, *History*, 188.

Briefly put, Foma did not really seek to identify Tver' with the Rus' Land. Given the fact that the myth of the Rus' Land derived from Kievan Rus', was the most potent and legitimizing political concept for a polity in medieval Rus', the only possible explanation for Foma's reticence is his realization that by the middle of the fifteenth century, if not well earlier, the concept of the Rus' Land had been coopted by Moscow.[22] Both the *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi, whether antecedent or near-contemporaneous to the *Slovo*, and the Muscovite tales of the Council of Florence, from about a decade later, identify Muscovy as the Rus' Land which is the patrimony of the Muscovite dynastic house. Not even the Muscovite civil war could weaken Muscovy's ideological hold on the myth of the Rus' Land and not even Foma's genuinely ambitious attempt to exalt the Grand Prince of Tver' could impinge on that monopoly. The most Foma could achieve was to question, vaguely, whether Moscow and the Rus' Land were one, as Muscovite texts invariably imply, or whether Tver' and Moscow were both parts of the Rus' Land. Such restrained political intentions better resonate with the cautious application of the Byzantine imperial model to Tver' in the *Slovo* than seeing the text as a precursor of Filofei's Third Rome theory. The Muscovite versions of the events at the Council of Florence define the Rus' Land as the territory ruled by Grand Prince Vasilii II.[23]

Curiously, Foma uses one expression for Muscovy which should have aroused scholarly interest. Foma calls Muscovy the "Muscovite Land." No Muscovite ideological work of or about the events of Muscovy history during the century before Foma wrote ever utilizes this concept. In the *Slovo,* referring to the Muscovite Grand Principality as the Muscovite Land obviously enabled Foma to avoid calling it the Rus' Land, which would not have been to his liking. Yet he uses the term only once, and an even vaguer circumlocution, the "Muscovite boundaries," also only once.

Foma's revision of the passage from Ilarion used in the *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi, like the passage in the *vita* of Donskoi, breaks syntactic consistency. Constantinople and Kiev are cities, but the Tverian Land praises Boris. Like in the *vita* of Donskoi but unlike in Ilarion, Foma has Kiev praise St. Vladimir, but unlike in both texts, Foma did not invoke the Rus' Land at all. No one praises a Muscovite prince here, but even so Foma could not muster the pretense that the Rus' Land praised a Tverian grand prince.

The itinerary of the envoy Foma (5) includes an impressively artificial but compulsively consistent list of "lands' (*zemli*), culminating in the "Florentine Land," so however Foma utilized "land" terminology cannot be explained by ignorance.

The usage of the term the Rus' Land in connection with Tverian rulers in the so-called "Preface" to the Tverian Chronicle (*Predislovie letopistsa: Kniazhenie Tferskago blagovernykh velikikh kniazei tferskikh*), is not compatible with the pattern of Foma's *Slovo*.[24] Although the "Preface" is also associated by scholars with the reign of Boris

---

22 See chapter 1. Similarly, Foma never utilizes the title "grand prince of all Rus'" (*velikii kniaz' vsea Rusi*), which belonged to the grand princes of Vladimir, i.e., the Muscovites. Foma would not have wanted to ascribe this title to Vasilii II, and could not apply it to Boris, so he avoids it, which has never been noted in studies of the *Slovo*.

23 Cherniavsky, "The Reception of the Council of Florence," 347–59.

24 See Lur'e, "Rol' Tveri," 94–97, despite Shakhmatov, *Otzyv*, 14–16. Text: *Rogozhskii letopisets,*

Aleksandrovich and sometimes assigned to the authorship of the monk Foma, these assertions must refer to an older redaction, because the surviving version covers the period from 1327 to 1499. Under 1327 (col. 465), the "Preface" describes Prince Aleksandr Mikhailovich as autocrat and ruler of the Rus' Land, like his father was; under 1363 (col. 469), on the other hand, it ascribes to Mikhail Aleksandrovich rule over the "Tver' regions" (*oblasti Tverskie*) but then alludes to the Tverian Land. Finally, s.a. 1462 calls Vasilii II on his death autocrat of the Rus' Land. I suspect careless adulteration of the original readings of those passages that link Tver' princes with the Rus' Land. After Muscovy incorporated Tver', such confusion in terminology would not be unexpected.

Tverian political thought and its attempt to create a myth of the Tverian Land cannot be dismissed as "provincial" or "separatist" because Muscovy had taken out a copyright on the myth of the Rus' Land. Indeed, Foma got farther pursuing an alternative to the Rus' Land, namely the Tverian Land, than did authors in either Novgorod or Pskov.

Tverskii sbornik in *PSRL*, 15 (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), cols. 463–504. Column numbers will be cited in parentheses in the text.

Chapter 4

THE NOVGORODIAN LAND

THE MEDIEVAL CITY of Novgorod, best known as Lord Novgorod the Great, continues to occupy the interest of specialists in the early history of the East Slavs. Indeed, Knud Rasmussen wrote that "No other medieval Russian city has drawn as much attention from scholars, as Novgorod the Great." Rasmussen attributed this unflagging attention to the quantity and quality of the surviving source material, which both raised innumerable questions and failed to provide definitive answers.[1] The gaps in the extant sources derive in part from the disappearance of Novgorod's state archive, although Igor' Shaskol'skii has absolved Muscovite Grand Prince Ivan III, who annexed Novgorod in 1471 and incorporated it into Muscovy in 1478, from responsibility for its destruction.[2] Mythology and politics have long infused research about Novgorod. Eve Levin concluded that "Most Western scholars still subscribe to the nineteenth-century romantic depiction of Novgorod as Russia's democratic alternative to Muscovite oriental despotism," even though "The historical framework espoused by most Western historians of Russia was abandoned by serious students of the Novgorodian past several decades ago."[3] The idealization of Novgorodian freedom began in the eighteenth century and had already peaked by the time of Alexander Radishchev and the Decembrists.[4]

---

1 Knud Rasmussen, "300 zolotykh poiasov drevnego Novgoroda," *Scando-Slavica* 25 (1979): 93–103 at 93. For example, A. L. Khoroshkevich concluded that it was impossible even to tell if *tamozhennye knigi* (customs books) existed in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Novgorod. See A. L. Khoroshkevich, *Torgovlia Velikogo Novgoroda s Pribaltikoi i Zapadnoi Evropy v XIV–XV vekakh* (Moscow: Nauka, 1963), 17n38.

2 I. P. Shaskol'skii, "Sud'ba gosudarstvennogo arkhiva Velikogo Novgoroda," *Vspomogatel'nye istoricheskie distsipliny* 4 (1972): 213–28. V. L. Yanin, "The Archaeological Study of Novgorod: An Historical Perspective," in V. L. Yanin, E. N. Nosov, A. S. Khoroshev, A. N. Sorokin, E. A. Rybina, V. I. Povetkin, and P. G. Gaidukov, *The Archaeology of Novgorod, Russia: Recent Studies from the Town and Its Hinterland*, ed. Mark A. Brisbane, trans. Katherine Judelson (Lincoln: Society for Medieval Archeology, 1992), 67–106 at 89 blames its destruction on Ivan IV's sack of the city in 1570.

3 Eve Levin, "Novgorod Birchbark Documents: The Evidence for Literacy in Medieval Russia," in *Medieval Archaeology. Papers of the Seventeenth Annual Conference of the Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies*, ed. Charles L. Redman (Binghamton: State University of New York, 1989), 127–37 at 128, 129.

4 Christian Lübke, *Novgorod in der russischen Literatur (bis zu den Dekabristen)* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1984); O. V. Martyshin, *Vol'nyi Novgorod. Obshchestvenno-politicheskii stroi i pravo feodal'noi respubliki* (Moscow: Rossiiskoe pravo, 1992), 6–26. On the often political nature of discussions of Novgorod even the greatest experts agree. See V. L. Yanin, "Foreword," in Henrik Birnbaum, *Novgorod in Focus. Selected Essays* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1996), 9–10. Thomas C. Owen, "Novgorod and Moscow as Models of Russian Economic Development," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 19 (1995): 497–512, especially 498–501, 507, provides evidence of the perseverance of the reified contrast noted by Levin.

Contemporary scholarly research owes much of its energy and excitement to the discovery of the Novgorodian birchbark documents by Soviet archeologists led by Artemii Artsikhovskii, and the stimulating and prolific publications of Valentin Ianin.[5] On many significant issues of Novgorodian history consensus is still lacking not only between Western and Russian scholars, but even among Russian specialists.

Little research has focused on Novgorod's political ideology. Usually, ideological significance has been found in Novgorod's sponsorship of its own chronicle-writing tradition, church architecture, *vitae*, coins, seals, and icons.[6] There have been noteworthy studies of Novgorodian saints, icons, and cults.[7] In narrative sources of Novgorod provenance the Novgorodians fought for "God and St. Sophia," thus identifying their polity with its cathedral church and visible symbol, the Holy Wisdom. In its treaties with northeastern princes and Western powers Novgorod defended its rights and privileges in terms of custom or tradition (*poshlina* or *starina*) sometimes embodied in "old charters" (*starye gramoty*). Relationships in treaty or narrative were defined according to the "will" (*vole/volia*) of Novgorod. Such a conception of ancient rights, even or espe-

5 On the birchbark correspondence see Levin, "Novgorod," 127–37, with citations to relevant literature. Surveys of Ianin's contributions to and the historiography of Novgorod include: Khoroshkevich, *Torgovlia*, 5–16; Lawrence N. Langer, "V. L. Ianin and the history of Novgorod," *Slavic Review* 33, no. 1 (March 1974): 114–19; A. S. Khoroshev, "The Origins of Novgorod in Russian historiography," *Soviet Studies in History* 23, no. 4 (1985): 22–45, translated from "Proiskhozhdenie Novgoroda v otechestvennoi istoriografii," *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta*, 6 (1983): 40–53; A. N. Tsamutali, "Istoriia Velikogo Novgoroda v osveshchennii russkoi istoriografii XIX–nachala XX vv.," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik* 1, no. 11 (1982): 96–112; L. A. Kocha, "S. M. Soloviev o novgorodskoi istorii," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik* 1, no. 11 (1982): 113–18; V. F. Andreev, "Problemy sotsial'no-politicheskoi istorii Novgoroda XII–XV vv. v sovetskoi istoriografii," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik* 1, no. 11 (1982): 119–45; N. A. Kazakova, "Vneshniaia politika Novgoroda v russkoi i sovetskoi istoriografii," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik* 1, no. 11 (1982): 146–64; E. A. Rybina, "Torgovlia srednevekovogo Novgoroda v istoricheskoi literature," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik* 1, no. 11 (1982): 165–88; Martyshin, *Vol'nyi Novgorod*, 31–49; and especially Levin, "Novgorod," 128–29. I. Ia. Froianov expounded his views of Novgorodian history in his *Miatezhnyi Novgorod. Ocherki istorii gosuarstvennosti, sotsial'noi i politicheskoi bor'by kontsa IX–nachala XIII stoletii* (St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskii Universitet, 1992). Cf. V. L. Ianin, *Ia poslal tebve berestu ...*, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Moskovskii universitet 1975), 105–6 for a contrast between the "old" and "new" images of Novgorod.

6 For example Joel Raba, "Novgorod in the Fifteenth Century: A Re-examination," *Canadian Slavic Studies* 1, no. 3 (Fall 1967): 348–694 at 351–53.

7 For example Paul Bushkovitch, "Urban Ideology in Medieval Novgorod: An Iconographic Approach," *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 16, no. 1 (January–March 1975): 19–26; A. S. Khoroshev, *Tserkov' v sotsial'no-politicheskoi sisteme Novgorodskoi feodal'noi respubliki* (Moscow: Moskovskii Universitet, 1980), on which see Richard O. Bosley, "The Saints of Novgorod: à propos of A. S. Choroševʼs Book on the Church in Medieval Novgorod," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 32, no. 1 (1984): 1–15; V. A. Plugin, "The Boyar Vasilii Danilovich Mashkov and Feofan Grek," *Soviet Studies in History* 23, no. 4 (1985): 47–70 translated from "Boiarin Vasilii Danilovich Mashkov i Feofan Grek," in *Drevnyi Novgorod* (Moscow: Iamshchikov, 1983), 248–70; Michael S. Flier, "The Semiotics of Faith in Fifteenth-Century Novgorod: An Analysis of the Quadripartite Icon," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 25, no. 1–4 (1991): 121–58; and Vladimir Vodoff, "Le culte de Znamenie à Novgorod: Tradition et réalité historique," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 28 (1995): 1–19.

cially when used to justify innovations, was as typical of the medieval world as invocations of God and divine protection.

Novgorod projected its identity through its self-designation. In the last quarter of the fourteenth century Novgorod became *Velikii Novgorod*, Great Novgorod or Novgorod the Great, as Ekkegard Klug has cogently argued, to distinguish itself from Nizhnyi (literally: lower) Novgorod on the lower Volga River, which called itself just "Novgorod." Novgorod-on-the-Volkhov did *not* call itself *Verkhnyi* ("Upper") Novgorod, nor was it so called by the inhabitants of the northeast. Such a purely geographic appellation would surely have offended Novgorodian sensibilities.[8] Novgorod's increasing political pretensions generated the more exalted *gospodin Velikii Novgorod* (Lord Novgorod the Great) well-known in scholarship, and even *gosudar' gospodin Velikii Novgorod* (Sovereign Lord Novgorod the Great).

Governmental actions emanated from these urban denotations. The Novgorod Judicial Charter from the 1470s was issued on behalf of Great Novgorod.[9] When Novgorod began issuing its own coinage in 1420 the inscription was always "Great Novgorod" (*Velikii Novgorod*).[10] Novgorodian lead seals were mostly *ex officio*, containing the name of the officeholder and the name of his office, but Ianin identified a series of seals as representing the Council of Lords (*soviet gospod*) [which some more recent scholarship concludes did not exist], an executive body of officials first attested in the last decade of the thirteenth century. The Council of Lords subsequently dominated the town assembly (*veche*). These seals carried the inscription *Pechat' Novgorodskaia* (Novgorodian Seal), *Pechat' Velikogo Novgoroda* (Seal of Great Novgorod), or *Pechat' vsego Novgoroda* (Seal of All Novgorod).[11] Novgorod's treaties also contained these self-identifications.

And yet these mutually consistent aspects of Novgorodian ideology do not tell the whole story. Something is missing, something, unfortunately, which the vagaries of scholarly prose have obscured. What these sources do not contain is any ideological invocation of the "Novgorodian Land" (*Novgorodskaia zemlia*).

---

8 Ekkegard Klug, "Novgorod: Groß Novgorod und Nižnij Novgorod: Zum Terminologie altrussischer Urkunden und Chroniken des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 33, no. 1 (1985): 92–102, despite V. V. Nizov, "Iz istorii titulirovaniia Novgoroda 'Velikim'," in *Shvedy i russkii sever: istoriko-kul'turnye sviazi* (Kirov: Kirovskiy gos. ob"edinnenyi istoriko-arkhitekturnyy i literaturnyy muzey, 1997), 60–72.

9 *PRP*, 2: *Pamiatniki prava feodal'no-razdroblennoi Rusi* (Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura: 1953), 212–18. Ironically, both the Beloozero Judicial Charter of 1488 and the 1497 Beloozero Customs Charter, both written after Muscovite annexation of Novgorod, do mention the "Novgorodian Land"; see *PRP*, 3: *Pamiatniki prava perioda obrazovaniia russkogo tsentralizovannogo gosudarstva XIV–XV v.* (Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1955), 170–74, 175–78. In several instances parallel phrasing might have inspired such usage.

10 Count Iv. Iv. Tolstoi, *Russkaia dopetrovskaia numismatika*, vol. 1: *Monety Velikogo Novgoroda* (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademia nauk, 1884). See the comments of V. L. Ianin, *Novgorodskie posadniki* (Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1962), 272–73.

11 V. L. Ianin, *Aktovye pechati drevnei Rusi X–XV vv.*, vol. 2: *Novgorodskie pechati XIII–XV vv*. (Moscow: Nauka, 1970), 125–33, 220–28.

The ubiquity of this system of "land" nomenclature lies at the foundation of the habitual use of the term the "Novgorodian Land" in scholarship. It found its way into the names of Viktor Bernadskii's seminal monograph and Andrei Kuza's article on historical geography.[12] Simply put, writers in Russian, and some writers in other languages, commonly use the phrase. At least they did not invent it. The phrase the "Novgorodian Land" did occur in narrative and documentary sources from eleventh- to fifteenth-century Novgorod, and it does merit attention, not only for what it may have meant, but also as a reflection of some fundamental principles of the Novgorodian political and social order. However, the Novgorodians did not invest the phrase with any ideological baggage. They did not fight for it or make treaties in its name. Indeed they seem not to have projected any specific definition onto it at all, which explains the confusion and contradictions in its geographic content and the arbitrariness and infrequency of its appearance in Novgorodian sources. The absence of a concept or myth (as opposed to merely a phrase) of the Novgorodian Land requires explanation.

To understand existing geographic definitions of the Novgorodian Land it is useful to recapitulate briefly Novgorod's political structure and administrative infrastructure.[13] The city of Novgorod was eventually divided into five *kontsy* (boroughs; literally: ends), each with its own town assembly (*veche*), beneath which functioned streets (*ulitsy*).[14] In addition, a decimal administrative structure organized people into ten hundreds (*sotni*), supervised by the chiliarch (*tysiatskii*). There were also social-economic organizations of merchants dealing with specific foreign trading partners and/or patronizing a specific church, the most famous the "Hundred" (*Sto*) of the Church of St. John the Baptist. (Whether such fraternities constituted guilds similar to those of western Europe is a separate matter.) Outside the city itself Novgorod's territorial empire included subordinate or satellite cities (*prigorody*); districts (*volosti*) perhaps later converted under Muscovite rule to fifths (*piatiny*),[15] and very outlying tribute-paying zones only irregularly visited

---

12 V. N. Bernadskii, *Novgorod i novogorodskaia zemlia v XV veke* (Moscow: Nauka, 1961), 9; Andrei Kuza, "Novgorodskaia zemlia," in *Drevnerusskie kniazhestva, X–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975), 144–201. It also appeared, less prominently, in the title of L. V. Danilova's *Ocherki po istorii zemlevladeniia i khoziaistva v Novgorodskoi zemle v XIV–XV vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1955), and in more article titles than can be counted.

13 All standard works on Novgorod agree on the nature of this structure. See Bernadskii, *Novgorod*; Ianin, *Novgorodskie posadniki*, Jörg Leuschner, *Novgorod. Untersuchungen zu einigen Fragen seiner Verfassungs- und Bevölkerungsstruktur* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1980); Henrik Birnbaum, *Lord Novgorod the Great. Essays on the History and Culture of a Medieval City-State*, vol. 1: *The Historical Background* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1981); and Birnbaum, *Novgorod in Focus*.

14 See, for instance, I. E. Kleinenberg and A. A. Sevast'ianova, "Ulichane na strazhe svoei territorii (po materialiam ganzeiskoi perepiski XV v.)," *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik* 2, no: 12 (1984), 157–64.

15 Martyshin, *Vol'nyi Novgorod*, 243, explicitly relegated the term *piatiny* to post-independence times, but his assertion that the districts were converted into fifths may be accepted only in general terms. The territory covered by the term "districts" may have been reorganized as fifths, but there was no one-to-one relationship between old districts and new fifths. V. L. Ianin, *Novgorodskie akty XII–XV vv. Khronologicheskii kommentarii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991), 7, also dates the fifths to after Moscow's conquest of Novgorod.

by Novgorodian expeditions having at most temporarily occupied outposts (*pogosty*). These systems were not static. Over the course of Novgorod's expansion to the north and northeast and the political and social development of Novgorod-city and its dependencies, such as Pskov, these overlapping organizational forms changed. Gradually full sovereignty came to reside in the Novgorod-city's town assembly, which at times included representatives from other cities and districts. The Novgorod-city's town assembly chose Novgorod's prince, elected the three nominees from whom its archbishop was chosen by lot, elected the archimandrite who supervised Novgorod's monasteries; elected the mayors (*posadniki*) and chiliarch, and decided all major political issues such as war and peace. Novgorod's urban assembly governed an empire stretching from the Baltic to the Arctic Seas, from Lake Peipus to the Urals and Siberia, and south and southeast to the borders of the Vladimirian–Suzdalian (later Tverian and Muscovite) principalities. Novgorod conducted foreign relations with Scandinavia, the Hanseatic League, and later Livonia, and Poland–Lithuania among its "western" neighbours.

To how much of this territory did the term the Novgorodian Land apply? Only to Novgorod-city proper? to the entire landmass incorporated under Novgorodian control? to a subset of subordinate cities and districts? Most scholars have merely assumed the broadest application of the term, and then utilized circumlocutions in a multiplicity of not always consistent ways to rationalize anomalies. A few examples will suffice. Henryk Birnbaum summarized the Muscovite annexation of 1471 as follows: "The city on the Volkhov was formally annexed by the Muscovite state together with its widespread possessions—the so-called Novgorod Land."[16] Why "so-called"? "Called" the Novgorodian Land by whom? Liudmila Danilova included the subordinate cities and fifths in the Novgorodian Land but also referred to the core or primary territory of the Novgorodian Land into which areas like the Dvina and Obonezh'e regions were incorporated after colonization and assimilation of the native non-Russian population.[17] Andrei Kuza defined the Novgorodian Land within maximal limits but also referred to the core (*iadro*) or the central region (*oblast'*) of the Novgorodian Land as well as the Novgorodian Land "itself" (*sama*), defined the districts as provinces (*provintsii*) [an obviously anachronistic term], and mentioned the core Novgorodian Lands [*nota bene* the plural form].[18] Ianin tried to separate the districts where princes could not own lands from the Novgorodian Land where they could. Although he defined the Novgorodian Land as including the subordinate cities and the lands eventually organized as fifths, he also contrived the expression the "Novgorodian Land properly speaking" (*sobstvennaia Novgorodskaia zemlia*).[19] Later he included the fifths in the Novgorodian Land,[20] and still later defined the Novgorodian

16 Birnbaum, *Lord Novgorod the Great*, 40. [In quotations from English I retain the original usage without converting "Novgorod Land" to "Novgorodian Land." Russian quotations of course used the adjectival form.]

17 Danilova, *Ocherki po istorii zemlevladeniia*, 4, 20, 34, 290, 297.

18 Kuza, "Novgorodskaia zemlia." My comments in brackets.

19 Ianin, *Novgorodskie posadniki*, 111–12, 157, 371.

20 V. L. Ianin, *Novgorodskaia feodal'naia votchina (Istoriko-genealogicheskoe issledovanie)*

Land as Novgorod and its adjacent lands, including the Dvina Land.[21] Aleksandr Khoroshev also both referred to the Novgorodian Land and to Novgorodian Lands.[22] Finally, Jörg Leuschner defined the Novgorodian Land as "all Novgorodian territory" but then assigned the fifths to the core lands in contradistinction to the subordinate cities.[23] In these interpretations the Novgorodian Land both circumscribed some core territory surrounding the city proper and constituted the totality of territories subsumed under the Novgorodian Empire, for which there was no separate term.[24] Indeed, the difficulty of defining the Novgorodian Land lies in the obvious but overlooked fact that it did not have a specific geographic meaning. It was used in both the narrower and broader senses historians have postulated, exactly as the term Great Novgorod could apply to city, city-state, or empire.[25] Confusion in the use of the phrase the Novgorodian Land results from a combination of the linguistic habit of scholars of early Rus' history of invoking "Land" nomenclature and the disposition of the term in the sources.

The Novgorodian chronicles did utilize the phrase. Only a single entry in the Old Recension of the *Novgorod First Chronicle*[26] referred to the Novgorodian Land:[27] in 1137 Prince Sviatoslav Ol'govich gathered the "entire Novgorodian Land" (*vsiu zemliu novgorod'skuiu*) to make war on his brother Gleb.[28] There was a single ambiguous new

(Moscow: Nauka 1981), 253. Cf. V. L. Ianin, *Ocherki kompleksnogo istochnikovedeniia. Srednevekovyi Novgorod* (Moscow: Vysshaia shkola, 1977), 78–79, 86–87.

21 Ianin, *Novgorodskie akty*, 7, 130–31.

22 Khoroshev, *Tserkov*, 49, 70, 72, 107, 141 vs. 134, 141 (both singular and plural on the same page), 143, 154, 159. Khoroshev identified the districts as "Lands." (This enumeration of page references is not exhaustive.)

23 Leuschner, *Novgorod*, 57–58.

24 The phrase "the Novgorodian state" (*gosudarstvo*) is of course not contemporary; for example, L. V. Cherepnin, *Novgorodskie berestianye gramoty kak istoricheskii istochnik* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 225, 319 implicitly equated the Novgorodian Land and the Novgorodian state.

25 Eduard Mühle, *Die städtischen Handelzentren der nordwestlichen Rus'. Anfänge und frühe Entwicklung altrussischer Städte (bis gegen Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts)* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1991), 303 observed that terms for the people of a city entailed also the people of the state = Land. Thus "Novgorodians" (*novgorodtsy*) referred to all inhabitants of the Novgorodian Land. This scenario is complicated by his citation of the term "Ladogans" (*ladozhane*), because Ladoga was a Novgorodian satellite city.

26 There is solid consensus on the dating of the *Novgorod First Chronicle*: Vladimir Vodoff, "Quelques remarques sur la première chronique de Novgorod," in *Studia slavica mediaevalia et humanistica Riccardo Picchio dicata*, ed. Michele Coluci, Guiseppi Dell'Agata, and Harvey Goldblatt, 2 vols. (Rome: Ateneo, 1986), 2:741–53 and B. M. Kloss, "Letopis' Novgorodskaia pervaia," in *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti drevnei Rusi*, vol. 1: *XI–pervaia polovina XIV v.*, ed. D. S. Likhachev (Leningrad: Bulanin, 1987), 245–47.

27 The Novgorodian chronicles utilized both the March and Ultra-March calendars, so converting their dates to Western equivalents requires careful study. However, since this chapter does not attempt to create a chronological sequence, it is not necessary to examine each entry's dating. I have therefore relied upon N. G. Berezhkov, *Khronologiia russkogo letopisaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1963), 212–306 to identify which years employed which calendrical style.

28 *NPL*, 6645 (1137–1138), 25. Obviously in this citation the phrase the Novgorodian Land

invocation of the Novgorodian Land in the Younger Recension: in 1441–1442 Grand Prince Vasilii II of Moscow made war on "many Novgorodians lands" (*mnogo zemle Novgorodchkoi*).[29] Given the frequency of scholarly references to the Novgorodian Land, the paucity of such invocations in these chronicles is surprising.

This phenomenon was not the product of ignorance of "Land" nomenclature. The Old Recension of the *Novgorod First Chronicle* utilized the following phrases: the Suzdalian Land,[30] Riazanian Land,[31] Danish Land,[32] Volhynian Land (in the southwest),[33] German Land,[34] Chud' Land,[35] and Em' Land.[36] Naturally the *Novgorod First Chronicle* employed the term Rus' Land to apply to the Dnieper River valley triangle of Kiev, Chernigov, and Pereiaslavl', but other entries implicitly raise the issue of Novgorodian inclusion within the aegis of that term: in 1263 Grand Prince Aleksandr Nevskii laboured for "Novgorod and the whole Rus' Land"[37] and in 1270 the metropolitan asserted his jurisdiction over the Rus' Land.[38] Some sort of *translatio* to the northeast, Vladimirian–Suzdalian Rus', might or might not be implied by the entry in 1327 that the Tatar general Shevkal had taken Tver', Kashin, and Torzhok (Novyi Torg, a Novgorodian possession), and "simply stated, laid waste the entire Rus' Land. God and St. Sophia protected only Novgorod" (*prosto reshchi vsiu zemliu russkuiu polozhisha pustu, tol'ko Novgorod ubliude Bog i Sviataia Sofiia*).[39] Novgorod's chroniclers were perfectly conversant with the names of "Lands."

One might argue that these allusions to 'Lands" derived from non-Novgorodian perceptions and were only borrowed by Novgorodian chroniclers. However, the appearance of a novel term in Novgorodian chronicles, one which could only have originated from a

---

denoted a collective of people, probably military, which is common in early Rus' terminology; see *Slovar' russkogo iazyka XI–XVII vv.*, vol. 5 (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), s.v. *zemlia*, definition 9, 376 right column–377 left column. Alternative terms in Novgorodian sources also carried both geographic and (in the literal sense of the word) popular meanings. In this chapter my focus is simply on identifying the presence of such terms, not with exploring their alternative geographic or social definitions.

29 *NPL*, 6949, 421. The use of the plural "lands" in and of itself suggests an accidental phrase, not a political concept. This entry was the only significant use of the phrase I found in the *Chronicle of Avraamka*, which also reflects fifteenth-century Novgorodian chronicle-writing. See *PSRL*, 16 (St. Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia kommissiia, 1889), s.a. 6949, 182.

30 *NPL*, 6812 (1304–1305), 92. See chapter 5 below.

31 *NPL*, 6746 (1237–1238), 74.

32 *NPL*, 6810 (1302–1303), 91.

33 *NPL*, 6838 (1330–1331), 99.

34 *NPL*, 6776 (1267–1268), 86 (the "entire German Land" = people); 6819 (1311–1312), 93.

35 *NPL*, 6684 (1176–1177), 35; 6722 (1214–1215), 52; 6731 (1223–1224) 61 (*vsiu Chudskuiu zemliu* here is geographic, the entire Chud' Land); 6745 (1236–1237), 74; 6750 (1242–1243), 78.

36 *NPL*, 6764 (1256–1257), 81.

37 *NPL*, 6771 (1263–1264), 84.

38 *NPL*, 6778 (1270–1271), 89.

39 *NPL*, 6835 (1327–1328), 98.

Novgorodian perspective, clinches the argument that the virtual omission of references to the Novgorodian Land in the Novgorod chronicle was deliberate. The *Novgorod First Chronicle* designed Vladimirian–Suzdalian Rus' as the Lower Land (*Nizovskaia zemlia*),[40] a term derived from referring to the people of the confluence of the Volga and Oka Rivers as the *Niz'* (those who dwell down-river). As far as I can tell all appearances of this term, also modeled grammatically on the Rus' Land,[41] were of Novgorodian provenance. In short, the Novgorodian book-men were familiar enough with the system of land-terminology to invent their own substitute for what would otherwise be called the Suzdalian Land.

At the same time the compilers of the *Novgorod First Chronicle* used other terms for what scholars call the Novgorodian Land, similarly in a non-ideological fashion. First, mention should be made of the term the Novgorodian region (*Novgorodskaia oblast'*),[42] often with the qualifier "all" or "the entire." Secondly, the *Novgorod First Chronicle* employed the term Novgorodian district, singular (*novgorodskaia volost'*) or Novgorodian districts, plural (*novgorodskie volosti*), also sometimes with "all" or "the entire," and sometimes identifying specific locations as districts.[43] From these citations it appears that the three terms (land, region, district) cannot be entirely separated chronologically or thematically. Sometimes they were used as synonyms but at other times they possessed different meanings according to context.[44]

Translations of the *Novgorod First Chronicle* do not clarify these terms. In the English translation[45] *Novgorodskaia zemlia* became "the Novgorod Land," *Novgorodskaia oblast'*

---

40 *NPL*, 6761 (1253–1254), 80; 6767 (1259–1260), 82; 6777 (1269–1270), 88; 6823 (1315–1316), 94; 6824 (1316–1317), 95; 6826 (1317–1318), 95; 6830 (1322–1323), 96; 6833 (1325–1326), 97. Note that both "land" and locational terms could be applied to a social group: both "the entire *Niz*" and "the entire *Nizovskaia zemlia*" could be used to designate an invading army from Vladimiria–Suzdalia.

41 Geographic viewpoint also substantiates the interpretation of the *Zalesskaia zemlia* (Land beyond the Forest) to denote Vladimiria–Suzdalia as southern in origin, either Kievan or perhaps steppe. See Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," 18–19.

42 *NPL*, 6642 (1134–1135), 23; 6650 (1142–1143), 26; 6655 (1147–1148), 27 (*so vsiu oblastiu Novgorodskoiu*—with the entire Novgorod region, people); 6706 (1198–1199), 44; 6748 (1240–1241), 77 (*vsiu oblast' Novgorodskuiu*—the entire Novgorodian region, geographic).

43 *NPL*, 6692 (1184–1185), 37; 6742 (1216–1217), 56 Volok; 6748 (1240–1241), 78; 6761 (1253–1254), 80; 6778 (1270–1271), 89 the "entire" (*vsia*) *volost' Novgorodskaia*, the Pskovites, Ladogans, Korelians, Izhera, and Vozhan = people. Cf. the new entries in the Younger Recension: 6781 (1272–1273), 322: the *volost' Novgorodskuiu* consists of Volok, Bezhitsi, and Vologda; 6856 (1347–1348), 360; 6953 (1445–1446), 425, fifty Novgorodian *volosti*. As a matter of principle, I have avoided citing Pskovian material as evidence of Novgorodian views, but it is legitimate to point out their compatibility. For example, Pskov I Chronicle, *Pskovskie letopisi*, 2 vols. [hereafter *PL*, 1 and *PL*, 2], ed. A. N. Nasonov (Moscow: Nauka, 1941–1955), 1:21 – 6851 (1343) records that Algirdas attacked the "Novgorodian *volost'*."

44 Apparently Nasonov thought the terms had the same meaning, as they are gathered under a single entry in the geographic index (*NPL*, 610).

45 *The Chronicle of Novgorod 1016–1471*, trans. Robert Michell and Nevill Forbes; intro. C.

"the Novgorod province,"and *Novgorodskaia volost'* "the Novgorod district."[46] The lower case initial letter of the second word in each case testifies that they were not considered technical terms. Indeed, the translators were inconsistent in rendering *zemlia* as "land." *Volynskaia zemlia* was translated as "Volhynia" and "the country of Volhynia"[47] and other "land" phrases became "the country of."[48] The "land"-system of nomenclature got lost in the translation. Nor is the more scholarly German translation superior in this regard.[49] *Novgorodskaia zemlia* was translated as "Novgoroder Land"[50] but *Novgorodskaia oblast'* as "Novgoroder Land," "Novgoroder Herrschaftsbereich" (realm) and "Novgoroder Gebiet" (district),[51] and *Novgorodskaia volost'* as both "Novgoroder Herrschaftsbereich" and "Novgoroder Gebiet."[52] Such examples could be multiplied but self-evidently to the translator these were not technical terms but expressions to be translated according to context.[53] Once again the system of "Land" nomenclature was disregarded.[54]

Material about Novgorod or of Novgorodian provenance found its way into novel entries in non-Novgorodian chronicles. An initial search uncovered very few unambiguous invocations of the Novgorodian Land. Two chronicles will suffice as examples. In a verbatim excerpt from the *Trinity Chronicle* transcribed by Karamzin s.a. 955 the Kievan Grand Prince Oleg collected tribute "from the whole Rus' and Novgorodian Lands"[55] and in the *Simeonov Chronicle* in 1264 Prince Iaroslav Iaroslavovich became grand prince "of the Vladimirian and Novgorodian Lands."[56] Parallel grammatical constructions mar the purity of these references to the Novgorodian Land. Similarly the mid-fifteenth century *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle* attributed to Prince Mstislav Rostislavovich "the brave" (*Khrabryi*) in 1179 the wish to free the Novgorodian Land from the "pagans," here the

---

Raymond Beazley, Camden Series 25 (1914; repr., New York: AMS, 1970). To 1333 the translators relied on the Synodal manuscript; after that, on the Commission and other manuscripts.

46 *NPL*, 6645 (1137), 15; 6642 (1134), 13; 6692 (1194), 32.

47 *NPL*, 6838 (1330), 126; 6857 (1349), 143

48 *NPL*, for example, "Low Country" for *Nizovskaia zemlia* (6742/1234, 79n2); "country beyond the Volok / Dvina Land" for *Zavolochkaia/Dvinskaia zemlia* (6894/1386, 161n1).

49 *Die erste Novgoroder Chronik nach ihrer ältesten Redaktion (Synodalhandschrift) 1016–1333/1352*, trans. and ed. Joachim Dietze (Munich: Sagner, 1971), contains an edition of the original text, a German translation, and a photo-facsimile of the manuscript.

50 *NPL*, 6645 (1137), 59.

51 *NPL*, 6642 (1135), 58; 6706 (1198), 77; 6650 (1142), 61.

52 *NPL*, 6692 (1192), 71; 6748 (1240), 110.

53 See *NPL*, 589n60 (to 62) and 62 (to 67) for explicit commentary on the terms. Even Leonard A. Jones, who translated the German introduction into English (7–28; the German is on the top half of the page, and English on the bottom half; synchronicity is soon lost), mixed German and English equivalents: German "Land" became English "territory"; "Herrschaftsbereich" became "realm" or "area," and so forth (e.g., 8, 18/19, 23/24, etc).

54 *NPL*, 6838 (1330), 139 "*iz Vylenskoi zemli*" = "aus Volhynian."

55 Priselkov, *Troitskaia letopis'*, s.a. 6455, 81–82 "*po vsei zemli Rus'tei i Novgorod'stei*." This passage appears in large type, meaning it was quoted verbatim by Karamzin.

56 *PSRL*, 18, s.a. 6772, 72 "*byst' kniaz' velikii Volodimerskoi i Novgorodtskoi zemli*."

Chud'.[57] This kind of unambiguous invocation was rare enough, but even more rare is a eulogy in the Hypatian Chronicle to that same prince declaring that the "entire Novgorodian Land cried" at his death in which the Novgorodian Land carries a social connotation, the entire population of the Novgorodian city-region, a rare case of the personification of the Novgorod Land.[58] Once again compound phrases obscure the landscape.[59] Comprehensive investigation of the geographic indices of all later chronicles would probably not significantly alter this pattern.[60]

Aside from the chronicles, non-chronicle Novgorodian literature, to judge from standard anthologies, did not refer to the Novgorodian Land with any frequency. It did not occur in the *Tale of the Trip of Ivan of Novgorod to Jerusalem on a Devil*,[61] the *Tale of the Novgorodian Mayor (posadnik) Shchil*,[62] the *Tale of the White Cowl*,[63] or the *Narration of the Battle of the Novgorodians with the Suzdalians*.[64] The "Novgorodian Land" did not occur in *The Vita of Mikhail Klopskii* until the second redaction, probably composed after Novgorod's annexation by Muscovy.[65] The absence of references to the Novgorodian Land in these works does not bespeak an active political concept.

Taken as a whole, the narrative sources by or about Novgorod suggest that any usage of the phrase the Novgorodian Land was conspicuous by its rarity. It was not a central or prolific concept of Novgorodian identity. This pattern contrasts sharply with Novgorodian familiarity with "Land" nomenclature and imaginative derivation of the term the Lower Land to describe Vladimiria-Suzdalia. It is difficult to escape the inference that

---

57 *PSRL*, 4, s.a. 6687, 15.

58 *PSRL*, 2 (St. Petersburg: Academy of Sciences, 1543), 120–21. Mari Isoaho, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy in Medieval Russia: Warrior and Saint* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 126 called my attention to this passage, but she translates *Novgorodskaia zemlia* as "the land of Novgorod," and uses the same translation for a subsequent reference to the Novgorodian *oblast'*. In another sentence not quoted by Isoaho, Mstislav declares his wish to protect the Novgorodian *volost'*. The author of this narrative hardly practised consistency in his references to the Novgorodian region.

59 For example, *PSRL*, 2, s.a. 6742 (1216), 22–23.

60 Again, from Pskovian material, the *Pskov III Chronicle* described Muscovite Grand Prince Vasilii II as having made peace with Novgorod in 6994/1456 "in Iazolvtsakh in the Novgorodian Land," after having "stood" (campaigned) in the Novgorodian Land for four weeks (*PL*, 2:142 (Stroev Manuscript)), but the *PL*, 2 (Synodal Manuscript) contained this entry for 6930/1422: "In the entire Rus' Land there was a great famine for three years, previously in Novgorod and all its districts, and in Moscow and in the entire (*vsei*) Muscovite and the entire (*vsei*) Tverian [Lands?]" (*PL*, 2:38). This curious phrasing, which grammatically implied invocations of the Muscovite and Tverian Lands, did not utilize the phrase the Novgorodian Land.

61 N. K. Gudzii, comp., *Khrestomatiia po drevnei russkoi literatury XI–XVII vekov*, 5th ed. (Moscow: Uchpedizd, 1952), 210–12; *Pamiatniki literatury drevnei Rusi XIV–seredina XV veka* (Moscow: Khudozhestvenaia literatura, 1981), 454–63.

62 Gudzii, *Khrestomatiia*, 213–15.

63 Gudzii, *Khrestomatiia*, 244–53; this text lauds the Rus' Land.

64 *Pamiatniki literatury*, 448–53.

65 *Povesti o zhitii Mikhaila Klopskogo*, ed. L. A. Dmitriev (Moscow: Nauka, 1958), 120: "there was a famine in the entire Novgorodian Land."

the Novgorodian book-men deliberately refrained from developing a concept of the Novgorodian Land.

The Novgorodian Land and Novgorodian districts (but not the Novgorodian region) figured prominently in Novgorod's treaties with Rus' princes. It is unexpected that in treaties on behalf of Great Novgorod, the phrase the Novgorod Land should be found more frequently than in the chronicles. Unlike the different annals in a chronicle, which might have been written by different chroniclers at different times, the articles in a treaty were a chronological whole, composed and ratified together. For that reason, the treaties must be considered not thematically, by term, but chronologically. Newer treaties repeated clauses from older treaties, but there is enough variety to reject the proposal that documentary inertia explains all such phrases. However, the fluidity in linguistic usage highlights the arbitrariness, and hence inconsequence, of usages of the Novgorodian Land.

The earliest extant princely treaty was concluded in 1264 with Grand Prince Iaroslav Iaroslavovich of Tver'.[66] It meticulously restricted the grand prince's rights in the Novgorodian districts, which it defined as Bezhiche, Gorodets, Melechia, Shipino, Egna, Vologda, Zavoloch'e (Beyond the Volok, but including Volok itself?), Koloperem', Tre, Perem' (Perm'), Iuigra, and Pechera.[67] It forbade the prince to own villages (*sela*) in these Novgorodian districts. It forbade him to export dependents from the "entire Novgorodian district'" (*A vyvod" ti, kniazhe, po vsei volosti Novgorod'skoi ne nadobe*). And it defined the prince's own realm as the Suzdalian Land.[68] The 1266 treaty with the same prince repeated the listing of Novgorodian districts with a few minor variations, adding Torzhok, the districts attached to Volok,[69] and redefining Gorodets as Gorodets Palits' (which it remained in later documents). The prohibition on the deportation of people was rephrased for Bezhitsy but the blanket proscription was not repeated. The Suzdalian Land still occurred.[70] The 1270 treaty with the same Tverian prince made no fundamental changes to the list of districts, referred for the first time to the *Niz'* (here meaning territory, not people),[71] and restored the blanket deportation clause in a new form: "And you, prince, will not export people between the Suzdalian Land and Novgorod" (*A*

66 All texts from *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova* [hereafter *GVNP*], ed. S. N. Valk (Moscow: Nauka, 1949). Again, because I am not constructing a narrative, there is no need to argue the dating of each treaty, and therefore only the datings in *GVNP* will be given. For a discussion of the accuracy of those datings see Ianin, *Novgorodskie akty*.

67 As we have seen, the *Novgorod First Chronicle* mentioned at least Volok, Bezhitsy, and Vologda as districts, so there is some compatibility between the narrative and documentary material.

68 *GVNP*, no. 1: 9–10.

69 This is intriguing. The Novgorodian administrative apparatus seems to have been hierarchical, so how could a district contain districts? This was not a slip of the quill; similar language reoccurred in later treaties.

70 *GVNP*, no. 2: 10–11.

71 I will not trace the further usage of this term; it is sufficient to note that it did find its way from the chronicles into the more "official" Novgorodian treaties.

vyvoda, ti, knizhe, mezhi Suzdal'skoiu zemleiu i Nov"mgorodom ne chiniti), which missed an opportunity to utilize Novgorodian Land for grammatical parallelism.[72]

In Novgorod's treaty with Grand Prince Mikhail Iaroslavovich of Tver' in 1304–1305 the list of Novgorodian districts remained unchanged. The Suzdalian Land was referenced in a new clause guaranteeing by the authority of the Mongol khan the safe passage of Novgorodian merchants across the Suzdalian Land. More intriguing was a change in the deportation prohibition clause, which now read "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian" (*mezhiu Suzdal'skoiu zemleiu i Novgorod'skoiu*).[73] The first, albeit implicit, appearance of the Novgorodian Land in the treaties obviously resulted from a scribe's conscious or unconscious use of grammatical parallelism, correcting the stylistic awkwardness of the previous phrasing.

Another treaty with the same prince from the same years contained yet further emendations. The list of Novgorodian districts remained substantially the same, although there was an allusion to "all Volok districts." A new clause forbade the prince, his princesses (I presume wife and daughters, although that implies that he had no sons who would also be princes) or nobles, to own villages in the Novgorodian Land. In restoring and amplifying the 1264 clause the clerk altered "Novgorodian district'" to read "Novgorodian Land." But lest one jump to the conclusion that the Novgorodian Land was becoming more widely disseminated in the treaties it must be noted that the population movement clause was rewritten to refer only to the Novgorodian district (*A vyvod" ti, knizhe, v" vsei Novgorod'skoi volosti ne nadobe*), the movements of people fleeing Torzhok on the Novyi Torzhok Land (*Novot"rzk'koi zemli*) were discussed, and there was a reference to runaway slaves entering the Tverian district (*Tferskuiu volost'*), neither the Tverian Land nor the Suzdalian Land.[74]

The 1307–1308 Novgorod treaty with Mikhail Iaroslavovich again retained the list of Novgorodian districts; reiterated the prohibition of princely landowning in the Novgorodian Land; affirmed the traditional boundary between the "Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian" (*mezhiu Suzhda'skoiu zemleiu i Novgorod'skoiu*), a new clause with another grammatical parallelism behind its usage; and restored the prior formulation of the population movement clause "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian," so that this phrase appeared twice in the same treaty.[75] These innovations were faithfully preserved in the Tverian version of the same treaty.[76] However, these slightly heightened invocations notwithstanding, usage of the Novgorodian Land in the treaties was not evolving in a linear direction.

The 1318–1319 treaty with the same prince was badly mutilated but definitely contained a new prohibition against Tverian officials crossing into the Novgorodian district.[77]

---

72 *GVNP*, no. 3: 11–13.

73 *GVNP*, no. 6: 15–16.

74 *GVNP*, no. 7: 16–18.

75 *GVNP*, no. 9: 19–20.

76 *GVNP*, no. 10: 21–22.

77 *GVNP*, no. 13: 25–26.

The 1326–1327 treaty with Prince Aleksandr Mikhailovich of Tver', while again retaining the list of Novgorodian districts, reverted to the Bezhitsy formula concerning deportations, thus losing the reference to the Novgorodian Land, and reformulated the definition of the border as between "your patrimony and the entire Novgorodian district," again omitting any reference to the Novgorodian Land. The Suzdalian Land still appeared.[78] But the 1371 Novgorod treaty with Prince Mikhail Aleksandrovich of Tver', without modifying the definition of Novgorodian districts, restored the border definition to "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian" and the population movement prohibition to "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian."[79] A 1375 Novgorodian treaty with the same prince, with different subject matter, also alluded to the Tverian district.[80]

The 1435 Novgorod treaty with Muscovite Grand Prince Vasilii II preserved the list of Novgorodian districts, the reference to the Suzdalian Land, the prohibition on sending officials into the "entire Novgorodian district," and the depopulation clause "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian." However, it also rephrased the landowning restriction to forbid the prince to establish districts on the Novgorodian Land (*A na Novgorodskoi zemli volostei ne staviti*).[81]

The 1446–1447 Novgorod treaty with Grand Prince Boris Aleksandrovich of Tver' included the prohibition on Tverian ownership of villages in the Novgorodian Land, referred to the boundary with the Novgorodian patrimony, and forbade Tverian court-members and officials (*dvoriane i pritsavy*) from entering the Novgorodian or Novyi-Torg districts. It contained no references to the Suzdalian Land and no list of Novgorodian districts.[82]

The 1456 Novgorod treaty with Grand Prince Vasilii II of Moscow, under the new political environment created by the Novgorodian defeat at the battle of Iazhelbitsy, did not alter the definition of Novgorodian districts, prohibited the establishment of princely villages in the Novgorodian Land (*na Nougorodskoi zemle sel" ne staviti*) (a purer sentence than in the preceding treaty), and continued the export of people clause "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian." (The boundary definition clause was not repeated.).[83]

Finally, the 1471 Novgorod Treaty with Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow, after the final defeat of the Novgorodians on the Shelon' River, nevertheless still repeated the list of Novgorodian districts (although omitting Volok and Vologda, no longer under Novgorodian control),[84] prohibited princely ownership in villages in the Novgorodian

---

78 *GVNP*, no. 14: 26–28.

79 *GVNP*, no. 15: 28–30

80 *GVNP*, no. 18: 33–34

81 *GVNP*, no. 19: 34–36.

82 *GVNP*, no. 20: 36–38

83 *GVNP*, no. 22: 39–41. But see below, chapter 8, for the Muscovite version of this treaty.

84 Ianin, *Novgorodskie akty*, 190 notes this omission, which I had not appreciated

Land, still used the phrase the Suzdalian Land for customs control, and referred to the export of people "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian."[85]

Little need be said of the texts of Novgorod's treaties with her "western" neighbours. The German-language treaties referred to Novgorod, and only rarely to the Novgorodian Land.[86] The 1323 treaty with Sweden referred to the German Land, the Swedish Land (several times), and even the Korelian Land, but never to the Novgorodian Land: "And peace to Novgorod, and all its subordinate cities and to all Novgorodian districts, and to the entire Swedish Land."[87] An agreement dated between 1440 and 1447 with Casimir, Grand Duke of Lithuania, referred to Novgorodians from "the entire Novgorod district," and frequently used that phrase, but the Novgorodian Land did not appear.[88] Finally, the treaty from 1470–1471 with Casimir IV, King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania[89] was largely repetitious in its use of the phrases discussed here. It mentioned the Polish (*liatskuiu*) and German Lands. It itemized the "Rzhev, and Velikii Luk, and Kholmovskii outposts [later the city of Kholm] as Novgorodian Lands (*a te zemli Novgorodskie*). It reworked the traditional clause about population deportation as follows: "And you, honourable king, will not deport people from the Novgorodian patrimony" (*iz nogorodtskoi otchiny*), although it continued using the phrase Novgorodian districts, which it listed for the last time (although restoring Volok and Vologda, perhaps a bit of Novgorodian irredentism). The king was forbidden villages in the Novgorodian Land, and envoys and merchants were guaranteed a clear path through "the Lithuanian Land and the Novgorodian," one parting syntactic parallel. Down to the end, Novgorod treaty-writers persisted in their eclectic use of political-administrative terminology.

Several conclusions can be drawn from this rich material. First, the phrase the Novgorodian Land and derivatives most often developed as a result of linguistic parallelism, a result of the use of other "Land" nomenclature, but not always. In other words,

---

85 *GVNP*, no. 26: 45–48. The Muscovite version (*GVNP*, no. 27: 48–51) mentioned Novgorod nobles who had bought "Rostovian and Beloozerian lands," and rights of safe passage across the Novgorodian Land and the Pskovian Land. A unique provision of the Muscovite version mentions the need for Novgorodians to kiss the cross (take a loyalty oath) to the "single grand prince in the Rus' Land" (upon the accession of a new Grand Prince in Moscow?).

86 The exceptions appear in the 1371 Lübeck treaty draft (*GVNP*, no. 42: 74–76), "der Nowerder lande" (twice), "der Nowerder lante" (once), and the 1420 treaty with the Livonian Order and the bishop of Dorpat, modern Tartu (*GVNP*, no. 59: 96–98) "der Nogardesche land" (once). Rybina observed that the German sources transliterated Novgorodian terms rather than translating them; thus the word "Neustadt" (New City) did not occur in reference to Novgorod: E. A. Rybina, *Inozemnye dvory v Novgorode XII–XVII vv.* (Moscow: Moskovskii Universitet, 1986): 28. Nevertheless, even Teutonic literalism sometimes got lost in the translation. Paragraph 92 of the Fourth Redaction of the Hanseatic Schra (*skra*), the statutes of the Hanseatic Hof (Court) in Novgorod, forbade anyone older than twenty to study Russian "in dem Nougorodeschen righte noch to Nougarden," which Kleinenberg translated as "in the Novgorodian Land nor in Novgorod itself" (*GVNP*, 157). I read "righte" as "realm." The Schra also recapitulated a reference to the *Niz'* (Nisowern) (Paragraph 97, *GVNP*, 159).

87 *GVNP*, no. 38: 76–68.

88 *GVNP*, no. 70: 115–16.

89 *GVNP*, no. 77: 129–32.

treaty-drafts were less successful than chroniclers in resisting the temptation posed by the system of "land"-terminology to reference a Novgorodian Land. Second, the pattern of usage, in which the Novgorodian Land appeared and disappeared from one treaty to the next, does not suggest that it possessed a rigorous substantive referent. Finally, the peculiar pattern of chronicle usage of the phrase the Novgorodian district in both singular and plural forms was, if anything, exacerbated by the inclusion in the treaties of what appears to be a technical list of local and strictly defined Novgorodian districts. Apparently, the term "district" served equally well in finite and amorphous contexts.[90] Further confirmation that the term had no ideological content comes from Muscovite usage of the Novgorodian Land in diplomatic correspondence[91] and in the Muscovite cadastres from 1563.[92]

The cumulative evidence of the Novgorodian chronicles, treaties, law codes, coinage, and seals undermines any attempt to specify which territories the Novgorodian Land encompassed and which levels of Novgorodian political and administrative organization were subsumed under it. The expression appeared most in Novgorod's treaties with northeastern princes, where it seems to have meant any territory under Novgorodian jurisdiction. It was not used in any ideologically pregnant sense.

The absence of a concept of the Novgorodian Land can be explained both positively and negatively. Positively, Novgorodian spokesmen put their faith in the identification of the city-state with its divine protectress, Hagia Sophia.[93] In view of the role of the archbishop of Novgorod, prelate of the St. Sophia Cathedral, in the life of the city, this equation elicits no surprise. The archbishop of Novgorod served as its head of state. The archiepiscopate was the largest landowner in Novgorod.[94] The state treasury was stored in the St. Sophia Cathedral. The archbishop often administered border territories directly,[95] his lieutenants and regiment led the Novgorodian army, he headed diplomatic embassies on behalf of the city, he chaired the Council of Lords (if it existed) and his representative chaired the Novgorod-city urban assembly, his intervention often calmed the city's heated political disputes, foreign merchants were judged in his court,[96] and other courts met on his property. The church was the guardian of the legal weights

90 Leuschner, *Novgorod*, 57–58, assigned one subordinate city (Beistadt) to each district, listing Volok Lamskii, Torzhok, Rzhev, Velikaia Luka, and Bezhitsy.

91 Bernadskii, *Novgorod*, 349.

92 Danilova, *Ocherki po istorii zemlevladeniia*, 291n1.

93 See conveniently Joel Raba, "Evfimij II., Erzbischof von Groß-Novgorod und Pskov. Ein Kirchenfürst als Leiter einer weltlichen Respublik," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 25, no. 1 (1977): 151–73; Raba, "Church and Foreign Policy in the Fifteenth-Century Novgorodian State," *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 13, no. 1–2 (1979): 52–58.

94 Cf. Danilova, *Ocherki po istorii zemlevladeniia*, 146–61 (on St. Sophia), to 99–145 (lands of Bogdan Esipov), 145–46 (summary of Shurichina's work on the lands of Marfa Boretskaia), 161–80 (Iur'ev and Arkazhskii Monastery lands).

95 Leuschner, *Novgorod*, 124–28; Martyshin, *Vol'nyi Novgorod*, 210–22.

96 Whenever the German *Hof* was shut down, its keys were placed in the hands of the archbishop for safekeeping (Rybina, *Inozemnye dvory*, 70.

and measures, a critical function in a commercial city.[97] In sum the archbishop guaranteed the domestic tranquillity and prosperity of the city. The equation of St. Sophia and Novgorod resonated with the prominent institutional role of the archbishop and his cathedral apparatus.

The Orthodox Christian faith of the Novgorodians was conducive to this identification of church and polity. Novgorodian coins showed St. Sophia handing over or receiving a sign of sovereignty from a man (prince? mayor?); Novgorodian seals included the *Vsederzhitel'* (Almighty, usually translated as the Pantocrator[98]) as well as other, more secular symbols. The hard-headed, practical Novgorodian boyars[99] and merchants surrounded the city with churches and monasteries, decorating them with icons and frescoes of lasting beauty. Boyars sometimes took the cowl and retired to a monastery. The seals of Novgorodian officials carried icons of their patrons' saints. It is no surprise that Novgorodians thought themselves favoured by the Divine Wisdom and fought in her name.[100] Historians have not explored the potential consequences of this identification, redolent not only of St. Sophia of Kiev but also of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, for Novgorodian self-perception as a Chosen People.

But Novgorod's political theology need not have entailed the absence of a concept of the Novgorodian Land, parallel to that of other Rus' polities.[101] The Muscovite army in

---

97 Khoroshkevich, *Torgovlia*, 141 reproduces the official seal for wax parcels, but neither transcribes nor explains it. The seal carried the slogan "*tovar" bozhii*" (literally: God's goods), either because various seals for weights and measures were kept in churches, or because of the use of wax for church candles and other sacred functions, or because the wax might have come from a monastery. (My thanks to Eve Levin for her ideas on this seal.) For security reasons all churches were utilized as storage facilities for goods: Cherepnin, *Novgorodskie berestianye gramoty*, 305, 313, 315–16.

98 My thanks again to Eve Levin for suggesting the more precise definition.

99 Khoroshev, *Tserkov'*, 42–43 identified one archbishop as of boyar origin, Dobrynia Iadreinovich, whose monastic name was Antonii, archbishop 1210–1220. (See George P. Majeska, "Politics and Hagiography in the Early Rus' Church: Antonii, a Thirteenth-Century Archbishop of Novgorod," in *The Tapestry of Russian Christianity: Studies in History and Culture*, ed. Nicholas Lupinin, Donald Ostrowski, and Jennifer B. Spock (Columbus, OH: Research Center for Medieval Slavic Studies, 2016), 23–40.) The boyars usually controlled churches and monasteries via patronage (*ktitorstvo*) (Khoroshev, *Tserkov'*, 155–69).

100 I do not know where to situate the political piety of the Novgorodians within Birnbaum's picture of their *mentalité* as a contrast between down-to-earth practicality and the kind of fantasy epitomized by the *Tale of the Trip of Ivan of Novgorod to Jerusalem on a Devil*.

101 This aspect of Novgorodian history has no parallel to Western Europe. For comments on the comparison and contrast between Novgorod and medieval Europe, see Langer, "V. L. Ianin," 118–19; Andreev, "Problemy," 145; Ianin, *Novgorodskie posadniki*, 272–73 identifying parallel development of the sphragistic symbolism in Novgorod and Venice; Birnbaum, *Lord Novgorod the Great* on St. Sophia, Venice's San Marco, and Dubrovnik's St. Vlados; and Henrik Birnbaum, "Novgorod and Dubrovnik: Two Slavic City Republics and their Civilization," in his *Aspects of the Slavic Middle Ages and Slavic Renaissance Culture* (New York: Lang, 1991), 355–95 [originally a 1989 Zagreb pamphlet]; Anna Leonidovna Choroškevič, "Der deutsche Hof in Novgorod und die deutsche Herberge (Fondaco dei Tedeschi) in Venedig im 13/14. Jahrhundert. Eine vergleichende Vorstudie," trans. Gertrud Pickan, in *Zwischen Lübeck und Novgorod. Wirtschaft, Politik und Kultur*

the *Zadonshchina* fights "for the Rus' Land and the Christian faith," but had the Novgorodians participated, they could have mustered only half such a slogan. The ubiquitous appearance of the Novgorodian Land in scholarly works owes more to the influence of the myth of the Rus' Land than to medieval Novgorodians. While not as anachronistic as allusions to the *Novgorodshchina*,[102] its use ought to be tempered.

It is the negative explanation of the absence of the concept of the Novgorodian Land which must take precedence, and that explanation rests on Novgorod's primary political attribute, the lack of an inherited princely line.[103] Because of that absence the city-state was able to develop a "republican" form of government and an oligarchic social order. In fact the limits of Novgorodian expansion were defined by the territories of western and Rus' princely lines.[104] Without an entrenched domestic princely line, Novgorod could manipulate rival princely contenders and principalities to maintain its autonomy, a game Novgorod played well, until Muscovy changed the rules.[105] Novgorod's way of life could not be exported to monarchic states.[106] Novgorod could not articulate a "Land" ideology, since that form of ideology depended upon the intimate connection between the Volodimerovich clan and the "Land." In this sense the lack of a myth of the Novgorodian Land testifies to Novgorodian recognition of its political distinctiveness (later aped by Pskov, of course). There was no concept of the Novgorodian Land, only a phrase, because Novgorod lacked the essential element of a "Land," its own dynastic line.

After Muscovy's conquest of Novgorod, book-men in Novgorod eventually assimilated Muscovy's self-identification as the Rus' Land. A prime example of that cultural transfer dates to the reign of Ivan the Terrible. The *Tale of Ivan IV's Campaign Against*

---

im Ostseeraum von frühen Mittelalter bis ins 20. Jahrhundert. Norman Angerman zum 60 Geburtstag, ed. Ortwin Pelc and Gertrud Pickan (Lüneberg: Institut Nordostdeutsches Kulturwerk, 1996), 67–87; and Martyshin, *Vol'nyi Novgorod*, 49–57.

102 Froianov, *Miatezhnyi Novgorod*, 181.

103 For this reason, references to Novgorod as a patrimony (*otchina i dedina*) require further elucidation. See *GVNP* no. 20 (1446–1447), 37; no. 7 (1470–1471), 131; *NPL*, 51 (6718/1209–1210), 54 (6723/1215–1216), 81 (6763/1255–1256), 89 (6778/1270–1271) from the Old Recension; 346 (6841/1333–1334), 360 (6856/1348–1349), 391 (6906/1398–1399), 418 (6943/1435–1436), 426 (6953/1445–1446) from the Young Recension.

104 Mülhe, *Die städtischen Handelzentren*, 142.

105 Birnbaum, *Lord Novgorod the Great*, 82–100.

106 For this reason, I have difficulty accepting the assertion that Novgorod and Moscow were rivals in the late fifteenth century or alternative political options for all of Russia. Had Moscow lost the battle on the Shelon' River, Novgorod might have survived longer as an autonomous city-state, but how would Moscow's political organization have changed? The most explicit exposition of this argument is Henrik Birnbaum, "Did the 1478 Annexation of Novgorod by Muscovy Fundamentally Change the Course of Russian History?" in *New Perspectives on Muscovite History. Selected Papers from the Fourth World Congress of Soviet and East European Studies, Harrogate 1990*, ed. Lindsey Hughes (New York: St. Martin's, 1993), 37–50, reprinted in Birnbaum, *Novgorod in Focus*, 166–80 (Birnbaum borrowed this hypothetical conceit from A. V. Isachenko), but it is implicit in the works of many other historians, for example, Joel Raba, "The Fate of the Novgorodian Republic," *Slavonic and East European Review* 45, no. 105 (July 1967): 307–23.

Novgorod in 1570[107] describes in gruesome detail the sack of the city in 1569–1570 by Ivan IV and his *oprichniki*.[108] Although the accuracy of the narrative has been questioned[109] there is general consensus that its author was from Novgorod and thoroughly sympathized with Novgorod's suffering. Not everyone thinks that this author was a contemporary of the event because the text survives only in later manuscripts. The phrase the "Novgorodian Land" does not appear in the text. However, its author lamented that such an event had never previously occurred in the "*Rossiiskaia zemlia*."[110] The adjective *rossiiskaia* derives from the word *Rossiia*, from the Greek *Ros* or *Rhos*. It was used in various grammatical forms during Ivan IV's reign as an alternative to *Rus'* to convey imperial (after Ivan's coronation as tsar in 1547) and ecclesiastical ambience.[111] *Rossiia* became the dominant imperial, non-ethnic concept for the "Russian" Empire only later, but already in the sixteenth century had partially acquired that nuance. In any event the author of the *Tale* utilized a Muscovite adaptation of the "Rus' Land" for situating the event he described, eschewing a local perspective. He did not write that such a catastrophe had never previously occurred in the Novgorodian Land.

107 "Povest' o pokhode Ivana IV na Novgorod v 1570 godu," in *Izbornik: Sbornik proizvedenii literatury drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969), 477–83.

108 In 1565 Ivan established the *oprichnina*, his personal appanage, from which he launched a reign of terror on the entire country. The *oprichniki* were the servitors of the *oprichnina*.

109 Hugh F. Graham, "How Do We Know What We Know about Ivan the Terrible (A Paradigm)," *Russian History* 14 (1987): 179–98.

110 "Povest' o pokhode Ivana IV na Novgorod v 1570 godu," 477.

111 Charles J. Halperin, "*Rus'* versus *Ros* in Ivan IV's Muscovy," *Slavia* 86, no. 4 (2017): 367–75.

Chapter 5

THE SUZDALIAN LAND

IF NEITHER NOVGOROD nor, as we shall see, Pskov could develop its own "land" ideological concept, the Novgorodian Land or the Pskovian Land, because each lacked its own dynastic line, Tver', which had its own princely line, did not get very far developing a concept of the Tverian Land. The history of the Suzdalian Land has its own complexities. The capital of the Suzdalian Land was not Suzdal' but the city of Vladimir. The phrase the Vladimirian Land existed but was very rare and insignificant. The princes of Vladimir and Suzdal' did not get much mileage out of the concept of the Suzdalian Land even in the twelfth century. As the expanded meaning of the Rus' Land to encompass all Volodimerovichi-ruled lands receded in the wake of the Mongol conquest, the term Suzdalian Land came into greater, but not ideological, use, as mentioned in Chapter One. It referred only to the northeast region of the confluence of the Volga and Oka Rivers. Confusion over its capital and territorial extent inhibited clear articulation of the phrase even geographically.[1] In the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, as noted in the preceding chapter, Novgorod used the phrase very flexibly to denote the sphere of rule of the grand princes of Vladimir with whom it contracted treaties, thus avoiding awarding those princes the legitimacy of association with the Rus' Land. Moscow finally succeeded in imposing its self-definition as the Rus' Land only in the Muscovite version of its 1470 treaty with Novgorod. The ambiguities and anomalies of the development of the Suzdalian Land in chronicles and saints' lives are inextricably entwined with the literary history and image of Grand Prince Aleksandr Nevskii, a problem further complicated by its recently contested dating.

The *Laurentian Chronicle*, which terminates in 1305, notes in its obituary of Grand Prince Vsevolod "Big Nest" in 1212 that he ruled the Suzdalian Land for thirty-seven years. There was joy in the Suzdalian Land in 1217 when Iurii Vsevolodovich was born there. In 1237 the Tatars did much evil to the Suzdalian Land and made war upon the Suzdalian Land. In 1250 Metropolitan Kirill travelled from Kiev to the Suzdalian Land, and in 1251 he went from the Suzdalian Land to Novgorod. There was great joy in the city of Vladimir and the "entire Suzdalian Land" in 1252 upon Nevskii's safe return from the Tatars. In 1257 Tatar census-takers "counted" the "entire Suzdalian, Riazanian, and Muromian Lands." In 1300 because of the Tatars Metropolitan Maksim moved to the Suzdalian Land from Kiev via Briansk.[2]

---

1 Therefore, I do not find convincing Plokhy's conclusions that the Suzdalian Land served as the "immediate forerunner of the notion of the Rus' Land in the political discourse of Northeastern Rus'" and that the Rus' Land' "was later appropriated by Northeastern Rus' to designate" the Suzdalian Land (Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 75, 158). The Suzdalian Land never rose to a level of ideological significance in which it could anticipate or be replaced by the Rus' Land.

2 "Lavrent'evskaia letopis'," in *Lavrent'evskaia letopis'. Suzdal'skaia letopis'*, ed. A. I. Tsepkov, Russkie letopisi 12 (Riazan': Aleksandriia, 2001), 415, 418, 439, 441, 449, 451, 461.

In these references overwhelmingly the Suzdalian Land appears to be a politically-neutral geographic phrase. Its capital was the city of Vladimir, an anomaly that neither medieval Rus' authors nor modern historians have ever addressed. The Suzdalian Land does not include Riazan', Murom, Novgorod, Kiev, or Briansk. Two passages speaking of joy in the Suzdalian Land do not endorse its complete reification or personification by declaring that the "Suzdalian Land rejoiced." The quantity of references to the Suzdalian Land in the *Laurentian Chronicle* strikes me as modest, but that may be a function of the chronicle's incomplete preservation. For example, key years in Nevskii's life, including his death, are missing from the extant manuscript.

The *Hypatian Chronicle* records the joy in the Suzdalian Land at the birth of Iurii Vsevolodovich. Batu attacked the Suzdalian Land in 1237. Two of Batu's generals besieging Kiev in 1240 had previously "taken" (conquered) the Bolgarian Land (Grand Bolgar on the Volga River) and the Suzdalian Land.[3] The narrative of Batu's capture of Kiev originated in the *Hypatian Chronicle* but its new reference to the Suzdalian Land later found its way into the northeastern Rus' chronicle tradition.

Iurii Begunov dated the First Redaction of Nevskii's "Life" to the 1280s. He argued that it was composed in the Rozhdestvenskii Monastery in the city of Vladimir. According to his reconstruction of the First Redaction, at Nevskii's funeral Metropolitan Kirill declared that "the sun has set in the Suzdalian Land." When Nevskii's brother Andrei aroused Batu's ire, Batu sent Nevrui to attack the Suzdalian Land.[4] In the text of what V. I. Mansikka called the Second Redaction of the "Life," Nevskii returned to the Suzdalian Land after fighting the Chud' (Estonians), his father Iaroslav restored the Suzdalian Land after Nevrui's devastation, and the sun set in the Suzdalian Land on Nevskii's death.[5] In Begunov's schema the text's Second Redaction first appeared in the *Sofia First Chronicle*. Here the sun sets in the Rus' Land.[6]

Frithjof Schenk and Mari Isoaho follow Begunov in interpreting the Suzdalian Land as an expression of provincial identity and patriotism,[7] but it looks more like a simple geographic term. According to the *Laurentian Chronicle* in 1249 Nevskii received a Mongol charter for the throne of "Kiev and the entire Rus' Land" while his brother Andrei was assigned the Suzdalian Land.[8] The "entire Rus' Land" would seem at that time to denote only the Dnieper River valley, thus excluding the Suzdalian Land. By staging the

3 *Ipat'evskaia Letopis'*, ed. A. I. Tsepkov, Russkie letopisi 11 (Riazan': Aleksandriia, 2001), 444, 519, 522.

4 Begunov, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII v.*, 192, 194.

5 V. I. Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo. Razbor redaktsii i teksty* (St. Petersburg, 1913), Appendix, 12, 13, 14.

6 *Sofiiskaia pervaia letopis'* in *PSRL*, 5, (St. Petersburg: Prats, 1851), 191.

7 Begunov, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII v.*, 97; F. B. Shenk, *Aleksandr Nevskii v russkoi kul'turnoi pamiati: sviatoi, pravitel', natsional'nyi geroi, 1263–2000* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2007), 65, an authorized translation by Elena Zemskovaia and Maiia Lavrinovich of Schenk, *Aleksandr Nevskij Heiliger–Fürst–Nationalheld: Eine Erinnerenungsfigur im russischen kulturellen Gedachtnis (1263–2000)* (Cologne: Bohlau, 2004); Isoaho, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy*, 122.

8 *PSRL*, 1, col. 472.

setting sun in the Suzdalian Land the author of the First Redaction of Nevskii's "Life" was merely being geographically correct.

Ostrowski dates the original, secular military tale of Nevskii, authored by a layman, to the late thirteenth century. This text, according to Ostrowski's reconstruction, mentioned neither the Suzdalian Land nor the Rus' Land. A century later a cleric inserted sufficient hagiographic motifs into the military tale to transform it into a chronicle tale. This was still not a redaction of the "Life" of Nevskii. It too mentioned neither the Suzdalian Land nor the Rus' Land. The earliest redaction of the "Life" arose in the middle of the fifteenth century, no earlier than after the composition of the *Novgorod First Chronicle*, Older Recension, which was among its sources. The author of the First Redaction made further interpolations, including an allusion to St. Vladimir's conversion of the Rus' Land and two references to the Suzdalian Land, including the setting sun.[9] Not very long after that the compiler of the *Sofia First Chronicle* changed "Suzdalian Land" to "Rus' Land."[10]

The thirteen stand-alone manuscripts of Nevskii's "Life" utilized by Begunov, save one, date to after the compilation of the *Sofia First Chronicle* but still read "Suzdalian Land," not the Rus' Land, in the setting-sun passage. The only possible exception is the *Laurentian Chronicle* from the late fourteenth century because this section of the manuscript did not survive. As far as I can tell no scholar has explained how the change in the conception of Nevskii's "homeland" (literally "home land") embodied in the *Sofia First Chronicle* did not intrude into the manuscript tradition of the autonomous "Life."[11] Not even the elevation of Nevskii to the status of a "countrywide" (usually phrased as "national") saint in 1547, to be precise a saint in all territory subject to the Russian Orthodox Church,[12] impaired the traditional textual tradition of the "Life."

---

9 Donald Ostrowski, "Redating the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*," in *Rude and Barbarous Kingdom Revisited: Essays in Russian History in Honor of Robert O. Crummey*, ed. Chester Dunning, Russell E. Martin, and Daniel Rowland (Bloomington: Slavica, 2008), 23–39.

10 Begunov, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII v.*, 59n128 infers that a sentence found in Mansikka's Second (see Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, Appendix, 14) and Third Redactions that there would never be another prince like Nevskii in the Suzdalian Land probably originated in the First Redaction but was deleted because it might be taken as a negative judgment of Nevskii's descendants, the Muscovite princes. However Muscovite princes rapidly assimilated themselves to the myth of the Rus' Land, which would have obviated any comparison to Nevskii's status in the Suzdalian Land. Schenk, *Aleksandr Nevskii*, 65 and Mari Isoaho, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy*, 119, 124, accept Begunov's inclusion of this sentence in the Primary Redaction of the "Life"; Donald Ostrowski, "Dressing a Wolf in Sheep's Clothing: Toward Understanding the Composition of the *Life of Alexander Nevskii*," *Russian History* 40, no. 1 (January 2013): 41–37 at 49n29 contests Begunov's textual justification for this inclusion.

11 The conservatism of the manuscripts of the "Life" on this passage makes it necessary to qualify the assertion of Shenk, *Aleksandr Nevskii*, 94 that the *Sofia First Chronicle* revision of the "Life" influenced all future redactions and Shenk, *Aleksandr Nevskii*, 181n38 that in the "Life" Kirill speaks of the Suzdalian Land but in redactions from the Muscovite period the Rus' Land. New redactions of the "Life" in larger narrative works that post-date the *Sofia First Chronicle* did perpetuate Nevskii's association with the Rus' Land (except for the *Pskov Second Chronicle*, for which see further below), but separate manuscripts of the First Redaction remained immune to that revision.

12 I borrow this formulation from Shenk, *Aleksandr Nevskii*, 58.

A reference to the Suzdalian Land appears in a non-chronicle saint's life. The *Life of Metropolitan Petr*, the first metropolitan to move to Moscow, was probably written in the 1320s at the behest of the princely authorities of Moscow, where Petr became the patron and defender of the city. "Thus did God praise the Suzdalian Land, and the city called Moscow."[13] In this case Moscow seems to be, if not the capital, then certainly the most praiseworthy city in the Suzdalian Land.

If the Primary Redaction of Nevskii's "Life" were composed in the 1280s it could have been utilized by the Older Recension of the *Novgorod First Chronicle*. It was not. In that chronicle Metropolitan Kirill said at Nevskii's funeral Nevskii had laboured for "Novgorod and the entire Rus' Land." However, the Older Recension did reference the Suzdalian Land s.a. 1304, where the chronicler noted the great "troubles" (*zamiatnia*) in the Suzdalian Land resulting from the feud between Princes Mikhail' of Tver and Iurii Daniilovich of Moscow.[14]

The Archeographic Commission manuscript of the *Novgorod First Chronicle* records that on Nevskii's death Prince Ivan Daniilovich (Kalita) received the charter from the Horde for the entire Rus' Land, but that Metropolitan Petr left Volhynia to travel to Moscow, unsaid: to Ivan Kalita in the Suzdalian Land.[15]

The Younger Recension of the *Novgorod First Chronicle* does contain passages from Nevskii's "Life" but not the setting sun. Nevrui attacked the Suzdalian Land. It repeats the Older Recension entry for 1304.[16] But on Nevskii's death, erroneously dated to 1251, Metropolitan Kirill lauds Nevskii's labours for "Novgorod and Pskov and the Rus' strength (*sila*) [or variant: Land]." In 1378 the Tatars invaded the Suzdalian Land to attack Prince Dmitrii Konstantinovich.[17] Which reading was original in the 1251 reference remains ambiguous but the influence of the Older Recension suggests the Rus' Land, not the Rus' "strength." Dmitrii Konstantinovich ruled in Nizhnii Novgorod, yet another city in the Suzdalian Land.

We might not expect Novgorod to be so generous toward a Northeastern Rus' prince as to associate him with the Rus' Land. In treaties with grand princes of Vladimir from 1264 to 1471, even though those princes came from Tver' and later Moscow, Novgorodian negotiators and scribes described the territory ruled by those grand princes as the "Suzdalian Land." Of course, the city of Vladimir, the grand-princely seat, was in the Suzdalian Land, but arguably Tver' was not. The earliest extant princely treaty was concluded in 1264 with Grand Prince Iaroslav Iaroslavovich of Tver'. It defined the prince's own realm as the Suzdalian Land.[18] As discussed in Chapter Four, in the 1266 treaty with

---

13 V. A. Kuchkin, "Skazanie o smerti mitropolita Petra," *Trudy otdela drevne-russkoi literatury* 18 (1962): 59–79.

14 *NPL*, 83–84, 92.

15 *NPL*, 469.

16 *NPL*, 304, 332.

17 *NPL*, 306, 375. "Strength" means something like "total armed forces." Cf. Isoaho, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy*, 181.

18 *GVNP*, no. 1: 9–10.

Iaroslav Iaroslavovich the Suzdalian Land again occurred.[19] The 1270 treaty with Iaroslav Iaroslavovich rephrased an old clause forbidding him to deport people to read: "And you, prince, will not export people between the Suzdalian Land and Novgorod."[20] In Novgorod's treaty with Grand Prince Mikhail Iaroslavovich of Tver' in 1304–1305, the Suzdalian Land was referenced in a new clause guaranteeing by the authority of the Mongol khan the safe passage of Novgorodian merchants across the Suzdalian Land. The deportation prohibition clause now read "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]."[21] The 1307–1308 Novgorod treaty with Mikhail Iaroslavovich affirmed the traditional boundary between the "Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]" and restored the prior formulation of the population movement clause "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]," so that this phrase appeared twice in the same treaty.[22] These innovations were faithfully preserved in the Tverian version of the same treaty.[23] The Suzdalian Land also appeared in the 1326–1327 treaty with Prince Aleksandr Mikhailovich of Tver'.[24] The 1371 Novgorod treaty with Prince Mikhail Aleksandrovich of Tver' restored the border definition to "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]" and the population movement prohibition to "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]."[25] The 1435 Novgorod treaty with Muscovite Grand Prince Vasilii II preserved the reference to the Suzdalian Land" and the depopulation clause "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]."[26] The 1456 Novgorod treaty with Grand Prince Vasilii II of Moscow continued the export of people clause "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]."[27] Finally, the 1471 Novgorod Treaty with Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow still used the phrase the Suzdalian Land for customs control, and referred to the export of people "between the Suzdalian Land and the Novgorodian [Land]."[28] However, the Muscovite version of the 1471 treaty reads "Rus' Land."[29]

S.a. 1152 the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle* noted that Iurii Vladimirovich founded many churches in the Suzdalian Land, in the cities of Vladimir, Suzdal', and Iur'ev. References to the Suzdalian Land s.a. 1237 and 1240 derive from the *Laurentian Chronicle* but the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle* makes the object of the Tatar invasion of 1237 both the Suzdalian Land and the Rostovian Land as if they were separate.[30]

---

19 *GVNP*, no. 2: 10–11.

20 *GVNP*, no. 3: 11–13.

21 *GVNP*, no. 6: 15–16,

22 *GVNP*, no. 9: 19–20.

23 *GVNP*, no. 10: 21–22.

24 *GVNP*, no. 14: 26–28.

25 *GVNP*, no. 15: 28–30.

26 *GVNP*, no. 19: 34–36.

27 *GVNP*, no. 22: 39–41. But see below, Chapter Eight, for the reference to the Muscovite Land in the Muscovite version of this treaty.

28 *GVNP*, no. 26: 45–48.

29 *GVNP*, no. 27: 48–51.

30 *PSRL*, 4, part 1 (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2000), 153 (1152), 217 (1237), 226 (1240).

In 1377, according to the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle*, the Tatars attacked the Suzdalian Land. S.a. 1389, the text of the so-called *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi identified Dmitrii Donskoi's widow, Evfrosiniia, daughter of the Grand Prince Dmitrii Konstantinovich (of Nizhnii Novgorod, not Suzdal'), as coming from the Suzdalian Land.[31]

The *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle* devotes considerable attention to the princely wars in 1216. It identifies the object of princely rivalry in 1216 as the "entire Suzdalian Land" and repeatedly mentions the strength and the regiments of the Suzdalian Land and the "entire Suzdalian Land" in the narrative. It also includes a speech by an unnamed boyar of Prince Iurii Vsevolodovich to him and to his brother Prince Iaroslav Vsevolodovich extolling the military prowess of the Suzdalian Land. This boyar exalts the Suzdalian Land by declaring that in the days of the princes' ancestors, grandfathers, and fathers, it had never happened that "any army entered the strong Suzdalian Land and left [having achieved its] goal. Even if the entire Rus' Land [including the] Galician, Kievan, Chernigovian, Riazanian, Smolenskian, and Novgorodian [Lands united], no one could succeed in opposing such strength [as possessed by the Suzdalian Land]." Princes Iurii and Iaroslav and their armies enthusiastically endorse the boyar's peroration.[32]

The enumeration of "lands" that were part of the Rus' Land extends far beyond the original Dnieper River valley triangle of Kiev and Chernigov, minus Pereiaslavl'. Some of its elements, such as Chernigov and Smolensk, are not particularly known to have been described as "Lands." However, because the Suzdalian army was defeated, the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle* was actually criticizing the arrogance of the Suzdalian Land's boosters. No other passage in Old Rus' literature known to me promulgates such overweening assertions of the military superiority of the Suzdalian Land to the Rus' Land. The clash of the two "lands" also entails that they were geographically discrete.

By contrast the *Sofia First Chronicle* modifies the 1152 reference to Iurii Volodimerovich by adding Pereiaslavl' to the list of cities in the Suzdalian Land in which he built churches. The *Sofia First Chronicle* contains some references to the Suzdalian Land s.a. 1216 found in the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle* but not its extended narrative of the speech of Iurii's boyar praising the military might of the Suzdalian Land. The *Sofia First Chronicle* repeats the 1237, 1240, 1304, and 1389 references to the Suzdalian Land found in the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle,* but changes the "Suzdalian Land" to Suzdal' s.a. 1377 and inserts the entire First Redaction of Nevskii's "Life," although somewhat contaminated by other verbiage. In 1246 Iaroslav restores the Suzdalian Land after Batu's depredations. Nevrui's attack on the Suzdalian Land derives from Nevskii's "Life." Iaroslav suffered greatly on behalf of the Rus' Land. On Nevskii's death the sun set in the Rus' Land, not the Suzdalian Land, but Nevskii "laboured for the Rus' Land and Novgorod and Pskov."[33]

---

31 *PSRL*, 4/1:306–7 (1377), 352 (1389).

32 *PSRL*, 4/1:188–89, 191, 193.

33 *PSRL*, 5:160 (1152), 172 (1216), 173 (1237), 175 (1240), 186 (1246), 191 (1262 for the setting sun on Nevskii's death), 204 (1304), 236 (1377), 243n* (1389).

The inconsistency in "land" terminology in the *Sofia First Chronicle* stands out. Nevskii's father Iaroslav restores the Suzdalian Land, but suffered for the Rus' Land. The region in which Nevskii acts remains largely identified as the Suzdalian Land, but with Nevskii's death the sun sets in the Rus' Land, for which Nevskii laboured according to a passage borrowed from the *Novgorod First Chronicle*, Older Recension.

Chronicles from the second half of the fifteenth century continued to repeat earlier references to the Suzdalian Land. For example, the *Suzdal' Chronicle* regurgitates references to the Suzdalian Land from the *Laurentian Chronicle* for 1216, 1237, and 1250, but adds the passages from the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle* containing Suzdalian boasting in 1216.[34] The *Pskov Second Chronicle* contains the two references to the Suzdalian Land of the First Redaction of Nevskii's "Life," on Nevrui and the setting sun.[35]

Later chronicles also adduced novel references. The *Tsar's Copy* of the *Sofia First Chronicle* revises an allusion to the founding of the city of Vladimir by St. Vladimir in 990 by describing him as travelling from Kiev to the Suzdalian Land to do so.[36] The *Moscow Chronicle Compilation of the End of the Fifteenth Century* criticizes Andrei Bogoliubskii s.a. 1162 for aspiring to become autocrat in the "entire Suzdalian Land," which definitely, but atypically, accords the phrase a political context. In recounting Nevskii's funeral it omits the setting sun metaphor but then redundantly describes him as having laboured "for the Rus' Land, for Novgorod, for Pskov, and for the entire Rus' Land." Whether Novgorod and Pskov were part of the Rus' Land, as ever, remains ambiguous. The chronicle specifies that in 1284 Prince Andrei Aleksandrovich made peace with Novgorod at Torzhok and then went to the Suzdalian Land, which clearly demarcates Novgorod and Torzhok as not part of the Suzdalian Land.[37] The Tverian chronicles rarely mentioned the Suzdalian Land, but one entry is quite curious. According to the *Tverian Miscellany* in 1262, the Rus' revolted and expelled the Tatars from the Rostovian Land, specifically from Rostov, Suzdal', Vladimir, and Iaroslavl'.[38] Clearly the concept of the Suzdalian Land did not have a monopoly on these metropolitan areas. The *Simeonov Chronicle* entry for 1293 on princely feuds illustrates the endemic inconsistency in "Land" terminology in chronicles: The Tatar Diuden' led a raid in the Rus' Land that did much evil to the Rus' Land, but princely feuds created troubles in the Suzdalian Land.[39] According to the *Nikon Chronicle*, the largest and latest compendium of previous and original chronicle entries for early and medieval Rus' history first compiled in the 1530s and then continued variously, in 1176 Iaropolk made himself grand prince of the Rostovian Land. In 1185 Luke was sent as metropolitan to the Suzdalian Land, the Vladimirian Land, and the "entire Rostovian Land." In 1191 Vsevolod asked for Ioann as bishop of those three lands. In

---

34 "Suzdal'skaia letopis'," in *Lavrent'evskaia letopis'. Suzdal'skaia letopis'*, ed. A. I. Tsepkov, Russkie letopisi 12 (Riazan': Aleksandriia, 2001), 469, 470, 472 (all 1216), 490, 491 (1237), 496 (1250).

35 *Second Pskov Chronicle* in *PL*, 2:14, 15.

36 *PSRL*, 39 (Moscow: Nauka, 1994), 35.

37 *PSRL*, 25:72 (1169), 145 (1263), 156 (1284).

38 *Tverskii sbornik* in *PSRL*, 15, part 1 (Petrograd: Nauka, 1922).

39 *PSRL*, 18:82 (1293).

1206 Iaroslav left Pereiaslavl' (in the Dnieper River valley) to go to those three lands. S.a. 1216 the *Nikon Chronicle* presents a slightly revised version of the extended Suzdalian Land debate from the *Novgorod Fourth Chronicle*. In 1230 an earthquake struck those three lands as well as Kiev, Pereiaslavl', Novgorod, and the "entire Rus' Land." The *Nikon Chronicle* revised a passage in an earlier chronicle to read that in 1252 when Nevskii went to attend Khan Sartak, he left his brother Andrei in charge of "Vladimir and the Suzdalian Land."[40] In 1352 an epidemic struck Smolensk, Kiev, Chernigov, Suzdal', and the "entire Rus' Land." In 1420 an epidemic struck a different "entire Rus' Land," specifically Kostroma, Iaroslavl', Iur'ev, Vladimir, Suzdal', Pereiaslavl', Galich, Pskov, and Rostov. The *Nikon Chronicle* contains no original or derivative references to the Suzdalian Land in its annals after 1420.[41] In the *Book of Degrees*, a thematic presentation of Rus' history variously dated to the 1560s and 1570s, Degree 8 on Nevskii largely follows the *Nikon Chronicle* and the Second Redaction of the "Life" concerning "lands": Nevrui invades the Suzdalian Land, but on Nevskii's death the sun sets in the Rus' Land.[42] The *Great Menology*, a compendium of texts for reading compiled by Makarii, Archbishop of Novgorod and later Metropolitan, in the Moscow redaction contains the Vasilii-Varlaam Redaction of the "Life," called the Vladimirian Redaction by Mansikka. It remained ambivalent on Nevskii's location. Nevrui invades the Suzdalian Land but on Nevskii's death the sun had already set in the Rus' Land. The text urges its readers to rejoice that the most famous Aleksandr, who "enriched (?) the Rus' Land" (*Ruskia zemlia udobrenie*), did not come from Rome or Mt. Sinai, but was a wonder-worker in the Rus' Land. This redaction also mentions the churches in the Rus' Land.[43]

In the late-fifteenth and early to mid-sixteenth-century chroniclers remembered the Suzdalian Land and even invented new historical references for it, but not contemporary affairs. Chroniclers had only inconsistent notions of its geographic parameters. They were far from averse to using other "Land" terms, including the Rostovian Land, to denote the same areas. Sometimes they required the Suzdalian Land to stick exclusively to the neighbourhood of the city of Suzdal' and share the "greater" Suzdalian Land with the Rostovian Land and the Vladimirian Land.

This survey of references to the Suzdalian Land suggests a number of conclusions. The Suzdalian Land never rose to the level of a major political myth. Only rarely did it even function as a concept, namely as the political domain of would-be autocrat Andrei Bogoliubskii. No one, even Bogoliubskii, ever fought for the Suzdalian Land.[44] No one,

---

40 Donald Ostrowski, "An Ideal Prince for the Times: Alexander Nevskii in Rus' Literature," *Palaeoslavica* 16, no. 2 (2008): 259–71 at 267.

41 *PSRL*, 9–13 (Moscow, 1965), 9:64 (992), 255 (1176); 10:10 (1185), 19 (1191), 72 (1216), 99 (1230), 224 (1352); 11:236 (1420).

42 *Stepennaia kniga tsarstogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam. Teksty i kommentarii*, ed. N. N. Pokrovskii and G. D. Lenkhoff, 3 vols., vol. 1: *Zhitie sv. Kniagini Ol'gi, Stepeni I–X* (Moscow: Iazyiki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2007), 327, 332. I consulted only Degree 8 in the *Book of Degrees*.

43 Mansikka, *Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, Appendix, 31.

44 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 74 suggests that "one might assume" that Bogoliubskii's development of a centre in Suzdal' to rival Kiev "slowed adoption" of the myth of the Rus' Land in

even Nevskii, ever laboured or suffered for the Suzdalian Land. In almost all instances, references to the Suzdalian Land carried only a geographic meaning, and even then it did not come close to monopolizing the territory of Northeast Rus'. The 1216 entry on the "strength" of the Suzdalian Land was an exception in its hyperbolic praise of the military superiority of the Suzdalian Land, but in context such praise proved futile and unwarranted. The phrase Suzdalian Land lacked the ideological resonance of a concept. However, it was, to be sure, flexible enough to serve Novgorod's purposes as a neutral description of the Grand Principality of Vladimir, even if that throne were held by princes from Tver' or Moscow.

Revision of the "Suzdalian Land" to the "Rus' Land" in Metropolitan Kirill's eulogy was never expanded to entail systematic substitution of the latter for the former in any redaction of the "Life." Allusions to the Suzdalian Land persisted even when his sun set in the Rus' Land in chronicles.

While the phrase "Suzdalian Land" was never political, during the thirteenth and especially the early fourteenth century it was at least contemporary, if decreasingly so in the late fourteenth century. The chronicle tradition codified as it were in the *Nikon Chronicle*, which amalgamated many local chronicle traditions, does not contain a single contemporary reference to the Suzdalian Land in its annals after 1420. This did not preclude revision of previous allusions to the Suzdalian Land or even the introduction of new but still "historical" references to the Suzdalian Land.

The shift in the middle of the fifteenth century in most chronicle versions of Nevskii's "Life" to the setting sun in the Rus' Land was probably not coincidental. By the time of the compilation of the common source of the *Novgorod Fourth* and *Sofia I Chronicles,* Muscovite monopolization of the myth of the Rus' Land was complete.[45] The Rus' Land meant the Grand Principality of Moscow, which had already assimilated the Grand Principality of Vladimir. Affiliating Nevskii to the Rus' Land by changing one word in Metropolitan Kirill's eulogy in the Nevskii "Life" was all it took for Moscow to acquire Nevskii as a defender and symbol. Nevertheless, why the compiler of the *Sofia First Chronicle* made that change remains a separate issue.

The Suzdalian Land, even in its heyday of the twelfth to early fifteenth century, remained a contested geographic phrase. Unlike Novgorod or Pskov, the Northeast region of Kievan Rus' had its own princely line, or lines, the sine qua non for developing a political and/or ideological "Land" concept, even a myth. The mid-thirteenth to the mid-fourteenth century was a period of transition in the evolution of the myth of the Rus' Land. Thirteenth-century Galicia–Volhynia took advantage by claiming the legitimacy of being the Rus' Land, but in the northeast, which continued to describe the Kievan region as the Rus' Land, no alternative expression took advantage of that window of opportunity. The area had perhaps too many leading cities. Vladimir was considered the capital of the Suzdalian Land, but references to the Vladimirian and Rostovian Lands

---

the northeast. I would contend that a *translatio* of the Rus' Land to the northeast in the twelfth century would have been premature; the connection of the Rus' Land to Kiev remained far too strong at that time.

45 Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar."

diminished the fluctuating territorial scope of the Suzdalian Land. Beginning with the *vita* of Metropolitan Petr in the early fourteenth century, Moscow proclaimed itself the capital of the region. Because political authority followed whoever became grand prince of Vladimir, princes not only from Vladimir, Suzdal', and Rostov, but also Tver' and later exclusively Moscow exercised authority over the Suzdalian Land. Even so Novgorod could employ the phrase to restrain articulation of Tverian and Muscovite ambitions as grand princes of Vladimir to exert influence over the northwest. Eventually the translatio of the Rus' Land to the northeast under Muscovite aegis made even the phrase the Muscovite Land superfluous. By no later than the second third of the fifteenth century, the Suzdalian Land had lost all currency even geographically. The isolated contexts in which the Suzdalian Land achieved prominence, as the object of a putative autocrat, the area mourning a saint, or a military powerhouse, never took hold. Yet, however inconsistently and ambivalently, the phrase Suzdalian Land continued to crop up in new if only historical narratives through the sixteenth century in chronicles and variants of Nevskii's "Life." The fluidity and manipulability of the phrase Suzdalian Land probably contributed to its durability, but not its significance.

Chapter 6

THE PSKOVIAN LAND

LIKE ITS "ELDER brother" Novgorod, the medieval city-state of Pskov lacked an indigenous branch of the Volodimerovich clan as its dynasty and for that reason did not and probably could not articulate a self-conception in the form of an ideology of a "Land." The phrase the Pskovian Land (*Pskovskaia zemlia*), like that of the Novgorodian Land, carried no ideological weight when it appeared in the sources. By the reign of Ivan IV, a literary work exhibiting strong local patriotism to Pskov did not deviate from this pattern. Instead, it showed signs of local assimilation of Muscovy's successful monopolization of the myth of the Rus' Land. This chapter will conclude with an analysis of that text to illustrate the triumph of the Muscovite myth of the Rus' Land over an annexed regional "Land" that lacked a mythic dimension.

Popular and scholarly publications alike elevate the phrase the Pskovian Land to a level of significance that far exceeds its much more modest usage in medieval sources. Elena Morozkina's *The Pskovian Land* is a popular tourist guide to the "beauty of the Pskovian Land" and the "artistic treasures of the Pskovian Land," a small format book with numerous (albeit black-and-white) illustrations whose second edition alone numbered 85,000 copies.[1] She establishes the geographic boundaries of the Pskovian Land and defines the Trinity Cathedral in Pskov's *Krov* (Kremlin) as the symbol of the "entire Pskovian Land." She modestly admits that she could not discuss all the architectural monuments of the Pskovian Land.[2] At the same time, she alludes to the *Pskovshchina* in both historical and contemporary contexts as in effect a synonym of the Pskovian Land.[3] That word appears only rarely in medieval sources from Pskov. Morozkina's discussion of partisan activity in the region of Pskov during World War II derives from a memorial volume bearing the title *The Unconquered Pskovian Land. Documents and Materials, 1941–1944*.[4]

Morozkina's volume is intended for a popular audience. Professional historians writing for both professional and popular audiences also refer to the Pskovian Land. Vladimir Arakcheev's monograph *Medieval Pskov: Authority, Society, Daily Life in the Fifteenth to Seventeenth Centuries*[5] contains a fold-out map which purports to illustrate the six-

---

1 Elena Nikolaevna Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1986), quotations 7, 12.

2 Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 12, 22, 164. Modern-day Nevel' is situated in the Pskovian Land (ibid., 147).

3 Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 80, 83, 146, 147, 153, 164.

4 Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 171 in the bibliography, citing *Nepokorennaia zemlia Pskovskaia, Dokumenty i materialy. 1941–1944* (Pskov, 1964).

5 Vladimir Anatol'evich Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov: vlast', obshchestvo, povsednevnaia*

teen districts (*uezdy*) as well as the boundaries of the *guby* (administrative-territorial districts) in the Pskovian Land.[6] Arakcheev finesses his own use of the Pskovian Land by referring to the history of "Pskov and its land." His study, he declares, delineates the geographic boundaries of the "Pskovian Land" from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries.[7] The publisher's blurb in Berngirdt Kafengauz's *Ancient Pskov: Studies of the History of a Feudal Republic* described it as a study of "Pskov and the Pskovian Land," to which Kafengauz himself also makes reference.[8] He later equates the Pskovian Land and the "territory of the *Pskovshchina*."[9] Other intrusions of the Pskovian Land in commentary on sources which do not contain it will be mentioned below, but these examples should suffice to establish the relevance and currency of the concept of the "Pskovian Land."[10]

I will discuss sources by genre: chronicles, a saint's life, documents, a law code, seals, and coins, all of which support the conclusion that the Pskovian Land possessed only a pragmatic geographic or territorial meaning which was not even exclusive and altogether lacked ideological nuances. I will then analyze why this pattern occurred and the attribution to Pskov of an identity within the Rus' Land.

The Pskov chronicle tradition was late but vibrant. Chronicles arose no earlier than the thirteenth century, probably during the fourteenth century, as Pskov gradually freed itself from subordination to Novgorod.[11] The usage of the Pskovian Land in the *First, Second, and Third Pskov Chronicles* was substantially consistent, with considerable repetition. We need not concern ourselves with chronology or the relationships among the chronicles and their manuscripts. I will therefore cite instances from all chronicles in chronological order by Byzantine year to illustrate the continuity of usage. It should be noted that the "Index" *sub verbo* "Pskovian Land" references passages which do not contain the phrase the Pskovian Land but use either the Pskovian region (*oblast'*) or the Pskovian district (*vlast'*, *volost'*), as was also true of the "Index" to the Novgorod chronicles.[12]

---

zhizn' v XV–XVII vekakh (Pskov: Pskovskaia oblastnaia tipografiia, 2004).

6 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, Map 1. See ibid., 331 for the definition of *guba*. Arakcheev does not warn the reader that these *guby* differ from the anti-banditry *guby* instituted in Muscovy in the 1530s and 1540s during Ivan IV's minority, to which he alludes elsewhere (ibid., 123). To add to the confusion, both sets of *guba* institutions were headed by elders (*starosty*).

7 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 5, 10.

8 Berngirdt Borisovich Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov: Ocherki po istorii feodal'noi respubliki* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 2, 3.

9 Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 7.

10 Of course, allusions to the Pskovian Land could be multiplied considerably. For example, Anti Selart, "Vvedenie," in Selart, ed., *Pskovo-Pecherskii monastyr' vo vremia Livonskoi voiny (1558–1582). Zemlevladenie v Estonii* (Hamburg: Kovač, 2016), 17–47, frequently refers to the Pskovian Land and cites numerous additional publications whose titles mention the Pskovian Land. (Selart is Estonian, but publishing in Russian he accommodated Russian-language usage.)

11 Hans-Jürgen Grabmüller, *Die Pskover Chroniken. Untersuchungen zur russischen Regionalchronistik im 13.–15. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975).

12 *PL*, 2, "Geographic Index," 355.

This indicates that the editor (or whomever compiled the Index) did not treat the Pskovian Land as a technical term. This semantic nonchalance illustrates the lack of semiotic weight carried by the phrase. I have disregarded possible duplication of events under different years and included annals which extend beyond the end of Pskov's independence in 1510 because the Pskovian chronicle tradition did not terminate in that year.

- In 6849 the Germans (the Livonian Order) attacked the Pskovian Land.[13] In the same year Algirdas, Grand Duke of Lithuania, raided the Pskovian village / villages (*selo*, *sela*) or the Pskovian regions (*oblasti*).[14]
- In 6851 Algirdas returned to his own land via the Pskovian district (*volost'*). In retaliation for a destructive German attack on the "entire Pskovian region" (*vsia pskovskaia oblast'*), the Pskovites attacked the German Land (*Nemetskaia zemlia*).[15] The Pskovian chronicles never refer to the Livonian Order as the *Orden*, only as "the German Land." The Pskovian chronicler was quite familiar with the "land"-system of political nomenclature.
- In 6856 Algirdas attacked the Pskovian villages in Oreshko. After he had raided the Novgorodian district, he returned to his own land via the Pskovian district.[16] In 6857 Algirdas returned from Novgorod via the Novgorodian district.[17] Note that the Pskovian chronicles used the Novgorodian land, region, and district interchangeably.[18]
- In 6912 Prince Daniil Aleksandrovich of Pskov and Pskov's mayor (*posadnik*) Larion Doinikovich and "all of (*vse*) Pskov" attacked Polotsk (Polatsk).[19]
- In 6914 Vytautus, Grand Duke of Lithuania, made war on the Pskovian district by travelling to the Pskovian Land, or, to phrase it differently, he invaded the Pskovian district by personally travelling to the Pskovian district.[20]
- In 6915 Vytautus attacked the Pskovian region. The Master (of the Livonian Order) invaded the Pskovian Land. Grand Prince Vasilii I of Moscow broke his peace with Vytautus because Vytautus had made war on the Pskovian district.[21]
- In 6916 the Livonian Master attacked the Pskovian district.[22]

---

13 *PL*, 1:18; *PL*, 2:24, 93.

14 *PL*, 2:94–96.

15 *PL*, 1:21; *PL*, 2:97.

16 *PL*, 2:98, 99.

17 *PL*, 2:26.

18 Halperin, "Novgorod and the Novgorod Land," 354n51; 356, 67.

19 *PL*, 2:32. The Index cites a non-existing entry for 6912 on 31, but omits this reference on 32 s.a. 6914. I infer typographical errors in the Index.

20 *PL*, 1:28; *PL*, 2:111.

21 *PL*, 1:29; *PL*, 2:33, 114. The Index's reference to 6915 on 34 would seem to be a typographical error.

22 *PL*, 1:31; *PL*, 2:34, 116.

- In 6917 Vasilii I with the "entire Rus' Land" marched against Vytautus, while the German Master with the "entire German Land" (*vsia nemetskaia zemlia*) and Lithuanians (*Litva*) attacked the Pskovian districts. Variously Germans attacked the Pskovian Land or the Pskovian regions or Vasilii I raised the "entire Rus' Land" against Vytautus, who, with a German army (literally: strengths, *sila*) and the Lithuanians (*Litva*), had invaded the Pskovian districts.[23] Note that regions and districts again serve as synonyms here.
- In 6933 the Germans attacked all (*vse*) the Pskovian regions.[24]
- In 6934 Vitautus with Lithuanians and Tatars attacked the Pskovian districts while Novgorod fought the brother of Vytautus en route to Pskovian districts.[25]
- In 6935 Germans attacked the Pskovian Land.[26]
- S.a. 6967 the chronicler observed that Pskov is the land of the Holy Trinity (*Sviataia Troitsa*). In that same year Prince Alexander Vasil'evich of Pskov attacked the German Land and Germans attacked the Pskovian Land.[27]
- In 6974 an epidemic occurred in "all the Pskovian regions" (variant: districts).[28]
- In 6975 an epidemic struck for two years in Pskov, its subordinate towns, and in "all Pskovian districts."[29] It would be tempting to infer from this passage that "all Pskovian districts" denoted only the countryside, rural zones, and did not include the city of Pskov or its subordinate cities.
- S.a. 6976 the Pskovian chronicler observed critically that widowed priests were performing the liturgy in Pskovian districts,[30] which violated the rules of the Russian Orthodox Church.
- In 9977 Germans invaded the Pskovian Land.[31]
- In 6979 the worst fire that had ever occurred in "all the" (*vsia*) Pskovian districts broke out.[32]

---

23 *PL*, 1:32, 35; *PL*, 2:117. The Pskov chronicles use the collective noun *Litva* rather than the plural Lithuanians (*litovtsy*, singular: *litovets*).

24 *PL*, 1:35. The Index contains a typographical error, listing the year 6935.

25 *PL*, 1:36; *PL*, 2:122, 123.

26 *PL*, 1:38; *PL*, 2:124.

27 *PL*, 1:56; *PL*, 2:145.

28 *PL*, 2:162.

29 *PL*, 2:163.

30 *PL*, 2:54.

31 *PL*, 2:167.

32 *PL*, 2:181.

- In 6985 in civil strife all mayors, well-to-do people (*zhitie liudi*), and "all of (*vsei*)" Pskov armed themselves, which the index erroneously lists as a reference to the Pskovian Land although it does not reference the Pskovian Land, districts, or region.[33]
- In 6988 Germans burned and looted the Pskovian district.[34]
- In 6993 Pskov envoys were killed in the Tverian Land and there was a grain shortage in the Pskovian Land.[35] Note the utilization of another "Land"-polity phrase, which a Tverian author treated as a political and ideological term.
- In 6994 Archbishop of Novgorod and Pskov Gennadii sent a boyar to survey all the churches and monasteries in the "entire" (*vsia*)" Pskovian Land.[36]
- In 7009 Germans attacked the Pskovian Land.[37]
- In 7011 a Muscovite army drove the Germans from the Pskovian Land.[38]
- In 7012 it was announced that in the future widowed priests would not serve as parish priests in Pskov and the "entire" (*vsia*) Pskovian Land.[39]
- In 7015 Lithuanians (*Litva*) and Rus' (here: Ruthenians, East Slavs residing in Lithuania) attacked the "entire" (*vsia*) Pskovian Land.[40]
- In 7018 in the Pskovian Land there were ten subordinate cities and two fortresses (*gorodishche*).[41]
- In 7026 Grand Prince of Moscow Vasilii III sent many Muscovite troops to the Pskovian Land en route to Opochko.[42]
- In 7031 the Pskovites began to build the Caves (*Pechera*) Monastery in the Pskovian Land.[43]
- In 7066 a Muscovite army en route west to campaign against Lithuania looted Pskovian villages on the border of the Pskovian Land.[44]

---

33 *PL*, 2:205.
34 *PL*, 1:77; *PL*, 2:220.
35 *PL*, 2:66.
36 *PL*, 2:68.
37 *PL*, 1:86.
38 *PL*, 1:87.
39 *PL*, 1:89.
40 *PL*, 1:138–39.
41 *PL*, 2:258.
42 *PL*, 1:99.
43 *PL*, 2:226.
44 *PL*, 2:235.

- In 7068 requisitions for auxiliary labour caused great losses to the entire Pskovian Land during the failed Muscovite campaign against Livonia.[45]
- In 7071 Lithuanians (*Litva*) attacked "the Pskovian area" (*Pskovshchina*), a rare term which also occurs in seventeenth-century annals.[46]
- In 7096 the Muscovites built Ivangorod to stop Germans from attacking the Pskovian Land.[47]
- In 7126 the extortions of Muscovite governor Prince I. F. Troekurov did great harm to the "entire" (*vsia*) Pskovian Land[48].

Clearly the Pskovian chronicles referred to the Pskov Land not as an ideological concept, let alone myth, but purely as a territorial and geographic phrase, to denote the area subordinate to Pskov's authority. The Pskovian Land is never reified. It is never an autonomous actor. It was the object of attack—Pskov was at war with the Livonian Order for over two hundred years[49]—but also fought Lithuania, Sweden, sometimes Novgorod, and later Muscovy, but never the subject. It was the "Land" to which Pskov armies abroad returned. Moreover, the term did not have exclusive rights to this meaning; Pskovian districts and regions carried the same meaning as the Pskovian Land. No one ever fought for the Pskovian Land as Kievans and later Muscovites fought for the Rus' Land. No one expresses loyalty to the Pskovian Land. Pskov is not identified as the Pskovian Land but as the land of the Holy Trinity, to which its main cathedral was devoted and to which we will return. The Pskovian Land had no social referent. No prince of Pskov consulted the Pskovian Land or led an army of "the entire Pskovian Land" into battle. To denote an action or belief of all the residents of the city of Pskov the chroniclers wrote "all Pskov." That is why I translate *vsia Pskovskaia zemlia* as "the entire Pskovian Land" rather than "all of the Pskovian Land," to encompass territory, rather than rhetorically "all of [the people][50] of the Pskovian Land." The Pskovian Land is a pragmatic, not intellectual, term. Such a pattern of usage of the phrase the Pskovian Land was not confined to Pskov chronicles.

Dovmont was a thirteenth-century Lithuanian prince who immigrated to Pskov, converted to Orthodox Christianity with the name Timofei, and served as prince of Pskov. His *vita* was probably composed during the fourteenth century, and is found within the corpus of the Pskovian chronicles. Our focus is on who and what Dovmont fought for, and who and what he did not fight for.[51]

---

45 *PL*, 2:240. The Index erroneously reads 7068.

46 *PL*, 2:243; see *PL*, 2, "Geographic Index," 355 (page 282 should read 283).

47 *PL*, 1:119. (*PL*, 1:7096, 120 and *PL*, 2: 7115, 269 are bogus Index entries.)

48 *PL*, 2:280.

49 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 18.

50 The understood term in brackets is inserted by me.

51 Valentina Il'inichna Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte. Issledovanie i tektsy* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1985), 1–187 (analysis), 188–230 (texts). Okhotnikova also published a text with facing modern Russian translation and commentary: "Skazanie o Dovmonte," ed. V. I. Okhotnikova, in *Bibilioteka*

Pskov treated Dovmont as a saint, but the genre to which this text belongs is ambiguous. Valentina Okhotnikova refers to the text as a "narrative" (*skazanie*) based upon its heading, *The Narration of the blessed prince Dovmont and his courage* (*Skazanie o blagovernom kniaze Dovmonte i o khrabrosti ego*), but in the title of her monograph she calls it a "tale" (*povest'*), *The Tale of Dovmont* (*Povest' o Dovmonte*). One of the major sources of the text was a redaction of Nevskii's *vita*, which also suffers from genre identity problems. Therefore, my use of the word *vita* is only for convenience, to distinguish it from the chronicle narratives into which it was usually embedded.

The author of the *vita* of Dovmont was familiar with "Land"-polity vocabulary, but used it selectively. He refers to the Lithuanian Land (and the "Lithuanians," *Litva*),[52] but never to the Pskovian Land. Dovmont's supporters wish to fight "for the Holy Trinity and all the holy churches." Dovmont urges the Pskovites to fight "for the Holy Trinity and for the holy churches and for our fatherland."[53] Other passages describe the Germans as raiding Pskovian villages, which might be no more than straightforward description. Dovmont defended "Novgorod and Pskov" without reference to either as a "Land." The *vita* emotionally records the sorrow of the men, women, and children of Pskov at Dovmont's death.[54] Nevskii's *vita* poetically depicted Nevskii's death by writing that "the sun has set in the Suzdalian Land," which was later changed to the "Rus' Land." The author of the primary redaction of Dvomont's *vita* did not borrow that phrasing. He could easily have written that the Pskovian Land mourned Dovmont's death, personifying or reifying the Pskovian Land with ideological import, but he did not. No subsequent redaction of the *vita* rewrote his description of the reception of Dovmont's death by the people of Pskov to include the Pskovian Land.[55] The Pskovian Land does not appear in Dovmont's *vita* even once.

Dovmont fights for the Holy Trinity, meaning the Holy Trinity Cathedral, the emblem of Pskov. Okhotnikova rightfully describes the Holy Trinity Cathedral as the "centre of political and religious life" in Pskov; the Holy Trinity functioned as the city's patron saint. Okhotnikova finesses the *vita*'s lack of references to the Pskovian Land by commenting that Dovmont "defended Pskov and its land."[56]

Documents from Pskov adhere to the same pattern of usage of the Pskovian Land. If it appears, it carries only geographic meaning. The documents manifest the usual familiarity with other "Land"-state names, but rarely projected such a linguistic construction on to Pskov. One late document, from 1509, goes beyond that framework in a fascinating way.

---

literatury drevnei Rusi [hereafter *BLDR*], vol. 6: *XIV–seredina XV veka* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1999), 56–63 (original on even-numbered pages, modern Russian translation on odd-numbered pages), 520–23 (commentary).

52 The *First Pskov Chronicle* redaction referred to the "Riga Land Master" (*rizhskaia zemlia master*), the Master of the Livonian Order, which was simplified in the Expanded Redaction as the "Riga Master" (*master risskii*). *BLDR*, 6:58; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 191, 220.

53 *BLDR*, 6:58; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 189–90.

54 *BLDR*, 6:58, 62; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 190, 192, 193.

55 Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*,195, 199.

56 *BLDR*, 6:521.

Unfortunately, no treaty between Pskov and the princes it invited to sit on its throne survives,[57] which deprives historians of what might have been very valuable evidence of both Pskov self-identity and princely perceptions of Pskov's identity. Extant treaties between Pskov and Muscovite rulers date to a period in which Pskov had little choice in the matter.

The 1417 treaty between Pskov and the Livonian Order, written in Riga, referred only to Pleskowe (Pskov) in its German original. In it Grand Prince Vasilii I of Moscow refers to Pskov as his patrimony. The text mentions Pskov's mayor and "all (*alle*) of Pskov," matching the Russian circumlocution of "all (*ves'* or *vse*) Pskov" to denote its entire population. It also alludes to the Pskovian districts.[58]

A 1440 treaty between Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir and Pskov refers only to Pskov. It stipulates free travel for merchants to the Lithuanian Land and Lithuania (*Litva*) from Pskov and all Pskovian subordinate cities.

In 1462–1465 Pskov issued a charter to Riga in response to a complaint by Prince Ivan Aleksandrovich of Pskov and Pskov's lord mayor (*stepennoi posadnik*)[59] Maksim Larivonovich, all of Pskov's mayors, Pskov's boyars, merchants, and "all of Pskov" (*vsego Pskova*).[60]

In 1477 Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow made a treaty with Pskov. The treaty was concluded on Pskov's part by its lord mayors, senior mayors (*starye posadniki*),[61] deputy mayors (*synove posadniki*),[62] merchants, the well-to-do (*zhitie liudi*), and "all of Pskov" (*ves' Pskov*).[63]

---

57 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovti Pskov*, 45.

58 *GVNP*, no. 334: 318–21.

59 George G. Pushkarev, comp., *A Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 95 defines *stepennyi posadnik* as "incumbent mayor." I follow Lawrence L. Langer, "The *Posadnichedstvo* of Pskov: Some Aspects of Urban Administration in Medieval Russia," *Slavic Review* 43, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 46–62 at 48 in my translation as "lord mayor." Pskov's political structure evolved. Eventually two "lord mayors" headed the city, while all former mayors belonged to the Council of Lords (*gospoda*, *sovet gospod*). The *stepen'* was the rostrum or podium on which Pskov's leaders stood when conducting meetings of the town assembly, like Golgotha (*Lobnoe mesto*) in Red Square in Moscow in front of the Kremlin. Sergei Vasil'eivch Beletskii, *Pechati pskovskie* (St. Petersburg: Institut istorii material'noi kul'tury, 1994), 27.

60 *GVNP*, no. 336: 323–24.

61 Pushkarev, *A Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms*, 95 defines "old mayors" as former mayors, now members of the Council of Lords. I follow Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 38, who concluded that "old" mayors were not necessarily former mayors, but "senior" mayors by reason of seniority in age or length of time in office.

62 Literally "sons of mayors." The office of mayor was hereditary, but I doubt that all sons of mayors (including minors?) held that status in Pskov's administration and society. My translation follows Langer, "The *Posadnichedstvo* of Pskov," 63 (although he also translates the term literally, p. 61). Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 53–58 too takes the phrase "sons of mayors" literally as evidence that the post of mayor was hereditary.

63 *GVNP*, no. 338: 324.

A 1480 charter (*gramota*) in the form of a petition from Prince Vasilii Vasil'evich of Pskov to Casimir, Grand Duke of Lithuania (and King of Poland) complaining of a Livonian Order raid mentioned a town meeting of all of Pskov's mayors and "all of Lord Pskov" (*ves' gospodin Pskov*) at a town assembly.[64] The documents refer to Pskov as the "land of the Holy Trinity," an expression we have seen before. The petition to Casimir came from the Pskov mayors, lord mayors, senior mayors, deputy majors, boyars, merchants, well-to-do, and "all of" (*ves'*) Pskov. The Pskovian petitioners asked Casimir not to permit the Lithuanians to detain Pskovian captives fleeing from the German Land across the Lithuanian Land to return to Pskov.[65] No Pskovian Land complements the Lithuanian Land and the German Land.

The expression Lord Pskov (*gospodin Pskov*) elevated the status of the city, really the city-state; it was an ideological statement. However, it references Pskov as a city, not the Pskov Land. Arakcheev dates the origins of Pskov's identification as Lord Pskov to no earlier than the 1460s.[66] Novgorod also declared itself Lord (*Gospodin*) Novgorod. Pskov originated as a subordinate city of Novgorod; historians date its independence from Novgorod to 1348,[67] when Novgorod acknowledged Pskov's status as "young brother" (*mladshii brat*) of Novgorod,[68] so it seems to have taken Pskov over a century to aspire to equal the "lord" status of its former master and implicit current older brother.[69] Ironically, by the time Pskov achieved the status of lord, at least in its own mind, the authority of the governor (*namestnik*) of Pskov, appointed by the government in Moscow, was expanding, in 1467, to include the right to judge cases in all of Pskov's subordinate cities.[70]

A 1483 judgment charter concerning a territorial dispute involving a monastery records that the trial was held "before Lord *(gospodin*) Pskov Prince[71] Iaroslav Vasil'evich and the lord mayors."[72] "Lord" applies to Pskov, not Prince Iaroslav Vasil'evich.

A 1503 treaty between Pskov and the Livonian Order was concluded on Pskov's side by the lord mayors, senior mayors, and "all Great" (*vsego Velikii*) Pskov," in German, "alle [corrected by the editor from "alte"] grote Plesckaw." It also refers to the mayors and "all

64 The composition and authority of the town assembly remain subjects of great disagreement among specialists. The word does not appear in Pskov chronicles until the 1450s. Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 90.

65 *GVNP*, no. 339: 325–26.

66 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 35.

67 Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 3; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 66.

68 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 17; Langer, "The *Posadnichedstvo* of Pskov," 51 dates this development to the late fourteenth century.

69 Because Pskov was not independent during the Kievan period, there is no chapter on Pskov in *Drevnerusskie kniazhestva, X–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975). If there were, it would certainly have been titled the "Pskovian Land."

70 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Psko*v, 45.

71 The text omits the word "prince," but the editor's heading for the document identifies him as a prince.

72 *PRP*, 2:325–27.

of Novgorod." Finally, it stipulates safe passage for Livonian and Pskovian envoys to and from the Pskovian Land (Plesckawer lande).[73] This document stands out for presenting the term "Great Pskov," which is something of an anomaly. Novgorod on the Volkhov River developed the term Great Novgorod to distinguish it from Nizhnii Novgorod (Lower Novgorod) on the lower Volga River, but there was no Lower Pskov to inspire use of the adjective "Great" to Pskov. The treaty also refers to the Pskovian Land in a purely territorial context.

An excerpt of a land survey of the boundaries of a suburb (*sloboda*) of Pskov belonging to the Holy Trinity Cathedral from the beginning of the sixteenth century explains that the survey was ordered by Lord (*Gospodin*) Pskov Prince of Pskov Semen Romanovich and all of Pskov's mayors and all (*ves'*) [the people of] Lord (*Gospodin*) Pskov in a town assembly. The suburb should be delivered to Lord (*gospodin*) Pskov in the presence of "all [the people of] Pskov" (*vsem Pskovom*). This excerpt virtually equates "Lord Pskov" and the Holy Trinity Cathedral. "Lord" applies to Pskov, not Prince Semen Romanovich.

A 1509 truce treaty between Pskov and the Livonian Order was concluded in large measure by the governor of Novgorod representing Grand Prince Vasilii III of Muscovy, but Pskovite officials and elite members participated. Pskov's governor Prince Ivan Mikhailovich, the lord mayors, the senior mayors, all [the people of] Great Pskov, the Pskov mayors, boyars, a merchant elder, an episcopal governor, and urban and commercial secretaries from Vasilii III's patrimony the Pskovian Land all approved the treaty. The treaty included permission for merchants from the Pskovian Land to travel freely to the German Land and to return freely to the Pskovian Land, German merchants could travel freely to the Pskovian Land and return. However, German merchants could not sell salt from the German Land in the Pskovian Land. Trade was to be conducted as of old between the German Land and the Pskovian Land. Procedures were established to handle the situation in which a German was executed in the Pskovian Land. Yet again the treaty emphasized that the Pskovian Land was the patrimony of Vasilii III.[74] Pskov's lord mayor and the "best people" (the upper crust) kissed the cross (swore to uphold the truce) "for (*za*) [= on behalf of] Pskov and all the Pskovian cities and the entire (*vsia*) Pskovian Land [and for] the patrimony" of the great sovereign Russian Tsar Vasilii III and affixed the seal of the Holy Trinity to the truce. (In fact, two Holy Trinity seals were attached to the document.)[75]

While the territorial meaning of the Pskovian Land dominates the text of the treaty, that is not the entire story. Pskov's representatives act "on behalf of" inter alia the Pskovian Land. The Pskovian Land in this expression cannot be territorial, it is social, that is, all the people of the entire Pskovian Land, implicitly including outside the city of Pskov and the subordinate cities. The term also becomes political. This is the only

73 *GVNP*, no. 347: 331–37.

74 The treaty accords Vasilii III the title "tsar and grand prince" although he had not been crowned "tsar." Ivan IV became Muscovy's first crowned tsar in 1547.

75 N. A. Kazakova, ed., "Dogovor Pskova s Livoniei 1509 g.," *Voprosy istorii* 1 (1983): 90–98, especially 91–95 (text of treaty); Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 26–27.

instance I have found of the concept of the Pskovian Land as a political and social construct. However, although the document is a truce between Pskov and Livonia and bears Pskov's seals, this is not only a very late statement, one year before Muscovy liquidated Pskov's independence, but also may not be of Pskovian provenance. As often as the text identifies the Pskovian Land as a geographic unit it defines that entity as the patrimony of Vasilii III and therefore not independent. Unlike calling Pskov "Great Pskov," this specific assertion reflected Moscow's, not Pskov's, ideology. The treaty, despite its staunch defence of Pskov's commercial rights vis-à-vis the Livonian Order, could still have been composed by Muscovite scribes, most likely employed by the Muscovite governor of Novgorod. While the term "Great Pskov" occurs in the treaty, the phrase Lord (*gospodin*) Pskov does not. The exceptional usage of the Pskovian Land in the 1509 treaty might derive from a non-Pskov origin.

The documentary evidence amplifies the instances in which the Pskovian Land was used geographically but also expands our appreciation of the concepts Pskovite authors used in lieu of assigning the Pskovian Land any ideological dimension. Of course, the identification of Pskov with the Holy Trinity Cathedral remains, but now that very association may have underlain the application of new attributes to the city's and the city-state's name. Great Pskov appears only in two documents; its usage requires further study. However, Lord Pskov can only be construed as projecting an attribute of sovereignty onto Pskov. It is no surprise that this only occurred after Novgorod recognized de jure what had been true de facto for some time, Pskov's independence from Novgorod. Novgorod attempted to soften the blow to its pride by insisting that Pskov was the young brother of Novgorod,[76] but that tells us more about Novgorod than Pskov. I doubt that Muscovy was enamored of the title, which did not appear in the 1509 treaty. The unique social and political meaning ascribed to the Pskovian Land in that treaty is problematic as an expression of Pskov's ideology.

Pskov never achieved ecclesiastical autonomy. Its efforts to emancipate itself from the eparchy of the Archbishop of Novgorod and Pskov failed, and it never had its own bishop during this period. Therefore, its autonomy, specifically and especially its autonomy from Novgorod, remained incomplete. This limitation on Pskov's independence had no effect on its lack of an ideological construct of the Pskovian Land, because Novgorod, which had its own (arch)bishop, also lacked a comparable concept.

Pskov's Judicial Charter (*Pskovskaia sudnaia gramota* or *pravda*) contains layers from the fourteenth and fifteenth century, but it certainly belongs to the period of Pskov's independence and antedates the Muscovite Law Code (*Sudebnik*) of 1497, of which it was a source. It does not refer to the Pskovian Land. Nevertheless, the translation of the text by Aleksandr Zimin dramatically illustrates the susceptibility of historians to fall back on "Land"-state nomenclature. Article 76 reads: if a dependent peasant (*izornik*)[77] runs away across the border (*za rubezh*)." Zimin translates "beyond the border" as "beyond the boundaries of the Pskovian Land" (*za predely Pskovskoi zemli*). Arti-

76 Langer, "The *Posadnichestvo* of Pskov," 51.

77 On *izorniki*, who were certainly peasants, although additional interpretations are all contested, see Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 9–35; Liudmila Mikhailovna Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*

cle 80 speaks of a Pskovite who has a charter to travel "across the border (*za rubezh*)," which Zimin translates as "beyond the boundaries of the Pskovian Land (*za predely (Pskovskoi zemli*)."[78] To be sure even here the notion of a Pskovian Land is territorial, but boundaries belong to political entities, and the Pskovian Land was not a political entity, as Zimin's translation implied.

Issuing coinage was a sovereign right in medieval Rus'; only an independent polity could issue its own coins. Pskov began issuing coins in 1425, and continued to do so for eighty-five years, until Moscow formally annexed it in 1510. Pskov's silver coins contain images of a man with a crown and a sword, perhaps Prince Dovmont, with a four-line inscription "Pskovian coinage" (*denga pskovskaia*), or an image of an animal (a snow leopard?) with an inscription, or a symbol which might represent the trident seal of the Volodimerovich royal clan in Kievan Rus' or a monogram of Prince Dovmont. A later, rarer, smaller copper coin had similar images, an inscription "Pskovian" (*pskovskaia*), but no monogram.[79] Because there is no need here to resolve the complex issues involved in interpreting the coins, we can confine ourselves to the obvious: No coin reads Great Pskov, Lord Pskov, or (unlike some mid-fifteenth-century Muscovite coins inscribed with the Rus' Land) the Pskovian Land. Pskov's coinage contributed to Pskov's political image but did not articulate an ideology of the Pskovian Land.

Pskov's seals are an even more problematic subject than its coins because of their lack of homogeneity. Pskov instituted a new seal in 1425 to coincide with the reorganization of its administration, the completion of a construction project that created the town assembly's architectural site, and the issuance of coinage. Seals used by Pskovite private citizens contain the religious illustrations that we would expect—the Holy Trinity, the Mother of God (*Bogoroditsa*), the Life-Giving Cross, Saint-Prince Dovmont[80]—but are hardly likely to contain and did not contain an inscription referring to the Pskovian Land. Seals with the name of the Grand Prince of Moscow that declare Pskov to be his patrimony derive from Muscovite ambitions, not Pskovite sensibilities. Seals issued by the Archbishop of Novgorod and Pskov or by his representatives (governors) in Pskov represent archepiscopal pretensions, not Pskov's. The illustration of the Mother of God of the Sign[81] is certainly ecclesiastical, and might echo the Church of Hagia Sophia, the archbishop's church in Novgorod. However, when archepiscopal administrators in Pskov acted as representatives of Pskov rather than the archbishop they used a seal with the Holy Trinity, reflecting Pskov's Trinity Cathedral. Whether "Pskovian seals" (*pechati*

XIV–XV vekov (Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1966), 126, 151–53. Halperin, *Ivan IV and Muscovy*, 323, 323n80, twice misprints *izorniki* as *izborniki*.

78 *PRP*, 2:296, 297 (original text), 315, 317 (translation).

79 Iuliia Aleksandrovna Sergeeva, "Monety nezavisimogo Pskova (XV–nachalo XVI v.)," *Pskov* 25 (2006): 16–26 (this is a popular but professionally written and annotated article); Beletskii, *Pechati pskovskie*, 16–17, 21.

80 Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*, documents no. 4–8, 18–20, 22 described the illustrations. According to Ianin, descriptions of a seal with "glaring eyes" (*glazukha*, *glazuta*), a seventeenth-century neologism, refer to Dovmont (see note 68 above in this chapter).

81 The Virgin with outstretched arms, with Jesus in her womb.

pskovskie) belonged to the prince, the mayors' court, the boyar council, the Pskov state, or some combination thereof remains contested. Seals reading "Pskovian mayors' seals" (*Pskovkie posadnitskie pechati*) contain comparable, in all cases religious, symbols, such as the Cross and the Trinity.[82] Seals with the Trinity might also represent Pskov's town assembly and were declared legally equal to princely seals.[83] Like Pskov's coins, Pskov's seals never display inscriptions reading Lord Pskov, Great Pskov, or the Pskovian Land.

Arakcheev writes: "The term the 'Pskovian Land' was used to denote the territory belonging to Pskov as a city-state," "the territory under Pskov's sovereignty."[84] The ample evidence of Pskov's chronicles and the scattered evidence from Pskovian documents confirms that definition of the phrase, which does not appear in Dovmont's *vita*, the Pskov Judicial Statute, or on Pskov's seals or coinage. Despite this intellectually neutral interpretation of the term in the Pskovian sources and because of the highly value-laden system of "Land" names in medieval and early modern Rus', typified by the exalted concept of the Rus' Land, historians nevertheless sometimes persist in ascribing ideological content for independent Pskov to the Pskovian Land. Arakcheev did not ask why the Pskovian Land did not rise to the level of self-identity of the Pskovite city-state.

The answer to that question is the same as the explanation for why the Novgorodian Land did not attain ideological importance in independent Novgorod. Novgorod identified itself with the St. Sophia Cathedral, the seat of its archbishop, who stood atop the Novgorod political pyramid. In Pskov the secular and ecclesiastical administrative apparatuses shared the same elite personnel. Mayors served as elders (*starosty*) of the Holy Trinity Cathedral and other churches. These elders controlled the economic life of Pskov's churches and monasteries.[85] The fusion of political and ecclesiastical structures in Pskov, as in Novgorod, might explain the prominence of religious concepts such as Hagia Sophia and the Holy Trinity. In Pskov political consciousness and identity were framed in religious terms. However, this positive explanation of the ideological insignificance of the Pskovian Land, like that of the Novgorodian Land, does not suffice.

Neither Novgorod's political thought nor Pskov's precluded the parallel development of concepts, even myths, of a Novgorodian Land or a Pskovian Land respectively, any more than Pskov's city-state political institutions inhibited the simultaneous existence of a princely administrative apparatus.[86] Rather, the negative explanation for the absence of "Land"-concepts comparable to those in other East Slavic polities comes into play, the lack of a princely dynasty. However significant a role the prince played in Pskov, a role that certainly increased,[87] as in Novgorod there was no princely dynasty in

82 Beletskii, *Pechati pskovskie*; V. L. Ianin, "Sfragisticheskii kommentarii k pskovskim chastnym aktam," in Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*, 163–78 (174 on *glazukha*); Langer, "The *Posadnichestvo* of Pskov," 52–53.

83 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 87; see *PRP*, 2:293.

84 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 9.

85 Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*, 148–49.

86 Aracheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 42.

87 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 39–42. Arakcheev cites Iurii Georgievich Alekseev, *Pskovskaia*

Pskov, and therefore Pskov, like Novgorod, could not articulate an ideology of a "Land"-polity. I exaggerated in attributing a "unique" status and absent "Land'-state concept to Novgorod because Pskov shared that status and that intellectual omission. One might even say that Pskov borrowed or inherited those attributes from Novgorod when it managed to terminate its political dependence on Novgorod and to convince Novgorod, however grudgingly, to recognize that independence.

After its annexation by the Grand Principality, later Tsardom, of Muscovy, sixteenth-century authors in Pskov, unlike some modern scholars, did not anachronistically invest the phrases the Pskovian Land with patriotic import, even as local or provincial boosterism. Historians have not investigated whether such authors assimilated Muscovite ideological monopolization of the Rus' Land. A text from Ivan IV's reign illustrates this issue and epitomizes Pskov's political identity after its incorporation into Muscovy.

How the icon-painter Vasilii, the Pskovian author of the *Tale of the Assault of Stefan Batory on Pskov* (*Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov*) in 1582,[88] dealt with "Land" terminology is quite instructive. Of course, the text articulates Pskov's pride in its successful resistance to the siege of the city during the Livonian War by Batory, King of Poland. It should be mentioned that Vasilii particularly extols the courage and skill of the Muscovite governor, Prince Ivan Petrovich Shuiskii, the *Tale*'s hero.

The title of the narration describes the Lithuanian king (*korol*) Stefan as attacking Pskov and the Rus' Land, the Imperial-Russian tsardrom (*Rossiiskoe tsarstvo*), employing the Hellenized adjective found in the *Tale of Ivan IV's Campaign Against Novgorod* in 1570 quoted above. Ivan IV returned from his campaign (in Livonia) to the Rus' Land, and then went to Pskov. Batory attacked Polotsk in the Rus' Land. He had travelled from Polotsk to the Rus' Land. His invasion marked the beginning of the decline of the Rus' Land. Prince Vasilii Mikhailovich Rostovskii-Lobanov vowed to defend Pskov for the Orthodox Christian faith, the holy churches, the sovereign Ivan IV, and the sovereign's children, and all Orthodox Christians, even unto death. The gentry and their captains, and the musketeers and their captains all took the same oath. Batory attacked the Rus' Land, proclaiming in his pronunciamento to all lands that he was invading the Rus' Land and would instill fear in the Rus' Land. He advanced in the Rus' Land (twice) toward the glorious (*slavnyi*) city of Pskov in the Rus' Land. At the border of the Rus' Land, he announced his destination as the Pskovian Land. The text invokes the saints of the Rus' Land three times. Former gentry warriors, now clerics, entered the field of battle on the walls of Pskov, proclaiming: Today let us die for the Christian faith and the Orthodox sovereign Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evich of All Rus'. Pskovites vow to die defending their faith, their sovereign (Ivan IV), and Pskov. During the siege Ivan sent troops to raid the Lithuanian Land; they return safely to the "Rus' Land.[89]

---

sudnaia gramota i ee vremia: Razvitia feodal'nykh otnoshenii na Rusi v XIV–XV vv. (Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie, 1980), 12–19, as one of the works that demonstrate this conclusion.

88 V. I. Malyshev, ed., *Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1952).

89 Malyshev, ed., *Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov*, 35, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 50–51, 59, 71, 74–75, 78, 83, 91, 98.

There is only one allusion in the text to the Pskovian Land, in its territorial sense. Overwhelmingly the narrative is situated in the Rus' Land ruled by Ivan IV. Pskov is praised as a "glorious city" even by Batory, and the city's defenders are willing to die fighting for the Orthodox Christian faith, for Ivan IV, and for Pskov, but not for the Pskovian Land. With some ambiguity Pskov, and incidentally Polotsk, belong to the Rus' Land.[90] King Stefan Batory rules not the Polish "kingdom" (*korolevstvo*), but the Lithuanian Land, which is juxtaposed to its opponent, the Rus' Land. Muscovite appropriation of the myth of the Rus' Land, for its state and for its ruler, finds full expression in this text. The Pskovian "patriotism" of the icon-painter Vasilii did not preclude his adherence to the Muscovite ideology of the Rus' Land and certainly did not inspire him to reconceptualize the Pskovian Land as an ideological construct. There is no evidence of Pskov separatism or political dissent against Ivan IV in the text, even though Batory's siege post-dated Ivan's sack of the city during the *oprichnina* in 1570.

Therefore, the concept of the Pskovian Land neither expressed Pskov's political ideology during its period of independence nor found new life in Pskov as a medium of local loyalty after its incorporation into Muscovy.

90 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 93 asserts that the Pskovian Land was part of the Novgorodian Land, so that when Muscovy annexed Novgorod in 1478, Pskov had already become part of the Rus' Land and the Russian state. This conclusion overlooks the fact that neither the Pskovian Land nor the Novgorodian Land possessed juridical value. It also disregards the obvious opinion of Pskov's government that by 1478, probably since 1348, Pskov had terminated its subordination to Novgorod.

Chapter 7

THE RUS' LAND AND IVAN IV

HOW THE MYTH of the Rus' Land was adapted to the new political circumstances created by Ivan IV's coronation as tsar in 1547 is of great interest for understanding Muscovite political consciousness. Did the term survive, and if so, did its meaning change? Was it displaced by terms generated by Ivan's new title such as Rus' tsardom (*tsarstvo*, *tsarstvie*) or the more imperial variant, the Ros (*rossiiskaia*) Land? Of course, sixteenth-century book-men continued to refer to the Rus' Land when discussing earlier history. They were after all quoting earlier sources, even if sometimes they could indulge in anachronism. This chapter looks at applications of the term only to events during Ivan's reign, beginning with descriptions of his accession upon the death of his father, Grand Prince Vasilii III.

Vladimir Bovykin's monograph *The Rus' Land and the State in the Epoch of Ivan the Terrible*,[1] although an excellent monograph on local self-government in sixteenth-century Muscovy, unfortunately serves as an example of how not to address this theme. Bovykin's goal is to dispute the assertion of the nineteenth-century Russian conservative journalist Mikhail Katkov that the Rus' Land and the state were synonymous. In so doing Bovykin equates the Rus' Land with the "Russian people" (*narod*) and "society" (*obshchestvo*). He interprets any reference to the "land" as an invocation of the Rus' Land, although (or because?) "land" also meant the commune (*obshchina*, *mir*). He also refers to the "entire territory of the Rus' Land," by which he seems to mean the territory of the state. He dates the transformation of the Rus' Land into a "single centralized national state" (*edinoe tsentralizovannoe natsional'noe gosudarstvo*) to this period.[2] The word "land" could have several meanings in Ivan IV's Muscovy, including "society," but treating "land" and the "Rus' Land" as synonyms without further analysis is unjustified.

In contrast to Bovykin, Mikhail Krom, in his recent stimulating analysis of the birth of the Muscovite state, observed that before the sixteenth century the only term available to express loyalty beyond the local level of city or principality was the Rus' Land which "designated the country (*strana*), a religious–cultural community (*religiozno-kul'turnaia obshchnost'*), but by no means a state (*gosudarstvo*)." Even in the middle of the fifteenth century the phrase was not fixed territorially or politically. It continued to be used after Ivan IV's coronation. It was not definitively replaced by "the Russian (Ros) tsardom" (*Rossiisskoe tsarstvo*) until the beginning of the seventeenth century during the Time of Troubles.[3]

---

1 Vladimir Valentinovich Bovykin, *Russkaia zemlia i gosudarstvo v epokhu Ivana Groznogo: Ocherki po istorii mestnogo samoupravleniia v XVI v.* (St. Petersburg: Bulanin, 2014).

2 Bovykin, *Russkaia zemlia* 5, 6, 79, 149, 377, 382.

3 Mikhail Krom, *Rozhdenie gosudarstva. Moskovskaia Rus' XV–XVI vekov* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018), 222 (quotation), 223, 231

Previously Krom had defined the Rus' Land as referring to a country, not a state, because it lacked political unity.[4] He had not, it appears, glossed the term as denoting a religious-cultural community.[5] Tracing in detail the appearances of the phrase in sources from Ivan's reign of course fell outside the scope of Krom's synthesis of evidence on Muscovite state-formation.

Krom's conception of the meaning of the Rus' Land before Ivan IV's reign should be qualified. The phrase did connote a country rather than a state, or even a government, and its territorial referents did vary. However, I have argued that the term was actually dynastic. It denoted the territory ruled by princely members of the clan of Saint Vladimir. The potency of the myth made it, in effect, a political football. Whichever prince could speak for the Rus' Land gained legitimacy. Therefore the concept "migrated" territorially as part of princely ideology, from the Kievan Dnieper River basin, to all of East Slavdom, to, in the thirteenth century, the Galician–Volhynian principality (now Ukraine) to the southwest both in contemporary Slavonic sources, the local chronicle, and in Latin as the *terra Russiae* (discussed below) and probably in the second half of the fourteenth century, although reliably dated documentation and evidence does not survive until the middle of the fifteenth century, to the Muscovite principality in the northeast. Thus, rulers who ruled Kiev, Galich, or Moscow each in turn claimed to rule the Rus' Land. By the middle of the fifteenth century Moscow's ascendancy was sufficient that it exercised a monopoly over the term. The *translatio* of the Rus' Land to Muscovy long preceded Ivan IV's coronation as tsar. At no time did the Rus' Land express "national consciousness," which would have been difficult since, as Krom observed elsewhere, agreeing with Kliuchevskii, no concept of the "Russian people" (*russkii narod*) existed before the end of the fifteenth century.[6]

Following its heritage of dynastic affiliations, we would expect the concept of the Rus' Land during Ivan IV's reign to refer to the territory that he ruled. Whether it also carried, as Krom suggests, religious, cultural, and social dimensions as well must be demonstrated from specific passages.[7] It is not only the appearance of the phrase that matters but the specifics of its usage. The "Rus' Land" appears in documentary and narrative sources of state and church provenance, in official and unofficial sources.[8]

---

4 Note the contrast to Cherniavsky's opinion that the Rus' Land did not connote a country.

5 M. M. Krom, "K voprosu o vremeni zarozhdeniia idei patriotizma v Rossii," in *Mirovospriiatie i samosoznanie russkogo obshchestva (XI–XX vv.). Sbornik statei*, ed. L. N. Pushkarev (Moscow: Institut rossiyskoy istorii, Rossiyskaya akademiya nauk, 1994), 16–30 at 19, 24, and its English-language publication, M. M. Krom, "Christian Tradition and the Birth of the Concept of Patriotism in Russia," trans. Ruth Coates, in *The Emancipation of Russian Christianity*, ed. Natalia A. Pecherskaya, with the assistance of Ruth Coates (Lewiston: Mellen, 1995), 17–37 at 21–22, 28.

6 Krom, "K voprosu o vremeni zarozhdeniia idei patriotizma v Rossii," 19; Krom, "Christian Tradition and the Birth of the Concept of Patriotism in Russia," 22.

7 Halperin, "*Rus'* versus *Ros* in Ivan IV's Muscovy," 370 only posed this question.

8 Charles J. Halperin, "What is an 'Official' Muscovite Source from the Reign of Ivan IV?" in *The Book of Royal Degrees and the Genesis of Russian Historical Consciousness / "Stepennaia kniga tsarskogo rodosloviia" i genezis russkogo istoricheskogo soznaniia*, ed. Ann M. Kleimola and Gail Lenhoff (Bloomington: Slavica, 2011), 81–93.

According to the diplomatic papers (*posol'skie knigi*) of Muscovite relations with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (*litovskie dela*, both before and after the Union of Lublin further fused Lithuania with Poland in 1569), in 1550 Metropolitan Makarii, according to Ivan's communique to King Sigismund Augustus of Poland, had crowned Ivan in 1547 as ruler of the Rus' Land.[9] In 1562 Ivan, again addressing Lithuania, claimed that he ruled the Rus' Land as his patrimony.[10] Clearly here the Rus' Land means the country that Ivan inherited from his father in 1533 and now ruled. In 1559 and 1569–1570, Ivan, addressing Sweden, asserted that the Swedish and Rus' Lands were now at peace, or should be, and also referred to his own country as the Rus' Land.[11]

In a domestic context in 1571 Prince Ivan Fedorovich Mstislavskii falsely confessed to having betrayed the Rus' Land by inviting Crimean Khan Devlet Girei to burn Moscow.[12] (Mstislavskii, more or less voluntarily, let himself play the scapegoat for the Crimean burning of Moscow. If Ivan had actually believed Mstislavskii guilty, he would have had him executed. Instead, he suffered no punishment at all.) It is noteworthy that in this highly emotional situation, fraught with implications of treason, Mstislavskii's confession did not refer to the Russian tsardom, but the Rus' Land.

The 1551 *Council of One Hundred Chapters* (*Stoglav*) is the text of the decisions of an ecclesiastical council on how to improve the faith in Muscovy. It refers to the bishops of the Rus' Land and the bishops of the "entire (*vsia*) Rus' Land."[13] Here the Rus' Land denotes the territory included in the metropolitanate of Muscovy and All Rus' headed by Metropolitan Makarii. Its meaning was ecclesiastical and organizational, but not religious. It should be kept in mind that the territorial boundaries of the Moscow metropolitanate depended upon the boundaries of the territory controlled by the government in Moscow. When Muscovy conquered Kazan' in 1552, the archbishopric subsequently established there was subject to the authority of the metropolitan of Moscow. It "joined" the Rus' Land. The same applied to Polotsk, then in Lithuania but now in Belarus, when Muscovy annexed it in 1563. Polotsk ceased to be part of the eparchy of Moscow, the Rus' Land, when Poland–Lithuania recovered it in 1579. In short, the Rus' Land here was ecclesiastical only derivatively. Ultimately it was political, and still dynastic. Orthodox bishops in lands governed by the tsar in Moscow were under the ecclesiastical supervision of the metropolitan in Moscow.

Confirming the conception of Metropolitan Makarii's eparchy in the *Council of One Hundred Chapters* is a 1563 epistle to him, ascribed to various authors including the

---

9 *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* 59 (1887): 345.

10 *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* 71 (1892): 108.

11 *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* 129 (1910): 57, 59, 181.

12 *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, khraniashchikhsia v Gosudarstvennoi Kollegii inostrannykh del*, ed. A. Malinovsky, 4 vols. (Moscow: Vsevolozhskago, 1813–1826), 1:561–65.

13 *Stoglav*, ed. D. E. Kozhanchikov (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademia nauk, 1863; repr. Letchworth: Bradda, 1971), 23, 160. Halperin, "*Rus'* versus *Ros* in Ivan IV's Muscovy," 370, erroneously included *Stoglav*, 196 among references to events during Ivan IV's reign. It alludes to the Rus' Land in connection with Constantinople Patriarch Photius and St. Vladimir.

monk Gerasim of the Iosifov Monastery, which also describes him as metropolitan over "the entire (*vsia*) Rus' Land."[14]

Chronicles provide rich information on the semantics of the Rus' Land during Ivan IV's reign, although due allowance must be made for the repetition resulting from their incestuous interrelationship. New chronicles cribbed material from older chronicles. The Nikon Chronicle is the generic name for a series of chronicle compilations that followed the compilation of the "core" *Nikon Chronicle* in 1530. S.a. 1533 the dying Vasilii III asserted that he had held (ruled) his realm (*derzhava*) the Rus' Land with his boyars, an echo of the so-called *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi. Vasilii III gave his son his realm (*gosudarstvo*), which the boyars should defend against Latins and Muslims abroad and "strong people" (*sil'nye luidi*) at home.[15] In 1541 the Crimean khan attacked the Rus' Land. In response to the Crimean threat the eleven-year-old Ivan IV prayed for God to defend the Rus' Land. Ivan IV placed his trust in the sainted Moscow metropolitans Petr and Aleksei to defend the Rus' Land from the Crimeans. In the last analysis Ivan's prayers were answered: God defended the Rus' Land.[16]

These chronicle passages are fully consistent with the documentary evidence of the diplomatic papers. Vasilii III's realm is the Rus' Land, which he bequeathed to his heir and eldest son, Ivan IV. *Gosudarstvo* clearly derives from *gosudar'* meaning "sovereign," and does not mean "state" (its modern Russian definition). *Gosudarstvo* and *derzhava* function as synonyms, signifying the entity, the country, the realm which Vasilii III ruled and which Ivan will rule. The Rus' Land threatened by the Crimeans manifests itself territorially. The protection of God and Russian saints accorded the Rus' Land does not make the term religious. In this instance Ivan IV prays for the Rus' Land, as a ruler should pray for the security of his realm and people, but below we shall see a more metaphorical and rhetorical ascription of prayer to the reified Rus' Land itself.

The *Resurrection Chronicle* (*Voskresenskaia letopis'*) contains the same passages as the *Nikon Chronicle* concerning Vasilii III's death-bed invocation of the Rus' Land; it served as the source for the *Nikon Chronicle* passages.[17]

Even the *Book of Degrees* (*Stepennaia kniga*), written probably during the 1560s, which is totally committed to the concept of the Muscovites tsardom, still recorded that

---

14 Archimandrite Makarii (Veretennikov), *Zhizn' i trudy sviatitelia Makariia mitropolita Moskovskogo i vsea Rusi* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii sovet Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy, 2002), 15.67, 451–52.

15 "Strong people" is a cliché term for those who abuse their economic, social, and political power to oppress commoners. In Muscovite sources it can denote boyars, monasteries, or government officials.

16 *PSRL*, 13 (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 76 (twice), 99, 103, 105, 106. Halperin, "*Rus'* versus *Ros* in Ivan IV's Muscovy," 370, erred in listing *PSRL*, 13:112, an historical allusion to the invasion of Rus' by Temir-Aksak (Tamerlane) in 1395, which is not about events during Ivan IV's reign.

17 *Voskresenskaia letopis'. Opis' russkikh gorodov*, ed. A. I. Tsepkov, Russkie letopisi 3 (Riazan': Uzoroch'e, 1998), 375, 395. The alternate version of the death of Vasilii III in the *Chronicle of the Beginning of the Tsardom* (*Letopisets nachala tsarstva*) does not refer to the Rus' Land: *PSRL*, 29 (Moscow, Nauka, 1965), 9–11, also in *PSRL*, 13:75–77, left column.

there were bad omens in "all regions (*oblasti*) of the Rus' Land" in 1533, portending Vasilii III's ill-health.[18]

The *Alexander-Nevskii Chronicle* (*Aleksandro-Nevskaia letopis'*), a part of the *Illustrated Chronicle Compilation* (*Litsevoi letopisnyi svod*), compiled later than the *Book of Degrees*, which was one of its sources, retained the assertion that in 1541 Crimean Khan Safa-Girei attacked the Rus' Land.[19]

Ivan IV referred to the Rus' Land both in an epistle in his own name and in epistles he putatively ghostwrote for boyars responding to an invitation from the King of Poland to betray Ivan. Ivan IV's *First Epistle to Prince Andrei Kurbskii* made only an historical reference to the Rus' Land in connection with Dmitrii Donskoi, but in his *Second Epistle to Kurbskii* Ivan wrote that Kurbskii, the priest Sylvester, and the associate boyar (*okol'nichii*) Alexei Adashev[20] "wanted to place the entire Rus' Land (*vsia russkaia zemlia*) under their feet" (control).[21]

The most intriguing references to the Rus' Land during Ivan's reign are found in two epistles to King of Poland Sigismund Augustus in the names of Muscovite boyars. The similarities among these epistles from boyars to Polish–Lithuanian figures, all dated 1567, suggest a common ghost-authorship by Ivan IV[22] or use of a template of his or someone else's design. In any event Prince I. D. Bel'skii offered to partition Poland–Lithuania, allowing Sigismund Augustus to take Poland, while Bel'skii would take the Lithuanian Grand Duchy (*Velikoe kniazhestvo litovskoe*) and the Rus' Land minus whatever lands were claimed by Prince M. I. Vorotynskii. An epistle from Prince I. F. Mstislavskii to Sigismund Augustus suggested the same partition between Bel'skii and Sigismund

18 *Stepennaia kniga tsarstogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam. Teksty i kommentarii*, ed. N. N. Pokrovskii and G. D. Lenkhoff, 3 vols., vol. 2: *Stepeni XI–XVII, Prilozheniia. Ukazateli* (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2007–2012), 323. Another historical reference to Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi as ruling the "Rus' Land" ambiguously implies that Ivan IV now also does so (ibid., 322).

19 *PSRL*, 29:135.

20 Traditional historiography associated these three men as members of the "Chosen Council" (*Izbrannaia rada*) that dominated the Muscovite government during the 1550s. This paradigm has been contested.

21 J. L. I. Fennell, ed., *The Correspondence of Prince A. M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia 1564–1579* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 12–13 (Ivan's *First Epistle*), 188–89 (Ivan's *Second Epistle*, modified from Fennell's translation "all the Russian land"). Whether Kurbskii referred to the Rus' Land depends upon treating the word "holy" in the expression "Holy Rus' Land" as an interpolation in the seventeenth-century manuscripts of Kurbskii's *History* (as proposed by Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 107–11) and then working backwards to the Rus' Land as the original phrase. It also depends upon accepting the authenticity of the text and its attribution to Kurbskii. Brian J. Boeck, "Eyewitness or False Witness? Two Lives of Metropolitan Filipp of Moscow," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 55, no. 2 (2007): 161–77 does not accept Kurbskii's authorship or the *History*'s authenticity.

22 For a different view, see Edward L. Keenan, *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha. The Seventeenth-Century Origin of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Prince A.M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV*. With an appendix by Daniel C. Waugh (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 67–68.

Augustus, with some lands in Lithuania to himself (he did not proffer any consideration to be given Vorotynskii).[23]

The credibility of the partition offer is not at issue here. Indeed, some historians doubt that these replies to Sigismund's missives were ever sent.[24] Lur'e in his commentary to Bel'skii's epistle glossed the Rus Land as all the Belarusian and Ukrainian lands under the authority of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania.[25] It is more likely that the phrase here denoted Galicia. In the thirteenth century Galicia–Volhynia was called the Rus' Land" by the local chronicle. Although administratively in the middle of the sixteenth century Galicia was part of the Rus' Palatine in Poland, in Slavonic narratives it was still called the "Rus' Land." Regardless of whether Rus' Land referred only to Galicia or a larger group of territories formerly part of Kievan Rus' but now incorporated into Poland or Lithuania, the more important context is what Rus' Land meant in Ivan IV's Muscovy. At the time of writing Ivan ruled the Rus' Land and Makarii presided over the bishops of the Rus' Orthodox Church in the Rus' Land, and neither Ivan's realm nor Makarii's eparchy included the regions denoted as the Rus' Land in Bel'skii's and Mstislavskii's epistles. The "Rus' Land" was a term of great political legitimacy, and belonged to the heir of the Volodimerovichi, Ivan IV. To apply the term to lands belonging to the Lithuanian Grand Duchy and the Crown of Poland in this way took considerable liberties with the concept. It was extraordinarily sloppy politically, intellectually, and ideologically.[26]

The *Tale of Batory's Assault on Pskov* (*Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov*), as previously discussed, is a gripping narrative of Batory's unsuccessful siege of the city in 1581. As expected, the text offers much fuel for Pskovian pride, but the text does not criticize Ivan IV, so one would not be surprised to see at least decorous allusions to the *rossiiskoe tsarstvo*. In fact, there is only one unmodified reference to the tsardom, and only one reference to the "Ros tsardom."[27] There are thirteen references to the Rus' Land, detailed above. There can be no doubt that the author of the *Tale* conceived of Pskov as an integral part of the Rus' Land, as a country and a territory, to which he was obviously devoted. This is quite curious in what is, after all, a regional text in which Ivan IV is barely present and the dynastic context of the Rus' Land is absent. To put it differently, it is as if Pskov appropriated a dynastic myth for regional self-defensive purposes.

More traditional but equally intriguing for a different reason are the appearances of the Rus' Land in the *Kazan' History* (*Kazanskaia istoriia*), a narrative, almost a romance, about the history of Rus'-Kazan' relations crowned by Muscovy's 1552 conquest of the khanate. In addition to historical invocations of the Rus' Land, the term appears seven-

23 D. S. Likhachev and Ia. S. Lur'e, eds., *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo* (Moscow: Nauka, 1951), 245, 253.

24 Ruslan Grigor'evich. Skrynnikov, *Tsarstvo terrora* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, Sankt-Peterburgskoe otdelenie, 1992), 312–14.

25 *Poslannia Ivana Groznogo*, 674n5. Lur'e utilized the Great-Russian nationalist term, "West-Russian (*Zapadnorusskie*) lands."

26 Contradictorily, ten years later, in a 1577 epistle to Prince Aleksandr Polubenskii in Lithuania, Ivan IV referred to his grandfather, Ivan III the Great, as the "gatherer of the Rus' Land." Ivan the Great did not "gather" Galicia into the Muscovite state.

27 Malyshev, ed., *Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov*, 35 (both).

teen times in passages discussing current events. There was great mourning in the Rus' Land at the death of Vasilii III. The Crimean and Kazan' Khanates attacked the Rus' Land during Ivan's minority. Kazan' had ruled part of the Rus' Land for 300 years, and looted and raided the border (*ukraina*) of "our" Rus' Land.[28] While Batu, grandson of Chingis Khan and the commander of the Mongol army that conquered Rus' in the thirteenth century, went through the entire Rus' Land, the Kazanis did not penetrate as deeply, but never left the Rus' Land alone. When the Muscovites captured Sumbek (Suiunbek), *khansha* (wife of the khan) of Kazan', she moaned that she would be ridiculed and cursed when held captive in the Rus' Land. Captured servants (*otroki*, literally "orphans") of Muscovite officers who refused to convert to Islam were tortured to death and lay down their lives for the Rus' Land. Metropolitan Makarii prayed for the "entire Rus' Land." Ivan described the Rus' Land as his "realm." The "entire Rus' Land" prayed for a Muscovite victory at Kazan'. Conquered and now Christian Kazan' had been and now resumed being part of the Rus' Land. News of the victory spread to the Rus' Land, which was Ivan's patrimony. God protects the Rus' Land. The Rus' Land had been suffering, but was now at peace. The author lauds the entire Rus' Land.[29]

In the *Kazan' History,* the Rus' Land has obvious dynastic and territorial referents. The author's assertion that Kazan' had been part of the Rus' Land before the advent of the Kazan' Tatars derives from his invention of autochthonous Rus' primary inhabitants of the region. Kazan' was once and will once again be part of the Rus' Land, but when it was not part of the Rus' Land it could attack the Rus' Land and the Rus' Land could pray for the ability to conquer Kazan'. Of course, the chronology is not that neat; defeated Kazan' immediately becomes (resumes being) part of the Rus' Land, yet news of its conquest spreads "to" the Rus' Land. There is a strong religious element too. It is not just that God protects the Rus' Land, but that Muscovites give up their lives for it (and are implicitly martyred for it). However, the concept of the Rus' Land is hardly religious. Metaphorically the "entire Rus' Land" engages in prayer, which is as close as any source from Ivan's reign comes to conceiving the Rus' Land as a social unit (which was not uncommon in the Kievan and Mongol periods). I cannot see any cultural connotations to the term in the *Kazan' History*.

The oddity is that although some scholars date the first redaction of the *Kazan' History* to the 1560s, all surviving manuscripts derive from a second redaction written no earlier than 1589 and perhaps after 1598. Only seventeenth-century manuscripts survive, and some historians date the text to the seventeenth century.[30] In the absence of any manuscripts of the first redaction it is very problematic to isolate passages in the second redaction that belonged to the first redaction, but the relatively great attention paid to the myth of the Rus' Land makes much more sense in a sixteenth-century context than in a seventeenth-century context when the term had already been superseded by

28 "Our Rus' Land" also appeared in the *Lithuanian-Belarusian Chronicles*; see chapter 9

29 G. N. Moiseeva, ed, *Kazanskaia istoriia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1954), 72, 74, 75, 110, 119, 137, 147, 163–64, 172, 173, 175–76.

30 Such as Edward L. Keenan, Jr., "Coming to Grips with the *Kazanskaya istoriya*," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in the United States* 31–32 (1967): 143–83.

the concept of the *rossiisskoe* tsardom. Ivan IV conquered Kazan' after his coronation as tsar, yet more imperial terms, the "Ros Land" (*rossiiskaia zemilia*), let alone the "Ros tsardom" (*rossiiskoe tsarstvo*), did not overwhelm the traditional historical term Rus' Land in the text.

As far as I can tell the Rus' Land appears once in the writings of Ivan Peresvetov, an immigrant who lived in Muscovy in the late 1540s and early 1550s. In the *First Prophesy of the Philosophers and Doctors* (*Pervoe predskazanie filosofov i doktorov*) these scholars predicted that with God's help the Rus' Land would conquer the Kazan' Khanate by force and convert it to Orthodox Christianity.[31] The Rus' Land is a country.

Despite the ubiquity of references to the Rus' Land in these sources from Ivan IV's reign, it should not be forgotten that quite a few sources from that period did not invoke the Rus' Land. In some cases, the nature of the source is such that we would not expect the phrase to appear. In others, we know that the phrase could have appeared, because comparable alternatives did show up, but the Rus' Land did not.

The Rus' Land is not found, nor would we expect to find it, in domestic official administrative sources, such as the Law Code of 1550 (*Sudebnik*); the *Book of the Thousand* (*Tysiachnaia kniga*), codifying the new land allocations of conditional landed estates (*pomest'e*) to selected servitors who lacked lands close enough to Moscow to be mobilized rapidly in time of need; the *Court Quire* (*Dvorovaia tetrad'*), a personnel register of the Royal Court or Household (*Dvor*), curiously not listing all its members, but including a larger number of potential members in a recruitment pool; or the *Registers* (*Razriady* or *Razriadnye knigi*), lists of primarily military commissions in field armies but also political appointments, largely governors (*namestniki*) of cities and county administrators (*volosteli*). For different reasons, mention of the Rus' Land was not required in Ivan IV's 1547 coronation ordo as tsar, focused entirely upon his tsardom. The unofficial *Book of Household Management* (*Domostroi*) did not need to mention the Rus' Land because it is oriented to the household level. There could have been an allusion to the Rus' Land in the introduction to the private political reform proposal of the cleric Ermolai-Erazm (the priest Ermolai took monastic vows as Erazm) to reform land measurement, ownership, and taxation, *On Administration and Land Measurement* (*Pravitel'nitsa. Ashche voskhotiat tsar'em pravitel'nitsa i zemlemerie*) in order to identify the country in need of reform, but there was not.[32] The phrase could have appeared with the same function as the location of the Valaam Monastery, where supposedly two elders debated objections to monastic landowning and the participation of monks in affairs of state, the *Valaam Discourse* (*Valaamskaia beseda*), but there it was not. The first redaction refers to Rus' (*russkie*) grand princes, the second redaction to Ros (*rossiiskie*) princes, but otherwise alludes

31 *Sochineniia I. Peresvetova* (Moscow: Nauka, 1956), 161. Some historians consider "Peresvetov" to be a pseudonym, even of Ivan IV himself, while others date the texts attributed to Peresvetov to the seventeenth century. For a discussion of these issues with bibliography, see A. V. Karavashkin, *Russkaia srednevekovaia publitsistika: Ivan Peresvetov, Ivan Groznyi, Andrei Kurbskii* (Moscow: Prometei, 2000), 27–126.

32 Text: L. A. Dmitriev and D. S. Likhachev, eds., *Pamiatniki literatury drevnei Rusi. Konets XV–pervaia polovina XVI veka* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1984), 652–53.

only once to the tsardom, and once in an ancillary work, the *Prophesy of Kiril of Novoezero* (*Prerechenie Kirilla Novoezera*) to the Ros Land (*Rossiiskaia zemlia*).[33] The narrative of Ivan's sack of the city of Novgorod in 1569–1570, the *Tale of Ivan IV's Campaign against Novgorod* (*Povest' o prikhode Ioanna IV na Novgorod v 1570 godu* or *Povest' o prikhode tsaria Ioanna IV v Novgorod*), discussed above, sadly observes that nothing like this had ever happened in the "Ros Land" (*rossiisskaia zemlia*), rather than the Rus' Land.[34]

The myth of the Rus' Land was utilized in a wide variety of sources of different genres and different provenances referring to events between 1533 and 1584, almost always denoting the territory over which Ivan IV reigned. Writers of all sorts—government, church, private—continued to employ the myth of the Rus' Land in its traditional meanings. Its meaning as a reference to Ukrainian and Belarusian lands in the boyar letters to the king of Poland definitely requires further study. In addition, the significant quantity of occurrences of the phrase in the *Kazan' History* and the *Tale of Batory's Assault on Pskov* deserves greater analysis. Hints of any social, cultural, or religious connotations attached to the Rus' Land seem minimal at best and always problematic. Even the promotion of the ruler from "grand prince" to "tsar" could not erase the bond between ruler and the Rus' Land. Nor could the elevation of Muscovy from a grand principality to a tsardom persuade Muscovite book-men to cease using what might have been considered an obsolete slogan. The concept of the Rus' tsardom carried an imperial colouration; whether from Byzantium or the Mongols is a separate question. The myth of the Rus' Land had no such ties to Ivan IV's new title or the new status of the realm he ruled, but it survived nonetheless. Only the termination of the dynasty itself during the Time of Troubles sounded the death knell of the Rus' Land as a current-event term for Muscovy.

Two aspects of the intellectual history of the myth of the Rus' Land should also be mentioned. First, Krom does not posit any connection between the Rus' Land and Muscovites/Russians as an ethnic entity. Krom acknowledges that the term had no such referent before the sixteenth century because no Russian "people" (*narod*) existed yet. However, in his articles but not in his monograph, he evaluates the sixteenth century as an important stage in the development of "political and national commonality (*obshchnost'*)," the formation of the Great Russian nationality (*narodnost'*), the formation of a Great Russian ethnicity via ethnic consolidation.[35] However, no passage in the sources suggests that the phrase signified a nationality.

Second, the word "land" (*zemlia*) had multiple meanings in sixteenth-century Muscovy, including, at times, the state and/or society, as in references to the "sovereign's and the land's affairs" in which it designates the state, apart from the sovereign,[36] and

---

33 Dmitriev and Likhachev, eds., *Pamiatniki literatury drevnei Rusi*, 162, 163, 178, 195.

34 *Izbornik: Sbornik proizvedenii literatury drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969), 477; *Novgorodskie letopisi. Kniga vtoraia*, ed. A. I. Tsepkov, 2 vols. (Riazan': Aleksandriia, 2002), 2:394.

35 Krom, "K voprosu o vremeni zarozhdeniia idei patriotizma v Rossii," 24; Krom, "Christian Tradition and the Birth of the Concept of Patriotism in Russia," 22, 28. I have modified the English translation rendering of the "Greater Russian ethnicity."

36 M. M. Krom, "'Delo gosudarevo i zemskoe': Poniatie obshchego blaga v politicheskoi diskurse

in expressions such as Ivan IV distributed gifts and rewards to "the entire land" upon his return from the conquest of Kazan'"[37] in which it encompasses Muscovite society as a whole (and cannot refer to the state). But when preceded by the adjective "Rus'," the Rus' Land rose to the level of myth, a myth that carried extensive ideological baggage by the time Ivan assumed the throne. In this form the myth of the Rus' Land had its own separate history quite apart from that of a "Land" in general.

The heterogeneity of purposes and shades of meaning conveyed by the myth of the Rus' Land in sources from Ivan IV's reign reflects the lack of uniformity we would expect in a manuscript culture, where imposing consistency is more difficult. The resilience of the myth of the Rus' Land stands out, attesting to the continued relevance of its historical legacy.

The title of the Kievan *Tale of Bygone Years* promised to tell the story of "where the Rus' Land came from…and from whence the Rus' Land came into being" (*otkudu est' poshla russkaia zemlia…i otkudu russkaia zemlia stala est'*).[38] The history of the myth of the Rus' Land during Ivan IV's reign contributes to the exploration of the final phase of this story, how the Rus' Land disappeared.

Rossii XVI v.," in *Sosloviia, instituty i gosudarstvennaia vlast' v Rossii. Srednie veka i rannee Novoe vremia. Sbornik statei pamiati akademika L. V. Cherepnina* (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2010), 581–85.

37 *PSRL*, 13:228.

38 Adapted from Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine–Rus'*, vol. 1: *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*, trans. Marta Skorupsky, ed. Andrzej Poppe and Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasiczynk (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1997), 289 (I have changed "Land of Rus'" to "Rus' Land").

Chapter 8

THE MUSCOVITE LAND

DANIIL AL'SHITS EXPRESSED a total lack of surprise that in the *Zadonshchina* the Russians fought for the Rus' Land. After all, Sofonii "could have said 'for the Muscovite Land' (*moskovskaia zemlia*), but, evidently, that was not suitable."[1] Notwithstanding Al'shits's lack of appreciation of the development of the myth of the Rus' Land, he was undeniably correct that the Muscovite elite of the period would not have been satisfied for Dmitrii Donskoi to have fought for the Muscovite Land. In no source did Muscovites ever fight for the Muscovite Land, which would be counter-intuitive save for the obvious superiority of the myth of the Rus' Land to any other "Land" in medieval and early modern Rus'. Nevertheless, the phrase, neither a concept nor a myth, can be found in a variety of sources, not all of Muscovite provenance, some of which have been mentioned above. In this chapter I will recapitulate those allusions and supplement them with others in a preliminary exposition of the history of Muscovite Land.

In the Basic Redaction of the *Narration of the Battle with Mamai* Grand Prince Oleg of Riazan' wrote a letter to the Tatar emir Mamai, de facto ruler of the Juchid ulus (Golden Horde). In that (fictitious) letter Oleg sought to arouse Mamai's greed to motivate him to invade Muscovy. Oleg informed his hoped-for ally that the Muscovite Land was full of gold and silver, an equally false assertion because through the seventeenth century Muscovy lacked gold or silver mines. This was the sole appearance of the phrase in that redaction. The same passage also appears in the Chronicle Redaction of the *Narration*. A few manuscripts of the *Narration* alter a reference to the Muscovite principality (*moskovskoe kniazhenie*) that Grand Duke Algirdas of Lithuania hopes to divide with Oleg to read the Muscovite Land. Algirdas elsewhere promises to give his nobles estates in the Muscovite Land and to divide the Muscovite Land with Oleg. References to the Muscovite Land increase significantly in different passages in different manuscripts of the Expanded Redaction. One such segment, a fictional account of Novgorodian participation in the battle on Donskoi's side, noted that Mamai had invaded the Muscovite Land, and that the personified Muscovite Land was in great confusion as a result. Other manuscripts contain Algirdas's lament upon hearing of Donskoi's victory that he had hoped to rule the Muscovite Land or a paean of praise to the Muscovite Land. The so-called Kiprian Redaction of the *Narration*, found in the *Nikon Chronicle*, constitutes a combination of the Basic Redaction and the *Chronicle Tale* (*letopisnaia povest'*) of the battle of Kulikovo Field. The Kiprian Redaction never refers to the Muscovite Land. This strongly suggests that the sole reference to the Muscovite Land in the Basic Redaction is an inter-

1 D. N. Al'shits, "Rol' Kulikovoskoi bitvy v opredelenii natsional'nogo soznaniia russkogo naroda," *Uchenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta* 36, Seriia istoricheskikh nauk 3 (1939): 110–23 at 120.

polation and therefore that the Basic Redaction did not mention the Muscovite Land.[2] We would not have expected it to do so. The *Narration* strongly identifies Donskoi with the Rus' Land. The dating of the redactions of the *Narration* is contested, but the Basic Redaction must predate the Kiprian Redaction, and the latter is reliably dated to the compilation of the core *Nikon Chronicle* in the 1530s. I infer that the sole reference to the Muscovite Land in the Basic Redactions was an interpolation, as was replacing the "Muscovite principality" with the Muscovite Land. The real curiosity is that references to the Muscovite Land, albeit overwhelmingly in neutral, descriptive territorial contexts, proliferated in the Expanded Redaction, by consensus dated to the seventeenth century.

By then the myth of the Rus' Land had been superseded in Muscovy by the concept of the "Muscovite state." It would have been blatantly anachronistic to project the "Muscovite state" onto the battle of Kulikovo, but there was no need to displace the Rus' Land in historical references to late fourteenth-century history. Moreover, some of the passages that adduce the Muscovite Land do carry political dimensions, notably the laud of the Muscovite Land. Further research in seventeenth-century sources should provide more context for interpreting the usage of the Muscovite Land in late manuscripts of late redactions of the *Narration*, but for the present we can draw two conclusions: First, Muscovite authors through the sixteenth century did not pay much attention to the Muscovite Land, and second, they must have been familiar with the phrase if it not only survived into the seventeenth century but to a certain degree flourished then.

Metropolitan Ilarion's famous comparison of rulers and saints praised by various lands, in which the Rus' Land praised Grand Prince St. Vladimir, inspired and was plagiarized by the authors of three texts, each of whom adapted that paragraph to suit his own point of view. The *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi claimed the Rus' Land's affection for Donskoi, and let the city of Kiev and environs praise St. Vladimir. The Tverian monk Foma retained Kiev's praise for St. Vladimir, omitted Dmitrii Donskoi, and let the Tverian Land praise Grand Prince Boris Aleksandrovich of Tver'. Neither mentioned Moscow or the "Muscovite Land." In his *vita* of St. Stefan of Perm', Epifanii Premudryi restored Ilarion's text that the Rus' Land praised St. Vladimir, like Foma omitted Donskoi, but added that Moscow praised St. Metropolitan Petr, and the Permian Land praised its baptizer, Stefan.[3] Not only did Epifanii not write that the Rus' Land praised the very Muscovite saint Petr, but he did not follow grammatical form and write that the Muscovite Land praised Petr, just the city of Moscow, even as he promulgated yet another "Land"-political or at least territorial concept, the Permian Land. The substitution of a city name, Kiev, for the Rus' Land in the *vita* of Donskoi must have been conscious and politically motivated (to claim the Rus' Land for Donskoi), so it is distinctly possible that Epifanii's use of a city name, Moscow, not a "Land" name, the Muscovite Land, must have been deliberate. I do not think it at all likely that Epifanii was unfamiliar with the phrase the Muscovite Land.

---

2 Charles J. Halperin, "Some Observations on Interpolations in the *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboishche*," *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 23 (1981) [1982]: 97–100.

3 Epifanii, *Zhitie Sviatago Stefana*, ed. V. G. Druzhinin (St. Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia kommissiia, 1907), 89–90. Cf. Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 73.

His allusion to the Permian Land strongly testifies that he could create "Land" terminology when needed.

As already mentioned, according to the *Pskov II Chronicle*, in 6930 (1422) "In the entire Rus' Land there was a great famine for three years, previously in Novgorod and all its districts and in Moscow and in the entire (*vsei*) Muscovite and the entire (*vsei*) Tverian [Lands?]."[4] This curious phrasing grammatically indirectly, almost accidentally, implied invocations of the Muscovite and Tverian Lands, in this case in a territorial meaning.

In the laud of Grand Prince Boris Aleksandrovich of Tver' by the monk Foma, that prince sends word of his support to the blinded and imprisoned Vasilii II. This information reaches the Muscovite Land.[5] Foma was unlikely to go out of his way to associate Vasilii II with the Rus' Land, so the neutral substitution makes sense. Rather, it is surprising that this is the only instance in which the phrase occurs in the text.

The Muscovite version of the 1456 Novgorod treaty with Vasilii II equated the Muscovite Land, the Rus' Land, and the Grand Principality.[6] As discussed above, the Novgorodians preferred to call the Grand Principality of Vladimir, in fact Muscovy, the Suzdalian Land rather than the Rus' Land. This text reflects Muscovite aspirations, not Novgorod recalcitrance, and it is the only occasion on which the Muscovite Land, by association, carried some ideological weight. (The seventeenth century references, even lauds to the Muscovite Land, were politically innocuous.) If the Muscovite Land equals the Rus' Land, especially in an official document of indisputable Muscovite provenance, then it had acquired some of the aureole of the myth of the Rus' Land. Two problems remain: first, the extreme rarity of such usage of the Muscovite Land, and second, its utter superfluousness. If Muscovy is *the* Grand Principality, namely, of Vladimir and all Rus', and the Rus' Land, then there was no need to generate an additional myth of the Muscovite Land.

A late fifteenth-century Muscovite chronicle s.a. 1461 noted that Rostov Archbishop Feodosii was installed as metropolitan "by the Rus' bishops of our Muscovite Land" (*vladykami russkimi nashea zemlia Moskovskaia*).[7] It is puzzling that the chronicler did not say "our Rus' Land."[8] In this case the chronicler cannot have been distinguishing "our" Muscovite Land from somebody else's Muscovite Land, because there was no other Muscovite Land.

Ukrainians' sense of themselves as Rus' induced them to avoid describing Muscovy as the Rus' Land by referring to it as the Muscovite Land. The concept of the Rus'

---

4 *PL*, 2:38.

5 *Inoka Fomy Slovo pokhval'noe o blagovernom velikom kniaze Borise Aleksandroviche*, ed. N. P Likhachev (St. Petersburg: Aleksandrov, 1908), 42.

6 *GVNP*, no. 23: 41–43.

7 *PSRL*, 25:277. Also found in *PSRL*, 18:214, *Simeonov Chronicle*. The only other reference in that chronicle is a cinnabar marginalia s.a. 1408 that Edigei made war on the Muscovite Land (*PSRL*, 18:155, footnote "a"), a geographic reference.

8 My previous reference to this passage misread it: Charles J. Halperin, "The Concept of the *ruskaia zemlia* and Medieval National Consciousness," 79, endnote 37.

Land was not unknown to fourteenth- to seventeenth-century Ruthenians (see below). I found the term the Muscovite Land only once in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles: in 1444 Casimir, King of Poland, fought the Muscovite Land,[9] but it appears in seventeenth-century sources of Ukrainian derivation. In 1626 the Kyivan Orthodox Brotherhood ascribed to Tsar Mikhail Romanov rule over "the entire Muscovite Land" (*vsia moskovskaia zemlia*), which grossly underestimated the territorial boundaries of Mikhail's realm or grossly exaggerated the extent of the Muscovite Land. Mikhail was also qualified, more to Muscovite taste, as ruling "Great *Rossiia*."[10] A 1636 thank-you note from Cossacks to the Muscovite governor of the border city of Vol'noe, V. Novosiltsev, for permitting free trade across the border lauded him for carrying out his instructions "to organize and defend the Muscovite Land" (*natsavlennomu stroiti i khraniti zemliu Moskovskuiu*).[11] In 1646 King Wladyslaw IV, in congratulating the leading Ukrainian political leader Adam Kysil for his service to the Commonwealth at home and abroad, alluded in Polish to the Muscovite Land (*ziemie Moskiewska*).[12] In 1648 Bohdan Khmelnytsky called Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich of Moscow the "ruler of the Muscovite Land," the sovereign, Orthodox Christian Muscovite tsar, which made the Muscovite Land a political concept.[13] In 1654 Khmelnytsky alluded to a Ukrainian envoy en route to Sweden who was crossing the Muscovite Land, here no more than a geographic term.[14]

It is difficult to draw conclusions from this scattered and unsystematic evidence. Locating all references to the Muscovite Land in all sources might not solve that problem. Certainly, the phrase existed, but given the ubiquity of the "Land" nomenclature system that is hardly newsworthy. The almost accidental nature of some references attests to the fact that such a term was no more than par for the course, a neutral territorial phrase. In some ways the "Land"-name system outlived its most famous product, the myth of the Rus' Land. However, non-Muscovite authors, such as Ukrainians, sometimes used the phrase the Muscovite Land deliberately, as an alternative, one might say counter-myth, to Muscovy's self-identity as the Rus' Land. Most infrequently, Muscovite book-men could attribute some significance to the concept of the Muscovite Land. All in all, the Muscovite Land could hardly compete with the Rus' Land for pride of place in depicting the grand principality and later tsardom of Muscovy.

---

9 *Letopisi Belorussko-litovskie* in *PSRL*, 35 (Moscow: Nauka, 1980), 60.

10 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei. Dokumenty i materiialy v trekh tomakh*, ed. P. P. Gudzenko, 3 vols, vol. 1: *Ukraina nakanune osvoboditel'noĭ voĭny, 1620-1647 gody* (Moscow: Nauka, 1954), 66–67.

11 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:254.

12 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:415–19.

13 *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo 1648–1657*, ed. L. Krip'iakevich and I. Butich (Kiev: Akademii Nauk USSR, 1961), 47–58 at 49.

14 *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo 1648–1657*, 364–65.

Chapter 9

THE RUS' LAND IN UKRAINE AND BELARUS (FOURTEENTH TO SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES)*

WHILE THE "CONTEST for the legacy of Kievan Rus'" has been the subject of considerable historical investigation,[1] one feature of Kievan–Ukrainian intellectual continuity/discontinuity has not received adequate attention. The myth of the Rus' Land did not disappear in the East Slavic lands that came under the control of Poland and Lithuania, but it played only a minor role there. Moreover, the myth was not mobilized at all in defence of the Cossack Rebellion under Bohdan Khmelnytsky (Khmel'nyts'kyi, 1648–1654). The reasons for this discontinuity remain unexplored and unexplained.

Until now the very existence of a myth of the Rus' Land myth in early modern Ukraine as a technical term has not been fully recognized in Ukrainian historiography. The noun Rus' has been extensively studied, but the phrase the Rus' Land has been considered mostly to be synonymous with Rus'.[2] Existing comments on the myth are brief, unsystematic, and lacking in historical context. It is premature to equate the two terms in Ukraine and Belarus until we have studied the myth of the Rus' Land separately. Consequently, this chapter will not discuss recent studies that examine the meaning of Rus' in any period of medieval and early modern East Slavic history. Phrases that do not use Rus' as an adjective (such as, White Rus') will not be considered. This chapter does not pretend to be comprehensive. In the hope of inspiring future research on the topic, its purpose is to raise the question of how the myth of the Rus' Land *stricto sensu* evolved in Ruthenian territory through the period of the Khmelnytsky uprising. The appearance or non-appearance of the phrase Rus' Land in post-Khmelnytsky sources—*Sinopsis* (*Synopsis*); the so-called Cossack Chronicles (*Litopis samovidtsa* or *Eyewitness Chronicle*); and the works of Hryhorii Hrab"ianka and Samiilo [Samuil] Velychko); and the *History of the Rus'* (*Istoriia Rusov*)—falls beyond the chronological limits of this chapter, and must also be left to other historians to explore.

* I wish to thank Frank Sysyn for reading an earlier draft of this chapter and providing invaluable assistance.

1 For example, Jaroslaw Pelenski, *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus'* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1998), but cf. Paul Bushkovitch's review in the *International History Review* 21, no. 4 (1999): 987–88.

2 Frank E. Sysyn, "Seventeenth-Century Views on the Causes of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising: An Examination of the 'Discourse on the Present Cossack or Peasant War'," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 4 (December 1981): 430–66 at 452–56; Sysyn, "Ukrainian–Polish Relations in the Seventeenth Century: The Role of National Consciousness and National Conflict in the Khmelnytsky Movement," in *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyi (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980), 58–82 at 72–73.

The myth of the Rus' Land continued to appear in sources in Ukraine and Belarus after their acquisition by Poland and Lithuania respectively. However, tracing its evolution is complicated by several problems. Many sources for the thirteenth through seventeenth centuries were written in Polish, Latin, or Russian, creating the possibility of linguistic distortion. Furthermore, Polish and later Muscovite influence might have introduced conceptual distortions even in sources written in the Slavonic, Ukrainian, or Belarusian languages, because Poles and Muscovites might have perceived the Rus' Land differently than Ruthenians.

In the thirteenth century, before and after the Mongol conquest, the princes of Galicia in the southwest who ruled Galicia and Volhynia attempted to appropriate the myth of the Rus' Land. In the twelfth century the narrow definition of the Rus' Land excluded Galicia–Volhynia.[3] Although Galician princes continued to try to occupy the throne of the grand prince of all Rus' in Kiev, their chroniclers used the Rus' Land, including in Latin (*terra Russiae*), to denote Galicia alone. The Hypatian Chronicle includes the *Galician–Volhynian Chronicle*, which contains entries describing events through the year 1292. Curiously it essentially does not use the term the Rus' Land except in one suggestive entry. S.a. 1250 the chronicle excoriates Prince Daniil Romanovich of Galicia for paying tribute to the Mongols. It is particularly improper for Daniil to do so, since he "ruled the Rus' Land, Kiev and Vladimir[–Volhynia], and Halich…(and his) father was tsar in the Rus' Land."[4] This passage asserts a *translatio* of the Rus' Land from Kiev to Galicia–Volhynia, in which Kiev remains the core of the Rus' Land but Vladimir in Volhynia replaced Chernigov and Halych replaced Pereiaslav.[5] However, the context is direct criticism of a grand prince. (The title of Daniil's father was exaggerated.) This is the only passage in any source from the tenth to the seventeenth centuries which mobilizes the myth of the Rus' Land in opposition to a Volodimerovich prince.

A second, equally tentative, *translatio* of the Rus' Land directly to Galicia seems to have been attempted in the fourteenth century. When the Galician princely line became extinct Poland acquired Galicia. King Casimir gave his administrator of Galicia the title *capitanus terrae Russiae*.[6] The administrative identification of Galicia as the Rus' Land stuck when Galicia was reconstituted in the fifteenth century as part of the Rus' (Ruthenian) Palatinate. When kings of Poland claimed that their rule included the Rus' Land, they meant the Ruthenian Palatinate. In Muscovy the Rus' Land appeared in the title of King Sigismund Augustus of Poland during the reign of Tsar Ivan IV in two of the four 1567 epistles to Sigismund in the names of Muscovite boyars whom he had invited to defect to Poland–Lithuania (see above).

---

3 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 58–59.

4 *PSRL*, 2, s.a. 1250, cols. 807–8. The Rus' Land is also referred to s.a. 1262, cols. 857–58, but in a neutral context.

5 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 60.

6 See A. V. Soloviev, "Der Begriff 'Russland' im Mittelalter," *Studien zur alteren Geschichte Osteuropas*, ed. G. Stökl, Wiener Archiv für Geschichte des Slaventums und Osteuropas 2, vol. 1: *Festschrift für Heinrich Felix Schmid* (Graz: Böhlau, 1956), 143–68 at 158; *Khrestomatiia po istorii SSSR…do kontsa XV v.* (Moscow: Sotseksgiz 1960), 641, 642.

This limited reference to the Rus' Land continued to be used during the seventeenth century, including the Khmelnytsky period. A 1648 report on Khmelmytsky by Adam Kysil',[7] referred to the Rus' governor of the Rus' Land ("*ruskim zem'em*"), but the editor changed the name of the region to Galicia.

Ukrainian areas other than Galicia, including Volhynia and the original "core" Rus' Land of Kiev and Chernigov, as well as Belarus, fell under the sovereignty of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The myth of the Rus' Land survived there as well, in chronicles and documentary sources. The Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles (*Belorussko-litovskie letopisi*), also called the Lithuanian Chronicles (*Litovskie letopisi*) or the Western Rus' Chronicles (*Zapadnorusskie letopisi*), are a set of intimately interconnected chronicles, redactions, and manuscripts produced from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries. The consensus among scholars is that the earliest version originated in Smolensk under Bishop Gerasim in the fourteenth century and continued to be written in Belarus, perhaps in the region of Navahrudak (Novogorodok, Novogrudok).[8] Generically they are labelled the *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Grand Dukes* (*Letopisets velikikh kniazei litovskikh*) or the *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Samogitia* (*Khronika velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo i Zhomoistka*) because they were commissioned by members of the Lithuanian royal family or because they reflected the political interests of various Lithuanian aristocratic clans. Therefore, they expressed the Lithuanian point of view even though they were composed by Orthodox Rus' authors, probably clerics, and written, at least originally, in Cyrillic in a form of Belarusian. It was only later that copies were sometimes transliterated into Latin script or translated into the Polish language. While associating their treatment of the phrase the Rus' Land with Belarusians should not arouse any objections, attributing their views to Ukrainians is speculative because no separate Ukrainian chronicles survive from the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries and no Ukrainian sources refer to these chronicles.

The *Hustynia Chronicle* (*Hustyns'kyi litopis*), a Ukrainian chronicle compiled in the 1620s but copied in the 1670s, provides more direct information on Ukrainian conceptions of the Rus' Land. References to the Rus' Land in the *Hustynia Chronicle* overlap but also diverge from those in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles, so I will treat the divergences separately.

Because the contents of these chronicles, redactions, and manuscripts coincide so much, I have not identified them individually. The consistency among the chronicles also obviates the need for chronological distinctions. The Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles

---

7 Frank E. Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1985), 2.

8 Nikolai Nikolaevich Ulashchik, *Vvedenie v izuchenie belorussko-litovskogo letopisaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1985), 9–81, 150–67, 237–38; Boris Nikolaevich Floria, "O 'Letopistse Bykhovtsa'," in *Istochniki i istoriografiia slavianskogo srednevekov'ia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1967), 135–44; Gudmantas Kiastutis, "Ob osobennostiakh raboty letopistsev s istochnikami (na materiale litovskikh letopisei XVI)," in *Narrativy Rusi kontsa XV–serediny XVIII v.: v poiskakh svoei istorii*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2018), 142–73; V. I. Ul'ianovskii, "Ukrainskie letopisi nachala XVI–pervoi poloviny XVII: nadregional'noe v regional'nykh narrativakh," in *Narrativy Rusi kontsa XV–serediny XVIII v.: v poiskakh svoei istorii*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2018), 229–60.

conveyed multiple meanings of the Rus' Land, simultaneously applying the myth to different, sometimes overlapping and sometimes mutually exclusive, regions. However, in these narrative sources the term is never applied to Galicia, because it was part of the Polish Crown, not the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

In his sub-chapter "Rus' in the chronicles and historical writing of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries," O. I. Dziarnovich tries to analyze each chronicle in chronological order. In the process he makes some valid comments on the different geographic parameters of the term Rus' Land.[9] Unfortunately, he simplistically reduces the alternative definitions of the Rus' Land to a narrow meaning and a broad meaning. His opening paragraph, moreover, vitiates any distinction between Rus' and the Rus' Land by identifying the coordinates of Rus' based on references to the "entire Rus' Land." He refers to "Rus' (the Rus' Land)" as if those terms were synonymous. He misinterprets references to the Rus' Land in passages about the battle of Kulikovo Field (see below) in which the Rus' land is the Muscovite grand principality. He argues that "entire Rus' Land" (always?) constituted an organic part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which is suggested by some passages but contradicted by other passages. His conclusion that Rus' and the Rus' Land refer to the same territory cannot withstand criticism. He fails to note that the Kievan Rus' Land included Galicia, a region that is excluded from the Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles. Dziarnovich's overall schema of the meaning of the Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles remains unconvincing. I will propose a different schema of how the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles employ the myth of the Rus' Land.

Plokhy proposes that Lithuania presented itself, albeit only briefly, as successor of the Rus' Land. He cites a 1338 treaty between Gediminas, Grand Duke of Lithuania, and the Master of the Livonian Order as evidence of Gediminas's aspiration to be "gatherer" of the Rus' Land (a term later applied to Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi and Ivan III) in which the Rus' Land presumably denoted the Lithuanian state. However, the treaty ascribes only geographic, not political, dimensions to the Rus' Land, mentioning the Lithuanian (Lettowen in the German original) and Rus' Lands (Ruslande or Ruscelande in the German original, *ruskoi zemle* in Slavonic) to which a German merchant could travel. The Rus' Land refers to Rus' territory under Gediminas's rule. By 1385 the Union of Krewo between Poland and Lithuania, however, the "Rus' lands" denoted the Rus' lands that Jogaila, the Grand Duke of Lithuania who became Wladyslaw, King of Poland upon his conversion to Catholicism, pledged to attach to Poland.[10]

---

9 O. I. Dziarnovich, "Rus' v leto- i istoriopisanie VKL XVI–XVII vv.," in *Narrativy Rusi kontsa XV–serediny XVIII v.: v poiskakh svoei istorii*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2018), 174–89, especially 175–80.

10 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 95–96. Plokhy cites the 1338 treaty from *Polotskie gramoty XIII–nachala XVI veka*, comp. A. L. Khoroshkevich, 4 vols. (Moscow: Nauka,1977–1982), 3:102–7, inaccessible to me, but another anthology compiled by Khoroshkevich also contains the text: *Polotskie gramoty XIII–nachala XVI veka*, ed. A. L. Khoroshkevich et al., 2 vols. (Moscow: Universitet Dmitriia Pozharskogo, 2015), 1:66–69, no. 8, and 2:22–23 (commentary). (The commentary does not address the issue of how the Rus' Land is utilized in the text.)

I have identified five geographic definitions of the Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles and will correlate them to the meaning of the Rus' Land in the *Eulogy to Witold*.

Given the volume of material, my citations might not be comprehensive, particularly in later chronicles, redactions, or manuscripts in Polish.

1. The Rus' Land is Kievan Rus', either in the narrower sense, the Dnieper River valley, or the broader sense of all East Slavic lands under Volodimerovich princes.

In the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles, as in the *Hutsynia Chronicle*, the narratives of Kievan Rus' history were derived from the *Hypatian Chronicle* and/or a mid-fifteenth-century Muscovite compilation; for our purpose the exact filiation of any given passage is secondary.[11] The content of these passages is purely derivative.[12]

2. The Rus' Land comprises all the Ruthenian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Locations in Belarus dominate this material, so some references here might quality as allusions only to Belarusian territories. In many cases the text referred to "the entire (*vsia*) Rus' Land"; the *Eulogy to Witold* might belong to this category. Smolensk, Vitsebsk (Vitebsk), and Navahudrak from Belarus, and Kiev and Chernigov from Ukraine, among many other cities, appear multiple times.[13] One passage stands out: In 1500 Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow invaded the Rus' Land. This is a one-sentence embodiment of the contest between Moscow and Vilnius for the legacy of the myth of the Rus' Land. Quite clearly here the Rus' Land is not Muscovy.

---

11 Omeljan Pritsak, "The Hypatian Chronicle and Its Role in the Restoration of Ukrainian Historical Consciousness," in *Chomu katedri ukratnoanavstva v Garvardi?* (Cambridge, MA: Ukrainian Studies Chair Fund, 1973), 54–60 at 57–60.

12 *Zapadnorusskie letopisi* in *PSRL*, 17 (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2008), 1, 3, 5, 11, 21, 25–26, 27, 111, 115, 123, 230, 243–44, 477; *PSRL*, 35:19, 27, 36, 37, 40, 79, 118, 119, 120, 129, 174, 176; Aleksandr Aref'evich Bevzo, *L'vivskii litopis i Ostrozh'skii litopisets. Dzhereloznavche doslidzheniia* (Kiev: Akademii Nauk USSR, 1970), 133; *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. and with introduction Oleksiy Tolockho (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2013), 34, 40, 41, 61, 62, 64, 69, 76, 86, 90, 103, 105, 108, 113, 115, 130, 138, 141, 143, 145, 152, 153, 158, 159, 160, 162, 164, 168, 186, 187, 217, 223, 224, 230, 233, 241, 245, 247 253, 254, 261, 264, 265, 266, 268, 270, 277, 278, 283, 287, 296, 297.

13 *PSRL*, 17:68, 93, 102, 108, 135–36, 136–37, 140, 137, 180, 188, 202, 275, 281–82, 285–86, 299, 325, 336, 339, 342 (discussed in the text), 360, 364, 365, 387, 391, 399, 451, 462, 464, 466, 514, 533; *PSRL*, 35:76, 92, 109, 131, 164, 210, 211; *Khroniki: Litovskaia i Zhmoitskaia, i Bykhovtsa, Letopisi: Barkulabovskaia, Averki, i Pantsyrnogo* in *PSRL*, 32 (Moscow: Nauka, 1975), 19, 20, 155; *Khronika Bykhovtsa* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966), 45, 72; *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 308, 329, 332, 344, 356; Iuate Kiaupene, "Problema samoidentifikatsii rusinov v kontekste zarozhdeniia rannemodernoi natsiogeneticheskoi mifologii velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo," in *Drevniaia Rus' posle Drevnei Rusi: diskurs vostochnoslavianskogo (ne)edinstva*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2017), 93–105 at 102.

3. The Rus' Land comprises the Belarusian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The Rus' Land could also, sometimes ambiguously, designate only the Belarusian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which could also encompass the *Eulogy to Witold*.[14] One passage in the *Khronikia Bykhovtsa* best attests to this connotation of the Rus' Land. Grand Duke Alexander and his wife Elena (incidentally, the daughter of Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow), travelled to the Rus' Land, staying in Smolensk, Vitsebsk, and Polatsk (Polotsk), before returning to Vilnius. Here Vilnius is not part of the Rus' Land.

4. The Rus' Land comprises the Ukrainian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

References to exclusively Ukrainian cities as constituting the Rus' Land are relatively few, because at the time this region did not play an active role in the political life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. However, Kiev and Chernigov make their appearance here.[15] The most intriguing passage recounts that in 1497 the Tatars invaded Volhynia, killing the local archbishop, something that had never before happened in the Rus' Land. Ergo Volhynia is in the Rus' Land. This is intriguing because in 1237–1238 the bishop of Vladimir in the northeast, very much part of the Rus' Land as it was then defined, perished when the Tatars took that city.[16] Vasyl Ul'ianovs'kyi (Vasilii Ul'ianovskii) interprets the Rus' Land here to mean the boundaries of the metropolitanate, by which he means the territory under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Kiev, the Ruthenian regions in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Ul'ianovs'kyi is probably correct that in practice the metropolitan in Kiev exercised authority only within the boundaries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, comparable to references in the *Council of One Hundred Chapters* identifying the bishops of the Rus' Land under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Moscow, but he should have clarified that the metropolitan in Kiev bore the title "metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'," never "metropolitan of the Rus' Land," just as the metropolitan of Moscow bore the title "metropolitan of Moscow and All Rus'," not "metropolitan of the Rus' Land."

5. The Rus' Land is the Northeast, later Muscovy.

The Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles and the *Hustynia Chronicle* also contain derivative material from the northeastern and later Muscovite chronicles covering events from the Mongol conquest to the end of the fourteenth century. These passages directly contradict any claim that the entire Rus' Land had been incorporated into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or that, according to the chronicles, the Rus' Land and Muscovy were mutually exclusive. The cities of Suzdal', Nizhnii Novgorod, and Moscow did not belong to Lithuania. In addition to recounting the Mongol census of the northeastern Rus' in

14 *PSRL*, 17:184, 338; *PSRL*, 35:143, 232; *Khronika Bykhovtsa*, 87, 107 (discussed in the text).

15 *PSRL*, 17:233–34, 248–49, 302, 392, 481, 580; *PSRL*, 35:124 (discussed in the text), 130, 148; *Khronika Bykhovtsa*, 40.

16 Ul'ianovskii, "Ukrainskie letopisi," 233. A passage in another chronicle located the Volhynian Land within the Rus' Land (Ul'ianovskii, "Ukrainskie letopisi," 237).

the thirteenth century these chronicle passages regurgitate excerpts from Muscovite depictions of events of Rus'-Tatar relations in the last two decades of the fourteenth century that identified Muscovy as the Rus' Land: the defeat of Emir Mamai by Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi at the battle of Kulikovo Field in 1380 (including excerpts from the *Narration of the Battle with Mamai*), the sack of Moscow by Khan Tokhtamysh in 1382, and the invasion of the Rus' Land by Timur (Temer-Aksak, commonly Tamerlane) in 1395. In 1399 Vytautus, Grand Duke of Lithuania, expected his ally Tokhtamysh to assign him the Rus' Land after Tokhtamysh had defeated Timur on the Vorskla River. Unfortunately for Vytautus, Timur won the battle. The Rus' Land that Vytautus expected to receive included Tver', Pskov, and Moscow, none of which belonged to the Rus' Land that Vytautus already ruled, even if Tver' and Pskov sometimes fell within the Lithuanian sphere of influence.[17] No northeastern or Muscovite chronicle ever referred to the northeastern grand princes as Lithuanian servitors, so the passage in the *Eulogy to Witold* characterizing them as such cannot derive from them.

The *Hustynia Chronicle* in discussing the pre-history of the Slavs opines that Sarmatia is now the Rus' Land.[18] The vagueness of the term "Sarmatia" precludes any analysis. In entries beginning after the Mongol conquest, the *Hustynia Chronicle* somewhat ambiguously refers to Galicia as the Rus' Land, either on its own or in combination with all the Kievan Rus' Lands. The Tatars returned from their Eastern European campaign of 1242 to the Rus' Land; in 1261 the Tatars harmed the Rus' Land; Khan Nogai in 1269 attacked the Rus' Land; in 1343 Casimir III the Great, King of Poland, divided the Rus' Land.[19]

The *Hustynia Chronicle* notes that s.a. 1469, the Volga Tatars attacked "our Rus' Land," referring at least in part to Podillia; s.a. 1516 it observes that Batu had attacked "our Rus' Land"; and s.a. 1589 the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah visited "our" Rus' Land.[20] I wonder if the qualifier "our," which occurs in other passages concerning the Kievan Rus' period,[21] implicitly acknowledges that there was a Rus' Land other than "ours," unlike the qualification of the Muscovite Land as "ours" cited above.

Finally, the *Hustynia Chronicle* notes s.a. 1589 that the Union of Brest was imposed on the Rus' Land.[22] If the extent of the Rus' Land corresponds to the jurisdiction of the newly-appointed Rus' metropolitan, then we might infer that the Rus' Land in that year encompassed all Ruthenian Orthodox territories, which would be historically true of the Union of Brest. Unfortunately, the vagueness of the passage precludes further analysis.

---

17 *PSRL*, 17:27, 37, 41–42, 43, 47, 97, 54, 173, 330–31, 456–57, 517; *PSRL*, 35:17, 29–30, 31, 45, 50, 52, 54, 73, 139, 161, 188; *PSRL*, 32:55, 58, 148; *Khronika Bykhovtsa*, 74; *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 303, 315, 316, 327, 330.

18 *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 27.

19 *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 299, 304, 306, 322.

20 *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 340, 363. This passage goes on to mention that Cossacks fought off the Tatars, but it does not categorize the region the Cossacks defended as the Rus' Land.

21 *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 90, 287.

22 *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 367.

However, this passage lends some credence to Ul'ianovs'kyi's interpretation of the 1497 passage (cited above) on the death of the metropolitan in Volhynia, that the Rus' Land coincides with the boundaries of the Kievan Metropolitanate.

Another text, outside the chronicle tradition, assigns yet another slightly different location to the Rus' Land. Plokhy discusses the *Eulogy for Vitold* (Vytautus) (*Pokhvala velikomu kniaziu Vitovtu*) originally composed for a native of Moscow, Germasim, Bishop of Smolensk and Metropolitan of Lithuania; the extant manuscript was commissioned in 1428. According to Plokhy, it lauded Vitold as suzerain "simply put" (*reshchi prosta*) all the Rus' Land." A further declaration clarified the meaning of Rus' Land in this text by stating that grand princes of Moscow, Tver', and Riazan', as well as Novgorod the Great (*Velikii Novogord*) and Great Pskov (*Velikii Pskov*),[23] "served" Vytautus. Therefore, according to Plokhy, "all the Rus' Land" meant all Rus' people apart from the Rus' Lands in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. When this text was incorporated into the *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania* the description of the service of the Rus' grand princes was deleted, depriving the reference to "all the Rus' Land" of any definition, but the Moscow and other grand princes were referenced next to the rulers of Moldavia, Bessarabia, and Bulgaria, their Orthodox co-religionists.[24] I would translate "*vsia russkaia zemlia*" as the "entire Rus' Land" and qualify Plokhy's interpretation. "Rus' Land" cannot denote *all* Rus' people apart from the Rus' Lands in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, because Galicia belonged to Poland at this time. Moreover, the list of territories within the Rus' Land treats the Muscovite grand principality (in Ruthenian perception, probably "duchies"), although listed first, as no more than one among several other realms, and does not reflect the Muscovite view that it alone was the Rus' Land. The grand principality of Vladimir (in the northeast) is conspicuously absent. Plokhy does not mention that the text summarizes the list of principalities/duchies and cities as "simply put (*reshchi prosta*) all the Rus' people" (*ves' russkii iazyk*, literally" tongue)," which diminishes its commitment to any concept of the Rus' Land. The particular configuration of territories denoted as the Rus' Land in the *Eulogy to Witold* further illustrates the malleability of the phrase. In any case its author seems to use the term descriptively, even if he avoids allocating too much influence to Muscovy, but also eluded Polish-held Galicia.

The ambiguities revealed by the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles and the *Hustynia Chronicle* attached to the assertion that the Rus' Land was located in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania also surfaced in the sixteenth century in the texts of the Union of Lublin of 1569 that created the Commonwealth and transferred some East Slavic lands under the sovereignty of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Crown of Poland. Galicia was already part of Poland, so its status was not altered. Sigismund Augustus referred to himself in

---

23 As we have seen above, Pskovian sources very rarely names Pskov "Great Pskov."

24 Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 106–7. Plokhy cites the text of the *Eulogy to Witold* from Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusy: v odynadtsyaty tomakh, dvanadtsyaty knyhakh*, 7 vols. (1905–1913; facsimile repr. Kiev: Lybid, 1992–1996), 5:164–65, which was inaccessible to me. He kindly provided me with a digital copy of an alternative publication which included the text, M. Hrushevs'kyi, "Pokhvala velikomu kniaziu Vitovtu," in Hrushevs'kyi, *Tvori*, 50 vols. (L'viv: Svit, 2003), 5:50–65, parallel "Eulogy" and chronicle texts at 55–58.

Latin and Polish as the ruler of both the "Kievan and Rus' Lands" (*terrarum…Cuiaviae, Russiae*, *ziemie…kijowskiej, ruskiej*), but then called Kiev in Latin the "capital of the Rus', Podillian and Volhynian Land" (*Kiioviae, tanquam caput terrarum Russiae, Podoliae et Voliniae*), which since ancient times had belonged to the Crown of Poland, but in Polish "the capital and main city of the Rus' Land" (*Kijow byl i jest glowa i glovnem miastem, a ruska ziemia wszytka z dawnich czasow od przodkow naszych krolow polskich miedzy inemi przedniejszemi czlonki do Korony Polskiej jest prazlacona*).[25] The title of the Polish King discriminated between the Rus' (Galician) and Kievan Lands. Volhynia or Podillia were not listed among his possessions, unless they and Podillia were subsumed under the Kievan Land. (The Kievan Land also occurred in a very late version of the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicle.)[26] However, if Kiev was accorded the dignity of capital of the Rus' Land in Latin, that impugned the distinction between the Rus' Land and the Kievan Land by subordinating Galicia, administratively the Rus' Land, to Kiev. The Polish version interpolated "and main city" after "capital," but more significantly eliminated the references to the Podillian and Volhynian Lands. In the Polish version of the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicle, Kiev is straightforwardly capital of the Rus' Land, despite the distinction between the Rus' and Kievan Lands under the royal title. If Galicia belonged to the Rus' Land and Kiev was always the capital of the Rus' Land, then implicitly but anomalously when Kiev belonged to Lithuania, it was nevertheless the capital of Galicia, which belonged to Poland. Of course, the language used obfuscated the differences between the pre-Lublin past and the post-Lublin present.

It is difficult to say whose point of view about Kiev was expressed in the Union of Lublin agreement. The Poles dominated the proceedings and dictated the resulting territorial adjustments. The Ukrainian nobility supported the adjustments because they promised greater security from the Tatars and Ottomans. Whether the Ukrainian elite shared the Polish definition of Kiev as the capital and main city of the Rus' Land at the time cannot be documented.

Other sources from Poland and Lithuania in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also refer to the Rus' Land. The Rus Land appears as an identifying qualifier to individuals in documents registered in the Lithuanian Metrica (*Litovskaia metrika*), by definition residents of the Grand Duchy, a boyar "of the Rus' Land," a monk (*chernits*) "of the Rus' Land."[27] A comprehensive search of all published and unpublished volumes of the Lithua-

---

25 Stanislaw Kutrzeba and Wladsyslaw Semkowicz, eds., *Akta unji Polski z Litwa 1385–1791* (Kraków: Gebethner & Wolff, 1932), 309, 310, 312

26 *PSRL*, 32:17 (the same sentence refers to the Rus' *monarkhiia*).

27 Vasilii Irinarkhovich Ul'ianovskii, Andrei Markovich Bovrigia, Nataliia Aleksandrovna Sinkevich, and Vitalii Anatal'evich Tkachuk, "K istokam ukrainskoi natsii," 15, a document prepared for a conference in Vilnius, September 25–27, 2019, as part of the continuing project "The Eastern Slavs in Search of New Supra-Regional Identities (End of the 15th–Middle of the 18th Centuries)" under the direction of Andrei Vladimirovich Doronin of the German Historical Institute, Moscow. For another reference, see *Lietuvos metrika / Knyga 7 (1506–1539): Uzrašymų knyga 7* (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2011), 195–97 (as cited in personal communication, Andrei Doronin, October 7, 2019). I wish to express my appreciation to Frank Sysyn for providing me with a copy of the conference document and Andrei Doronin and Vasilii Ul'ianovskii for consultation.

nian Metrica from the fourteenth century through the middle of the seventeenth century is needed to determine the frequency of such allusions, the geographic locations that were denoted as the Rus' Land, and the context in which the reference arose. In addition, the fifteen volumes of *Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii iuzhnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, published between 1862 and 1892, might also contain documentary references to the Rus' Land.[28] These research desiderata are best left to specialists with the necessary access.

In *Palinodia*, his 1621–1622 defence of Rus' Orthodox Christianity against advocates of the Union of Brest, Zakhariia Kopysten'skij twice referenced the Rus' Land historically: Saint Vladimir baptized the Rus' Land, and the Apostle Andrew visited and blessed the Rus' Land. In the same work he also called the Rus' Land his "fatherland" (*otchizna*).[29]

The Jagiellonian kings of Poland (like the Piast rulers before them) and the grand dukes of Lithuania were not descendants of St. Vladimir. Therefore, from a Rus' perspective they were not entitled to rule the Rus' Land or any other "Land" within the Rus' dynastic system. Nevertheless, they were legitimate princes and kings. By right of conquest, they could succeed the Volodimerovichi as rulers of the Rus' Land, even if they and their Ruthenian subjects could not agree on which territories constituted the Rus' Land. Before the Grand Duke of Lithuania automatically succeeded to the elective throne of Poland and before the Union of Lublin, Lithuanian grand dukes and kings of Poland could simultaneously rule different Rus' Lands, because Galicia was the Rus' Land to Poland, whereas Belarus and the rest of Ukraine were the Rus' Land to Lithuania. It is also plausible that from the thirteenth century on in all Ruthenian territory under Polish or Lithuanian rule the myth of the Rus' Land was separated from its dynastic roots because the indigenous Rus' princely line was extinct.

Mid-seventeenth-century Ukrainians could have been familiar with the myth of the Rus' Land from its continued administrative use to refer to Galicia, historical references to Kievan Rus', the multiple narrative applications of Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles, and occasional documents such as the Union of Lublin or contemporary texts of political discourse, such as Kopystens'kyi's *Palinodia.* Such access, however, has never been documented, in part because the Rus' Land was not considered a technical term deserving of separate investigation. Nor has anyone realized that when Kmelnytsky and the Ukrainian Cossacks came to power after 1648 their spokesmen and diplomats never invoked the Rus' Land.

---

28 All documents in that series relevant to the Khmelnytsky period were incorporated into the documentary collections cited below, so the search need address only the pre-Khmelnytsky documents.

29 *Lev Krezva's* A Defense of Church Unity *and Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj's* Palinodia*. Part I: Texts*, trans. with foreword Bohdan Strumiński, ed. Roman Koropeckyj and Dana R. Miller with William R. Veder (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1995), 720, 721. (The translation reads "the Land of Rus'," which I have revised. Other passages in this work which repeat the references to Vladimir and Andrew replaced "the Rus' Land" with "Rus'."); *Pamiatniki polemicheskoi literatury v Zapadnoi Rusi*, ed. Peter A. Gil'tebrandt, 3 vols. in 4, Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka 4, 7, and 19 (St. Petersburg: n.publ., 1878), 1:col. 1055 (citation courtesy of Vasilii Ul'ianovskii, 7 October 2019, personal communication). In this text Rus' and the Rus' Land appear to be synonymous, but note that references to the Rus' Land are rare and never refer to contemporary events.

As far as I can tell, documents from Khmelnitsky never mentioned the Rus' Land and documents about Khmelnitsky never attributed use of the myth of the Rus' Land to him. These documents attest that the Ukrainian Cossacks were Rus' (as a noun), even if "Rus' people" (multiple individuals; in Ukrainian "*liudy*") could mean inhabitants of Galicia or any non-Cossack Ruthenians,[30] individuals belonging to the "Rus' people" ("*narod*", the collective noun), the "Rus' gentry,"[31] individuals that practised the "Rus' faith" under the guidance of "Rus' priests" in "Rus' churches,"[32] individuals who performed "Rus' liturgical services" using "Rus' books"[33] which they learned to read in Rus' schools,[34] or individuals who venerated Rus' saints[35] and entered "Rus' monasteries."[36] The documents also identified various countries, near and far, as "Lands."[37] However, Khmelnytsky and his scribes never brought Rus' as an adjective together with the noun "Land" as a myth.

No document has expressed Khmelnytsky's[38] reasons for not trying to take advantage of the myth of the Rus' Land; I can imagine three theories:

1. Khmelnytsky could simply have been ignorant of the myth.

Given his ubiquitous invocations of the noun Rus' and his application of the adjective Rus' to a plethora of other nouns, I find it unlikely that Khmelnytsky had never heard of the Rus' Land.

2. Khmelnytsky could have been more or less familiar with the myth of the Rus' Land, but found it archaic, obsolete, and useless.

Certainly, the myth of the Rus' Land was superfluous to Khmelnytsky. His loyalty was to the Cossack Zaporozhian Host. He did not need the myth of the Rus' Land. This second theory is more persuasive than the first. On the other hand, unless Khmelnytsky had some aversion to the myth, we would expect it to surface, however randomly.

The myth of the Zaporozhian Host was sufficient for Cossack purposes but need not have been exclusive. Cossacks and non-Cossack Ukrainians and Ukrainian clergy honoured the Kievan inheritance, for example, by comparing Khmelnytsky to St. Vladimir.[39]

---

30 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:117–20, 260–6l, 2:40–42; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo 1648–1657*, ed. L. Krip'iakevich and I. Butich (Kiev: Akademii Nauk USSR, 1961), 628–29.

31 *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 181–82.

32 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:113–14, 117–20, 173–74, 197–99; 3:24. 256–57, 361; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 225–26, 285–87, 292–94, 369–71.

33 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:220, 229.

34 *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 46–47, 105–7.

35 *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 105–7.

36 *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*. 292–94.

37 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 2:432, 3:361; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 225–26, 292–94, 369–71.

38 I use "Khmelnytsky" as shorthand not just for Khmelnytsky personally, but also in general to indicate his officials and publicists, and the authors of all relevant sources from the period of his leadership.

39 Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford: Oxford University

This did not extend to the inclusion of the Kievan myth of the Rus' Land in their ideological expressions or as part of their identity. Khmelnytsky, in Serhii Plokhy's words, "did not fully identify himself with the Kyivan political tradition."[40] He made Chyhyrin, not Kiev, his capital. The kings of Poland still valued the Rus' Land enough to include it in their titles. As the myth of the Rus' Land was not in vogue in Ukraine, it is possible that Khmelnytsky found it to be totally without merit or utility. Although this is certainly possible, I find it odd.

3. Khmelnytsky's seemingly consistent reticence toward the myth of the Rus' Lands suggests that to him the myth of the Rus' Land was different from other "Rus' X" formulations (with Rus' as an adjective) that were not similarly absent from Cossack sources, because the myth of the Rus' Land belonged to the Volodimerovich princely dynasty.

My third theory is that despite the separation of the Rus' Land from the old Volodimerovich dynasty, the myth of the Rus' Land retained a vestigial resonance of the dynastic privilege associated with the original Rus' dynasty to which a non-prince such as Khmelnytsky had no claim. Corroboration of this theory might be found in Khmelnytsky's attitude toward the concept of a Rus' principality. A deposition by Kysil' in Polish to a courier from Khmelnytsky concerned the Rus' principality ("*ksiestwie Ruskim*"; "*ksiestwie*" meant "principality" or "duchy").[41] The abortive 1658 Treaty of Hadiach would have created a Rus' Grand Duchy / Principality headed not by a Grand Duke or a Grand Prince but by a Cossack Hetman. According to Tat'iana Tairova-Iakovleva, Khmelnytsky supposedly called himself "Kievan and Rus' Prince" and in 1658 his successor Ivan Vyhovsky aspired to become "Grand Prince / Duke of Ukraine." Nevertheless, Tairova-Iakovleva opines that Khmelnytsky rejected the concept of a "Rus' duchy / principality."[42] If Khmelnytsky declined to enhance his legitimacy by claiming an inheritance from or a right to succeed the Rus' grand princes, he might have been reluctant to invoke the major myth of the Kievan Rus' that was tied to the Volodimerovich dynasty, the Rus' Land.

Why Khmelnytsky and the Zaporozhian Cossacks did not refer to the myth of the Rus' Land requires further study. Regardless of how we explain Khmelnytsky's (in) action, we may conclude that he broke the continuity of the myth of the Rus' Land in Ukraine that dated from Kievan times.

Press, 2001), 154–56, 165–66. 228, 267, 270, 272–73, 386–89; Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 277–81, 294–99, 232, 237–39, 247–48; V. I. Ul'ianovskii, *Drevniaia Rus' posle Drevnei Rusi*, 133–69; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 646.

40 Plokhy, *The Cossacks and Religion*, 272–73.

41 *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 2:203–4.

42 *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 44, quoted in Tat'iana Tairova-Iakovleva, "'Otechestvo' v predstavleniiakh ukrainskoi starshiny kontsa XVII–nachala XVIII vekov," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 33–34 (2008): 453–58 at 455. See also *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 2:117.

CONCLUSION

THE "RUS' LAND" is an historical myth, "historical" because it began to be used in a specific century and ceased being used in a specific century, and a "myth," because clerical and lay authors, writing narratives and documents, manipulated it in order to claim its legitimacy. By its existence it compelled rivals to whoever succeeded in linking the Rus' Land to its identity to avoid it or create alternatives. The creativity of authors in using or finessing the myth stands out. This was not the kind of articulation and rationalization that a modern myth would generate because medieval and early modern Rus' lacked any proclivity toward abstract thought. Instead, originality of thought consisted in playing with a fixed deck of cards, but fixing the deck so that a particular player – Rus' prince or princely line – had the best hand.

> [A] good deal of medieval…ideology [in Rus'] was expressed in extremely laconic terms. Phrases, words, and titles served in lieu largely of theoretical treatises. The consistent usage of such forms suggests that the medieval ideologues knew what they were doing, for the references are neither arbitrary nor promiscuous. A medieval…scribe or copyist, author or redactor, could assume that his audience would understand a meaning conveyed so tersely. The creativity and subtlety of the ideologues was manifested not in the composition of vast theoretical and abstract tractates, but rather in the manipulation of key concepts.[1]

It is easy in analyzing the Rus' Land to fall into the trap of reifying an abstraction and forgetting that ideas do not manipulate themselves, they are manipulated by human contrivance. (I do not doubt that my prose sometimes commits precisely these errors.) The history of the Suzdalian Land illustrates that phenomenon particularly well. In the twelfth century, chroniclers from the Suzdal'ian principality in the northeast described it as the "Suzdalian Land" to distinguish it from the Rus' Land in the Dnieper River valley. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries scribes from Novgorod in the northwest labeled the region of the northeast from which Grand Princes of Vladimir attempted to extend their influence over Novgorod as the Suzdalian Land to deprive those princes of a legitimizing prop. In Novgorodian eyes the Suzdalian Land lacked authoritativeness. This strategy failed when Muscovy, master of the Rus' Land, eventually imposed its will and its myth on Novgorod. The Suzdalian Land could serve as a counter-myth or a non-myth.

To describe the Rus' Land as durable reifies it; rather, it would be more appropriate to say that the myth of the Rus' Land was so flexible that for give-or-take seven centuries Rus' authors found it useful. Such longevity deserves to be appreciated in scholarship. The history of the rise and demise of the Rus' Land as a myth must be understood within the context of the history of the use of other "Land" terms – Novgorodian Land, Pskovian Land, Tverian Land, Suzdalian Land, and Muscovite Land, to name only a few – which never rose above the level of phrase or only very rarely acquired the political status of a concept. Neither the evolution of the Rus' Land nor of its "cognates" makes sense

---

1 Halperin, "Kiev and Moscow: An Aspect of Early Muscovite Thought," 317.

without the other. Historians have only begun to appreciate the subtlety and creativity underlying the seemingly inarticulate usage of these technical terms in medieval and early modern Rus' texts.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

For the convenience of the reader the "Select Bibliography" lists key publications that appear in more than one chapter. Where short forms of works appear in notes and are not listed below, the full details are provided earlier in the notes.

Primary Sources (and Abbreviations)

GVNP *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*. Edited by S. N. Valk. Moscow: Nauka, 1949.

NPL *Novgorodskaia pervaia letopis' starshego i mladshego izvodov*. Edited by A. N. Nasonov. Moscow: Nauka, 1950.

PRP *Pamiatniki russkogo prava*. Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1952–.

PSRL *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*. 43 vols. St. Petersburg: Akademiya nauk, 1841–2004. For an overview of the volumes in this series see http://psrl.csu.ru/indexs/index_tom.shtml.

Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov. Edited by V. I. Malyshev. Moscow: Nauka, 1952.

PVL *Povest' vremennykh let*. Edited by V. P. Adrianova-Peretts. Text preparation by D. S. Likhachev. Translation [into Russian] by D. S. Likhachev and V. A. Romanova. 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1950.

Priselkov, M. D. *Troitskaia letopis'. Rekonstruktsiia teksta*. Moscow: Nauka, 1950.

PL *Pskovskie letopisi*. Edited by A. N. Nasonov. 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1941–1955.

Stepennaia kniga tsarstogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam. Teksty i kommentarii. Edited by N. N. Pokrovskii and G. D. Lenkhoff, 3 vols. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2007.

Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei. Dokumenty i materiialy v trekh tomakh. 3 vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1954.

Secondary Works

Begunov, Iu. K. *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII v. Slovo o pogibeli russkoi zemli*. Moscow: Nauka, 1965).

Cherniavsky, Michael. "The Reception of the Council of Florence in Moscow." *Church History* 24, no. 4 (December 1955): 347–59.

——. "Russia." In *National Consciousness, History and Political Culture in Early Modern Europe*, edited by Orest Ranum, 118–43. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1975.

——. *Tsar and People*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.

Halperin, Charles J. "Kiev and Moscow: An Aspect of Early Muscovite Thought." *Russian History* 7, no. 3 (1980): 312–21.

——. "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar: The Emergence of Muscovite Ideology, 1380–1408." *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 23 (1976): 7–103.

Plokhy, Serhii. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.