

Kiev and All of Rus': The Fate of a Sacral Idea

OMELJAN PRITSAK

I

A sense of Kiev's uniqueness, its pride in its often exaggerated antiquity, and its status as "being chosen" constitute a distinctive feature of Ukrainian political mythology through the ages. It was first manifested in the Rus' "Primary Chronicle" (*Pověst' vremennyx lét [PVL]*, ca. 1115–1123), and later elaborated in the *Kievan Synopsis* (1671–1681). The longevity and vitality of this myth can be seen in its two instances in our century.

In 1919, after the dissolution of the Habsburg Empire, the Ukrainians of Galicia had a good opportunity to consolidate their independent state, the Western Ukrainian National Republic. But influenced by the myth of Kiev's centrality to Ukrainian nationhood, the leaders of this nascent state sent their well-disciplined, 70,000-man strong army to the east to save "the Golden Domed" Kiev. The slogan "Through Kiev to Lviv" proved unrealistic. The enterprise ended in disaster for the heroic Ukrainian Galician Army, and with the Polish occupation of Galicia.

In 1982, the sesquimillennial anniversary of Kiev (proclaimed in 1980) was celebrated in the Soviet Union. This need to express pride in antiquity came at a time when archaeologists had proven beyond any doubt that Kiev as a town did not exist before the last quarter of the ninth to the first half of the tenth century.¹

This essay is an attempt to analyze the manifestations of the Kiev myth, and to uncover the real reasons behind them. Leaving aside the clearly apocryphal story of St. Andrew's voyage through Kiev, I begin with the myth of Kiev as the "mother of (the) Rus' towns." This well-known phrase is to be found in the *PVL*, where it is attributed to the "conqueror" Oleg under the year 6390/882. Although Oleg (Helgi) was indeed a historical

¹ Johan Callmer, "The Archaeology of Kiev ca. A.D. 500–1000: A Survey," *Le pays du Nord et Byzance: Scandinavie et Byzance*, Figura, 19 (Uppsala, 1981), pp. 29–52. See also Omeljan Pritsak, "Za kulisamy prohološennja 1500-littja Kyjeva," *Sučasnist'* 21, no. 9 (September 1981):46–54.

personage, he could not have ruled in Kiev in 882, since until ca. 930 Kiev was still in Khazar hands.² But there is another difficulty with the notion. Even by the end of the tenth century, Kiev's size was rather modest in comparison with neighboring towns. While Bilhorod covered 52 hectares, and Perejaslav as many as 80 hectares, Kiev extended over a mere 11 hectares.³ Finally, archaeological data prove that Old Ladoga/Aldeigjuborg was the oldest town in Rus', founded sometime during the second half of the eighth century.⁴

II

In 1037/1038 the first "jubilee" (the fiftieth anniversary) of Christianity served as a stimulus to the ruling elite of Rus' to undertake decisive measures toward the transformation of the formerly pagan kaganate into a Christian polity, or to be more exact, into a member of the Byzantine Commonwealth. This is not the place to discuss details of the process,⁵ which have not as yet been adequately researched. One thing is clear however: the Rus' rulers gave up their imperial title of Khazar origin (*kagan*) and after some conflicts (one may mention here, for example, the last Rus' naval expedition against Constantinople in 1043)⁶ accepted the universalistic and patrimonial ideology of Byzantium, happy to be admitted as associates (*proxenoi*) of the "basileus and autokrator of the Romans—that is, of all Christians."⁷

As part of their program to elevate their dynasty the Rus' rulers sought to canonize two members of their house. The price for the canonization of Boris (Borys) and Glěb (Hlib) in 1072⁸ was, politically speaking, very high. The canonization led to a complete fragmentation of political power. The

² Norman Golb and Omeljan Pritsak, *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1982), pp. 60–71. See also O. Pritsak, "The *Pověst vremennyx lět* and the Question of Truth," *History and Heroic Tale: A Symposium* (Odense, 1984), pp. 151–52.

³ Boris A. Kolčín, ed., *Drevnjaja Rus': Gorod, zamok, selo* (= *Arxeologija SSSR* 15) (Moscow, 1985) p. 53.

⁴ See, e.g., Vasilij A. Bulkin, Igor' V. Dubov, and Gleb S. Lebedev, *Arxeologičeskie pamjatniki Drevnej Rusi IX–XI vekov* (Leningrad, 1978), esp. pp. 85–90.

⁵ This will be treated in vol. 4 of my *The Origin of Rus'* (in preparation).

⁶ George Vernadsky, "The Byzantine-Russian War of 1043," *Südostforschungen* 12 (1953): 47–67.

⁷ Dimitri Obolensky, "The Relations between Byzantium and Russia (11th–15th century)," in idem, *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe* (London, Variorum Reprints, 1982), no. 5, p. 5.

⁸ See *PVL*, ed. Dmitrij S. Lixačev, 2 vols. (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), 1: 121. Concerning the canonization see Evgenij E. Golubinskij, *Istorija kanonizacii svjatyx v russkoj cerkvi*, 2nd ed. (Moscow, 1903), pp. 43–49; George P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind* (New York, 1946), pp. 94–105.

fate of Boris and Glëb's murderer, the "Cain" Svjatopolk, and the church's popularization of the princely martyrs Boris and Glëb, were clear warnings to any ambitious prince who intended to rule alone.

A special type of *Symphonia*⁹ developed in Rus': on the one hand it meant the fragmentation of political power, and on the other, centralization based on the *ad hoc* concept of the *indivisibility* of the Metropolitanate of Rus', a subordinate component part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.¹⁰ Since there was never any successful attempt at a separation, or even strict division, of the functions of the ecclesiastical and secular "swords" (as occurred in the West), the former (the patriarch) was usually dominated by the latter (the emperor). Byzantium had found a way to prevent the formation of a rival empire.

As a result, from the Orthodox-Christian and Byzantine political point of view, Rus' ceased to be an independent structured polity. It was regarded as a Byzantium-subordinated system of principalities, ruled by co-equal archons (= barbarian chiefs) under the "spiritual" leadership of the metropolitan of Rus', who at first had no fixed city of residence,¹¹ and was, significantly, a subject and agent of the political interests of the Byzantine Empire. The metropolitan and his bishops had a special status in Old Rus'; they remained foreigners in language and culture, and generally did not nationalize, i.e., did not emerge as the missing elite for the potential local polity.¹²

⁹ Heinrich Gelzer, "Das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche in Byzanz," *Ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 57–141; Georg Ostrogorsky, "Otnošenje cerkvi i gosudarstva v Vizantii," *Seminarium Kondakovianum* (Prague), 4 (1933): 121–32.

¹⁰ Francis Dvornik, "Byzantine Political Ideas in Kievan Rus'," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 9–10 (1956): 265–76; Dimitri Obolensky, "Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 11 (1957): 21–78. See also Ludolf Müller, *Zum Problem des hierarchischen Status und der jurisdiktionellen Abhängigkeit der russischen Kirche vor 1039* (Cologne, 1959).

¹¹ In 1299 Metropolitan Maksim, in fact, deserted his see and transferred his residence from Kiev to Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma (*Lavrent'evskaja letopis'*, ed. Evfimij F. Karskij, *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej*, 2nd ed. [hereafter *PSRL*], vol. 1 [Leningrad, 1927], col. 485). See also *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani 1315–1402*, ed. Franz Miklosich and Joseph Müller, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1860–62), 1, no. 158: 391.

¹² Contrary to the West, where the Latin sacred language was the precondition for entering into Roman Christianity yet was also a vehicle for upward mobility (the barbarians of yesterday could join the higher Latin language culture as equals), the Byzantine culture had two levels. The high-brow culture, using Greek as a literary (and sacred) language, was reserved exclusively for the Grecophone residents of the empire (basically Constantinople), while the barbarians were allowed to use their vernaculars for their low-brow culture, among others the Church Slavonic. They were preordained to retain forever their status of barbarians (even if Christian barbarians) and that of non-participants in the high-brow Byzantine culture. See, e.g., Ihor Ševčenko, "Byzantium and the Slavs," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (1984): 289–303.

This dichotomy—foreign higher clergy and local lower clergy, usually “not on speaking terms”—was the legacy of the Kievan period in the Ukraine.¹³ In short, from a political entity, *Rus'* emerged as an entity in the church geography of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In such a situation the role of the Metropolitanate in *Rus'* was quite broad, and its see of Kiev acquired a special place.

Hence a unique feature of the Metropolitanate of Kiev came into existence: its official title during the medieval period was styled not after the see (city), but after the people—the *Rus'*. While the bishops of all other provincial centers used in their seals the name of their see city, e.g., Novgorod, Smolensk, Halych, the metropolitan used in its place the name “*Rus'*”: He was “Metropolitan of *Rus'*,” and not “Metropolitan of Kiev.”¹⁴ In reaction to the political fragmentation, mentioned above, the Kiev metropolitan in the second half of the twelfth century restyled his title into “Metropolitan of all of *Rus'*” (πάσης Ῥωσίας = *vseja Rusi*).¹⁵ By the first quarter of the twelfth century, the oneness of *Rus'*, Kiev, and the Kiev-centered and Byzantium-subordinated Slavonic rite, as well as the merger of the “Varangian” military-economic elites was an established fact. The Kievan hegumen Sil'vester records this as follows (in the *PVL*): “The Slavonic rite and the *Rus'* are the same, because of the Varangians that called themselves *Rus'*, though originally they were Slavs. While they called themselves Poljanians (= Kievans), their language was still Slavic.”¹⁶

In consequence a dichotomy was developing between the secular and the sacral usages of the term “*Rus'*.” In the secular sphere, *Rus'*, also called *Rus' skaja zemlja*, referred to the core lands of the kaganate, where Jaroslav had settled his (until then itinerant) retinue (*družina*). They included Kiev, Černihiv, and Perejaslav, and were in principle *indivisible* but under the joint rule of three dynastic seniors (*triumviri*),¹⁷ in contrast to the *divisible* marginal lands. The Ljubeč council of the *Rus'* princes (1097) invalidated the *indivisibility* of the *Rus'* core territory. As a result, from two to five

¹³ When in the sixteenth/seventeenth centuries the Greeks were replaced by prelates of local origin, the division between the higher and lower clergy persisted, and led to partisan decisions, such as the Union of Brest (1596), or submission to the Patriarchate of Moscow (1686), which had tragic consequences, especially from the point of view of identity.

¹⁴ Valentin L. Janin, *Aktovye pečati drevnej Rusi X–XV vv.*, 2 vols. (Moscow, 1970), 1: 174–79.

¹⁵ Alexandre Soloviev, “Metropolitensiegel des Kiewer Russland,” in idem, *Byzance et la formation de l'Etat Russe: Recueil d'études* (London, Variorum Reprints, 1979), no. 9: 292–301, pl. 4–5.

¹⁶ *PVL*, ed. D. S. Lixačev, 1: 23.

¹⁷ That is, Izjaslav Jaroslavyč (d. 1078), Svjatoslav Jaroslavyč (d. 1076), and Vsevolod Jaroslavyč (d. 1093).

Rus' dynasties on the core Rus' territory were in competition for rule over Kiev and Rus' from that time until the Mongol invasion.¹⁸

The sacral usage of the term *Rus' / vsja Rus'* encompassed the notion of an *indivisible* Metropolitanate of Rus', regardless of "barbaric" political allegiances. In this structure the name Kiev was used as a kind of synecdoche for "all of Rus'."

In 1204 the unthinkable happened. The Holy Roman Christian Byzantine Empire collapsed. The ruler in Constantinople was now a Latin Frankish emperor, and Saint Sophia was the seat of a Latin patriarch. The story of the empire's end was related matter-of-factly by a Rus' eyewitness, and preserved in the Novgorod I Chronicle.¹⁹

Deprived of both secular (emperor) and church (patriarch) overlordship, the Rus' princes had to act. At the time there were three powerful princes in Rus': the senior of the dynasty, Prince Vsevolod Jur'evič ("Bol'soe Gnězdo") of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma; Roman Mstyslavych, prince of Halyč; and Rjryk Rostyslavych of Kiev. In addition there was also the king of Hungary (for Old Rus' he was *korol'*, i.e., the king *par excellence*), Andrew II (1205–1235), who was very much involved in East European affairs. What was their reaction?

Vsevolod arranged a very elaborate ceremony for the investiture of his oldest son Konstantin (Vsevolod himself had been exiled to Constantinople by his autocratic brother Andrej and spent several years there) as ruler of Novgorod the Great; Vsevolod decided that Novgorod was to have precedence over all principalities of the Rus' land.²⁰ It may be noted here that until that time Novgorod had not been included in the concept of *Rus'skaja zemlja*. Vsevolod's wife, who before her death became a nun, also gave her blessing, and the Trinity Chronicle stresses that through her agency Konstantin obtained charisma not only from Saint Helena (the mother of the Roman emperor Constantine the Great) but also from Ol'ga (the first Christian ruler of Kiev, d. 969) and Volodimer.²¹ In this way the newly proposed center of Rus' was to gain acceptance by (the historical) Kiev.

¹⁸ There were originally two: the Monomaxovyči and Ol'hovyči. In the mid-twelfth century the Monomaxovyči branched into two lines: the older (Mstyslavychi) and the cadet (Jurijeviči); the former soon separated into two subdivisions—the Volhynian and the Smolensk branches. In the second half of the twelfth century there were also two branches of the Ol'hovyči.

¹⁹ *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov*, ed. Arsenij N. Nasonov (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), pp. 46–49.

²⁰ Mixail D. Priselkov, *Troickaja letopis': Rekonstrukcija teksta* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950), pp. 287–98.

²¹ *Troickaja letopis'*, p. 290.

Unfortunately, no detailed reports about Roman and Rjuryk (the latter was the former's father-in-law, but by this time they had become competitors and foes) have come down to us. But the data of the Hypatian Chronicle allow us to suppose that the two princes now assumed—for the first time in the history of Rus'—the Byzantine imperial title of αὐτοκράτωρ (*samodržьсь*).²² Like Novgorod, Halyč until then had never been included in the concept of *Rus'skaja zemlja*. Now Roman of Halyč became *samodržьсь vseja Rusi*.²³ In his title are subsumed two Byzantine concepts, that of the secular emperor (*autokrator*) and the sacral idea of "all Rus'."

Andrew II made an attempt (between 1214 and 1223) to establish—in cooperation with the leading Polish prince, Leszek the White, and Pope Innocent III—a Latin Kingdom of Galicia under his dynasty (as a secundogeniture). Not surprisingly, the term *Rus'*, redolent of sacred Byzantine Orthodox concepts, is missing from the title of the Catholic king of Galicia, Koloman, Andrew's son.²⁴

After the revival of the Byzantine imperial and church establishments in Nicaea, the Byzantines soon regained their influence over the non-Greek Orthodox, first among the Serbs and later also among the Rus'. Byzantine ties with the khans of the Golden Horde, the de facto sovereigns of Rus', made this task easier.²⁵ A new compromise was now elaborated. The Rus' princes of Halyč, Kiev, and Novgorod-Suzdal' surrendered their recently acquired title of *autokrator* in exchange for canonization of their progenitor, Volodimer the Great, the baptizer of Rus'.

Just as the name "Kiev" became a kind of synecdoche for "the Metropolitanate of all of Rus'," the name of the baptizer of Rus', Volodimer the Great, developed from the mid-twelfth century into a symbol of the political charisma of the dynasty, now with no recognized senior. Jurij Monomaxovyč, the perennial pretender to the Kievan throne, is called by the chronicler (under the year 1149) an offspring of "Volodimer the Great, who baptized the whole land of Rus'."²⁶ The same style is used with reference to Jurij's

²² *Ipat' evskaja letopis'*, ed. Aleksej A. Šaxmatov, *PSRL*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1908), col. 715. On the title *samovlastec' / samodržьсь* = Greek αὐτοκράτωρ see A. S. L'vov, *Leksika 'Povesti vremennyx let'* (Moscow, 1975), pp. 182–84.

²³ See A. N. Nasonov, "Russkaja zemlja" i obrazovanie territorii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva (Moscow, 1951).

²⁴ On the Szepes (Spyš) agreement and the coronation of Koloman, see Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy*, 10 vols. (rpt. New York, 1954–57), 3: 31–36 and 510–513.

²⁵ George Vernadsky, *The Mongols and Russia* (New Haven, 1953), and Mixail D. Priselkov, *Xanskije jarlyki russkim metropolitam* (Petrograd, 1916).

²⁶ "Načalo kn[ja]ženiija v Kievě kn[ja]zja velikago Djurgja, s[ly]na Volodimirja Monomaxa, vnuka Vsevoloža, pravnuka Jaroslavlja, praščjura velikago Volodimera xr[is]tivšago vsju zemlju Ruskouju," *Ipat' evsakaja letopis'*, cols. 383–84.

son Hlib (Glěb) in 1172,²⁷ and Danylo Romanovyč of Halyč in 1229.²⁸

Until the 1250s, the Byzantine government had its reasons not to allow the canonization of Volodimer the Great (or that of Ol'ga). At that time, the Byzantine government in exile was based in Nicaea, whereas Rus' had become a part of the Golden Horde. It seems that it was Cyril III, the long-lived metropolitan of Kiev (and formerly a diplomat in the service of Danylo of Halyč), who succeeded in persuading the Nicaean government that this was the appropriate time to canonize Volodimer. The exact date of the canonization is unknown, but it must have taken place before 1254.²⁹ At that time (1254) Danylo was involved in a war of succession in Austria. The chronicler wrote in this connection: "Before this time no one from Rus' had made war upon the Czech land, not even Svjatoslav the Bold or *Saint Volodimer* (emphasis added)."³⁰

In the eulogy to Alexander Nevskij, Danylo's rival in Rus' affairs, the Suzdal' Chronicle (under the year 1263) refers to "Saint Volodimer," as well as to the martyrs Cyricus (Kjurik) and Julitta (Ulita).³¹ A church dedicated to St. Volodimer, in Novgorod the Great, is first documented in 1311.³²

Constantinople refused on principle to divide the *indivisible* Metropolitanate of Rus' (Kiev), even when this demand was made by Andrej Bogoljubskij (d. 1174), powerful ruler of a new political center in Rus'—Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma.³³ And this was despite the fact that Andrej used, in his peculiar way, the charisma that attached to Kiev through the sack of the city in 1169. He adopted as his palladium the *Theotokos* ("the Mother of God") icon, which he took north from the Kiev suburb of Vyšhorod.

²⁷ "v tož[e] lět[o] čjudo stvori B[og]" i s[vja]taja B[ogorodi]ca c[e]rk[ov]' Desjatinnaja v Kyevě juže bě sozdał" Volodiměr" iž[e] kr[']stil" zemlju i dal" bě desjatinu c[e]rkvi toi po vsei Rus'koi zemli," *Ipat' evskaja letopis'*, cols. 554–55 = *Troickaja letopis'*, p. 247 (s.a. 1169).

²⁸ "inyi bo knjaz' ne vxodil" bě v zemlju Ljad'skou tol' glouboko proče Volodimera Velikago iže bě zemlju krestil," *Ipat' evskaja letopis'*, col. 758.

²⁹ On some reasons why Volodimer's canonization never happened in the pre-Mongol period, see, e.g., Stepan Tomašivs'kyj, *Vstup do istoriji cerkvy na Ukrajinu* (Žovkva, 1932), p. 88.

³⁰ "ne bě bo v zemlě Rouscěi pervee iže bě voeval" zemlju Č's'skou ni S[vja]toslav" Xorobry ni Volodimer" S[vja]tyi," *Ipat' evskaja letopis'*, col. 821.

³¹ "na pamjat' . . . s[vja]toju m[u]č[e]n[i]ku Kjurika i Ulity i s[vja]t[o]go kn[ja]zja Volodimera kr[es]tivšago Russkiju zemlju. . .," *PSRL*, vol. 1, col. 479.

³² "Togo že lěta arxiepiskop" Davyd" postavi cerkov' kamenu na vorotěx" ot Nerev'skogo konca svjatogo Volodimira," *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis'*, p. 93; cf. *ibid.*, pp. 334, 343, 350, 405.

³³ See A. V. Kartašev, *Očerki po istorii russkoj cerkvi*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1959), pp. 177–81. Andrej's violent death stimulated efforts to canonize him. Although he sponsored the destruction of Kiev in 1169, his "Life" had to be written in Kiev by a Kievan, Kuz'myšče; see *Ipat' evskaja letopis'*, cols. 580–93.

This was also despite the fact that the “miraculous” victory of Andrej over the Muslim Volga Bulgars in 1172 was attributed to this icon.³⁴

In the fourteenth century, however, Constantinople changed its policy three times—twice in the creation of the Metropolitanate of Little Rus’ with its see in Halyč (ca. 1300,³⁵ and again in ca. 1370),³⁶ and in the further formation of the Metropolitanate of Lithuania (ca. 1316;³⁷ in 1356³⁸ the bishoprics of Little Rus’³⁹ were added to that Metropolitanate).

The permanent division of the *indivisible* Metropolitanate of all Rus’ occurred in 1448–1458. The former date marks the creation, without the blessing of the patriarch of Constantinople,⁴⁰ of an autocephalous Metropolitanate of “Kiev and all Rus’” with its see in Moscow; the latter is the date of the decision by Pope Calixtus III, with the concurrence of the Uniate patriarch of Constantinople and the Kiev metropolitan, to establish the “Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus’” with its seat in the capital of Lithuania, Vilnius.⁴¹ In 1461, the autocephalous Metropolitanate changed its title to “Moscow and all Rus’,” leaving the title “of Kiev” to the metropolitan who presided over the Ukrainian and Belorussian lands.

Two comments are necessary here. First, the names Kiev and Rus’ now functioned merely as symbols, devoid of reality. Until 1620 no Orthodox metropolitan resided primarily in Kiev. The second, and this must be emphasized, is that Moscow, which until the erection of its own

³⁴ *PSRL*, vol. 1, cols. 352–53.

³⁵ See M. Hruševs’kyj, *Istorija Ukrajiny-Rusy*, 3: 269–75, 543–45.

³⁶ Documentation in *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani* 1, no. 318: 577–79. See also *ibid.* 1, no. 120: 267–71, and 1, no. 121: 271.

³⁷ Heinrich Gelzer, “Beiträge zur russischen Kirchengeschichte aus griechischen Quellen,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 13 (Gotha, 1892), pp. 261–76; Aleksej S. Pavlov, “O načale galickoj i litovskoj mitropolij i pervyx tamošnix mitropolitax po vizantij’skim dokumental’nym istočnikam XIV veka,” *Russkoe obozrenie* (Moscow), 27, no. 5 (May, 1894): 215–28.

³⁸ *Acta Patriarchatus* 1, no. 183: 425–33, esp. p. 426: *περὶ μέντοι τοῦ ἱερωτάτου μητροπολίτου κῦρ Ῥωμανοῦ ὡς χειροτονηθέντα καὶ αὐτὸν Λιτβῶν, διωρίσατο ὁ κράτιστος καὶ ἄγιός μου αὐτοκράτωρ συγκαταβάσεως λόγῳ καὶ ἅμα διὰ τὴν ἀνενοχλησίαν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῦ ἐκεῖσε τόπου ἔχειν σὺν ταῖς οὐσαις τῇ τῶν Λιτβῶν ἐπαρχίᾳ δυσὶν ἐπισκοπαῖς, τὸ Πωλότζικον καὶ τὸ Τούροβον μετὰ καὶ τοῦ Νοβογραδοπουλίου, τοῦ καθίσματος τοῦ μητροπολίτου, καὶ τὰς τῆς μικρᾶς Ῥωσίας ἐπισκοπᾶς.*; “As for the most holy Metropolitan Lord Romanus, inasmuch as he was ordained for Lithuania, my most mighty and holy sovereign (= Byzantine emperor) condescended, in order to remove the obstacles to peace in those parts, to command that he should possess in addition to the two bishoprics Polotsk and Turov in Lithuania, along with Novogrodek, the Metropolitan seat, the bishoprics of Little Rus’ as well.”

³⁹ See Excursus II below.

⁴⁰ Kartašev, *Očerki*, 1: 364–66.

⁴¹ See *Documenta pontificum romanorum historiam Ukrainae illustrantia*, vol. 1 (Rome, 1953), pp. 138–39 (no. 78). See also Kartašev, *Očerki*, 1: 364–66.

Patriarchate in 1589 was in schism from Constantinople, never recognized the partition of the Kiev Metropolitanate. Thus the quasi-secularized Muscovite concept of "all Rus'" was, in fact, never secularized. Rather, it developed into a kind of fundamentalistic theory and later still was simply transformed into an imperial (not national!) political slogan of official nationality, that of "one and *indivisible* Russia."⁴²

In the Ukrainian territories of the thirteenth century, the designation "Rus'" came to take on a new meaning. There are two characteristic features of the mid-thirteenth-century Galician chronicler's ideology that contrast with that of his Volhynian counterpart. First is the chronicler's pride in Danylo's title of king *korol'* (= *Rex Rusciae*), which he adds at each mention of Danylo's name. In the Volhynian chronicler's view, on the other hand, Danylo is merely prince (*knjaz'*) or just Danylo.⁴³ Secondly, the Galician chronicler consistently substitutes for the "local" name "Galicia, Galician(s)," the "national" (in modern terms) designation "Rus'." (As is well known, the Kiev Chronicle of the twelfth century never used the term "Rus'" in reference to Galicia.)⁴⁴ Moreover, having appropriated this now both political and secular term, the chronicler seems to show special delight in using it wherever he can.⁴⁵ Danylo's council with his brother and sons is called *snem' ruskim' knjazem* (col. 857); Danylo's warriors are called *Rus'* (and not Galicians);⁴⁶ their standard is *ruskaja xorugov'* (col. 505); their battle is *ruskyj boj* (col. 505); Danylo's castle is *krěpost' ruskaja* (col. 539); Danylo acts according to the Rus' custom (*ruskyj obyčaj* [cols. 539, 541]), etc.

The Volhynian chronicler applies to his land, people, and princes only the regional term, e.g., *zemlja Volodimer'skaja* (col. 893). Vasyľko is "Grand Prince of Volodymyr" (cols. 848, 867); the ruling elite is styled as "the best men of Volodymyr" (*lěpšii mouži Volodimer'stii* [col. 920]). Even the Galicians are not referred to as Rus', but by their regional name (Galician; cols. 724, 743), or subsumed under the general regional term Volhynia. Thus, it is related that the khan of the Golden Horde, Telebuga, sent orders in 1283 to the Trans-Dnieper (*zadněprěiskym*) and the

⁴² Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825–1895* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), esp. pp. 73–183. See also the articles by Paul Bushkovitch and James Cracraft in this issue.

⁴³ *Ipat' evskaja letopis'*, col. 830: "Potom že Voišelk' stvori mir" s Danilom" . . . i pride Xolm" k Danilou. . . ." But cf., e.g., col. 827: "korolevi že Danilou . . .," col. 828: "Danilou že korolevi," . . . "se že ouvědav' Danilo korol'," . . . "Danilou že korolevi. . . ."

⁴⁴ Nasonov, "Ruskaja zemlja," pp. 127–44.

⁴⁵ The columns of the *Ipat' evskaja letopis'* are given in parentheses.

⁴⁶ See the interesting study by Anton I. Hens'ors'kyj, *Halyc'ko-volyns'kyj litopys: Proces skladannja, redakciji i redaktory* (Kiev, 1958).

“Volhynian” (*ko volyn'skim'*) princes; included in the latter category is the prince of Galicia, Lev Danylovyč (col. 892).

Between 1199 and 1340 Galicia and Volhynia were ruled by the Volhynian branch of the Rurikides. Sometimes one person ruled in both lands, e.g., Roman, Jurij I, and Jurij II. But Galicia differed from Volhynia in a very important way. While the latter strictly adhered to the Byzantine concept of *Symphonia* and used the name *Rus'* only for the sphere of sacral terminology analogously to the Patriarchate's usage, Galicia, with its close connections with Catholic Hungary, had adapted the term to secular use, especially after Danylo's acceptance of the crown from Pope Innocent IV (1253). Galicia was in the process of becoming a “national,” Western-style sovereign kingdom (*regnum Russie*), while Volhynia adhered to the concept of patrimonial, presecular Byzantine universalism. This opposition is clearly demonstrated in the inscriptions on the seal of Jurij I (1300–1315), ruler of both Galicia and Volhynia. As ruler of the former he is styled *Rex Russiae* “King of Rus’,” but as prince of Volhynia his seal was that of *Principis Ladimeriae*.⁴⁷ It is clear that the designation *Rus'* is connected with the concept of kingdom (*regnum*), while *Ladimeria* (*Volodymyr*) is tied with the notion of principality.

It is now understandable why during the period of direct Polish rule only Galicia of all the Ukrainian lands retained its “national” name and was officially styled as the “Rus’ Palatinate” (*Województwo Ruskie*, ca. 1434–1772). A comparable development can be observed for the territory of the Hetman State (the Zaporozhian Host) which, after the demise of its autonomy, was given (in 1796) the designation “the Little Russian gubernia” (*Malorossijskaja gubernija*).⁴⁸

III

In Kiev's ecclesiastical life, in addition to the Metropolitanate there was another religious institution, often at odds with it—the Kiev Monastery of the Caves.⁴⁹ In various periods, it was the breeding ground of clerics and church elites for Eastern Europe. The second half of the twelfth to the first half of the fourteenth century adumbrated the seventeenth and eighteenth

⁴⁷ See the facsimiles of the seal in J. Řežábek, Arist Kunik et al., *Boleslav-Jurij II, knjaz' vsej Maloj Rusi* (St. Petersburg, 1907), pl. 1, 2a (A.D. 1316), pl. 3b (1325), pl. 5a, b (1327), pl. 6 (1334) and pl. 9 (1335).

⁴⁸ On the fate of the Little Russian identity, see the article by Z. Kohut in this issue.

⁴⁹ On the relations between the Metropolitanate and the Caves Monastery during the Kievan Rus' period, see M. D. Priselkov, *Očerki po cerkovno-političeskoj istorii Kievskoj Rusi X–XII vv.* (St. Petersburg, 1913), esp. pp. 184–190, 339–41, 358–60, 400–405.

centuries, in that the clerics from Kiev (and mainly from the Caves Monastery) played the role of enlighteners—and frequently made good careers—in the North. In consequence of a dialogue between two monks, one of whom became bishop of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma, there came into being the famous “Kievan Patericon” (ca. 1222), a compilation of the lives of Kievan saints. This *Paterik Pečers'kyj* remained the most popular book in the Ukraine until the nineteenth century. In times of political and cultural restorations the Caves Monastery would be used to revive people's allegiance to the Kievan myths. Thus was conceived the so-called Kassijan versions of the Patericon during the brief revival of Kiev as a cultural and political center under the Lithuanian Kievan dynasty (1440–1471). This policy was also important in the cultural rebirth of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.⁵⁰ At that time three editions of the original Patericon (1661, 1678, 1702) as well as a Polish version (by Metropolitan S. Kosov, 1635) were published.⁵¹ There Volodimer the Great is styled as *samodrǫžc Ruskya zemlja*.⁵²

The first attempted history of Eastern Europe, though naturally still in a universalistic, presecular perspective, was produced at the Caves Monastery. The very title is a summary of the interrelations among Rus', Kiev, St. Volodimer and the presecular notion of “all Rus'”: “*Synopsis*, or a brief compilation from various chronicles on the origin of the Slav-Rosian (*rosijskoho*) people and the original (*pervonačalnŭx*) princes of the divinely-protected city of Kiev; on the life of the Orthodox Saint, Grand Prince of Kiev and of all Rossija (*vseja Rossiy*) [and] the very first Autocrat, Volodimer; and on the successors to his pious Rus' *dominion* (*blahočestyvŭja Deržavy eho Rossijskija*), up to the most serene and pious Lord our Tsar and Grand Prince Alexis Mixajlovič, Autocrat of all Great, White and Little Rössija” (five editions between 1671 and 1681).⁵³

⁵⁰ On the Smolensk rebirth see Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, *Istoriya ukrajins'koji literatury*, vol. 5 (Kiev, 1926) pt.1: 157–73.

⁵¹ Sylwester Kossow, *Patericon abo żywoty SS. Oycow pieczarskich* (Kiev, 1635).

⁵² “V” knjaženie samodrǫžca Ruskŭja zemlja. . . .” *Kyjevo-Pečers'kyj Pateryk (Vstup, tekst, prymitky)*, ed. Dmytro Abramovyč (Kiev, 1929) p. 16.

⁵³ *Sinopsis. Kiev 1681*, Facsimile mit einer Einleitung von Hans Rothe (Cologne, 1983), p. 399 (ed. 1674); p. 141 (ed. 1680). A vision of Rus' history after 1240 is absent from the *Synopsis*. Instead there is, significantly enough, only a list of the Kievan *voevody*. The list of the metropolitans is missing, although lists were compiled in the Ukraine in 1617–1627, one result of the revival of historical consciousness. I have in mind Krevza's *Obrona iednošci cerkiewney* (Vilnius, 1617), pp. 55–66, and Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj, *Palinodija* (manuscript at the University of Michigan Library), fols. 482v–485v. A facsimile edition, as well as English translations of both texts, is being prepared for the *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*.

Kievan history is divided here into three periods, each marking a step down: the period of the autocrats, initiated by St. Volodimer, was followed after 1240 (the Tatar invasion) by a Grand Principality, which in 1471 was degraded to a palatinate.⁵⁴

Because of its universalistic, presecular orientation, the *Synopsis* ignored the existing secular Ukrainian Cossack State of the Zaporozhian Host. Its creator Bohdan Xmel'nyč'kyj and his struggle with the Poles are not mentioned.⁵⁵

All this happened because, among other things, the Kievan church elites between 1654 and 1685, when they were still subordinated to the patriarch of Constantinople (and despite the Nikon controversy in 1667), never undertook to define exactly their status with relation to the hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, on the one hand, or to his new suzerain, on the other. The tsar of Muscovy was also the protector of the patriarch of Moscow (and hence independent of the patriarch of Constantinople). Unwilling to submit

It is worth mentioning that the 1680 edition of *Synopsis* introduced a fictitious woodcut portrait of *Car' Vladimir* (fol. 46b = Rothe reprint, p. 232).

⁵⁴ "Po prestavlěny Blahověrnaho knjazja Simeóna Olělkovyča, Koról' Pólskij, Kazýmír'' Carstvėnnŷj Hrád'' Kíev'' i Knjažėnie ehò v'' voevódstvo premínŷ, Martýna že Gaštólta Lytvýna, Voevódu v'' Kíeví predložŷ y outverdŷ, Róku ot Rož. Xva, 1471. Y ot tohò vremeny Preslávnoe Samoderžavie Kíevskoe, Bohu táko hríx'' rády čolovíčeskyx'' popustŷvšu, v'' ounyčŷženie tolŷko prijde, jáko ot Carstvija v'' knjažėnie, a ot knjaženija v'' Voevódstvo premínŷsja," *Synopsis*, ed. Rothe, p. 358.

An almost identical text is to be found in the introductory chapter added to the "Krojnika Litovskaja i Žmojtskaja": "After the righteous Prince Semen Olel'kovyč passed away, Casimir, the Polish king, transformed the royal city of Kiev (*hrad carstvennyj*) and its Princedom (*i knjazstvo eho*) into a palatinate (*voevodstvo*). He proposed and confirmed in the year 1471 the Lithuanian Martin Gaštold as the palatine (*voevoda*). And from that time on the kingdom of Kiev (*carstvovanie kievskoe*) and the autocratic rule (*samoderžavnoe knjaženie*), which because of mankind's sins God yielded to happen, became such a laughingstock, since it changed from kingdom (*ot carstvija*) into princedom (*vo knjaženie*), and from princedom into palatinate (*v voevodstvo*)." See *PSRL*, ed. N. N. Ulašėik, vol. 32 (Moscow, 1975), p. 214.

It is noteworthy that the author of the "L'vivs'kyj litopys" (ca. 1649) regarded it as crucial to begin his chronicle with information about the following two events:

"Roku 1339. Król Kazimierz polski Lwów wziął, poddali się sami; skarby wielkie pobrał, srebra, złota, kamieni drogich, bławatów, 2 krzyże złote, kamieniami sadzone, w jednym drzewo krzyża ś., 2 koronie, krzesło drogo robione, szatę szczerym złotem przetykaną i drogim kamieniem sadzoną; zamki obadwa, Wysoki i Niski drewniane pali, Kroniki 263 list, księga XII.

1471. Król Kazimierz polski przerobił księstwo Kijowskie na powiat i za wojewódstwo za radę litowską 1 starosta litwin Gosztold." Oleksander Bevzo, *L'vivs'kyj litopys i Ostroz'kyj litopyssec': Džereloznavče doslidžennja* (Kiev, 1970), p. 99.

These two essential events are described in Polish; thereafter follows the chronicle proper (1498–1649), written in Middle Ukrainian.

⁵⁵ See Excursus I, below. Strangely enough, the *Synopsis* does not even mention the Union of Brest of 1596 and the ensuing Orthodox-Uniate controversy.

to the authority of the hetman, they aimed rather to obtain a special position within the Muscovite political and church structure, as the enlightened custodians of the sacred idea of "all of Rus'." Hence in the critical years 1685–1686, the Kievan church elites proposed to the Muscovite government an unrealistic solution—that the Kiev metropolitan, even after his submission to the patriarch of Moscow, still remain as before the metropolitan of "all of Rus'" and the "Exarch of the Patriarch of Constantinople." The Muscovite bureaucrats simply ignored the demands of the Kiev ecclesiastics and the matter ended with the practically unconditional transformation of the Kiev Metropolitanate of "all of Rus'," a fully autonomous body within the Patriarchate of Constantinople, into a mere diocese (with no suffragans) of the Patriarchate of Moscow.⁵⁶

IV

The third Kievan spiritual institution of great renown was the Kiev Collegium, later the Mohyla-Mazepa Academy, founded by Petro Mohyla in 1632.⁵⁷ Although still presecular in nature, it was too closely linked with Western developments to ignore the secular world. Feofan Prokopovyč, one of the academy's professors, in the prologue to his "tragicomedy," *Vladymyr* (1705), acknowledged Hetman Ivan Mazepa as the successor to the rule of St. Volodimer in Kiev.⁵⁸ Prokopovyč's choice of St. Volodimer as the hero of his work was certainly not accidental.⁵⁹ As Myxajlo

⁵⁶ On these developments see Konstantin V. Xarlampovič, *Malorossijskoe vlijanie na velikoruskyi žizn'*, vol. 1 (Kazan', 1914), pp. 218–49.

⁵⁷ See the special issue of this journal *The Kiev Mohyla Academy*, = *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (1984), no. 1/2.

⁵⁸ *Vladymyr* begins as follows: "Vladymyr vsix slavennorossyjskых stran knjaz' y povelytel', ot nevirya tmy vo velykij svit evanhelskij duxom svjatym pryveden v lito ot roždества Xrystova 988; nyni že v preslavnoj Akademij Mohylo-Mazepovyanskoj Kievskoj, pryvyststvujuščoj Jasnevelmožnoho eho carskoho presvitloho velyčestva Vojska Zaporožskoho Oboyx Stran Dnepra Hetmana y slavnaho čynu svjatoho Andreja Apostola Kavalyera Yoanna Mazepy, prevelykaho svoeho kytora, na pozor Rossyjskomu rodu ot blahorodnyx Rossyjskых synov, dobrī zde vospytuemyx. . . ." *Feofan Prokopovič: Sočinenija*, ed. I. P. Eremin (Moscow and Leningrad, 1961), p. 149. See also fn. 56.

⁵⁹ In the "Prologue" to his work, Prokopovyč acknowledges that his aim is to show that Kiev was the eternal city of Rus' and Hetman Ivan Mazepa, the living St. Volodimer: "Se že y dom Vladymyrov, se y Vladymyrova čada, kreščenyem svjatym ot neho roždennaja (čo pače vsix yzjaščnīe na tobī javljaetsja, Jasnovel'možnyj Pane, kytore y dobrodijju naš [= Mazepa], emu [= Mazepa] že y stroenye seho otčestva Vladymerovaho po carju ot Boha vručeno est, y Vladymyrovymy ydajj ravnymy emu pobīdamy, ravnoju v Rossyy ykonomyeju, lyce eho, jako otčeskoe syn, na tebī pokazueš). Ubo seho yzobraženye pryjmy ot nas, jako toho ž (= Volodimir) velykij naslīdnyk, vmīsto pryvystvujja. Zry sebe samaho [= Mazepa] v Vladymerī, zry v pozorī sem, ak y v zercalī, tvoju xrabrost, tvoju slavu, tvoej ljubvū sojuz s monaršym serdцем,

Hruševs'kyj noted, it was Prokopovyč who in his "Rhetoric" (bk. VI, chap. 3) "insisted on the need to devote more attention (in the curriculum of the Kiev Academy) to the 'history of the fatherland,' particularly to its most recent period."⁶⁰ In fact, this direct involvement of the Kiev Academy in local, secular matters ended soon after the defeat at Poltava (1709).

Indirectly, however, the Kiev Academy can be given credit for the appearance of a stratum of Cossack military chancellors (*soslovije vojskovýx kanceljarystov*) who developed an interest in Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj's revolution and turned their attention to history. Sons of Cossack officers from the time of the insurrection, they were also alumni of the Kiev Academy. Actively engaged in the administration of the Hetmanate, they carried out the secularization of the sacral term "Little Russia" in reference to their polity. But without the necessary support of the churchmen the secular idea of Little Russian statehood⁶¹ was too abstract for the common people, who for centuries had been taught universalistic, religious, fundamentalist concepts. Hence the secular idea of Little Russia remained the intellectual property only of the Little Russian elites, surviving the abolition of its autonomy to be revived during the period of Enlightenment (*Istorija Rusov*, ca. 1818–1824).

tvoe ystynnoe blaholjubye, tvoju yskrennuju k pravoslavnoj apostolskoj edynoj kafolyčeskoj vîry našoj revnost y userdye" (ed. Eremin, p. 152).

The *trahedokomedyja* ends with a monologue of St. Andrew, where again Hetman Mazepa is hailed as the successor to the rulers of Rus' and Kiev (although Mazepa's capital was, of course, Baturyn):

se toj est svît, eho že, duxom zde vodomyj,
 obiščax ty, Kyeve, hrade moj ljubymyj! . . .
 No hdî esm? čto se vyždu? Kyja ešče lîta
 otkryvaeš mnî, carju vîkov? . . .
 Ot vsêx že krasnjšoe pozoryšče sye:
 Zyždetsja dom učenyj (= Kievan Academy). O dnej tyx blažennyx,
 Rossye! Kolyko bo mužej soveršennýx
 Proyzvedet ty dom sej! Nad všimý že symý
 xramynamý zyždytel' Yoann slavymyj (= Ivan Mazepa)
 Načertan zrytsja. Bože dyvnyj y velykyj,
 otkryvyj mnî tolyku radost i tolykyj
 Svêt na mja yzlyjavyi. Dažd krêpost y sylu,
 dažd mnohodenstvye, dažd ko vsjakomu dîlu
 Pospîx blahopolučnyj, bran' vsehda pobîdnu!"
 (ed. Eremin, pp. 203–206).

⁶⁰ Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj, "Ob ukrainskij istoriografii XVIII veka. Neskol'ko sobraženij," *Bulletin de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS, Classe des Sciences Sociales* (Leningrad, 1934), pp. 215–33; English translation by Zenon E. Kohut in *The Eyewitness Chronicle*, pt. 1, ed. O. Pritsak (Munich, 1972), pp. 9*–16*.

⁶¹ See Zenon E. Kohut, "The Development of a Little Russian Identity and Ukrainian Nationbuilding," in this issue.

V

The wholesale transplantation of West European secular culture into the Russian Empire can be dated to 1804–1805, when universities of a new type were established there. For various reasons Kiev was endowed with a university only thirty years later (1834). Significantly, it was named “St. Volodimer’s University.”⁶²

Ten years later, there appeared in Kiev the greatest Ukrainian national poet, Taras Ševčenko, born near Kiev, but a cultural product of the Imperial St. Petersburg variant of Western Romanticism. His role was critical in forging the Ukrainian vernacular into a medium for secular literature of the highest order. Ševčenko abandoned the presecular terms Rus’/Little Russia for his native land, and linked his creativity with the secular name *Ukraine*.⁶³ (However, he never used the term “Ukrainian” in reference to himself or his countrymen.)⁶⁴ His legacy was the transformation of Kiev from the center of East Slavonic Orthodox piety (Metropolitanate, Caves Monastery) into the focal point for a Ukrainian secular national identity. Since the populist intelligentsia in the Eastern Ukraine was basically agnostic, in this system the secular figure of Ševčenko replaced St. Volodimer as the symbol of Kiev. Ševčenko, a secular hero associated with Kiev, became and remains to this day the symbol of modern Ukrainian nationhood, due to the continued influence of nineteenth-century populism which stressed ethno-cultural rather than political categories.

I do not know if it was an understanding of Ševčenko in this context that prompted the Soviet government in 1939 to rename Kiev’s “St. Volodimer University” as “Ševčenko University.”⁶⁵ Apparently the government officials felt that this was at least a logical conclusion to an irreducible intellectual development.

Thus, the sacral idea of “Kiev and all of Rus’” was introduced in Kiev during the eleventh–twelfth centuries by the Greek metropolitans, who were also political agents of the Byzantine Empire.

⁶² On the *Istoriia Rusov* and the transplantation of Western secular culture to the Ukraine, see Omeljan Pritsak, “Lypyns’kyj’s Place in Ukrainian Intellectual History,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 9 (1985): 245.

⁶³ Ševčenko’s participation in the clandestine political Cyrillo-Methodian Brotherhood during the period of his activity at the University of Kiev (1846–1847) should be stressed. See George S. N. Luckyj, *Between Gogol’ and Ševčenko* (Munich, 1971), pp. 162–95; Dennis Papazian, “Kostomarov and the Cyril-Methodian Ideology,” *Russian Review* 29 (1970): 59–73.

⁶⁴ *Slovnyk movy Ševčenko*, ed. V. S. Vaščenko et al., 2 vols. (Kiev, 1964), has entries only for *Ukrajina* (2: 359–60) and for *ukrajins’kyj (jazyk)* (2: 360).

⁶⁵ See *Istoriia Kyjivs’koho universytetu*, ed. O. Z. Žmuds’kyj (Kiev, 1959), p. 364.

All local attempts to secularize this idea of “all of Rus’” or/and “all of Little Rus’” in the Ukrainian lands failed. We can advance two reasons for this failure. First, in contrast to the North, in the South there was no enduring polity between 1340 and 1648, which would have been necessary for the establishment of common ties. The changing local political elites and the (also changing) foreign church administrations, especially since the idea of “all of Rus’” itself was not “national” but rather sacral and universalistic, were too disparate. The second reason was the original split between the higher foreign-born prelates and the lower clergy of local origins.

By inertia both splits continued into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, despite the facts that the church administration in the Ukrainian lands had been taken over by the local churchmen and that a native polity (the state of the Zaporozhian Host) had been established. This lack of cooperation prevented the creation of a basis for a well-defined Ukrainian secular national identity before the impact of Romanticism (see Excursus I, below). As a result, the *sacral* idea of “all of Rus’” simply vanished in the Ukraine soon after 1721, before the *secular* concept of “(all of) Little Rus’” could take firm root.

Excursus I: *Ideological Tampering with Historical Consciousness*

Why did the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle stop with 1291 and not continue through the 1340s? The Kingdom of Galicia and Volhynia remained an independent, economically and politically healthy polity. But a historian of Rus’ is confronted with a strange situation when he turns to the period following 1290. It is reminiscent of the chronicle’s description of the period prior to A.M. 6367/A.D. 859. After 1290 we are not told when Lev Danylovyč or any of his successors died, what happened to the senior member of the dynasty, Mstyslav Danylovyč, or how and through whose agency Jurij L’vovyč was crowned King of Galicia. Not a word about the Jurijevyči and Boleslav Jurij II. The period is a blank page. Why did this happen? What accounts for such an instance of national amnesia in a highly eventful epoch?

The answer is simple:⁶⁶ it was a “terrible vengeance” on the part of the Orthodox Rus’ Church leadership directed against a dynasty that dared act according to a political vision that rationalized their cooperation with the Roman Catholic world. In ca. 1307, Jurij I of Galicia dethroned his uncle Mstyslav of Volodymyr-in-Volhynia, at that time the senior of the dynasty,

⁶⁶ My monograph devoted to this question is being prepared for publication. These are the results of my research in capsule form.

and, having appropriated Volhynia for himself, initiated relations with the pope. Soon he was crowned King of Rus', and thereafter he showed no intention of patronizing the traditional Orthodox institutions. This coup d'état surprised both the newly named metropolitan of Halyč, who had not yet left Constantinople for his see, and the patriarch of Constantinople. The fortuitous death of the Kiev metropolitan provided the patriarch with an opportunity for an ingenious solution. The metropolitan of Halyč was now consecrated as metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus' and was dispatched to Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma, then the seat of the Kiev Metropolitanate. Peter of Rata, the Galician now turned North-Rus'ian ("St. Peter of Moscow"), not only initiated a policy of cooperation between the Kiev Metropolitanate and the rising powers in Moscow, but also expunged his former native country from historical memory. The fate of the "traitor" Galician dynasty was henceforth not to be mentioned in Rus' chronicle writing, as it subsequently developed in the North (since ca. 1300) under the metropolitan's auspices.⁶⁷

In 1395 the Lithuanians conquered Smolensk, a province which from the 1160s until the destruction of Kiev by the Mongols in 1240 was very closely connected to Kiev through dynastic ties. When Vitold (Vytautas) succeeded in establishing himself in Lithuania, he was initially confronted with two Rus' uprisings, one in Smolensk (1401–1404) and another in Pskov (1404–1408). In 1416 he appointed a Ruthenian "patriarch" in Lithuania (the Bulgarian Gregory Camblak), and sponsored a Rus' Orthodox literary revival in Smolensk. Although a Catholic and a Lithuanian "chauvinist" (if one may use modern terminology), Vitold—in his struggle with Jagiello (Jogaila) and the Catholic Poles—had to coopt the only higher cultural stratum in his realm, the Ruthenian Orthodox.

Between 1420 and 1440, scholars in Smolensk completed a historical compilation known as "The Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania," and a panegyric to Vitold. This represented the first revival of chronicle writing in the western Rus' territories after the events of 1307. Naturally, the Lithuanians were represented there as the legitimate successors of the Rus' princes. The great problem that the Smolensk scholars (perhaps aided by Camblak) faced was the lacuna of fifty years (1291–1340), for which there was no information in the existing northeastern Rus' chronicles (controlled by the northern metropolitan). The Smolensk scholars solved the problem by introducing at this point—anachronistically, of course—the Lithuanian Grand Duke Gedymin (Gediminas) (1315–1341) as the main

⁶⁷ See Aleksandr E. Presnjakov, *Obrazovanie velikorussskogo gosudarstva* (Petrograd, 1918), pp. 106–109.

actor. He supposedly had undertaken two expeditions of conquest, one against Volhynia, the other against Kiev. The annalists had difficulty with the chronology of events; therefore they are vague about two dates: 1285, i.e., 30 years before Gedymin became ruler of Lithuania, and 1321/1322.⁶⁸ All the Rus' princes mentioned under these dates either do not belong in this period or were invented.⁶⁹ Lev I Danylovyč ruled 1264–1300 in Halyč and Xolm, but not in Luc'k in Volhynia (as reported in the Lithuanian Chronicle). Volodymyr, Prince of Volhynia (d. 1289), was not the son of Lev I but of Vasyl'ko Romanovyč (d. 1269). Lev I's son was King Jurij I, who became anathema to Metropolitan Peter, with the result that—as mentioned above—he and his kin were expunged from Rus' Orthodox memory. Apparently the Smolensk annalists did not attempt to fill the gap by referring to Polish sources. Whether this oversight was intentional is difficult to say.

Another instance of national amnesia, artificially produced by the ecclesiastical elites of Kiev who wrote history, occurred as late as the sixties of the seventeenth century: this was the publication of the *Synopsis* (1671–1681).

The great victories of Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj, Hetman of the Zaporozhian Host, over the Poles in the spring and summer of 1648 were soon interpreted by the Kiev churchmen as a victory over Catholicism. But they mistrusted Xmel'nyc'kyj, who was an alumnus of a Jesuit college (rather than of the Orthodox Kiev Mohyla Academy). In order to find out more about him, they invited Xmel'nyc'kyj to Kiev at the end of 1648, possible at that time because the Kiev Orthodox hierarchy had been strengthened by the visit of the Orthodox Patriarch of Jerusalem, Paisius. The ensuing discussions between Xmel'nyc'kyj and Metropolitan Kosov (1650–1651) failed to produce agreement. Kosov demanded joint rule over the Ukraine by the hetman and the metropolitan. Xmel'nyc'kyj, who was raised in the

⁶⁸ The chronological information of this "chronicle" posed problems to the historians of the sixteenth to seventeenth century. While Maciej Strykowski in 1582 synchronized the events around the years 1320 (conquest of Volhynia) and 1321 (conquest of Kiev) [see *Kronika polska, litewska, żmódzka i wszystkiej Rusi*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Warsaw, 1846), 1: 362–68], the author of the *Hustyn' (Hustynja) Chronicle* chose other dates: 1304 (conquest of Volhynia) and 1305 (conquest of Kiev), see "Gustinskaja letopis'," in *PSRL*, vol. 2 (pt. 3) (St. Petersburg, 1843), p. 348. Gizel's *Synopsis* condensed the two alleged events into one and dated it to 1320 (ed. Rothe, p. 351).

⁶⁹ The alleged prince of Kiev, Stanyslav, contemporary with Gedymin, was freely invented. Cf. *PSRL*, vol. 32, ed. Ulaščik, pp. 37–38.

political culture of Poland, refused to yield power from the noblemen (*szlachta* = Cossack *staršyna*) to the churchmen.⁷⁰

The response of the Kiev churchmen is reflected in their attitude toward Xmel'nyc'kyj's name and his state. The author of the *Synopsis* ignored their very existence. This attitude certainly contributed to the political "Ruin" of the Cossack state in the Ukraine after Xmel'nyc'kyj's death. Paradoxically, it also contributed to the ruin of the Kiev Metropolitanate.

Had plentiful contemporary Polish and Russian documentation not existed, and if—after the catastrophe at Poltava (1709)—the new secular history writing elite (*soslovije vojskovŷx kanceljarystov*) had not looked for inspiration to the "glorious" revolution of Xmel'nyc'kyj, the modern historian, looking only to the authority of the Kievan historical presentation as reflected in the Kievan *Synopsis*, would not know that Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj had ever existed.

One can understand the ire of the "retired" scribe of the Zaporozhian Host, Samuil Velyčko, who in 1720 wrote:

But I saw that the chivalrous and heroic deeds of our Sarmatian-Cossack ancestors, which equal those of foreign nations, have been left unrecorded and unexplained by our writers and have been covered with a mantle of obscurity and forgotten due to the sloth of the authors. . . . If any praise and glory for our forefathers is to be found in writing, it is not found with our *lazy* [emphasis mine—O.P.] historians, but in works of foreign historians: Greeks, Latins, German, and Polish historiographers. . . .⁷¹

Excursus II: *Little Rus'* and *All of Rus'*

The name "Little Rus'" (ἡ Ῥωσία μικρά) first occurs in Byzantine terminology ca. 1300, when it was necessary to erect a second Metropolitanate in Rus' after the Kiev metropolitan left that city (see fn. 11). The northern Rus' Metropolitanate received the designation "Great Rus'" (ἡ Ῥωσία μεγάλη), while the new "Little Rus'" Metropolitanate, with its see at

⁷⁰ See Oleksander Ohloblyn, "Problema deržavnoji vlady na Ukrajinі za Xmel'nyččyny j Perejaslavs'ka Uhoda 1654 roku," *Ukrajins'kyj istoryk* 2 (1965), pt. 1–2: 5–13, and pt. 3–4: 11–16.

⁷¹ "Našyx že sarmato-kozackyx" prodkov," podobnije inostrannym" v" voinskyx" slučajax davnyx vremen" y vŷkov" byvšije rycerskije otvahy y bohatyrskije dŷjanija bez opysanija y objasnenija črez" jix" vlasnyx pysarov" ostavlennije, y vsehdašnoho zabvenija nŷkčemnym" lŷnasty jix" plaščem" uvydŷx" pokrytije. . . . Ašče-že čto onym" prodkom" našym" kozakoruskym" poxvaly hodnoho y obrŷtysja možet", to ne v" našyx lŷnyvyx", ale v" inostrannyx, hrečeskyx, latynskyx, nŷmeckyx i polskyx hystoryohrafax". . . ." *Samijla Velyčka Skazanije o Vojni kozackoj z Poljakamy*, [ed. Kateryna Lazarevs'ka] (Kiev, 1926), p. 2

Halyč, embraced the dioceses Halyč, Volodymyr-in-Volhynia, Xolm, Peremyšl', Luc'k, and Turov (in that order).⁷²

But although the deserted see of Kiev was theoretically subordinate to the metropolitan of Great Rus', the city of Kiev was regarded by the Patriarchal Synod (*endomusa*) as being located in Little Rus'; this was substantiated by the decisions of the *endomusa* from ca. 1354: εἶχε μὲν ἡ ἁγιωτάτη μητρόπολις Ῥωσίας μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κάστρον καὶ χωρῶν τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν ἐνορίαν ταύτης τελούντων καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ Μικρῇ Ῥωσίᾳ κάστρον, τὸ Κύεβον ἐπονομαζόμενον, ἐν ᾧ ἦν ἄνωθεν ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία τῆς μητροπόλεως, ἠύρισκοντο δὲ καὶ οἱ ἱερώτατοι ἀρχιερεῖς Ῥωσίας τὴν οἴκησιν ποιούμενοι ἐν αὐτῇ. ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ καιροῦ συγχύσεως καὶ ἀνωμαλίας καὶ τῆς τῶν γειτονούντων Ἀλαμάνων δεινῆς ἐπιθέσεως ἐφθάρη, καὶ εἰς στενοχωρίαν κατήνησε. . . , i.e., "Among the other places and villages which have been the subject of the jurisdiction of the most holy Metropolis of Rus' was the place in Little Rus' called Kiev. In this place the cathedral church was located from the beginning, and the most holy hierarchs of Rus' made their residence there. But during the period of confusion and disorder and the terrible attacks of the neighboring *Alamans*⁷³ the place was ruined and reduced to a wretched state. . . ."⁷⁴

The Metropolitanate existed between 1300–1347 and 1371–1400 (?). It was Boleslav Jurij II (poisoned in 1340 at Volodymyr-in-Volhynia)⁷⁵ who first applied this terminology to his polity (Galicia and Volhynia): *Nos Georgius, Dei gratia natus dux Totius Russiae Minoris*, i.e., "all of Little Rus'."⁷⁶

After the demise of the Galician-Volhynian state the term "Little Rus'" fell into oblivion until it was rediscovered by Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj (d. 1627), who used it again in its sacral meaning, namely, in referring to the restored (in 1620) Kiev Orthodox metropolitanate. Soon the phrase became part of the official title of the Kiev metropolitan, used side-by-side with

⁷² *Acta Patriarchatus* 1, no. 158: 351.

⁷³ Here the Byzantine devines used the Turkic (Oghuz) designation for "bands; bandits" with relation to the Tatars. Concerning the etymology of the word *aleman / alaman* 'bandit', see È. V. Sevortjan, *Ètimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov*, vol. [1] (Moscow, 1974), p. 134. The Turkic word Ἀλαμάνοι was not recognized as such by Gyula Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. 2, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1958). Sometimes this word is confused with the Ottoman designation (< French) for "Germans."

⁷⁴ *Acta Patriarchatus* 1, no. 158: 351.

⁷⁵ It is important to investigate whether the extraordinary activities of the Moscow-oriented Greek metropolitan of "all of Rus'" Theognost (1328–1353) in Western Rus', especially in Volhynia (see *Analecta Byzantino-Russica*, ed. W. Regel [St. Petersburg, 1891–1898; rptd. New York: Ben Franklin (s.a.), pp. 52–56]) were crucial in the conspiracy of 1340. The poisoning of a ruler was not typical for Medieval Rus' mores.

⁷⁶ Řežabek-Kunik, *Boleslav-Jurij II* (see fn. 47), no. 8, p. 154.

another more traditional phrase, “all [of] Rus’ ”; noteworthy is the fact that Ukrainians preferred to use the “learned” form *Rossija* (written with *o* or ω), whereas Muscovite Russians styled the name as “vernacular” *Rusija* (written with a *u*).

In the middle of the seventeenth century the Muscovite chancery began to distinguish the two originally sacral terms “all of Rus’,” which they had applied indiscriminately both to their patrimonial polity and to the Patriarchate, and “all of Little Rus’,” their new designation for the contemporary Kiev Metropolitanate. This terminology was used consistently by the tsar and the patriarch in their correspondence with the Kiev metropolitan even before the Perejaslav Treaty of 1654.

On the other hand, Metropolitan Syl’vester Kosov and even the patriarch of Constantinople, to whom the Kiev Metropolitanate was still subordinate, usually ignored this Muscovite usage and preferred to keep the title “all of Rus’ ” (rather than “all of Little Rus’ ”) for the Kiev Metropolitanate. Some instances of that usage follow.

(1) Tsar Alexis Mixajlovič to Metropolitan Kosov in 1650: “Velikomu gospodinu preosvjaščennomu Seliverstu, arxiepiskopu, božieju milostiju mitropolitu Kievskomu i Galitckomu i Vsea Malye [sic!] Rusii.”⁷⁷

(2) Kosov to the voievoda of Belgorod, B. Repnin (1 August 1650): “Božyjeju mylostyju apxyjepyskop mytropolyt Kyjevskyj, Halyckyj i Vseja Malyja [sic!] Rossiji. . .”; but Kosov’s title in his signature is styled differently: “Sylvester Kosov, mytropolyt Kyjevskyj, Halyckyj i Vseja [sic!] Rossiji.”⁷⁸

(3) Kosov’s circular letter of 7 May 1652: “Selvester Kosov mylostyju božyjeju pravoslavnŭj arxyjepyskop mytropolyt Kyjevskyj, Halyckyj i Vseja Rosiji ekzarxa svjatoho apostolskoho fronu Konstantynopolskoho.”⁷⁹

The patriarch of Constantinople, Parthenius, styled Kosov’s title in the same way (18 February 1651; the letter was written in Latin): “Sanctissime, eloquentissime metropolita Kiovensis, Galicki et Totius Russiae domine Sylvester.”⁸⁰

Both the tsar of Muscovy and the patriarch of Moscow appropriated for themselves the form “Rusija”: “car’ i velikij knjaz’ Aleksej Mixajlovič

⁷⁷ *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiej*, 3 vols. (Moscow, 1954) 2: 345.

⁷⁸ *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiej*, 2: 380.

⁷⁹ *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiej*, 3: 215.

⁸⁰ *Dokumenty ob osvoboditel’noj vojne ukrainskogo naroda 1648–1654 gg.* (Kiev, 1965), p. 383.

vsea Rusii samoderžec,” and “svjatejšij Nikon, patriarx Moskovskij i Vsea Rusii.”⁸¹

It was Ivan I. Kalita (1328–1341) who (following the advice of Metropolitan Peter) appropriated for himself, on the model of the metropolitan’s title, the sacral formula *vseja Rusi*.⁸² The patriarchal chancery in Constantinople soon recognized that usage. Thus Simeon Ivanovič (1341–1353) was styled by Emperor John VI Cantacuzenes (1341–1354) in 1347 as μέγας ῥήξ πάσης Ῥωσίας (= *knjaz’ velikii vseja Rusi*), on the pattern of the title of the Kiev metropolitan ἕξαρχος πάσης Ῥωσίας.⁸³ The final adoption of these two parallel formulae of *vseja Rusi*, one for the “Kiev” Metropolitanate and the other for the Muscovite polity, was the work of Metropolitan Aleksej (1353–1378),⁸⁴ a scion of the Černihiv boyars.

After the Perejaslav Treaty, following the tsar’s “secular” usage of the title “Tsar... of Little Rus’,” the Moscow patriarch was illegitimately styled (in April 1654) the patriarch “of Little Rus’,”⁸⁵ despite the fact that the Kiev Metropolitanate was still a part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

After the liquidation of the Halyč Metropolitanate (ca. 1400), the Kiev metropolitans (first the Orthodox and after 1596 the Uniate) added “of Halyč” to their official title. This interrelation between Kiev and Halyč (later replaced by Lviv) was never terminated. In 1807 the Uniate Metropolitanate of Halyč (with residence in Lviv) was restored, following the death of the last Uniate metropolitan of Kiev, Theodosius Rostoc’kyj (1788–1805). The Metropolitanate was abolished in 1795 by Catherine II, and the metropolitan was exiled to St. Petersburg, where he died.

The Cossack chroniclers of the eighteenth century combined the two terms: “Little Rus’” and “Ukraine.” Hence, Samuil Velyčko (1720; quoted above) used the following phrases to designate his *patria*: *Malorosyjskuju Ukraynu; Ukrayno-Malorosijskije polja*; or *otčyzna naša Ukraynomalorosyjskaja; zapustînyy tohobočnom’ ukrayno malorosyjskom’*; or, simply, *o tom’ zapustînyy ukraynskom’ vîdenijje*.⁸⁶ The concept of “Little Rus’” had begun to be shelved.

Harvard University

⁸¹ *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiej*, 3: 406, 407.

⁸² E.g., *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*, ed. S. N. Valk (Moscow and Leningrad, 1949), pp. 142–43 (nos. 84, 86).

⁸³ *Acta patriarchatus*, vol. 1, pp. 261 (no. 117), 263 (no. 118); p. 267 (no. 120).

⁸⁴ Presnjakov, *Obrazovanie velikoruskago gosudarstva*, pp. 371–373.

⁸⁵ Xarlampovič, *Malorossijskoe vlijanie*, p. 164.

⁸⁶ Velyčko, *Skazanie*, p. 3.