

THE ORIGINS OF THE OFFICIAL MUSCOVITE CLAIMS TO THE "KIEVAN INHERITANCE"

JAROSLAW PELENSKI

No other historico-ideological assertion of the Muscovite government and ruling elite has made such a powerful impact on modern Russian historical thought, as well as on Western scholarship dealing with the early history of the Eastern Slavs, as Muscovy's claim to the Kievan inheritance. Its impact has been so strong and so all-pervasive that, until very recently, Muscovite views on Kievan Rus' and her history, and particularly Muscovy's assertions that she succeeded to Kiev by right of inheritance, were accepted by a large number of historians as matters of fact, beyond the limits of permissible inquiry and critical examination. Some caustic remarks by P.N. Miljukov¹ and by A.E. Presnjakov² questioning Muscovite perceptions of the Kievan inheritance and bringing up some related problems that seemed to cast doubt upon them were conveniently overlooked. The profound influence of the historical ideas and ideological propositions of the Muscovite chroniclers and publicists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries on Russian historiography has not diminished from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries up to the present day.

The classical controversy over the Kievan inheritance between the "Northerners" and the "Southerners," i.e., between Russian historians and Ukrainian historians, which began in the nineteenth century and culminated in Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj's "rational organization" of early East Slavic history,³ has not effectively disturbed traditional patterns

¹ P.N. Miljukov, *Glavnye tečenija russkoj istoričeskoj mysli*, 3rd ed. (Moscow, 1913), pp. 174-177.

² A.E. Presnjakov, *Obrazovanie velikoruskogo gosudarstva: Očerki po istorii XIII-XV stoletij* (Petrograd, 1918), pp. 2-3, 7, 19.

³ For a summary of Hruševs'kyj's views and a convenient English translation of his seminal article on this subject, see "The Traditional Scheme of Russian History and the Problem of a Rational Organization of the History of Eastern Slavs [1909]," in *The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the U.S.*, 2 (1952): 355-364. Hruševs'kyj's views as stated in this article reflect those found in his *Istorija Ukrainy-Rusy*, 10 vols., 3rd rep. ed. (New York, 1954-58).

of thinking that are always so difficult to revise. National historiographies have devoted a great deal of effort to discussing the influence of the Kievan heritage, or at least its most outstanding features, on subsequent socio-political organizations (for example, the Suzdal'-Vladimir Grand Principality and Muscovite Russia, in the case of Russian historiography, and Lithuania-Rus' and subsequently the Cossack Ukraine, in the case of Ukrainian historiography). But the problems of the origins of these claims, their dating, and their promulgators have received only scant attention. Both Miljukov and Presnjakov, for example, refer only in very general terms to Muscovite diplomats, bookmen, and "philosophers" of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; neither has written explicitly on these problems.

The first attempt to deal more specifically with the origins of the Muscovite preoccupation with the Kievan succession was undertaken by D. S. Lixačev in the process of trying to prove that Russian culture in general, and Muscovite culture and chronicle-writing in particular, were permeated by a new historicism—an assumption that also served as the crucial argument for his hypothesis about the existence of an Early Renaissance movement in Russia in the late fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth century.⁴

The application of the combined concepts of historicism and Early Renaissance to the Muscovite culture of this early period not only raises a number of questions of a semantic nature, but also poses serious methodological and theoretical problems concerning Lixačev's understanding of these ideas. Lixačev's use of the concept of historicism is at the same time monogenistic and surprisingly sweeping. He reduces historicism to a simple interest in history or participation

⁴ D. S. Lixačev, *Nacional'noe samosoznanie drevnej Rusi: Očerki iz oblasti russkoj literatury XI-XVII vv.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1945), pp. 68-81; *Kul'tura Rusi epoxi obrazovanija russkogo nacional'nogo gosudarstva: Konec XIV – načalo XVI v.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1946), pp. 40-41, 57-97, 103-104; *Russkie letopisi i ix kul'turno-istoričeskoe značenie* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1947), pp. 293-305; *Kul'tura vremeni Andreja Rubleva i Epifanija Premudrigo: Konec XIV – načalo XV v.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1962), pp. 4, 6, 11-12, 17, 19-20, 90-115, 142-146; 161-170; *Die Kultur Russlands während der osteuropäischen Frührenaissance vom 14. bis zum Beginn des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Dresden, 1962), pp. 6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 20-21, 90-117, 145-152, 167-175; "Predvozroždenie na Rusi v konce XIV – pervoj polovine XV veka," in *Literatura epoxi vozroždenija i problemy vsemirnoj literatury* (Moscow, 1967), pp. 136-182. Curiously enough, the most recent attempt to substantiate Lixačev's hypothesis with an extravagant antedating of Muscovite texts pertaining to the Kulikovo Battle of 1380 was made in an American dissertation: C. J. Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar: The Emergence of Muscovite Ideology, 1380-1408," (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1973), especially pp. 22, 199.

in a history-related endeavor. His distinction between "real/realistic" historicism and medieval historicism is not very helpful in clarifying his meaning of the term.⁵ His thesis about the existence of "monumental historicism" in the literature and chronicle-writing of Old Rus' from the eleventh to the thirteenth century is even more ambiguous,⁶ mainly because his dating of historicism back to the Middle Ages brings forth additional questions with regard to his methodological and conceptual approach. In the study of modern intellectual history, the origins of historicism—i.e., of a history-oriented mode of thinking and of a general theory of history and culture—have been traced back to the early eighteenth century, that is, to the Enlightenment in France and England, and subsequently to German Classicism and Early Romanticism.⁷

Lixačev consistently avoided considering the classical discussions of historicism (Troeltsch, Hintze, Meinecke, Popper) in his studies on Russian culture, which may partially explain his surprisingly uninhibited use of this concept. A manifest interest in history or a general preoccupation with history is not necessarily identical with historicism. A historicist approach to history and culture implies an active rethinking and redefining of a historical process, preferably in its own terms, possibly in terms of a superimposed historical perspective. The earliest manifestations of such an approach to history in the West can be detected in Humanism and in the Renaissance, although the revival and the reception of classical antiquity that took place then was formalistic and mechanical, and therefore lacked a genuine historicist quality.

Lixačev's assumption that the historicist mode of thinking was present in Muscovite Russia at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century does not stand up to scrutiny. His hypothesis is based primarily on the revival of chronicle-writing in

⁵ Lixačev, *Kul'tura Rusi*, p. 57.

⁶ D.S. Lixačev, *Čelovek v literature drevnej Rusi*, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1970), pp. 25-62.

⁷ For the most fundamental study of historicism as a phenomenon of intellectual and cultural history, see Friedrich Meinecke, *Die Entstehung des Historismus*, 3rd ed. (Munich, 1959). The concept of historicism was applied to the history of plastic art in the nineteenth century: L. Grote, ed., *Historismus und die bildende Kunst* (Munich, 1965). Lixačev's introduction of this idealistic and genetic German concept in the Soviet Union in 1946 coincided with attacks on the works of M. Hruševs'kyj and his school for having "imported" German theoretical concepts from Hegel and Ranke, which in fact Hruševs'kyj never utilized in his work (cf. J. Pelenski, "Soviet Ukrainian Historiography after World War II," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 12, no. 3 [1964]: 377-378).

Muscovy, as reflected in the compilation of the *Troickaja letopis'* (*TL*) under the auspices of Metropolitan Cyprian during that time.⁸ The *TL* represented an official, or semi-official, codex composed in the metropolitan's chancery. It included the *Povest' vremennyx let* (*PVL*) following either the Laurentian recension or a closely related text. For the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it incorporated Suzdalian and Vladimirian historical materials, also based on the Laurentian version or other closely related sources; its entries from 1305 to 1408 represent a very valuable source and the only contemporary Muscovite chronicle now extant.⁹

The study of the *TL* was greatly facilitated by A.A. Šaxmatov's discovery of the Simeonov Chronicle (*SCh*) and by his finding that for the years 1177 to 1393 both chronicles are virtually identical.¹⁰ This, in turn, proved to be immensely helpful for M.D. Priselkov's reconstruction of the *TL* text. The *TL* also included information pertaining to the history of the Rus' lands when they were under the sovereignty of the Lithuanian Grand Principality, and of other Russian states such as Novgorod and Rjazan'. Lixačev claims that the inclusion of the *PVL* in the *TL* by the Muscovite compilers indicates that they were aware of the Kievan tradition and of Moscow's assumed exclusive right to the Kievan inheritance. Its inclusion can also be interpreted in other ways, however. Since most Rus'ian chronicles contain the *PVL*, we can assume that it was standard procedure for editors and compilers of Rus'ian chronicles to begin their compilations with the *PVL* or a synopsis of it, for it was the earliest existing text they had available.

⁸ Lixačev, *Kul'tura Rusi*, pp. 64-67; Lixačev, *Kul'tura vremeni Andreja Rubleva*, pp. 100-103.

⁹ For the text of the reconstructed *Troickaja letopis'* see M.D. Priselkov, *Troickaja letopis': Rekonstrukcija teksta* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950). The most important scholarly contributions to the study of the *Troickaja letopis'* are the following: M.D. Priselkov, "Letopisanie XIV veka," in *Sbornik statej po russkoj istorii posvjaščennyx S.F. Platonovu*, 1922, pp. 24-39; "O rekonstrukcii teksta Troickoj letopisi 1408 g., sgorevšej v Moskve v 1812 g.," *Učenyje zapiski Gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta im. Gercena*, 1939, pp. 5-42; M.D. Priselkov, *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XI-XV vv.* (Leningrad, 1940), pp. 113-142; Priselkov, *Troickaja letopis'*, Introduction, pp. 7-49; S.I. Kočetov, "Troickij pergamennoj spisok letopisi 1408 g.," *Arxeografičeskij ežegodnik za 1961* (1962), pp. 18-27; G.N. Moiseeva, "Otryvok Troickoj pergamennoj letopisi perepisannyj G.F. Millerom," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* (hereafter *TODRL*) 26 (1971): 93-99.

¹⁰ The text of the Nikifor Simeonov Chronicle was published in *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej* (hereafter *PSRL*), 18 (1913), under the editorship of A.E. Presnjakov.

The First Novgorod Chronicle (*INCh*) of the "older" recension (about mid-fourteenth century), as well as of the "younger" recension (about mid-fifteenth century), also included edited Kievan historical materials, as do the Tverian and Pskovian codices, compiled around the middle of the fifteenth century. In fact, the most consistent and historically integrated codices were provided by the editors and compilers of the Hypatian and the Laurentian chronicles, which were completed long before the *TL*. The *TL* reflects the all-Rus'ian perspective, however, not so much of the Muscovite state as of the Moscow-based Metropolitanate of "Kiev and all Rus'." At the time of Cyprian's tenure, the Metropolitanate was attempting to preserve a united ecclesiastical organization for all Rus', an endeavor supported by the Patriarchate of Constantinople for practical and political reasons.¹¹ Thus it may be argued that the inclusion of the *PVL* does not represent a reevaluation of the history of the Kievan Rus'—not even in terms of a hypothetical "medieval" or providential historicism. The latter variant of "historicism" cannot be attested in Muscovite historical writing earlier than the sixteenth century, where it is found in the Voskresensk, L'vov and Nikon chronicles. It is particularly evident in the *Kniga stepennaja*, where the new historical and ideological perspective was superimposed on the history of early non-Muscovite Rus'.¹²

The dating of the origins of the official Muscovite claims to the Kievan succession is complicated by the appearance of these claims in some texts that traditionally have been regarded as belonging to the so-called Kulikovo cycle. Until very recently, the majority of scholars who have studied these sources tried to date them soon after the Battle of Kulikovo (1380). However, some scholars have begun to question

¹¹ For a discussion of Byzantine policies and attitudes with regard to the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' in the fourteenth century and the literature on the subject, see the following recent studies: D. Obolensky, "Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957): 21-78; I. Ševčenko, "Russo-Byzantine Relations after the Eleventh Century," in *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, ed. J. M. Hussey, D. Obolensky, and S. Runciman (London, 1967), pp. 93-104; F. Tinnefeld, "Byzantinisch-russische Kirchenpolitik im 14. Jahrhundert," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 67 (1974): 359-384.

¹² I have serious reservations about applying the term *Renaissance* to cultural developments in Muscovite Russia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The limits of space preclude a fundamental critique of Lixačev's notion of the Russian Early Renaissance in this article, but the use of this concept as applied to Muscovite Russia is even more problematic than the assumptions about the presence of historicism in the culture and art of Muscovy.

these early attributions, and to revive and refine some of the tentative suggestions made by A. A. Šaxmatov, who proposed different dates. Since it is impossible to deal adequately with the cumulative problems of all the texts of the Kulikovo cycle here, I shall present my own chronology of the texts in question, concentrating my analysis on those texts that are of an official or semi-official nature, with a few additional remarks about the unofficial *Zadonščina*. At the same time, I shall propose a reinterpretation of the crucial Kievan references.

It appears that the earliest text that refers to the Kulikovo Battle is the concise version of the Short Chronicle Tale (1380), entitled *O velikom poboišče, iže na Donu* of the reconstructed *TL*, the *SCh*, and the *Rogožskij letopisec*.¹³ This Short Chronicle Tale is the most factual; in its style and composition, it perfectly fits into the general pattern of the Muscovite annalistic tales contained in the *TL* and its control text, the *SCh*.¹⁴ It was most probably written for the *Letopisec velikij russkij* (an official Muscovite chronicle), which, according to Priselkov, covered events up to the death of Dmitrij Ivanovič [Donskoj] (1389).¹⁵ It can be assumed that the Short Chronicle Tale about the Kulikovo Battle was composed before the death of Dmitrij Ivanovič, possibly very soon after the battle, i.e., in the 1380s. The ideological claims and justifications found in this Tale are limited. According to its author, Dmitrij Ivanovič fought "wishing to defend his patrimony, for the holy churches and for the true [Orthodox] faith and the whole Russian land." The term "whole Russian land" was used in fourteenth-century Russian sources rather loosely, and it usually referred to Northeastern Rus' or ethnic Great Russian territory, but not to Southern, or Kievan, Rus'.¹⁶

¹³ Priselkov, *Troickaja letopis'*, pp. 419-421; *PSRL* 18 (1913): 129-131. The *Rogožskij letopisec* was published in *PSRL*, 2nd ed., 15, no. 1 (1922) under the editorship of N. P. Lixačev (for the text of the Tale, see cols. 139-141). For the best treatment of the Short Chronicle Tale and the literature on the subject, see M. A. Salmina, "'Letopisnaja povest' o Kulikovskoj bitve i 'Zadonščina,'" in *Slovo o Polku Igoreve i pamjatniki Kulikovskogo cikla* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1966), pp. 344-384, especially 344-364.

¹⁴ Its similarity to the "Tale About the Battle on the Voža River" prompted Salmina to suggest that both texts had the same author ("'Letopisnaja povest'," pp. 356-359).

¹⁵ Priselkov, *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XI-XV vv.*, pp. 121-122.

¹⁶ For the various uses of the concept *vsja russkaja zemlja* from the twelfth to the fifteenth century, see L. V. Čerepnin, "Istoričeskie uslovija formirovanija ruskoj narodnosti do konca XV v.," in *Voprosy formirovanija ruskoj narodnosti i nacii: Sbornik statej* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1958), pp. 61-63, 79-88. One example from the *INCh* will suffice to illustrate the Northeastern Russian meaning of *vsja russkaja zemlja* in the fourteenth century. The entry about the Mongol-Tatar invasion of Tver, under-

The second major text devoted to the Kulikovo Battle is the Expanded Chronicle Tale, entitled *O poboišče iže na Donu, i o tom, knjaz' velikij kako bilsja s ordoju* in the Fourth Novgorod Chronicle (*IVNCh*),¹⁷ or *Poboišče velikogo knjazja Dmitreja Ivanoviča na Donu s Mamajem* in the First Sophia Chronicle (*ISCh*),¹⁸ in the Nikanor Chronicle (*NCh*),¹⁹ and in other compilations, although with various changes and adjustments. Two views can be found regarding the dating of the Expanded Chronicle Tale and its relationship to the short version. The first, following the lead of S. K. Šambinago, assumes that the Expanded Chronicle Tale is the earlier version and that the Short Chronicle Tale represents an abridged form.²⁰ The second school of thought, introduced by A. A. Šaxmatov, holds that the Expanded Chronicle Tale is later. According to M. A. Salmina's analysis, it was composed in the second half of the 1440s, after the Battle of Suzdal' (1445) and before 1448,²¹ the year of the compilation of the hypothetical Codex of 1448,²² and it reflected the political atmosphere of the beginning of the last phase of the great Muscovite civil war (1444/46-1453). Salmina's hypothesis may still be in need of refinement, but she is certainly on the right track in dating the text after the Battle of Suzdal'.

It can be argued that the account of the Battle of Kulikovo in the Expanded Chronicle Tale represented, among other things, an ideological response to the crushing defeat of the Russian army by the military forces of the emerging Kazan Khanate in the Battle of

taken with Muscovite support in 1327, reads as follows: "Na tu že zimu priide rat' tatarskaja množestva mnogo, i vzjaša Tfer i Kašin, i Novotor'skuju volost' i prosto rkušče vsju zemlju ruskuju i položiša ju pustu, tokmo Novgorod ubljude Bog i svjataja Sofeja" (A. N. Nasonov, ed., *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov* [Moscow and Leningrad, 1950], p. 341).

¹⁷ *PSRL*, 2nd ed., 4, pt. 1, nos. 1-2 (1915-1925): 311-325.

¹⁸ *PSRL* 6 (1853): 90-98.

¹⁹ The Nikanor Chronicle was published under the editorship of A. N. Nasonov in *PSRL* 27 (1962). For the text of the Tale, see pp. 71-76.

²⁰ S. K. Šambinago, *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboiščě* (1907), pp. 1-2.

²¹ Salmina, "'Letopisnaja povest'," pp. 364-376, including the literature on the subject.

²² A. A. Šaxmatov was the first to suggest the existence of a Codex of 1448 ("Obščerusskie letopisnye svody XIV i XV vv.," *Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvěščenija* (hereafter *ŽMNP*), n.s., 1909, no. 9, pp. 98, 104; *Obozrenie russkix letopisnyx svodov XIV-XVI vv.* [Moscow and Leningrad, 1938], pp. 151-160). Recently Ja. S. Lur'e revived the Šaxmatov thesis and offered additional evidence to substantiate Šaxmatov's views that it was an all-Russian codex ("K probleme svoda 1448 g.," *TODRL* 24 [1969]: 142-146; and "Obščerusskij svod—protograf Sofijskoj I i Novgorodskoj letopisej," *TODRL* 28 [1974]: 114-139).

Suzdal' (7 July 1445), in which Grand Prince Vasilij II was taken prisoner. The dynastic struggle between Vasilij II and Dmitrij Šemjaka made the Tatar problem, now in its Kazanian version, particularly acute, since both contenders sought the support of Ulu Mehmet, the Kazanian khan, in their endeavors to seize the throne of the Muscovite Grand Principality; in addition, Vasilij II was using "service Tatars" in his struggle with Šemjaka. Tatar influence during the final years of the Muscovite civil war (1446-1453) is clearly reflected in the Pastoral Epistle of the five Russian Bishops (one of the five was the future Metropolitan Iona), dated 29 December 1447.²³ It appears that the later texts of the Kulikovo cycle have more relevance for the ideological justifications of the Muscovite-Kazanian struggle and the Muscovite relations with the Golden Horde from the time of the invasion of Edigü (1408) to 1480, than for the history of the Kulikovo Battle and its significance for the Muscovite political thought of the late fourteenth and the early fifteenth century. The Expanded Chronicle Tale refers hardly at all to the Kievan inheritance: one perfunctory comparison of Oleg of Rjazan' with Svjatopolk [Okajannyj], and one vague reference to Boris and Gleb.

Of special significance to the problem of the Kievan succession is the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič [Donskoj], a work thematically connected with the texts of the Kulikovo cycle, although of a different genre and date. The earliest and the most complete of the known texts of this *Vita* are the *Slovo o žitii i o prestavlenii velikogo knjazja Dmitrija Ivanoviča carja rus'skago*, which appears in the *IVNCh* under the entry for 1389,²⁴ and the *O žitii i o prestavlenii velikogo knjazja Dmitrija Ivanoviča, carja rus'skago*, in *ISCh* under the same date.²⁵ The latter text, with some editorial adjustments and emendations, was incorporated into the official Muscovite chronicles of the 1470s.²⁶ The earliest Muscovite account of Donskoj's death is found in *TL* and in *SCh* in an annalistic necrolog, entitled *O prestavlenii velikago knjazja Dmitrija Ivanoviča*, and composed in a form similar to the necrologs written for the Muscovite rulers before and after him.²⁷

²³ *Akty istoričeskie, sobrannye i izdannye Arxeografičeskoju kommissieju* (hereafter *AI*), 1, no. 67 (1841): 75-83. For a discussion of the Russo-Kazanian relations and their ideological ramifications, see J. Pelenski, *Russia and Kazan: Conquest and Imperial Ideology (1438-1560s)* (The Hague and Paris, 1974), pp. 23-26; 180-182.

²⁴ *PSRL*, 2nd ed., 4, pt. 1, no. 2 (1925): 351-366.

²⁵ *PSRL* 6 (1853): 104-111.

²⁶ *PSRL* 27 (1962): 82-87 (under the year 1387); *PSRL* 25 (1949): 215-218.

²⁷ "O prestavlenii velikago knjazja Danila Moskovskago" under the entry for 1304,

The dating of the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič presents a number of problems. The chronicles into which it was integrated and the contents of the *Vita* itself must be analyzed together in order to obtain a plausible dating. Even A. A. Šaxmatov, the founder of modern critical studies of the Russian chronicles, assumed that it had been composed soon after the death of the prince by someone who had attended the funeral.²⁸ The first to question this early dating was V. P. Adrianova-Peretc, who, because of the stylistic peculiarities of the text—i.e., *pletienie sloves* (the “braiding of words”)—came to the conclusion that it could not have been written before 1417-1418, and was probably even later than that.²⁹ A. V. Solov'ev's attempts to antedate the *Vita* to the 1390s and to attribute it to Epifanij Premudryj do not hold up under scrutiny, and are further examples of his excessively optimistic approach to the study of old Russian literature.³⁰ Recently, M. A. Salmina, on the basis of an analysis similar to that used for the Expanded Chronicle Tale of the Kulikovo Battle, has dated the text around 1444-1447, that is, just before the compilation of the hypothetical Codex of 1448.³¹ Salmina assumes, of course, that the variant of the *Vita* found in the *IVNCh* was included in the hypothetical Codex of 1448, and that it reflects, as does the Expanded Chronicle Tale, the political conditions of Muscovy during the civil war in the later part of the 1440s.

But even if one were to assume the existence of the hypothetical Codex of 1448,³² doubts can be raised concerning its inclusion of the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič. In contrast to the Expanded Chronicle

and “V leto 6848 (1340) prestavisja knjaz' velikij moskovskij Ivan Danilovič” (Priselkov, *Troickaja letopis'*, pp. 351, 364; cf. also *PSRL* 18 [1913]: 85, 93. “O prestavlennii velikogo knjazja Vasilija Dmitrieviča” under the entry for 1425, and “O prestavlennii velikogo knjazja Vasilija Vasil'eviča” under the entry for 1462 (*PSRL* 27 [1962]: 100, 123).

²⁸ A. A. Šaxmatov, *Otzyv o sočinenii S. K. Šambinago “Povesti o Mamaevom poboišče”* (St. Petersburg, 1910) (also separate offprint from “Otčet o 12-m prisuždenii premii mitropolita Makarija”), p. 119.

²⁹ V. P. Adrianova-Peretc, “Slovo o žitii i o prestavlennii velikogo knjazja Dmitrija Ivanoviča, carja Rus'skago,” *TODRL* 5 (1947): 73-96, especially 91-92.

³⁰ A. V. Solov'ev, “Epifanij Premudryj kak avtor ‘Slova o žitii i prestavlennii velikogo knjazja Dmitrija Ivanoviča, carja rus'skago,’” *TODRL* 17 (1961): 85-106.

³¹ M. A. Salmina, “Slovo o žitii i prestavlennii velikogo knjazja Dmitrija Ivanoviča, carja Rus'skago,” *TODRL* 25 (1970): 81-104.

³² The date 1448 had been set by A. A. Šaxmatov on the basis of the computation of certain holidays. However, Šaxmatov changed his opinion on this matter (“Kievskij Načalnyj svod 1095 g.,” in *A. A. Šaxmatov, 1864-1920* [Moscow and Leningrad, 1947], p. 135).

Tale about the Kulikovo Battle, which was included, for all practical purposes, into every manuscript copy utilized for the edition of the *IVNCh*,³³ the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič was incorporated in only some of them.³⁴ According to F.P. Pokrovskij and A.A. Šaxmatov, the Copies N, G, and T were dated earlier than the other manuscripts utilized for the second edition of the *IVNCh*.³⁵

Salmina is undisturbed by the fact that Copy A ends with the entry for 1447, Copy N with 1437, and that the final entry for Copy T is unknown. Her assumption seems to be that the *Vita* constituted an integral part of the hypothetical Codex of 1448, but, particularly in view of Copy N, she evidently came to the conclusion that all the copies that included this *Vita* and became the basis for the second edition of *IVNCh* were taken down at a later time. The textual history of the *IVNCh* justifies this reasoning; in its various manuscripts, especially after the events of 1470s and the final annexation of Novgorod (1478), heavy layers of Muscovite political propaganda came to be incorporated into it over time.

Salmina also believes that the *IVNCh* version of the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič is closest to the original work because it is the most complete text. The texts of the *IVNCh* and *ISCh* are in fact virtually identical, except for an extensive and rhetorical middle section in the "Praise for Dmitrij Ivanovič," a section which is found only in *IVNCh*.³⁶ However, a different conclusion can be drawn from these

³³ The following copies were used by F.P. Pokrovskij, the editor of the second edition of the *IVNCh* (publication of the edition was supervised by A.A. Šaxmatov):

Stroev Copy, from the last quarter of the fifteenth century, covering historical materials from 912 to 1477 (St);

Sinodal' Copy, copied in 1544, beginning with the *PVL* and ending with the entry for 1477 (S);

Public Library Copy (Frolov), taken down in the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century, starting with *PVL* and ending with 1447 (P);

Academy of Sciences Copy from the first half of the sixteenth century, opening with *PVL* and concluding with the entry 1447, like P (A);

Golicyn Copy, from the first half of the sixteenth century and ending with the year 1516 (G);

New-Russian Copy, from the last quarter of the fifteenth century, starting with the *PVL* and ending with the entry for 1437 (N);

[F.P.] Tolstoj Copy, taken down at the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century, lacks the beginning and the end of the manuscript, and covers only the years from 1382 to 1418 (T).

³⁴ The text of the *Vita* was published from Copy A with variant readings from G, N, T. The *Vita* was not included in St, S, P.

³⁵ *PSRL*, 2nd ed., 4, pt. 1, no. 1 (1915): ix.

³⁶ *PSRL*, 2nd ed., 4, pt. 1, no. 2 (1925): 361-365.

facts. One is certainly justified in arguing that the middle section of the "Praise" was lacking in the original work, which was presumably identical to the text in the *ISCh*. Furthermore, there seems to be no logical reason why the Novgorodian chroniclers should have included ideologically-imbued Muscovite texts into their own codices. Lur'e, for example, explains the inclusion of the Expanded Chronicle Tale about the Kulikovo Battle in *IVNCh* as a reflection of the formation of a pro-Muscovite faction in Novgorod by the 1440s,³⁷ but this is rather unlikely. Such a faction could only have emerged in Novgorod a decade or so later, as a result of the Muscovite campaign against that city in 1456³⁸ and the Treaty of Jaželbicy concluded in the same year;³⁹ consequently, this would be the earliest possible date for the inclusion of pro-Muscovite materials in the *IVNCh*. However, there is no conclusive evidence it was done even then.

Thus we are left with the text of the *Vita* in *ISCh* as being the safer of the two earliest ones. This brings us to the question of when it was included into *ISCh*. It was incorporated in all of the known manuscript copies that served as basis for the edition of *ISCh*, with one exception—namely, the Voroncov manuscript.⁴⁰ *ISCh* is a Muscovite chronicle that exists in two recensions: the first was compiled in 1422, and the second ends with an entry for 1456.⁴¹ While Šaxmatov emphasized the similarity of the second recension of the *ISCh* (or a hypothetical Codex of 1456) with the official Muscovite Codex of 1479,⁴² Priselkov advanced the hypothesis that the Codex of 1456 was in fact a chronicle written in the metropolitan's chancery.⁴³ He also suggested that both the metropolitans and the grand princes had chronicles compiled throughout the fifteenth century, and that the two chronicles (the recensions of 1426 and 1463) existed before the compilation of the Muscovite Codex of 1472.⁴⁴ The

³⁷ Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar," p. 117, n. 194.

³⁸ For an analysis of the campaign and the resulting developments, see L. V. Čerepnin, *Obrazovanie russkogo centralizovannogo gosudarstva v XIV-XV vekax* (Moscow, 1960), pp. 817-825.

³⁹ For the texts of the Treaty of Jaželbicy, see S. N. Valk, ed., *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1949), pp. 39-43. For a commentary on this treaty, see L. V. Čerepnin, *Russkie feodal'nye arxivy XIV-XV vekov*, 2 pts. (Moscow and Leningrad, 1948-1951), 1: 356-363.

⁴⁰ *PSRL* 5 (1851): 243 n *. Cf. also Salmina, *TODRL* 25 (1970): 81, n. 4.

⁴¹ Šaxmatov, *Obozrenie*, pp. 208-221; Priselkov, *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XI-XV vv.*, pp. 151-154, 162-164.

⁴² Šaxmatov, *Obozrenie*, p. 217.

⁴³ Priselkov, *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XI-XV vv.*, pp. 162-164.

⁴⁴ Priselkov, *Istorija russkogo letopisanija XI-XV vv.*, pp. 164-173.

idea that there were two separate lines of Muscovite chronicle-writing (grand princely and metropolitan) during the fifteenth century is rather doubtful, but there is no reason to question the hypothesis of a Codex of 1456, which reflected the interests both of the grand prince and the metropolitanate. The assumption that such a codex existed is as valid as the notion that the hypothetical Codex of 1448 existed. It is also much more likely that a pro-Muscovite text such as the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič was first incorporated in a Muscovite chronicle, of which *ISCh* seems to be a much closer version than *IVNCh*, and that it was included not in the later 1440s, but in the mid-1450s, and specifically in the Codex of 1456.⁴⁵ The internal evidence of the *Vita* strongly suggests the political circumstances, the time of writing, and the author of this work.

The *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič [Donskoj] is an exceptional document loaded with Muscovite ideological content.⁴⁶ In it (for the first time, to my knowledge) a direct claim to the Kievan dynastic succession was made for a Muscovite ruler. The opening statement to the *Vita* reads as follows :

This Grand Prince Dmitrij was born to his honorable and venerable father, Grand Prince Ivan Ivanovič, and his mother, Grand Princess Aleksandra, and he was a grandson of Grand Prince Ivan Danilovič, the gatherer of the Russian land[s], [and] he was the most fertile branch and the most beautiful flower from the God-planted orchard of *Car* Vladimir, the New Constantine who baptized the Russian land, and he was [also] a kinsman (*srodnik*) of Boris and Gleb, the miracle-workers.⁴⁷

This statement on the direct and uninterrupted dynastic continuity

⁴⁵ Ja.S. Lur'e has postulated the existence of a Codex of 1453 on the basis of the manuscript GBL M. 3271, the main entries of which end with the year 1453 ("Nikanorovskaja i Vologodsko-Permskaja letopisi kak otkroženie velikoknjažeskogo svoda načala 70-x godov XV v.," *Vspomagatel'nye istoričeskie discipliny* [hereafter *VID*], 5 [1973]: 225, 238, 249-250). However, the manuscript in question does not contain the crucial text of the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič and does not include any material of relevance for its dating. For a good outline of the contents of GBL M. 3271, consult the informative study by I.M. Kudrjavcev, "Sbornik poslednej četverti XV-načala XVI v. iz Muzejnogo sobranija," *Zapiski Otdela rukopisej Gosudarstvennoj biblioteki im. Lenina* 25 (1962): 220-288, especially 225-233.

⁴⁶ It is surprising that such an astute specialist in the field of Old Russian literature as John Fennell could have written: "Indeed, there are few biographies of laymen in medieval Russian literature that are so strikingly lacking in 'message' or political tendentiousness. As the sharp historical outline of earlier works has faded here [in the *Vita*—J.P.], as fact has given way to generalities, so has ideology receded into the background. For once we are not expected to learn a political lesson from a text" (J. Fennell and A. Stokes, *Early Russian Literature* [London, 1974], p. 133).

⁴⁷ *PSRL* 6 (1853): 104; *PSRL*, 2nd ed., 4, pt. 1, no. 2 (1925): 351-352.

from the Kievan ruler Vladimir I definitely represents a major departure from the statements on the dynastic lineage that appeared in the annalistic necrologies of the previous Muscovite rulers. Those found in *TL* and the control text of *SCh* that list the names of the dynastic ancestors start from the Suzdal'-Vladimir Grand Principality.⁴⁸ For the purpose of genealogical linkage, two rulers were carefully selected. The first, Vladimir I, whose role in the baptism of the land of Rus' is emphasized, is elevated to the position of a *car*, a title he never held. The second, Ivan Danilovič [Kalita], is given the extraordinary epithet of "gatherer" of Russian lands, apparently alluding to his successful Russian policies. Finally, Dmitrij Ivanovič is referred to as a blood relative of the first, martyred saintly princes of Rus'.

The *Vita* abounds with terms designed to strengthen claims to the inheritance of Kievan Rus' and to enhance the position of the Kievan and, even more, of the Muscovite ruler to the highest political rank. Dmitrij Ivanovič is referred to nine times as *car*—a title he, like Vladimir, had never dreamed of attaining. Terms such as *carstvo*, *carskij*, *carstvovat'* are used quite frequently with regard to his reign; and the concept *russkaja zemlja* is employed in the text twenty-two times.⁴⁹ Furthermore, the author of the *Vita* twice maintains that the *russkaja zemlja* is a *votčina* (patrimony) of the Muscovite ruler.

This last assertion reflects the traditional Muscovite legal theory concerning the relationship between the ruler and the land. Like its Western equivalents, Russian patrimonial theory made no distinction between the private and public spheres in the realm of law and political domination (*Herrschaft*).⁵⁰ In political terms, the claim constituted a sweeping extension of the relevant statement in the Testament of Dmitrij Donskoj, in which he bequeathed the Principality of Vla-

⁴⁸ In the *Troickaja letopis'* and the *SCh*, the relevant phrases read as follows: (1304) "prestavis' knjaz' Danilo Aleksandrovič, vnuk Jaroslavl'[ja Vsevolodoviča (1238-1246)], pravnuke velikogo Vsevoloda [Jur'eviča (1176-1212)...]"; (1340) "prestavisja knjaz' velikij moskovskij Ivan Danilovič, vnuk velikogo Aleksandra [Jaroslavljiča (1252-1263)], pravnuke velikogo Jaroslava [Vsevolodoviča]..."

⁴⁹ Solov'ev, *TODRL* 17 (1961): 104, n. 47.

⁵⁰ For the classical Western definition of patrimonial theory, see M. Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology*, ed. G. Roth and C. Wittich, 3 vols. (New York, 1968), 3: 1013, 1028-29, 1085-86. The best historical discussion of the concept of patrimonialism and the scholarly controversies concerning the actual existence of a patrimonial state in medieval Germany has been provided by O. Brunner, *Land und Herrschaft*, 4th ed. (Vienna, 1959), pp. 146-164. For a discussion of the meaning of the term *votčina* in the old Russian sources and the literature on the subject, see Pelenski, *Russia and Kazan*, pp. 76-78, n. 1.

dimir, in theory a territory of the grand prince, whoever he might have been, to his son. This step had not only been a major departure from the old assumption that Muscovy alone was a patrimony of the Muscovite rulers, but it also signified the merging of the Vladimir Grand Principality with the Principality of Moscow.⁵¹ The "Praise for Dmitrij Donskoj" in the *Vita* concludes with the most extravagant upgrading of Dmitrij Donskoj, placing him above Vladimir I, and a downgrading of the significance of Kievan Rus', followed by a glorification of the all-Russian and imperial Muscovite ruler and his country. Paraphrasing the famous Praise of Vladimir I by the Metropolitan Ilarion, the author of the *Vita* exclaims :

The Roman land praises Peter and Paul, the Asian [land] John the Evangelist, India [praises] the Apostle Thomas, [the land of] Jacob, the brother of the Lord; Andrew the Apostle [is praised] by the Black Sea Coast (*pomor'e*), *Car* Constantine by the Greek land, Vladimir [is praised] by Kiev and the neighboring towns (*Kiev s okrestnymi grady*). You, however, Grand Prince Dmitrij [Ivanovič], are praised by the whole Russian land.⁵²

A document such as the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič, in which the status of the Russian ruler is elevated to that of a *car* and his position in the world is exalted, could hardly have been written during a Muscovite dynastic civil war, and certainly not when the Muscovite Grand Principality, in spite of all its intra-Russian expansionism, was only an insignificant territorial state. A text with such exaggerated political claims could only have been written after the fall of Constantinople (1453), when the Muscovite ecclesiastical and political establishment had begun to recognize the religio-political significance of the Council of Florence (1438-39) and, in view of the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, to offer its ideological interpretation of those two epochal events.⁵³ Only in Muscovite texts of the Florentine cycle can one find claims and assertions analogous to the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič. The two texts of relevance for our discussion are the *Povest' Simeona Suždalca, kako rimskij papa Evgenij sostavljal os'myj sobor*

⁵¹ For the texts of the Testaments of Dmitrij Donskoj and an English translation, see R. C. Howes, trans. and ed., *The Testaments of the Grand Princes of Moscow* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1967), pp. 126-130; 208-217, especially pp. 127, 212 (the relevant phrase reads: "And, lo I bless my son, Prince Vasilij, with my patrimony, the Grand Principality").

⁵² *PSRL* 6 (1853): 110; *PSRL*, 2nd ed., 4, pt. 1, no. 2 (1925): 356.

⁵³ For an informative and perceptive discussion of the theological and political currents at the Council of Florence and its impact on posterity, as well as the literature on the subject, see I. Ševčenko, "Intellectual Repercussions of the Council of Florence," *Church History* 24, no. 4 (1955): 291-323.

so svoimi edinomyšlenniki,⁵⁴ and the *Slovo izbrano ot svjatyx pisanij eže na latynju i skazanie o sostavlenii osmago zbora latynskago i o izverženii Sidora prelesnago i o postavlenu v rustej zemli metropolitov. O sixže poxvala blagověrnomu velikomu knjazju Vasil'ju Vasil'evičju vseja Rusi.*⁵⁵

In both accounts the title of *car* is used for the Russian Grand Prince Vasilij Vasil'evič (1425-1462): in the *Povest'* of Simeon of Suzdal' the term *belyj car*, meaning "white *car*," is applied once, and in the *Slovo izbrano* the term *car* is employed fourteen times, not to mention a frequent appearance of the variants of the term in this text. The only other contemporary Russian source that uses the terms *car*, *carskij*, *carstvujuščij* in reference to a Russian ruler—namely, the Tverian grand prince Boris Aleksandrovič (1425-1461)—is a Tverian ideological treatise, entitled *Slovo poxval'noe o blagověrnom velikom knjazě Borisě Aleksandroviče*, written, in my opinion, after the fall of Constantinople, most probably in 1454 or 1455.⁵⁶

In all three treatises—that is, the two "Florentine" texts and the *Vita*—Vladimir I and his role in the baptism of Rus' is prominently acknowledged. The Tale of Simeon of Suzdal' was definitely written after the fall of Constantinople, in the late 1450s,⁵⁷ and the extensive *Slovo izbrano* in the early 1460s.⁵⁸ The *Slovo izbrano* seems to provide the closest parallel to the *Vita* of Dmitrij Donskoj in its glorification of the Russian ruler (Vasilij II). The praises in both works are strikingly similar in terms of style (*pletienie sloves*).

Almost a century ago, A. Pavlov advanced the hypothesis that

⁵⁴ For the texts of the Tale of Simeon of Suzdal', see V. Malinin, *Starec Eleazarova monastyrja Filofej i ego poslanija* (Kiev, 1901), apps. 17 and 18, pp. 89-114.

⁵⁵ For the text of the *Slovo izbrano*, see A. N. Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor drevnerusskix polemičeskix sočinenij protiv latinjan* (Moscow, 1875), pp. 360-395.

⁵⁶ For the text of the *Slovo poxval'noe*, see N. P. Lixačev, ed., "Inoka Fomy Slovo poxval'noe o blagověrnom velikom knjazě Borisě Aleksandroviče," *Pamjatniki drevnej pis'mennosti i iskusstva* 168 (1908): 1-55. For a review of Lixačev's publication, consult A. A. Šaxmatov, *Otzyv ob izdanii N. P. Lixačeva: "Inoka Fomy slovo poxval'noe o blagověrnom velikom knjazě Borisě Aleksandroviče"* (St. Petersburg, 1909). An interesting analysis of this work was provided by W. Philipp, "Ein Anonymus der Tverer Publicistik im 15. Jahrhundert," in *Festschrift für Dmytro Čyževs'kyj zum 60. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1954), pp. 230-237.

⁵⁷ F. Delektorskij showed that Simeon's Tale was written many years after the Council of Florence but before 1458 ("Kritiko-bibliografičeskij obzor drevne-russkix skazanij o florentijskoj unii," *ŽMNP* 300 (1895): 131-184, especially 138-144. Cf. *idem*, "Florentijskaja unija (po drevnerusskim skazanijam) i vopros o soedinenii cerkve v drevnej Rusi," *Strannik*, September-November 1893, pp. 442-458.

⁵⁸ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, p. 359. A. Pavlov, *Kritičeskie opyty po istorii drevnej greko-russkoj polemiki protiv latinjan* (St. Petersburg, 1878), pp. 106, 108.

Paxomij Logofet (the Serbian) was the author of *Slovo izbrano*, as well as of some works attributed to Simeon of Suzdal'.⁵⁹ Pavlov based his argument on stylistic analysis, on the use of the title *car*, and on the presence of political terms stressing the God-given nature of the Muscovite ruler's power. Other Russian scholars have disagreed with Pavlov's hypothesis. F. Delektorskij, for example, claimed, without evidence, that Russian authors had been using the title of *car* quite frequently by that time.⁶⁰ Another author maintained that the *Slovo izbrano* was "imbued with vital Muscovite patriotism" and that Paxomij Logofet, who was a Serbian and who "worked for money, had no reason to be a Russian patriot" and therefore he could not have written the *Slovo*.⁶¹ Conclusive evidence exists, however, that Paxomij knew Simeon of Suzdal', the author of the Tale, and that both lived in the Troice-Sergiev Monastery until 1458-1459.⁶² It is quite possible that Paxomij Logofet helped Simeon of Suzdal' to compose his Tale, or parts of it.

The preponderance of evidence points to Paxomij Logofet as the most probable author of the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič. He might have written it at the request of Muscovite authorities during his stay in the Troice-Sergiev Monastery, following the fall of Constantinople, but before the compilation of the Codex of 1456—that is, in 1454 or 1455.⁶³

The other two principal texts of the Kulikovo cycle, i.e., *Zadonščina* and the *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboiščě*, need not concern us here. The *Zadonščina* never became part of the official Muscovite political

⁵⁹ Pavlov, *Kritičeskie opyty*, pp. 105-108, 99-102.

⁶⁰ Delektorskij, *ŽMNP* 300 (1895): 154. M. Cherniavsky repeated Delektorskij's claim; moreover, he maintained that the title *car* had been used in Russian documents (*AI*, I [1841], nos. 44, 56, 60, 61, 63) ("The Reception of the Council of Florence in Moscow," *Church History* 24, no. 4 [1955]: 347-359, especially 358, n. 30). A rechecking of the five documents quoted revealed that the title *car* does not appear in them.

⁶¹ V. Jablonskij, *Paxomij Serb i ego agiografičeskie pisaniija* (St. Petersburg, 1908), pp. 201-202.

⁶² Pavlov, *Kritičeskie opyty*, p. 100. Paxomij Logofet was an intellectual who worked for different employers (from both Novgorod and Moscow) and, for a price, could adjust his views according to the wishes of his employers. He could easily assume a more patriotic Muscovite tone than any of his Muscovite contemporaries.

⁶³ The following sentence in the *Vita* fits particularly well into the context of the "Florentine" texts and is definitely premature for the period of Dmitrij Donskoj: "ty že stolp nečestja razdrušil esi v ruskoj zemli i ne priměši sebe k bezumnym stranam na krestianskiju pogibel'" (*PSRL* 6 [1853]: 110). Cf. also Salmina, *TODRL* 25 (1970): 102-103.

literature, and it seems not to have been widely distributed, judging by the limited number of its manuscript copies.⁶⁴ However, several important references to the Kievan succession found in the text of the *Zadonščina* pose certain problems for the student of Muscovite ideology. Their study has been complicated by the tendency to date this text as closely as possible to 1380, although the arguments in favor of this early dating are unconvincing, at least for me. In my judgment, this work was composed after the Expanded Chronicle Tale,⁶⁵ and after the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič, as well.⁶⁶

It is also very improbable that the early chronological attributions of the *Skazanie o Mamaevom poboišče* will stand up to critical scrutiny.⁶⁷ Even if one were to assume that the text of the *Skazanie* of the London (British Museum) manuscript of the Vologda-Perm Chronicle (*VPCh*), which concludes with entries under 1499 and dates from the second half of the sixteenth century, reflects the earliest variant of the basic recension of the *Skazanie*,⁶⁸ it cannot be dated earlier than into the late 1480s or early 1490s,⁶⁹ although a strong case could be made for dating it later, into the 1520s-1540s.⁷⁰ The difficulties in dating the *Skazanie* combined with its limited official use (it is found only in one provincial, but official codex, the *VPCh*), force us to eliminate it from the present analysis.

The composition of the *Vita* of Dmitrij Ivanovič Donskoj and its inclusion into the Muscovite Codex of 1456 can be characterized as the first major step in the development of the official Muscovite claims to Kiev. The significance of this *Vita* for the emergence of

⁶⁴ For the most recent critical edition of the *Zadonščina* texts and the extensive literature on the subject up to 1965, see *Slovo o Polku Igoreve i pamjatniki Kulikovskogo cikla*, pp. 535-556; 557-583. For a recent reconstruction of an ideal text and an English translation, see R. Jakobson and D.S. Worth, eds., *Sofonija's Tale of the Russian-Tatar Battle on the Kulikovo Field* (The Hague, 1963).

⁶⁵ Salmina, "Letopisnaja povest'," pp. 376-383.

⁶⁶ I shall present my arguments for this dating in another study.

⁶⁷ For the most recent dating of the *Skazanie* between the middle of the fifteenth and the early sixteenth century and the literature on the subject, see M.A. Salmina, "K voprosu o datirovke 'Skazanija o Mamaevom poboišče,'" *TODRL* 29 (1974): 98-124.

⁶⁸ The *VPCh* has been published in *PSRL* 24 (1959) under the editorship of M.N. Tixomirov. For the text of the *Skazanie* from the London copy, see *ibid.*, pp. 328-344.

⁶⁹ I hope to offer my hypothesis for the dating of this work elsewhere.

⁷⁰ V.S. Mingalev, "Letopisnaja povest' – istočnik 'Skazanija o Mamaevom poboišče,'" *Trudy Moskovskogo istoriko-arkivnogo instituta* 24 no. 2 (1966): 55-72; "Skazanie o Mamaevom poboišče" i ego istočniki (Avtoreferat kand. dissertacii; Moscow and Vilnius, 1971), especially pp. 10-13.

Muscovite governmental pretensions to the Kievan inheritance was further enhanced by its incorporation, albeit with some editorial modifications, into the official Muscovite codices of the 1470s, in which additional dynastic claims were raised. The newly articulated claims represented the second stage in the evolution of Muscovite political thought concerning the Kievan succession. The editors of the Muscovite Codex of 1472 as reflected in the *NCh*, for example, not only integrated the *Vita* into their work, but formulated their own version of the dynastic *translatio* theory from Kiev through Suzdal'-Vladimir to Muscovy.⁷¹ The latter version appears in the annalistic Tale under the entry for 1471, entitled "About the Novgorodians and Vladyka Filofej." The Tale is devoted to the problem of the struggle between the Novgorodian irredentist faction, which wished to preserve the Novgorodian constitutional system and ecclesiastical autonomy, on the one hand, and the pro-Muscovite group, which supported Muscovite attempts to subordinate Novgorod to Muscovy, on the other. The leaders of the irredentist faction were trying to realize their objectives by inviting Mixail Olel'kovyč of Kiev, a prince with indisputable Orthodox credentials, who came from the Rus' lands of the Lithuanian Grand Principality, as the prince-protector of the Novgorodian city republic. The Tale also dwelt on the Muscovite diplomatic preparations aimed at Novgorod's subordination.⁷²

Two expositions of the dynastic *translatio* theory appear in the Tale. One was allegedly made by the leaders of the pro-Muscovite faction; another, similar statement was put forward by the Muscovite envoys on behalf of Ivan III Vasil'evič.

*Pro-Muscovite Novgorodian
Leaders*

Ivan's [III] Envoys

"From antiquity we [the Novgorodians] have been the patrimony of those

"From antiquity, you people of Novgorod have been my patrimony, from

⁷¹ For a detailed recent treatment of the relationship between the Muscovite grand princely codices of the 1470s and the *NCh*, as well as the *VPCh*, and the literature on the subject, see Ja. S. Lur'e, "Nikanorovskaja i Vologodsko-Permskaja letopisi kak otkrazenie velikoknjažeskogo svoda načala 70-x godov XV v.," *VID* 5 (1973): 219-250.

⁷² For the text of the Tale, see *PSRL* 27 (1962): 129-134. The most recent literature on Novgorodian affairs, as well as Muscovite policies aimed at the incorporation of Novgorod, is written from the Muscovite point of view. For the two most prominent examples of the Moscow-centered interpretations of Muscovite-Novgorodian relations in the 1470s and the literature on the subject, see Čerepnin, *Obrazovanie*, pp. 855-874, and V. N. Bernadskij, *Novgorod i Novgorodskaja zemlja v XV veke* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1961), pp. 264-313.

Grand Princes, from Rjurik, our first Grand Prince, who with his two brothers has been willingly invited from the Varangians by our own land. Afterwards, Grand Prince Vladimir, [Rjurik's] great-grandson was baptized and [he] baptized all our lands: the Rus' [land] and our Slavic [land], and the Meria [land] and the Krivičijan [land], and the Ves', called the Bělozero [land], and the Murom [land], and the [land] of the Vjatičijans, and [many] other [lands]. And from that Grand Prince, St. Vladimir and to our [present] lord Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evič..."

our grandfathers and our ancestors, from Grand Prince Vladimir, who baptized the land of Rus', the great-grandson of Rjurik, the first Grand Prince in our land. And from that Rjurik and up to this day, you have recognized only one [ruling] gens (*rod*) of those grand princes, first [those] of Kiev, and [then] Grand Prince Vsevolod [III] Jur'evič [and Grand-Prince] Dmitrij [Ivanovič] of Vladimir. And from that Grand Prince and until my time, we, their kin, rule over you, and we bestow upon you [our mercy] and we protect you against [all adversaries] and we are free to punish you if you shall not recognize us in accordance with the old tradition (*po starine*)."⁷³

These pronouncements of the Muscovite court were incorporated into the Muscovite Codex of 1479⁷⁴ and *SCh*,⁷⁵ and this suggests that they were fundamental assumptions of official Muscovite political theory in the last quarter of the fifteenth century.⁷⁶

The Muscovite claims to the Kievan dynastic legacy were expounded at the beginning of the three-century-long contest between Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania for the lands of Old Rus'.⁷⁷ While political and military struggles were conducted to conquer as much territory and as many cities as possible, an ideological contest was waged for all of Old Rus'. During its first phase, this struggle centered on the important Great Russian, albeit non-Muscovite, territories—namely, Great Novgorod and the Grand Principality of Tver (1449-1485). Its outcome was the annexation of those two Russian states—a major

⁷³ *PSRL* 27 (1962): 130; for some additional remarks on the application of the Muscovite dynastic *translatio* theory to Novgorod, see A.L. Gol'dberg, "U istokov moskovskix istoriko-političeskix idej XV v.," *TODRL* 24 (1969): 147-150.

⁷⁴ *PSRL* 25 (1949): 285.

⁷⁵ *PSRL* 18 (1913): 226-227.

⁷⁶ Most of these fundamental assumptions were used not only for the justification of Muscovite expansionism in Russia proper but also in conjunction with the annexation of non-Russian ethnic territories, as, for example, the Kazan Khanate in the sixteenth century. Cf. Pelenski, *Russia and Kazan*, especially chaps. 6 and 7.

⁷⁷ An outline of the major methodological and theoretical problems connected with the study of this contest in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries is presented in my unpublished study entitled "The Contest between Muscovite Russia and Poland-Lithuania for the Lands of Old Rus' (1450s-1580s)."

Muscovite victory. Particularly in the process of annexing Novgorod, Muscovy formulated an ideological program that remained in use until the end of the sixteenth century. However, these claims were also employed in anticipation of the second major phase of this contest, which was conducted for the Great Russian border areas, and also for the Belorussian territories and the lands of Ukrainian Rus'. Five major wars (1487-1494; 1500-1503; 1507-1508; 1512-1522; 1534-1537) were waged and they resulted in Muscovy's annexation of the lands of Černihiv and Novhorod-Sivers'kyj, Brjansk, Homel, and Starodub in 1503, and Smolensk in 1514.⁷⁸

In the second phase of the struggle, the annexation of Kiev was also a major goal of the Muscovite ruler. Over a period of eleven years (1493-1504), the Muscovite court formulated its claims for all of Rus' against the Jagiellonian double monarchy. The views expressed during this period can be regarded as the third stage in the development of Muscovite thought concerning the Kievan inheritance. The Muscovite court advanced its pretensions cautiously, step by step. In a radical departure from the traditionally established arrangements between Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania concerning the titles of their respective rulers, the Muscovite court, in a charter of 4 January 1493 that verified the credentials of its envoy Dmitrij Davidovič Zagrzazskij, used for the first time the phrase "Sovereign of all Rus'" as part of the title of the Muscovite ruler.⁷⁹ The Muscovite envoy was instructed to avoid any confrontation regarding the use of this sweeping term; still, the wording of the title and the note of instruction made it clear that Ivan III was claiming sovereignty over all lands of Rus'.⁸⁰ The Lithuanians were well aware of the significance of this addition, but were unable to negotiate in the summer of 1493 any change in the Muscovite position.⁸¹

⁷⁸ For the best factual accounts of these wars, albeit from the Muscovite perspective, see G. Karpov, "Istorija bor'by Moskovskogo Gosudarstva s Pol'sko-Litovskim," *Čtenija v Imperatorskom Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskix*, pt. 1, 1866, bk. 3, pp. 1-140—pt. 2, 1866, bk. 4, pp. 1-154; E. I. Kašprovskij, "Bor'ba Vasilija III Ivanoviča s Sigizmundom I Kazimirovičem iz-za obladanija Smolenskom (1507-1522)," *Sbornik Istoriko-filologičeskogo obščestva pri Institute knjazja Bezbordko v Nežine* 2 (1899): 173-344; K. V. Bazilevič, *Vnešnjaja politika Russkogo centralizovannogo gosudarstva* (Moscow, 1952). F. Papée had touched upon some aspects of the first of these wars in his informative work, *Polska i Litwa na przelomie wieków średnich*, vol. 1 (Cracow, 1904), pp. 132-150.

⁷⁹ *Sbornik Imperatorskogo russkogo istoričeskogo obščestva* (hereafter *SIRIO*) 35 (1882): 81.

⁸⁰ *SIRIO* 35 (1882): 82.

⁸¹ *SIRIO* 35 (1882): 103-108.

The Muscovite court, in addition to adhering to its original claim, refined its wording from the point of view of its own patrimonial theory by maintaining that the Muscovite ruler had included in his title only those lands that he had received "from his grandfathers and ancestors and that from antiquity he has been by law and by birth the Sovereign of all Rus'."⁸² In diplomatic terms, Muscovy scored a temporary, but nevertheless important, success by forcing Lithuania to recognize the phrase "Sovereign of all Rus'" as part of the title of the Muscovite ruler in the Peace Treaty of 1494.⁸³ This triumph reflected the great change that had taken place in the relations between Muscovy and Poland-Lithuania since the Treaty of 1449. That treaty had been concluded between Kazimierz Jagiellończyk and Vasilij II with the aim of delimitating each ruler's spheres of influence in Rus'. In it, the word *Rus'* did not even appear in the title of the Muscovite ruler, who was referred to simply as *moskovskij*, whereas his Polish-Lithuanian counterpart was designated as *ruskij*.⁸⁴

In addition to the claim implicit in the change of this title, the Muscovite court, at the very outset of the sixteenth century, promulgated a patrimonial justification for its expansionist aims in the lands of Old Rus'. This justification was simultaneously advanced in diplomatic negotiations with the Hungarian king Władysław Jagiellończyk and the Polish-Lithuanian ruler Aleksander Jagiellończyk in 1503-1504. The two statements of the Muscovite government are almost identical in terminology.

*Muscovite Response to the
Hungarian King*

"And we responded to the Hungarian king's envoy that his patrimony [Aleksander Jagiellończyk's] is the Polish land (*ljackaja zemlja*) and the Lithuanian land (*litovskaja zemlja*), but [that] the whole Russian land is our patrimony from antiquity. And those cities, which with God's help we conquered from the Lithuanian [Grand Prince],

*Muscovite Responses to the Polish-
Lithuanian Ruler*

"And not only those cities and provinces which are now in our hand are our patrimony, [but] the whole Russian land, according to God's will, is our patrimony from our ancestors and since antiquity."⁸⁵

"It is well known to our son-in-law, the King and Grand Prince Aleksander, that all the Russian land, according to

⁸² *SIRIO* 35 (1882): 107.

⁸³ *SIRIO* 35 (1882): 125, 129.

⁸⁴ For the text of the Treaty of 1449 see L. V. Čerepnin, ed., *Duxovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikix i udel'nyx knjazej XIV-XVI vv.* (Moscow, 1950), pp. 160-163.

⁸⁵ *SIRIO* 35 (1882): 380.

are our patrimony and we shall not return them. And whichever Russian cities are still [in the possession] of the Lithuanian [Grand Prince, namely] Kiev, Smolensk and other cities of the Russian land, with God's help, we would like to obtain all this patrimony which is ours."⁸⁶

God's will, is our patrimony from our ancestors and since antiquity... and his patrimony [Aleksander's] is the Polish land (*ljackaja zemlja*) and the Lithuanian land (*litovskaja [zemlja]*)... And not only those cities and provinces that are now in our possession are our patrimony, [but] the whole Russian land, Kiev and Smolensk and other cities that he holds in the Lithuanian land, according to God's will is our patrimony from our ancestors and since antiquity."⁸⁷

These statements reveal some confusion in the delimitation of the patrimonies; Kiev and Smolensk are both claimed as part of the Russian patrimony and referred to as being in the Lithuanian land. The constant and often ambiguous use of the terms *zemlja* and *votčina* is indicative of the fact that the Russian patrimonial law of the Muscovite period lacked a sophisticated theoretical framework, limiting itself to a few general assumptions regarding the focus of territorial possession and political domination.

The Russian, as well as the Polish, preoccupation with Kiev as the symbolic capital of Old Rus' lasted throughout the sixteenth century. The Muscovite court culminated its claims to Kiev and all Rus' lands with the assertion that Moscow was the "second Kiev."⁸⁸ Much earlier, the Polish-Lithuanian side rejected Muscovite expansionist claims, as well as the Muscovite ruler's insistence on being addressed as the "Sovereign of all Rus'," as unjustified, since the larger part of Old Rus' was under the sovereignty of the Polish Kingdom, i.e., the Polish-Lithuanian state.⁸⁹ In connection with the annexation of the Ukrainian lands of Old Rus' into Crown Poland at the Diet of

⁸⁶ *SIRIO* 41 (1884): 457.

⁸⁷ *SIRIO* 35 (1882): 460.

⁸⁸ The claim that Moscow was "the second Kiev" was most explicitly formulated in the *Kazanskaja istorija*, whose author or authors stated that "the capital and the most famous city of Moscow shineth forth as a second Kiev..." (G.I. Moiseeva, ed., *Kazanskaja istorija* [Moscow and Leningrad, 1954], p. 57). A parallel to this statement is found in the last sentence of the *Otryvok russkoj letopisi*, which reads: "May we see as ruler in Kiev, the Orthodox Car, Grand Prince Ivan Vasil'evič of all Russia" (*PSRL* 6 [1853]: 315). For additional comments and the literature on this problem, see Pelenski, *Russia and Kazan*, chap. 7.

⁸⁹ "... v korolevstve i pod korolevstvom est' bol'saja čast' Rusi,..." (*Akty, odnosjaščiesja k istorii Zapadnoj Rossii* 1 [1846]: 347-348).

Lublin (1569), the Polish ruling elite and the Polish king Zygmunt II August formulated their own set of legal and historical pretensions to Kiev and the whole land of Rus'.⁹⁰

The first phase of the official Muscovite claims to the Kievan inheritance extended over a period of approximately half a century (1454/55-1504). They originated at the time of Muscovite ideological awakening that had followed the Council of Florence and the fall of Constantinople, when the Muscovite political and ecclesiastical establishment saw its chance to strengthen its position not only in Russia but in all of Eastern Europe, as well. These ambitions were reinforced by Muscovy's successes in her expansionist policies, especially in Novgorod, where dynastic claims had been successfully applied, and subsequently, with the annexation of the Russian border areas, a large part of the Belorussian, and some Ukrainian lands.

Between the initial implementation of these dynastic pretensions to Novgorod in the early 1470s and the full formulation of the claim to the whole Rus' in 1493-1504, there was a period of about two decades when Muscovy's foreign policy, and especially her relations with the Crimea, underwent a major transformation. In particular, Mengli-Girey's campaign against the Kievan area and the sack of the city of Kiev in 1482, which had resulted from the reversal of alliances in Eastern Europe and close Muscovite-Crimean cooperation, may have delayed for a time the development of Muscovite ideology.⁹¹ This slow pace may also have been due to the static and traditionalist tendencies of Muscovite legal and political theory. By the beginning of the sixteenth century, however, a fairly coherent set of claims to the

⁹⁰ For an extensive discussion of this problem and the literature on the subject, see J. Pelenski, "The Incorporation of the Ukrainian Lands of Old Rus' into Crown Poland (1569): Socio-material Interest and Ideology—A Reexamination," *American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists*, Warsaw, 21-27 August 1973, vol. 3 (The Hague and Paris, 1973), pp. 19-52, especially pp. 38-46; cf. also *idem*, "Inkorporacja ukraińskich ziem dawnej Rusi do Korony w 1569 roku: Ideologia i korzyści—próbna nowego spojrzenia," *Przegląd Historyczny* 65, no. 2 (1974): 243-262, especially 252-256.

⁹¹ For factual accounts of the sack of Kiev in 1482, see Papée, *Polska i Litwa*, pp. 83-92; and Bazilevič, *Vnešnjaja politika*, pp. 192-199. The actual attitude of Ivan III toward Kiev and Kievan sacred places and ecclesiastical treasures is best reflected in the following statement of the oppositional Muscovite codex: "Knjaz' že velikij posla k Mengirěju k Krymskomu, povelě vovati korolevu zemlju; Mengirěj že s siloju svoeju vzja Kiev, vsja ljudi v polon povede, i deržatelja Kievskago svede s soboju i s ženou i s dětmi, i mnogo pakosti učinil, Pečerskuju cerkov i monastyr' razgrabil, a inii bėžali v pečeru i zadxošasja, i sudy služebnye Sofěi velikoj, zolotyj potir' da diskos, prislal k velikomu knjazju" (*PSRL* 6 [1853]: 234).

Kievan inheritance had been formulated, based on the uninterrupted dynastic continuity of the Rurikides, on the Kiev- (Suzdal'-) Vladimir-Moscow *translatio* theory, and on traditional patrimonial law.

*University of Iowa
Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute*