History ETDs

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

2-14-2014

Power and Property Relations in Rus and Latin Europe: A Comparative Analysis

Yulia Mikhailova

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/hist_etds

Recommended Citation

Yulia Mikhailova

Candidate

History

Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:

Timothy Graham, Chairperson

Melissa Bokovoy

Tanya Ivanova-Sullivan

Erika Monahan

David Prestel

Power and Property Relations in Rus and Latin Europe: A Comparative Analysis

by

Yulia Mikhailova

M.A., Russian, Michigan State University, 2002

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
History

The University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico

December, 2013

Dedication

To my husband Oleg Makhnin and to my daughters Katya and Tanya Makhnina

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my advisor, Professor Timothy Graham, for his support, guidance, and, above all, for his Latin reading group, without which this dissertation would be impossible. I would also like to thank David Prestel and Tania Ivanova-Sullivan for their detailed feedback on my drafts and for all their comments, suggestions, and corrections that helped make this dissertation better, and I thank all my committee members for their help, patience, and support. I thank Oleg and Katya for their help with Russian-English translations, I thank Katya for her help with English, and I thank Tanya and all my family members for their patience and support. Finally, I cannot thank Oleg enough for formatting this dissertation for me, which at times appeared to be a more difficult task than writing it.

Power and Property Relations in Rus and Latin Europe: A Comparative Analysis

by

Yulia Mikhailova

M.A., Russian, Michigan State University, 2002

Ph.D., History, University of New Mexico, 2013

Abstract

This dissertation offers a comparative analysis of forms of social and political organization in eleventh- and twelfth-century Rus, Norman England, and Aquitaine as they are represented in accounts of conflicts, disputes, peace-making, and interpersonal agreements found in Rusian, English, and Aquitanian political narratives. From this analysis, Rus, the Eastern European polity that later gave rise to Russia, Ukraine, and Belorussia, emerges as a regional variation of a European society, in contrast with the predominant view of Rus as being profoundly different from Latin Europe. A comparison of narratives from all the three regions examined in the dissertation shows that they display very similar understanding of key concepts of aristocratic medieval politics, such as honor, vengeance, reconciliation, and legitimacy as well as significant parallels between the unwritten "rules of play" (Gerd Althoff) that guided behavior of lay elites. The parallels with Rus are most pronounced in the Western sources written in the vernacular (*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*) or semi-vernacular (*Conventum Hugonis*); the *Conventum* displays particularly striking similarities with some Russian chronicles. Western vernacular texts, as well as Rusian chronicles written in East Slavonic, probably offer a more direct representation of

oral political discourse than learned Latin works do, and similarities between Rusian and Western vernacular narratives may be explained by similarities between political cultures reflected in those narratives. One aspect of the comparative analysis offered in this dissertation deals with elements of the noble fief and feudal pyramid seen by many historians as an exclusive feature of the medieval West. According to Susan Reynolds, they were created by academic lawyers at the time of the rise of the centralized bureaucratic state. This dissertation argues that elements of the noble fief and feudal pyramid existed in twelfth-century Rus in no lesser degree than in its contemporary England and in eleventh-century Aquitaine. The absence of any knowledge of Roman law and of a bureaucratic state in Rus along with the presence of relations looking remarkably "feudo-vassalic" suggests that such relations in the West may have more "native" roots than is allowed by Susan Reynolds and her followers.

Contents

Contents

Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

The present dissertation offers a comparative analysis of forms of social and political organization in Rus and in Western Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In the historiography of Western Europe this period is known as the "High" or "Central" Middle Ages, an important stage in the formation of distinctly European social and political structures. In the words of Judith Bennett, "all [historians] would ... agree that these were the centuries when the medieval West came of age."[1] As for Rus, these were the centuries of its existence as an independent Christian polity after the Kievan princes converted to Christianity in 998 and before Rusian lands became part of the Mongol empire in the 1230s. The goal of my comparative analysis is twofold: on the one hand, I seek to help situate Rus within the broader context of medieval European history, and, on the other hand, to contribute to a better understanding

---

[1]Judith M. Bennett, *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, 11th edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2011), 133.

of how high medieval Western society functioned, and in particular, how land was used to mediate relations among the nobility.

An overriding assumption that has long dominated scholarship in both European and Slavic history was that Rus was part of a Byzantine Commonwealth separate from Latin Europe. Recent studies have challenged the concept of a Byzantine Commonwealth that stood in opposition to Europe, as well as ideas of Russian exceptionalism. According to these widespread ideas, Russia has been isolated from the West since the tenth century when Rus, to which Russia traces its origins, accepted Christianity from Constantinople rather than from Rome. Christian Raffensperger and Alexander Nazarenko have recently demonstrated that Rus had considerable political, religious, marital, and economic ties with European kingdoms, and Raffensperger also has made a compelling case for the concept of a "Byzantine Ideal," esteemed and emulated in all parts of Europe in the eleventh and the first half of the twelfth centuries which describes reality better than the idea of a Byzantine Commonwealth consisting of Orthodox countries of Southern and Eastern Europe.[2] According to Raffensperger, appropriation of Byzantine customs and art as an attempt to gain legitimacy and prestige by association with the surviving remnant of the Roman Empire was widely practiced at Western European courts, and, therefore, was not an exclusive feature of Rus and the Balkan Orthodox polities, which would set them apart from the rest of Europe.[3]

However, the concept of a Byzantine Commonwealth that allegedly isolated Orthodox countries from Catholic Europe is only one aspect of the theory of Ru-

---

[2]Aleksandr Vasil'evich Nazarenko, *Drevniia Rus na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh: Mezhdistsiplinarnye ocherki kulturnykh, torgovykh, politicheskikh sviazei IX-XII vekov* (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kultury, 2001); Christian Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World*, Harvard Historical Studies 177 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

[3]Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, 10-46.

sian/Russian exceptionalism.[4] Another widespread assumption is that the social and political organizations of Rus and Western Europe were profoundly different. The absence of feudalism has been named as one of the most important features that set Rus apart from Western Europe.

Understandings of feudalism in the traditional scholarship fall into two categories, which can be broadly defined as Marxist and non-Marxist.[5] Feudalism in its Marxist sense is concerned primarily with the relations between nobles and peasants. Thus, Geoffrey Hosking uses a Marxist understanding of feudalism when he writes in his survey of Russian history, "The prince and his *druzhina* (retainers) ... were not ... a feudal ruling class, since they did not possess extensive landed estates, but rather small domains and wealthy townhouses. What they levied from the rest of the community was ... not dues based on ownership of land but rather tribute extorted by superior military power."[6] Feudalism in this sense is a rough equivalent of the manorial system. On the other hand, non-Marxist feudalism is concerned predominantly with the relations *within* the noble class. The classical definition formulated by Marc Bloch includes both relations between peasantry and nobility and relations among the nobles. According to Bloch, fundamental features of feudalism are "[a] subject peasantry; widespread use of service tenement (i.e. the fief) ...; the supremacy of a class of specialized warriors; ties of obedience and protection which ... within the warrior class, assume the distinctive form called vassalage; fragmentation of authority; and, in the midst of all this, the survival of other forms of association,

---

[4]"Rusian" refers to pre-Mongolian Rus, the Eastern European polity that later gave rise to Russia, Ukraine, and Belorussia. The proponents of the concept of Russian exceptionalism often trace back to Rus the features allegedly unique to Russia.

[5]See Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 3, 10-12, 15; Fredric L. Cheyette, "'Feudalism': A Memoir and an Assessment," in Belle S. Tuten and Tracey L. Billado, eds., *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 121-2.

[6]Geoffrey Hosking, *Russia and the Russians: A History*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2011), 34.

family and State."[7] Societies that had these features formed what Bloch called "the feudal zone," to which Rus did not belong.[8] François-Louis Ganshof offered a more narrow definition of feudalism as "a body of institutions creating and regulating the obligations of obedience and service – mainly military service – on the part of a free man (the vassal) towards another free man (the lord), and the obligation of protection and maintenance on the part of the lord with regard to his vassal. The obligation of maintenance had usually as one of its effects the grant by the lord to his vassal of a unit of real property known as a fief."[9] Rus – as well as other regions of Northern and Eastern Europe – clearly lacked such a body of institutions.

Most importantly, as was repeatedly pointed out in the traditional scholarship, Rus lacked the type of social relations known as the "feudal contract," unequal, but nonetheless reciprocal, obligations of the lord and the vassal towards each other created by the ritual of homage.[10] These contractual relations "befitted what was seen as the uniquely free character of European civilization," in the words of Reynolds.[11] According to Jacques Le Goff, "a system of loyalty" associated with vassalage "was this that would make it possible for hierarchy and individualism to coexist" in modern Europe.[12] In contrast with Western Europe, the absence of the tradition of the mutual obligations based on a free contract between the superior and the subordinate in Rus – or in the "Byzantine Commonwealth" in general – has been connected with the failure to develop the rule of law and with authoritarian and totalitarian tendencies in Russian history. When the Soviet medievalist Aron Gurevich described the Byzantine aristocrats as the emperor's "lackeys looking for a career and a chance to

---

[7]Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, translated by L. A. Manyon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 446.

[8]Bloch, *Feudal Society*, 70, 228.

[9]François-Louis Ganshof, *Feudalism*, translated by Philip Grierson, 3rd English ed. (New York: Harper, 1961), xvi.

[10]See Ganshof, *Feudalism*, 70-81.

[11]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 54.

[12]Jacques Le Goff, *The Birth of Europe*, translated by Janet Lloyd (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 59.

enrich themselves, devoid of personal dignity," his readers easily recognized a covert portrayal of the Soviet high-ranking officials. Gurevich explained the *nomenklatura*-like qualities of the Byzantine aristocracy by the fact that "Byzantium knew nothing of the feudal treaty, the loyalty of the vassal or the group solidarity of the peers. ... It is quite impossible to imagine anything like Magna Charta – a legal compromise between the monarch and his vassals – in a Byzantine setting."[13] An implicit connection between the "feudal" relations among the nobility and the subsequent development of democracy and the rule of law is also present in the work of the Russian pre-revolutionary scholar Nikolai Pavlov-Silvanski, the only historian who argued for the existence of the "feudal contract" in Rus/Muscovy.[14] It is hardly coincidental that he was a member of the Constitutional-Democratic party that sought to establish western-style democracy in Russia.[15]

The "feudal contract" is part of the classical concept of European feudalism best represented by the works by Bloch and Ganshof. This classical concept has

---

[13]A. J. Gurevich, *Categories of Medieval Culture*, translated by G. L. Campbell (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985), 128. On the more recent position of Gurevich in regards to the debate about feudalism and on his opinion about *Fiefs and Vassals*, see A. Ia. Gurevich, "Feodalizm pered sudom istrorikov, ili o srednevekovoi krestianskoi tsivilizatsii," in I. G. Galkova et al., eds., *Feodalizm: poniatie i realii* (Moscow: Institut vseobshchei istorii RAN, 2008), 11-51. On the absence of the "feudal contract" – or, indeed, any concept of a contract in Rus and, subsequently, Russia, see Yu. M. Lotman, "'Dogovor' i 'vruchenie sebia' kak arkhetipicheskie modeli kultury," in idem, *Izbrannye statii*, 3 vols. (Talinn: Alexandra, 1993), vol. 3, 345-55. For the widespread opinions about the "feudal contract" in the present-day Russian intellectual milieu, see e.g. the site *Historical Personality* at http://rus-history.ru/feodalnaya-razdroblennost-na-r/rossiiskii-feodalizm-bil-osobi.php; Igor Kobylin, *Fenomen totalitarizma v kontekste evropeiskoi kultury* at http://cryptograd.ru/prel/kobylin_igor%27_igorevich_-_fenomen_totalitarizma_v_kontekste_evropejskoj_kul%27tury.html (accessed 01.10.2013).

[14]N. P. Pavlov-Silvanskii, *Feodalizm v udelnoi Rusi* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1910), reprinted in Russian Reprint Series 21 (The Hague: Europe Printing, 1966).

[15]On the connection between the concept of the "feudal contract" and a liberal political ideology, see Cheyette, "'Feudalism'," in Tuten and Billado, *Feud, Violence and Practice*, 123.

been largely rejected by modern scholars. The process of a broad reconsideration of the traditional paradigm of the Western Middle Ages started in the 1970s, when Elizabeth Brown published her famous article arguing that historians should discard the term "feudalism" because it is fundamentally misleading.[16] Brown's criticisms were developed further by Susan Reynolds, who argued that the concepts of vassalage and the fief "as they are generally defined by medieval historians today, are post-medieval constructs" and as such they "distort the relations of property and politics that the sources record" and force historians "to fit their findings into a framework of interpretation that was devised in the sixteenth century and elaborated in the seventeenth and eighteenth." Therefore, Reynolds rejected the concepts of both vassalage and the fief because "[w]e cannot understand medieval society ... if we see it through seventeenth- or eighteenth-century spectacles. Yet every time we think of fiefs and vassals we do just that."[17]

Although the main thrust of *Fiefs and Vassals* is negative because the goal of the book is to dismantle the classical teaching on feudalism, not to create a new theoretical construct to replace the old one,[18] Reynolds does propose an alternative model of medieval society. Her model stresses "strong collective ideas" that were more important than dyadic interpersonal relations. According to her, medieval societies were held together mainly by effective governments, whose rule was based on consultation and consensus. She depicts widely shared medieval values and norms, such as a concept of "the public welfare" and "a belief in hierarchy, obedience, and loyalty on the one hand and a belief in custom, immanent justice, mutuality of obligations, and collective judgment on the other." In the medieval sources, Reynolds sees "the belief in *peoples* as natural, given units of society and politics [emphasis original]" and an equally strong belief in "kingdoms as the archetypes of political

---

[16]Elizabeth A. R. Brown, "The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe," *American Historical Review* 79 (1974): 1063-88.

[17]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 2-3.

[18]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 475, 482.

units and kings as the archetypes of rulers." Accordingly, the concept of *subditus*, a ruler's subject, was more important than that of a vassal; and great men, such as counts, owed service and obedience to the king more as subjects and office-holders to the supreme ruler than as vassals to their lord.[19]

 Fiefs and Vassals generated a heated discussion. Now, almost twenty years later, fiefs, vassalage, and occasionally even feudalism – or, more often, "feudo-vassalic relations" - are still present in scholarly discourse contrary to the predictions of Reynolds' most enthusiastic supporters back in the 1990s.[20] However, even among historians who find these concepts useful, hardly anyone still thinks of them in terms of a coherent body of institutions that dominated the social organization and made other "forms of association," using the phrase by Bloch, relatively insignificant. Thus, Gerd Althoff, who believes that "feudalism – in the sense of a network of interpersonal relationships" – "most certainly did exist" even before the twelfth century, also believes that "it cannot be considered in isolation, however, but must be discussed in the context of all other processes and techniques with which people in the Middle Ages sought to engender the obligation to help and support."[21] Similarly, Hélène Débax, who has examined feudo-vassalic relations in Languedoc, and Jürgen Dendorfer, co-editor of a volume on feudo-vassalic relations in the Empire, Provence, and the Low Countries, describe these relations as one form of social ties that bound together members of medieval society along with other equally important

---

 [19]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 25-7, 34-5, 111, 138-140, 291, 311, 402- 4; eadem, "*Fiefs and Vassals* after Twelve Years," in Sverre Bagge, Michael H. Gelting, and Thomas Lindkvist, eds., *Feudalism: New Landscapes of Debate* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 15-26, at 17, 24-25.

 [20]For the predictions of the imminent disappearance of the term "feudalism" and its derivatives see e.g. Paul Hyams, "The End of Feudalism? *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* by Susan Reynolds," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 27 (1997): 655-62; Fredric L. Cheyette, review of *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* by Susan Reynolds, *Speculum* 71 (1996), 998-1006. For the present state of scholarship, see Cheyette, "'Feudalism'"; Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*.

 [21]Gerd Althoff, "Establishing Bonds: Fiefs, Homage, and Other Means to Create Trust," in Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 101-14, at 101.

forms, such as kinship.[22] "Feudo-vassalic relations" appears to be the closest English equivalent of the German *das Lehnswesen*, which Dendorfer defines as "the interplay of land grants, vassalage, and the duties resulting from them."[23] Most contributions to the volume co-edited by Dendorfer examine various types of sources in different regions and find unambiguous evidence for the existence of *das Lehnswesen* no earlier than the second half of the twelfth century; Jan-Dirk Müller, who analyzes German epic songs of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, does not find any evidence for feudo-vassalic relations at all.[24]

Another recent work that makes use of the concept of "feudo-vassalic relations" is a study of the ritual of homage in Ottonian Germany by Levi Roach.[25] Roach argues that in the tenth and eleventh centuries homage did not create "a putative 'feudal contract'" between the parties involved in the ritual. Rather, it was a flexible rite used to signify various types of relations. However, Roach sees "important developments towards something approximating" the classical "feudal system" which, according to him, "comes more fully into view by the second half of the twelfth century."[26]

There are also numerous works on medieval social and political history that do not refer to anything "feudo" or anything "vassalic" at all. Their authors, in accordance with the injunctions of Brown and Reynolds, adhere to concepts and

---

[22]Hélène Débax, "L'aristocratie languedocienne et la société féodale," in Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 99; Jürgen Dendorfer, Introduction to Jürgen Dendorfer and Roman Deutinger, eds., *Das Lehnswesen im Hochmittelalter. Forschungskonstrukte – Quellenbefunde – Deutungsrelevanz* (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2010), 77-100, at 16, 23.

[23]Dendorfer, Introduction to Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 19, 21, 26. On the difference between the German concepts of *Lehnswesen* and *Feudalismus*, see Levi Roach, "Submission and Homage: Feudo-Vassalic Relations and the Settlement of Disputes in Ottonian Germany," *History* 97 (2012): 356-7.

[24]Jan-Dirk Müller, "Die Ordnung des *rîche* in epischer deutscher Literatur des 12. and 13. Jahrhunderts," in Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 125-41.

[25]Roach, "Submission and Homage," 355-79.

[26]Roach, "Submission and Homage," 355, 369.

notions found in medieval texts and try to avoid the use of any post-medieval the-
oretical constructs as much as possible. Of course, to achieve this goal completely,
one must also avoid the use of any modern language and write in Latin, Old French
or whichever languages are used in the sources.

The dilemma of a historian who does not want to impose anachronistic categories
on medieval sources is described by Paul Hyams in his work on medieval English
feud.[27] Hyams does not deem it feasible to come up with a precise definition for
"a social practice as amorphous as feud" and questions the usefulness of definitions
in general: "Definition arguments among historians are among the most arid and
unproductive of all their disagreements." Furthermore, feud, the subject of much
recent research, "like its unconnected dictionary neighbor 'feudalism,' is a much
overused term, a notion in real peril of collapsing and losing all precision and utility."
On the other hand, Hyams acknowledges that "one cannot analyze process without
some delineation of what it is and where it starts and ends." Therefore, he proceeds
to propose not a definition, but a "loosely delineated notion" consisting of a list of
features which, if present in a "particular behavior pattern," turn this behavior into a
feud. These features are not listed in any medieval text but are derived from multiple
narrative sources that describe either what "various Germanic languages apparently
denoted by the precursors of our word 'feud'" or what is signified by the Germanic
word *werra*, Old French *guere* and Latin *inimicitia*. In sum, Hyams "endeavored
to construct ... from the various kinds of available evidence behavioral patterns"
of feud.[28] Thus, the notion of "feud" discussed in his article is still constructed or
"delineated" – however "loosely" – by a modern scholar rather than taken directly
from the sources. Even if the term "feud" is arguably source-based, notions such as
"behavioral pattern" or "social practice" are, of course, scholarly constructs that go

---

[27]Paul R. Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud in the High Middle Ages?"
in Susanna A. Throop and Paul R. Hyams, eds., *Vengeance in the Middle Ages: Emotion,
Religion and Feud* (Farnham, U. K.: Ashgate, 2010), 151-75.

[28]Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 163.

back not to medieval sources but to anthropological theory.

However, the important difference between the scholarly terms used by Hyams and other present-day medievalists and the old-school terms such as "feudalism" is that recent terminology is constructed – or "delineated" – with much more precision and attention to the sources. Current terms are also much more narrowly focused. If "feudalism" described a five-century-long period of Western European history, Hyams' "feud" describes "behavioral patterns followed in certain circumstances by some people in England between ... the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, in order to avenge perceived wrongs done to the shame of themselves and their friends."[29] This "feud" is still a scholarly model, but it is a kind of model that Hyams envisaged while responding to "the end of feudalism" brought about by Reynolds, a model "derivable from strictly contemporary medieval material."[30]

In his review of *Fiefs and Vassals*, Hyams predicted that the demise of the conceptual framework of "feudalism" would make medievalists "free to frame new formulations that facilitate a better understanding of how Europe functioned as a single culture."[31] Indeed, since the mid-1990s, there has been a virtual explosion of new topics and subjects in medieval research. In addition to "feud," scholars of medieval Western and Central Europe, Spain, and the Mediterranean world have examined subjects such as vengeance, conflict and peace-making, concepts of honor and shame, construction of authority and legitimacy, political and social roles of friendship and kinship, and social uses of emotions.

It is obvious that this revolutionary change in the conceptual framework of Western medieval history has profound implications for comparative studies in general and scholarship on Rus in particular. The rejection of the concept of "feudalism" in the sense of a coherent sociopolitical system unique for the medieval West removes

---

[29]Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 164.
[30]Hyams, "The End of Feudalism," 660.
[31]Ibid.

the cornerstone from the theory of Rus exceptionalism. Back in 1997, Hyams expressed the belief that when new formulations replace the outdated "feudal" model, they will not only facilitate a better understanding of medieval Europe, but will also "promote comparisons with more remote regions and different times."[32] So far, in the area of Rus studies, this prediction has not been realized. Apparently, to arrive at a conclusion as to how Rus – or, indeed, any other region – was similar to, or different from, Western Europe, it is necessary to base the examination of the sources on the same analytical categories that are used by Western medievalists. Did people in Rus pursue vengeance, start and end conflicts or legitimize authority in similar or different ways from people in medieval France, England, and other regions of Western Europe? How similar or how different are the notions of honor and shame or of kinship and friendship in Rusian and in Western sources? How comparable are social and political uses of publicly expressed emotions? To my knowledge, nobody has ever asked such questions. To be sure, Peter Stefanovich has made an attempt to compare the concepts of honor in Rus and in the medieval West.[33] Stefanovich has thoroughly analyzed Rusian sources, but at the same time he makes unfounded claims about the honor in the West without making any references to either primary sources or scholarly literature, as we shall see.

The article by Stefanovich exemplifies what Nazarenko has called the "annoying rift" between the scholarship of Rus and Western medieval studies.[34] This rift is most evident in the striking lack of response on the part of the Rus scholars to the broad reconsideration of the paradigms of medieval history that has so profoundly changed Western medieval studies in the last two decades. This change has affected Russian scholars who study the medieval West,[35] but not those studying Rus, with the single,

---

[32]Hyams, "The End of Feudalism," 660.

[33]P. S. Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti po pamiatnikam literatury domongolskoi Rusi," *Drevniaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki* 15 (2004): 63-87.

[34]Nazarenko, *Drevniia Rus na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh*, 10.

[35]See e.g. I. V. Dubrovskii et al., *Konstruirivanie sotsialnogo. Evropa. V-XVI vv.*

to my knowledge, exception of Anton Gorskii whose response to *Fiefs and Vassals* is discussed below. For the most part, works on Rusian/Russian history published in Russia continue the Soviet practice of labeling any member of the upper social strata between the ninth and eighteenth century "feudal lord," a practice that goes back not even so much to Marx, but rather to Stalin.[36] Hosking, one of the leading British historians of Russia, objects to this practice, but at the same time he, as we have seen, also uses the "feudal lord" in his book published in 2011 as if this were an unambiguous, universally accepted term.[37] The same is true of the survey of Russian history by the leading American scholars Nicholas Riasanovsky and Mark D. Steinberg. The eighth edition of their celebrated *A History of Russia* published in 2010 discusses whether some developments in Rus and Muscovy bore "resemblances to the feudal West."[38]

Thus, historians of Russia, whether Russian or Anglophone, have so far largely ignored the developments in Western medieval history in the last two decades and have continued the use of the outdated model of feudalism as the basis for their comparisons between Rus and the West. Even the scholars who do not explicitly refer to "feudalism" still accept the conclusions based on the use of this model. For example, Marshall Poe does not point to the absence of feudalism to support his claim that Rus never followed the "path of Western development."[39] However, he does not explain how the Rusian path of development was different. He briefly

---

(Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2001); Galkova et al., *Feodalizm: poniatie i realii.*

[36]See I. V. Stalin, "O dialekticheskom i istoricheskom materializme," in *Sochineniia* (Moscow: Pisatel', 1997), vol. 14, 253-82. This is, of course, not to say that present-day Russian historians are Stalinists; rather they are unaware of the origins of the terminology that they inherited from their Soviet predecessors, who, in their turn, mostly did not realize that the "feudal socioeconomic formation" of the Soviet textbooks had been first outlined by Stalin in 1938.

[37]See above, p. 3, note 6.

[38]Nicholas V. Riasanovsky and Mark D. Steinberg, *A History of Russia*, vol. 1, 8th ed. (Cambridge, MA: Oxford University Press, 2010), 110.

[39]Marshall T. Poe, *The Russian Moment in World History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003), 24.

mentions the cultural isolation resulting from the use of Church Slavonic and the fact that "neither Greeks not Romans ... had ever lived in the region that would soon be Russia."[40] The first of these arguments concerning Church Slavonic was developed by nineteenth-century Russian scholars, and it has been uncritically repeated ever since George Fedotov popularized it in his work published in 1946.[41] As Simon Franklin has pointed out, according to this logic, the early medieval Islamic culture must have been "culturally isolated" because of their use of Arabic – which, as is well-known now, was not the case.[42] Poe's second argument applies to Sweden no less than to Russia, but he, nevertheless, forcefully asserts that Sweden *is* a truly European country.[43] Poe, a prominent scholar of Muscovy, apparently did not see any need to provide compelling arguments in order to show that Rusian and Western paths of development were radically different because this seems self-evident to him. He simply follows the long tradition that asserts the fundamental difference between Rusian and Western societies, the tradition which is based, as we have seen, on the interpretation of Western medieval history rejected by most recent scholars.

Probably, the best evidence of how this tradition of Rusian exceptionalism is both very deeply entrenched in the minds of scholars and very little supported by research can be found in a paradoxical statement by Stefanovich: "Even though it appears that nobody doubts that Rusian society followed its own path of development [and not that of the West – Yu. M.], a comprehensive and meaningful picture of this

---

[40]Poe, *The Russian Moment*, 20-21.

[41]George Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind*, 2 vols., vol. 1, *Kievan Christianity: The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946), 39-50.

[42]Simon Franklin, "Po povodu 'intellektualnogo molchaniia' Drevnei Rusi," in Edgar Hösch, Ludolf Müller, and Andrzej Poppe, eds., *Russia Mediaevalis*, vol. 10/1 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 2001), 268. A leading modern proponent of the theory of the cultural isolation of Rus is Francis Thomson. See Francis Thomson, *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Medieval Russia*, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1999).

[43]Poe, *The Russian Moment*, 6.

path has not yet been produced."[44] Stefanovich takes for granted the idea of Rusian exceptionalism so much that he sees as quite normal the situation in which scholars do not know what the Rusian very own path of development was, but, nonetheless, they have no doubts that it was different from that of the West. Stefanovich then proceeds to offer an interesting and stimulating analysis of Rusian social practices with the aim of contributing to a better understanding of the "Rusian path," which we will discuss later, but he does not use any primary or secondary sources on the medieval West to show that Rusian practices were, indeed, different. In this respect, his paper is quite typical.[45]

Unlike general histories of Russia, most works on Rus published since the mid-1990s usually do not contrast the feudal West and non-feudal Rus and do not recycle the idea that Church Slavonic brought about a fatal cultural isolation.[46] If anything, various aspects of Rusian culture have been more and more often analyzed in wide comparative contexts.[47] However, this is not the case with the Rusian social and political structures. To my knowledge, Anton Gorskii is the only scholar who has discussed implications of the demise of the classical model of feudalism for comparative studies of Rus.[48] He argues that medieval Western Europe and Rus had the

---

[44]"Tselostnogo i vnutrenne sviaznogo predstavleniia ob etikh zakonakh i putiakh ne skladyvaetsia," P. S. Stefanovich, "Boiarskaia sluzhba v srednevekovoi Rusi," in I. G. Galkova et al., *Feodalizm: poniatie i realii*, 180.

[45]See above, notes 6, 33, 38, 39.

[46]A notable exception is Thomson, *The Reception of the Byzantine Culture*.

[47]See e.g. Inés García de la Puente, "The Indo-European Heritage in the *Povest' Vremennykh Let*," in Russell E. Martin and Jennifer B. Spock, eds., *Papers of the First Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Eastern Christian History and Culture* (Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press, 2009), 49-62; eadem, "The Revenge of the Princess: Some Considerations about Heroines in the *PVL* and in Other Indo-European Literatures," in Juan Antonio Alvarez-Pedroza and Susana Torres Prieto, eds., *Medieval Slavonic Studies: New Perspectives for Research* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 2009), 193-204; Francis Butler, "Ol'ga's Conversion and the Construction of Chronicle Narrative," *Russian Review* 67 (2008): 230-42; David Prestel, "Plody provideniia: iazycheskaia i sviashchennaia istoriia v Povesti vremennykh let," *Rossica Antiqua* 4 (2011): 23-42.

[48]Anton Gorskii, *Russkoe Srednevekov'e* (Moscow: Astrel, 2009); idem, "'Russkii' feo-

same "type of social development."[49] However, he defines this "type" so broadly that it could be applied to the majority of pre-modern societies: the military elite, "whether members of the comitatus (*druzhina*), the knightly order (*soslovie*), or the princely/royal court," dominates the society and receives income from the commoners. Just as the organization of the elite, so also the ways of receiving this income can take multiple forms – from the salary paid to an official by the government to the rents and dues paid to the lord by his serfs to the tribute extorted from the subjugated population.[50] Gorskii is, of course, right when he states that this "type" of society was common for both Western and Eastern Europe – as well as, it should be added, for many places in Asia, Africa, and pre-Columbian America. However, when it comes to what Gorskii calls "certain regional variations" in the organization of the military elite, it turns out that feudo-vassalic relations and "the so-called feudal pyramid ... existed during a certain period in some regions of Western Europe," but not in Rus.[51] For Gorskii, this statement appears to be self-evident because he does not support it by any source-based arguments.

In fact, I know only one source-based comparative study of Rusian social forms that has appeared since the work by Pavlov-Silvanski had been published posthumously in 1910. This is an article by Nazarenko in which he compared principles of inheritance of the Riurikids, the Rusian ruling dynasty, and the Merovingians.[52] Otherwise, serious source-based works on the social and political history of Rus do not make any connections with developments in the West and, as a rule, do not include a comparative perspective.

---

dalizm v svete feodalizma 'zapadnogo,'" in I. G. Galkova et al., *Feodalizm: poniatie i realii*, 190-2.

[49]Gorskii, *Russkoe Srednevekov'e*, 80.

[50]Gorskii, *Russkoe Srednevekov'e*, 79.

[51]Gorskii, *Russkoe Srednevekov'e*, 78.

[52]A. V. Nazarenko, "Rodovoi siuzerinetet Riurikovichei nad Rus'iu (X-XI vv.)," in A. P. Novosel'tsev, ed., *Drevnie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR, 1985 god* (Moscow: Nauka, 1986), 149-57.

Chapter 1. Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

This lack of comparative studies leaves unanswered the question about the place of Rus in the medieval world, a question that is important not only for historians of Rus and of its successors Russia, Ukraine, and Belorussia, but for general medieval history as well. According to Le Goff, "one uncertainty remained outstanding" for Europeans throughout the medieval period: "Where did the eastern frontier of Europe lie?"[53] The same uncertainty is evident in the modern-day histories of medieval Europe. Le Goff, in his *The Birth of Europe*, apparently shares the uncertainty that he describes as characteristic of medieval Europeans. To discuss Europe as a whole he, of course, has to rely on secondary sources for regions on which he is not an expert. The existing scholarly literature provides sufficient material for his discussion of Central and Northern Europe, as well as of Eastern Europe excluding Rus.[54] Rus is barely mentioned in *The Birth of Europe*, and when it is, it shifts between Europe and Asia, as is especially evident in the appendix, which provides a chronology of European events and events outside of Europe. The baptism of the Prince of Kiev is placed among the European events, but the Mongol overtaking of Kiev and other Rusian territories in 1236-42 is subsumed under the "formation of the Mongol Empire" in the rubric "Events outside of Europe." At the same time, the Mongolian raiding of Silesia, Poland, and Hungary in 1241 is a "European event."[55] The present state of scholarship simply does not allow a careful scholar such as Le Goff to confidently place Rus either in Europe or outside of it.

Mostly, general histories of medieval Europe exclude Rus, just as general histories of Russia, as we have seen, describe Rus as not belonging to Europe. Unlike historians of Russia, present-day Western medievalists do not claim that the absence of feudalism is what sets Rus apart. Instead, they – or at least, those who provide any explanation as to why Rus does not belong to Europe – point to the

---

[53]Le Goff, *The Birth of Europe*, 197, see also pp. 9-10.
[54]Le Goff, *The Birth of Europe*, 42-5, 91-3, 149, 182-4.
[55]Le Goff, *The Birth of Europe*, 204, 206, 209.

religious differences. William Chester Jordan expressed a widely accepted opinion when he stated that medieval "Europe was where Latin Christians—Roman Catholic Christians—dominated the political and demographic landscape. A profound divide ... separated Catholics from Greek or Orthodox Christians."[56] Raffensperger and Nazarenko have shown that at least until 1204 Latin and Orthodox Christians did not perceive the divide between them as "profound" and that the lay elites in many cases were hardly aware of any divide at all.[57] However, even if we recognize that religious and other ties between Rus and Latin Europe were stronger than scholars used to believe, the question still remains whether the forms of social and political organization of Rus had much in common with those of the West. Sverre Bagge, Michael Gelting, and Thomas Lindkvist ask the same question about Scandinavia in its relation to Western Europe: "Are we dealing with legal and institutional differences between essentially similar societies or with deep-rooted differences?" They point out that, rather than being "a concern only to indigenous specialists," this is "an essential part of a general discussion about the fundamental features of European society in the Middle Ages."[58] The same can be said about comparative studies of Rus – they are important for a better understanding of not only Rusian/Russian history, but of medieval Europe in general.

How "European" was Rusian society? I will investigate this question through the lens of narrative sources, mostly chronicles, which are the main source for the social and political history of Rus. While analyzing the chronicles, I will ask the same questions that Western medievalists pursue in their examinations of political narratives, and I will follow the leading principle that has guided recent medieval

---

[56]William Chester Jordan, "'Europe' in the Middle Ages," in Anthony Pagden, ed., *The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 75.

[57]See above, note 2.

[58]Sverre Bagge, Michael Gelting, and Thomas Lindkvist, Introduction to Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 13.

studies, namely, close attention to the terminology found in the sources and the use of only such models that are "derivable from strictly contemporary medieval material."[59] For example, scholars have long recognized the centrality of the notions of honor and shame for medieval aristocratic politics. While describing the turn of medieval historiography from modern theoretical constructs to the categories that were essential for medieval people, Dendorfer names "honor" as the most obvious example of such a category.[60] Thus, to be able to compare Russian and Western societies, it is important to compare their concepts of honor.

Honor and shame were often articulated through demonstrative emotional behavior. Public displays of emotions were an important aspect of medieval political culture – so important, in fact, that their examination has developed into a subfield of historical studies, "emotions history."[61] Analysis of the social functions of emotions has been productively used for comparative studies of different regions and time periods.[62] Emotions figure prominently in Rusian political narratives, but, to my knowledge, their functions have never been studied, let alone compared with those from other times and places.

While investigating topics such as honor or emotions, which are extensively studied by Western medievalists but barely, if at all, addressed by scholars of Rus, I will, for the most part, analyze Rusian primary sources and compare my findings with the picture that emerges from scholarly literature on the medieval West. I will

---

[59]See above, p. 10.

[60]"...die Zeitgenossen entscheidende, handlungsleitende Kategorien wie die 'Ehre'," Dendorfer, Introduction to Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 12. See ibid. for the recent German-language titles on the medieval concept of honor.

[61]See Barbara H. Rosenwein, "Eros and Clio: Emotional Paradigms in Medieval Historiography," in Hans-Werner Götz and Jörg Jarnut, eds., *Mediävistik im 21. Jahrhundert: Stand und Perspektiven der internationalen und interdisziplinaren Mittelalterforschung* (Munich: Fink, 2003), 428, for bibliography see ibid., 437-40.

[62]See Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007); Barbara H. Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

use more direct comparison of Rusian and Western political narratives to discuss another topic, the fate of which is very different in the historiography of Rus and medieval Europe, namely, the structure of the upper strata of the society and the way land was used to mediate relations within the ruling class. The inner organization of the upper class and noble landholding have been extensively studied for both Rus and Western Europe, but from very different perspectives. The discussion of these questions among Western medieval scholars has continued to be shaped mostly by the debate on feudalism, with new evidence and new interpretations being used in order to reject, reconsider, or defend some elements of the traditional paradigm.

In her work published in 2011, Reynolds again states that "the words that we translate as *fief*, *Lehen*, *feudo*, etc. were used in a variety of contexts and senses in the Middle Ages, so that they seem to relate to rather different phenomena – that is, to different kinds of property entailing different rights and obligations."[63] Her main argument is still negative – the word "fief" does *not* signify what historians often believe it does, but rather has multiple meanings. However, all we seem to know at this stage about these meanings is that they are "different." Similarly, before the twelfth century, nobles and free men held most of their land "with as full, permanent, and independent rights as their society knew."[64] What exactly their society recognized as such rights and how it was different from the concepts of property in other times and places remains a subject for future research.

Dendorfer disagrees with Reynolds on some important points,[65] and he is among those historians who, to Reynolds' dismay, use the term *Lehnswesen*.[66] However, his checklist of those characteristics of *das Lehnswesen* in the twelfth-century Empire about which modern scholars know little or nothing gives the same impression as

---

[63]Susan Reynolds, "*Fiefs and Vassals* after Twelve Years," in Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 19.

[64]Reynolds, "*Fiefs and Vassals* after Twelve Years," 17.

[65]Dendorfer, Introduction to Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 18.

[66]See Reynolds, "*Fiefs and Vassals* after Twelve Years," 23.

the statements by Reynolds quoted above, namely, that essential features of noble landholding and rights and obligations associated with land remain to be studied.[67]

If Dendorfer defends the use of the more narrow concept of *Lehnswesen*, but not of broad and imprecise *Feudalismus*,[68] Débax operates with the notion of "société féodale." In her contribution to *Feudalism: New Landscapes of Debate*, she argues that such was the society of Languedoc in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, contrary to the established opinion of the traditional scholarship that placed Languedoc outside of the "feudal zone." According to her, Languedoc presents a special variety of a feudal society that does not necessarily conform to Ganshof's model.[69]

In her review of *Feudalism*, Brown, the pioneer of the struggle against the "tyranny of the construct," objects to Débax's characterization of the Languedocien society as "feudal," because it encourages readers "to focus on the image of a vague global feudal society rather than the concrete reality she illuminates." For the same reason, Brown disagrees with Dominique Barthélemy when he applies the term *féodalité* to the society of Francia around the year 1000.[70] Concerning Barthélemy's contribution to *Feudalism*, she writes: "Although institutions resembling those associated with the [feudal-Yu. M.] model can be found in the sources he examines, there seems no reason to privilege them over others designed 'to reinforce alliances' and secure support against adversaries." She also criticizes the editors of the volume for being "loath to acknowledge that in some parts of medieval Europe no trace of the elements long associated with feudalism can be found," as well as unjustifiably arguing for the existence of at least some parallels to fiefs and vassalage in one such part,

---

[67]Dendorfer, Introduction to Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 26; see also 38-9.

[68]Dendorfer, Introduction to Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 21, 26.

[69]"'Charactères originaux' de la société féodale," Débax, "L'aristocratie languedocienne," in Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 78, 98.

[70]On the difference in meaning between the French *féodalité* and *féodalisme*, see Cheyette, "'Feudalism'," in Tuten and Billado, *Feud, Violence and Practice*, 121-2.

Romania.[71] Thus, Brown agrees that "institutions" and "elements" associated with the feudal model can be actually found in the sources of some regions of medieval Europe, but she objects, firstly, to calling them "feudal" and, secondly, to emphasizing them at the expense of other aspects of the social organization of these regions. On the other hand, there are some regions where no traces of anything "feudal" may be found. In this way, the position of Brown is somewhat reminiscent of the old school division of Europe into the "feudal zone" and the non-feudal "periphery."

Similarly, Reynolds does not deny the existence of fiefs and vassals, but, as Hyams neatly summarizes her argument, thinks that they "were neither ubiquitous enough nor, before the thirteenth century, central enough to warrant focusing property and power relations in Western Europe on them."[72] Most importantly, she argues that "neither the relationship that medieval historians call vassalage nor the kind of property that they call fiefs took their shape from the warrior society of the earlier Middle Ages ... they owe it to the more bureaucratic governments and estate administrations that developed from the twelfth century, and to the arguments of the professional and academic lawyers who appeared alongside."[73]

Thus, we can see something like a convergence between the views of the scholars on both sides of the debate on feudalism. On the one hand, the most vehement opponents of the "feudal construct" still recognize the existence of what historians have traditionally called feudo-vassalic relations, but they object, firstly, to the use of the term because of all the baggage that it carries, and, secondly, to ascribing to these relations more importance than they had for medieval people, who, arguably,

---

[71]Elizabeth A. R. Brown, Review of *Feudalism: New Landscapes of Debate*, edited by Sverre Bagge, Michael H. Gelting, and Thomas Lindkvist, *The Medieval Review* 2012 (6) at https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/14548/12.06.10.html?sequence=1 (retrieved December 19, 2012).

[72]Hyams, review of *Fiefs and Vassals*, 659.

[73]Reynolds, "*Fiefs and Vassals* after Twelve Years," in Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 16.

saw them as just one form of social ties among others. On the other hand, their opponents, who use the terminology condemned by Brown and Reynolds, and even those who, like Althoff, insist that feudalism "most certainly did exist," agree that it co-existed with other, equally important forms of social organization.[74] Thus, to some extent, the controversy appears to be terminological. There are also disagreements about chronology and, most essentially, about the origins of feudo-vassalic relations.

In terms of chronology, most scholars recognize the twelfth century as an important watershed and discuss only the degree of change that it brought. Reynolds emphasizes the twelfth century as the formative period for "the type of property known as fief," but she also admits that before 1100 some "nobles and free men ... might acknowledge that they held specific estates ... as fiefs," even though such estates constituted a small part of all landed property.[75] Althoff discusses examples of what he sees as enfeoffment in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries, but he does not offer any estimation of the quantitative relation of fiefs to other forms of landed property; in fact, the narrative sources that he uses do not allow any quantitative analysis.[76] Thus, Reynolds and Althoff view pre-twelfth-century noble landholding from different perspectives and emphasize different aspects, but, apart from terminology, their positions, in this respect, are not irreconcilable.

Another time-period has been proposed as crucial for the emergence of feudal society by historians who argue for the "feudal revolution" or "feudal transformation" around the year 1000. This school of thought traces its origin to the works by Georges Duby, who, according to Thomas Bisson, "postulated a breakdown in public law and order in the Mâconnais region during the years 980 to 1030. A new and harsh regime of lordship arose in castles sheltering knights who imposed an array of novel

---

[74]See above, pp. 5-7.

[75]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 59; see also at p. 33.

[76]Althoff, "Establishing Bonds," in Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 105-10.

obligations on peasants."[77] The proponents of the "feudal transformation" model argue that a violent breakdown of the Carolingian public order occurred around the year 1000; it led to the shift from the formalized Carolingian and immediately post-Carolingian justice to the privatized world of feudal law, the one close to the "feudal anarchy" of the nineteenth-century scholars. The systematic synthesis of the "feudal transformation" theory was presented by Jean-Pierre Poly and Eric Bournazel in 1980.[78] In the early 1990s, it was challenged by Dominique Barthélemy and has been debated ever since. This debate deals with the "feudal" in the broad sense, that is, it is concerned with the social organization of the nobility as well as with the position of the peasants and relations between the peasants and nobles. Scholars arguing for and against the "feudal transformation" theory have devoted much attention to such questions as serfdom, slavery, the role of castles, and the character of noble lordship over peasants. These questions are not directly relevant for the comparative analysis that is the subject of the present dissertation and, therefore, there is no need to discuss the "feudal transformation" here in detail.[79] However, one aspect of the "feudal transformation" controversy is important for my topic.

---

[77]Thomas Bisson, "The 'Feudal Revolution'," *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6-42, at 6, with reference to Georges Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise* (Paris: Éditions de l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales, 1971, 2nd edition, first published in 1953, reprinted in 1988). For a somewhat different interpretation of Duby's findings about the Mâconnais, see Dominique Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, trans. by Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009), ix, 2-3, 8-9. See also Fredric L. Cheyette, "Georges Duby's Mâconnais after Fifty Years: Reading It Then and Now," *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002): 291–317.

[78]Jean-Pierre Poly and Eric Bournazel, *La mutation féodale, Xe–XIIe siècles* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1980); English translation Jean-Pierre Poly and Eric Bournazel, *The Feudal Transformation: 900–1200*, trans. by Caroline Higgitt (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1991). For the most recent synthesis of the "feudal transformation" theory, see Thomas N. Bisson, *The Crisis in the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 22-68; 574.

[79]For a review of literature on the "feudal transformation," see Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 3-11, 302-5; Roach, "Submission and Homage," 355-7.

This aspect is methodological; it concerns the problem of how to interpret the observed changes in the written sources. The increasing number of narratives about conflicts between members of the nobility and the more private character of these conflicts and of the ways to settle them in eleventh-century diplomatic texts have been used as an argument for the breakdown of public order. Barthélemy challenged this interpretation; he has argued that the differences between the tenth- and eleventh-century documents reflect not the changes in society, but rather changes in the ways documents were written and preserved, and, more broadly, changes in the monastic culture from which these texts originated.[80] He has also criticized conclusions based on diplomatic documents alone, when they are examined in isolation from other types of sources. For example, he has discussed a case of two Aquitanian texts that give very different impressions about the state of public order in the region, even though they not only belong to the same time period but also describe the same events and the same personalities.[81]

There is also a disagreement over whether high and late medieval fiefs are connected with earlier antecedents. Reynolds argues that the concept of a fief known to historians was created by academic lawyers who applied to lay property the rules that used to govern ecclesiastical property. To the extent that they existed in medieval society, "the noble fief and the feudal pyramid ... were the creation of the stronger, more centralized, more bureaucratic, and more effective government ... and of the professional law that went with it." For her, there would have been no "feudalism" without the *Libri Feodorum*, the treatise compiled in Lombardy in the twelfth and

---

[80]Dominique Barthélemy, "Une crise de l'écrit? Observations sur des actes de Saint-Aubin d'Angers (XIe siècle)," *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 155 (1997): 95-117; translated in *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 12-36.

[81]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 10-11; idem, "Autour d'un récit de pactes ("Conventum Hugonis"): La Seigneurie châtelaine et le féodalisme, en France au XIe siècle," *Settimane di studio/Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo* 47 (Spoleto: Presso La sede del Centro, 2000): 447-96, at 453-7.

early thirteenth centuries.[82] An opposing point of view is represented by Roach. According to him, "important developments towards something approximating" the classical "feudal system" existed as early as the tenth century.[83]

At the same time, Roach is in no way a follower of the classical teaching on feudalism as a whole; on the contrary, he has shown that some Ottonian descriptions of homage traditionally viewed as evidence for the existence of feudo-vassalic relations, in fact did not create "feudo-vassalic bonds of the textbook variety." Rather, in some cases, homage described in the sources amounted to "a standard ritual of acknowledgment for a new ruler" on the part of a magnate without his necessarily becoming the ruler's vassal; in others, it served to end a conflict "as a form of settlement used to appease the honour of the senior party."[84] In this respect, Roach continues the task of "a judicious separation" between homage and feudalism started by Hyams, who has shown that some, but by no means all, performances of homage created a lord-vassal relationship.[85] According to Hyams, the essence of the ritual "lay in making manifest an act of submission" and "as such it nicely served to demonstrate the subordination of inferiors to some superiors."[86] In addition to creating honorable lordship, it was used for a variety of other purposes. Hyams discusses at some length one such purpose, namely, ending a conflict. This type of homage is described in the classical literature on feudalism as "homage in march" or *hommage de paix*. Hyams has shown that *hommage de paix* was far from being an exception, as traditional scholarship maintained; in fact, homage was used to restore peace at least as often,

---

[82]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 74; see also 3, 5-6, 31, 64-8, 215-30.

[83]Roach, "Submission and Homage," 355, 375-7.

[84]Roach, "Submission and Homage," 364-5, 367.

[85]Paul Hyams, "Homage and Feudalism: A Judicious Separation," in Natalie Fyrde, Pierre Monnet, and Otto-Gerhard Oexle, eds., *Die Gegenwart des Feudalismus/Présence du féodalisme et présent de la féodalité/The Presence of Feudalism*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 173 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002), 13–49.

[86]Hyams, "Homage and Feudalism," 49.

if not more often, than to create a vassalic bond.[87]

If Hyams describes cases of acts of homage with no "feudal" content, Débax discusses a "feudal society" where homage played a small role, which, according to her, was the case of eleventh- and twelfth-century Languedoc.[88] She examines the records of the oaths that the Languedocien nobles swore to each other on different occasions and argues that many of these oaths created a feudo-vassalic bond: firstly, they contained a promise of fidelity and military aid in exchange for the grant of a castle or a part of a castle and, secondly, they established a hierarchical relation between the grantor and the recipient.[89] Such oaths do not refer to the grant as a fief, but other Languedocien charters use words such as *fevum* or *feudum*, traditionally translated as "fief." However, neither type of document mentions investiture, and neither displays systematic use of homage. Débax concludes that investiture did not exist in Languedoc; as for homage, "it was one ritual among others," as can be seen from the fact that "one finds enfeoffments with or without homage with no difference regarding the constraints imposed on the vassal." On the other hand, homage was used for purposes other than entering into vassalic relations, and first of all, for peace settlements.[90] In this respect, her conclusions about Languedoc are similar to those of Hyams whose analysis of homage is based on material from England, France and the Low Countries.

Terminological differences apart, Débax's treatment of homage is also close to the findings of Roach. One of the cases examined by Roach is Emperor Henry II's granting of a benefice to Duke Boleslaw of Poland in 1013. Roach argues against the traditional interpretation of this account as evidence for feudo-vassalic relations between the two rulers. One of the reasons for Roach not to see it in "feudal" terms

---

[87]Hyams, "Homage and Feudalism," 29-32.
[88]Débax, "L'aristocratie languedocienne," *Feudalism*, 77-100.
[89]Débax, "L'aristocratie languedocienne," 87-91, 96-7.
[90]Débax, "L'aristocratie languedocienne," 98-9.

is that the benefice is not explicitly connected with Boleslaw's homage to Henry and that "we hear of no formal investiture into it."[91] On the other hand, Débax questions the necessity of homage for the creation of the feudo-vassalic bond and argues against the significance of the "triad of homage-oath-investiture" that Ganshof turned into "a kind of dogma."[92] She sees as "feudal" hierarchical relations based on the connection between granting a property and receiving military support no matter what rituals and procedures accompany or do not accompany entering into such relations. Thus, Roach and Débax apparently differ in their understanding of what makes a relation "feudo-vassalic." Nonetheless, they both show that their sources, Ottonian as well as Languedocien, depict a society where granting of a property and creating hierarchical relations between the members of the elite could be done without the "triad of homage-oath-investiture" and where homage was a flexible rite used for a variety of purposes, a rite that had no special, let alone exclusive, connection with the feudo-vassalic bond. Hyams depicts such a situation as typical of the time before "lawyers have set to their task of standardizing socially significant rituals" in the wake of the Investiture Controversy. Before that, the performers of homage and other rituals were "capable of *bricolage*" and thus generated "the opposite to lawyers' uniformity."[93]

If we turn from rituals that helped to create and regulate various types of relations among the members of the elite to the land and to the role it played in these relations, we will see a similar lack of uniformity. First of all, recent studies have shown that Reynolds is, indeed, right that the words usually translated as "fief" can take multiple meanings and some of these meanings have nothing to do with the "fief" of traditional scholarly literature. Thus, Brigitte Kasten has demonstrated that in Frankish documents of the eighth and ninth centuries the term *beneficium*, usually understood as synonymous with "fief," in fact most commonly referred to the

---

[91]Roach, "Submission and Homage," 365.

[92]Débax, "L'aristocratie languedocienne," 98.

[93]Hyams, "Homage and Feudalism," in Fyrde, Monnet, and Oexle, *Die Gegenwart des Feudalismus*, 21.

Chapter 1. Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

land that was leased in return for rent. Therefore, the Carolingian *ius beneficiarum* (sic) or *ius beneficii* "was a law of leases that regulated non-payment of rent and there can not have been any direct connection from it to feudal law."[94] Such direct connection was traditionally assumed because historians used to believe that "behind every benefice there lurks a fief."[95]

If Kasten examines different meanings that the same word, *beneficium*, took at different times, Stephen White presents an even more complicated case of multiple and mutually contradicting understandings of the notion of a fief that co-existed not only at the same time, but within the same text. His analysis of the French vernacular epic *Raoul of Cambrai* demonstrates that this poem, structured as it is around violent disputes over fiefs, knows no "authoritative unambiguous rule about fiefs" and no "coherent system of real property law." Rather, it presupposes the existence of a "malleable and internally contradictory legal culture or discourse that included several different models of what a fief was."[96]

Thus, we can see that the general picture of noble landed property and of the social organization of the upper classes in early and high medieval Western Europe is far from clear. The list of unresolved questions in need of further research compiled by Brown as recently as 2010 is impressive: "How material assets (including land) were acquired, exchanged, apportioned, and exploited; how wars were fought, conflicts resolved, and violence restrained; what rituals were practiced; what records were kept and preserved; and how social bonds and power relationships were forged and

---

[94] Brigitte Kasten, "Economic and Political Aspects of Leases in the Kingdom of the Franks during the Eighth and Ninth Centuries: A Contribution to the Current Debate about Feudalism," in Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 27-55, at 42-43.

[95] Kasten, "Economic and Political Aspects of Leases," 38.

[96] Stephen D.White, "The Discourse of Inheritance in Twelfth-century France: Alternative Models of the Fief in Raoul de Cambrai," in George Garnett and John Hudson, eds., *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 173-97, at 177.

maintained."[97]

However, Brown's statement, that "the time is long overdue for historians of medieval society to turn" to research on these questions, is not entirely justified. I hope to have shown that historians of medieval society have been doing exactly that since at least the 1990s. Numerous case studies examining different regions and different sources have been conducted during the past two decades. These studies show a complicated, often contradictory, reality that is far from the clear-cut classical "feudal system." Most scholars agree that the relations traditionally described as "feudo-vassalic" existed in medieval society; however, they did not dominate the social organization, as the traditional scholarship maintained, but co-existed with other types of interpersonal bonds, both vertical and horizontal. Another point of general agreement is the important role of kinship. However, it is not clear how these various types of relations interacted within a single society and how different interpersonal bonds were correlated with each other. The key word that we encounter again and again in the studies of forms of social organization is "complexity." There is a vast diversity of opinions about the validity of the term "feudo-vassalic," about the origins of the relations traditionally described by this term, about the time when they emerged and about their place and role vis-à-vis other types of relations.

In addition, there is no consensus about the roles played by the communities and by public authority and about the relations between interpersonal bonds, on the one hand, and abstract and impersonal categories, on the other. Barthélemy has noted that modern medievalists "of all persuasions" find in the sources what the old school did not see, namely, "a particular understanding of political order, the exercise of a control of sorts over violence." They disagree, however, about the nature of this order and about the means used to control violence.[98] Reynolds argues that the central

---

[97]Brown, review of *Feudalism: New Landscapes of Debate.* Cf. Dendorfer, Introduction to Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 26.

[98]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 305-6.

role in medieval society belonged to government and to the concepts of "the public welfare" and of full land ownership, but this thesis has found much less support from scholars than her critique of the traditional "feudal" paradigm.[99]

Thus, broad re-examination of the sources, as well as regional studies of the past two decades, have dismantled the classical teaching on feudalism and have greatly advanced our knowledge of medieval society, but they have not yet produced a new synthesis. Many important questions still remain controversial. I suggest that a comparison with Rusian texts can shed new light on Western sources and contribute to a better understanding of Western medieval society.

Rus had some fundamental commonalities with the medieval West. It consisted of an agricultural population and of a warrior upper class; Scandinavians played an important role in its early history. After the conversion to Christianity in the late tenth century, Rusian culture presented a typical medieval interplay between Christian principles, the warrior ethic of the elite, and the traditional ways of the rural population going back to the tribal past. There was, of course, one more important component in the makeup of medieval Europe – the heritage of the Roman Empire and, more broadly, of the ancient Mediterranean world. The significance of this heritage varied from place to place, but in Rus it was, probably, at its smallest. Jonathan Shepard describes Rus as a polity "far-removed from the Roman empire's territories and with an essentially 'home-brewed' political culture."[100] Unlike Western Europe and the Balkans, which had once been parts of the Empire, Rus did not inherit any Roman infrastructure, any tradition of classical learning and, overall,

---

[99]See e.g. Hyams, "The End of Feudalism?" 661; Stephen White, review of *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* by Susan Reynolds, *Law and History Review* 15 (1997): 349-355, at 353-5; Dendorfer, Introduction to Dendorfer and Deutinger, *Das Lehnswesen*, 18.

[100]Jonathan Shepard, "Crowns from the Basileus, Crowns from Heaven," in Miliana Kaĭmakamova, Maciej Salamon, and Małgorzata Smorąg Różycka, eds., *Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone* (Cracow: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze Historia Iagellonica, 2007), 139-60, at 156.

experienced little influence from classical culture. The role of Latin was, in the words of Simon Franklin, "almost negligible"; the degree to which Greek was known is a subject of debate, but all agree that it was much less than in the Balkan Orthodox polities and that it was in no way comparable with the knowledge of Latin in the West.[101]

The language of religion and learning was Church Slavonic; how it was related to the spoken language of the Eastern Slavs, the core population of Rus, is also a matter of debate. Church Slavonic and East Slavonic have been described as parts of a single language, two different languages or two dialects of one language. Simon Franklin's view of them as "registers of [one] language" appears the most convincing to me:

> Church Slavonic is the 'bookish' ... register: the mode of expression that one is most likely to find in manuscript books, derived from the core devotional writings in those books. East Slavonic is the 'practical' ... register: the mode of expression that one is most likely to find in commerce and administration. A sermon, for example, would be written in a register based on Church Slavonic, whereas a law-code or private birch-bark communication would normally be based on East Slavonic. [102]

---

[101]On Latin in Rus, see Simon Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950-1300* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 106-10. On the degree and the character of the knowledge of the Greek language and of the classical culture in Slavonic translations, see D. M. Bulanin, *Antichnye traditsii v drevnerusskoi literature XI-XVI vv.*, Slavistische Beiträge 278 (Munich: Otto Sagner, 1991); Thomson, *The Reception of Byzantine Culture*; Simon Franklin,"Po povodu 'Intellektualnogo molchaniia' Drevnei Rusi (o sbornike trudov F. Dzh. Tomsona)," *Russia Mediaevalis* 10 (2001): 262-70; Olga B. Strakhova, review of F. J. Thomson, *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Mediaeval Russia*, *Russia Mediaevalis* 10 (2001): 245-61; Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture*, 101-6, 202-6, 223-8; idem, *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Translation Series 5 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), lviii-lxxiv, xcv-cix; Simon Franklin and Jonathan Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus', 750-1200* (New York: Longman, 1996), 238-43; A. A. Alekseev, "Koe-chto o perevodakh v Drevnei Pusi (po povodu stat'i Fr. Dzh. Tomsona 'Made in Russia')," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury* (hereafter *TODRL*) 49 (1999): 278-95; G. G. Lant, "Eshcho raz o mnimykh perevodakh v Drevnei Rusi (po povodu stat'i A. A. Alekseeva)," *TODRL* 51 (1999): 435-41; A. A. Alekseev, "Po povodu stat'i G. G. Lanta Eshcho raz o mnimykh perevodakh v Drevnei Rusi," *TODRL* 51 (1991): 442-5.

[102]Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture*, 87. See also Dean S. Worth, "Was There a

Chapter 1. Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

The Rusian sources on social and political history are based mostly on East Slavonic, but they also contain what Franklin describes as interaction and "mutual contamination" of the two registers.[103]   What are the implications of this language situation for a comparative analysis of the Rusian and Western sources? While discussing the difficulties of a comparative study of the social organization in medieval Romania, Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist point to the fact that the Romanian sources "were written in Old Church Slavonic, which makes it difficult to trace the presence or absence of feudal terminology."[104] However, I see the linguistic divide between Rus and the West not as an impediment, but as a great advantage to a comparative analysis.

Language is a core issue in much of the debate on power and property relations in Western medieval society. The thrust of Reynolds' critique of the "feudal construct" is directed against the "confusion of words, concepts, and phenomena that seems to be involved in most discussions of the medieval forms of property and political relations that the words supposedly denote."[105] According to her, historians erroneously assume the existence of a certain phenomenon (type of property and/or relations) when they see a certain Latin word. Barthélemy, in contrast with Reynolds, believes that "fiefs and vassals can and must retain their presence" in historiography; however, he also sees "an unrealistic, almost fetishistic trust in the uniformity of medieval Latin terminology" as one of the main methodological prob-

---

'Literary Language' in Kievan Rus'?" *The Russian Review* 34 (1975): 1-9; idem, ([Church] Slavonic) Writing in Kievan Rus'," in Boris Gasparov and Olga Raevsky-Hughes, eds., *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 141-53; B. A. Uspenskii, *Iazykovaia situatsia Kievskoi Rusi i ee znachenie dlia istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka* (Moskow: Nauka, 1983), 9-54. For more titles on the relation between Church Slavonic and the vernacular of Rus, see Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture*, 85-8. The language spoken in Rus is known as "Old Russian," "Old Ukrainian," "Rusian," and "East Slavonic." I follow Franklin in using the latter term (see ibid., 84).

[103]Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture*, 88.

[104]Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, Introduction to Bagge, Gelting and Lindkvist, *Feudalism*, 12. "Old Church Slavonic" here is used as a synonym for "Church Slavonic"; on the term "Old Church Slavonic," see Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture*, 84.

[105]Reynolds, "*Fiefs and Vassals* after Twelve Years,"17. See also eadem, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 12-14.

lems of medieval studies. He calls historians to revive "the philological spirit" and "to listen more attentively to their sources."[106] Thus, Western medievalists "of all persuasions," to borrow Barthélemy's phrase, see the baggage of traditional interpretation of the Latin terminology in the medieval sources as one of the main problems for reconstructing the reality reflected in these sources.

At the same time, the Rusian terminology does not carry this baggage. In fact, the terms for power and property relations in the Rusian chronicles analyzed in this dissertation do not carry *any* baggage because they hardly have been studied at all, as we shall see. Moreover, they were expressed in vernacular East Slavonic and not in a language that had originated in a different, and a more complex, society and then been applied to the medieval reality, which was the case with Latin and, to some extent, also with Church Slavonic created for the purpose of translating from Greek.[107] Of course, no text in any language offers a direct, unmediated representation of reality; however, arguably, much less cultural baggage, whether created by the use of a classical language or by the long tradition of scholarly interpretations of this language, goes between "words, concepts, and phenomena" in a study of Rusian social history than it does in a similar study of Latin Europe. I suggest that a comparison between Rusian and Western sources has the potential to help to disentangle words, concepts, and phenomena in the latter. For a better understanding of the interplay between language, the "learned" concepts of medieval authors, and medieval realities, it is especially interesting to compare texts written in Latin, in Western vernaculars, and in both "registers" of the language used in the Rusian sources, that is, in the vernacular East Slavonic and in the bookish Church Slavonic. Hence my choice of the Western sources for the comparative analysis offered in this dissertation.

It is, of course, impossible to make a source-based comparison of Rus – or of

---

[106]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, ix-x, 265.
[107]On Church Slavonic and Greek, see Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture*, 85-6.

anything else, for that matter – with the "West" in general. For the purposes of my analysis, the best regions are those that, firstly, produced political narratives typologically analogous to Rusian chronicles and, secondly, produced them in both Latin and the vernacular. The large-scale advent of the vernacular into the writing of chronicles and histories in continental Europe started in the thirteenth century, when the West saw the rise of central governments, universities, and academic law while Rus was conquered by the Mongols. This period is outside of the chronological scope of my dissertation.

The earliest narrative from continental Latin Europe written in what is apparently very close to the actual spoken language of the time is the *Conventum Hugonis* (1020s) from eleventh-century Aquitaine.[108] Moreover, its subject matter is similar to that of many Rusian chronicle narratives describing interprincely conflicts: just like these narratives, the *Conventum* is a partisan account of a conflict between two magnates intended to justify the actions of one party. The *Conventum* can be juxtaposed with the Latin chronicle by Adémar of Chabannes written within the same time period and containing an account of the same events from a different perspective, and with the letter that the well-known scholar Fulbert of Chartres wrote to one of the participants in the conflict.[109] Thus, the texts range from the letter penned by

---

[108]First publication: Jane Martindale, "Conventum inter Guillelmum Aquitanorum comitem et Hugonem Chiliarchum," *English Historical Review* 84 (1969): 528-48. Published with a parallel translation in Jane Martindale, *Status, Authority and Regional Power: Aquitaine and France, 9th to 12th Centuries*, Variorum Collected Studies Series (Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1997), VIIb. Martindale thinks that, in connection with the *Conventum*, "it is necessary to make some allowance for the possibility that spoken Latin survived in some form – even into the eleventh century," and she notes that "the 'errors' with which the text is studded have many affinities with the 'late' or 'vulgar Latin'," Martindale, *Status, Authority and Regional Power*, VIII, 4, 24; for a review of literature on the language of the *Conventum*, see ibid., VIII, 3-4. Paul Hyams describes the *Conventum* as "a text, which ought perhaps to have been written in the vernacular, Occitan?" Paul Hyams, Introduction to the *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan* at http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/agreement.asp (retrieved 01.23.2013).

[109]P. Bourgain, R. Landes, and G. Pon, eds., *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 79 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999); *The Letters and*

one of the best Latin scholars of the time to the *Conventum* connected with the oral culture,[110] and all of them discuss relations between members of the secular aristocracy. The rich possibilities offered by these texts led me to choose eleventh-century Aquitaine as a region from the medieval West for my comparative study.

The other region is England with its traditions of both vernacular and Latin historiography. Vernacular historiography thrived before the Norman Conquest, when it was produced in Old English, and then again in the twelfth century, when "a new vogue for writing history in Anglo-Norman" appeared more than half a century earlier than a vernacular historical culture began to emerge elsewhere in Latin Europe.[111] The Old English *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in its original part covers the period when Rus did not yet exist.[112] Its later continuations describe mostly pre-conquest England, the social and political organization of which was, in many respects, idiosyncratic; there is no consensus as to how Anglo-Saxon kingdoms were similar to, or different from, continental Western Europe. M. T. Clanchy summarizes the generally accepted view of English history when he writes that "England was brought into the mainstream of European politics" by the Norman Conquest.[113] Therefore, I concentrate on Norman England. The history of this "mainstream" European society in the twelfth century is exceptionally well covered by a significant number of

---

Poems of Fulbert of Chartres, ed. and trans. F. Behrends (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1976), 92.

[110]See Martindale, *Status, Authority and Regional Power*, VIII, 22.

[111]Chris Given-Wilson, *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England* (New York and London: Hambledon, 2004), 138.

[112]The so-called "Common Stock," the original extinct texts on which the surviving manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle are based, was produced in 890 or 891. See Janet Bately, "The Compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 60 BC to AD 890: Vocabulary as Evidence," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 64 (London: Oxford University Press, 1978), 96; Thomas A. Bredehoft, *Textual Histories: Readings in the* Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), 4; Michael Swanton, Introduction to *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, trans. Michael Swanton (New York: Routledge, 1998).

[113]M. T. Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers: 1066-1307*, 3rd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006), 4.

Chapter 1. Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

Latin historiographical works and by the first post-conquest vernacular chronicle describing contemporary events, known as *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*.[114] Not only is this written in a vernacular language, namely Anglo-Norman, but it also belongs to the same time period as the Rusian chronicles and it discusses a similar subject: a conflict within the ruling strata of society. Even though Fantosme's work is an epic poem while Rusian chronicles are written in the traditional annalistic format, both he and the Rusian chronicle-writers produced vernacular accounts about political struggles in their contemporary societies, and as such their narratives are worth comparing.

On the other hand, *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, as well as the *Conventum Hugonis*, were written in regions belonging to what traditional scholarship described as the "feudal zone" of Europe. As we have seen, even the most passionate critics of the "feudal construct" do not argue against the existence of feudo-vassalic relations in places such as Aquitaine and Norman England, but object only to attributing to these relations more significance than they deserve.[115] Moreover, Fantosme belongs to the late twelfth century and to a country with a strong (by the standards of high medieval Europe) central government, and thus his place and time period meet Reynolds' criteria for the emergence of "the noble fief and the feudal pyramid."[116] In contrast with that, the attempts of Pavlov-Silvanski and his followers to show the existence of fiefs and a feudal pyramid in Rus have been universally, and justifiably, rejected by modern scholars. Nonetheless, I still think that the social organization of the upper strata in Rus can be productively compared with those in Aquitania and England, firstly, by looking at other than feudo-vassalic types of relations and, secondly, by making another attempt to find "fiefs and vassals" in Rus.

---

[114]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. and trans. R. C. Jonston (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981).

[115]See above, pp. 20-21.

[116]See above, p. 24.

Chapter 1. Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

Most studies that have tried to find Rusian analogies to feudo-vassalic relations share one fundamental problem: they examine relations between "the prince and the nobles (boyars)."[117] This is problematic for two reasons: firstly, the information about the boyars in the sources is so meager that it hardly allows any meaningful conclusions. A handful of charters that survive from the pre-Mongolian period do not deal with boyars, and neither do references to the lost charters found in the chronicles. Law codes never served as a reliable source on relations between rulers and aristocracy even for the West, where law was more developed. As for the main source for social history, the chronicles, they "speak of little else but princely disputes," in the words of Franklin.[118] Secondly, studies of "the prince and boyars" are problematic because there was no such a thing as "the prince" in Rus. Rus was a collection of lands ruled collectively by an extended and ever-growing dynasty.

The sources provide a wealth of information about the relations between the princes, but these relations have been studied very little because historians have been concerned primarily with the Riurikids' "failure" to develop a centralized monarchy and have viewed the accounts of princely politics as tales of "meaningless" internal strife. This view was first formulated in the late eighteenth century by the founding father of Russian historiography, Nikolai Karamzin, even before he started working on his magnum opus, *History of the Russian State* (1818-24). In his *Letters of a Russian Traveler* (1791), Karamzin describes the dullness and triviality of the pre-Mongolian chronicle accounts about "the pedigree of the princes, their quarrels and intestine feuds" as the main problem for anyone who would write a history of Russia.[119] His work on the *History* was informed by this *a priori* unfavorable view

---

[117] For a review of literature on "feudalism" in Rus, see Stefanovich, "Boiarskaia sluzhba," in I. G. Galkova et al., *Feodalizm: poniatie i realii*, 180-83.

[118] Simon Franklin, "Literacy and Documentation in Early Medieval Russia," *Speculum* 60 (1985): 1-38; on the charters see at 20, 22-25; on the chronicles, see at 21.

[119] Nikolai M. Karamzin, *Letters of a Russian Traveler*, trans. and ed. Anderw Kahn and Jonathan Mallinson (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2003), 293.

of the pre-Mongolian period, which he deemed the "appanage period," the term he coined to describe the division of power between the princes after the death of Iaroslav the "Wise" in 1054.[120]

Following Karamzin, the nineteenth-century historians described the period of the single rule by Iaroslav in the eleventh century as the "golden age" of Rus that ended all too soon because of the unfortunate, and irrational, decision of Iaroslav to divide his realm among his sons. More divisions followed, and Rus descended into the chaotic "appanage period." Soviet historians rechristened it as "the period of feudal disintegration,"[121] but otherwise they inherited the master narrative best summarized in a humorous poem by the nineteenth-century author Aleksei K. Tolstoy. The poem describes the fatal inability of all Russian rulers to establish public order. Iaroslav almost succeeded in this elusive task, but, "out of love for his children, he divided all the land between them":

> This was a bad idea:
> His sons began to fight
> One pummeling another
> With all his strength and might.[122]

Franklin and Shepard have convincingly criticized this traditional view of interprincely relations based on "a general sense that well-run states ought to progress towards monarchy," and they have demonstrated the efficiency of the Riurikids' col-

---

[120]See N. M. Karamzin, *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskogo v dvenadtsati tomakh* (Moscow: Nauka, 1989), vol. 1, 15-16.

[121]For a review of literature on the "feudal disintegration," see P. P. Tolochko, *Kniaz' v Drevnei Rusi: vlast', sobstvennost', ideologiia* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1992), 173-5, 220-21 (note 124); Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus'*, 367-9.

[122]A. K. Tolstoy, "Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskogo ot Gostomysla do Timasheva," in A. K. Tolstoy, *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 1, 384-400, at 388. For a conventional narrative on the "appanage disintegration," see e.g. B. A. Rybakov, *Pervye veka russkoi istorii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), 145-57. For a review of pre-1990s literature on the "feudal/appanage disintegration," see P. P. Tolochko, *Kniaz v Drevnei Rusi: vlast, sobstvennost, ideologiia* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1992), 173-5, 220-21 (note 124); Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus*, 367-9.

lective rule.[123] However, most historians still reproduce the paradigm created by the nineteenth-century scholars.[124] On the other hand, those scholars who do not see interprincely relations as meaningless chaotic strife, argue that the dynasty, in fact, had a system of succession, even though its principles have not been fully spelled out in any surviving document. This putative system is then reconstructed on the basis of chronicle narratives.[125]

Janet Martin has argued against the belief in either "a fully formed, comprehensive system ... introduced at a single stroke by Iaroslav" or "a complete failure of the Riurikid dynasty to create an orderly pattern of succession." Her reading of the chronicles shows that "the succession pattern evolved in conjunction with the growth of the dynasty and the expansion of the state it ruled."[126] She describes interprincely conflicts as a series of crisis resolutions rather than as meaningless strife.[127] This approach allows a deeper analysis of the sources than either the traditional "strife and disintegration" framework or attempts to reconstruct an orderly succession system. Martin offers a number of new and convincing interpretations of chronicle narratives; however, she still reads the sources through the lens of the question of succession.

---

[123]Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus*, 245-77, 368.

[124]See e.g. N. F. Kotliar, "K voprosu o prichinakh udelnoi razdroblennosti na Rusi," *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy Medievistiki* 43 (2011): 5-17; idem, "Nastuplenie udel'noi razdroblennosti na Rusi (kniaz'ia-izgoi)," *Ruthenica* 10 (2011): 69–77; M. B. Sverdlov, *Domongol-skaia Rus: kniaz' i kniazheskaia vlast' na Rusi VI-pervoi treti XIII vv.* (St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2003), 513-14, 659-60; Hosking, *Russia*, 45-8.

[125]For one of the most sophisticated attempts to reconstruct the Rusian system of succession and for a critique of Western scholars of Rus who deny the existence of such a system, see A. V. Nazarenko, "Poriadok prestolonaslediia na Rusi X-XII vv.: nasled-stvennye razdely, seniorat i popytki designatsii (tipologicheskie nabliudenia)," in V. Ia. Petrukhin, ed., *Iz istorii russkoi kultury*, vol. 1: *Drevniaia Rus* (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kultury, 2000), 500-519. For a review of literature on the succession system, see Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 30; Nancy Shields Kollmann, "Collateral Succession in Kievan Rus'," Harvard Ukrainian Studies 14 (1990): 377-88.

[126]Janet Martin, *Medieval Russia, 980-1584*, 2nd ed. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 30.

[127]Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 100-48.

Chapter 1. Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

The view of princely politics exclusively as a succession struggle within a ruling dynasty appears problematic because of the sheer size of this dynasty. There was a limited circle of the leading princes who vied for the Kievan throne and for positions in several other important centers. For these princes, the question of succession played an important – even though not exclusive – role. However, most princes did not belong to this circle. The sources do not allow us to establish the precise number of princes at any given time, but by the late twelfth – early thirteenth century this number seems to be close to a hundred, and, as O. M. Rapov pointed out, the chronicles often leave less significant princes unmentioned.[128] It is diffcult to see how all these princes, some of them holding only tiny pieces of land,[129] could be characterized collectively as a dynasty ruling over a state.

The Soviet historian V. T. Pashuto and his followers have offered a different view of the Riurikids. They have treated Rusian princes not so much as a ruling dynasty but rather as a ruling stratum somewhat analogous to the top nobility in the West. Pashuto never formulated this analogy explicitly; however, he has argued that lesser princes, along with boyars and other categories of nobles, could be "vassals" of other princes, and he has interpreted interprincely relations as "feudal."[130] Following Pashuto, P. P. Tolochko has described relations among the princes as "based on vassalic principles."[131] However, neither Pashuto nor Tolochko explain what they

---

[128]O. M. Rapov, *Kniazhaskie vladeniia na Rusi v X – pervoi polovine XIII v.* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo MGU, 1977), 128. See ibid., for lists of the known princes arranged by generations that allow a rough estimation of their numbers.

[129]See Rapov, *Kniazhaskie vladeniia na Rusi*, 92-3.

[130]V. T. Pashuto, "Cherty politicheskogo stroia Drevnei Rusi," in A. P. Novoseltsev, V. T. Pashuto, and V. L. Cherepnin. *Drevnerusskoe gosudarstvo i ego mezhdunarodnoe znachenie* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 11-77. An example of a recent work which, in Pashuto's tradition, describes interprincely relations in "feudal" terms is Sverdlov, *Domongolskaia Rus.* Sverdlov provides even less argumentation to support his view of interprincely relations as "feudo-vassalic" than Pashuto does, and no discussion at all of feudo-vassalic relations in the West.

[131]Tolochko, *Kniaz'*, 178.

understand by "vassalic principles." Apparently, they both share the assumption that Western feudalism is a coherent system and that its principles are self-evident. Much of Pashuto's argumentation is based on conjectures about the meanings of the words used in the political narratives not supported by analysis of the context or, in many cases, by any arguments at all. He then uses these conjectures in order to show correspondences between East Slavonic and Latin social and political terminology[132] Tolochko's arguments for the vassalic nature of the interprincely relations consist of several examples taken from different sources without a detailed analysis of the context. The whole discussion occupies three pages in a book of small format.[133]

Tolochko's book has been largely ignored, probably both because of its cursory argumentation and because it was published in Ukraine during the time of the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The deficiencies of Pashuto's arguments have been criticized in recent works by Russian scholars who deny that Rusian society had any significant similarities with the West. These recent works offer a productive discussion of Rusian sources; however, when it comes to comparing Rusian and Western material, they display a very outdated view of Western medieval history. Thus, Stefanovich, one of the most outspoken critics of the tradition associated with the names of Pavlov-Silvanskii and Pashuto, takes his ideas about vassalic relations from the work by Le Goff published in 1975, which, according to him, represents the "present state of scholarship (*sovremennyi uroven nauki*)."[134] Completely ignoring recent developments in medieval studies, Stefanovich claims that investiture was an "inseparable part" of homage. He sees a big difference between Rus and the West in the fact that, even though there was "a kind of 'feudal contract (*nekoe vassalno-dogovornoe nachalo*)'" in Rus, it "was not central enough (*opredeliaiuschim*) to use

---

[132]E.g., Pashuto, "Cherty politicheskogo stroia," 19, 39, 48, 52-6.

[133]Tolochko, *Kniaz'*, 153-6.

[134]P. S. Stefanovich, "Kniaz' i boiare: kliatva vernosti i pravo ot'ezda," in A. A. Gorskii et al., *Drevniaia Rus: Ocherki politicheskogo i sotsialnogo stroia* (Moscow: Indrik, 2008): 148-269, at 201-3.

it as a basis for any 'feudal' constructions."[135] As we have seen, exactly the same is true for the medieval West, according to the really "present" state of scholarship, that is, according to works published within the last decade rather than forty years ago.

Stefanovich apparently thinks about the medieval West in terms of the classical feudal system. Underestimation of the complexity and fluidity of medieval societies and the nineteenth-century-style belief in neat and comprehensive theoretical systems as the most useful tools of historical analysis are shared by both critics and proponents of the concept that Rus was similar to the "feudal West." Thus, Tolochko's study contains many valuable observations about princely politics, but his analysis as a whole is informed by the anachronistic idea of a consistent "legal system (*iuridicheskii poriadok*)" that governed interprincely relations. Tolochko finds several such consecutive "legal systems" between the tenth and thirteenth centuries. Both Tolochko and Stefanovich, disagreeing as they do on many key points, use equally anachronistic ideas of the public and private spheres and the concepts such as "state law" and "family law" borrowed from the constitutional historians of the nineteenth century whose works Tolochko quotes abundantly.[136]

Franklin and Shepard have shown that interprincely relations did not develop in the framework of anything approximating Tolochko's "legal system," or, indeed, any "system" at all. They describe eleventh- and twelfth-century Rus in terms of an emerging political culture rather than a "fixed political system."[137] In this respect, their approach to Russian society is similar to recent scholarship on the medieval West. However, they do not offer any comparison between Rus and the West, except a passing remark that the change in Russian political discourse after Iaroslav's death

---

[135]Stefanovich, "Kniaz' i boiare," 202; idem, "Boiarskaia sluzhba," 181.

[136]See e.g. Tolochko, *Kniaz*, 26-7, 161; Stefanovich, "Boiarskaia sluzhba," 185.

[137]Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus*, 246-8, 275-6.

Chapter 1. Introduction. Rus and "Feudalism": Words, Concepts, and Phenomena

(discussed below) "is not unparalleled among early medieval monarchies."[138] While discussing Soviet and Russian scholarly literature on the "feudal disintegration," they do not address the works by Pashuto and his followers, which have been generally ignored by Western historians of Rus. Western scholars probably have seen Pashuto's references to "vassalic principles" on par with the "feudal" terminology of the Soviet historians who had to find "feudal socio-economic formation" in Rus *ex officio*.

However, when applied to interprincely relations rather than to relations between the peasants and landowners, "feudalism" is not used in the Marxist sense. Neither Pashuto nor any of his followers provided sufficient argumentation to support their view of interprincely relations. However, it appears to me that their suggestion about the parallels between the inner organization of Rusian princes and of Western aristocracy deserves further study.

In my comparative analysis, I concentrate on princes. Rather than using scarce information about the boyars, I analyze the copious accounts about relations between the princes and compare them with the accounts about the Aquitanian aristocrats and about members of the royal family and nobility in England.

Before proceeding to this task, in the second and third chapters of the dissertation, I outline the general history of the Riurikid dynasty as it is presented in the chronicles and discuss the terms that Rusian sources use in reference to princes and princely politics. Then, in the fourth and fifth chapters, I compare the concepts of honor and shame and the social uses of emotions in the Rusian chronicles and Western political narratives. The sixth chapter is devoted to a comparative analysis of accounts of the princely politics with the Aquitanian and English political narratives.

---

[138]Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus*, 247.

Chapter 2

Terminology of Rulership, Power, and Property in Rusian Political Narratives from a Comparative Perspective

The most important Rusian political narratives are chronicles (*letopisi*). Pre-Mongolian chronicles survived only as parts of later chronicle compilations. Most such compilations have a very similar beginning section that starts with the sons of biblical Noah and ends with the entries for the 1110s. This section is apparently based on the same extinct text. In some manuscripts, this beginning section is entitled *Povest Vremennykh Let* (*PVL*), traditionally translated into English as the *Tale of Bygone Years*, and also known in Anglophone scholarly literature as the *Primary Chronicle*. Scholars believe that the *Primary Chronicle* was compiled in Kiev in the 1110s on the basis of earlier chronicles and other texts that are now

lost.[139]

The earliest extant dated chronicle manuscript, the *Laurentian Codex*[140] was, according to its colophon, copied by a certain monk Lavrentii in 1377 from some "very old books (*knigy vetshany*)." The *Laurentian* starts with the *Primary Chronicle*, thus containing its earliest surviving copy; the continuation of the *Primary Chronicle* in the *Laurentian Codex* is usually referred to as the *Laurentian* or *Suzdalian Chronicle*. The text of the *Primary Chronicle* in the *Laurentian Codex* ends abruptly, in mid-sentence, in the entry for1110; the entries for the years 1111-57 describe events both in the middle Dnieper region around Kiev and in Suzdalia, the region in the north-east where Moscow later rose. The part that covers 1158-1282 concentrates mostly on Suzdalia, and the very end of the *Laurentian* is centered on Tver, a city on the middle Volga that became prominent in the fourteenth century. The last entry of the *Laurentian* is for the year 1304. Two different redactions of the part of text of the *Laurentian* that covers the period before 1205 are found in the *Radzivill Chronicle* and in the *Chronicle of Pereiaslavl-Suzdalskii*. The *Radzivill* ends at the entry for 1205, the *Chronicle of Pereiaslavl-Suzdalskii* at the entry for 1214; both are found

---

[139]The best edition of the *Primary Chronicle* is Donald Ostrowski, ed. and coll., with David Birnbaum and Horace G. Lunt, *The* Povest' vremennykh let*: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Text Series 10 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003; hereafter *PVL*). For my purposes, it is not necessary to follow an interlinear collation, which is an extremely tedious task. Therefore, I give references not to the PVL, but to the *Laurentian Chronicle*, the oldest codex containing the *Primary Chronicle* (see below, note 140). On the manuscripts and editions of the *Primary Chronicle*, see Ostrowski, Introduction to PVL, vol. 1, XIX-XXVI; D. S. Likhachev, "Arkheograficheskii obzor spiskov *Povesti vremennykh let*" in *Povest Vremmennykh Let*, ed. D. S. Likhachev and V. P. Adrianova-Perets, new rev. ed. (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1996), 359-62. For a general information and bibliography on the *Chronicle*, see Ia. N. Shchapov, ed., *Pis'mennye pamiatniki istorii Drevnei Rusi: letopisi, povesti, khozhdeniia, poucheniia, zhitiia, poslaniia: annotirovannyi katalog-spravochnik* (St. Petersburg: Russko-Baltiiskii informatsionnyi tsentr "BLITS", 2003), 21-3. See also Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus*, 317-19.

[140]E. F. Karskii, ed., *Lavrentevskaia letopis*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1926-8; reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 1997, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss), hereafter PSRL 1.

in manuscripts datable to the fifteenth century. [141]

In addition to the chronicle, the *Laurentian Codex* contains the only copy of the works by Prince Vladimir Monomakh (1053-1125). These are the *Instruction* (*Pouchenie*) for Monomakh's sons, a rare example of a mirror for princes in Rusian literature, a letter to Prince Oleg Sviatoslavich with a peace offer, and a prayer probably composed by Monomakh, all of which are interpolated into the *Primary Chronicle*'s entry for 1096.[142]

Another important manuscript is the *Hypatian Codex*.[143] It contains the *Hypatian Chronicle* believed to have been compiled in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century; the manuscript has been dated to the early fifteenth century on the basis of paleographical evidence. The *Hypatian* also begins with the *Primary Chronicle*, and then it seamlessly transitions into a continuation known as the *Kievan Chronicle*. The *Kievan Chronicle*, apparently a compilation based on

---

[141]B. A. Rybakov and V. I. Buganov, eds., *Letopisets Pereiaslavlia-Russkogo (Letopisets russkikh tsarei)*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 41 (Moscow: Arkheograficheskii tsentr, 1995); hereafter PSRL 41. On the editions and bibliography of the *Chronicle of Pereiaslavl-Suzdalskii*, see Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 33-6. B. A. Rybakov, ed., *Radzivillovskaia letopis*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 38 (Moscow - Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk, 1989), hereafter PSRL 38. The text of the *Radzivill Chronicle* can be followed by referring to the variant readings of the *Laurentian* in PSRL 1; there is also a facsimile edition: M. V. Kukushkina and G. M. Prokhorov, eds., *Radzivillovskaia letopis'. Tekst, issledovaniia, opisanie miniatiur*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Glagol, 1994-1995). For general information on, and bibliography of, both *Letopisets Pereiaslavlia-Russkogo* and the *Radzivill*, see Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 28-36.

[142]On the *Laurentian Codex*, see B. M. Kloss, Introduction to the reprint of PSRL 1 at http://www.lrc-lib.ru/rus_letopisi/Laurence/preface2.htm (accessed 01.29.2013); Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 23-6; see ibidem for the editions and bibliography.

[143]A. A. Shakhmatov, ed., *Ipatevskaia letopis*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 2, 2nd ed. (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia archeograficheskaia komissia, 1908); reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 1998, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss and a new index); hereafter PSRL 2; Omeljan Pritsak, ed. *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Cetvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: Text Series 8 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).

a number of lost chronicles and other texts, ends with an elaborate eulogy for Prince Riurik Rostislavich in the entry for 1198. It is followed by what is known as the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* which describes the history of the south-western Galician-Volhynian principality in the thirteenth century.[144]

Finally, there are two redactions of the *First Novgorodian Chronicle* known as the "older" and the "younger" redaction.[145] The "older" one covers the period from 1016/17 to 1352; its only copy misses the first booklet, which apparently contained entries for the years before 1016, and it is datable to the fourteenth century on the basis of paleographical evidence. The "younger" redaction, which exists in two copies, is close to the "older," but it continues up to the 1440s. One of the copies is part of a miscellany datable to the fifteenth century; another copy, from which the beginning and the end are missing, is a manuscript also datable to the fifteenth century. The early part of the *First Novgorodian Chronicle* has some parallels with the *Primary Chronicle*, but is not identical to it. This early part arguably reflects the lost text which was one of the sources of the *Primary Chronicle*.[146]

Besides these coherent chronicle texts, there are some twelfth-century entries in several fifteenth- and sixteenth- century compilations that appear to go back to a lost

---

[144]Pritsak, Introduction to *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles*; Kloss, Introduction to the reprint of PSRL 2 at http://www.lrc-lib.ru/rus_letopisi/Ipatius/preface.htm (accessed 01.30. 2013). Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 26-8, see ibidem for bibliography; a study of the *Galician-Volhynian* that appeared after Shchapov's *Pismennye pamiatniki* and that is, therefore, not included in the bibliography there is M. F. Kotliar, V. Iu. Franchuk, and A. G. Plakhonin, eds., *Galitsko-volynskaia letopis: Tekst, kommentarii, issledovanie* (St. Petersburg: Aleteia, 2005).

[145]A. N. Nasonov, ed., *Novgorodskaia pervaia letopis starshego i mladshego izvodov* (Moskow-Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1950; reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2000, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss), hereafter *N1L*. For other editions, see Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 38.

[146]For general information about *N1L* and for bibliography, see Nasonov, Introduction to *N1L*; Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 37-8. Joachim Dietze, ed., *Die erste Novgoroder Chronik: nach ihrer ältesten Redaktion (Synodalhandschrift)*; *1016 - 1333/1352* (Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1971) provides a facsimile and a printed text of the original as well as a German translation.

redaction of the *Kievan Chronicle* different from the one preserved in the *Hypatian Codex*.[147] Also, some sixteenth-and seventeenth-century miscellanies contain several twelfth-century annals apparently going back to one or more unknown extinct pre-Mongolian chronicle(s).[148]

In addition to chronicles, an important source for social and political terminology is the Slavonic translation of the *Jewish War* by Flavius Josephus, the earliest copy of which is datable to the mid-fifteenth century on the basis of paleographical evidence. Some scholars believe that the linguistic features of the text indicate that the translation was made in Rus in the twelfth century. Even if it was not translated in Rus, it appears to have been well-known there: the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* contains some passages that look like quotations from it, and most of the surviving copies of the translation, over thirty in number, originate from East Slavonic territories.[149] Comparing the Slavonic terms of the translation with the corresponding

---

[147]See Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 39-40. The entries in question are found in the following compilations: A. F. Bychkov, ed., *Letopis po Voskresenskomu spisku*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 7 (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia archeograficheskaia komissia, 1856; reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2001, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss), hereafter PSRL 7; F. I. Pokrovskii, ed., *Ermolinskaia letopis*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 23 (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia archeograficheskaia komissia, 1910; reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2004, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss), hereafter PSRL 23; S. P. Rozanov, ed., *Letopis po Tipografskomu spisku*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 24 (Petrograd: Arkheograficheskaia komissia, 1921; reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2000, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss), hereafter PSRL 24; M. N. Tikhomirov, ed., *Moskovskii letopisnyi svod kontsa XV v.*, Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei, vol. 25 (Moskow-Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1949; reprinted: Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2004, with a new introduction by B. M. Kloss), hereafter PSRL 25.

[148]See Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 44-51.

[149]On the manuscripts of the Slavonic translation of the *Jewish War* and for a review of literature, see the Introduction in A. A. Pichkhadze et al., eds., *"Istoriia iudeiskoi voiny" Iosifa Flaviia: Drevnerusskii perevod*, Pamiatniki slaviano-russkoi pismennosti: Novaia seriia series, vol. 1 (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kultury, 2004), 7-61. For a different point of view about the place of the translation, see Francis J. Thomson, "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," in Gerhard Birkfellner, ed., *Millenium Russiae Christianae: Tausend Jahre Christliches Russland* (Cologne: Böhlau

Chapter 2.   Terminology of Rulership, Power, and Property

Greek terms of the original helps elucidate the meanings of the former.

Greek expressions also appear to lurk behind the wording of the treaties between Rus and Byzantium interpolated into the *Primary Chronicle* under 907, 911/12, and 945. Franklin and Shepard summarize general scholarly consensus about these texts: "There is no serious doubt that they derive from actual charters or treaties, even if the editors of the chronicle omitted or embellished passages."[150] However, no originals survived, and guesses about the Greek prototypes of the texts included into the *Chronicle* must be made on the basis of the general knowledge about the Byzantine documentation. There is also information about, and what looks like quotations from, a treaty between the Rusian prince Sviatoslav and Byzantium in the *Primary Chronicle*'s entry for 971.[151]

We also need to mention several texts which, while not being political narratives, still offer valuable information on political culture and ideology. First of all, there is the *Sermon on Law and Grace* (*Slovo o Zakone i Blagodati*) by Metropolitan Hilarion (Ilarion) composed in the mid-eleventh century; its earliest copy is datable to the second half of the fifteenth century.[152] The *Sermon*, written in learned Church Slavonic, celebrates the conversion of Rus; one of its parts is an elaborate encomium to Prince Vladimir that makes a case for his sanctity. Franklin expresses the generally accepted view when he describes Hilarion as "intellectually the most sophisticated"

Verlag,1993), 295-354, at 340-41.

[150]Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 103.

[151]PSRL 1, 31-8, 46-53, 72-3.On the treaties, see Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 103-107, 117-20; Jonathan Shepard, "The Viking Rus and Byzantium," in Stefan Brink and Neil Price, eds., *The Viking World* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 496-516, at 499-500; Franklin, *Writing, Society and Culture*, 163-5; M. V. Bibikov, "Rus v vizantiiskoi diplomatii: dogovory Rusi s grekami X v.," *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy medievistiki* 19 (2005): 5-15; P. S. Stefanovich, *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny: Voenno-politicheskaia elita Rusi v X-XI vv.* (Moscow: Indrik, 2012),194-247; for a general review of literature on the treaties, see ibid., 194-202. I am grateful to Professor Stefanovich for allowing me to consult with the manuscript of this work before it was published.

[152]A. M. Moldovan, ed., *"Slovo o zakone i blagodati" Ilariona* (Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1984).

writer of pre-Mongolian Rus and his *Sermon* as exemplifying Rus's "finest literary craftsmanship."[153] Francis Thomson, who vehemently denies any knowledge of Greek in Rus, makes a possible exception for Hilarion. Thomson sees him as the only Rusian author who may have read Greek works in the original.[154]

Another text that provides information on political terminology was written by a Greek. This is an epistle from the Kievan metropolitan Nicephorus (m. 1104-21) to Vladimir Monomakh about Lent that contains a discussion of the ruler's duties; its earliest copy is datable to the late fifteenth/early sixteenth century. Only Slavonic texts of this and other epistles by Nicephorus have survived; it is unknown if they were composed in Slavonic or translated from lost Greek originals.[155]

Finally, a wealth of information on the ideas about princes and rulership is found in the texts connected with the cult of the saint princes Boris and Gleb (died in 1015). The main sources on Boris and Gleb and their cult are the account about them in the *Primary Chronicle*, the *Lesson* (*Lection*) *on the Life and Murder of the Blessed Passion-Sufferers Boris and Gleb* (*Chtenie o zhitii i pogublenii blazhennykh strastoterptsev Borisa i Gleba*), the *Tale and Passion and Encomium of the Holy Martyrs Boris and Gleb* (*Skazanie i strast' i pokhvala sviatoiu mucheniku Borisa i Gleba*), and the *Tale of the Miracles of the Holy Passion-Sufferers of Christ Roman and David* (*Skazanie chudes sviatoiu strastoterptsy Khristovu Romana i Davida*; Roman and David were Boris's and Gleb's baptismal names). All of these texts were written in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. The earliest copy of the *Tale and Passion* is from a menologion datable to the twelfth or early thirteenth century,

---

[153]Introduction to Simon Franklin, ed. and transl., *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Translation Series 5 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), xvi. For the English translation of the Sermon, see ibidem, 3-30; for the editions, see ibidem, cxi.

[154]Thomson, "'Made in Russia," 307.

[155]On the epistles of Nicephorus, see Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 232-7; Introduction to G. S. Barankova, ed. and transl., *Chista molitva tvoia: pouchenie i poslaniia drevnerusskim kniaziam Kievskogo mitropolita Nikifora* (Moscow: Ikhtios, 2005).

and the earliest copies of the *Lesson* and the *Tale of the Miracles* are found in a fourteenth-century miscellany. The liturgical office for Boris and Gleb was written in the eleventh century and expanded in the twelfth century; the earliest copies are from the twelfth century. The *Eulogy and Martyrdom of the Holy Martyrs Boris and Gleb* (*Pokhvala i muchenie sviatykh muchenik Borisa i Gleba*), also known as the *Homily* (*Sermon*) *on Princes* (*Slovo o kniaziakh*), commemorates the translation of the relics of Boris and Gleb (1072), and it contains an account about the saintly life of Prince David Sviatoslavich who was locally venerated in the Chernigov Land. The *Homily* was, most likely, composed in the late twelfth century; its earliest copy is from the fifteenth century.[156]

2.1 Terminology Describing a Ruler

"Prince" is the translation of the Slavonic word *kniaz*. This is how the Rusian rulers are known in the East Slavonic texts, although on some occasions, discussed below, the sources also use other terms. *Kniaz* is the most generic East Slavonic term for a "ruler." The chronicler explains that "God gives power (or: authority, *vlast*) according to his will, for the Most High appoints a *tsesar* and a *kniaz*. If a land is righteous before God (*upravitsia pered Bogom*), he appoints a righteous,

---

[156]On the cult of Boris and Gleb, see N. I. Miliutenko, *Sviatye kniazia-mucheniki Boris i Gleb* (St. Petersburg: Izdatelstvo Olega Abyshko, 2006); Gail Lenhoff, *The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Sociocultural Study of the Cult and the Texts*, UCLA Slavic Studies Series 19 (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 1989); Jonathan Shepard, "Slav Christianities, 800-1100," in Thomas F. X. Noble and Julia M. H. Smith, eds., *The Cambridge history of Christianity*, vol. 3, *Early Medieval Christianities, c.600-c.1100* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 130-58, at 153-4; on the texts, see Shchapov, *Pismennye pamiatniki*, 187-90, 197-9; Lenhoff, *The Martyred Princes*, 55-121; Introduction to Paul Hollingsworth, ed. and transl., *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Translation Series 2 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992), xxvi-lvii; for the English translation of the *Lesson, Tale and Passion*, and of the *Tale of Miracles*, see ibidem, 3-32, 97-134.

justice-loving *kniaz* to it."[157] *Tsesar/tsar* normally signifies either the Byzantine or German emperor.[158] In the Slavonic translation of the *Jewish War*, the Greek *basileus* is translated as *tsesar*.[159] Thus, *tsesar* means "emperor."[160] According to the statement quoted above, a land can be ruled either by an emperor or by a *kniaz*; these are the only two types of a sovereign ruler that the author of this chronicle passage knows.

In addition to these two titles, the *Kievan* and *Galician-Volhynian* chronicles use the word *korol/kral* which means "king" in modern Russian, but which, in the twelfth century, referred to the Hungarian rulers exclusively.[161] Hegumen Daniel, in his early twelfth-century description of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, calls Baldwin I "*kniaz* of Jerusalem"; the *Primary Chronicle* in the *Hypatian Codex* refers to the biblical Belshazzar as "the Persian *kniaz*."[162] In all these cases, *kniaz* apparently means "king." Moreover, contemporary Latin sources normally translate *kniaz* as *rex*.[163] The modern convention of translating *kniaz* as "prince" may owe more to the meaning of *kniaz* in imperial Russia, where this word signified an aristocratic title, than to the usage of *kniaz* in the Rusian texts.

On the other hand, a *kniaz* is different from a king in that a king is made and a *kniaz* is born. There was no ritual analogous to a coronation, anointing, or any other procedure that signified becoming a *kniaz*. Of course, many early medieval kings were

---

[157]PSRL 1, 349; PSRL 2, 691, 693.

[158]E.g. *N1L*, 46-7; PSRL 2, 666-7, 723**.**

[159]Drevnerusskii ukazatel' [Old Russian index] in A. A. Pichkhadze et al, *"Istoriia iudeiskoi voiny"*, vol. 2, 459-60.

[160]Except for the Roman emperor who is signified by a slightly different form of the same word, *kesar* (see Tolochko, *Kniaz' v Drevnei Rusi*, 110).

[161]PSRL 2, 301, 384-8, 405-9, 447-54, 461-7.

[162]PSRL 2, 272.

[163]A. V. Soloviev, "'Reges' et 'Regnum Russiae' au Moyen Age," *Byzantion: Revue internationale des études byzantines* 36 (1966): 143-73; A. V. Nazarenko, *Nemetskie latinoiazychnye istochniki IX-XI vekov: Teksty, perevod, kommentarii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1993),111, 149-50.

neither crowned nor anointed; however, to be a king, one had to rule a kingdom, or, at least, to be considered a nominal ruler of a kingdom, as was the case with the late Merovingians. In contrast with that, a *kniaz* could have authority over no more than a tiny piece of land, and he remained a *kniaz* even if he did not have authority over any territory. The latter situation was abnormal because a share in land and power was considered a birthright for any legitimate[164] son of a *kniaz*; however, occasionally, a *kniaz* could lose his territory, as was the case with the landless *kniaz* Ivan Rostislavich "Berladnik."[165] In this respect, *kniaz* was from the very beginning more reminiscent of an aristocratic title received at birth and unalienable for life than of a ruler's title. The closest analogy for this aspect of Rusian *kniaz* elsewhere is perhaps to be found in medieval Ireland which consisted of a multitude of lordships and kingships ruled by many genealogically interrelated dynasties. There was no clear distinction between a king and a local lord.[166] Similarly, in Rus the term *kniaz* was indiscriminately applied to figures whose social functions were, from a modern perspective, rather different. On the one hand, it signified rulers of big territorial units who participated in international politics and had marriage ties with various European monarchs. It is they who are described in the contemporary Latin sources as *reges.* On the other hand, the same word was used for men who, for a modern historian, look more like noble landlords than kings, for men who had authority over a compact piece of land and who were, as we shall see, subordinate to greater princes. Thus, one may say that *kniazi* (plural of *kniaz*) represented the upper stratum of

---

[164]There is at least one case when a prince bequeathed his dominion to his illegitimate son (PSRL 2, 657), and one case when a prince granted a town to an illegitimate son (PSRL 1, 270). Prince Vladimir, who brought Christianity to Rus, also was illegitimate; he was a son of a prince and a female servant (*milostnitsa*) (PSRL 2, 27; PSRL 1, 299-300). However, the line between legitimate and illegitimate children in pre-Christian Rus was probably blurred because of the tradition of polygamy.

[165]PSRL 2, 316-17, 329, 338, 488, 497-8, 519; see also Pashuto, "Cherty politicheskogo stroia," 65-6.

[166]See Bart Jaski, *Early Irish Kingship and Succession* (Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2000).

Chapter 2. Terminology of Rulership, Power, and Property

Rusian society, analogous to the Western royalty and aristocracy taken together.

With all this in mind, I still use the conventional English term "prince" to translate *kniaz*.

Besides the standard term *kniaz*, there are several cases when a Rusian prince is called *kagan*. *Kagan*, or *chaganus*, was the title of the ruler of Khazaria, a polity that dominated the steppes north of the Caspian Sea and along the Volga in the ninth and tenth centuries. The Rusian sources use *kagan* only in the tenth and eleventh century when the princes probably wanted to send the message of the equality of their status with that of the Khazarian ruler.[167]

Some princes are occasionally called *samoderzhets*, *edinoderzhets*, or *samovlastets*. *Samoderzhets* is used in the *Jewish War* to translate both *autokrator* and *monarhias*, *edinoderzhets* is also used for *autokrator*.[168] In fact, all three words are translations of "autocrat": *edin* means "one," *sam* "self," *vlast* "power, rule, authority." *Derzh-* is the root of the verb *derzhati*. The basic meaning of the verb is "to hold," but, just as the Old French *tenir*, it could also mean "to rule." [169] In the *Song of Roland*, Charlemagne "holds" (*tient*) France (8.116);[170] and the chronicles describe Rusian princes as "holding" their dominions.[171] Thus, when a prince is called *samoderzhets*, *edinoderzhets*, or *samovlastets*, he is represented as somebody who exercises power alone, as a sole ruler. These terms have been interpreted as evidence of a develop-

---

[167]See Shepard, "Orthodoxy and Northern Peoples," 182; A. A. Gorskii, "Ob evoliutsii titulatury verkhovnogo pravitelia Drevnei Rusi (domongloskii period), in A. N. Sakharov et al., eds., *Rimsko-Konstantinopolskoe nasledie na Rusi: Ideia vlasti i politicheskaia praktika. IX Mezhdunarodnyi seminar istoricheskikh issledovanii "Ot Rima k Tret'emy Rimu," Moskva, 1989* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, Institut Rossiiskoi istorii, 1995), 97-102, at 97.

[168]"Drevnerusskii ukazatel' [Old Russian index]," in Pichkhadze, *Istoriia iudeiskoi voiny*, vol. 1, 842; vol. 2, 338.

[169]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 53.

[170]Gerard J. Brault, ed. and trans., *The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978), 8.

[171]E.g. PSRL 1, 299; PSRL 2, 88, 500, 709.

ment towards a "normal" monarchy, all the more so that *samoderzhets vseia Rusi*, "autocrat of all Rus" later became part of the official title of the tzars.[172]

In fact, in most chronicle narratives, "autocrat" has a strong negative connotation.[173] This word signifies a prince who plots to get rid of other princes or to deprive them of their shares in land and power in order to concentrate all the resources in his hands.[174] On the other hand, there are some cases when "autocrat" is used in a laudatory manner, in sharp contrast with the common use of this word in the chronicles. Tolochko has argued that "autocracy" had neutral or positive connotations when it resulted from circumstances beyond the power of the "autocrat," such as the natural death of his brothers, and that in such cases, the sole rule was believed to be God-given. He also discusses the laudatory use of "autocrat" in two chronicle entries where the word is applied to princes who do not meet Tolochko's criteria for exercising "God-given sole rule." He interprets this as evidence that "the idea of sole rule came to be viewed somewhat more positively at the very end of the twelfth century."[175]

However, both entries are not accounts of events, but eulogies. The first of them, unlike the bulk of the chronicles, uses Church Slavonic heavily, and it is written in the tradition of Hilarion's encomium to Vladimir, whom Hilarion calls "our kagan" and "the autocrat (*edinoderzhets*) of his land."[176] Franklin and Shepard describe Hilarion's strategy for "furthering the dignity, prestige and legitimacy" of the Kievan princes as a "complex amalgam" of Byzantine ideas and elements borrowed from

---

[172]For a review of literature on the concept of the "autocrat" in Rus, see Tolochko, *Kniaz*, 69-70.

[173]See Jonathan Shepard, "Rus'," in Nora Berend, ed., *Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus' c.900-1200* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 369-416, at 392-3.

[174]For the chronicle entries condemning the "autocratic" princes, see Tolochko, *Kniaz*, 71-4.

[175]Tolochko, *Kniaz*, 75-6.

[176]Moldovan, *"Slovo o zakone i blagodati" Ilariona*, 19.

various other sources, including Khazar rulership.[177] By the late twelfth century, the memory of once-powerful Khazaria had faded, and references to its kagan became irrelevant. However, the Byzantine Empire was as powerful and prestigious as ever, and its terminology of rulership was used in high-register Church Slavonic texts. An especially fine example of such a text is the *Kievan Chronicle* entry under 1199, one of the entries that supposedly indicate a changing attitude to the idea of "autocracy." This is an elaborate piece of praise for the "pious Grand Prince Riurik, named Basil[178] after his spiritual birth from the divine baptismal font [*po porozhdeniiu zhe ot bozhestvennyia kupeli dukhom pronarechenu Basiliu*]," for Riurik's "Christ-loving princess, a namesake of Ann, which means 'Grace', who gave birth to the mother of our Lord God," and for their "God-favored [*bogonabdimymi*] children." This Riurik, aka Basil, belonged to the long line of the "autocrats [*samoderzhitsi*] holding the throne of Kiev."[179] In such a context, "autocrat" is simply an element of high-register rhetoric, a reference to the prestigious Byzantine ideal. The same entry calls Riurik not only "autocrat," but also "emperor"[180] and *kur*, from the Greek *kurios* meaning "lord," or "supreme power."[181] Raffensperger has shown that such Byzantine-style titles were used to enhance the prestige of various rulers all over Europe.[182] Thus, some Anglo-Saxon kings, as well as William the Conqueror, called themselves *basileis*, and King Symeon of Bulgaria was the "Emperor of the Romans and the Bulgarians."[183]

---

[177]Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus'*, 214.

[178]Princes usually had two names: a Christian one given at baptism and an "unofficial" traditional Slavic or Scandinavian name that commemorated one of their princely ancestors. The chronicles call most princes by their traditional non-Christian names.

[179]PSRL 2, 708-9.

[180]"*tsesarskoi mysli ego*," PSRL 2, 712.

[181]PSRL 2, 711.

[182]Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, 17-27.

[183]Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, 221, 223. On Symeon's appropriation of the title and symbols of the *basileus*, see Jonathan Shepard, "Orthodoxy and Northern Peoples: Goods, Gods and Guidelines," in Liz James, ed., *A Companion to Byzantium*, (Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 171-86, at 179.

Wladimir Vodoff has demonstrated that *tsesar/tsar* as a designation of a Rusian prince did not have any technical meaning. This was a high-register laudatory epithet rather than a title.[184] Apparently, *kur* and *samoderzhitsi* in Riurik's eulogy perform the same function. Similarly, the designation of Prince Roman as *samoderzhets* in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* under 1201 is part of a eulogy for this prince.[185] The difference between the usage of "autocrat" in these two eulogies and in the accounts of political and military events reflects stylistic and functional differences between the contexts, not the evolution of the attitude towards "autocracy."

In addition to other pompous titles, both Riurik's and Roman's eulogists use the term *velikii kniaz*, that is, "grand prince." [186] The chronicles apply this term to some other princes as well. The use of "grand prince" in the chronicles is very irregular, with one and the same person being called now "grand" and now simply "prince" and with more than one "grand prince" existing simultaneously.[187] In spite of that, many scholars see it as a technical title for the supreme ruler and propose elaborate explanations in order to reconcile the inconsistencies of the chronicle narratives and to discover general rules that guided the "strictly hierarchical system of titles," which, according to Gorskii, existed in Rus, at least in some periods.[188] Other historians have argued that "grand prince," just like *tsesar*, was not a title with a precise meaning and that no single prince was universally recognized in Rus as "grand."[189]

---

[184]Wladimir Vodoff, "Remarques sur la valeur du term le 'tsar' appliqué aux princes russes avant le milieu du XV siècle," *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 11 (1978): 1-41.

[185]PSRL 2, 715.

[186]PSRL 2, 711, 715.

[187]For review of the usage of "grand prince" in pre-Mongolian chronicles, see Wladimir Vodoff, "La titulature princière en Russie du XIe au début du XVIe siècle: Questions de critique des sources," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 35 (1987): 1-35, at 20-25.

[188]Gorskii, "Ob evoliutsii titulatury," 100. See also Tolochko, *Kniaz*, 128-35; Dimnik, "The Title," 306-8.

[189]Shepard, "Rus'," 393; V. L. Ianin, *Aktovye pechati Drevnei Rusi X-XV vv.*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Nauka, 1970), 20-21; Wladimir Vodoff, "La titulature des princes russes du Xe au début du XIIe siècle et les relations extérieures de la Russie kiévienne," *Revue des études slaves* 55 (1983): 139-50. For a review of literature on the term "grand prince," see Dimnik,

Vodoff, in particular, has pointed to the indifference to precise titles and the fluidity of the terminology of rulership that existed in pre-Mongolian Rus.[190] His conclusions correspond to findings of Western medievalists about the use of titles before the rise of bureaucracy and academic law. Words such as *dux*, *comes*, *princeps*, traditionally translated as "duke," "count," and "prince" did not have precise technical meanings and were not used uniformly in all Latin works written within a certain time period. Indeed, they were not necessarily used uniformly even by the same author within a single text. Thus, Felice Lifshitz has argued that for a proper understanding of terminology used in Dudo of Saint-Quentin's *Gesta Normannorum* (late tenth/early eleventh century), it is necessary "to consider the entire narrative context of each episode analyzed" and to avoid "unjustified conflation" of vocabulary taken from separate passages.[191] In terms of titles, Lifshitz has shown that for Dudo, *dux* "was a temporary military leader and not a ranked official ruler of a stable territory." Such usage had a specific purpose: by calling warband leaders *duces*, Dudo denigrated the Capetian ancestor Duke Hugh the Great. Lifshitz has argued against the practice of translating *dux* as "duke" when applied to Hugh and as "leader" when applied to figures such as the early Viking leader Astign. According to her, this was exactly Dudo's point: to proclaim the equal status of Hugh and Astign, to show that Hugh the Great was no better than a warlord.[192]

Robert Helmerichs has analyzed the designation of the rulers of Normandy in

---

"The Title," 253-5.

[190]Vodoff, "La titulature des princes russes," 150; idem, "La titulature princière," 29, 35 ("la titulature princière doit être envisagée dans la Russie ancienne comme une réalité mouvante et parfois assez floue").

[191]Felice Lifshitz, "Translating 'Feudal' Vocabulary: Dudo of Saint-Quentin," *The Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History* 9 (1997): 39-56, at 50. On Dudo, see the Introduction to Dudo of St Quentin, *History of the Normans*, ed. and transl. by Eric Christiansen (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1998). See also *Viking Normandy: Dudo of St. Quentin's Gesta Normannorum*, ed. and transl. by Felice Lifshitz at http://www.the-orb.net/orb_done/dudo/dudindex.html (accessed 01.03.2013).

[192]Lifshitz, "Translating 'Feudal' Vocabulary," 42-3.

contemporary sources and has found that it is consistently inconsistent: Rollo and his immediate successors "bore a range of designators, such as *comes*, *consul*, *dux*, *princeps*, and *marchio*, with adjectives like *Normannorum*, *Rotomagensis*, *piratarum*, or, more commonly, no adjective at all."[193] According to Helmerichs, it is impossible to establish what was the "real" title of the ruler of Normandy because the very concept is anachronistic. The confusing and shifting nature of the designators used to describe the Rollonids reflects "a genuine lack of interest" in legalistic titles on the part of contemporaries. Thus, the tenth-century chronicler Flodoard of Reims applies the term *princeps* to so many different persons of varied statuses that the only meaning of this word that can be derived from his text is a very generic "'leading man,' on no matter what scale."[194]

Barthélemy came to similar conclusions about the use of titles in central-western France. He concentrated on the lesser nobility, the lords of the numerous castles for whom *princeps*, *castellanus*, *dominus castri* and other designators were used, none of which had an exact technical meaning. In the absence of a clear administrative hierarchy, all these terms were no more than "pseudo-titles."[195] The same is true for the designators of greater nobles. Thus, Adémar of Chabannes in his *Chronicle* (1020s) consistently calls the ruler of Aquitaine William V *dux*,[196] but on one occasion he uses *duces* (rendered as "chefs" in the French translation) for two brothers belonging to the lesser Aquitanian nobility (III.45).[197] The only reason for this seems to be the fact that these brothers were Adémar's own uncles, and he wanted to compliment them. Furthermore, in the royal charters, William V is consistently called

---

[193]Robert Helmerichs, "Princeps, Comes, Dux Normannorum: Early Rollonid Designators and their Significance," *The Haskins Society Journal: Studies in Medieval History* 9 (1997): 57-77, at 57.

[194]Helmerichs, "Princeps, Comes, Dux Normannorum," 65, 70.

[195]Dominique Barthélemy, "Note sur le titre seigneurial, en France, au XIe siècle," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* 54 (1996): 131-58, at 156.

[196]*Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, 161 (III.41) and passim.

[197]*Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, 165; Adémar de Chabannes, *Chronique*, ed. and transl. by Yves Chauvin and Georges Pon (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003), 256.

"count of Poitou" or simply "our count."[198] In the *Conventum Hugonis*, William is also *comes* rather than *dux*.[199] The *Conventum* also illustrates Raffensperger's point about the Europe-wide vogue for pompous Byzantine-style titles: the Aquitanian magnate Hugh is called *chiliarchus* (Greek for "commander of a thousand") there. William, on his part, calls himself "the monarch of all Aquitaine (*totius tunc Aquitaniae monarchus*)" in one of his charters.[200]

Finally, Adémar uses *princeps* as generically as Flodoard does according to Helmerichs. On the one hand, a *princeps* of Rancon is someone subordinate to the count of Angoulême (III.60);[201] on the other hand, the same word *princeps* describes the king of Navarre, who is also called a *rex* (III.69).[202] Barthélemy has suggested that in the late twelfth century the kings began to object to applying *princeps* to non-royalty because of the renaissance of Roman law that occurred at that time.[203] From the twelfth century on, not only *princeps*, but also other titles came to be used more regularly and precisely as the result of the increasing importance of legal categories in social relations.[204]

Roman law, of course, was unknown in Rus, and Rusian terms remained imprecise and polysemic throughout the pre-Mongolian period. Therefore, I agree with those scholars who do not see "grand prince" as an established title. I use "grand prince" only in direct quotations from Rusian sources if the translated passages contain the expression *velikii kniaz.*

---

[198]B. S. Bachrach, "'Potius Rex quam Esse Dux putabatur': Some Observations Concerning Adémar of Chabannes' Panegyric on Duke William the Great," *The Haskins Society Journal* 1 (1989): 11-21, at 17.

[199]"Conventum," 541 and passim.

[200]B. S. Bachrach, "'Potius Rex quam Esse Dux putabatur'," 20.

[201]"Aimericus princeps Roconiensis contra *seniorem suum* Willelmum comitem Egolismae... castrum... extruxit (emphasis added)," *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, 181.

[202]*Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, 189.

[203]Barthélemy, "Note sur le titre seigneurial," 147.

[204]"les rapports sociaux se juridisèrent," Barthélemy, "Note sur le titre seigneurial," 157.

2.2　Terminology for Ruler's Men

A prince (*kniaz*) is usually represented in a company of his *muzhi, druzhina*, and/or *boyars*.

The basic meaning of *muzh* is "man." When the late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century text known as the *Petition of Daniel the Exile* criticizes a *muzh* dominated by his wife, or when the *Primary Chronicle* uses *muzhi* and *zheny* (women) in its discussion of different marriage customs and gender roles, the word clearly signifies any male regardless of his social standing.[205] Men of higher status are sometimes referred to as the *luchshie muzhi*, "best men." For example, on one occasion, Prince Iziaslav took so many prisoners of war that he could not transport them safely; therefore, he ordered most captives to be killed, but spared "their best men."[206] In political narratives, *muzhi* with no modifier are usually represented as men close to the prince. The chronicles often depict princes consulting (*dumati*) with their *muzhi*, dispatching *muzhi* as envoys and entrusting various tasks to them.[207] Thus, *muzhi* corresponds to Latin *homines* as a word for a ruler's or magnate's men. Old school scholars tended to translate *homo* as "vassal" because of the association with the word "homage." However, there is no evidence that every person to whom the sources refer as somebody's *homo* performed a ritual of homage, and even if he did, we often do not know if the ritual established the feudo-vassalic bond or some other type of relationship. Therefore, in recent works, "so and so's *homo*" is rendered by a more generic "so and so's man." This appears the best way to translate *muzh* as well.

"Prince's men," or possibly "friends," also appears to be the best way to trans-

---

[205]"Slovo Danila Zatochenika, ezhe napisa svoemu kniaziu, Iaroslavu Volodimerovichiu," BLDR 4 at http://lib.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4942 (accessed 02.26.2013); PSRL 1, 15-16.
[206]PSRL 1, 341.
[207]E.g. PSRL 1, 316, 320, 342; PSRL 2, 303, 304, 328.

late *druzhina* in most cases.[208] This is a collective noun signifying a group of people; its most basic meaning is "fellows," "friends" or "companions." Etymologically, it is connected with the word *drug* - "friend," "companion"; *druzhba* means friendship, *druzhitisia* "to be friends."[209] There was no word for an individual member of a *druzhina*; *druzhinnik* used in Russian scholarly literature to signify a person belonging to *druzhina* is a modern coinage.[210] Princes are often represented as consulting with *druzhina* – in this sense the word seems to be interchangeable with *muzhi*, and they are accompanied by *druzhina* in battles.[211]

Druzhina is usually rendered in English as "retainers," which, in my opinion, is too narrow. Like most medieval terms, the word covers a range of meanings. In some contexts, *druzhina* is a small group of closest advisers, as when two princes, both with their *druzhinas*, are sitting in a tent and discussing their plans.[212] In other cases, *druzhina* seems to be synonymous with "army." Nothing suggests that *druzhina* always accompanied the prince and formed his "retinue." On the contrary, the chronicles describe situations when *druzhina* act independently of their prince. For example, when Prince Sviatoslav found out that a rival prince was advancing with a big army in order to besiege him in his town of Novgorod-Seversky, he sought the advice of his *druzhina*. They unanimously recommended him to leave the town

---

[208]For a case when the word *sui* was rendered in a medieval Western Slavic text as *druzhina*, see Stefanovich, *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny*, 87. *Sui* was normally used interchangeably with *homines*, see below, p. 66.

[209]R. I. Avanesov et al., *Slovar drevnerusskogo iazyka (XI-XIV vv.)*, vol. 3 (Moscow: Russkii iazyk, 1990), 91-3. In Russian scholarly literature, historians of Rus leave *druzhina* untranslated, and historians of the medieval West normally use *druzhina* to translate "comitatus." For a review of literature on *druzhina*, see Stefanovich, *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny*, 63-5, 91-2; for a detailed discussion of the meanings of *druzhina* and *drug*, see ibidem, 66-90 (in Slavic medieval texts in general), 91-131 (in Rusian texts).

[210]On *druzhinnik*, see Stefanovich, *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny*, 70-71.

[211]For a review of different contexts in which the Rusian sources mention *druzhina*, see Sverdlov, *Domongolskaia Rus*, 532-3; A. A. Gorskii, *Drevnerusskaia druzhina: k istorii genezisa klassovogo obshestva i gosudarstva na Rusi* (Moscow: Prometei, 1989), 25-37, 39-41, 61-5, 73-4; Stefanovich, *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny*, 93-131.

[212]PSRL 1, 277.

because there was not enough provision there and to move to a place where he would be in a better position to fight his enemy. "And thus Sviatoslav fled from Novgorod to Korachev, and some of his *druzhina* went with him, but others left him."[213] Another prince planned a campaign without consulting with his *druzhina* first. "And his *druzhina* told him, 'You, prince, planned this by yourself (*sobe esi, kniazhe, zamyslil*), we will not go with you [because] we did not know about [your plan]."[214] This is not the behavior of "retainers."

The basic meaning of *druzhina* as a group of friends or companions has correspondences in Old French texts where kings and magnates are also depicted as consulting with, and accompanied by, their companions and friends. For example, in *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, Louis VII of France "holds a great council of all his good friends (*de tuz ses bon amis*)" (3.32).[215] Other Old French words for "friend," in addition to *ami*, are *drujun* (*drugon, drugun*) and *dru*, and all these *dru*-words also have a meaning of "follower" or "supporter."[216] In another passage of *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, King William of Scotland is sitting in a pavilion surrounded by his chamberlains and by his "privé drujun" (79.715).[217] However, "friends" did not always signify the men most close to the lord. Thus, in one version of the twelfth-century verse literary history of Britain, *Roman de Brut*, Brutus goes out to fight the king of Greece with three thousand of his men (*sa gent*), and the next lines reiterate that he has left his castle "with three thousand friends" (157-62).[218] In another ver-

---

[213]PSRL 2, 334.

[214]PSRL 2, 536.

[215]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 4.

[216]Alan Hindley, Frederick W. Langley, and Brian J. Levy, *Old French-English Dictionary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 244; *Anglo-Norman Dictionary* available as an electronic text at http://www.anglo-norman.net/gate/

[217]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 54.

[218]"Brutus ...Cuntr'els [the king's army] vint vivement/ Od treis mile de sa gent. Li dux [Brutus] est a son chastel venuz/ Od treis mile de ses druz." Alexander Bell, ed., *An Anglo-Norman 'Brut' (Royal 13.A.xxi)*, Anglo-Norman Texts Series 21-22 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1969), 6. The text published by Bell is found in a late thirteenth-century manuscript. Numerous vernacular texts based on Geoffrey of Monmouth's fantastic history of Britain,

sion of *Brut*, Brutus fights the king with three thousand *armez*, that is, armed men
(273).[219] In other words, Brutus's "friends" are equivalent to his soldiers. The word
"companions" has an equally wide range of meanings. For example, Fantosme refers
to the *Song of Roland* and calls the twelve peers of France "les dudze cumpaignuns"
(10.113), and he also calls Henry II's whole army "sa cumpaigne" (5.66).[220]

Thus, both in Rusian and in Anglo-Norman texts, a lord's "friends" or "compan-
ions" are his men ranging from a small circle of advisers to an army. The correspond-
ing words should be either rendered literally as "friends" - this is how R. C. Jonston
translates Louis's *ami* and William's *drujun*[221] – or they should be expressed by a
range of varied terms depending on the context. In any case, there is no reason why
druzhina should be uniformly rendered as "retainers." I chose to translate *druzhina*
differently in different contexts and to supply the original word in parenthesis.

Druzhina included men of various status. The sources talk about the "best"

Historia Regum Britanniae (c. 1136), are collectively known as *Roman de Brut* or simply
Brut. The best-known among them is the one written by Wace in the 1150s. On Wace, his
Roman de Brut, and on other *Bruts*, see Peter Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the
Twelfth-Century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (New York: Boydell Press,
1999), 53-6, 61-5; Introduction to Judith Weiss, ed. and transl., *Wace's Roman de Brut:
A History of the British* (Exeter, UK: University of Exeter Press, 1999).

[219]Weiss, *Wace's Roman de Brut*, 8.

[220]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 4, 10. For more examples of the usage of "cumpaignuns,"
"cumpaigne," and related words, see e.g. *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle* 12.119 (p. 10);
Weiss, *Wace's Roman de Brut* 835 (p. 22); Brault, *The Song of Roland* 125[113].1632
(p. 100), 131.1735 (p. 106). Latin accounts of twelfth-century events also occasionally use
comitatus in the original sense of the "group of followers," probably as an equivalent of the
vernacular *cumpaigne*. For example, William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*
(1130s) writes about the count of Boulogne going "cum toto comitatu" on a punitive
expedition against the people of Canterbury who killed his servant. The townsmen fought
back, and the count lost "viginti ex suis," that is, "twenty of his [men]" (II.199). Thus,
suis is another word to describe the members of the count's *comitatus*, which, again, points
to the rough correspondence between *sui* and *druzhina* (see above, note 207). William of
Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, ed. and transl.
by R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom (Oxford: Clarendon Press,
1998), 356.

[221]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 5, 55.

(*luchshaia*, *lepshaia*, *peredniaia*, *perviaia*) or "senior" (*stareishaia*) *druzhina*, which is sometimes opposed to the "junior" (*molodshaia*) one. While describing princes' councils with *druzhina*, the chronicles either do not use any modifier, or if they do, they refer to the "best" or "senior" *druzhina*.[222] The only exception is the occasion when the chronicler criticizes the prince who "started to love the reasoning of young men (*smysl unykh*)," to consult with them, and "to neglect his best *druzhina* (*negodovati druzhiny svoeia pervyia*)," who, apparently, consisted of seniors whether in regards to age or to rank.[223] The sources sometimes refer to members of *druzhina* and/or prince's men of apparently lower status as *otroki* or *detskie*. The basic meanings of *otrok* are "youth, adolescent" or "servant"; *detskie* literally means "children, minors."[224]

Senior members of *druzhina*, as well as prominent men in general, are sometimes called *boiare* (singular *boiarin*). This word is traditionally represented in English as "boyars" or "boyards." Some passages depict boyars as men whose social standing is one step below the princes. For example, this is how the *Kievan Chronicle* explains a defeat of Prince Iziaslav Mstislavich's men: Iziaslav had sent his only adult son to Hungary, and the soldiers could not withstand an attack "because there was no prince there, and not everyone would obey a boyar (*boiarina ne vsi slushahiut*)."[225] Thus, it is apparently assumed that a boyar takes a command in the absence of a prince.

---

[222]See Gorskii, *Drevnerusskaia druzhina*, 39-41.

[223]PSRL 1, 217. The basic meaning of *pervaia* (nominative case of *pervyia*) is "first." As a modifier of *druzhina*, this word may mean either "best," or possibly "previous." In any case, the *pervaia druzhina*, with which Vsevolod should have consulted, is contrasted with the "young men."

[224]For the discussion of these and other terms used to signify members of the *druzhina* of various status, see Gorskii, *Drevnerusskaia druzhina*, 49-56; P. S. Stefanovich, "'Bolshaia druzhina' v Drevnei Rusi," *Srednie veka: Issledovaniia po istorii Srednevekovia i rannego Novogo vremeni* 73 (2011): 27-57.

[225]PSRL 2, 425-6.

Chapter 2. Terminology of Rulership, Power, and Property

Historians have exercised much effort and ingenuity in order to establish the precise meanings of the *druzhina* in general, of the "best" or "senior" *druzhina*, of *muzhi* and *boyare*, and to determine how all these terms relate to one another. Did *muzh* constitute a "title"? Were *muzhi* synonymous with the boyars? Were all members of the best *druzhina* boyars? Were there boyars who were not members of any prince's *druzhina*? Much scholarly literature has been devoted to such and similar questions.[226] Recent studies tend to view these terms as polysemic; overall, "boyars" and, on many occasions, *muzhi* appear to signify "prominent men"; *muzh* could also be used as a generic word for "man"; *druzhina* in the political narratives most often describes prince's men, in other contexts it may signify various groups of "companions" or "fellow men."[227]

Western medieval authors are likewise uninterested in the precise status of the lord's or ruler's men. Latin texts usually represent them as *homines* or simply as *sui*, "his," as in the oft-used expression "so-and-so *cum suis*," that is "with his men."[228] Similarly, the French texts often use *hommes* and its many variations (*homes, hummes, ums* and so on) and *gent*.[229] *Baron/ber*, which is probably the

---

[226]For this literature, see Sverdlov, *Domongolskaia Rus*, 148-9; Gorskii, *Drevnerusskaia druzhina*, 3-13, 41-9; Stefanovich, *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny*, 115-6.

[227]Stefanovich, *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny*, 124-8; P. V. Lukin, "Veche: Sotsialnyi sostav," in Gorskii et al., *Drevniaia Rus*, 33-147, at 73-7.

[228]E.g. *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon* III.45 (p. 165); Jules Lair, ed., *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum auctore Dudone Sancti Quintini decano* (Caen: Le Blanc-Hardel, 1865), III.61 (p. 206); William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum* II.200 (p. 364), III.233, 244, 248 (pp. 434, 456), IV.309 (p. 550), IV.311 (p. 554), IV.319 (p. 562). Interestingly, in the last case Mynors, Thomson, and Winterbottom translate *homines* as "vassals," while normally they render this word as "men." The reason for this may be that the passage mentions "lands" belonging to these *homines*, although there is no reference to these lands being held as fiefs or to *homines* doing homage and fealty to anyone.

[229]E.g. Weiss, *Wace's Roman de Brut*, 493 (p. 14), 2706, 2708 (p. 68), 3257 (p. 82); Brault, *The Song of Roland* 125[113].1628 (p.100), 271.3743 (p. 228); see ibidem 128.1691 (p. 104) for the Old French usage of *soens* in the sense of "his men" analogous to the Latin *sui*.

most common word for a king's man in the vernacular texts, also has the basic meaning of "man."[230] In the political and military narratives it means a brave and noble man, while the same word in the plural or in the form of a collective noun, such as *barnage, baronie* and the like, signifies a group of king's men ranging from a council to an army. For example, in *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle* Louis's "baruns" are the same as his "friends," that is, his counsellors. On the other hand, one of those "baruns," while discussing plans for a war against Henry II of England, points out that the French king has "grant barnage" capable of inflicting great damage on his enemies. All agree, and they decide to send messages to "many regions" to summon this "barnage" for war (3.37, 5.59). [231] In this respect, "barons/barnage/barounie" are similar to *druzhina,* the meanings of which, as we have seen, also ranged from a "council" to an "army."

Baron and related words can also be used as laudatory epithets that describe the qualities and/or deeds of a nobleman. For example, when Fantosme wanted to praise the advice that Earl Duncan gave to King William of Scotland, he commented that Duncan was speaking "as a baron (*cume barun*)" (27.300).[232] In the prologue to the *Roman de Rou*, Wace discusses the mission of history to commemorate "les felonnies des felons/ et les barnages des barons," that is, wicked deeds of wicked men and noble deeds of noble men (5-6).[233]

Theo Venckeleer has demonstrated that *vassal* in early and high medieval literary

---

[230] *Old French-English Dictionary*, 69, 75; *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, where the entry for *baron* contains examples such as *saives ber* used to translate *vir sapiens* in the unpublished Anglo-Norman translation of the *Dialogues of Saint Gregory.*

[231] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 4, 6.   For more examples of the usage of "barons/barnage/barunie," see e.g. ibid., 7.83 (p. 8), 13.149 (p. 12), where Henry II's "barnage" is equivalent with his "chevaliers"; Weiss, *Wace's Roman de Brut*, 2693 (p. 68), where the expression "le chavalier et le baron" sounds as if these are two different categories.

[232] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 22.

[233] A. J. Holden, ed., *Le Roman de Rou de Wace*, vol. 2 (Paris: Éditions A. and J. Picard, 1973), 309.

sources is often used interchangeably with *baron*. He argues that both words took up the function of the classical Latin *vir* (which was not used in Gallo-Roman anyway). In the constructions where classical Latin would have had *vir*, high medieval texts, French as well as Latin, "employed two lexemes, one of Celtic origin (*vassal*), and the other one of Germanic origin (*baro*)."[234] Thus, the basic meaning of *vassal* was "man"; in the literary texts it signified "brave and noble man," while *vassalage* stood for "brave and noble deeds" and for qualities appropriate to a *vassal*, such as loyalty and bravery.[235] According to Venckeleer, the first usage of *vassal* in the "feudal" sense that is traditionally associated with this word is attested in a text produced in 1398.[236] On the other hand, Barthélemy quotes a document written in 892 in which a *vassalus* is someone holding a *beneficium* from the person whose *vassalus* he is.[237] However, this contradiction may be explained by the fact that the meaning of *vassal(us)* in diplomatic documents was different from that in the literary texts which are the subject of Venckeleer's article. For the purpose of comparative analysis with the Rusian chronicles, the Latin and Old French literary texts are more relevant than diplomatic documents, and in the literary texts, *vassal* either signified a (military) man or was a laudatory epithet. Similarly, *muzh* and its related words were used in a laudatory sense signifying manly, that is, brave and noble, deeds and/or qualities.[238]

Sometimes, a lord goes to battle *cum electis*,[239] "with his chosen ones," an expression reminiscent of the "best *druzhina*." Lord's men can be also described as *milites* or *caballarii*, meaning "warriors on horseback" and often translated as

---

[234]Theo Venckeleer, "Faut-il traduire VASSAL par vassal?" in Q. I. M. Mok et al., eds., *Mélanges de linguistique, de littérature et de philologie médiévales, offerts à J. R. Smeets* (Leiden: Université de Leiden, 1982), 303-16, at 312.

[235]Venckeleer, "Faut-il traduire VASSAL par vassal?" 310-11.

[236]Venckeleer, "Faut-il traduire VASSAL par vassal?" 314, but see below, p. 98.

[237]Dominique Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes ("Conventum Hugonis"): La seigneurie châtelaine et le féodalisme, en France au XIe siècle," *Settimane di studio / Centro Italiano di studi sull' Alto Medioevo* 47 (2000): 447-96, at 471, note 65.

[238]E.g. PSRL 1, 436; PSRL 2, 391, 577, 583, 642, 653.

[239]E.g. *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, III.42 (p. 163).

"knights." According to Constance Bouchard, when these words first appeared in the late tenth century, they were a "description of a function, not of a social group."[240] The Old French *chevalier* did not necessarily signify a man belonging to "knights" as a specific social group either. A good illustration for the lack of fixed meanings and the interchangeability of the terms signifying a lord's men is a passage from the *Roman de Brut* where Brutus divides his "armed men (*armez*)" into three parties, addresses them as "baron (sic)" while giving them instructions to attack the enemy from three sides, and then the author concludes that "li chivaler" did as they were ordered (441-459).[241] Similarly, in the *Song of Roland*, Charlemagne gathers his men ("baruns") for a council (11.166) and addresses them now as "francs chevaller" (20.274), now as "seignurs barons" (13.180).[242] One of those present is Archbishop Turpin (12.170) who, of course, cannot belong to "knights" as a social group. Turpin is a "knight" only in the sense that he fights in battles while riding on horseback. In the battle of Roncevaux, he slays Abisme, one of King Marsile's best warriors (126 [114].1648-1670). This act is described as "grant vasselage," that is, a heroic deed, and Roland praises the Archbishop as a "very good knight (*mult bon chevaler*)" (127.1673).[243] Thus, even in a text written down around 1110, *chevaler* could mean not what we understand by the word "knight" today, but could simply signify a warrior in the most generic sense.[244]

Rusian texts also occasionally describe a prince's men as *voi* which means

---

[240]Constance Brittain Bouchard, *'Strong of Body, Brave and Noble': Chivalry and Society in Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 11, 174. *Milites* are normally understood as horsemen because the sources sometimes contrast them with *pedites*, the foot soldiers.

[241]Weiss, *Wace's Roman de Brut*, 12.

[242]Brault, *The Song of Roland*, 12, 18.

[243]Brault, *The Song of Roland*, 12, 102-4.

[244]The Oxford manuscript that contains the most well-known and the oldest version of the *Song of Roland* is commonly dated to ca. 1110. On the Oxford version and its dating, see Margaret Jewett Burland, *Strange Words: Retelling and Reception in the Medieval Roland Textual Tradition* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), 20-24.

"soldiers" or "warriors."[245] Words such as *caballarii, chevaliers*, or *milites* as opposed
to *pedites*, represent Western soldiers as, first and foremost, "horsemen." Rusian
princes' men were also horsemen. This is indicated not only by many descriptions
of battles where they fight on horseback, but also by the chronicler's remark about
Prince Vsevolod's ninety-year-old *muzh* who was so afflicted by his old age that "he
could not mount a horse."[246] Of course, in Rus, mounted soldiers were not associated
with the cultural developments that came to be associated with knights. Rusian
texts do not describe tournaments or dubbing ceremonies,[247] let alone courtly love
and rescuing damsels in distress. However, the characters of the *Song of Roland*
are, likewise, not "chivalrous" in any other sense apart from fighting on horseback
and a willingness to die in battle rather than retreat before the enemy regardless of
their numbers. These traits they, most certainly, share with the characters of Rusian
heroic narratives. Consider an exchange between Prince Sviatoslav and his men in the
Primary Chronicle, the compiler of which most likely borrowed his information about
Sviatoslav from an oral tradition. During one of their raids, the Rusian warriors
unexpectedly found themselves outnumbered by the Byzantines ten to one.

> And Sviatoslav said, 'We have no choice (*uzhe nam nekamo sebia deti*), we must fight
> them whether we want it or not. May we not disgrace the Rus Land, but let us die
> (*liazhem kostmi*) here. For the dead are not disgraced, but we shall be disgraced if
> we flee. May we not take to flight, but let us resist strongly. I myself will go in front
> of you. If my head falls, look after yourselves (*promyslite soboiu*).' And the soldiers
> (*voi*) said, 'Where your head [falls], there we too lay down our heads.'[248]

Replace the "Rus Land" with "Fair France," and this passage would not have been
out of place in the *Song of Roland.*

By pointing to these similarities, I do not mean to propose to use "knights" as a
translation for *muzhi, voi*, and *druzhina*. What I do propose is to bear in mind that in

---

[245]E.g. PSRL 1, 296, 303, 307, 320; PSRL 2, 288, 290, 297.

[246]PSRL 2, 340, under 1147.

[247]With one possible exception discussed below.

[248]PSRL 1, 70; PSRL 2,

reality men signified by these words had more in common with men described as the *caballarii, chevaliers*, and *milites* than is implied by the conventional translations. On the other hand, if we turn from "real life" to literary representations, *li chevaler* of the *Song of Roland* are, in many respects, closer to Sviatoslav's *voi* than to *li chevaler* of the Arthurian romances.

Thus, we have seen that in Latin, French, and Rusian texts, a ruler is surrounded by his "friends" or "companions," by "warriors," or simply by "men," and all these terms appear to be more or less interchangeable. The only Western term for a lord's/ruler's men that lacks an East Slavonic correspondence is *fideles*, meaning "faithful (loyal, trusted) men." Stefanovich has shown that "*vernost* (loyalty/faithfulness/fidelity)" and its related words were common in religious contexts, but were rarely used in accounts of political and military events. This does not mean that the secular elite did not value loyalty. Princes' men are often represented as being ready to make sacrifices and to die for their lord; they are praised when they do so. However, on such occasions, Rusian texts use phrases such as "to lay down one's head for one's prince/one's land" that express the idea of loyalty without using the actual word.[249] We will discuss loyalty and the ways that it was expressed in more detail later. Let us now see over what the princes, with the help of their men, ruled.

2.3   *Zemlia, Regnum, Terre,* and *Res Publica*

When we say that the Riurikid dynasty ruled over Rus, what do we mean by "Rus"? The answer is tautological: this is the territory over which the Riurikids

---

[249]P. S. Stefanovich, "Poniatie vernosti v otnosheniiakh kniazia i druzhiny na Rusi v XII-XIII v.," *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy medievistiki* 31 (2008): 72-82; idem, "Kniaz i boiare: kliatva vernosti i pravo ot'ezda," in A. A. Gorskii et al., *Drevniaia Rus: Ocherki politicheskogo i sotsialnogo stroia* (Moscow: Indrik, 2008), 148-269, at 175-9.

had authority. The expression most often used by the sources is *Ruskaia zemlia*, usually translated into English as the "Rus Land," "Rusian Land," or the "Land of Rus." The meaning of *Rus(kaia zemlia)* in the medieval texts is as shifting and imprecise as that of *Francia* which, as is well-known, could signify "one of several things."[250] Both words most often described a block of lands around Paris and Kiev respectively, but sometimes they were also applied to a much larger territory, to what modern historians call "medieval France" and "Rus." In accordance with scholarly convention, I use "Rus" in the broad sense of "all the Riurikids' dominions," and I use "Southern Rus" for the territory in the Middle Dnieper around Kiev often described in the medieval texts as the "Rus Land."[251]

The sources normally use the word *zemlia* with an ethnic modifier to signify a country, as in the expressions "*Grecheskaia zemlia* (Greek Land)" for "Greece," "*Ugorskaia zemlia* (Hungarian Land)" for "Hungary," or "*Agnianskaia zemlia* (English Land)" for "England."[252] Quite often, the name of the people stands for the name of their land, as when somebody is said to travel, for example, "*v greki* (to the Greeks)." The accusative of destination of the "Greeks" in this phrase signifies a place, not persons: "Greeks" become a metonymy for the "Greek land." This way of expression exemplifies a wide-spread medieval attitude described by Reynolds: peoples (*gentes*, *nationes*, *populi*) were "perceived in territorial terms" so that "land and people were assumed to be one."[253] Reynolds also argues that medieval people saw

---

[250]Elizabeth M. Hallam and Judith Everard, *Capetian France: 987-1328*, 2nd ed. (Gate Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, 2001), 7.

[251]For the usage of the "Rus Land" in the sources and for the territories that constituted the "Rus Land" in the narrow sense, see V. A. Kuchkin, "'Russkaia zemlia' po letopisnym dannym XI – pervoi treti XIII v.," in A. P. Novoseltsev, ed., *Drevnaishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy: Materialy i issledovaniia, 1992-1993 gody* (Moscow: Nauka, 1995), 74-100; I. V. Vediushkina, "'Rus' i 'Russkaia zemlia' v Povesti vremennykh let i letopisnykh statiiakh vtoroi treti XII – pervoi treti XIII v.," ibid., 101-116.

[252]E.g. PSRL 1, 4-5, 22, 29, 35.

[253]Susan Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 258-9.

gentes as "natural," "given" communities which made a basis for kingdoms. The kingdom, in its turn, was "the highest, most honorable, and most perfect of all secular communities," the archetype of a political unit, while the king was the archetype of a ruler.[254]

Rusian texts undoubtedly display the perception of peoples (*iazytsi*, singular *iazyk*) as the most basic, "given" communities. The *Primary Chronicle* begins with the story about Noah's sons who divided the world among themselves. Then their descendants gave origin to all existing peoples who still live in the parts that were the original lots of each son.[255] Thus, humanity is divided into peoples and the surface of the Earth into these peoples' lands.

On the other hand, Rusian sources contain no evidence for what constitutes the second part of Reynolds's argument, namely, the connection between peoples and their kingdoms and the view of the kingdom as the highest form of community. However, the evidence that Reynolds sees in the Western sources is based mostly on the use of the words *rex* and *regnum*. For example, she argues that "the extent to which kingdoms were perceived, even in France, as the political norm of the eleventh and twelfth centuries is exemplified by the occasional references to Flanders and Normandy, two particularly well-governed areas, as kingdoms." She also thinks that "the power of the rulers of Normandy and Flanders" caused "people to slip into referring to each of them as a kingdom, but their rulers never went as far as to call themselves kings," and neither did William V of Aquitaine who "was, after all only *like* a king (emphasis original)."[256] One wonders how great is the difference between calling himself *rex* and *monarchus*.[257] More importantly, it appears that by giving so much importance to the words that described or did not describe different territories

---

[254]Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, 250-1; eadem, "Fiefs and Vassals Twelve Years Later," 54-5.

[255]PSRL 1, 1-6.

[256]Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, 260, 278.

[257]See above, p. 60.

and rulers, Reynolds is using the same methodology that she criticizes when it is applied to words with "feudal" connotations. If "fiefs" and "vassals" mean different things in different contexts and if there is no reason to think that every time when we encounter them in the sources they signal the existence of "feudalism," why should *rex* and *regnum* invariably signal the ideas of good government and the view of the kingdom as the highest community?

Consider, for example, a passage from Dudo where he describes how "counts" and "princes" (*comites principesque*) of the Normans and the Bretons were concerned that Rollo was getting so old and infirm that he could not take good care of the *regnum*. Therefore, they asked him to transfer power to his son William whom they wanted to have as their "duke, count, and patrician (*nobis ducem eumque praeferamus, nobis patricium et comitem*) (III.37). On this occasion, Normandy is explicitly and forcefully described as not being "well-governed." The magnates addressing Rollo thus depict the condition of the land:

> Most powerful lord and duke, you are burdened with the inconvenience of old age, you cannot be of good help to yourself and to us (*tibique et nobis non potes salubriter subvenire*). For that reason, foreign peoples already afflict us and tear away [from us] all that is ours. There are division and strife (*duellum*) among us, and the concord that should exist in a kingdom is not established and therefore *publica res* is destroyed and wasted.[258]

It is difficult to see how the use of *regnum* here signifies the alleged perception of Normandy as an "especially well-governed area." It is equally hard to imagine that Dudo, in one and the same passage, would pay so little attention to the terminology of rulership as to represent "counts" as subjects of another "count" (who is also a "duke" and a "patrician"), but that he would simultaneously split hairs about what region "deserves" to be called *regnum*. Dudo's use of *regnum* may be better explained if we suggest that in his mind it was not connected with any specific type of governance, good or bad, royal, ducal, or comital, but that he simply used

---

[258]Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 181.

this word to designate any relatively large and coherent territorial unit. Indeed, Reynolds herself has referred to an occasion when the Latin *regnum* was translated into the vernacular as *la terre*.[259] The vernacular works use *terre* both for kingdoms and for smaller territorial units, and also for "landed property" or "piece of land," much as the word "land" is used in modern English.[260] The Latin authors who called Normandy or Flanders *regnum* probably did so because they had in mind the vernacular *terre*.

Lifshitz draws even more far-reaching conclusions on the basis of the usage of *regnum* and other words related to political and territorial authority than Reynolds does. She sees in Dudo's usage of these words "statist elements," the recognition that "the *regnum Francorum* possessed sovereignty (*imperium*) over Normandy."[261] According to her,

> All the conflicts, negotiations and alliances described by Dudo take place within one of three *regna* (realms) defined as *res publica*, namely Dacia, Anglia or Francia, where royal figures possessed *imperium* (sovereignty). Dudo's usage is further evidence that the abstract public power embodied in a *res publica* was part of socio-political discourse long before the academic explosion of the twelfth century ...[262]

Lifshitz also argues that Dudo's vocabulary supports the thesis of Reynolds's *Kingdoms and Communities*.[263] In fact, as we have seen, Reynolds herself admits that Dudo calls Normandy *regnum*, even though it is ruled by a duke/count/patrician/ prince/marquess rather than by a "royal figure." Moreover, Dudo does not reserve *res publica* for either "*res publica* of Francia"[264] or for the two other *regna* mentioned by Lifshitz. We have seen that the magnates referred to *publica res* while asking Rollo to transfer power to William. Their *publica res* clearly cannot signify Francia; if it

---

[259]Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities*, 271.
[260]E.g. Weiss, *Wace's Roman de Brut*, 1050 (p. 28), 1474 (p. 38), 3241 (p. 82); *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 5.62 (p. 6), 13.152 (p. 12).
[261]Lifshitz, "Translating 'Feudal' Vocabulary," 54.
[262]Lifshitz, "Translating 'Feudal' Vocabulary," 45-6.
[263]Lifshitz, "Translating 'Feudal' Vocabulary," 45-6.
[264]Lifshitz, "Translating 'Feudal' Vocabulary," 54.

has any territorial connotations at all, it means "Normandy," or, maybe, something like the "well-being of Normandy." Probably, the best translation in this case is the literal "public affairs." Similarly, when Arnulf of Flanders makes a false peace proposal to William, Arnulf's envoys use *res publica* among other high-register words intended to present their mission as good and noble.[265] On behalf of Arnulf, they ask William to make peace between "monarchies under your and his authority (*monarchiae tuae ditionis et suae*) so that *res publica* would not be ruined by pillaging and burning" (III.61).[266] The deceitfulness of this proposal does not make its wording unrepresentative of the political ideas expressed by Dudo. On the contrary, the "accursed (*exsecrabiles*) envoys" crafted their speech so as to include notions that would be appealing to the Normans. Does their *res publica* serve to express concern for the well-being of France as a whole ruined by the war between Normandy and Flanders? This seems unlikely since the whole speech is about the condition of William's and Arnulf's "monarchies" and peoples. In appears that *res publica* here refers not to a territory, but to the abstract idea of the public good.

Similar connotations are present in the usage of *res publica* by Dudo's contemporary Adémar. He applies this word to the rule of Abbot Peter over the Aquitanian *marcha* centered around the city of Périgueux, the region that later became known as the county of La Marche. William V of Aquitaine appointed Peter as the guardian of the minor sons of the deceased count of Périgueux. Initially, Peter ruled the area well, guided by the wise council of his adviser Ainard. As long as Ainard lived, "abbas Petrus rem publicam optime administravit." Then Ainard died, another good adviser died also, and one more became incapacitated by a serious illness. After that, "Peter, having no trusted advisers, while he did everything rashly and according [only] to his own judgment," terrorized his people and burnt a castle for no good

---

[265]E.g. they address William as "dux tantae bonitatis tantaeque mansuetudinis," Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 206.

[266]"ne res publica, annullata tanta praedatione et incendiis, labatur exitialiter pejoribus ruinis," Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 206.

reason. Because of that, the magnates, supported by Duke William, decided that Peter overstepped the boundaries of the lawful ruler and that he behaved "as if he had dared [to establish] a tyranny (*quasi tirannidem praesumeret*)." Consequently, Peter was deprived of his position as the young counts' guardian and the county's ruler (III.45).[267] Thus, excellent managing of *res publica* during the first period of Peter's rule is contrasted with the "tyranny" that reigned after Peter lost his wise advisers. Adémar normally does not apply *res publica* to any territorial unit; indeed, he avoids general territorial designators, such as *regnum*, *comitatus*, or *ducatus*, and prefers to use proper nouns – Aquitania, Francia etc.[268] It is very unlikely that he suddenly decided to describe one of the territorial units within Aquitaine as *res publica*. Rather, for him, this expression means "public affairs"; it conveys the idea of the public good and proper rulership.

Thus, I agree with Reynolds and Lifshitz that this idea was present in socio-political discourse; however, I do not see why it had to have an exclusive connection with the royal power. *Res publica* did not necessarily describe a *regnum*; a *regnum*, in its turn, did not necessarily have a *rex* and could mean simply a "land" or "region" and, as such, be synonymous with *terre*.

Laura Ashe has shown that Anglo-Norman vernacular authors, Fantosme in particular, invoke the notions of *Engleterre*, or simply *la terre*, when they condemn the devastation brought by war and express other ideas related to the public good.[269]

---

[267]"Petrus, neminem fidelem consiliarium habens, dum ad suum temere facit arbitrium omnia et inter suos terribilis ut leo videtur, castrum proprium Morterarense concremat, contradicente consilio suorum, et hujus rei occasione ... principibus marchionibus cum ... Willelmo duce, quasi tirannidem praesumeret, in eum insurgentis, paulatim ex potestate marchionum ejectus est." *Ademari Cabannesis Chronicon*, 165. Incidentally, all three good advisers responsible for Peter's successful rule were brothers of Adémar's mother.

[268]In "principibus marchionibus" in the footnote above, *marchionibus* are derived from *Marcha*, which, in the Aquitanian context, served more as a proper name for a specific region than as a general term for any borderland territory.

[269]Laura Ashe, *Fiction and History in England, 1066-1200*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 68 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 97-105.

"For Fantosme, the key value is the sanctity of the English land," and the king himself derives "great power" from his connection with the land.[270] Fantosme's *terre* as analyzed by Ashe is functionally similar to the *regnum* and *res publica* in Dudo's passages discussed above: a good ruler, king or not, cares above all about the well-being of the *terre*, *regnum*, or *res publica*, while a bad ruler and/or internal strife destroys it.

Zemlia performs exactly the same function in Rusian political discourse. Linguistically, *Ruskaia zemlia*, the Rus Land, is, of course, structurally analogous to *Engleterre*, and it is as much the key value for the Rusian authors as *Engleterre* is for Fantosme. The chroniclers praise those who "suffer" or "die" to defend the Rus Land from external enemies.[271] Even more importantly, they present the well-being of the Rus Land as the main reason for the princes' efforts to maintain internal peace.[272] The *Primary Chronicle* thus describes a princes' conference in the entry for 1097:

> And they talked among themselves, saying, 'Why do we ruin the Rus Land by making strife among ourselves (*sami na sia kotoru deiushche*)? The Cumans tear our land apart (*zemliu nashu nesut rozno*) and rejoice that there are wars between us. Let us be united in one heart from now on and let us guard (or: take good care of) the Rus Land (*bliudem Ruskyia zemli*).'[273]

While the central role of the "land" here is reminiscent of Fantosme, the description of the evils of internal strife and foreign depredations is close to the speech of the Norman and Breton magnates about the sufferings of their *regnum* and *publica res*. Another expression used in the exhortations to protect the well-being of the Rus Land is also close to the one used by Dudo. Rollo answers to the request of his magnates, "I hand over [to William] the kingdom acquired by the labor of battles and sweat of fighting (*trado regnum labore certaminum sudoreque praeliorum adeptum*)"

---

[270]Ashe, *Fiction and History in England*, 104, 107.
[271]E.g. *N1L*, 53, 104; PSRL 1, 378, 403; PSRL 2, 289, 308, 538, 611.
[272]E.g. PSRL 2, 364, 392.
[273]PSRL 1, 256.

(III.38).[274] Similarly, Prince Iaroslav warns his sons that if they fail to live in love and peace with each other and to obey the eldest brother, they will "ruin the land of your forefathers that they acquired by their great labor"; representatives of the Kievans ask the warring princes to make peace lest the external enemies "capture our land that your forefathers acquired by fighting for the Rus Land with great labor and courage (*trudom velikim i khrabrstvom pobaraiushcha po Russkei zemli*)." [275]

Thus, the ways to end or to prevent the sufferings of the land are different depending on different forms of political organization. For the Norman author, this is a capable, vigorous duke; for the Anglo-Norman poet, this is the restoration of the royal authority challenged by the domestic rebels and foreign invaders; and for the Rusian chronicler, this is cooperation among the princes and their respect for the authority of the senior prince. However, for all of them, the starting point and the key value is not the royal power, but the well-being of the land, be it *regnum*, *terre*, or *zemlia*.

All three terms could signify a "land" on several levels. Along with the "Rus Land" or "Greek Land," the region centered around a big city that included all the territory under the power of the prince who had his residence in this city was also called a *zemlia*.[276] The conventional scholarly term for such a region is "land" or "principality." Gorskii sees the beginning of such usage of *zemlia* in the 1120s-30s as evidence that this was the start of "the period of disintegration." Expressions such as "German Land" or "Hungarian Land" have caused him to believe that *zemlia* described "an independent state." According to him, as soon as we see the "Chernigov Land" or "Suzdalian Land" in the sources, we must conclude that these polities were "independent states."[277] Needless to say that the concept of an "independent state"

---

[274]Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 182.

[275]PSRL 1, 161, 264.

[276]For a list of these lands, see A. A. Gorskii, "Zemli i volosti," in Gorskii et al., *Drevniaia Rus*, 19-23.

[277]Gorskii, "Zemli i volosti," in Gorskii et al., *Drevniaia Rus*, 12, 23, 32.

is utterly anachronistic for the twelfth century and that there is no reason why the same word could not be used for polities of different status. The *regnum* of Normandy was part of the *regnum* of Francia. Similarly, lesser lands were parts of the Rus Land in the broad sense of all the Riurikids' dominion. The princely authority over this dominion, as well as an individual prince's share in land and power, was signified by the polysemic word *volost/vlast.*

2.4 *Dan, Volost*, and *Honor*; *Gorod* and *Castrum*

The meanings of *volost/vlast* are a nice illustration for the lack of distinction between rulers and landlords, rights of property and rights of government, which, in the words of Reynolds, is typical of any "settled, agricultural, and hierarchical polity where there is no bureaucracy and little or no land market."[278] The act of having a *volost* is expressed by the verb *volodeti/vladeti*, which means both "to rule, to govern, to have power, dominion, or authority" and "to own, to possess." The same meaning of *volodeti/vladeti* and "to have *volost/vlast*" is evident if we juxtapose statements from two texts: "Love your wives, but do not give them *vlast* over you" and "He whom his wife *vladeet* is not a man."[279] Both statements apparently express the same idea of a wife dominating, or having authority over, her husband.

In addition to "authority" or "domination," the meanings of *volost/vlast* include "right." Thus, when the treaty between Rus and Byzantium (945) states that the Rusian prince "does not have a *vlast*" to wage war in a certain territory or that Rusian traders in Constantinople "do not have a *volost*" to stay in the city over the winter, the word clearly signifies "right."[280] In other instances, the same word

---

[278]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 53.

[279]*Instruction* by Vladimir Monomakh, PSRL 1, 246; "Slovo Danila Zatochenika." *Vladeet* is the third person singular of *vladeti.*

[280] PSRL 1, 49, 51.

means "rule," as in the chronicle entry for 1146 describing the overthrow of the Kievan prince Igor. The account of Igor's capture and imprisonment is concluded with, "And this was the end of Igor's *vlast*" ("the end of Igor's *volost*" in another chronicle), that is, apparently, the end of his rule.[281]

However, the most widespread usage of *volost* in political narratives is in the expression "the *volost*(s) of the prince so-and-so." Princes "hold" (*derzhati*), "give (*dati*)," "grant (*nadeliati*)," and "receive (*priimati*)," *volosts*, they fight over *volosts*, seek to obtain more and better *volosts*, justify their rights to their *volosts* and accuse each other of wrongful *volost*-grabbing. Such a *volost* is a territory "held" by a prince.[282] Thus, the same word signifies the prince's rule, his authority over a certain territory, and also the territory itself.

In this respect, *volost* is somewhat reminiscent of *honor* as "the term which encompasses the holding of land with the personal standing derived from its holding."[283] Barthélemy refers to *honor* as an example of the ambiguity of the "vocabulary of vassalage and chivalry" because this word signifies both a "fief" and "power or authority."[284] Latin *principatus* could be used in a similar sense of both the territory under the authority of a *princeps*, the act of ruling this territory, and the status of being a *princeps*. For example, Adémar writes that Count Adoun, after his father's death, "succeeded in the *principatus* of Angoulême, and there was great joy about the beginning of his *principatus*" (III.66).[285] The second *principatus* clearly is Adoun's rule over the county of Angoulême; however, the construction with the first

---

[281] PSRL 25, 38; PSRL 1, 314.

[282] On *volosts* as territorial units, see Tolochko, *Kniaz v Drevnei Rusi*, 151-61; Gorskii, "Zemli i volosti," in Gorskii et al., *Drevniaia Rus*, 15-17.

[283] Ashe, *Fiction and History in England*, 98.

[284] "... l'ambivalence qui s'attache à tout le vocabulaire chevaleresque et vassalique: l'*honor* est à la fois un fief et un pouvoir," Dominique Barthélemy, *La société dans le comté de Vendôme: de l'an mil au XIVe siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 1993), 557.

[285] "Successit ... Alduinus ... in principatu Egolismae, et praeclarum laeticiae in initio principatu ejus ostensum est," *Ademari Cabannesis Chronicon*, 187.

one may be translated both as "succeeded in the principality of Angoulême" and "succeeded in ruling Angoulême." Adémar probably did not differentiate between these two meanings.

A similar lack of differentiation is often present in the usage of *volost/vlast* in Rusian sources, when it is hard to tell whether the word means a territory or rule/power/authority over the territory.[286] The conflation of these two meanings is especially evident in the exchange between two princes, Vsevolod of Kiev and Andrei of Pereiaslavl, reported in the *Kievan Chronicle* under 1140:

> Vsevolod came to Pereiaslavl; he wanted to drive Andrei away and to install his [Vsevolod's] brother there, saying to Andrei, 'Please go to Kursk.' And Andrei, having consulted with his men, said thus, 'It is better for me to die with my men [here], on the land of my father and grandfather, than to be a prince of Kursk ... If, brother, it is not enough of *volost* for you to hold all the Rus Land, and if you want this [Pereiaslavl] *volost*, then the *volost* will be yours after you kill me, but I will not leave my *volost* as long as I live. However, this would not be anything new for our kin. The same thing occurred before: did not Sviatopolk kill Boris and Gleb for the sake of *volost*?[287]

Andrei refers to Sviatopolk the "Cain-like," who killed his two half-brothers later canonized as martyrs. In fact, the circumstances of this murder, as they are presented in the chronicles and in the texts related to the cult of Boris and Gleb, are very different from the situation described in the entry for 1140. Andrei and Vsevolod are having a dispute over a specific territory; Vsevolod offers Andrei another *volost* in exchange for Pereiaslavl. Thus, *volost* here clearly signifies a territorial unit.

---

[286]E.g. "let you and your brother Vasilko have one *vlast,* Peremyshl" (PSRL 1, 274); "and started to think that I will kill off all my brothers and will alone receive the *vlast* of Rus" (PSRL 2, 126); "then their brother Jonathan received that [Antiochian] *vlast* (Pichkhadze, *Istoriia iudeiskoi voiny*, vol. 1, 67).

[287]"Prished zhe Vsevolod k Pereiaslabliu, khote vygnati Andreia, a brata svoego posaditi, Andreevi rekuche, 'Kursku izvoli iti.' Andrei zhe tako reche, sdumav s druzhinoiu svoeiu, 'Lepshi mi togo smert i s druzhinoiu na svoei otchine i na dedine vziati nezheli Kurskoi kniazhenii! ... Ozhe ti brate ne dosyti volosti vsiu zemliu Ruskuiu derzhachi, a khochsheshi sei volosti, a ubiv mene, a tobe volost, a zhiv ne idu iz svoei volosti. Obache ne divno nashemu rodu, tako zhe i perezhe bylo: Sviatopolk pro volost chi ne ubi Borisa i Gleba?" (PSRL 2, 305).

However, Sviatopolk killed Boris and Gleb not because of a conflict over any territory, but because he wanted to get rid of his brothers in order to be the sole ruler of all Rus. Thus, to say that Sviatopolk committed his crime "for the sake of *volost*" is possible only if *volost* is understood as "power" or "rule." The rhetorical strategy of Andrei's speech is based on the polysemy of *volost*; even if the speech purposely manipulates different meanings of the word, this manipulation would have been impossible if there had been a clear distinction between *volost* as a territory and *volost* as power.

What did *volodeti* or having a *volost* mean in practical terms? Sometimes, the sources identify this with receiving payments (*dan*) from the subject population. Thus, according to the *Primary Chronicle*, Khazarian elders predicted that one day the Khazars would pay *dan* to Rus, and "this came to be ... for the Rusian princes have a dominion over (*volodeiut*) Khazars even until the present day."[288] *Dan* is traditionally translated into English as "tribute." Franklin has noted that "tribute" is the "archaic and perhaps primary" meaning of *dan*, but that, in the course of time, the word came to signify different things. In the passage about the Khazars, rendering *dan* as "tribute" appears quite appropriate, and so it does in the accounts about the early princes, such as the story about Prince Igor's failed attempt to extort too much *dan* from the Derevlians, one of the Eastern Slavic groups:

> Igor's followers (*druzhina*) told him, "Sveneld's men (*otroki*) have fine clothes and weapons (*izodelisia sut oruzh'em i porty*), but we are naked. Go with us, prince, to collect *dan*, (*poidi s nami v dan*), so that both you and we may profit (*da i ty dobudeshi i my*). Igor agreed, and they went to the Derevlian land for the *dan*, and they demanded more and more *dan*, and they made violence until the desperate Derevlians refused to give more and killed Igor and his men.[289]

The Rusian texts continue to use the word *dan* for the payments received by the princes from the population throughout the pre-Mongolian period. Nonetheless, it appears that for the eleventh and twelfth centuries, *dan* can be legitimately translated

---

[288]PSRL 1, 17.
[289]PSRL 1, 54-5, under 945.

as "tribute" only when it describes furs collected from the tribal huntsmen of the northern forests,[290] but not payments received from the core population of Rusian principalities – even though the word is the same. Latin texts use the same words *duces* and *comites* for the members of the early war-bands as well as for the rulers of territorial units in the high medieval monarchies. However, historians translate these terms differently: as "leaders" and "followers" in the former case and as "dukes" and "counts" or "earls" in the latter. In my opinion, to apply the same terms to the twelfth-century princes and to Igor is wrong for the same reason that it would be wrong to describe the rulers of Normandy in the same terms as the early Viking raiders. I think that Hosking does exactly this when he states that "what princes levied from the rest of the community was ... tribute extorted by superior military power."[291] This is true for the early princes only. *Dan* is presented in a rather different light in the famous story about the invitation of the Scandinavians, known in Rus as Varangians, to Novgorod:

> In the year 859. The Varangians from across the sea collected (*imakhu*) *dan* from [different Slavic and Finnic groups] ... In the year 862. They drove the Varangians [back] beyond the see and did not give them *dan*. And they started to govern (*volodeti*) themselves, and there was no law (or: justice - *pravdy*) among them, and one kin made war against the other. There was strife among them, and they started to make war on one another. And they said to one another, 'Let us seek a prince who would govern us (*volodel nami*) and would judge [us] justly (*po pravu*).' And they went across the sea to the Varangians ... and said, 'Our land is vast and abundant, but there is no order (*nariada*) in it. Come and be our princes and govern us (*knizahiti i volodeti nami*).'[292]

Needless to say that such an invitation can only be legendary and that, although

---

[290]On these furs, their collection and the trade in them, see Janet Martin, *Treasure of the Land of Darkness: The Fur Trade and its Significance for Medieval Russia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[291]Hosking, *Russia and the Russians*, 34.

[292]PSRL 1, 19-20. Meanings of *pravda* include "law," "justice," and "truth." On its meaning as "law" and on other words signifying law, see Simon Franklin, "On Meanings, Function and Paradigms of Law in Early Rus'," *Russian History/Histoire Russe* 34 (2007): 63-81, at 70-71.

the story is included in the entries for the mid-ninth century, it must have been composed much later. Most likely, it reflects the ideas that existed at the time of the compilation of the *Primary Chronicle* in the early twelfth century. On the one hand, these ideas include equating the collection of *dan* from a population with rule over this population: the Variangian rule ended as soon as they were refused *dan.* On the other hand, payment of *dan* is clearly connected with the princes' duty to provide justice and to maintain peace and order in return for this payment. The passage implies a kind of a "social contract" between the ruler and the ruled, and in such a context *dan* looks more like taxation rather than tribute.

It appears that the "political theory" expressed in the story about the invitation of the Varangians was, by and large, based on actual political practice. On the one hand, to have a *volost* meant to receive an income from the population. For example, Sviatoslav Vladimirovich of Vshchizh is represented as complaining about the unfair treatment that he received from Iziaslav Davidovich of Chernigov who forced Sviatoslav to take a bad *volost* while reserving a better one for himself:

> [I agreed] to take Chernigov with seven empty towns, Moroviesk, Liubesk, Orgoshch, Vsevolozh, they are populated by *psareve*, and the Cumans devastated them all (*v nekh sediat psarevi i to zhe poloivtsy vypustoshili*), while he and his nephew hold all the [rest of] the Chernigov *volost.*[293]

The towns apparently are not literally empty: they are populated by some kind of people whom Sviatoslav calls *psareve*, which is the plural form of *psar*, a word related to *pes* (dog). The reference to *psareve* in this passage is unique for the twelfth century; in later documents *psar* signifies a lord's man who works in a kennel

---

[293]PSRL 25, 65 (under 1159). In a different redaction of the *Kievan Chronicle* in the *Hypatian Codex*, the same passage reads, "they are populated by *psareve* and Cumans," PSRL 2, 500. The Cumans were the nomads who lived in the steppe to the south of Rus; no sources other than this passage contain any information about the Cumans living in a Rusian town. Therefore, I assume that the reading from PSRL 25 is more correct. The towns "populated with Cumans" in the *Hypatian* probably resulted from a mistake of the scribe who accidentally skipped the word "devastated." I here translate the word *gorod*, which is discussed below, as "town."

and takes care of the hunting dogs.[294] It is difficult to imagine seven towns so full of kennels that all their inhabitants would be busy caring for dogs. Probably, Sviatoslav uses *psareve* as a derogatory epithet to express his frustration about the population of his *volost*. A derogatory connotation of the word *pes* is evident from the Rusian law postulating that, under some circumstances, a burglar caught red-handed may be killed on the spot without a trial, "as if he were a dog (*vo psa mesto*)."[295] Whoever the *psareve* are in this passage, they must have been some kind of people who did not provide Sviatoslav with adequate income: this appears to be the only sense in which towns populated by *psareve* can be described as "empty."

Another prince, who, after some political and military perturbations, found himself in the *volost* of Vyr, rejected exhortations to make peace in an interprincely war. He argued that other princes, after the peace is made, "will go back to their *volosts*," but he did not have anywhere to go: "I cannot die from hunger in Vyr, I prefer to die here [fighting]."[296] We can be sure that this prince was not literally starving; this was just his way of expressing the idea that the resources of Vyr, a small town in the Chernigov principality, were not sufficient for a prince of his rank.

The importance of *volosts* as sources of income is manifest in the fact that they had monetary value. At least, this was the case at the turn of the twelfth century, when Prince Riurik of Kiev granted a *volost* to Prince Roman, but then a complicated situation arose, which will be discussed below, and Riurik had to ask Roman to give this *volost* back. Roman agreed to return the *volost* on the condition that he expressed thus: "Give me another *volost* instead of this one, or give me its worth in money (*kunami dasi za nee vo chto budet byla*)."[297]

---

[294]G. A. Bogatova et al., *Slovar Russkogo iazyka XI – XVII vv.* [Dictionary of the Russian Language: Eleventh to Seventeenth Centuries], vol. 21 (Moscow: Nauka, 1995), 36.

[295]V. L. Ianin, ed., *Zakonodatel'stvo Drevnei Rusi*, Rossiiskoe zakonodatel'stvo X-XX vekov 1 (Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1984), 66.

[296]PSRL 2, 518.

[297]PSRL 2, 685 (under 1195).

It is possible that *volosts* had monetary "prices" already in the early twelfth century. The *Primary Chronicle* entry for 1110 describes the conference of the leading princes convened in order to punish the crime of one of them, Prince David, who had another prince blinded. They decided to confiscate David's *volost* and to give him a smaller *volost* and four hundred grivnas.[298] The smaller *volost* and money must have been a partial compensation for the confiscated *volost*, because the chronicle presents the decision of the conference as a rather lenient punishment, but still a punishment, which would not have been the case if David had received the full compensation. It is likely that the four hundred grivnas covered part of the difference between the value of the confiscated *volost* and the smaller one granted to David by the conference. If this is true, then the princes were able to calculate the monetary value of the two *volosts*.

Income that a prince received from his *volost*, in addition to *dan*, consisted of judicial fines, fees for various administrative and judicial services, custom fees, transit duties, and occasional sales taxes.[299] "Tribute" apparently looks out of place among these revenue sources. Franklin has discussed the difficulties of translating *dan* in the context of the foundational charter of Smolensk bishopric issued by Prince Rostislav (1136). The charter includes a list of the settlements under Rostislav's authority with the annual payments that their inhabitants owe to the prince, and it allocates a tithe on them to the bishop, such as, "In Toropichi, a *dan* of four hundred grivnas [is collected annually], and the bishop is to take from that forty grivnas."[300] Franklin

---

[298]PSRL 1, 274. Grivna was a unit of value related to a silver-standard. On Rusian money, see V. L. Ianin, *Denezhno-vesovye sistemy russkogo srednevekovia: Domongolskii period* (Moscow: Nauka, 1956); Thomas Noonan, "The Monetary History of Kiev in the Pre-Mongolian Period," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 11 (1987): 383-443.

[299]See Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 78-86.

[300]V. L. Ianin, ed., *Zakonodatel'stvo Drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1984), 213-14; for the English translation of the charter, see Daniel H. Kaiser, ed. and transl., *The Laws of Rus' - Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries* (Salt Lake City: Charles Schlacks Jr., 1992), 51-3.

argues that Rostislav's charter reflects "straightforward community taxation" rather than "tribute" because the latter "tends to imply a coerced payment to an external power, whereas the payments in the Smolensk list ... had been absorbed into regular internal administration ... and had become institutionalized as part of the system of government."[301]

This interpretation may be too statist. It is possible to argue that what Rostislav collected from his dominions was more like a rent paid to a landowner than taxes paid to a ruler, all the more so that Smolensk principality was Rostislav's patrimony. This status of Smolensk is evident from the account about the conflict between Rostislav's sons, Roman, David, and Mstislav Rostislavichi and Andrei Bogoliubskii of Suzdalia reported in the *Kievan Chronicle* under 1174. Andrei accused the Rostislavichi of failing to fulfill the obligations that they owed to him and consequently decided to deprive them of the *volosts* that he had granted to them:

> And Andrei said to Roman, '... You go from Kiev, and David [must go] from Vyshe-gorod, and Mstislav from Belgorod. You have your Smolensk, go ahead and divide it among yourselves (*ato vy Smolensk, a tem sia podelite*).'[302]

This passage contrasts the *volosts* controlled by Andrei with Smolensk over which Andrei has no power, arguably because it is the Rostislavichi's inheritance. The mocking proposition to divide this inheritance apparently is intended to remind the Rostislavichi that the income from Smolensk is not sufficient for three princes and to underscore their dependence on Andrei who has the power to grant good *volosts*. In such a context, the region described in the 1136 charter looks more like a private domain of Rostislav and his sons than like a territory under their government. This again reminds us of Reynolds's observation about the medieval lack of distinction between rulers and landlords, rights of property and rights of government. For a modern scholar, certain aspects of princely authority may be associated with "public

---

[301]Franklin, "On Meanings, Function and Paradigms," 80.

[302]PSRL 2, 569-70. During this time, Andrei had the power to appoint the prince of Kiev.

government" while others may be closer to "private ownership," but for contemporaries they were indistinguishable.

Thus, the translation of *dan* as "taxes" may be problematic because of the association with the modern notion of public governance, while the translation as "tribute" is also problematic because of the association with external coercion.

The eleventh- and twelfth-century sources offer abundant evidence that princes were anything but an external power extorting tribute from the population by sheer coercion. In the words of Franklin and Shepard, "there is a consistent implication [in the chronicles – Yu. M.] that the prince ruled by assent."[303] The *Laurentian* account about the political crisis in Suzdalia in the 1170s forcefully asserts that a lawful prince cannot behave as a conqueror. The crisis was caused by the murder of Prince Andrei Bogoliubskii of Vladimir who was killed by his servants. Several princes from different regions vied for the vacant princely seat of Vladimir; Mstislav and Iaropolk Rostislavichi prevailed, and the population of Vladimir agreed to have them as princes. The story is so informative that it is worth quoting at length:

> The people of Vladimir made an agreement with the Rostislavichi that they would not do any harm to the city and sealed it by kissing the Cross (*utverdivshesia s Rostislavichema krestnym tselovaniem*).[304] The townsmen went out of the city with crosses to meet Mstislav and Iaropolk who, having entered the city, consoled the townsmen and, having divided the [Suzdalian] *volost* [among the two of them] started to rule as princes (*sedosta kniazhiti*). The people of Vladimir placed Prince Iaropolk on the throne of the city of Vladimir with joy, and they made an agreement about everything with him (*ves poriad polozhshe* (sic)) in the Church of the Holy Mother of God ... And then the people of Rostov placed Mstislav on the throne of his ancestors in Rostov with great joy.

---

[303]Franklin and Shepard. "Emergence of Rus," 196. Also see Lukin, "Veche," 44-60, 81-93 for an analysis of the chronicle accounts about the political significance of local communities and about their interactions with the princes.

[304]Kissing of the Cross was the most common way to make an oath so that the word *krestotselovanie* (cross-kissing) was often used as a synonym for "oath." On oaths on the Cross, see Yulia Mikhailova and David Prestel, "Cross Kissing: Keeping One's Word in Twelfth-Century Rus," *Slavic Review* 70 (2011): 1–22.

However, the joy was short-lived:

> When the Rostislavichi were princes in [Suzdalia], they appointed their men from [southern] Rus as governors of cities and towns (*rozdaiala biashe po gorodam posadnichestvo Russkym dedtskim*), and [these men] oppressed (literally: made an oppression to) the people with [excessive] fees and judicial fines (*mnogu tiagotu liudem sim stvorisha prodazhami i virami*). And the princes themselves were young and listened to the boyars, and the boyars taught them to take more and more (*uchakhut na mnogoe imanie*). And on the first day [of their rule], the princes took gold and silver from the Church of the Holy Mother of God, and they took by force (*ot'iasta*) the key from the church treasury, and [they also took away] the settlements and rents (*gorody eia i dani*) that blessed Prince Andrei had given to this church. And the people of Vladimir started to say, 'We have accepted the princes out of our free will and took an oath on the Cross about everything (*my esmy volnaia kniazia priiali k sobe i krest tselovali na vsem*), but these two behave as if this were not their *volost*, as if they do not plan to stay here as our princes (*iako ne tvoriashchesia sideti u nas*): they plunder not only all the *volost*, but even the churches. Take action, brothers!'

The "action" that they decided to take was inviting a different prince, Michael Iurievich (Mikhalko), and supporting him militarily against the Rostislavichi. During the struggle between the Rostislavichi and Michael, the people of Vladimir remained without a prince for seven weeks, "placing all their hopes and all their expectations only in the Holy Mother of God and in the justice of their cause (*na svoiu pravdu*)."[305]

Thus, the chronicler expresses a strong belief in the contractual nature of the relations between the prince and the people of his *volost*. By extorting arbitrary payments, the Rostislavichi, according to the chronicler, treated Suzdalia as if it were not their *volost*. The *Kievan Chronicle* uses the same word "oppression (*tiagota*)" that the *Laurentian* does to describe the behavior of a prince who imposes arbitrary payments on the people. The *Kievan* entry for 1174 relates how Prince Iaroslav Iziaslavich accused the Kievan townsmen of not preventing the capture of his wife and son by his rival, Prince Sviatoslav. Consequently, Iaroslav,

> in his anger, contrived an oppression (*na gnevekh zanysli tiagotu*) for the Kievans, and he told them, 'Sviatoslav did this to me because of you (*podveli vy este na mia*

---

[305]PSRL 1, 374-7.

> *Sviatoslava*). Now provide the means to ransom (*promyshliaite chim vykupiti*) my princess and my child.' They did not know what to answer, and [Iaroslav] imposed payments on [*poproda*] all Kiev, on the hegumens, and priests, and monks, and nuns, and on the Latins and on the merchants conducting long-distance trade (*goste*).[306]

To stress the arbitrary and oppressive character of the payments that angry Iaroslav imposed on the Kievans, the chronicler lists the categories of people who appear to be normally exempted from *dan*, such as clergy and foreigners ("Latins").[307] Another angry prince, Vladimir of Galich, frustrated by his participation in a failed military expedition, left the camp of his allies near Kiev and marched back to Galich together with his men. He made an ultimatum to the townsmen of Michesk, the first town that he encountered on his way:

> 'Give me as much silver as I want or else I will sack your town.' They did not have as much silver as he wanted from them, and they took silver [jewelry] from their ears and necks, melted it, and gave it to Vladimir. Vladimir, having taken the silver, went on. And he took silver in the same manner from all the towns on his way until he reached his own land (*tako zhe emlia serebro po vsim gradom oli i do svoei zemli*).[308]

This story reflects the same idea that is expressed in the *Laurentian* account about the bad behavior of the Rostislavichi in Suzdalia: a prince does not use force to extort arbitrary payments from the people in his *volost* as is evident from the fact that Vladimir stopped demanding silver by threat as soon as he reached his land. Silver paid by those who had the misfortune to live along the route that Vladimir took to Galich can be described as "tribute," but the chronicler makes it clear that this was not a regular *dan*. Vladimir of Galich simply robbed the people on his way, but a prince receiving *dan* and other regular payments from his *volost* performed essential social functions in exchange for these revenues. Just how essential a prince was for a *volost* can be seen from the chronicler's hint that only the intercession of the Mother of God made it possible for the city of Vladimir to last seven weeks

---

[306]PSRL 2, 579.

[307]For a discussion of various interpretations of the term "Latins" in this passage, see Lukin, "Veche," 125.

[308]PSRL 2, 417.

without a prince.[309] The indispensability of a prince and his men for the normal life of the community is further evident from the fact that twelfth-century Novgorod, often described as a "republic" or "independent city," in fact also had a prince. Novgorodian republicanism or independence lay in the important political role of the citizens' assembly (*veche*) which elected officials, and in the limited role of the prince who was invited to the city on specific conditions and had to make a contract with the Novgorodian community. A contract between a city and a prince was not a uniquely Novgorodian feature; we have seen the people of Vladimir making a contract with the Rostislavichi. However, this contract presented a special case, being made during the turbulent time that followed the murder of Prince Andrei of Vladimir who died without an heir. In Novgorod, which did not have its own dynasty branch, a formal contract with a prince was a regular practice, and the limitations imposed on the princely authority were more systematic and more institutionalized than elsewhere. Most of the practical business of government was performed by elected officials.[310] In 1140-41, Novgorod remained without a prince for nine months because of a conflict with the powerful prince Vsevolod Olgovich of Chernigov who prevented other princes from taking the vacant position in Novgorod. All this time, "the Novgorodians with their bishop governed their land (*derzha u sebe*) by themselves," but eventually they "could not bear being (*sideti*) without a prince anymore" and managed to get the son of Vsevolod's rival as their prince.[311]

What was so unbearable about being without a prince in a city where elected officials maintained order and provided justice? The answer can be found in the

---

[309]PSL 1, 377.

[310]See Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 112-15.

[311]PSRL 2, 308; see also *N1L*, 26. The account in the *Kievan Chronicle* adds that "no corn (*zhito*) came to the Novgorodians" (PSRL 2, 308) presumably because of the trading blockade imposed by Vsevolod; however, it does not present the trading blockade as the only, or even as the main, reason for the wish of the Novgorodians to get a prince. "Not bearing" to be without a prince and not getting corn are described as two distinct motives for the Novgorodians to seek a prince.

Kievan Chronicle entry for 1154 that describes the fears of the Kievans who, for a brief spell of time, had no prince:

> Iziaslav [Davidovich of Chernigov] sent to the Kievans saying, 'I want to come to your city.' They were afraid of the Cumans, because the Kievans were in difficult straits (*tiazhko biashe Kiianom*) then, for not a single prince remained in Kiev. And the Kievans sent Bishop Damian of Kanev [to Iziaslav], saying 'Come to Kiev lest the Cumans capture us, you are our prince, do come!'[312]

The Cumans were the nomadic people who populated the steppe to the south of Rus; they often raided southern Rusian regions and even more often served as allies of Rusian princes in their internecine wars, which was, indeed, the case described in the entry for 1154: for the Cumans were located not far from Kiev and were brought there by warring princes. The proximity of the Cumans in the absence of a prince made the Kievans panicky. Princes and their men were professional soldiers, and not having a prince amounted to not having a defense from external enemies.

Novgorod, being relatively safe because of its location amidst forests and marshlands and far from the troublesome steppe, could afford staying without a prince for some time, but prolonging this state of defenselessness was too risky even for Novgorod. The Kievans threatened by the Cumans could not wait, and they accepted the first available prince, even though he belonged to the branch of the dynasty that was extremely unpopular in Kiev during this time. As soon as a more suitable prince, Iurii Dolgorukii of Suzdalia, reached Kiev, he replaced Iziaslav on the Kievan throne. The exchange between Iurii and Iziaslav Davidovich on this occasion illustrates another dimension of the relations between the prince and the population:

> George sent [envoys] to Iziaslav, saying, 'Kiev is my inheritance (*ottsina*), not yours.' And Iziaslav sent [envoys] to George in humility, bowing down to him (*moliasia i klaniaiasia*), saying, 'I did not come to Kiev on my own, the Kievans put me on the princely throne (*posadili mia Kiiane*). Do not do any harm to me, here is your Kiev for you (*a se tvoi Kiev*).' And George, being merciful, forgave his anger against him (*otda emu gnev*), and thus Iziaslav left Kiev.[313]

---

[312]PSRL 2, 476.

[313]PSRL 2, 478.

Chapter 2. Terminology of Rulership, Power, and Property

In this passage, Kiev suddenly becomes unequivocally "Iurii's" by right of inheritance as if the Kievans had never invited princes and had never supported some candidates for the Kievan throne against others – or as if princes themselves had never advanced competing claims for Kiev. The concept of a princely "inheritance" or "patrimony" (*otchina/ottsina*) was never as straightforward as is implied by Iurii's message to Iziaslav. In fact, this chronicle entry describes an ideal case when the Kievans support a prince who had a reasonable claim for Kiev according to the dynastic rules of succession.

These rules, or rather general guidelines, as we shall see, were constantly evolving and open to different interpretations leading to multiple competing claims for Kiev, for other princely seats, and for the *volosts* in general. This ambiguity was often used by the people to their advantage because they could choose which claimant to support. For example, when the murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii left Suzdalia without a prince, there were two pairs of brothers competing for the vacant princely seats of Vladimir and Rostov, the two main Suzdalian cities. As we have seen, the Rostislavichi initially prevailed, and the people decided to give them a chance. After the Rostislavichi became unpopular, their rivals, who had lost the first tour of the competition for Suzdalia, received an invitation and military support from the population.[314]

However, the people of Suzdalia, Kiev, or any other region, while often able to choose among several claimants, were not free to have any prince they liked. They could not completely disregard the dynastic principles of the distribution of the *volosts*and invite a prince on the basis of his personal characteristics alone. An attempt to do so proved catastrophic for Kiev when the townsmen invited Prince Mstislav Iziaslavich who, according to the dynastic rules of seniority, had no rights whatsoever to the Kievan throne. Moreover, Mstislav, while being popular in Kiev, made himself rather unpopular among his fellow Riurikids. Therefore, when Mstislav

---

[314]See above, pp. 89-90.

became the Kievan prince, most princes put aside their own rivalries and united their forces for a punitive expedition on Kiev that ended with the notorious sack of the city in 1169.[315]

Kiev was not an ordinary *volost*. It had a special status in Rus, but this special status affected only the dynastic arrangements regarding the Kievan throne, which passed from one prince to another according to principles different from those of other princely seats.[316] However, the role of the Kievans in determining who was going to be their prince appears the same as the role of the population in any other region. They could not choose their ruler freely, but they had room for maneuvering by supporting some of the competing princes against others. Therefore, it was advisable for a prince to be on good terms with the population. Overall, no single factor determined the legitimacy of the princely authority over a *volost*. A prince's success in acquiring and holding *volosts* resulted from the interplay of various factors. We will see later what was the role of dynastic rules and of interprincely relations in the distribution of the *volosts*; for now, it suffices to note that the prince was not an external power imposed on the passive population. Just as every prince needed a *volost*, every region needed a prince, and the population had some say in who this prince should be.

Thus, we have seen that a *volost* in the territorial sense is, on the one hand, a kind of land property, a source of income for the prince; on the other hand, it is an administrative unit that the prince governs. The relations between the population of the *volost* and the prince have a contractual element. The people make payments to the prince; and the prince, for his part, is responsible for maintaining order, fighting external enemies, and providing justice. Furthermore, payments are expected not to be "oppressive," that is, excessive and arbitrary. The chroniclers clearly differentiate between the right amount of payments and those that constitute oppression (*tiagota*), but they do not explain their criteria. It is well known that in the medieval West

---

[315]PSRL 1, 354-5; PSRL 2, 543-5.

[316]See Shepard, "Rus'," 393-4.

the key word in the discussions about lordship was "custom": a good lord did not want from his people more than they owed to him according to the custom; in contrast with that, bad lords invented "bad" or "new" customs to be resisted.[317] Most likely, the Rusian ideas of what a prince can rightfully demand from his *volost* were also based on tradition. The people of the *volost* resisted the princes whom they considered oppressive and sought to replace them with alternative princes taken from the pool of those who had legitimate claims for the *volost*.

The characteristics of the *volost* that we have just discussed are also typical of the land units for which the Western sources use *honor* and other words traditionally translated as "fief." For example, the *Conventum Hugonis* describes disputes over various *castra* which, according to Hugh, were his rightful *honores*. The most basic meaning of *castrum* is, of course, "castle"; however, the "castles" discussed in the *Conventum* apparently have economic value, which is at least as important as – if not more important than – their military significance. Just as with the *volosts*, the holders of the *castra* apparently were able to calculate their worth in money. Thus, when Hugh's enemy burnt and plundered one of his *castra*, this was "such a great evil to Hugh and his men that Hugh would not accept [even] fifty thousand solidi," presumably if this sum would have been offered as a compensation.[318] William V of Aquitaine "reddidit" another *castrum* and received money for it.[319] It is not clear what exactly "reddidit" means here. It is clear from the context that it could not mean "returned," which is, of course, the primary meaning of *reddo*. Hyams translates it as "surrendered" and Martindale as "disposed of." "Redditus" indeed

---

[317]See Bisson, *The Crisis of the Twelfth Century*, 50-68, 136-42, 166-74.

[318]"Bernardus et sui operati sunt malum Ugoni et viris suis quantum nec accipere potest per quinquaginta mil. solid." *Conventum Hugonis*, 545.

[319]"Reddidit Comes Gentiaco [the castle of Gençay] ... pecuniamque accepit et terram dominicam." *Conventum Hugonis*, 547. I do not understand what the "domain" is that William received while "giving away" the castle, and I was not able to find any discussion of *terram dominicam* from this passage in the scholarly literature.

meant "surrender," and also "rent" and "gift."[320] In any case, it seems clear enough that William in one way or another exchanged a *castrum* for a sum of money. A complicated series of agreements and counter-agreements concerning yet another *castrum* included, at one point, William's proposal to Hugh, "If I can buy it from Count Fulk with your and my money, one part [of the *castrum*] will be mine and the other yours."[321]

This is not the only passage of the *Conventum* that describes a division of a *castrum* among several holders. There are agreements concerning a half of one *castrum* and a quarter of another one.[322] From a military standpoint, control over a quarter of a fortification structure does not seem to have much importance. What might it mean in practical terms to have a half of a *castrum* here and a quarter of a *castrum* there? The agreement about the castle of Vivonne provides a glimpse into such arrangements. According to this agreement, Hugh had to receive "half of the *causa dominicata* and two thirds of *fevos vassalorum*."[323] *Causa* is, of course, a word of many meanings; in medieval Latin it signified, among other things, "property."[324] *Casa dominicata* was a lord's manor or domain, and *dominicata* was a standard term

---

[320]J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), 895.

[321]"si ego valeo acaptare [the castle] cum comite Fulconi de pretio meo et de tuo, uno pars sit mea et alia tua," *Conventum Hugonis*, 546. "Sit" seems to mean "will be" because the *Conventum* often uses present subjunctive forms to express the future.

[322]*Conventum Hugonis*, 543, 544. One of these cases unambiguously discusses one quarter of a *castrum* (p. 544); another one is more complicated. It is clear that Hugh gets a part of the *castrum*, but, in the words of Martindale, "it is difficult to work out the divisions involved in these arrangements." (Martindale, *Status, Authority and Regional Power*, VIIb, 550, note 16).

[323]"pars media de castro Ugoni medietasque de causa dominicata, et due partes de fevos vassalorum," *Conventum Hugonis*, 543. It is not clear what exactly this means; Martindale and Hyams translate *pars media de castro* differently. See Martindale, *Status, Authority and Regional Power*, VIIb, 543; Paul Hyams, trans., *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan* at http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/agreement.asp (accessed 3.22.2013).

[324]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon*, 160.

for demesne.[325] The *Conventum* mentions *terra dominica* in connection with another *castrum*.[326] What are then those *fevi vassalorum* of Vivonne that are contrasted with *causa dominicata*, lord's own domain? Barthélemy notes that the word *fevum* could describe lands held by people who were "closer to serfs than to nobles,"[327] and this may very well be the case with the *vassali* of Vivonne. Venckeleer has shown that in literary texts "*vassal(us)*" signified man in general, and a noble military man in particular. However, in the context of landed property and economic relations, the *vassalus* often means a dependent peasant, a serf of the manor or a servant.[328]

Barthélemy refers to the *Conventum*'s passage about Vivonne to illustrate his point that the lord of the castle was, first of all, the lord of the knights of this castle: "They had the rights of the lordship over the castle together ... Their parts were given to them as fiefs to hold from him, his was reserved for him as his own domain."[329] The *Conventum* does not provide any information about the social status of the Vivonne *vassali*, and it is impossible to know for sure whether they were knights or peasants. It is worth noting, however, that the *Conventum* mentions horsemen and the men who perform honorable service for their lord on many occasions, but they are never called *vassali*. Hugh's "homines" inform him about an attack on his property, William sends a message to Hugh "per viros suos," Hugh's enemy captures Hugh's "caballarios" and Hugh retaliates by capturing that enemy's "caballarios meliores."[330] The closest

---

[325]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon*, 149, 351.

[326]*Conventum Hugonis*, 547.

[327]"Il y a des usages de *fevum*, pour des terres tenues ... par des gens plus serfs que nobles," Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 460.

[328]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 1061-2. In the dictionary entry for *vassalus*, the examples of the usages of the word in the meaning of serf, servant, or dependent are taken mostly from diplomatic sources.

[329]"Au XIe siècle, le seigneur, le 'prince' d'un château, est d'abord le prince des chevaliers de la place. Ensemble ils ont les droits de la seigneurie châtelaine ... Leurs parts sont données comme des fiefs tenus de lui; la sienne, comme son domaine propre, sa réserve. Le Récit des Pactes montre à Vivonne la *causa dominicata* et les *feva vassalorum*." Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 483.

[330]*Conventum Hugonis*, 543, 545.

person to a "vassal" in the "feudal" sense is Hugh himself in his relation to William: he addresses William as his "senior" and "dominus," he holds land "from" William, he has to accompany William and to provide military aid to him, and the *Conventum* discusses at length the fidelity that Hugh and William owe each other.[331] However, Hugh is called William's *homo*, not *vassalus*. Finally, when their relations of lord and man were broken and an open hostility arose, William's men seized "benefitium hominibus Ugoni" before Hugh's men were able to do any harm to William.[332] Their capability to do harm suggests that these men were knights, but their holdings are described not as *fevi vassalorum*, but as *benefitium*.[333] Therefore, it seems likely that the *fevi vassalorum* in Vivonne are closer to peasant, than to knightly, holdings.

In any case, regardless of what exactly was the social status of these *vassalorum*, their *fevi*, taken together with the demesne, must have described an agricultural land. In this case, the agreement about Vivonne stipulates that Hugh receives half of the income from the lord's domain and two thirds of the income from the land held by tenants. A quarter of another *castrum* probably means the same thing – a quarter of the income provided by the landed property belonging to the *castrum*.

Martindale thinks that the "number of occasions on which disputes with Hugh turned on the control or possession of castles ... show how essential they were for the exercise of power, and presumably also for any increase in landed resources as well as for the control of existing estates."[334] It is, of course, well known that the lord of the castle dominated the area around the castle and exploited it economically.[335]

---

[331] *Conventum Hugonis*, 542, 545, 547, 548 and passim.

[332] *Conventum Hugonis*, 547.

[333] It is hard to tell whether *hominibus* is used here instead of genitive *hominum*, similar to the usage of *Ugoni* in the meaning of "Hugh's." If yes, this phrase means "benefice of Hugh's men." On the other hand, the form *hominibus* may be grammatically correct, and then the phrase means "seized the benefice from Hugh's men." In any case, Hugh's military men here are not *vassali*, and their holdings are not *fevi*.

[334] Martindale, *Status, Authority and Regional Power*, VIIb, 535.

[335] See e.g. Hélène Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne – XIe-XIIe siècles: serments,*

The *Conventum* apparently uses *castrum* to describe a complex consisting of the fortress and the surrounding area which provides income for the lord of the castle, a complex constituting the lord's *honor*.[336] The Languedoc charters examined by Débax also describe a *castrum* as a unity of the fortification and the land depending on it. A typical grant of a *castrum* included resources such as "lands, vineyards, forests, waters, pastures" with all the payments that were attached to them ("taxes, qu'elles soient de nature foncière ou banale"), as well as the authority over the "men and women who depend on the *castrum*."[337] In view of this, I wonder if the enigmatic *pars media de castro* of Vivonne might have something to do with the meaning of *medius* as vineyard land rented on specific conditions?[338] In any case, whether the agreement about Vivonne described in the *Conventum* mentions a vineyard or not, the Aquitanian *castra* to which Hugh claims his rights appear not to be different from the Languedoc *castra* in the sense that both were units consisting of the fortification and the agricultural lands.

Small *volosts* of the Rusian sources have the same structure. A *volost* is normally centered around a *gorod/grad*.[339] The core meaning of *gorod* is "defensive wall," "fortification," hence this word came to signify any settlement surrounded by walls. The size of such a settlement could range from a big city to a wooden fortress; in other words, *gorod* covers the meanings of the English words "city," "town," "borough," "castle," and "fortress." Thus, what I rendered above as "towns" are not necessarily

---

sommages et fiefs dans le Languedoc des Trencavel (Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2003), 302-4.

[336]See Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 483.

[337]Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 163.

[338]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon*, 228, 668. On *pars media*, see above, note 323.

[339]Occasionally, a *volost* is defined by reference not to the *gorod* around which it is centered, but to the name of the Eastern Slavic group that populated its territory, such as a Viatichi or Derevlian *volost* (PSRL 2, 343, 492). However, even in such cases, the *volost* is described as belonging to a certain prince; the ethnic name serves only as a geographic reference, not as an indication that this was an autonomous territory of the Viatichi or Derevlians.

truly urban settlements. In some cases, it is evident that *gorod* refers to a relatively small settlement, such as in the chronicler's statement that the Rostislavichi took away from the Vladimir Church of the Mother of God its *gorods* and *dans.* I have translated this as "settlements and rents," because it appears unlikely that a church, even a cathedral church, could control multiple towns in a not very densely populated region such as Suzdalia.

In fact, apart from well-known cities such as Kiev, Vladimir, or Novgorod, only archeology can provide information about the character of any given *gorod* mentioned in the chronicles. Furthermore, even if we have an idea about the *gorod*'s size and structure, what are the criteria that define a "town"? How exactly is a "town" different from a "fortress"? Every walled settlement had a military significance and thus can be described as a "fortress" or "castle"; on the other hand, most, if not all, of them also had economic and administrative functions that we associate with a "town." Débax writes about the importance of control over the castles in a "little-urbanized region."[340] It appears that in such a region castles performed the functions of towns. Duby described a castle as the place of gathering and interaction of the upper crust of the rural population.[341] According to Barthélemy, eleventh-century charters show a castle as the political, military, and administrative center of the area around it, the area which some documents call *vicaria castri* or *castellania.*[342] How is such a castle different from a town in anything but name?

The word *gorod* also sometimes describes a unit consisting of the fortified settlement and the rural area around it. For example, the *Kievan Chronicle* entry for 1171 contains an account of events that followed the death of Prince Vladimir Andreevich of Dorogobuzh, which was a *gorod* in the Volhynian principality:

---

[340]Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 273.

[341]"Les châteaux du XIe siècle sont les lieux de ralliement de l'élite des villages d'alentour," Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 479, with reference to Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise.*

[342]Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 480-83.

> [Prince] Vladimir Mstislavich ... heard that Vladimir Andreevich died, and he went to Dorogobuzh, but Andreevich's men (*druzhina*) did not let him into the *gorod*. He then sent a message [to them] and said, 'I will swear an oath by kissing the Cross (*tseluiu krest*) to you and to your princess that I will not do any damage either to you or [to the princess] (*iako zhe mi na vas ne pozreti likhom ni na iatrov svoiu*), to her villages or to anything else. And he swore an oath on the Cross to them and entered the *grad* (=*gorod*) – and on the next day he broke his oath on the Cross ... He grabbed property, and villages, and herds (*uklonisia na imenie, na sela, i na stada*), and he drove the princess out of the *gorod*.[343]

Dorogobuzh was a rather significant center; therefore, in this case "town" appears to be a more appropriate translation than "fortress." However, the main point is that, whether we understand *gorod* as a town or fortress, villages and herds could not be located inside its walls. When the chronicler writes that the perfidious prince grabbed villages and herds as soon as he entered the *gorod*, the *gorod* here apparently refers not just to the settlement of Dorogobuzh, but to the whole area located around this settlement. The *gorod* of Dorogobuzh is a territorial unit similar to what the *Conventum* and the Langedoc charters call *castrum* and what the charters examined by Barthélemy call *vicaria castri* and *castellania*.

The terminological conflation of the walled settlement and the area around it makes it difficult to determine the status of the "people of such and such *castrum* or *gorod*." What I have rendered as "people of Vladimir," "people of Kiev," or "people of Michesk" is expressed by words with roots derived from the name of the city/town and suffixes signifying an inhabitant: *vladimirtsy*, *kiiane*, *michane* and so on. Linguistically, these terms are parallel to words such as "Londoners," "Parisians," or "New-Mexicans," that is, they are generic names for all the inhabitants of a certain place. That is why I have used "people of Vladimir (Kiev etc.)" rather than "men of Vladimir (Kiev etc.)" to translate *vladimirtsy*, *kiiane* and other such words. Of course, given what we know about medieval society in general, those engaged in negotiations with princes and in other political activities must have been mostly men.

---

[343]PSRL 2, 546-7.

However, because the sources use gender-neutral words, I chose to use gender-neutral "people."

The question of what categories of the population are covered by these generic designators is of great interest because, as we have seen, they played a rather active role vis-à-vis princes, making agreements with them, supporting some princes against others, and resisting the demands of the princes which they viewed as "oppressive." In this respect, small fortified settlements were no different from big cities. We have more detailed information about events in the cities, because the chronicles pay more attention to the important centers, such as Kiev or Vladimir. However, there are also references to similar activities of the inhabitants of small fortified places who negotiated with princes, "shut themselves in the *gorod*" not letting in an undesirable prince, and supported some princes against others.[344]

In fact, the chronicles talk about the inhabitants of the Rusian *gorods* in exactly the same terms as the *Conventum* talks about the *homines* of the Aquitanian *castra*.[345] Thus, two of Hugh's lords, William and Bernard, granted him the *castrum* of Civray.[346]

> However, the men (*homines*) of Civray, when they saw the oppression (*oppressione*) which Hugh made to them, not being able to bear it, made an agreement (*finem*) with Bernard and handed over (*reddiderunt*) the *castrum* to him. He accepted it without consulting Hugh... Coming to the Count [William], Hugh said to him, 'My lord, things are very bad for me, because [Bernard] has now taken away my property (*fiscum*). I beseech you and urge you by the faith which [stipulates that] a lord ought to help his

---

[344]E.g. PSRL 2, 487, 505, 526.

[345] *Homines* in this context is probably also closer to the gender-neutral "people" than to "men" because the *Conventum* uses *vir* rather than *homo* when it refers to the "men and women": "coepit viros hac (=ac) mulieris," *Conventum Hugonis*, 546. *Homo*, of course, could signify a "human being," a "person" in general; for example, Hildegard of Bingen referred to herself as *homo* (see Anna Silvas, ed. and trans., *Jutta and Hildegard: The Biographical Sources* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 131). However, I follow the long-established convention by translating *homines* as "men."

[346]"Respondit ei [to Hugh] comes, 'Faciam tibi castrum ...' Factumque est castrum per consilium Bernardi," *Conventum Hugonis*, 544.

> man (*per fidem quam senior adiuvari debet homini suo*): let me have either a good *placitum*, or my property ... or give over to me [Bernard's] hostages...' However, the Count did nothing to help, neither arranged an agreement for him (*nec finem non fecit*), nor gave over the hostages to him.[347]

We see the "men/people of Civray" doing exactly the same thing as the "people of Vladimir" when they encounter what they consider "oppressive" behavior on the part of their lord: they invite another person, who can put forward a legitimate claim for the *castrum*, and they make a formal agreement with him. The word for this agreement – *finis* – is the same as for the agreements that Aquitanian magnates make with each other. Interestingly, Hugh does not request that the count simply go and crush the resistance of the *homines* of Civray and install Hugh as their lord by force. What Hugh wants is some kind of arbitration between him, Bernard, and the men of Civray. He blames William for not arranging an agreement regarding Civray, thus implicitly acknowledging the legitimacy of the actions of the men of Civray.

Thus, there was a contractual element in the relations between the inhabitants of the *castrum* and the lord similar to what we have observed for the *volost* and the prince. The inhabitants of the *castrum* were among the players in the disputes described in the *Conventum*, and they used competing claims for the lordship over their *castrum* to their advantage. The regular participation of the "men of the castle" in the distribution of the *castra* among the Aquitanian magnates is evident from the remark made in passing in the *Conventum* about William's agreement with the *homines* of another castle, Thouars.[348]

It is also interesting that the document written from Hugh's standpoint refers to Hugh's *oppressio* of the inhabitants of Civray. The *Conventum* presents all Hugh's

---

[347] *Conventum Hugonis*, 544-5. *Placitus* could be used in a legal sense meaning a "plea" or "hearing" (Janet Martindale, "The *Conventum*: A Postscript," 14, in eadem, *Status, Authority and Regional Power*, VIII; Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 17); in the *Conventum* this word is also used in the sense of "meeting" or "negotiations" (*Conventum Hugonis*, 546).

[348] *Conventum Hugonis*, 542-3.

actions as good and just; the use of *oppressio* in such a context can be explained only if this word did not have any judgmental connotations, but rather was a technical term for the actions of the lord that caused the discontent among the *homines* of his castle. The existence of such a term suggests that *homines* expressed their discontent on a regular basis.

Barthélemy describes these *homines* as "chevalerie des châteaux" of various levels, ranging from those whose rank was right below the lord of the castle to the inhabitants "de profil déjà bourgeois" and to the "petit élite" of the surrounding countryside. Ordinary villagers, who were often rebellious, also presented a force to be taken into account.[349] The same is probably true regarding the population of the *volosts* of the Rusian princes. Those who sent invitations to princes and, as was the case in Kiev, dispatched bishops to deliver these invitations must have belonged to the city elites.[350] The fact that the "Kievans" of the chronicles often mean "elite Kievans" is evident from the passage describing a prince who invited "the Kievans" to a banquet and, at the same time, gave alms to the Kievan "paupers."[351] When another prince gave a banquet for the Novgorodians of all levels of social standing, the chronicler specifically states that he invited "all, great and small."[352] Apparently, "Kievans," "Novgorodians," and similar words often signify the "great" men of the *gorod* who act on behalf of the population in general.

Often, however, does not mean always. Thus, the chronicles regularly describe cases of popular discontent, ranging from a noisy crowd urging an unpopular prince to leave and voicing their support for an alternative prince to full-scale rebellions. In all likelihood, these threatening or rebellious crowds included people of lower social standing. The rebellion in Kiev in 1113 was followed by the new legislation

---

[349]Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 472-3, 479.
[350]See above, p. 93.
[351]PSRL 2, 681-2.
[352]PSRL 2, 369.

that alleviated the position of *zakupy*, the bankrupt debtors who had to pay off loan by becoming indentured laborers of the creditor. Many of them lived in the countryside, and some of the new laws about *zakupy* discuss fieldwork and plow-horses, which makes some historians think that the rural population participated in the uprising.[353]

On the other hand, P. V. Lukin has argued that chroniclers explicitly exclude the rural population from their descriptions of social and political activities because all such activities, as presented in the chronicles, take place in the *gorod*, and the participants are called either "people of such and such *gorod*" (Kievans, Novgorodians and so on), or *gorozhane*. In modern Russian, *gorozhane* stands for "urbanites," "city dwellers"; however, there is no reason to assume that the twelfth- and the twenty-first-century meanings of this word are identical. Lukin points to some passages where *gorod* is distinguished from the surrounding countryside;[354] however, there are also contrary examples. We have seen that on one occasion a *gorod* included "villages and herds."[355] When Prince Sviatoslav referred to his "seven *gorod*s,"[356] does this mean that he only had authority over those who lived inside the walls of the seven fortified settlements, not over all the population of the area where these *gorods* were located? This appears very unlikely.

Narrative sources, with typical lack of precision, use the word *gorod* sometimes in the narrow sense of the fortified settlement, and sometimes in the broader sense of such a settlement taken together with the countryside around it. The terminology is somewhat more consistent in the legal sources. The *gorod* of the legal documents

---

[353]See Ianin, *Zakonodatelstvo Drevnei Rusi*, 67-8, 101-2;V. M. Mavrodin, *Narodnye vosstaniia v Kievskoi Rusi XI-XIII vv* (Moscow: Sotsekgiz, 1961), 13-15; M. N. Tikhomirov, *Krest'ianskie i gorodskie vosstaniia na Rusi X-XIII vv* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatelstvo politicheskoi literatury, 1955), 130-48.

[354]Lukin, "Veche," 82-108.

[355]See above, p. 102.

[356]See above, p. 85.

normally includes the countryside. Thus, article 114 of the so-called expanded redaction of the legal code known as the *Rusian Law* (*Ruskaia Pravda*) prescribes what the *gorod*'s governor (*posadnik*) must do if the master of an escaped slave finds his slave in the *gorod* for which the *posadnik* is in charge.[357] Of course, the runaway slave was not safe in the countryside any more than he was in the town; the *gorod* here stands not for the town only, but for the whole territorial unit administered by the governor. Article 36 describes a situation when somebody buys a stolen object, not knowing that it was stolen, and then the original owner of the object recognizes it "in his *gorod*." The original owner then needs to follow a certain procedure to recover his property. However, if it turns out that the present owner of the item in question bought it from somebody who lives *po zemliam*, literally "in the lands," the procedure is different.[358] M. N. Tikhomirov interpreted *gorod* as a legal district, and "in the lands" as "in the other lands," that is, in the territories outside of this district.[359] V. L. Ianin has returned to the reading of the pre-revolutionary historian M. F. Vladimirskii-Budanov, who understood "the lands" as the countryside outside the town/city walls.[360] Such an interpretation is problematic because there are no examples of the usage of *zemlia* in the meaning of the "countryside," "territory outside of the city walls" in the twelfth-century sources;[361] the plural number used in the *Rusian Law* – "lands" – makes it even more difficult to accept Vladimirskii-Budanov's and Ianin's reading. Moreover, article 39, which clarifies article 36, ex-

---

[357]Ianin, *Zakonodatelstvo Drevnei Rusi*, 72.

[358]Ianin, *Zakonodatelstvo Drevnei Rusi*, 66.

[359]M. N. Tikhomirov, *Posobie dlia izuchenia Russkoi Pravdy* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Mosvovskogo universiteta, 1953), 93, 110.

[360]Ianin, *Zakonodatelstvo Drevnei Rusi*, 96-7; Tikhomirov, *Posobie dlia izuchenia Russkoi Pravdy*, 93, with reference to M. F. Vladimirskii-Budanov, *Obzor istorii russkogo prava* (Kiev, 1915). Tikhomirov, in his reference to Vladimirskii-Budanov, does not provide the page number.

[361]No examples of such usage are given either in the Old Russian dictionary (Avanesov, *Slovar*, vol. 3, 371-6) or in Gorskii's study of the term *zemlia*, which includes a list of passages from the eleventh – to early thirteenth-century sources using *zemlia* in various meanings, see Gorskii, "Zemli i volosti," 11-13, 19-23.

plicitly contrasts "his [the crime victim's] *gorod*" *wi*th a "different" or "another" (*chuzha*) *la*nd.[362] In this case, Ianin interprets "his *gorod*" as an equivalent of "his land": the territorial unit where the victim lives is contrasted with other territorial units.[363] The complementary, clarifying character of article 39 in relation to article 36 is evident from their titles. The procedure of the recovery of the stolen object was called *svod*; article 36 is entitled "On the *svod*," and article 39 "More on the svod (*o svode zhe*)."[364] Therefore, the two articles must have used terminology consistently, and the meanings of *gorod* and *zemlia* in both of them must have been the same.

In my opinion, Tikhomirov is right when he states that the *Rusian Law* consistently uses *gorod* as a legal district.[365] The word *gorozhane* sometimes signified all the population of such a district, not only the town/city dwellers, as in the admonition to the *gorozhane* to obey their prince.[366] In all likelihood, obedience to the prince was expected from those living in the countryside no less than from the townsmen.

Likewise, the words consisting of the name of a city/town and of the suffix signifying the inhabitants sometimes refer to the population of the whole region. For example, the *Primary Chronicle* describes the appearance of mysterious ghosts in the city of Polotsk and in the region around it (*oblast*). First, the ghosts appeared in Driutsk, a town in the Polotsk principality; then they spread throughout the land "and the people said that the spirits of the dead were attacking the *polochany*," that is, "the people of Polotsk."[367] "The people of Polotsk" in this passage are those

---

[362]Ianin, *Zakonodatelstvo Drevnei Rusi*, 66.

[363]"Statia ogranichivaet protseduru svoda territoriei svoei *zemli* molchalivo protivopostavliaa ee *chuzhei zemle* – drugomu kniazhastvu (emphasis original)," Ianin, *Zakonodatelstvo Drevnei Rusi*, 98.

[364]Ianin, *Zakonodatelstvo Drevnei Rusi*, 66.

[365]Tikhomirov, *Posobie dlia izuchenia Russkoi Pravdy*, 93, 110.

[366]*Merilo Pravednoe*, 24v, unpublished manuscript, Gosudarstvennaia rossiiskaia biblioteka, Troitskoe sobranie 15, as quoted in Avanesov et al., *Slovar*, vol. 1, 360.

[367]"i chelovetsy glagoliakhu iako navie biut' polochany," PSRL 1, 214-15.

living not just in the city of Polotsk, but in the whole principality. Therefore, when Lukin, in his otherwise admirable study, interprets "people of such and such *gorod*" as the inhabitants of the city or town, this interpretation appears too restrictive. These are generic terms signifying the population of the city/town and of the region belonging to it.

The use of these generic terms makes it impossible to find out the precise social composition of the "people of such and such *gorod*" whose actions the chronicles describe. In many cases, they apparently belonged to the elites; however, the ordinary people also had some significance in the complicated balance of power between the prince and the population of his *volost*.[368] In one case, the chronicler refers to the common people explicitly: he describes the supporters of the landless prince Ivan "Berladnik" as *smerds*. This chronicle passage contradicts Lukin's interpretation of the word *smerd* as a "non-urban person practicing agriculture."[369] In fact, *smerd* is a generic term for commoner, whether rural or urban. The sources often use *smerds* to describe peasants simply because most commoners were peasants. However, townsmen of low social status also could be called *smerds*, as is evident from the chronicle passage describing *smerds* as part of the population of Ushitsa, a town in the Galich principality. When Ivan, trying to obtain a *volost* for himself, attacked Ushitsa, the men sent by Prince Iaroslav of Galich defended the town, but "the *smerds* climbed over the wall to join Ivan, and [thus] three hundred of them went over" to him. It appears that this defection of the *smerds* left the town defenseless: according to the chronicler, the only reason why Ivan did not capture Ushitsa was his conflict with the Cumans, his allies. He did not allow them to sack Ushitsa, "and the Cumans got angry and left Ivan."[370] This episode shows the commoners of Ushitsa making their own decision about which prince to support and playing the crucial role in the

---

[368]See Lukin, "Veche," 108-45.

[369]"Kak by ni otsenivat sotsialnyi status smerdov, iasno, chto eto negorodskie zhiteli, zanimaiushchiesia selskim khoziaistvom," Lukin, "Veche," 83.

[370]PSRL 2, 497.

defense of their town. Prince Iaroslav's men apparently were not able to control them and to prevent their defection to Ivan.

This is a unique occasion when we have direct information about the social status of those who supported one prince against another. Normally, the chronicles refer to the undifferentiated "people of such and such *gorod*," just as the *Conventum* refers to the undifferentiated "*homines* of such and such *castrum*." Both categories potentially included the inhabitants of the fortified settlement and of the area around it of diverse social standings; more often than not, we do not know which segment(s) of the population took part in the actions described on each particular occasion.

Overall, the relations between the population and the lord appear complicated and multifaceted. In the words of Barthélemy:

> The *honor* of a castle in the eleventh century includes diverse elements that are very heterogeneous from our modern perspective. There are rights that we would call regalian mixed with the personal commendation and protection payments that would look like feudal extortion to us... In addition to that, lands and forests. The lord of the castle, as well as the knights, employ agents to exercise their rights. This is a complex whole...[371]

As we have seen, a *volost* presented a similar mixture of heterogeneous elements. The figure of the prince combined elements of a ruler and a landlord, just as the figure of the lord of the castle did. The same is true for the lords of more significant territorial units such as counties. If Aquitanian *castra* of the *Conventum* are similar to small *volosts* consisting of a town and its vicinities, counties resemble larger *volosts*, those centered around a city and including multiple towns. One of the best examples is the account about the county of Maine in the *Ecclesiastical History* by the Norman

---

[371]"Un honor châtelain au XIe siècle comporte des éléments diverses, à nos yeux très hétérogènes. Il y a des droits que nous dirions régaliens auxquels se mêlent de taxes de protection du type du sauvement et de la commendise qui nous paraissent des extorsions féodales ... Avec cela encore, des terres et des forêts. Le seigneur châtelain, comme les chevaliers, recourent à des agents pour gérer leurs droits. C'est un ensemble complexe..." Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 483.

historian Orderic Vitalis (written between 1114 and 1141).

In this account, the *Cenomanni*, that is, "people of Maine" (*Cenomannia* in Latin), play a role similar to what we have seen in the Rusian chronicle accounts about the actions of the "Kievans" and "people of Vladimir." Orderic relates how the *Cenomanni* were not happy with the rulers of Maine installed by the Normans. Therefore, they took advantage of the political instability that followed the death of William the Conqueror, and invited two brothers, marquesses of Liguria, to be their lords. These two brothers, through their mother, were related to the late count of Maine; thus they could put forward their hereditary rights to the county, as the envoys sent by the *Cenomanni* explained to them. The younger brother, Hugh, accepted the invitation, arrived in Maine and became the count. However, the people soon were disappointed in him. They managed to persuade Hugh that Maine was threatened by the Normans, who wanted to recover their possession of the county, and that it was too dangerous for him to remain there. Hugh decided to return to Italy; therefore, he sold his rights to Maine to his kinsman Helias for ten thousand shillings (*pro comitatu Cenomannensi decem milia solidorum ... recepit*). Orderic then explains Helias's hereditary rights to Maine and concludes that Helias made a good count: he took good care of the church and provided justice for all his subjects (*subiectis aequitatem seruauit*) and peace for the poor (*pacemque pauperibus ... tenuit*).[372]

Thus, the county of Maine, just like Rusian *volosts* and Aquitanian *castra*, has a monetary value. It is apparently considered a source of income for the count, a kind of a landed property. By selling it, the count acts as a landlord. On the other hand, these "private" aspects of authority over a county are combined with "public" duties of the count who is not only a landlord, but also a ruler responsible for maintaining peace and justice. The people of Maine are the count's "subjects,"

---

[372]Marjorie Chibnall, ed. and trans., *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis*, vol. 4 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 192-8.

Chapter 2. Terminology of Rulership, Power, and Property

but these "subjects" take a very active role in choosing their lord. The pool of potential counts, however, is limited to those who have hereditary rights to Maine, broadly interpreted.

All these features look very familiar: we have encountered the same elements in accounts about the Rusian *volosts* and the Aquitanian *castra*. All these very diverse territories combine features of a landed property and an administrative unit, all are subject to competing claims. The question of which of the claimants becomes the lord of a particular unit is resolved through the interplay of several factors. On the one hand, the rights to land units are determined by rules that guide relations among the princes in Rus or among the magnates in the West: they make agreements about who gets lordship over what, big lords grant territories to their men, the claimants put forward their hereditary rights. On the other hand, a major player is the population of the land units in question: the people resist some lords and support others. They have an opportunity to do so because there is usually more than one potential lord who has a legitimate claim to their territory. Those competing claims emerge in the absence of clear and unambiguous rules that would guide the distribution of power and land resources among the elite. The rules are more implicit than explicit, they are open to different interpretations, but they still exist. The disputes over the *volosts* or *castra* may lead to violence, but not to complete chaos. Investigation of these rules will be our next task. However, before proceeding to this task, we need to look at the history of the Riurikids and at interprincely relations as they are presented in the chronicles.

Chapter 3

Riurikids and Their "Rules of Play"

3.1   The Early Princes

The Rusian princes traced their origin to the legendary Scandinavian leader Riurik. According to the *Primary Chronicle*, diverse peoples who lived in the area of Novgorod invited the "Varangians," as the Scandinavians were known in Rus, to rule over them.[373] Three brothers came "with their kin" in response to this invitation and started to rule in three different areas with the eldest, Riurik, being based in Novgorod. The two younger brothers died childless, and Riurik inherited their lands. When Riurik died, his son Igor was still a minor, and Riurik appointed one of his men, Oleg, as Igor's guardian. Oleg, on behalf of Igor, subjugated Kiev and took over the whole middle Dnieper region, imposing tribute on the Slavs who lived there. The *Primary Chronicle* describes various groups of these Slavs - Polianians, Derevlians, Krivichi, Viatichi, and others, and mentions that some of them had their

---

[373]See above, p. 84.

own fortified settlements (*gorody*) and their native princes. Oleg is, in all probability, a historical figure; it is likely that he ruled in Kiev in the late ninth–early tenth century.[374] Igor and all subsequent princes are undoubtedly historical. The princes are presented as based in Kiev; however, the *Primary Chronicle* also mentions princes of Polotsk, a center in the north-west, in the territory of modern-day Belorussia. The princely family of Polotsk is apparently unrelated to that of Kiev, but the chronicle does not explain its origins. The first prince of Polotsk mentioned in the chronicle, as well as his daughter, bear Scandinavian names. The prince was Rogvolod, the East Slavic transcription of the Old Norse Ragnvaldr, and his daughter's name was Rogned (Ragnheithr); their descendants' names were Slavic. In all likelihood, the princes of Polotsk were Scandinavian leaders who subjugated the population of the area and who in the course of time became assimilated, just like the Kievan dynasty.[375] In fact, Igor is the last Kievan prince with a Scandinavian name; his son's name is already Slavic.

Igor and his men demanded too much tribute from the Derevlians; this resulted in a rebellion in which Igor was killed.[376] His widow Olga executed a bloody revenge on the Derevlians, but she also laid down rules and procedures for future payments of tribute and fixed its amount, apparently in order to reduce the risk of another uprising. She ruled until her and Igor's son Sviatoslav came of age. In the 950s, Olga was baptized in Constantinople, but she could not persuade Sviatoslav to convert to Christianity. Sviatoslav's response to Olga's entreaties was, "My followers (*druzhina*) will make fun of me [if I convert]."[377]

---

[374]See the discussion of historical evidence about Oleg in Franklin and Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus*, 106-7, 114-17.

[375]PSRL 1, 75-6; Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 152-3, see also Omeljan Pritsak, *The Origins of Rus*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981), 136-7.

[376]See above, p. 83.

[377]PSRL 1, 54-64.

After Sviatoslav was ambushed and killed by the Pechenegs, the nomadic Turkic neighbors of Rus, his three sons started a struggle for power. First, Iaropolk, who had become the Kievan prince after Sviatoslav's death, attacked his brother Oleg based in the Derevlian land. Oleg died in the battle with Iaropolk; the third brother Vladimir, who was located in Novgorod, "was scared and fled beyond the sea. Iaropolk appointed his governor (*posadnik*) in Novgorod and became the sole ruler of Rus."[378] However, his sole rule did not last long: Vladimir returned to Novgorod "with the Varangians" and marched on Kiev. He ended up treacherously killing Iaropolk during the negotiations "and started his sole rule as the Kievan prince."[379]

Vladimir is, of course, best remembered for his conversion to Christianity (988) and for his marriage to a Byzantine princess. After his conversion, he officially ended pagan worship, destroyed the idols, established the church hierarchy and sponsored mass baptism of the population. What Vladimir did not change were the rules of inheritance – or, rather, the absence of such rules. In his lifetime, Vladimir appointed his sons to rule different regions. After Vladimir's death in 1015, these sons started a struggle for power not unlike the one that followed the death of Sviatoslav.

3.2   Boris and Gleb

At the moment of Vladimir's death, Prince Sviatopolk was in Kiev; Prince Boris, on Vladimir's orders, was waging a campaign against the steppe nomadic Pechenegs; other princes were each in his respective region. When Vladimir died, Sviatopolk "sat on the Kievan throne (*sede Kyeve*) after Vladimir." Boris and his men were on their way back from the campaign when they received the news of Vladimir's death. According to the Tale of the Murder of Boris found in the *Primary Chronicle*,[380]

---

[378]PSRL 1, 75.

[379]PSRL 1, 75-9.

[380]PSRL 1, 132-41.

Vladimir's men (*druzhina*) approached Boris and offered to support him against Sviatopolk:

> And his father's men said to him, 'Behold, you have your father's men and [your own] soldiers (*voi*). Go and sit on your father's throne in Kiev!' He, however, answered, 'I will not raise my hand against my older brother. As my father is dead now, he [Sviatopolk] will be in place of a father for me (*mi budi v ottsa mesto*).' Having heard this, the soldiers left Boris.[381]

This passage presents a clash between the two concepts of interprincely relations. Both concepts are based on the idea that the authority over Rus belongs to all members of the princely family. So far, the implication of this idea has been the desire on the part of those princes who had sufficient resources and support to get rid of their brothers, because this was the only way to obtain power. Vladimir's and Boris's men take for granted Boris's intention to attack Sviatopolk and to seize the Kievan throne for himself. Boris, however, is represented as formulating a novel approach to relations within the princely family: he recognizes the authority of the older brother and presumably expects him to grant younger brothers regions to rule in the same way as it was customary for the Kievan prince to grant regions to his sons. Boris's men are shocked by what they apparently perceive as his non-princely behavior and leave him. In this passage, Boris expresses the idea of cooperation among the princes under the leadership of the eldest brother, an idea promoted in the *Primary Chronicle* as the remedy against internecine wars.

The Tale of the Murder of Boris (*O ubienii Borisove*) is part of the entry for 1015, but the earliest, hypothetically reconstructed text on which it is probably based, was written sometime in the late 1030s-early 1040s.[382] The "Tale" as it is known to us, most likely took its final form at the time of the compilation of the *Primary Chronicle* in the early twelfth century. It is impossible to tell at what time Boris's words about his unwillingness to fight against his brother appeared in the

---

[381]PSRL 1, 132.

[382]Miliutenko, *Sviatye kniazia-mucheniki*, 39-45, 169.

text, but in any case this is the first instance of the use of the formula "in place of a father (*v ottsa mesto*), "which came to play an important role in the relations between junior and senior princes. The Tale relates how Boris's peaceful intentions did not save him from Sviatopolk, who sent assassins to murder first him and then their younger brother Gleb. Both died martyrs' deaths, praying and not making any attempts to resist. Some chronicle accounts also contain information about the murder of one more brother, Sviatoslav.[383] Sviatopolk is represented as thinking, "I will kill all my brothers and will obtain the sole rule over Rus (*priimu vlast Russkuiu edin*)."[384]

At this point, yet another brother, Iaroslav, based in Novgorod, received a message from his sister about the death of their father and the actions of Sviatopolk. Iaroslav gathered an army and marched on Kiev against Sviatopolk, which the chronicle presents as both an act of piety and rightful vengeance for the murdered kinsmen:

> [Iaroslav] marched against Sviatopolk, calling on God and saying, 'This is not me, but him, who started to kill the brothers. May God be the avenger of the blood of my brothers because he shed the righteous blood of Boris and Gleb with no guilt on their part. What if he does the same to me? Judge me, O Lord, according to the right, so that the malice of the sinful may end.'[385]

After a series a battles, Iaroslav defeated Sviatopolk and became the prince of Kiev; Sviatopolk died in exile.[386]

However, there were two more brothers left. One of them, Prince Mstislav, located in the far-away principality of Tmutorokan between the Black and the Azov seas, advanced against Iaroslav. A battle between the brothers followed; Mstislav emerged victorious, and Iaroslav fled to Novgorod. What happened next was unprecedented:

---

[383]Miliutenko, *Sviatye kniazia-mucheniki*, 99-100.
[384]PSRL 1, 139.
[385]PSRL 1, 141. See also Lenhoff, *The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb*, 34-7.
[386]PSRL 1, 141-5.

> Mstislav sent [envoys] to Iaroslav, saying, 'Sit in your Kiev: you are the older brother.
> Let me have this side [of the Dnieper]'... In the year 1026. Iaroslav gathered many
> soldiers, came to Kiev, and made a peace treaty with his brother Mstislav... They
> divided the Rus Land along the Dnieper: Iaroslav received [the land] on this [western]
> side, and Mstislav received the other [eastern] side, and they began to live in peace
> and brotherly love. Strife and tumult ceased, and there was a great tranquility in the
> land.[387]

It is hard to tell whether the veneration of Boris and Gleb as saints had already
started by the time when Iaroslav and Mstislav made this peaceful arrangement.
Pre-Mongolian Rus did not know a formal canonization procedure; the earliest of-
ficial "inclusion among the saints (*prichislenie k liku sviatykh*)" analogous to the
canonizations occurred in the fourteenth century.[388] The discovery of Boris and
Gleb's relics, their translation to the Church of St. Basil in Vyshgorod and the re-
ports about their first posthumous miracles have been dated to various years, from
the 1020s to the early 1050s.[389] In any case, in the account of the peace agree-
ment between Iaroslav and Mstislav, we see a practical application of the idea first
expressed in the Tale of the Murder of Boris: the younger brother recognizes the
authority of the older one, the older brother does not seek to be "a sole ruler," but
gives the younger prince his fair share. The murder and subsequent veneration of
Boris and Gleb became a major landmark in the development of the ideology of the
princely cooperation under the leadership of the senior members of the family.

The peaceful agreement may have also been influenced by the position of the
Kievans. Mstislav first came from Tmutorokan at the moment when Iaroslav was
in Novgorod. He probably hoped to take advantage of Iaroslav's absence from Kiev
and to seize the Kievan throne for himself. However, in the words of the *Primary*

---

[387]PSRL 1, 149.

[388]Miliutenko, *Sviatye kniazia-mucheniki*, 56.

[389]For a review of literature on the dating of the development of the cult of Boris and Gleb
and for arguments that the first translation of the relics occurred in 1051/2, see Miliutenko,
Sviatye kniazia-mucheniki, 44-56.

Chronicle, "the Kievans did not accept him."[390] The reaction of the Kievans probably made Mstislav offer the division of the land so that Iaroslav would continue to "sit in his Kiev." Thus, the account of the conflict and subsequent agreement between Iaroslav and Mstislav displays the two features of princely politics that would become increasingly prominent in the course of the twelfth century: the rights of the senior and the role of the population that "accepts" or "rejects" a prince.

The peaceful coexistence of multiple princes, the "peace, brotherly love, and great tranquility" so enthusiastically described by the chronicler, was more often an ideal rather than a reality. Nonetheless, there was an important change in the practical behavior of the princes. They continued having open armed conflicts, they occasionally captured and imprisoned their rivals, but they did not assassinate each other any more. The succession of the Kievan and other thrones was rarely completely smooth, but it was never again accompanied by a fratricidal bloodbath comparable to those following the death of Sviatoslav and Vladimir. The notoriety of Sviatopolk, labeled the "Cain-like," whose grave, according to the *Primary Chronicle*, emitted a terrible stench "even until the present day,"[391] apparently compelled the princes to abstain from following in his footsteps and trying to obtain undivided power over the Rus Land by killing off the potential rivals.

The only case of a political assassination after the murder of Boris and Gleb in 1015 occurred two hundred years later, in 1217, when brothers Gleb and Constantine, princes of Riazan, treacherously killed at a feast six other princes who had *volosts* in the Riazan Land. According to the *Laurentian Chronicle*, Gleb and Constantine "thought like Sviatopolk," saying, "Let us kill those so that the two of us may obtain the sole rule [over Riazan] (*priiemeve edina vsiu vlast*)."[392] Their plan failed, however: they were driven away from Riazan by other princes and had to flee to

---

[390]PSRL 1, 147.
[391]PSRL 1, 145.
[392]PSRL 1, 440.

the Cuman steppe.[393] This case is clearly anomalous; normally, the princes made arrangements so that every dynasty member received some share of land and power. It is this practice of arranging a *volost* for each prince that was labeled "appanage" or "feudal" disintegration. This "disintegration," which we will discuss in the following sections, allegedly arrived after the death of Iaroslav, whose rule has traditionally been regarded as the "Golden Age" of Rus.

3.3   Iaroslav's "Golden Age," "Feudal Disintegration," and "Feudal Revolution"

We left Iaroslav after he and his brother Mstislav divided Rus according to their peace treaty. Even though he lost the battle, Iaroslav received the two most important cities, Kiev and Novgorod, which Mstislav conceded to him out of respect for Iaroslav's seniority and, probably, out of fear that the Kievans would not "accept" him. In 1036, Mstislav died without heirs, "and after that Iaroslav received all [Mstislav's] dominion (*vlast*) and [thus] became an autocrat (*samovlastets*) of all Rus."[394] A more accurate statement would have been "of almost all Rus" because the Polotsk Land had its own princely dynasty. Polotsk princes never competed for Kiev, while the Kievan princes left them undisturbed in their dominion. Iaroslav's sole rule over all Rus except Polotsk was complicated by the fact that he had one more brother, Sudislav, located in Pskov, a town in the north near Novgorod. The *Primary Chronicle* reports (without explaining what was the accusation) that Sudislav "was slanderously accused in front of Iaroslav," and Iaroslav imprisoned him.[395] It is probably not coincidental that this happened in the same year that Mstislav died and Iaroslav became the "autocrat of Rus." It is likely that Iaroslav was aware of

---

[393]PSRL 1, 444.
[394]PSRL 1, 150.
[395]PSRL 1, 151.

the potential challenge to his sole rule on the part of Sudislav, but, in the new spirit of interprincely relations, he imprisoned, rather than murdered, his last remaining brother.

In the traditional narrative of Rusian history, the reign of Iaroslav (1019-54; sole rule 1036-1054) is represented as a time of unity, prosperity, and well-organized government. In Soviet and Russian historiography, it is known as the period of the existence of the "unified Rusian state (*edinoe Drevnerusskoe gosudarstvo*)" with the capital city of Kiev and the monarchical rule of Iaroslav exercising his authority over all the land. This "unified state" disintegrated after Iaroslav's death, when his sons and grandsons started a struggle for power, which eventually resulted in multiple princes entrenched in different regions of what was once a single polity. These princes pursued their private interests, trying to increase their personal wealth and power rather than taking responsibility for governing Rus as a whole, as Iaroslav had done. A recent survey of Russian history written by the prominent historian Evgenii Anisimov summarizes this conventional view going back to the early nineteenth-century historian Karamzin with whom Anisimov wholeheartedly agrees: "After the death of Iaroslav ... strife and conflicts overwhelmed Rus. In the words of N. M. Karamzin, 'While burying Iaroslav, Rus buried her might and prosperity together with him.'"[396]

One reason for such an exalted view of Iaroslav is his cultural patronage which was, indeed, impressive and which earned him the name of "Iaroslav the Wise" in the later tradition.[397] However, if we turn from unquestionable cultural achievements to political history, the picture becomes more complicated. The contrast between the orderly "autocracy" of Iaroslav and the chaotic strife among his descendants greatly

---

[396]Evgenii Anisimov, *Istoriia Rossii on Riurika do Putina: Liudi, Sobytiia, Daty* (Moscow: Piter, 2007), 15.

[397]See V. Ia. Petrukhin, "Drevniaia Rus: Narod. Kniazia. Religiia," in idem, ed., *Iz istorii russkoi kultury*, vol. 1: *Drevniaia Rus*, 184-6; Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 208-17 .

resembles the "feudal anarchy" of nineteenth-century Western historiography and its modified twentieth-century version describing the "feudal revolution" that allegedly destroyed the Carolingian public order and replaced it with the privatized world of warring feudal lords. As we remember, the concept of the "feudal revolution" has been challenged by the scholars who have argued that the increase of information about private conflicts in the eleventh-century documents, compared to the tenth-century ones, reflects a change not in reality, but in the written culture. Barthélemy used the expression "feudal revelation" to express his idea that the eleventh-century sources reveal hitherto undocumented aspects of medieval society.[398] The documents in question are diplomatic: the proponents of the "feudal revolution" point to the contrast between the official charters that make up the majority of the tenth-century documents and the private notices that came to dominate the documentation in the eleventh century. According to the proponents of the "feudal revolution," the charters indicated the existence of public order and of an established judiciary, while the notices "told the story of violence, documented a very imperfect justice system and revealed ... the independence of the castellan lords."[399]

However, according to Barthélemy, it cannot be said that the new types of documents "*replaced* something else (emphasis original)" in the eleventh century; rather, they supplemented the traditional forms that continued to be produced. Therefore, "in relation to ... common agreements, to the detail behind the plea settlement or social 'unrest,' suddenly ... information is available where before there was none." This increase in information occurred because "notices began to include pieces of narrative that invoked a multitude of otherwise unrecorded episodes, particularly in relation to conflicts."[400] Furthermore, even though "no narrative exactly repro-

---

[398]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 33.

[399]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 5, with reference to Olivier Guillot, *Le comte d'Anjou et son entourage au XIe siècle*, vol. 1 (Paris: A. & J. Picard, 1972), 433.

[400]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 12, 17, 31.

duces reality," the forms of expression typical of   eleventh-century notices suggest that these notices reflect aspects of reality which escaped the earlier official charters. One such notice is the *Conventum Hugonis*, clearly connected with the oral culture and representing what looks like the actual spoken arguments of the participants in the property disputes.[401] The Angevin notices examined by Barthélemy, unlike the *Conventum*, have good Latin grammar and syntax; however, they also use many Latinized vernacular words, the terms that "constituted the lifeblood of feudal France."[402]

These features of the French eleventh-century diplomatic sources greatly resemble the Rusian twelfth-century chronicles on which the concept of the "feudal disintegration" is based. In fact, French historians have described the eleventh-century notices as looking "like pages out of a chronicle."[403] Some Rusian chronicles, the *Kievan* in particular, have more in common with the notices than this generic similarity. Moreover, the evolution of the Rusian narrative sources in the eleventh and twelfth centuries went along the same lines as the evolution of the French diplomatic sources in the tenth and eleventh centuries as described by Barthélemy. Thus, a major source on Iaroslav's rule is the *Sermon on Law and Grace* written in the learned Byzantine tradition and creating an imperial-style image of Rus and its prince.[404] The chronicle entries about Iaroslav also use Byzantine imagery, although not to the same extent as Hilarion.[405] In fact, the presence of Greek language and culture in Rus was at its highest in the eleventh century, according to Franklin. It was never as significant as Latin in the West: "Literary culture was Slavonic, but in symbolic dis-

---

[401]See above, p. 135.

[402]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 32.

[403]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 15, with references to Pierre Gasnault, "Les actes privés de l'abbaye de Saint-Martin de Tours du VIIIe au XIIe siècle," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 112 (1954): 24-66, at 40, and to Duby, *La société aux XIe et XIIe siècles dans la région mâconnaise*, 9.

[404]See above, p. 49.

[405]See Petrukhin, "Drevniaia Rus: Narod. Kniazia. Religiia," 182.

play it was fashionable for the Kievan elite of the day to wear the linguistic badge of *homo byzantinus*."[406] The significance of Greek was decreasing from the late eleventh century on. Franklin and Shepard very appropriately entitled their chapter on early twelfth-century culture "Going Native."[407] This period saw

> the passing of what might be called the age of primary borrowing, of the age when the elite had based its images of authority and authenticity on a sense of direct *translatio* from Byzantium to Kiev. By the end of the [eleventh] century *translatio* was increasingly giving way to *traditio*, as the Scandinavian, Byzantine and Slav strands fused into a less declamatory, more confident and self-sustaining synthesis. From birch-bark to parchment, Slavonic literacy and literature spread in the city. Greek lost its aura of prestigious display.[408]

The French eleventh-century notices, even though still written in Latin, display a similar process of "going native" from the increasing use of vernacular terms in the Angevin documents to the heavily vernacularized language of the *Conventum Hugonis*.

Another common feature is what Barthélemy calls "documentary diversification" resulting from the "growth in the use of the written record."[409] Eleventh-century notices were used in dispute resolutions: "read out or memorized, they must often have illuminated the debate." In order to perform this function, they provided "narratives about social relations, genealogies, interrelations, and property." Most importantly, "they were required to aspire to 'factual accuracy' because those whose memories they sought to awaken or correct also partially knew the facts. Moreover, their opponents ... would be sure to find the loopholes in their narratives."[410] The Rusian twelfth-century narrative sources saw a similar diversification. Most scholars believe that chronicle-writing started at the time of Iaroslav in the Kievan Caves

---

[406]Franklin, "Greek in Kievan Rus'," 80-81.
[407]Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 313.
[408]Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 315.
[409]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 17, 30 .
[410]Barthélemy, *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*, 30-32.

monastery.[411] Thus, it is likely that the annals describing Iaroslav were produced in his capital city in a monastery that probably enjoyed his patronage. Hilarion, the author of the *Sermon on Law and Grace* was a priest in the church at Iaroslav's residence of Berestovo on the outskirts of Kiev; later Iaroslav appointed him as the metropolitan of Rus.[412] Thus, all the sources on the reign of Iaroslav originate from a narrow circle of authors, all of whom were in more or less close proximity to Iaroslav himself. There are no competing narratives produced at different centers and representing different perspectives. In the twelfth century, this situation changed dramatically. Centers of chronicle-writing proliferated; increasing numbers of princes employed their own chroniclers who were busy with creating the best possible images of their patrons while discrediting rivals and adversaries of the same patrons. In addition, some chroniclers apparently expressed the interests of the city communities, as we have seen, for example, in the account of the Rostislavichi in Vladimir: the author of this part of the *Laurentian Chronicle*, commonly believed to be a cleric of the Vladimir cathedral church, clearly writes from the perspective of the "people of Vladimir."[413]

Furthermore, the subject matter and probably even the function of many of the twelfth-century chronicles is the same as that of the French eleventh-century notices: they provide detailed narratives of disputes and their resolutions through either armed conflicts, or negotiations, or a combination of both. If the notices are "like pages out of a chronicle," the Rusian chronicles, in the words of Franklin:

> on one level ... are in themselves legal documents of a kind. ... Their accounts of
> the past are to some extent designed to justify or condemn, with written evidence,
> the actions of princes in the present, demonstrate or refute the legitimacy of current

---

[411]O. V. Tvorogov, *Drevniaia Rus: Sobytiia i liudi* (St Petersburg: Nauka, 1994), 15; Petrukhin, "Drevniaia Rus: Narod. Kniazia. Religiia," 184.

[412]Franklin, *Sermons and Rhetoric*, xvi.

[413]See A. N. Nasonov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI – nachala XVIII veka: Ocherki i issledovaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 133.

claims and campaigns.[414]

Therefore, the chroniclers had "to aspire to 'factual accuracy'" no less than the authors of the French notices did. Both eleventh-century French and twelfth-century Rusian authors found themselves in a situation when "their opponents ... would be sure to find the loopholes in their narratives."[415] Thus, similar developments in the French and Rusian written cultures, namely the diversification and "nativization" of the sources, occurred during the periods which allegedly saw the breakdown of the Carolingian public order and of the "unified Rusian state" respectively. Can this be a mere coincidence? In my opinion, these parallels between eleventh-century France and twelfth-century Rus support the position of Barthélemy with respect to France and the position of Franklin and Shepard with respect to Rus. In other words, they suggest that the "feudal disintegration" in Rus and the "feudal revolution" in France primarily took place on parchment rather than in reality.

3.4   The Political Developments in Rus in the Late Eleventh-Early Thirteenth Centuries

Iaroslav had six sons. The eldest of them, Vladimir, ruled in Novgorod. He predeceased his father; thus, Iaroslav had five heirs at the moment of his death.[416] The *Primary Chronicle* entry for 1054 contains what is known as Iaroslav's Testament. This Testament describes the allocation of different regions to each of the five sons, and it also includes Iaroslav's alleged deathbed speech about the principles that should govern relations among the brothers. We will discuss the ideological aspects of the Testament later; for now, we will concentrate on the practical arrangements.

---

[414]Franklin, "Literacy and Documentation," 21.
[415]See above, note 410.
[416]PSRL 1, 160.

Chapter 3. Riurikids and Their "Rules of Play"

Iaroslav bestowed Kiev on his eldest son Iziaslav, and four other important centers – Chernigov, Pereiaslavl, Smolensk, and Vladimir-in-Volhynia – on four other sons. He commanded his children "not to transgress your brother's boundaries and not to drive [each other] out" and "to obey [Iziaslav] in the same way as you obey me; may he be instead of me for you." Iziaslav, on his part, had the responsibility of maintaining the prescribed order: "if anyone wants to commit wrongdoing (*obideti*) against his brother, you help the one who is being wronged."[417] Polotsk continued to be the domain of a separate princely line; Iaroslav apparently had no authority over the Polotsk land and could not bequeath it. No provisions were made for the children of Iaroslav's son Vladimir, who predeceased his father. After a series of conflicts with other princes, Vladimir's descendants established themselves in the south-western Galician principality.[418]

The line of Vladimir, whose premature death deprived his descendants of their share in Iaroslav's inheritance, was not the only source of conflicts. The *Primary Chronicle* reports the rebellion in Kiev, the attacks of the younger brothers on Iziaslav of Kiev, the battle of the joint forces of Iaroslav's three sons with Vseslav of Polotsk who attempted to enlarge his domain by attacking the Novgorod Land ...[419] There is no need to follow all the conflicts, negotiations, and peace settlements among the rapidly multiplying dynasty members in detail. The next landmark event in the development of interprincely relations after the death of Iaroslav was the 1097 princely conference in Liubech, a town in the Chernigov Land. The six most powerful princes among Iaroslav's grandsons

> came and gathered at Liubech to establish peace (*na ustroenie mira*), and they spoke
> to one another saying, 'Why do we ruin the Rus Land making strife among ourselves,
> while the Cumans tear apart our land and rejoice that there are wars among us?
> From now on, let us be of one heart and let us protect the Rus Land. Let each hold
> his paternal inheritance (*otchina*): let Sviatopolk have [his father] Iziaslav's Kiev,

---

[417]PSRL 1, 161.
[418]PSRL 1, 163-4, 257; PSRL 2, 152-3, 196, 284.
[419]PSRL 1, 166-7, 170-71, 182-3.

and let Vladimir have [his father] Vsevolod's [inheritance], and let David and Oleg and Iaroslav have [the inheritance of their father] Sviatoslav. And for those to whom Vsevolod granted towns (*gorody*): Vladimir[-in-Volhynia] [goes to] David; as for the two Rostislavichi, Peremyshl [goes to] Volodar and Terebovl [goes to] Vasilko. And on this they kissed the Cross: 'If from now on anyone turns against another (*kto otsele na kogo budet*), then we all and the Venerable Cross shall turn against him.' And they all said, 'May the Venerable Cross and all the Rus Land [be against him].' And having kissed each other, they returned to their lands.[420]

All the princes – or, at least, those participating in the conference – are presented as equal partners. Iaroslav bequeathed to Iziaslav both Kiev and the position of leadership among the brothers. Now, Iziaslav's son Sviatopolk receives Kiev as his father's inheritance, but not the authority over other princes. No single prince is "in place of a father" for others; rather, they all take an oath on the Cross ("kiss the Cross") to take collective responsibility for maintaining peace and order and to punish violators. However, the accounts of political and military events in the remaining part of the *Primary Chronicle* represent one of the princes, Vladimir Monomakh, as the *de-facto* leader of the dynasty. Monomakh, whose father Vsevolod was Iaroslav's fourth son, did not have any official position that would set him apart from other princes. Monomakh's only special circumstance was his kinship with the imperial Byzantine family through his mother, a Byzantine princess. The imperial connection, of course, added to his prestige, but it did not give him any formal rights in Rus. The chronicles represent Monomakh's authority as based, first and foremost, on moral grounds. We shall see later how this moral authority was constructed.

Monomakh is first presented as the informal leader of the princes in the account of the dramatic events that occurred soon after the Liubech conference. Sviatopolk of Kiev and David of Vladimir-in-Volhynia believed that Prince Vasilko of Terebovl had hostile plans against them. They decided to strike preemptively; therefore, they

---

[420]PSRL 1, 257.

captured Vasilko and had him blinded. Monomakh and two other princes sent envoys to Sviatopolk reminding him of the Liubech agreement about the collective exercise of justice:

> 'Why have you committed this evil deed in the Rus Land and plunged a knife into us? Why did you blind your brother? If you had a charge against him (*ashche ti by vina kakaia byla na n'*), you should have accused (*oblichil by*) him before us and, after having proved him guilty, you could do this to him. Now explain his offense (*vinu*) for which you did this to him.'[421]

The envoys are sent by the three princes, but they are obviously speaking on behalf of all the dynasty, for the members of which it became increasingly common to call each other "brothers" regardless of how they were related biologically. It is in this sense that Vasilko, the son of Sviatopolk's cousin, is called his "brother." By taking out Vasilko's eyes with a knife,[422] the blinders injured all the princes collectively: "you plunged a knife into us." The *Chronicle* does not provide any explicit explanation for why these three particular princes act on behalf of all; as the narrative progresses, the two other princes move to the background and Monomakh, on a number of occasions, is presented as being solely responsible for the dealings with the blinders. Thus, the plural forms of the verbs, indicating all the three princes, are used in the account of how they did not find Sviatopolk's explanation satisfactory and advanced with their troops against Kiev where Sviatopolk ruled.[423] However, then the *Chronicle* states that the Kievans sent a delegation to Monomakh asking him to spare their city. Monomakh agreed to the Kievans' plea, and, instead of attacking Sviatopolk, started negotiations with him. There is no mention of the other two princes; the passage creates the impression that Monomakh conducts negotiations and makes decisions alone.[424]

An agreement was reached that Sviatopolk would march against David, the

---

[421]PSRL 1, 263.
[422]PSRL 1, 260-61.
[423]PSRL 1, 263.
[424]PSRL 1, 264.

main perpetrator. Finally, the leading princes came together for another conference to discuss David's crime; they decided to confiscate his *volost* and to give him a smaller one and a sum of money as partial compensation.[425] This might look like a rather lenient punishment for a blinding, as the princes themselves pointed out to David:

> 'We deprive you of the throne of Vladimir[-in-Volhynia] because you plunged a knife into us, which had never happened in the Rus land, [but] we will neither arrest (*imem*) you nor do any other harm to you.'[426]

In spite of such leniency, this act of collective justice appears to have been quite efficient. No other blinding of a prince by another prince occurred until the obscure episode that occurred in Suzdalia in 1177. The end of the *Laurentian* entry for this year is lost. The entry reports the devastation of the vicinities of the city of Vladimir (in Suzdalia) by Prince Gleb of Riazan who

> did much harm to the church in Bogoliubovo ... burned boyars' villages and allowed [his allies the Cumans] to capture women, children, and property, and he burned many churches.

Therefore, when Vsevolod of Vladimir defeated and captured Gleb, with his sons and his brothers-in-law, and brought them to Vladimir as prisoners, the people became "riotous" and demanded that Vsevolod either execute or blind the prisoners, or else hand them over to the people.

> However, Prince Vsevolod, being pious and God-fearing, did not want to do that, and he put them in a dungeon (*porub*) on account of the people so that the riot might cease (*aby utishilsia miatezh*) ... But after a few days all the people and boyars rose again, and a great multitude of them came to the prince's court with weapons saying, 'What is the point of keeping them (*chego ikh doderzhati*)? We want to blind them.' And Prince Vsevolod, being sad and not able to restrain the people because a multitude of them issued a battle cry (*ne mogshiu uderzhati lidii mnozhstva ikh radi klicha*)...

After that, there is a blank spot in the manuscript and a new entry begins.[427] According to one redaction of the *Kievan*, Vsevolod offered to release Gleb on the

---

[425]PSRL 1, 265-74.
[426]PSRL 1, 274.
[427]PSRL 1, 383-6.

condition that he would leave Riazan and would permanently move to "Rus" in the narrow sense of the region in the Middle Dnieper. "Gleb said, 'I better die here, but will not leave,' and then he was dead (*togda zhe mertv byst'*)," apparently killed on Vsevolod's orders. Gleb's son was released, and Gleb's brothers-in-law Mstislav and Iaropolk Rostislavichi were blinded and then released.[428] Another version of the *Kievan* and the *First Novgorodian* report that Mstislav and Iaropolk were blinded, "and Gleb died at that time." Soon thereafter, the blinded princes miraculously restored their eyesight when they entered the Church of Boris and Gleb in Smolensk on St. Gleb's day. Since they later functioned as princes of Novgorod and Torzhok, they, indeed, must have been able to see.[429] This led the eighteenth-century historian Vasilii Tatishchev to speculate that Vsevolod only imitated blinding to placate the mob.[430]

Whatever happened to the prisoners in Vladimir in 1177, the *Laurentian* passage makes it clear that blinding a prince, even one who had committed a serious offense, would badly tarnish the image of the perpetrator. The Vasilko affair made blinding as unacceptable in princely politics as the murder of Boris and Gleb had done in respect to assassination – even though one of the perpetrators, Sviatopolk, continued to rule in Kiev after his crime, and Vasilko, whose image in the *Primary Chronicle* is far from saint-like, was never considered a martyr.[431] The condemnation of the act by the leading members of the dynasty turned out to be a sufficient measure to deter princes from blinding their enemies in the future. Thus, the collective action of the princes was, in the final end, successful. In accordance with the Liubech agreement, "they all and the Venerable Cross" solved the crisis caused by the blinding of Vasilko. The twelfth century saw a number of occasions when princes acted jointly, in the spirit of the Liubech agreement; however, another principle formulated at Liubech -

---

[428]PSRL 2, 606.
[429]PSRL 25, 89; N1L, 35.
[430]V. N. Tatishchev, *Istoriia Rossiiskaia*, vol. 2 (Moscow: AST, 2003), 149.
[431]See PSRL 1, 267-9.

"let each hold his paternal inheritance" - was discarded, at least in respect to Kiev, because of the interference of the Kievan population.

As we remember, the Liubech conference allocated Kiev to the line of Iziaslav, the eldest of the five sons of Iaroslav who survived their father. Iaroslav bequeathed Kiev to Iziaslav, and the princes at Liubech decided that his son Sviatopolk should have Kiev as his paternal inheritance – and so he did until his death in 1113. After that, Kiev was supposed to pass to his son. However, the Kievans, with whom Sviatopolk apparently was unpopular,[432] invited Vladimir Monomakh to occupy "the throne of his father and grandfather." Monomakh's father Vsevolod, indeed, occupied the Kievan throne after the death of his two elder brothers, who had ruled in Kiev before him. In this respect, Kiev could be considered Monomakh's "inheritance," but the same could be said about the progeny of all three of Iaroslav's sons who had been the Kievan princes. This was precisely the point of the Liubech conference – to prevent competition between all the cousins whose fathers had formerly ruled in Kiev and to allocate Kiev to just one princely line to the exclusion of the other potential claimants. In fact, the *Primary Chronicle* presents Monomakh as considering his options after his father Vsevolod died in Kiev in 1093:

> 'If I sit on the throne of my father [in Kiev], I will have to have a war with Sviatopolk because this had been previously the throne of his father.' And having considered everything (*porazmysliv*), he sent an invitation to Sviatopolk (*posla po Sviatopolka*) to Turov [where Sviatopolk was at the moment], and left [Kiev] for Chernigov.[433]

---

[432]Thus, the chronicler states that Sviatopolk was mourned by "boyars and by all his men (*druzhina*)," passing over in silence "people" or "Kievans," and he also notes the unusually generous alms that Sviatopolk's widow gave at his death to the poor, which may indicate her awareness of their hostility against her late husband (PSRL 2, 275). Janet Martin also points out that the invitation of Vladimir corresponds to "the principle of naming the senior eligible member of the eldest generation of the dynasty to rule as prince in the capital city, Kiev" (Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 37). However, the chronicler does not discuss any principles of a prince's eligibility for Kiev in the connection with the invitation of Monomakh. As the events are presented in the chronicle, the decisive factor appears to have been Monomakh's personal popularity.

[433]PSRL 1, 217.

This was before the Liubech agreement, but the *Chronicle* presents Monomakh as already recognizing the principle of inheritance that would be formulated in Liubech four years later.

Therefore, Monomakh, law-abiding and peace-loving as he was (according to his image in the chronicles, at any rate), declined the invitation of Kievans in 1113. This did not help Sviatopolk's son to inherit the Kievan throne, however, as the the Kievans started an uprising, the first act of which was the sacking of the household of the *tysiatskii*, one of the chief city officials appointed by the prince. The uprising continued with plundering of the lesser officials, *sotskii* and, unusually, of the Jews. The targeting of Sviatopolk's officials suggests that the people were unhappy with his rule. As for the Jews, this is the only recorded occasion of violence against them in all pre-Mongolian history, and historians generally attribute the plundering of the Jews in 1113 to some kind of economic grievances of the population involved in the uprising.[434] The account of the uprising exemplifies the vagueness of the chronicles' social terminology discussed above: while the "Kievans" were plundering the officials and the Jews, presumably other "Kievans" sent a second invitation to Monomakh urging him to come to Kiev to prevent further violence: "if you do not come ..., they will attack [Sviatopolk's widow], and the boyars, and the monasteries." This convinced Monomakh; and as soon as he arrived in Kiev, "all the people were happy and the riot ceased."[435]

Monomakh remained in Kiev until his death in 1125, when the Kievan throne passed to his eldest son Mstislav; the succession was smooth and uncontested. The degree of authority that Monomakh and Mstislav exercised over other princes from the start of Monomakh's rule in Kiev in 1113 to the death of Mstislav in 1132, has caused some scholars to move the date for the beginning of the "period of the feudal disintegration of Rus" to 1132, when the Kievan throne passed (again, peacefully) to

---

[434]See Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 286.
[435]PSRL 2, 275-6.

Mstislav's younger brother Iaropolk.[436] Then a challenge came from another princely line, the descendants of Monomakh's cousin Oleg Sviatoslavich who, together with his two brothers, is named among the participants of the Liubech conference. Oleg Sviatoslavich and Vladimir Monomakh had had conflicts over the Chernigov Land which, after a number of military confrontations and peace treaties, became the uncontested dominion of Oleg and his clan.[437] Oleg and his descendants, known as the Olgovichi, did not have rights to Kiev according to the Liubech agreement – but neither had Monomakh, as we have seen. The installation of the Monomakhovichi, as the princely line of Monomakh is called, in Kiev in 1113 invalidated the old rules formulated in Liubech, but no new rules were proposed to replace the old ones – not explicitly, in any case.[438] The uncontested successions from Monomakh to Mstislav to Iaropolk appear to be based on Monomakh's and Mstislav's charisma more than on anything else. Iaropolk's position as the Kievan prince was recognized by all the dynasty, but he did not exercise authority over other princes comparable to that of his father and elder brother.[439] When he died in 1138, his brother Viacheslav entered Kiev, but he did not stay there long:

> [Vsevolod] Olgovich came together with the people of Vyshgorod [the stronghold near Kiev] and, having joined forces (*pristroivsia*) with his brethren, sent [a message] to Viacheslav, 'Better leave the city on your own (*idi z dobrom iz goroda*).' And he

---

[436]See e.g. Petrukhin, "Drevniaia Rus: Narod. Kniazia. Religiia," 208 ("Naslednik Monomakha Mstislav ... schitaetsia poslednim kniazem Kievskoi Rusi").

[437]See Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 35.

[438]Martin Dimnik suggests that the succession of Kiev was "governed by a genealogical seniority," a complicated system reconstructed by Dimnik and not described in any Rusian source. According to Dimnik, Sviatopolk and Vladimir Monomakh masterminded the Liubech agreement that violated this putative system, Oleg Sviatoslavich of Chernigov had a right to Kiev, but Monomakh did "injustice" by "pre-empting" his claim. Therefore, Oleg's son Vsevolod Olgovich "refused to submit" to this "injustice" when he "usurped" Kiev in 1138. Furthermore, according to Dimnik, "usurpation was a recognized form of seizing power" (whatever this means). and Vsevolod had to resort to usurpation because he had a right to Kiev according to some principles postulated by Dimnik, but lacked other qualifications which allegedly made a prince eligible for Kiev. See Martin Dimnik, *The Dynasty of Chernigov, 1146-1246* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), 8-13.

[439]See PSRL 1, 301-6; PSRL 2, 294-302.

> [Viacheslav], not wishing to shed blood, did not fight with them. The Metropolitan brokered a peace between them (*smiri i*) and confirmed it with the Venerable Cross, and [Viacheslav] went back to Turov, and Vsevolod entered Kiev on the fifth of March. As for Chernigov, he [Vsevolod] installed [his cousin] there.[440]

Another chronicle adds that Vsevolod supported his message to Viacheslav with a demonstration of force: he started to set fire to the houses outside of the city wall.[441] This episode is, in many respects, quite typical of the representation of the princely politics. On the one hand, there is no explanation for the action of Vsevolod Olgovich, no discussion of his versus Viacheslav's rights to Kiev. In this context, the behavior of the princes seems simply arbitrary, supporting the notion that chaotic internal strife was the essence of the "period of disintegration." On the other hand, we see a negotiation process, mediation by the head of the Rusian church. In the end, little harm was done, as nobody was killed, and no property was destroyed except for the houses on the outskirts, which Vsevolod only "started" to set on fire, so hopefully he did not burn many of them. The prince who lost the competition for Kiev lost neither life, nor eyesight, nor freedom together with it, but simply returned to the *volost* he had had before, and continued to hold it in peace. From this perspective, the passage quoted above can be seen as an account of a rather successful resolution of a political crisis.

This is not to say that the conflicts over Kiev were always resolved with as little violence as this one. Not all princes aspiring for the Kievan throne shared Viacheslav's unwillingness to shed blood, and the Kievans continued to take an active, and at times violent, part in the decision-making over who their next prince would be. We have seen how they installed Monomakh in 1113 in violation of the Liubech agreements; in 1138 they did not fight for Monomakh's son Viacheslav and accepted Vsevolod, a representative of a different princely line. However, when Vsevolod bequeathed Kiev to his younger brother Igor in an attempt to make the Olgovichi a

---

[440]PSRL 1, 306-7.
[441]PSRL 2, 302.

permanent Kievan dynasty, the Kievans rebelled against Igor and supported Mono-makh's grandson Iziaslav, declaring, "We do not want to be as if a hereditary property of the Olgovichi."[442] The result of all these developments was that Kiev did not have its own princely line, which, for the most part, apparently suited the Kievans just fine because this gave them an opportunity to choose which prince to support. To some extent, this resembled the situation in Novgorod, although the Kievans never developed the same degree of self-government and of freedom to choose their prince as enjoyed by the Novgorodians since the 1130s.

All other regions, except Kiev and Novgorod, had their own princely dynasties and often, although not always, experienced quite orderly succession. For example, the first known prince of Suzdalia was one of the Monomakh's sons, Iurii Dolgorukii, who received Suzdalia from his father sometime before 1108.[443] He passed the throne to his son Andrei. Andrei was killed by his servants; since his only son predeceased him,[444] Andrei's murder caused a crisis, but eventually his younger brother Vsevolod became the new Suzdalian prince. Vsevolod, in his turn, passed the throne to his son Iurii. It is true that Iurii had an armed conflict with his brother Constantine, but the conflict was ended with a peace agreement: the brothers shared the Suzdalian principality until Constantine's death when Iurii became the uncontested prince of Suzdalia again; he ruled until his death in battle with the Mongols in 1238.[445] Thus, in the period from 1113 to 1238, more than a century, Suzdalia saw one serious succession crisis caused by the extraordinary circumstance of Andrei's murder and one battle between two princely brothers. This record seems as good as that achieved by many "real" monarchies with crowned kings.

The descendants of Iurii Dolgorukii based in Suzdalia are known as the northern

---

[442]PSRL 2, 323.
[443]Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 43.
[444]PSRL 1, 365.
[445]PSRL 1, 436-44, 465.

Monomakhovichi. There was also another, southern, branch of Monomakh's descendants in the Dnieper region. The line of Monomakh's cousin Oleg, the Olgovichi, was based in the other part of the Dnieper region, the Chernigov Land. By the 1140s, all these branches of the dynasty claimed rights to the Kievan throne, but none of them could monopolize it. This was not for lack of trying. We have seen that the Olgovichi tried and failed to make Kiev "as if their hereditary property" in the 1140s. Half a century later, the *Kievan Chronicle* entry for 1195 reports an equally unsuccessful attempt of the Monomakhovichi to establish their exclusive right to Kiev. At this time, their two branches, northern and southern, were united under the leadership of Vsevolod of Suzdalia, and the senior prince among the southern Monomakhovichi, Riurik Rostislavich, ruled in Kiev.

> [The Monomakhovichi] sent their men (*muzhi*) to [the senior Olgovich] Iaroslav and to all the Olgovichi, saying to him (sic), 'Take an oath on the Cross [literally: kiss the Cross to us] with all your brethren that you will not try to take our inheritance Kiev and Smolensk from us, and from our children, and from all our clan of the descendants of Vladimir [Monomakh] (*ne iskati otchiny nasheia Kieva i Smolenska pod nami i pod nashimi detmi i podo vsim nashim Volodimerim plemenem*), as our forefather Iaroslav divided us along the Dnieper; and you do not lay claims for Kiev (*Kiev vy ne nadobe*).' The Olgovichi deliberated, and they pitied themselves, saying to [the Monomakhovichi senior] Vsevolod, 'If you mean that we should recognize your and your relation Riurik's right to Kiev, we agree; but if you want us to lose Kiev forever, then [know that] we are neither Hungarians nor Poles, but descendants of the same forefather as you (*edinogo deda esmy vnutsi*). We do not seek Kiev during your (plural) lifetime; but after you (plural), to whomever God will grant it.'[446]

The chronicles express the common belief that God grants military victories and popular support to princes; thus, the Olgovichi argue that they can legitimately use these factors in their bidding for Kiev after the death of the current Kievan prince Riurik and, as the plural form of "you" indicates, also after the death of Vsevolod, the current leader of the Monomakhovichi clan.

This passage shows that in the late twelfth century, princes could act not only

---

[446]PSRL 2, 688-9.

as individual political players, but also as members of relatively stable princely clans. Each clan has a leader that represents all its members who are collectively signified by the singular form of the neuter noun *bratia*, traditionally translated into English as "brethren." This neuter noun is not to be confused with the plural form of the masculine noun *brat* (brother), which is also *bratia*, but which is normally translated as "brothers." In the passage quoted above we see the leaders consulting with their "brethren" and then presenting the consolidated decision on behalf of the whole clan.

3.5   "Rules of Play" of Princely Politics

The same passage from the entry for 1195 demonstrates an aspect of princely politics that saw no change throughout the pre-Mongolian period. This is the absence of any normative documents regulating the succession and the relations within the dynasty in general. In the the 1130s, Vsevolod Olgovich did not give any explanation as to why Viacheslav should "better leave the city on his own" and vacate the Kievan throne for Vsevolod.[447] Likewise, in the 1190s, the Monomakhovichi do not explain why Kiev is supposed to be their, and not the Olgovichi's, "inheritance." This is not to say that princes never provide arguments to support their claims. On the contrary, they do so quite often. In fact, it is not quite fair to say that the princes provide no arguments in the entry for 1195. They do, but their arguments can hardly be considered satisfactory from a modern perspective. The Monomakhovichi refer to Iaroslav's division of the land along the Dnieper. There was, indeed, such a division, but on that occasion it was not Iaroslav dividing "us," that is, presumably, his descendants, but rather Iaroslav and his brother Mstislav dividing the land between the two of them.[448] On the other hand, when Iaroslav divided the land among his sons, he allocated Kiev to Iziaslav whose line, by the late twelfth century, was in such a

---

[447]See above, p. 135.
[448]See above, p. 118.

decline that it was inconceivable for Iziaslav's descendants to claim Kiev or any other significant center for themselves. As for Smolensk, the other supposed "inheritance of all the descendants of Vladimir Monomakh," Iaroslav gave it to Viacheslav whose line died out in the late eleventh century. Iaroslav never allocated either Kiev or Smolensk to Monomakh's father Vsevolod.[449] What did the Monomakhovichi mean then by referring to Iaroslav's division of "us" along the Dnieper? Possibly, we can reconstruct their logic thus: when Iaroslav and Mstislav were the only two powerful players in Rus, they divided the land between themselves among the Dnieper. By doing so, they created a precedent. Now, in the 1190s, there are two powerful collective players in Rus, namely the two princely clans; therefore, the Monomakhovichi propose to repeat the precedent and to divide the land along the Dnieper again.

Similarly, the Olgovichi reject the Monomakhovichi's proposal on the grounds that they are "neither Hungarians nor Poles," but the descendants of Iaroslav, just as the Monomakhovichi are. This argument apparently implies that any Rusian prince who traces his origin back to Iaroslav has a right to compete for Kiev in the hopes that God grant him victory over the rival claimants. However, this was never the case, and the Olgovichi could not possibly have the intention of making all the multitude of Iaroslav's descendants eligible for the Kievan throne. Other princes, who were the "descendants of the same forefather" Iaroslav no less than the Monomakhovichi and Olgovichi were, never attempted to claim Kiev. Why should the Olgovichi? Again, we can speculate that the Olgovichi point out that they are equal to the Monomakhovichi in all respects: in military power, in wealth, in influence and political experience - and also in pedigree. Other princes are silently excluded from the argumentation because it is not realistic for them to aspire to Kiev in any case. There may of course be other explanations for the Olgovichi's argument that were apposite for the princes and their men, but they are unknown to us.

---

[449]See PSRL 1, 161.

This kind of ambiguity is typical for all accounts of princely politics in the sources. The chronicles describe disputes and arguments, but they never cite any explicit, unequivocal rules and norms that would explain the princes' behavior to the satisfaction of scholars who seek to reconstruct the Rusian "political system" or the "legal norms of interprincely relations." This is typical not of Rus only, but of early and high medieval sources in general. Thus, Gerd Althoff, in his study of the German Empire, notes the virtual absence of normative documents in the period between the tenth and the thirteenth centuries.[450] This, however, does not mean that it was a time of chaos and anarchy. There existed a type of social order not recognized by scholars who look at medieval society through the prism of the anachronistic notion of the state that regulates social life through its laws and that has adequate institutions for enforcing these laws.[451] In the absence of such a state, social relations were guided by implicit, unwritten norms which Althoff sets out to reconstruct through an analysis of the reports about social interactions in historical narratives (*Geschichtsschreibung*).[452] He has shown that these norms were expressed through behavioral patterns (*Verhaltensweisen, Verhaltenmuster*) that included both verbal and non-verbal forms of communication.[453] All those participating in social interactions apparently had a shared understanding of the meanings of these patterns, which constituted what Althoff has deemed the "rules of play" (*Spielregeln*) of medieval politics.

---

[450]"Da es zwischen den karolingischen Kapitularien und dem Sachsenspiegel so gut wie keine normativen Texte gibt, ... kamen die Verhältnisse des 10. bis 13. Jahrhunderts gar nicht genauer ins Blickfeld." Gerd Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde* (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 1997), 7.

[451]"Für heutige Betrachter, die daran gewöhnt sind, dass der moderne Staat durch seine Gesetze die Rahmenbedingungen des Zusammenlebens vorgibt und durch seine Institutionen dieses Systems im Mittelalter zu verstehen, das unter anderen Bedingungen stand," Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik*, 2; "Ob Macht und Machtausübung im 8., 10. oder 12. Jahrhundert überhaupt das gleiche beinhalteten wie im 19. und 20. Jahrundert, hat man nicht gefragt," ibid., 5.

[452]Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik*, 6-7.

[453]Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik*, 12.

Similarly, Stephen White, in his discussion of the legal sources of eleventh-century France, operates with the notion of the "implicit normative frameworks or cultural models" to be recovered by a historian: "Although litigants did not cite rules or customs explicitly, they invoked them by telling stories; they alleged facts that would have been meaningless unless they were interpreted in the context of an implicit normative framework."[454] In his study of the medieval French epic *Raoul de Cambrai*, White explains the difference between modern explicit legal norms and the implicit frameworks, or cultural models that guided the behavior of people in pre-modern societies. According to cultural anthropologists, "these legal (or cultural) models are 'presupposed or taken for granted models of the world that are widely shared (although not to the exclusion of other, alternative models) by the members of a society and that play an enormous role in their understanding of that world and their behavior in it." These models do not form a coherent system, they are "better thought of ... as resources or tools, to be used when suitable and set aside when not," which explains "the co-existence of the conflicting cultural models."[455]

Since these works by Althoff and White appeared in the 1990s, Western medievalists have gone a long way towards reconstructing the cultural models and behavioral patterns that guided medieval politics. Much less research has been done on the "rules of play" that existed in Rus. Out of many implicit normative frameworks found in the accounts of princely politics, there are two that have been studied better than others. These are the notions of seniority and of the sanctity of oaths.[456]

---

[454] Stephen White, "Debate: The 'Feudal Revolution'," *Past and Present* 152 (1996): 205-23, at 214.

[455] White, "The Discourse of Inheritance in Twelfth-century France," 177-8, notes 9, 12, with reference to Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, "Culture and Cognition," in Dorothy Holland and Naomi Quinn, eds., *Cultural Models in Language and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 4, 10.

[456] On oaths, see P. S. Stefanovich, "Krestotselovanie i otnoshenie k nemu tserkvi v Drevnei Rusi," in A. A. Gorskii et al., eds., *Srednevekovaia Rus*, (Moscow: Indrik, 2004), 86-113; idem, "Poniatie vernosti v otnosheniiakh kniazia i druzhiny na Rusi"; Mikhailova and Prestel, "Cross Kissing." On seniority, see Kollmann, "Collateral Succession in Kievan

Chapter 3.   Riurikids and Their "Rules of Play"

The normative framework based on the notion of seniority first emerges in the accounts of the martyrdom of Boris. As we remember, Boris was prepared to have Sviatopolk "in place of a father," and he preferred to be abandoned by all his men (*druzhina*), be left with only a handful of servants, and to die defenseless rather than to "raise his hand" against his elder brother. Promotion of the authority of the senior members of the ever more extended family became an important aspect of the cult of Boris and Gleb. Evidence for this is found in the *Homily on Princes* (*Slovo o kniaz'iakh*) commemorating the translation of their relics and probably composed in the 1170s. The author of the *Homily* admonishes the princes who "oppose the senior brethren (*stareishei bratii*)," and he calls them to emulate the example of Boris and Gleb who "chose to accept death rather than to press hostilities (*smert uliubita pache priiati, nezheli vrazhdu uderzhati*)." At the same time, the *Homily* presents an image of a model senior prince, David Sviatoslavich (died in 1123), who "was the main prince of the Chernigov land (*kniazhashe v Chernigove v bolshem kniazhanie*) because he was the oldest among his brethren."[457] David's seniority made him the leader of the princely clan based in the Chernigov land that later came to be known as the Olgovichi. We also see references to biological seniority in the accounts of the struggles for the Kievan throne. For example, in the *Kievan Chronicle* entry for 1151, Prince Viacheslav says to his younger brother Iurii with whom he has a dispute over Kiev, "I am older than you, and not a little older, but much: I already had a beard when you were born."[458] The leaders of the princely clans were supposed to be the clan's most senior members, while the other princes were considered their "juniors." In the *Laurentian* entry for 1176, the chronicler expresses his belief that "God commanded princes not to break their oaths sworn on the Venerable Cross (*kresta chestnogo ne prestupati*) and to honor the senior

---

Rus"; Tolochko, *Kniaz' v Drevnei Rusi*, 90.

[457]"Slovo o kniaz'iakh," BLDR 4, 226.For an alternative interpretation of the position of David Sviatoslavich in Chernigov land, see Dimnik, *The Dynasty of Chernigov*, 12.

[458]PSRL 2, 430.

brother."[459] These are two important precepts, but they are by no means the only ones. Rusian princely politics were guided by multiple – and at times conflicting – cultural models, no less than French aristocratic politics were according to White. A reconstruction of those models through an analysis of repetitive patterns, found in the political narratives, will be our next task.

---

[459]PSRL 1, 377.

Chapter 4

Functions of Emotions in Political Narratives

One of the most conspicuous narrative patterns in the chronicles is the representation of emotions as a driving force of political actions. Love, hatred, fear, anger, pity, and joy are given as reasons for starting and ending wars, for making and breaking alliances, as well as for supporting and rejecting princes. Not only that, but emotions often assume a normative, prescriptive character, as, for example, in Iaroslav's "Testament" which the *Primary Chronicle* presents as a guide for relationships between all princes of Rus.[460] The recommendations of the Testament are very simple: all will be well, as long as the princes love each other as befits brothers, respect the oldest among them like a father and avoid hatred.[461] To note the primitive and inefficient character of a "political theory" based on such a feeble foundation as sentiments of family love has long been a commonplace for Rus scholars.[462] In

---

[460]See above, p. 126.

[461]PSRL 2, 149-150.

[462]The first, to my knowledge, ironic reference to Iaroslav's – or the chronicler's – political theory based on family sentiments was made by Mykhailo Hrushevskyi in 1905. Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusi*, vol. 2 (Lviv: Naukovo Tovaristvo imeni Shevchnka,

this respect, they have been no different from Western medievalists who, until the 1990s, shared Marc Bloch's view of the irrationality of Western medieval politics resulting from the emotional instability of medieval society.[463] However, since the 1990s, scholars of the medieval West have left behind the paradigm of childlike medieval people dominated by uncontrolled emotional outbursts.[464] Medievalists have started to connect historical concepts of emotions with concepts of social relationships and institutions, and within the past decade emotions history "has positively bloomed," in the words of Barbara Rosenwein.[465] This blooming is connected with chronologically preceding developments in psychology: cognitive and social constructionist theories changed attitudes towards emotions, which are now viewed not as irruptions of the irrational, but rather as aspects of interactions between individuals and the environments/societies that they live in.[466] According to Rosenwein, one of the leading historians of emotions in the medieval West, "the new theories invite us to reconsider our sources anew."[467] This is the task of the present chapter in regards

---

1905), 47-8.

[463]Marc Bloch, *Feudal Society*, trans. L. A. Manyon (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 73; idem, *La sociéte féodale: La formation des liens de dépendance* (Paris: Editions Albin Michel, 1949), quoted in Stephen D. White, "The Politics of Anger," in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, 127-52, at 128.

[464] See Barbara Rosenwein, "Even the Devil (Sometimes) Has Feelings," *The Haskins Society Journal* 14 (2005): 1-14, at 4.

[465]Barbara Rosenwein, "Eros and Clio: Emotional Paradigms in Medieval Historiography," in Hans-Werner Goetz and Jörg Jarnut, eds., *Mediävistik im 21. Jahrhundert; Staat und Perspektiven der internationalen und interdisziplinaren Mittelalterforschung* . (Munich: Fink, 2003), 427-41, at 428, for a review of literature see ibid., 437-440; See also White, "The Politics of Anger," 131; Thomas Roche, "The Way Vengeance Comes: Rancorous Deeds and Words in the World of Orderic Vitalis," in Belle S. Tuten and Tracey L. Billado, eds., *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010), 115-36, at 125-6; Martin Hinterberger, "Emotions in Byzantium," in Liz James, ed., *A Companion to Byzantium* (Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 123-34.

[466] Barbara Rosenwein, "Eros and Clio," 435. For an overview of the developments in psychology in connection with the history of emotions, see eadem, "Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions," *Passions in Context: International Journal for the History and Theory of Emotions* 1 (2010): 1-32.

[467]Rosenwein, "Eros and Clio," 441.

to the Rusian sources.

4.1 The Evolution of the Representation of Emotions in the *Primary Chronicle*

The early entries of the *Primary Chronicle* rarely verbalize emotions. In this respect, they are similar to sagas, whose authors and characters, according to William Ian Miller, do not especially like to indulge themselves in "emotion talk," so that emotions must often be inferred from literary context.[468] In the earlier parts of the *Primary Chronicle*, the context is typically provided by representing the characters' gestures and direct speech. This feature is especially evident in the story about the Byzantine emperor's gifts to the fierce warrior prince Sviatoslav (under 970). When the envoy gave him gold and silk, "Sviatoslav said to his men, looking the other way (*krome zria*), 'Put these away,'" but having received a gift of weapons, he "started to praise and to love them and kissed the emperor."[469] The "kiss" was purely symbolic, since the emperor was not physically present. The chronicler describes the gesture of love and gratitude as a way to convey Sviatoslav's feelings about the gift of weapons, just as Sviatoslav's words and the direction of his sight served to show that the first gift of gold and silk disappointed him.

The later parts of the *Primary Chronicle* are much more explicit in the treatment of emotions. This change in the representation of feelings occurs as the princely politics described in the *Chronicle* become more complex. We have seen that the latter half of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, the period after the death of

---

[468]William Ian Miller, *Humiliation: And Other Essays on Honor, Social Discomfort, and Violence* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 108, as quoted in White, "Politics of Anger," 132.

[469]PSRL 1, 71.

Iaroslav the "Wise," saw the development of a political culture, which, in the words of Franklin and Shepard, stressed "collective action, communal care for the lands, a unity of the extended kin."[470] This development was anything but easy. The princes had to work out how to regulate relationships among the rapidly expanding dynasty's members and how to resolve their disagreements. I argue that the public display of emotions was an important means of communication that helped princes in achieving these goals. At the same time, description of emotions in the chronicles served as a means of conveying a political message. These functions of the representation of emotions can be seen in the accounts of the Liubech conference, and the subsequent blinding of Vasilko and its aftermath. In contrast with the earlier entries of the *Primary Chronicle*, these accounts not only describe the actions and the behavior of the characters, but name their feelings explicitly.

As we remember, the princes who gathered in Liubech noted that the Cumans "rejoiced" because of the internal strife in Rus and decided to stop the strife and to have "one heart." The "love" of the princes established at Liubech made "all people glad," and only the Devil was sad.[471] Therefore, he entered into the hearts of certain men of Prince David and instigated them to slanderously accuse Vasilko of conspiring against David and against the Kievan prince Sviatopolk. David not only believed the slander, but also shared it with Sviatopolk, stating that Vasilko was behind the death of Sviatopolk's brother who had been killed by one of his own men for an unknown reason. In addition, David insisted that "if we do not capture Vasilko, you will not be able to rule in Kiev, nor I in Vladimir[-in-Volhynia]. "Sviatopolk "was confused in his mind," and hesitated whether to believe David or not, but in the end he "felt pity for his brother [allegedly murdered at Vasilko's instigation] and for himself" and agreed to David's proposal to capture Vasilko.[472] We remember that

---

[470]Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 276.
[471]PSRL 1, 256-7. Cf. Rosenwein, "Even the Devil (Sometimes) Has Feelings," 9-10.
[472]PSRL 1, 257-8.

eventually David was punished for the crime of blinding Vasilko, but Sviatopolk was not.   It is likely that the chronicler refers to Sviatopolk's "confusion of mind" and to his feeling of pity for his brother and for himself in order to provide some alleviating circumstances for his participation in the crime.   The chronicler then proceeds to relate how Sviatopolk and David invited Vasilko to visit and have breakfast with them, how Sviatopolk left for a while, leaving David and Vasilko together at the table, and David was not able to carry on a conversation: he "had neither voice nor hearing, because he was terrified and had deception in his heart."[473] The description of the external behavior – inability to talk or to listen – is typical of the earlier parts of the *Primary Chronicle*. The new feature in this passage is the explicit naming of the emotion that was causing the behavior.

Furthermore, when Vladimir Monomakh learned about the blinding, he "was terrified and wept profusely [*velmi*]." He then informed two other princes who "were very sad and began to weep."[474] Here, again, the visible behavior – crying – is explained by naming the emotions behind it. The difference with the passage about the fateful breakfast is that David, terrified with the thought of the crime he was about to commit, was not able to carry on a conversation in spite of himself and tried in vain to hide his confusion, while the weeping princes did not make any attempt to hide their tears.

4.2   Display of Emotions and the "Civilizing Process"

The description of princes weeping over Vasilko's blinding exemplifies those medieval accounts used by scholars to demonstrate the inability of medieval people to control

---

[473]PSRL 1, 259.

[474]PSRL 2, 236; PSRL 1, 262.

their emotions. Such interpretations often made use of Norbert Elias's influential concept of the "civilizing process," which gradually brought about the degree of self-control necessary for abstaining from "weeping profusely" after receiving bad news.[475] Althoff has pointed out that the picture of a medieval society not yet affected by the "civilizing process," a society in which emotions allegedly had a free rein, is in stark contradiction to the medieval moral literature written in the tradition of Christian ethics that preached self-control and prohibited unrestrained (*überbordende*) emotions. Christian ethics of lordship in particular taught the kings to control their emotions.[476] The same is true for the Rusian princes. Monomakh writes in his Instruction,

> Oh, pious man .... according to the word of the Gospel, learn to govern your eyes, to restrain your tongue (*iazyku uderzhanie*), to keep your mind in humility (*umu smerenie*), to subdue (*poraboshchenie*) your body, to destroy your anger (*gnevu pogublenie*).

He advises his sons to follow the teachings of St. Basil of Caesarea, which, among other things, included precepts "to eat and drink without a noise (*bes plishcha velika*)," "not to use wild language (*ne svirepovati slovom*)," "not to laugh much," and "to cast the eyes downwards." To these, Vladimir adds his own recommendation,

> When riding a horse, if you do not have any business to discuss with anyone (*ni s kym orudia*), and if you do not know other prayers, then call incessantly within yourselves (*vtaine*), 'Lord, have mercy on me!' This is the best prayer of all, [and better] than thinking idle thoughts (*bezlepitsu*) while riding. [477]

Thus, Monomakh argues that a "pious man" should control his anger, his laughter, his mind and body in general, his speech, and his facial expression. As for his own sons, he wants them to control their inner thoughts as well. Therefore, if we see the

---

[475]See Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik*, 11, 260. For the theory of the "civilizing process," see Norbert Elias, *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations* (Boston: Blackwell Publishing, 2000). This work was first published in 1939 in German as *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation: Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen*. Because of World War II the book was virtually ignored, but it became very influential when it was republished in 1969 and translated into English.

[476]Althoff, *Spielregeln der Politik*, 265.

[477]PSRL 1, 242-5.

same Monomakh, who wrote all these recommendations, bursting into tears on every other page of the chronicle, we should seek a different explanation than his inability to control his emotional outbursts.

White has argued that the display of anger in the Western medieval sources involves "a quasi-juridical appraisal of the act and of the person or persons deemed responsible for it."[478] The princes who learn about Vasilko's blinding display terror and grief rather than anger; however, the presentation of their emotions has clear overtones of "a quasi-juridical appraisal" of the blinding and of what would constitute an appropriate response to it. Thus, Monomakh's emotional expression is stronger than that of the other two princes: he wept "profusely" and was "terrified," while they were merely "very sad." Moreover, the two princes' emotional reactions are caused by Monomakh's action. They "began to weep" when Monomakh informed them about the crime. In contrast with that, Monomakh was not "informed" by some other prince, but "found out" about what had happened. Correspondingly, it is Monomakh who gives an appraisal of the crime and of its implications for the well-being of Rus, and he is the one who organizes the collective action against the perpetrators:

> 'Let us correct this evil that occurred in the Rus Land ... if we do not correct it, more evil will arise among us, and brother will start stabbing brother to death, and the Rus Land will perish, and the Cumans, our enemies, will come and take the Rus Land.'[479]

Thus, the account of the princes' emotional response to Vasilko's blinding serves both as "a quasi-juridical appraisal" of the crime and as a way to establish Monomakh's leadership. Also, this episode is part of a bigger picture of late eleventh- and early twelfth-century princely politics and of Monomakh's role in them. Another passage that represents Monomakh as crying in public helps us to understand better the role of the display of emotions in the later part of the *Primary Chronicle*. This passage

---

[478]White, "Politics of Anger," 140.
[479]PSRL 1, 262; PSRL 2, 236.

deserves attention also because of its representation of a woman playing an important political role, a rare case in the chronicles since the mid-tenth century entries about Princess Olga.

4.3   The Peace-Making Mission of Monomakh's Step-Mother

The punitive expedition against the blinders of Vasilko did not go as planned. When the forces of the princes participating in the expedition reached Kiev, Sviatopolk attempted to flee, but the Kievans prevented him from doing so and sent Monomakh's step-mother and the metropolitan with a plea not to attack the city. The account of their meeting with Monomakh is worth quoting at length:

> The Kievans ... sent Vsevolod's widow[480] and Metropolitan Nicholas to Vladimir [Monomakh], saying, 'Oh Prince, we beseech you and your brethren not to ruin the Rus Land. For, if you start fighting with one another, the pagans will be glad and they will take our land, which your fathers and grandfathers obtained by great labor and courage, having fought for the Rus Land and having added other lands to it, and you now want to ruin the Rus Land.' Vsevolod's widow and the metropolitan came to Vladimir and besought him, and told him the plea of the Kievans to make peace and to take care of the Rus Land and to fight the pagans. Having heard this, Vladimir burst into tears [*rasplakavsia*] and said, 'Indeed, our fathers and grandfathers preserved the Rus Land, and we are about to ruin it' - and he inclined to the plea, because he honored her as his mother for the sake of his father. For he had been very dear to his father and he never disobeyed him in anything, and he obeyed her as his own mother, and he also obeyed the Metropolitan, not ignoring his plea either, having also honored the ecclesiastical rank. Vladimir loved the metropolitans and the bishops, and he loved the monks even more, and he gave food and drink to those coming to him, like a mother feeding her children. If he saw any of them uproarious or behaving inappropriately in any way, he did not condemn them, but dealt with them lovingly. We will, however, return to the aforesaid story. The princess, having visited Vladimir, returned to Kiev and related everything he said... [481]

---

[480]Vsevolod was Monomakh's father.
[481]PSRL 1, 263-4; PSRL 2, 237-8.

Monomakh's emotional reaction to the plea of the Kievans serves to explain his unconventional decision not to carry on the punitive expedition. This decision must have appeared controversial to contemporaries, because the attack on Vasilko was done in violation of the Liubech agreements, which included an oath sworn on the Cross to collectively punish anyone who would break the peace.[482]

The unexpected proposal to make peace and to start negotiations with one of the offenders was delivered to Monomakh by an unexpected envoy. Women are normally absent from the male-dominated world of the narratives of princely politics, except for brief accounts about political marriages. To show how insignificant women, even princesses, were for Rusian chronicle-writers, scholars usually cite the practice of referring to them as "so and so's daughter/wife/widow" and omitting their personal names.[483] In the above-cited passage the princess is also called simply *Vsevolozhaia*, "Vsevolod's one." Despite the omission of her personal name, "Vsevolod's one" is uncharacteristically presented as a person of great authority. Firstly, she is the head of the delegation with the metropolitan playing the secondary role and being consistently mentioned after the princess: Vladimir "inclined to the plea, because he honored her as his mother, ... and he *also* obeyed the Metropolitan (emphasis added)." The passage about Monomakh's respect towards clergy and monks appears to have been inserted later: it is followed by the typical phrase indicating an interpolation, "We will, however, return to the aforesaid story," which in its turn is followed by the statement, "The princess, having visited Vladimir, returned to Kiev."[484] In other words, the metropolitan is not mentioned at all after what appears to be an interpolation, and it is possible, therefore, that the original text described the princess as the sole representative of the Kievans.

---

[482]See above, p. 127.
[483]See e.g. Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 292.
[484]PSRL 2, 238.

4.4   Maternal Imagery and the "Emotional Community" of Vladimir Monomakh

Monomakh's tearful response to the plea of a woman whom he "honored as his mother" is consistent with the representation of his "emotional community" in the *Primary Chronicle*. The concept of "emotional communities" has been proposed by Barbara Rosenwein, who defines them as "groups in which people adhere to the same norms and value – or devalue – the same or related emotions."[485] The emotional community of the princes acting together under Monomakh's leadership is characterized by intense sentiments of family love. In this respect, it is similar to Rosenwein's description of the Austrasian kings of Gaul (second half of the sixth-early seventh centuries), who practiced "effusive affirmations of family feeling, love, and sweetness." These features of the Austrasian emotional community "may be related to the royal family structure and its fragility in the second half of the sixth century. Brothers and half-brothers shared a kingdom ... However fragmented it may have been in reality, it was understood to be a whole. Its rulers ... needed the tools and metaphors of family bonding to keep this myth in place."[486] This bears striking resemblance to the situation in Rus.[487] It is easy to see why the Austrasian-style rhetoric of family bonding had to be an essential part of a dynastic culture where there was no crowned king and no clear rules of succession. In the Rusian case, emotions associated with family bonding not only helped to hold together the extended dynasty, but also played an important role in articulating the position of leadership. To claim the leading role in the "joint enterprises"[488] of the dynasty, a prince was to

---

[485]Barbara Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), 2.

[486]Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 129.

[487] For a discussion of the similarities between the sixth-century Merovingians and the eleventh- and early twelfth-century Riurikids see Nazarenko, "Rodovoi siuzerinetet Riurikovichei."

[488]Franklin and Shepard, *Emergence of Rus*, 276.

demonstrate how much he cared about the well-being of the extended kin and the Rus Land as a whole. Monomakh's leading role in organizing the expedition against the violators of the Liubech agreement, and then in negotiations with one of them and in the trial of the other, is apparently connected with his tears over the prospect of "brother stabbing brother" and the resulting ruin of the Rus Land.

We have also seen that the chronicler underscores Monomakh's respect for a mother figure. "Honoring" and "obeying" the step-mother "as one's own mother" not only was appropriate for the emotional community, which placed high value on family love, but it also was consistent with an important aspect of Monomakh's image. To understand this aspect better, we need to turn again to the Gaulish emotional communities described by Rosenwein. She contrasts the warm emotional style of the Austrasian court with the Neustiran court of Clothar II, who took over in 613 and who brought to the fore a new and colder emotional sensibility.[489] One feature of the Neustrian emotional community was deep suspicion of mothers with their allegedly uncontrolled emotions. Clothar II, arguably an illegitimate child, may have "found it politically important to downgrade mothers altogether as he took up the royal mantle of his putative father."[490] The cold and restrained emotional style of Clothar's court was, therefore, a part of this "downgrading of mothers," who were generally associated with "warmer emotional expression."[491] Was it possible then that the high regard for mothers was a part of the intensely emotional style ascribed to Monomakh by the chroniclers? Monomakh's mother was a Byzantine princess; he proudly refers to "my mother of the Monomakhus family" in the opening of his *Instruction*.[492] If it is true that Clothar's alleged illegitimacy caused him "to downgrade mothers altogether," Monomakh's imperial mother could have caused him and his chroniclers to stress the importance of mothers in general.

---

[489]Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 130, 192.

[490]Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 150.

[491]Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 150, 192.

[492]PSRL 1, 240.

Indeed, maternal imagery permeates the representations of Monomakh in both *Primary* and *Kievan* chronicles. His obituary in the *Kievan* states that people "wept over him just as children weep over their father or mother." Mourning a prince as a father is quite common; however, a reference to a mother, to my knowledge, never occurs in any other princely obituary. The comparison of Monomakh to a mother in the *Kievan Chronicle* obituary has a precedent in the *Primary Chronicle* description of Monomakh, in which he is said to have fed the monks and clergy just as a mother feeds her children.[493] Thus, motherly features make up a prominent part of Monomakh's image. The significance of these features appears to go beyond stressing Monomakh's prestigious Byzantine connections. According to Caroline Walker Bynum, medieval religious writers applied maternal imagery to male authority figures when they felt "the need to supplement authority with love," because the prevailing stereotypes associated "emotionality and love, nurturing and security" with the female or maternal, while "authority, judgment, command, strictness, and discipline" were labeled male or paternal.[494]

The characteristics described by Bynum as "maternal" are prominent features of Monomakh's image both in the *Primary Chronicle*, where he displays leniency towards drunken clergy,[495] and in his own texts, especially in the well-known letter to his cousin and rival Oleg Sviatoslavich. In this letter, Monomakh declares that he would not pursue revenge for the death of his son in a battle against Oleg and discusses his territorial disputes with Oleg. However, these political matters come up only towards the end of the letter, while the bulk of the text is devoted to the lyrical

---

[493]See above, p. 151.

[494]Caroline Walker Bynum, "Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing," in Caroline Walker Bynum, ed., *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 148, 155.

[495]"If he saw any of them uproarious or behaving inappropriately in any way [apparently euphemism for 'being drunk'], he did not condemn them, but dealt with them lovingly." See above, p. 151.

description of Monomakh's feelings: grief over the death of his son, "a withered flower or a slaughtered lamb," his desire to embrace his widowed daughter-in-law and mourn together, while she would "sit like a dove on the dry tree," as well as regret that he was not present at his son's wedding.[496] In his *Instruction*, Monomakh claims that he stopped his war with Oleg because he "felt pity (*szhalivsia*) for the Christian souls and for the burning villages and monasteries."[497] If the texts analyzed by Bynum "supplement authority with love," Monomakh's authority as represented in his own works and in the *Primary Chronicle* appears to be not so much supplemented by, but rather based on, love.

Love and other emotions play an important role in accounts of princely politics in the later chronicles as well, especially in the *Kievan* and *Galician-Volhynian*.

Let us now see what these emotions are and what words the chronicles use to describe them.

4.5 The Emotional Vocabulary of the Twelfth-Century Chronicles

According to White, the emotional vocabulary actively and repeatedly used in Western narratives of aristocratic politics of the eleventh and twelfth centuries "is limited to anger, grief, shame, love, hatred or enmity, fear and joy."[498] Pity (*compassio*) may also be added to this list. The same vocabulary is used to represent emotions in the Rusian chronicles. Furthermore, in both Old French and Latin the notions of grief and anger often "merge to form a single emotion – a kind of sad

---

[496]PSRL 1, 252-5.
[497]PSRL 1, 249.
[498]White, "Politics of Anger," 134.

anger, angry sadness."[499] This emotion is often ascribed to the characters of the *Kievan Chronicle*, and it is expressed by words with the root *zhal*, the preposition *na* and the direct object in the accusative (*zhal na* somebody or something).

Zhal-words normally stand for "pity," "grief," "sorrow," but with the preposition *na* they convey the additional meaning of complaint and anger, thus signifying White's "sad anger or angry sadness." The best example of how the prepositions affect the meaning of *zhal*-words is found in the words of the leader of the Olgovichi, Prince Sviatoslav, when he was expressing his feelings towards a junior member of the clan, Prince Igor, who went on a campaign without asking Sviatoslav's permission and was defeated and captured: "Just as I was angry at (*zhal mi biashet' na*) Igor, I now feel as much and [even] more pity for (*zhaluiu po*) Igor, my brother."[500] "Sad anger" towards Igor experienced by Sviatoslav when he learned about the campaign is expressed by *zhal na*. *Na* changes to *po* when Sviatoslav's anger changes to pity.

The word with the root *zhal* most often used with the preposition *na* is a verb, *pozhalovati*. A good example can be found in an account about the deterioration of relations between Mstislav Iziaslavich and his allies after Mstislav, who led a joint campaign against the Cumans, sent his men at night, unknown to the other princes, to capture booty. The princes "were angry at" (*pozhalovasha na*) Mstislav "and their hearts were not truly with him" with the result that they soon joined his enemies.[501]

The most typical words for "anger," however, are *gnev* and its derivatives. *Gnev*-words may signify both righteous and unjustified anger. Those angry without legitimate reasons may be referred to as "burning with anger" (*razh'gsia gnevom, paspoliv'sia gnevom*)[502] or as being "furious." The *Primary Chronicle* in one case

---

[499]White, "Politics of Anger," 135.

[500]PSRL 2, 645.

[501] PSRL 2, 539, 544. For other entries containing z*hal*-words with *na* see PSRL 1, 318; PSRL 2*, 364, 386, 499, 513, 570, 624.

[502]PSRL 2, 572, 574, 614.

uses "fury" (*iarost*) to refer to God's righteous anger,[503] but when applied to humans, *iarost* and its derivatives invariably have negative connotations and are often used in conjunction with "burning with anger" to emphasize the chronicler's condemnation of the angry and furious prince.[504]

Burning with anger and fury often leads a prince to commit an act of aggression. In such cases, anger and fury may also be accompanied by pride (*gordost'*), always condemned most severely. Thus, a combination of burning anger, fury and pride led Andrei Bogoliubsky to start an unjust war, in which he was defeated.[505]

Fury (in humans) and pride were bad in all cases, but anger could be quite legitimate. One example of justified anger is found in the account about the struggle between Iurii Dolgorukii and Iziaslav Mstislavich over the Kievan throne in the 1150s. Iurii's ally, Vladimir of Galich, broke the alliance and left Iurii, because he was angry when Iziaslav's attack took Iurii by surprise. In Vladimir's opinion, the failure to gather accurate and timely information about Iziaslav's military moves testified to Iurii's ineptitude. Vladimir expressed his anger to Iurii's son Andrei:

> 'What kind of prince is [Iurii]?! An army from Vladimir[-in-Volhynia] is advancing against him, how is it possible not to know about it, while you, his son, are a prince in Peresopnitsa and another son of his is in Belgorod? How could he fail to find out?' And he said to Andrei with anger, 'If this is how your father and you rule, sort it out yourselves (*pravite sami*)!' ... And having said this, he returned to Galich.[506]

This passage exemplifies a common reason for breaking an alliance: one party gets angry at the other.[507]

At times, the chronicler also refers to a negative feeling, which appears to be close to anger, but not as strong; it is conveyed by expressions with the word

---

[503]PSRL 1, 225; PSRL 2, 216.
[504]PSRL 1, 310.
[505]PSRL 2, 574.
[506]PSRL 2, 416-17.
[507]See also PSRL 2, 366, 519, 543, 628.

"heart (*serdtse*)": to be displeased or annoyed by somebody is expressed as "to have a bad (or heavy) heart at" him, while making someone displeased, upset, or annoyed is sometimes referred to as "harming his heart (*verediti serdtse*)" or to cause "*pereserdie*".[508]

Anger and displeasure usually led to enmity – *vrazhda, kotora, neliubie, raspre, svara, svada*[509] – or to hatred, expressed by *nenavist'* and its derivatives.[510]

Grief, fear, and shame are also on the list of negative emotions identified by White in the Western sources, and they are found in the twelfth-century Rusian chronicles as well. The most common word for grief, or sadness, is *pechal'* and its derivatives; *unynie, skorb', tuga* and their derivatives are also used occasionally.[511] In many cases, the emotion is not named, but is expressed by weeping, sighing and moaning, as in the statement of the chronicler that the "borderland region moaned greatly" over the death of a prince who was particularly good at fighting the Cumans (*o nem zhe ukraina mnogo postona*).[512]

Grief (as well as joy) "has a propensity to circulate among friends, who should share it" in the Western sources analyzed by White.[513] The same is true for Rus. For example, when Prince Sviatoslav learned that his brother Igor had been killed, he "summoned his chief men (*druzhinu svoiu stareishuiu*) and informed them and thus (*tako*) he wept over his brother bitterly."[514] The presence of the chief men is depicted as a necessary precondition for grieving over the brother's death.

The words for fear are *strakh, trepet, uboiatisia, upoloshitesia, uzhasatisia* and their derivatives. The type of fear found in the chronicles most often is fear of God,

---

[508]PSRL 1, 379; PSRL 2, 241, 450, 609.
[509]PSRL 1, 405, 412, 440; PSRL 2, 676, 694, 700.
[510]PSRL 1, 161, 403; PSRL 2, 219.
[511]PSRL 2, 626, 645.
[512]PSRL 2, 653.
[513]White, "Politics of Anger," 142.
[514]PSRL 2, 355.

regarded, of course, highly positively. The chronicler also often mentions the fear that his favorite princes inspire in the "pagans," "enemies," or even in "all the lands," as in the obituary of Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo: "all the lands trembled merely hearing his name (*sego imeni tokmo trepetakhu vsia strany*)."[515] Words with the root *uzhas* (terror) may refer to either fear or moral shock. Thus, Monomakh, as we remember, was "terrified" (*uzhasasia*) by the blinding of Vasilko, that is, he was shocked and outraged rather than scared.[516] On the other hand, when Prince Igor was preparing to escape from Cuman captivity, he got up at night "terrified and trembling (*uzhasen i trpeten*)."[517] In this case "terrified" clearly refers to the fear that Igor was feeling.

Finally, shame (*sorom*) was a powerful negative emotion often ascribed to the princes by the chronicler. Shame, and its opposite honor, are discussed in detail in Chapter Five.

Before we proceed to positive emotions, we have to discuss pity or compassion, which Rusian chronicle writers often ascribe to their characters. It is expressed by words with the *zhal*-root with the prepositions *o*, *po*, *v*, or without any preposition. In many cases, the representation of this emotion is, probably, closest to our contemporary meaning of "being sorry" or "having compassion": two princes brought their dead brother to their parents "with pity (*s zhalostiu*)"; Iziaslav, who kept his defeated and captured rival Igor in a dungeon, had pity (*szhalivsia*) when Igor got sick, and allowed him to become a monk; Sviatoslav felt pity for another Igor when the latter was captured by the Cumans.[518] Z*hal* words could also mean "regret": in a rare case of an internal monologue in a chronicle, Igor, captured by the Cumans, thinks about his sins, interpreting his defeat and captivity as God's punishment, and concludes, "I do not regret that I had to suffer all that I have suffered for my evil

---

[515]PSRL 1, 436.

[516]PSRL 1, 262; PSRL 2, 236. For the use of "terrified (*uzhasesia*)" in the meaning of "shocked, outraged," see also PSRL 2, 542.

[517]PSRL 2, 651.

[518]PSRL 2, 337, 339, 645

deeds [*ne zhal' mi est' za svoiu zlobu priiati nuzhnaia vsia*]."[519]

Pity is ascribed to both princes and commoners. The most graphic description of pity refers to the people of Igor's principality at the news about the defeat of their troops and the capture of the princes:

> The towns (*gorody*) of Posemie were all stirred up, and there was grief and sorrow as had never been in all of Posemie and in Novgorod-Seversky and in all the Chernigov Land: the princes are captured, the soldiers are captured and killed; and they all rushed around as if in frenzy, and nobody cared about what was dear to him, but many were ready to part with their souls (*otrekakhusia dush' svoikh*) out of pity for their princes.[520]

On the other hand, expressions of pity often play an important part in princely politics. Mostly, political uses of this emotion fall into two categories: either a pity for somebody else's injury or loss compels a prince to take action to protect the suffering party and to avenge the wrongdoing, or pity for the Christians who perish in warfare is used as an argument for making peace. It appears that the second use was pioneered by Monomakh: according to his Instruction, Monomakh abandoned his attempt to conquer Chernigov from his cousin Oleg and made peace with Oleg, "having pity for the souls of the Christians and for the burning villages and monasteries."[521] Similarly, he made peace with another adversary, Prince Gleb, "feeling pity that blood is being shed during Lent."[522] A few decades later, his son Iurii besieged Prince Mstislav in Vladimir-Volynsky and was fighting to take the city, but then "felt pity for the perishing people" and made peace. In contrast with Iurii, his enemy Mstislav "rejoiced at blood being shed," according to Iurii's chronicler.[523] Other princes also made peace or decided not to start a war out of

---

[519]PSRL 2, 649.
[520]PSRL 2, 645-6.
[521]PSRL 1, 249.
[522]PSRL 2, 283.
[523]PSRL 2, 487.

pity and not wishing to shed Christian blood.[524] This argument allowed a prince to make concessions and accept defeats while saving face and even enhancing his image as a Christian ruler.

Pity could be used as a motive not only to stop a war, but also to start it. Thus, when Prince Mstislav called for the joint campaign against the Cumans, he addressed other princes and their men, "Have pity for the Rus Land! ... For they [the Cumans] bring the [captured] Christians to their tents every year." Mstislav's audience was convinced by this appeal and expressed their readiness "to die for the Rus Land and for the Christians and to be among the martyrs."[525] Iziaslav attacked Igor in Kiev, because, according to his chronicler, he "had pity [*szhalisi*]" for the Kievans, who did not want Igor as their prince and asked Iziaslav to take care of their city.[526]

As we remember, the positive emotions that White identified in the high medieval Western sources are limited to love and joy. The same is true for Rusian chronicles. Love is expressed by words with the root *liub* (*liubiti* for "to love," *liuby*, *liubov'* for "love," and their derivatives), and also by the expression "to be dear (*mil* with various endings)." *Liub*-words can take multiple meanings. They are often used in reference to Christian love. Thus, the standard praise for deceased princes is that they "loved all people," "loved the poor," "loved the monks."[527] Good princes also loved justice [*pravdu*], their men (*druzhinu*), their brethren, and the Rus Land.[528] In some cases, *liub*-words signify affection, as in Monomakh's *Instruction*, "Love your wives, but do not allow them to have authority over you."[529]

In other instances, *liub*-words mean "to like" or "to be pleased." An example

---

[524]E.g., PSRL 1, 247; PSRL 2, 291, 487.

[525]PSRL 2, 538.

[526]PSRL 1, 313.

[527]PSRL 2, 198, 207.

[528]PSRL 2, 137, 198, 207,

[529]PSRL 1, 246.

can also be found in the *Instruction*: Monomakh describes the structure of his work, where the arrangement of quotations from the Psalter and from St. Basil is followed by the original text composed by himself, and he asks his sons to heed the first part, the quotations, even if the second one, his original composition, "does not please" them (*ashche vy posledniaia ne liuba*).[530] An interesting phrase, "did not like it in his mind (*ne liubovashe vo ume svoem*)," is used to describe the disappointment of a prince who came to visit his father's tomb, but could not enter the church because the priest with the key was away and the prince could not wait for him.[531] The same meaning of "to like" or "to be pleased" in quite a different context is illustrated by the passage about the complicated relationships between the two branches of the Riurikid dynasty in the 1140s. The Monomakhovichi senior, "having discussed the matter [*smolviasia*]" with the Olgovichi senior Vsevolod, gave the strategically important principality of Pereiaslavl to Iziaslav Mstislavich, the most talented and ambitious member of the Monomakhovichi clan. The Olgovichi "did not like this (*ne liubiakhut' sego*) and complained (*poroptakhu*) that he [Vsevolod] has love with (*liubov' imeet' s*) ... our enemies."[532]

This passage also provides a good example of the usage of "love" in narratives of interprincely relationships. The "love" expressed by Vsevolod's consent to the transfer of Pereiaslavl signifies Vsevolod's political goodwill and his readiness to cooperate with the Monomakhovichi rather than any feeling of affection towards them. "Love" can also mean "alliance," as, for example, in the statement that the two princes "joined Iziaslav by love (*liubov'iu slozhilasia s Iziaslavom*)."[533]

Political meanings of "love" are discussed in detail in Chapter Six. For now, it is essential to note that the use of the same word for the feeling of affection,

---

[530]PSRL 1, 241.
[531]PSRL 2, 680.
[532]PSRL 2, 312-13.
[533]PSRL 2, 513-14.

Christian love, and political cooperation reflects the lack of differentiation between the private and public spheres of life, a feature typical of pre-modern societies.[534] It is interesting, therefore, to note a few cases for which the choice of words to represent "love" reflects differentiation between the public and the private. It appears that the word *mil* (dear) refers primarily to the emotions experienced in the private sphere. For example, the chronicler uses this word to explain why Iaroslav of Galich loved his illegitimate son Oleg more than his other son Vladimir: "Oleg was dear to him because he was Nastasia's (*biashet' bo Oleg Nastas'chich i be emu mil*)," that is, he was from Iaroslav's mistress Nastasia rather than from his wife from whom Iaroslav persistently and unsuccessfully tried to get separated.[535] Iaroslav's feelings towards Nastasia and her son had political implications – he bequeathed the better *volost* to him, not to the legitimate heir – but the use of *mil* rather than any word with the root *liub* seems to indicate that Iaroslav's attitude towards his sons originated in the private sphere.

Another example of this usage of a *mil*-word is found in the famous account about the marriage of the eight-year-old Princess Verkhuslava. The wedding sealed the long-awaited and widely celebrated alliance between the two major branches of the Monomakhovichi, the southern Kiev-based and the northern Suzdalia-based. The Kievan prince Riurik, the senior of the southern Monomakhovichi, asked the Suzdalian prince Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo to give his daughter in marriage to Riurik's son. The marriage was too significant politically to delay; therefore, the request was granted in spite of the bride's tender age. Verkhuslava was sent off to Kiev, "and father and mother rode with their dear daughter for three leagues (*do trekh*

---

[534]On public and private spheres, see Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991). On pre-modern societies, see e. g. Susan Mosher Stuard, *Women in Medieval Society* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Shannon McSheffrey, *Marriage, Sex and Civic Culture in Late Medieval London* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

[535] PSRL 2, 657.

stanov) and wept over her because she was dear to them and was [so] young." On the other hand, when Verkhuslava's entourage returned back to Suzdalia and presumably gave an account about the gifts and honors bestowed on Verhkuslava and about her splendid wedding, "there was great joy for the grand prince and princess and for all the people."[536] The chronicler seems to differentiate between the public and private spheres of life of the princely family: private sadness about the separation from the "dear daughter" and public joy at the successful political marriage. The unusual attention paid to the private feelings of Vsevolod and his wife Princess Mary might be explained by the chronicler's desire to stress how great was their sacrifice for the sake of unity among the Monomakhovichi.

This brings us to joy, the last on our list of emotions found in both Rusian and Western sources. Feelings of joy, happiness, and gladness are very prominent in the chronicles and they are usually expressed by words with the root *rad.* Princes and "people" rejoice over military victories;[537] a prince's accession to the throne makes the "people" of the principality happy;[538] faithful subjects rejoice when sons are born to their princes, as, of course, do the princes and their wives on such occasions - and in one instance the *Kievan Chronicle* also reports the joy over the birth of a princess.[539] The Suzdalian chroniclers also report the joy of the "people" on the occasions of the little princes' *postrigi*, a rite-of-passage ritual of trimming a baby boy's hair for the first time in his life.[540]

Joy is not always regarded positively: to say that the Cumans "rejoiced" about the disagreements between the Rusian princes is a way to condemn these disagreements.[541] Similarly, the chronicler expresses his disapproval of the strife among the

---

[536]PSRL 2, 658-9.

[537]E.g., PSRL 2, 540.

[538] E.g., PSRL 2, 384, 416, 470, 504.

[539]PSRL 2, 708.

[540]PSRL 1, 411, 437; PSRL 2, 674.

[541]PSRL 1,256.

Monomakhovichi by noting that their rivals the Olgovichi "rejoiced" at the news about the Monomakhovichi problems.[542]   An accusation against a prince that he "rejoices at the bloodshed" is a very strong negative statement.[543]

Veselie and other words with the root *vesel* are also used for "joy." It appears that they are related to the public display of emotion, because they are most often used in the descriptions of feasts, gifts, and celebrations and in connection with the notion of "receiving honor."[544]

Let us now compare the social uses of emotions in Rusian and Western political narratives.

4.6   A Case Study: Emotions and Legitimacy in the *Kievan Chronicle* and in *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*

We have seen that the representation of Vladimir Monomakh's emotions played an important role in asserting his leading position within the dynasty in the late eleventh-early twelfth century. Throughout the pre-Mongolian period, the chronicles continue to present emotions as arguments to support or to refute the legitimacy of both a prince's rule over a certain territory and his position in the dynastic hierarchy. We will now compare the uses of emotions for the purposes of constructing legitimacy in the Rusian chronicles and in the Anglo-Norman *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*.

Fantosme is a good choice for a comparative analysis because of two fundamental similarities that his work shares with the Rusian chronicles. Firstly, this is an original

---

[542]PSRL 2, 572.
[543]PSRL 2, 487.
[544]E.g., PSRL 2, 340, 359, 369.

political narrative about contemporary events written in the vernacular, while other twelfth-century Western accounts of contemporary politics are written in Latin.[545] As for the vernacular historical narratives other than *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, they are either adaptations of earlier Latin works, or are devoted to the distant past, or both, or else they describe the histories of monastic foundations.[546] A vernacular account of contemporary lay politics and of war, to some episodes of which Fantosme claims to be an eye-witness, sets him apart from other Western twelfth-century authors and makes his work uniquely suitable for a comparison with the Rusian chronicles, which also consist mostly of vernacular accounts of contemporary lay politics. Secondly, one of Fantosme's central concerns is the question of a ruler's legitimacy. This question was always of high importance for the Riurikids with their collective authority over a vast and ever-growing conglomerate of territories; the problem of legitimacy, as we have seen, was especially acute for Kiev which did not have its own branch of hereditary rulers. The legitimacy of the contestants' claims for Kiev is one of the main topics of the *Kievan Chronicle* which, in this respect, is especially close to Fantosme. To understand why the question of legitimacy assumed such importance in a work written in England, a monarchy ruled by the crowned and anointed king, we need to take a closer a look at the political situation that Fantosme describes.

Fantosme's subject matter is the defeated rebellion of Henry the Young King (or "Henry the Younger") against his father Henry II in 1173-4. Henry II, the founder

---

[545]A partial exception is the twelfth-century German vernacular *Kaiserchronik*, which starts with Julius Caesar and thus is devoted mostly to the distant past, but its final part deals with contemporary events. However, even its presentation of twelfth-century events includes some features of epic fiction, and the main topic of this work, the *translatio imperii* from Rome to Germany, is very different from the subject matter of the Rusian chronicles. See Henry A. Myers, ed. and trans., *The Book of Emperors: A Translation of the Middle High German Kaiserchronik* (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2013).

[546]See Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, 16-32, 49-67.

of the new Plantagenet dynasty on the English throne, is famous for his reforms of law and administration, cultural patronage, and vast territorial additions to the dominions of the Anglo-Norman kings. In spite of all these achievements, Henry's reign saw many upheavals, and his authority and legitimacy as a king was challenged more than once. Henry's problems started soon after he became king in 1154. His accession to the throne was the result of the compromise that ended the war waged by Henry and his mother Matilda against King Stephen. Stephen, the son of William the Conqueror's youngest daughter, had very weak hereditary rights to the English throne. He came to power after the death of King Henry I whose only surviving legitimate child was his daughter Matilda, known as "Empress Matilda" because she was a widow of the German Emperor Henry V. Matilda had been named the heiress to the English throne; however, at the time when her father died, she was in Normandy with her second husband, the Count of Anjou, and Stephen used Matilda's absence to claim the English throne for himself. A prolonged war between Stephen and Matilda followed; Matilda's eldest son Henry joined the struggle when he was old enough to do so. Finally, they reached an agreement that Stephen would remain the king as long as he lived, but that he would be succeeded not by his own son, but by Matilda's son Henry, the future Henry II, whom Stephen recognized as the "lawful heir."[547]

Thus, Henry II's right to the throne was based on the hereditary principle. After he became a king, Henry reversed the policies of Stephen who had made hereditary grants of offices such as earldoms and sheriffdoms. Clanchy points out that Henry emphasized the principle of hereditary monarchy, but at the same time he "challenged the hereditary and traditional rights of everyone else." Thus, his policy was "contradicting the hereditary principle on which his own rule depended." This contradiction

---

[547]See Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers*, 97-111; Edmund King, "The Accession of Henry II," in Christopher Harper-Bill and Nicholas Vincent, eds., *Henry II: New Interpretations* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2007), 24-46.

resulted in Henry II's idiosyncratic style of rulership:

> Because of the contradiction in his attitude to hereditary and traditional jurisdictions Henry II could not develop a coherent ideology justifying his rule. Consequently he and his sons ... had to insist on their own will power as the ultimate justification for their actions ... As J.E.A. Jolliffe had argued: 'The king rules by his passions more than by his kingship, and is ready to advance them, if not as a moral or political, at least as a natural justification.'[548]

It is most remarkable that Clanchy and Jolliffe, writing as they were before the development of emotions history, see the connection between Henry II's need to assert his legitimacy and the heightened emotionality of his political behavior, his "rule by passions." Arguably, *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, which White has called "a treasure trove of emotion talk," represents these passions better than any other source.

Fantosme describes the rebellion, which was widely interpreted as divine retribution for Henry II's sins. In the eyes of many contemporaries both in England and abroad, Henry's legitimacy was most seriously undermined by his challenge to the traditional ecclesiastical jurisdiction, the resulting conflict with the Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Becket, and by Becket's subsequent murder in 1170. Henry the Young King turned against his father three years later; Louis VII of France and Theobald count of Blois justified their support for his rebellion by arguing that Becket's murder had deprived Henry II of his right to rule.[549] The Young King was the ideal rallying figure for Henry II's discontented magnates at home and for his enemies abroad. He had been formally crowned in 1170, which gave his supporters an opportunity to present themselves not as rebels, but as champions of the lawful monarch. According to Clanchy, in having his oldest son crowned, Henry II "attempted to reinforce the principle of hereditary monarchy by copying French and

---

[548]Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers*, 107, with reference to J.E.A. Jolliffe, *Angevin Kingship*, 2nd ed. (London: Black, 1963), 87.

[549]Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers*, 116.

imperial practice."[550] He wanted to achieve the security of succession by designating his heir, but not to relinquish real power to him. His plan, however, backfired by imposing on Henry the Younger the ambiguous status of being a king without real power and even without sufficient material resources necessary to provide for his queen and his knights in a suitably regal style.[551] Frustrating as it was for Henry the Younger, the lack of an opportunity to exercise authority was good for his image: "Precisely because he had not had to govern, to tax, ... or to disappoint men by his judgments, the Young King was highly popular, though no doubt such popularity would have dissipated soon enough had he begun to reign."[552] Therefore, supporters flocked to Henry the Younger when he rebelled against his father after Henry II had given to another of his sons, John, some territories previously assigned to Henry.

Fantosme presents this situation in all its complexity. Overall, he is on the side of Henry II, the "most honorable" king wronged by his son.[553] Nonetheless, he admits that the son, even though he should not have taken arms against his father, had legitimate grievances. Fantosme addresses Henry II reproachfully: "After [Henry the Younger's] crowning ... you took away from your son some of his authority (*auques de seignurie*) ... so that he could not have power." The "noble and gracious" Young King started hostilities because he found himself in the difficult situation of being a king without an *honur*.[554]

---

[550]Clanchy, *England and Its Rulers*, 107; see also Matthew Strickland, "On the Instruction of a Prince: The Upbringing of Henry, the Young King," in Harper-Bill and Vincent, *Henry II: New Interpretations*, 184-214, at 196-200.

[551]Strickland, "On the Instruction of a Prince," 194, 206-9; R. J. Smith, "Henry II's Heir: The Acta and Seal of Henry the Young King, 1170–83," *English Historical Review* 116 (2001): 297–326.

[552]Strickland, "On the Instruction of a Prince," 213.

[553]E.g., *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 8, 10; in the words of Anthony Lodge, it would be "burdensome" to list all Fantosme's laudatory references to Henry II (Anthony Lodge, "Literature and History in the *Chronicle* of Jordan Fantosme," *French Studies* 44 (1990): 257-70, at 262).

[554]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 5-6.

Honur, just like medieval Latin *honor*, among its many other meanings, signified a high rank or office and the landed property associated with this office. Fantosme apparently points out that Henry the Younger had the title, but neither the real office of the king nor the land resources to which his title gave him rights. Thus, Henry the Younger's actions are, to some extent, justified, as are the actions of another of Henry II's adversaries, King William of Scotland, whose complicated relations and territorial disputes with Henry II Fantosme describes in great detail.[555] We will discuss the disputes between the two kings, English and Scottish, later; for now it is important to notice that Fantosme's William puts forward claims that can be construed as at least partly legitimate. However, ultimately, Henry II not only defeats his adversaries on the battlefield, but he also emerges as the only truly legitimate ruler of England and of all the Plantagenet dominions. Although Fantosme's *Chronicle* includes some criticism of Henry II,[556] in the final judgment, the detailed discussion of all the reasons and circumstances of the rebellion makes Fantosme's pro-Henry II message even stronger. Philip Bennett has argued that Fantosme, who was apparently a learned cleric well-versed in Latin, wrote his *Chronicle* in the vernacular so that his message could reach the widest possible audience and to counter the pro-Capetian vernacular epic *Couronnement de Louis* and, most importantly, the vernacular *Life of Thomas Becket*, which contained a thinly veiled comparison of Henry II with Pontius Pilate.[557] Fantosme's representations of the conflicting parties' emotions play an important role in his construction of Henry II's legitimacy and in undermining the claims of Henry the Young King and his supporters. We will now compare this aspect of Fantosme's work with the Rusian chroniclers' uses of emotions for supporting or undermining the competing claims of princes.

We have seen the connection between Monomakh's role as the leader of the

---

[555]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 18-22.

[556]See Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, 130.

[557]Philip E. Bennett, "La Chronique de Jordan Fantosme: épique et public lettré au XIIe siècle," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 40 (1997): 37-56, at 55-6.

dynasty and his public expressions of grief about the misfortunes of the Rus Land in the chronicle entries for the 1090s. Almost a century later, in the entry for 1185, we see the Kievan prince and the Olgovichi senior Sviatoslav shedding tears and "sighing deeply" at the news that the Cumans are about to break into Rus'.[558] Similarly, when Henry II heard about the prospect of Northumberland being laid waste by the Scots, "'By God, - thus the king said, - this will be a great pity.' Then his eyes wept and he sighed deeply."[559] Lesser princes in the Rusian chronicles, as well as the rebels and their foreign allies in Fantosme, are sad when they suffer defeat, damage to their honor, or a personal loss. However, only legitimate rulers display sadness over the condition of the land and the people. In the Rusian chronicles, in addition to Vladimir Monomakh weeping at the thought that the Rus Land would be ruined by the internecine strife and Sviatoslav crying and sighing over the Cumans' attack, we see the Kievan prince Mstislav expressing his pity for the Christians captured during the Cuman raids. Mstislav's exhortations to other princes to pity the Cumans' victims are clearly connected with his leading role in the organization of an anti-Cuman campaign.[560] Henry II is sad not only about Northumberland, but about all the people of England who have to live in fear of the Scots. Henry's "heart is sorrowful" and he is sad because of the sufferings of "his good people" and the devastation of his land.[561]

Public display of emotions as an expression of legitimate lordship is especially manifest in Henry II's tears over the fate of Northumberland. This was a disputed territory, with both Henry II and William of Scotland claiming their rights to it.[562] As Fantosme presents it, both claims had some legitimacy.[563] What ultimately makes

---

[558]PSRL 2, 645-6.

[559]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 118-20.

[560]PSRL 2, 538.

[561]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 142, 144.

[562]See Seán Duffy, "Henry II and England's Insular Neighbours," in Harper-Bill and Vincent, *Henry II: New Interpretations*, 129-53, at 130-31, 142.

[563]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 20-22.

Henry, and not William, the rightful lord of Northumberland is the fact that he, and not William, cries and sighs over the prospect of its devastation. In contrast with Henry's attitude, William approvingly listens to his men's statement, "Northumberland is yours, [regardless of] who cries or who laughs [about it]." R. C. Jonston renders this as "whether people like it or not."[564] The Scottish king thinks only about his hereditary rights to the land that he seeks to obtain; he neither cares about the feelings of the people who live there, nor displays any emotions of his own that would testify to his concern about the well-being of the land and its population.

This is not the attitude of the rightful lord who is connected to the population by a bond of mutual love, another emotion that signified legitimacy. Thus, when Fantosme states that one of Henry the Younger's supporters, Earl Robert of Leicester, has found no love for himself on the part of the people of Dunwich, the reader understands that Robert has no rights to this town, which he tries to take. The townsmen of Dunwich fight heroically for their "good and rightful king" Henry II and reject Robert's proposal to go over to his side.[565] William has no love not only for the people of the contested territories that he tries to conquer, but even for those of his own country (*la sue gent demeine ne volt unkes amer*). Instead, he "cherished, loved, and held dear people from abroad."[566] In contrast with him, Henry II loves "London and its barons," while they are "delighted to love him as much as they can."[567] It is hard to say who these "barons of London" exactly are because Fantosme uses the word *barun* very loosely; in some contexts it cannot possibly signify a social rank. Thus, on one occasion, Fantosme swears by "le barun saint Jacme," which Jonston translates as "by the noble St. James."[568] The meanings

---

[564]"Vostre est Northumberland, u quin plure u quin rie," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 130-31.

[565]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 62-4.

[566]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 48.

[567]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 68.

[568]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 50-51.

of *baron/barun*, indeed, included "noble" or "valiant"; as we remember, the basic meaning of the word was simply "man."

People's love for their rightful lord is often displayed as joy: they rejoice when they see their ruler. Henry II is the only character in Fantosme's work who inspires this kind of joy. Even when one of the rebels, Roger, is "proclaimed as the lord (*se fait seignur clamer*) of all Yorkshire," there is no information about any people of Yorkshire rejoicing when they see their newly proclaimed lord or expressing their love towards him.[569] In contrast with that, there is a detailed description of the joy displayed by the Londoners at the arrival of Henry II from Normandy and of the splendid welcome that they offered to the king.

Henry II proceeded to London from Canterbury where he had been reconciled with St. Thomas by acknowledging himself to be "guilty, sinful, and wretched" and by undergoing a harsh penance. The effectiveness of Henry's penance and the restoration of God's grace is evident immediately: even though Henry does not know this yet, for at exactly the same time that he was in Canterbury, his soldiers defeated the Scots and captured their king.[570] The central importance of this episode for the message of the *Chronicle* is universally recognized by scholars.[571] The description of Henry's arrival in London has received much less scholarly attention, although in the poem it is connected with the penance scene. Arguably, representations of Henry II both in Canterbury and in London are parts of a larger statement proclaiming his legitimacy as the one and only true king. This can be seen from the way Fantosme structures the final part of his *Chronicle*.

The battle scene at Alnwick, where William of Scotland was captured, is preceded by the accounts contrasting William and Henry II in their attitude towards the

---

[569]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 70.

[570]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 140-2.

[571]See Lodge, "Literature and History in the *Chronicle* of Jordan Fantosme," 261; Ashe, *Fiction and History*, 114.

lands over which the two kings fight. Henry, while leaving Normandy for England in order to participate in the war personally, displays his sadness over the plight of Northumberland and hears about the loyalty of the barons of London to him. The barons apparently represent all the Londoners, because their loyalty is manifest from the fact that "there is none in the town [London] old enough to bear arms" who is not ready to fight for Henry II.[572] At the same time, William's soldiers devastate the countryside by destroying gardens and crops, desecrate the church of St. Lawrence and murder those who seek shelter in it, and after this act of sacrilege, they advance to Alnwick. While riding there, they assure William that Northumberland is his, regardless of whether people like it or not.[573] Fantosme concludes his description of their defeat at Alnwick and of the capture of William by explaining that this was God's punishment for the sin committed in St. Lawrence's church. William provoked God's hatred *(Deus ... ad le rei William enhaiz)* because God was distressed (*marris*) by the "grief, tears, and cries" of people killed by the Scots in the church.[574] The next stanza explains that Henry II made his peace with St. Thomas on the very morning when William was taken prisoner. Then we see a brief four-line description of Henry's penance and a much more detailed account of his entry into London and of the Londoners being "joyous at the coming of their lord."[575]

> When they heard the news of the king in London, everyone dressed richly ... A marvelous procession comes from the town. He is indeed a king by right who has such people under him [as his subjects] (*cil deit bien estre reis qui tels genz as suz sei*).[576]

In this last statement, Fantosme explicitly presents the display of joy by the subjects as the ultimate justification of the king's legitimacy. Henry II *deit* (from *deveir*), that is, he is entitled or has right,[577] to be a king because the Londoners come to

---

[572] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 120.
[573] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 124-30.
[574] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 140.
[575] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 144.
[576] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 142-4.
[577] *The Anglo-Norman Dictionary.*

meet him in their best clothes.

In the overall account of Henry II's triumph over William, the theme of piety versus sacrilege and of divine interference is intertwined with the theme of popular support. William desecrates the church *and* he does not care about the people of Normandy; Henry II commits an act of piety earning St. Thomas's forgiveness and divine assistance, *and* he grieves over the hardships endured by his people who, on their part, show him love and loyalty. The God-granted victory, simultaneous with his penance at Canterbury, is the most important argument for Henry II's legitimacy; but next to it in importance is Henry's recognition by his subjects, which is indicated by the fact that Henry receives the news of the victory at Alnwick right after the rejoicing Londoners give him gifts and "honor him greatly."[578]

The ideology of rulership that emerges from Fantosme's representation of Henry II and William is close to that expressed by the Latin saying *Vox populi, vox Dei*: the rightful king is both favored by God and supported by the people. If we turn again to Rus, we see that Prince Iziaslav Mstislavich in the *Kievan Chronicle* expresses the same idea in his statement about his victory in the struggle for the Kievan throne. Iziaslav instructs his son to inform the Hungarian king about "how God helped us and how all the Rus land supported us (*po nas iala*), and all the Black Caps."[579]

The rejoicing Kievans, in particular, play the same role in the *Kievan Chronicle* as the Londoners do in Fantosme. The legitimizing function of the population's joy is evident from the account about the entrance into Kiev of another Iziaslav, Davidovich, who temporarily guarded Kiev for a short period of time. This happened on the occasion when the Kievans found themselves threatened by the Cumans and without any prince to protect them; therefore, they invited the nearest prince, who

---

[578] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 144.

[579] PSRL 2, 421. The Black Caps were the Turkic nomadic *federati* of the Rusian princes. "All the Rus Land and all the Black Caps" amounts to all the population of the middle Dnieper region, of which Kiev was the center.

happened to be Iziaslav Davidovich, to come to Kiev with his troops.[580] Judging from the urgency of their request and their fear of the Cumans, the Kievans must have been excited to see Iziaslav Davidovich and his soldiers entering the city. However, if the Kievans felt any joy on this occasion, the chronicler does not report it; he writes simply that "Iziaslav, having entered Kiev, sat on the throne." In contrast with that, when Iurii of Suzdalia, to whom Kiev belonged according to the rights of succession, reached Kiev, he ordered Iziaslav Davidovich to leave, and entered the city, at which time "a multitude of people came to meet him, and he sat on the throne of his forefathers, and all the Rus land accepted him with joy."[581] The lack of joy and of a proper welcome demonstrates that Iziaslav Davidovich was not a rightful prince of Kiev and stresses the interim character of his brief occupation of the Kievan throne.

Out of all the chronicle accounts, the one most illuminating for the understanding of Rusian ideas about legitimacy is, probably, the story of what is known in the scholarly literature as the "duumvirate" of Viacheslav Vladimirovich and Iziaslav Mstislavich. In particular, the representation of the "duumvirate" in the *Kievan Chronicle* illustrates the role of emotions in establishing legitimacy.

The "duumvirate" was arranged after Viacheslav's several failed attempts to occupy the Kievan throne. The first such attempt took place after his older brother Iaropolk died as the Kievan prince and Viacheslav remained the most senior Monomakhovich and the next in line for the succession of Kiev. The *Kievan* chronicle reports that after Iaropolk's death "his brother Viacheslav entered Kiev," and the *Laurentian* adds that "the people with the Metropolitan met him and put him on the throne of his great-grandfather Iaroslav."[582] However, neither chronicle mentions any expressions of joy at the start of Viacheslav's rule, nor continues the phrase "entered Kiev" with the standard modification "with honor and glory." These are

---

[580]See above, p. 93.

[581]PSRL 2, 476-8; see also above, 93.

[582]PSRL 2, 302, PSRL 1, 306.

not accidental omissions: they indicate that in spite of the Metropolitan putting Viacheslav on the throne, the Kievans did not consider him their rightful prince, and this was what ultimately mattered. Viacheslav was soon driven out of Kiev by Vsevolod Olgovich with no Kievans expressing any wish to fight for him.[583] The chronicler uses the face-saving formula "not wishing to shed blood" to explain Viacheslav's acquiescence to Vsevolod; however, soon after that we learn that other princes attacked Viacheslav in his *volost*, and he was not able to defend himself. His nephew Iziaslav and the same Vsevolod who had taken Kiev from him had to send their troops to protect Viacheslav in his *volost*, which clearly shows that Viacheslav was a poor warrior.[584] This must have been the reason for the Kievans' unwillingness to have him as their prince because protecting Kiev from the Cumans was one of the prince's main functions.

In any case, the Kievans apparently did not object to Vsevolod's accession to the Kievan throne, all the more so because in terms of dynastic seniority Vsevolod's status was roughly equal to that of Viacheslav. They were both the remaining eldest sons of the two cousins, Oleg Sviatoslavich and Vladimir Monomakh, and thus Vsevolod was the most senior among the Olgovichi, and Viacheslav among the Monomakhovichi. Vsevolod ruled in Kiev until his death; he proved to be a successful warrior, but the Kievans were apparently unhappy with his domestic policy. After Vsevolod's death, they "started to accuse (*pochasha skladyvati vinu na*)" his officials of mistreating people, and refused to accept Vsevolod's brother Igor as their next prince.[585] Viacheslav was still alive, and now, with the death of Vsevolod, he remained the oldest prince among both the Monomakhovichi and the Olgovichi. Thus, Viacheslav clearly had the right to Kiev according to the dynastic rules of succession, but he had neither sufficient military power, nor popular support to make this

---

[583]See above, p. 135.
[584]PSRL 2, 311.
[585]PSRL 2, 321.

happen.

The Kievans invited Viacheslav's nephew Iziaslav, widely popular and famous for his military prowess, and he happily seized the opportunity. He deposed Igor, and claimed the Kievan throne for himself.[586] According to the *Kievan Chronicle*, Iziaslav "entered Kiev with great glory and honor, and a multitude of people went out to meet him, and the hegumens with monks, and the priests of all the city of Kiev in their vestments."[587] The Kievans may have been happy at getting the prince of their choice, but Iziaslav's position in Kiev was not stable because most princes did not recognize his right to the Kievan throne. Iziaslav's adversaries among the princes included not only the Olgovichi, the kinsmen of the deposed Igor, but also many Monomakhovichi who pointed out that Kiev should belong to the most senior living member of the dynasty. However, when Viacheslav tried to exercise the senior's right to occupy the Kievan throne, the townspeople sent a message to Iziaslav, "Viacheslav is in Kiev, but we did not want him," and threatened Viacheslav with violence unless he conceded Kiev to Iziaslav voluntarily.[588]

The next in line in terms of biological seniority was Iurii of Suzdalia, who started a war against Iziaslav over the Kievan throne. First, Iurii claimed that his goal was to depose the usurping junior prince Iziaslav and to give Kiev to Viacheslav. However, when he succeeded in temporarily wrestling Kiev from Iziaslav, he "suddenly" realized that Viacheslav would not be able to retain the Kievan throne against the will of the population and proclaimed himself the lawful prince of Kiev as the most senior after the hopelessly inept Viacheslav.[589] Iziaslav responded by challenging the principle of seniority and arguing that Kiev should belong not to the oldest, but to the most successful and popular prince – such as himself.[590] However, most princes

---

[586]PSRL 2, 322-7.
[587]PSRL 2, 327.
[588]PSRL 2, 396-7.
[589]PSRL 2, 394.
[590]See Mikhailova and Prestel, "Cross Kissing," 15-16.

were not convinced that seniority did not matter. Iurii had as many supporters as Iziaslav, and they took Kiev from each other back and forth until Iziaslav came up with a brilliant plan. He abandoned his proclamations that seniority was irrelevant and conceded Kiev to the true senior Viacheslav. At the same time, Iziaslav offered Viacheslav his "assistance" in exercising the onerous responsibilities which the position of the Kievan prince entailed, thus making Viacheslav a figurehead and himself a *de-facto* ruler. This strategy worked. Seeing the most senior prince on the Kievan throne, many of Iurii's allies left him because now they perceived his fight for Kiev as unjust, and Iziaslav defeated Iurii once and for all. Iurii was able to achieve his heart's desire and become the Kievan prince only after Viacheslav's natural death in 1154. Before that, the combination of Viacheslav's seniority and Iziaslav's popularity made the legitimacy of their position in Kiev irrefutable. Viacheslav's formal status as the Kievan prince justified the "duumvirate" in the eyes of the dynasty, while the fact that the real power belonged to Iziaslav justified it in the eyes of the population.

From the point of view reflected in the *Kievan Chronicle*, Viacheslav became the legitimate prince only after he made the agreement with Iziaslav to rule in Kiev jointly. Correspondingly, the chronicler changes his style of representation of Viacheslav's arrivals to Kiev. From this point on, he reports joy, love, honor, and splendid welcoming ceremonies in connection with Viacheslav:

> Iziaslav led (*uvede*) ... Viacheslav into Kiev, and Viacheslav entered Kiev and rode to the Cathedral of St. Sophia and sat on the throne of his father and his grandfather, and he invited ... Iziaslav to a banquet, and also all the Kievans, and the men of [his and Iziaslav's ally] the [Hungarian] king, and all the Hungarians with their men, and they remained in great love.[591]

The representation of the Kievans' reaction to the news that the major contestant for the Kievan throne, Iurii of Suzdalia, is approaching the city with his troops serves to further bolster the legitimacy of Iziaslav's and Viacheslav's rule:

> And the Kievans said ... that everyone who could as much as hold a stick in his hands

---

[591]PSRL 2, 418-19.

> (*kako mozhet i khlud v rutsi vziati*) would go and fight ... And thus they all went forth. They did not leave each other behind, but all went to fight for their princes with joy.[592]

In the ensuing battle, Iziaslav was wounded, and for a while his troops lost sight of him. When some Kievans found the prince, they initially did not recognize him.

> And Iziaslav said, 'I am Iziaslav, your prince' – and took off his helmet, and then they recognized him. And many heard this and raised him on their arms with great joy as their emperor (*tsesaria*) and their prince, and thus all the troops called *Kyrie Eleison*, rejoicing.[593]

The joy of the Kievans asserts Iziaslav's status as their ruler and undermines the legitimacy of Iurii's claim for the Kievan throne. When Viacheslav and Iziaslav return from the battle with Iurii, they enter Kiev

> with honor and great praise, and thus the church hierarchs came to meet them carrying crosses, and Metropolitan Clement, and the venerable hegumens and priests, and a great multitude of ecclesiastics. And they [Viacheslav and Iziaslav] entered Kiev with great honor ... and remained in great joy and great love.[594]

The accounts of the Kievans greeting Viacheslav and Iziaslav use the same means to convey legitimacy as Fantosme's description of Henry II's arrival in London does.

The connection between joy and legitimacy takes many forms. The message could be conveyed by joy displayed by the prince himself rather than by the population. Thus, joy is the main emotion associated with Iziaslav's younger brother Rostislav, who is presented in the *Kievan Chronicle* as a paragon of princely propriety. Rostislav in the *Chronicle* may lack his older brother's charisma or military brilliance, but his strength lies in the undisputed legitimacy derived from scrupulous observation of the dynastic rules. During the lifetime of Iziaslav, Rostislav, as a proper young brother, invariably carried out Iziaslav's orders, even though he did not support his usurpation of the Kievan throne and "urged him earnestly (*mnogo ponuzhival*) to put honor on" the most senior member of the dynasty, Viacheslav,

---

[592]PSRL 2, 434.
[593]PSRL 2, 439.
[594]PSRL 2, 441.

which Iziaslav finally did.[595] After Iziaslav and Viacheslav died, Rostislav did not make any attempt to dispute the right to Kiev of the next senior in line, Iurii of Suzdalia, and readily recognized Iurii as his "father," thus officially making himself his junior.[596]

The brief struggle for Kiev that followed Iurii's death resulted in the victory of the coalition led by Rostislav's nephew Mstislav, who inherited his father Iziaslav's boldness and belligerence. Mstislav, however, learned his lesson from his father's frustrated attempts to become the sole prince of Kiev in violation of the rules of seniority, and repeated the move that had finally brought success to Iziaslav. Just as Iziaslav invited the most senior of the Monomakhovichi, his uncle Viacheslav, to be his co-ruler, Mstislav, after his takeover of Kiev, sent his envoys to his uncle Rostislav, the most senior Monomakhovich at the moment. Mstislav apparently hoped to replicate the situation of his father and Viacheslav, intending to be the real ruler and to use Rostislav as a figurehead in the same way as Iziaslav had used Viacheslav. Rostislav, however, was no Viacheslav. As a junior, he had observed the rights of his seniors; now, when he, in his turn, became a senior, he was determined to assert his rights and to receive proper obedience:

> Rostislav ... said to them, 'If you truly invite me with love, I, in any case, will go to Kiev on the condition that I have my full free will (*ia vsiako idu Kievu na svoiu voliu*), so that you truly (*v pravdu*) have me as your father and be obedient.[597]

Greatly disappointed, Mstislav had "much dispute" and "angry speeches" with Rostislav's envoys, but finally had to accept the condition to "truly" be his junior.[598]

Eventually, Rostislav's right to Kiev was recognized by all, including the Ol-

---

[595]PSRL 2, 422

[596]PSRL 2, 477. At some point Rostislav did join the anti-Iurii alliance, but Iurii died before the alliance had a chance to take any action against him. Rostislav's participation in the alliance, which contradicts his image in the *Chronicle*, is mentioned briefly and in an undertone (PSRL 2, 489).

[597]PSRL 2, 503.

[598]PSRL 2, 503-4. See also PSRL 2, 519-20.

govichi,[599] and he ruled peacefully until his death in 1167. Essentially, his princely career exemplifies the triumph of legitimacy. Consequently, almost every mention of Rostislav in the *Kievan Chronicle* includes a display of joy with the exception of the account of his conduct during Lent, when he, as a model Christian, "had communion every week, washing his face with tears and humbling himself with frequent sighs, issuing forth moans from his heart."[600] At all other times, Rostislav in the *Chronicle* is joyous, as is everyone around him. Iziaslav and Viacheslav rejoice every time they see him.[601] Rostislav "remains in joy" with his brother after their successful joint campaign,[602] and he "has great joy" when he hears about Iziaslav's victories:

> And Iziaslav sent [a messenger] to his brother Rostislav to Smolensk and informed him that he himself went to fight with Sviatoslav Olgovich and made peace with him, while [his son] Mstislav went against the Cumans and, having defeated them, took many captives. Rostislav, having heard all this, praised God and the power of the life-giving Cross and rejoiced greatly.[603]

The records of how Rostislav rejoiced after each success achieved by Iziaslav appear to serve two goals: in addition to stressing Rostislav's proper attitude to his older brother, his displays of joy also make him an indirect participant in Iziaslav's victories, so that Iziaslav's charisma reflects on Rostislav as well. When Rostislav came to Kiev after Iziaslav's death, "all the Kievans, all the people of the Rus land, and all the Black Caps" rejoiced.[604] In spite of that, Rostislav, as we remember, chose not to challenge Iurii's claim to the Kievan throne and acknowledged Iurii as his senior. Consequently, "Iurii and Rostislav embraced each other with great love and great honor and thus remained in joy."[605] Rostislav's nephew Sviatoslav, in his turn, "bowed to Rostislav" and accepted the *volosts* that Rostislav gave to him, thus

---

[599]PSRL 2, 520.
[600]PSRL 2, 530.
[601]PSRL 2, 357, 369, 423, 470.
[602]PSRL 2, 359.
[603]PSRL 2, 461. See also PSRL 2, 454-5.
[604]PSRL 2, 470.
[605]PSRL 2, 480.

making himself Rostislav's junior, "with joy."[606] It goes without saying that the people of his patrimony, Smolensk, "rejoiced greatly" when Rostislav visited the city.[607] When, after Iurii's death, Rostislav finally became the prince of Kiev, he entered Kiev on Easter Sunday

> and all the people accepted him with praiseworthy [*dostokhvalnoiu*] honor, and this pious prince Rostislav sat on the throne of his father and of his grandfather, and there was double joy for the people: the resurrection of the Lord and the accession to the throne of the prince.[608]

This is the celebration of Rostislav's legitimacy at its highest.

Another interesting example of the connection between joy and legitimate rule is found in the the *Kievan Chronicle* annal for 1190, which, unusually, records a hunting expedition of two princes on par with important military and political events. All important happenings of the year are usually introduced by the phrase "in the same year." The annal for 1190 has a typical structure: "In the year 6698. Prince Sviatopolk died ... In the same year the Bishop Maksim of Belgorod died... In the same year the German emperor went with the people from his whole land to fight for the Holy Sepulcher..." The inclusion of a hunting trip within such a context may seem odd. The reason for the unusual attention paid to this ordinary upper-class pastime is that the joy experienced by the two princes during this hunt signified the legitimacy of their rule, which ended the conflict for Kiev and brought peace and stability:

> In the same year, Sviatoslav with ... Riurik, having brought peace and quiet to the Rus Land [*utishivsha zemliu Ruskoiu*] and having made peace with the Cumans on their [Riurik's and Sviatoslav's] conditions, decided to go hunting in boats on the Dnieper to the mouth of the Tesmen', and they hunted there, and, having caught a multitude of beasts and thus having been merry [*naglumistasia*], they remained in love and in joy all the time and returned home.[609]

---

[606]PSRL 2, 471.

[607]PSRL 2, 528.

[608]PSRL 2, 504.

[609]PSRL 2, 668.

The symbolic significance of this joyous hunt is all the more important considering that the joint rule of Sviatoslav and Riurik ended a period of warfare that started after Sviatoslav, in violation of his oath on the Cross, had made a surprise attack on Riurik's brother while the latter was hunting.[610] Thus, the chronicler implicitly contrasts two hunts: the one, during which a treacherous attack started a war, and the other that celebrated the mutual love and joy of erstwhile enemies turned legitimate co-rulers.

Fantosme also associates joy with the rightful king Henry II. Men on both sides are sad when the war goes badly for them; however, the rebels are not represented as joyous when they are victorious. Even when Fantosme explicitly states that "the Young King has accomplished much," he does not report any joy on the part of Henry the Younger about these accomplishments.[611] The Scots rejoice only when they seize a lot of booty, and their king is represented as joyous when he makes the decision that will lead to his defeat. In this last case, Fantosme apparently refers to William's joy in order to create a contrast with the grief and shame that he will experience soon.[612] Henry II, on the contrary, "exalts himself joyfully (*joius se glorifie*)" and has "great joy" over his victories.[613] The *Chronicle* ends when the king receives the news about the final defeat of William of Scotland. Fantosme presents this triumph of the rightful king through a detailed description of Henry II's emotions. First, Henry is "sad," he "has grief and anxiety in his heart" when he is thinking about the devastation brought by the Scots. At this time, the messenger arrives and tells the news about the victory at Alnwick. Henry gives thanks to God and St. Thomas, thus reminding the reader that the main problem with his legitimacy has been recently resolved by his act of penance at Canterbury. Then Fantosme reports that "the king is so glad and so happy" that he goes to wake up his men so that they may rejoice

---

[610]PSRL 2, 614-15.

[611]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 10.

[612]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 88, 100, 110, 126, 136, 153.

[613]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 16, 62.

too.[614]   Joy marks the triumph of legitimacy for Fantosme just as it does for the Kievan chronicler.

Another important emotion in the discourse of legitimacy is anger. This emotion had a special place in medieval political narratives. These narratives often reflect what White has called a "dialectical" relationship between secular and religious concepts of anger.[615]   From the strictly religious point of view, anger was, of course, a deadly sin. However, Western medievalists describe positive presentations of just anger as a characteristic feature of the twelfth-century ethic of rulership.[616]   Thus, according to Althoff, the twelfth century was a time when a "new conception of the ruler's obligations and behavior" emerged, in addition to the old one, which stressed mildness and forgiveness. This new conception connected the ruler's righteous anger with his obligation to do justice and to inspire fear in wrongdoers.[617]   Apparently, there was a parallel development in Rus, although it took place somewhat later, as can be seen from the early thirteenth-century change in the catalogs of virtues listed in princely obituaries. In earlier obituaries, the princes inspired fear only in "enemies" and "pagans," while showing nothing but love, mercy, and generosity towards their Christian subjects.[618]   In contrast with that, the obituary of Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo of Suzdalia under 2012 stresses his "true and impartial (*nelitsemernyi*) justice" and states that Vsevolod

> was adorned with all good morals, punishing evil men (*zlyia kaznia*), while showing mercy to the good-thinking (*dobrosmyslennyia*), for a prince bears his sword not for nothing (*ne tune*), but to avenge evildoers and to encourage those doing good (*v pokhvalu dovro tvoriashchim*).[619]

The obituary does not mention anger, but it clearly expresses the idea of a ruler's

---

[614]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 148.

[615]White, "Politics of Anger," 149.

[616]Gerd Althoff, "*Ira Regis*," 70.

[617]Gerd Althoff, "*Ira Regis*," 73.

[618]E.g., PSRL 1, 293; PSRL 2, 289, 550, 563, 609-12.

[619]PSRL 1, 436; see also PSRL 1, 422.

obligation to do strict justice to evildoers, which Althoff describes as a new twelfth-century development connected with a more positive attitude towards the ruler's just anger.

Hyams objects to Althoff's presentation of the justly angered king as a twelfth-century novelty. He thinks that a "secular ideology of *ira regis*" had existed before, and in the twelfth century it was "made explicit rather than new."[620] In any case, whether this was a new attitude or an old one made more explicit, the twelfth-century texts often present the ruler's anger positively. This did not necessarily signify the triumph of secular concepts over religious. The secular and religious ethic of rulership found common ground in the clerical concept of good anger, represented, in the words of Hyams, by "God's anger, and ... the righteous indignation of believers confronted with evil. Who better to exercise a distant reflection of *ira Dei* against sin than kings, ... God's earthly representatives?"[621]

This connection between just anger and rulership by divine right can be seen in both Fantosme and in Rusian chronicles. It is present in the description of negotiations between Viacheslav and Iziaslav leading to their agreement about the "duumvirate." If we approach the chronicles with the "common sense" view of emotions as biological entities "universal within all human populations,"[622] we would be puzzled why Viacheslav expresses anger for the first time when Iziaslav offers him Kiev, but not earlier. He apparently had plenty of reasons to be angry with a number of princes and with the Kievans, all of whom repeatedly ill-treated him. However, the chronicler reports neither anger nor any other emotional reaction of Viacheslav, while describing several occasions when his seniority was trampled upon and he was driven out of Kiev. Viacheslav is first represented as angry only in the account of

---

[620]Paul Hyams, "What Did Henry III of England Think in Bed and in French about Kingship and Anger?" in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, 92-126, at 100.

[621]Hyams, "What Did Henry III of England Think in Bed," 100.

[622]See Rosenwein, "Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions," 1-5.

his exchange with Iziaslav in the entry for 1150. This entry reports that in response to Iziaslav's offer of Kiev and of "all the *volosts* that you wish to take (*kotoroe tobe godno*)," Viacheslav

> said to Iziaslav with anger, 'Why did you not give it back to me then [*vo onom dni*], but I had to leave Kiev with great shame?! You are giving Kiev to me now, when one army is advancing from Galich and another from Chernigov!'[623]

Iziaslav had to recant and to apologize profusely and repeatedly. Satisfied, Viacheslav responded, "Oh my son, may God help you that you put honor on me, you should have done so long ago. You honored God when you honored me."[624] Of course, Viacheslav here does not claim that he is God-like; rather he refers to the precept that "God commanded princes ... to honor the senior brother," that is, the senior member of the dynasty.[625] Viacheslav again refers to the "God-given" order of proper relationships between senior and junior princes during his talks with Iurii who came to fight for Kiev with Iziaslav and was unpleasantly surprised to find out that the latter had given the Kievan throne to Viacheslav. It was on that occasion that Viacheslav pointed out that he already had a beard when Iurii was born, and then continued, "If you want to assault my seniority, go ahead and do that (*na moe strishinstvo poekhati, iako to esi poekhal*), but [remember that] God governs all (*da Bog za vsim*)."[626] The account of his speech to Iurii begins with Viacheslav's declaration that he wants to "prove his right of seniority (*svoe starishinstvo opraviti*)." Then he expresses his conviction that "God will help the just cause (*na pravdu prizrit*)." After presenting all his arguments, "Viacheslav said, looking at [the icon of] the Holy Mother of God which is above the Golden Gates, 'It is for this most pure (*prechistoi*) Lady together with her Son and our God to judge us in this and in the future life.'"[627]

Thus, Viacheslav's display of anger in response to Iziaslav marks the start of

---

[623]PSRL 2, 399.
[624]PSRL 2, 418.
[625]PSRL 1, 377.
[626]PSRL 2, 430.
[627]PSRL 2, 428, 431.

the process of establishing his legitimacy as the Kievan prince by right of seniority in accordance with the God-sanctioned dynastic rules. Iziaslav's offer signifies the recognition of Viacheslav's legitimacy for the first time. Correspondingly, Viacheslav displays anger for the first time – at least, according to the chronicler, who apparently supports the "duumvirate," but opposes Viacheslav as an independent Kievan prince. Fantosme also sees the connection between a display of just anger on the part of a ruler and the legitimacy of this ruler. This is evident from his representation of Henry II's reaction to the news that the barons of Brittany have joined the rebellion led by his son. In Henry's speech, the display of anger is intertwined with the assertion of his legitimacy:

> When [Henry II] heard this, he was both saddened and angry, ... and he said to his knights: 'My lords, now listen to me! I was never so grieved in all my life. Rage seizes (*tient)* my body, I am nearly crazy. The barons of Brittany have opposed me; they have devoted themselves ... to King Louis of France and to my eldest son, who come to disinherit me of my rightful possessions (*chasez*). He wants to take away my lands, my fiefs, and my inheritances. I am not so old that I should lose the realm (*terre*) ... Keep a watch this night so that no Flemings or men of this region be in ambush. The barons of Brittany up to Finstère, as you know, are subject to me (*sunt en me poestez*); but Ralf de Fourgères is in revolt against me ... Then, it is well to attack them with great hostility ... His barons reply: 'You are full of goodness (*buntez*) ... The realm (*terre*) is yours, so defend it! ... Your son is in the wrong to make war on you.'[628]

This passage bears striking resemblance to the representation of Prince Sviatoslav's reaction to the news about the disastrous campaign against the Cumans led by Prince Igor (1185). Igor, a junior prince in the Olgovichi branch of the dynasty, waged a separate campaign without asking the permission of, or even informing, the Olgovichi senior Sviatoslav, who at that time was also the prince of Kiev. Not only was Igor's army defeated, but he and his son were taken prisoner by the Cumans, which had never happened to a Rusian prince before. Moreover, Igor's defeat invalidated the results of the previous successful campaign against the Cumans made

---

[628]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 11-13.

jointly by the princes of Rus under the leadership of Sviatoslav (1184), and enabled the Cumans to make a destructive raid into Rus.[629] Making a campaign without Sviatoslav's permission was a violation of the proper relationships between the junior prince Igor and the senior of all the Olgovichi. The author of the 1180s annals in the *Kievan Chronicle* took great care to demonstrate the legitimacy of Sviatoslav as the Olgovichi top senior, as is evident from the passage where Sviatoslav gives a precise explanation for why he has the right to give orders to the other Olgovichi:

> Behold, I am senior to Iaroslav and you, Igor, senior to Vsevolod, and I am now the one who is in the place of your father. Therefore, I command you, Igor, to stay here together with Iaroslav and to guard Chernigov and all your *volost*, while I will go to Suzdal with Vsevolod ...[630]

By the late twelfth century, the phrase "in place of a father" (*v ottsa mesto*) was routinely used to refer to the position of the senior prince in respect to his juniors. After Igor's act of insubordination, Sviatoslav (or his chronicler) apparently felt the need to reassert his position as a leader. Just as Henry explains his overlordship over the barons of Brittany, who are wrong to take arms against him, so Sviatoslav explains his seniority over Igor who is wrong to make a campaign without Sviatoslav's sanction. The *Chronicle* thus presents Sviatoslav's reaction to the news about Igor's defeat and capture:

> Sviatoslav heard about this and, having sighed deeply, he wiped away his tears and said, 'Oh, my beloved brethren, and sons, and men of the Rus land! God had allowed me to oppress the pagans, but they [Igor and his brother] did not restrain their youth and opened the gates of the Rus Land. May the Lord's will prevail in all things! Just as I was angry at (*zhal mi biashet' na*) Igor, I now feel as much and [even] more pity for (*zhaluiu po*) Igor, my brother.' After that, Sviatoslav sent his sons Igor and Oleg to Posemie... After that, he sent an envoy to David of Smolensk, saying, "We had planned to go against the Cumans and to spend the summer on the Don, but, behold, the Cumans have just defeated Igor and his brother and son. Come, brother, guard the Rus Land.'[631]

---

[629]PSRL 2, 630-49.
[630]PSRL 2, 618.
[631]PSRL 2, 645-6.

Thus, both Henry and Sviatoslav start with the verbalization of their feelings in front of their men and then proceed to giving military orders. Henry's knights have to keep watch against the Flemings, while Sviatoslav's brother has to come and guard the Rus Land against the Cumans. The Kievan prince and the English king display the same emotion - they are "both saddened and angry," which in East Slavonic, as we know, is expressed by verbs with the root *zhal-* followed by the preposition *na*. The difference in the emotions that they display in addition to anger – Sviatoslav's pity and Henry's rage – are caused by the difference in circumstances: Igor is now in captivity, while Henry the Young King is laying waste to his father's lands.[632]

These passages illustrate Gerd Althoff's observation that "communication in medieval public life was ... determined by demonstrative ... behaviors. People revealed their ranks and positions ... using signs and firm rules of behavior to express their relationships to one another. ... Many of the mannerisms of medieval communication, which may appear to us as overemotionalized, were bound up with this demonstrative function – especially the demonstration of anger."[633] Henry and Sviatoslav both needed to reassert their status as rightful lords and their demonstrative anger served this purpose very well: Sviatoslav's men obediently fulfilled all his orders after hearing his speech, and Henry's barons replied: "The land is yours, so defend it! Your son is in the wrong to make war on you."[634]

However, not every kind of anger was associated with legitimacy. Medieval authors differentiated *mala* and *bona ira*, and both *Fantosme's* and the *Kievan* chronicles ascribe unjustified anger to those who made claims presented in these chronicles as illegitimate. The primary way of construing "bad" anger in the *Kievan Chronicle* is to connect it to pride. If anger was, paradoxically, both deadly sin and,

---

[632] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 11.

[633] Gerd Althoff, "*Ira Regis*: Prolegomena to a History of Royal Anger," in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, 74.

[634] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 13.

in a sense, a ruler's virtue, there was no such controversy about pride, which was always viewed exclusively as a sin.[635] Therefore, when anger originated from pride, it also became unquestionably sinful. The chronicler ascribes such anger to Prince Andrei Bogoliubskii of Suzdalia when he attempted to take the Kievan throne from Mstislav Rostislavich who, according to the *Chronicle*, had every right to rule in Kiev:

> Andrei ... got full of arrogance, became very proud, placing his hope in the force of the flesh, surrounded himself with a multitude of soldiers, and burned with anger ... Prince Andrei, indeed, being so wise and so valiant in all his deeds, ruined his reason by immoderation (*nevozderzhaniem*), burned with anger, having issued forth such boasting, while boasting is shameful and disgusting in the eyes of God, because all these were from the Devil who sows boastfulness and pride in our hearts, as the Apostle Paul says: 'God thwarts the proud and gives grace to the humble.' This saying of Apostle Paul was fulfilled, as we shall relate later.[636]

Predictably, Andrei was defeated, and the saying of the Apostle Paul was fulfilled when his troops "had come to Kiev haughty but went home humbled."[637]

Andrei, generally wise and valiant, ruined his sense by pride, arrogance, and immoderation. Similar traits caused the "noble King William" of Scotland to make poor decisions, according to Fantosme who has a high respect for William and thinks that "never did a more honorable man govern any realm":

> Fantosme says, and pledges you his faith on it, that William would never in his life have thought about waging war against Henry [II] ... But by [bad] counsel and by evil envy (*malveis envie*), a wise man can be pushed into great folly.[638]

Jonston translates *malveis envie* as "the deadly sin of envy," and this is apparently what Fantosme had in mind.[639] This is how Fantosme begins his account of the

---

[635]PSRL 1, 304, 362; PSRL 2, 287-8, 561, 574, 646.

[636]PSRL 2, 572-4.

[637]PSRL 2, 578.

[638]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 50.

[639]The connection between "bad" anger and envy may be typical not of Fantosme only, but of English historiography in general: according to Roche, when Orderic Vitalis wants to condemn his characters, he presents their anger as caused "by devilish feelings of envy," Roche, "The Way Vengeance Comes," 127.

events that led to the Scots' defeat: "Hear, my lords, what comes of immoderation (*trop ultrage*) and what happened to those from Scotland the wild."[640] Envy, pride, and immoderation make William's and Andrei's anger sinful and lead them to foolish decisions. Elements that constitute bad anger are very similar in *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle* and the Kievan chronicles.

Thus, we have seen general similarities in the use of emotions for political purposes in the two chronicles. The similarities in their treatment of anger are especially remarkable, given how complicated and controversial the medieval understanding of anger was. The dialectical, as White puts it, relationship between religious and secular concepts of anger reflected the complicated interaction between Christian values and the warrior ethos of the lay aristocracy, which shaped the medieval ethic of rulership. Similar attitudes to anger in the two texts, Anglo-Norman and Rusian, suggest similarities between the ethics of rulership in the two societies.

However, anger played an important role not only in the context of rulership, but also in aristocratic politics in general. In particular, the legitimizing function of the public display of anger was often used to start or to sustain a feud. According to Timothy Reuter, "a feuding culture is one in which questions of legitimacy, both as to ends and means, are constantly being posed."[641] This culture, as it is presented in medieval narrative sources, existed among the upper social strata, which, as we will see in the next section, appear to have had an exclusive right to be angry.

---

[640]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 54.

[641] Timothy Reuter, "Debate: The 'Feudal Revolution' III," *Past and Present* 155 (1997): 183.

4.7   Anger and Social Status in Rusian and Western Texts

In Western medieval narratives, anger is presented not only as a royal virtue, but also as "an essentially noble prerogative."[642] Thus, according to Paul Freedman, the anger of peasants in late medieval literature is "ludicrous with respect to individuals," and peasants' acts of violence, while being serious and capable of inflicting great damage, are not represented as human actions of revenge motivated by anger, but rather "are likened to those of ravening beasts."[643] Similarly, to be angry was a princely prerogative in Rus. All words signifying anger (including *zhal*-words with *na*) are reserved for princes exclusively.

Rusian pre-Mongolian chronicles hardly ever discuss peasants; however, they contain accounts of violent rebellions in cities and a detailed story of the murder of Andrei Bogoliubsky by his servants. Rebellions may be presented sympathetically. Their goal was usually to displace one prince in favor of another, and when the chronicle account was written by a supporter of the winning prince, it may even depict an extremely violent rebellion quite favorably. Interestingly, the motives for the violence can be derived from the narrative, but are never stated explicitly. A good example is the description of the 1113 rebellion in Kiev. After Sviatopolk of Kiev died, leaving the throne to his unpopular son Iaroslav, the Kievans invited Vladimir to be their prince, but he refused to bypass the legitimate heir.

> The Kievans sacked the household of Putiata the *tysiatskii*, and then went and sacked the Jews, and the Kievans sent the message to Vladimir again, saying, 'Come to Kiev, O Prince, and know that great evil will be done lest you come: not only Putiata's and the *sotskiis'* houses are being sacked, but those of the Jews also, and they will soon attack your sister-in law, and boyars, and monasteries and you would have to answer

---

[642]Althoff, "*Ira Regis*," 59-65; Paul Freedman, "Peasant Anger in the Late Middle Ages," in Rosenwein, ed., *Anger's Past*, 171-90, at 171.

[643]Freedman, "Peasant Anger," 171.

> [to God] if they plundered the monasteries.' Having heard this, Vladimir came to
> Kiev ... and all the people were glad and the riot ceased. [644]

The riot ceased because "the people" were glad to have Monomakh as their prince, but why did it start? The feelings of the Kievans toward the late prince's officials and toward the prospect of having his son as their ruler are not named and can only be inferred from their actions. It seems that the chronicler felt that, while it was appropriate for "the people" to be glad at a prince's ascension to the throne, they were not supposed to feel anger or hatred, which, apparently, motivated their actions after Sviatopolk's death.

The same attitude is evident in the account about the murder of Prince Igor by the Kievan mob (under 1147). Igor, a member of the Olgovichi clan, was deposed by the Monomakhovich Iziaslav Mstislavich and took a monastic habit. Iziaslav became the prince of Kiev and Igor stayed in a Kievan monastery closely supervised by Iziaslav's men. While Iziaslav was away from Kiev on a campaign, he found out that the Olgovichi were plotting to kill him and, presumably, to make Igor the Kievan prince. When the Kievans learned about the plot, they stormed the monastery and lynched Igor. The account of these events in the *Kievan Chronicle* appears to be a combination of narratives derived from two different sources, one pro-Iziaslav and the other pro-Olgovichi. In the latter Igor is presented as a martyr killed at the instigation of Iziaslav, while the former claims that Iziaslav's officials and his brother, whom Iziaslav left in charge of Kiev in his absence, did all they could to rescue Igor, but were overwhelmed by the mob.[645] This account contains a detailed description of what the murderers said and did and how unruly and violent they were, but it never refers explicitly to any emotions behind the violence:

> And one man said, 'Let us think about what happened in the past, during the reign
> of Iziaslav Iaroslavich. Certain evil men freed Vseslav from the dungeon and made

---

[644]PSRL 2, 275-6.

[645]PSRL 1, 316-18; PSRL 2, 347-55. The *Laurentian* account is solely pro-Iziaslav.

him their prince, and much evil befell our city because of that.[646] And behold, Igor, our prince's and our enemy is not in a dungeon, but in St. Theodore's. Having killed him, we will go to Chernigov and fight for our prince. Let us finish them [the Olgovichi]!' ... And [Iziaslav's brother] Vladimir told them, 'My brother did not command you to do so, Igor is watched by guards, let us go and fight for my brother, as he commanded.' But the Kievans said, 'We know that goodwill will be of no help either for you (plural) or for us while dealing with this stock [the Olgovichi] (*ne konchati dobrom s tem plemenen ni vam ni nam*). And the Metropolitan opposed them, and Lazarus the *tysiatskii*, and Raguilo, Vladimir's *tysiatskii*, told them not to kill Igor, but they issued a battle cry and went to kill Igor, and Vladimir mounted his horse and galloped, ... but the Kievans were faster than he was. ... They seized Igor, and when they were bringing him out of the monastery, Vladimir met them at the monastery gate, and Igor said, looking at Vladimir, 'Oh, brother, where are they bringing me?' Vladimir jumped down from the horse and covered him with his mantle, and he said to the Kievans, 'My brothers, do not do this evil, do not kill Igor!' ... and they hit Vladimir while beating Igor ... and people seized Vladimir and wanted to kill him on account of Igor.[647]

The "Kievans" were apparently full of anger and hatred, but neither emotion is named. Nor are they named in the pro-Olgovichi passages, where the murderers are presented, on the one hand, as "ravening beasts" motivated by animal fury rather than by human feelings and, on the other, as "a deceiving impious gathering" and "Christ-deniers [*Khristovy otmetniki*]," who attacked Igor in church during a mass, "yelling, 'Kill him!'"[648] The latter presentation places the story within a Scriptural framework, with the monk Igor striving to imitate Christ[649] and his murderers,

---

[646]This is a reference to the Kievan uprising of 1068, which gave power to Vseslav, the rival of the then prince of Kiev, Iziaslav Iaroslavich.

[647]PSRL 2, 349-52.

[648]PSRL 2, 351.

[649]Igor "was thinking in his heart how such great sufferings and diverse kinds of death had befallen the righteous ... and how our Lord Jesus Christ redeemed the world from the deception of the Devil with his honorable blood," and prayed to become a martyr. After his death, "pious people" took his blood and pieces of his clothing "to be saved and healed," and while his body lay in a church, awaiting burial, candles miraculously kindled themselves. The goal of this account is apparently to make Igor be recognized as a saint. This goal was achieved only partially: Igor came to be locally venerated in the Chernigov land, the patrimony of the Olgovichi. PSRL 2, 350, 353.

who are implicitly compared to Jews yelling, "Crucify him!" The events are thus transposed into the plane of the eternal struggle between God and the Devil, making human emotions irrelevant. In contrast with the presentation of the "Kievans," Iziaslav's emotions are named: when he learned about Igor's murder, he "shed tears" and expressed his "sad anger [*zhalova na*]" at the Kievans.[650]

The two accounts about the murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii ["God-loving"] by his servants a few decades later also present the murderers as "beasts" full of animal fury.[651] Furthermore, ready to carry out their plans and approaching the prince's bedchamber in the dead of night, they were suddenly gripped by such "fear and trembling" that they had to run to the cell and get drunk to restore their spirits. "And Satan cheered them up in the cell, waiting on them invisibly, taking care of them and strengthening them ... And thus, having become drunk with wine," they went back to the bedchamber and killed their prince.[652] This representation of Andrei's servants shares all the essential features of the typical Western medieval representation of violent peasants identified by Freedman: they are both dangerous like "ravening [*sverepii*] beasts" and comically cowardly. At the same time, the facts presented in the story make it clear that the true motive for the murder was revenge:

> [Andrei] had a beloved servant Iakim, who, having heard from somebody that the prince ordered the execution of his brother, was inspired by the Devil's teaching and ran to to his fellow servants, evil counselors, just as Judas to the Jews, striving to please his father Satan, and began to say, 'He executed him today, he will execute us tomorrow, let us decide what to do with this prince.'[653]

Iakim's anger and his desire to avenge the death of his brother are easily inferred from the narrative, but they are never mentioned explicitly, because such feelings

---

[650]PSRL 2, 354-5; PSRL 1, 318.

[651] "*zver'e sverepii*," PSRL 2, 586. The same adjective *sverepii* is applied to Igor's murderers in the pro-Olgovichi account, when they are compared to "ravening beasts," PSRL 2, 351. In the *Laurentian* account, Andrei's murderers are compared to the "wild beasts" (*iako zver'e divii*), PSRL 1, 369.

[652]PSRL 2, 586.

[653]PSRL 2, 585.

were apparently not appropriate for a servant.

In one case, the chronicler uses interesting lexical choices to describe the anger of non-princely nobles, certain Peter and Nester Borislavichi. Their noble status is not named, but it is indicated by the use of the patronymic form with -*ich* and by the fact that they had slaves (*kholopi*). Furthermore, Prince David referred to them as his *priateleve*, that is, friends or supporters.[654] The Borislavichi served Prince Mstislav, who dismissed them (*otpusti ia*) after their slaves stole Mstislav's horses and re-branded them with "their" (presumably, the Borislavichi's) marks. By dismissing the Borislavichi, Mstislav made them "mad" or "evil-wishing" (*biashe ozlobiv ia*). Consequently, they falsely said "evil things" about Mstislav to his ally, Prince David, who believed the slander, broke the alliance and joined Mstislav's enemies.[655] Essentially, the Borislavichi are presented as angry and vengeful, but their anger is described not by the standard words with the roots *gnev* or *zhal* with *na*, but with the verb *ozlobiti*, the root of which, *zlo* (evil), gives their emotion a strong negative connotation, differentiating it from the rightful anger of princes. The story about the re-branded horses further taints the legitimacy of the Borislavichi's anger. It is deliberately ambiguous, leaving the question of the Borislavichi's role in the theft open. It appears that the chronicler did not want to accuse them of stealing explicitly, but rather tried to place their anger and revenge in the most unfavorable context.

Thus, anger in Rusian chronicles was strongly linked to social status, just as it was in Western sources. However, the social stratum, the members of which had the "right" to be angry, appears to be narrower in Rus: anger was not as much "noble" as specifically the Riurikids' prerogative. This is one of the aspects of the Rusian princes that make them somewhat analogous to the Western upper nobility. Western medievalists have shown that the public display of anger, along with other

---

[654]PSRL 2, 541.

[655]PSRL 2, 541.

forms of demonstrative emotional behavior, played an important role in the discourse of honor.[656] This complicated concept which, together with its opposite, shame, occupied a central place in the worldview of medieval aristocracy, is the subject of the next chapter.

---

[656]See e.g. White, "Politics of Anger"; Roche, "The Way Vengeance Comes," 123-7.

Chapter 5

Honor, Shame, and Conflict in Rusian and Western Literary Sources

Western medievalists long ago established the key role of the notion of honor for aristocratic politics. William Brandt, in his study of English and French chronicles published in 1966, showed that the aim of chronicle-writers was not so much to report actions as to celebrate the values implicit in these actions, with honor being the foremost among such values.[657] Since then, extensive research has been done on the medieval understandings of honor and shame and on their representations in different types of sources.[658] At the same time, there have been only two studies devoted to honor (*chest'*) in pre-Mongolian Rus, one of them by the scholar of early modern Russia Nancy Shields Kollmannn, who was drawn to the subject by her research on

---

[657]William J. Brandt, *The Shape of Medieval History: Studies in Modes of Perception* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966), 90, 111.

[658]Literature on honor is immense. For the most important recent works, see Hugh M. Thomas, "Shame, Masculinity, and the Death of Thomas Becket," *Speculum* 87 (2012): 1050-88, at 1051-2, 1057, note 29.

honor in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Muscovy and who was interested mainly in the relations between the concepts of honor in pre-Mongolian and Muscovite legal sources.[659] There is also a short section on the pre-Mongolian period in an essay by L. A. Chernaia that discusses the evolution of the concepts of honor and dishonor in literary texts from the eleventh to eighteenth centuries, and some observations about honor in the article on military accounts by Helen Prochazka.[660] Finally, the prominent literary scholar and historian of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Russian culture, Yuri Lotman, offered a semiological analysis of the notions of honor and glory in the pre-Mongolian texts; his interpretations were justifiably rejected by Rus historians.[661]

Kollmann has demonstrated that "there were two kinds of honor in Kiev Rus': the 'honor and glory' of warrior princes [and] saintly martyrs" found in the literary sources and "the simple honor of the individual, the implied right of all to be protected from insult and disgrace" expressed in the legal documents.[662] Rusian laws, to some extent, protected the personal dignity of all members of society by punishing crimes that inflicted "shame" and "disgrace" and thus implicitly ascribing honor to

---

[659]Nancy Shields Kollmann, "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus'?" *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 36 (1988): 481-92.

[660]L.A. Chernaia, "'Chest': Predstavleniia o chesti i beschestii v russkoi literature XI-XVIII vv.," in A. S. Demin, ed., *Drevnerusskaia literatura: Izobrazhenie obshchestva* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991), 56-84; Helen Y. Prochazka, "On Concepts of Patriotism, Loyalty, and Honour in the Old Russian Military Accounts," *Slavonic and East European Review* 63 (1985): 481-97.

[661]Iu. M. Lotman, "Ob oppozitsii 'chest'-slava' v svetskikh tekstakh Kievskogo perioda," *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 3 (1967): 100-112; idem, "Eshchio raz of poniatiiakh 'slava' i 'chest'' v tekstakh Kievskogo perioda," *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 5 (1971): 469-74; A. A. Zimin, "O statie Iu. Lotmana 'Ob oppozitsii *chest' – slava* v svetskikh tekstakh Kievskogo perioda,'" ibid., 464-8; P. S. Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti po pamiatnikam literatury domongolskoi Rusi," *Drevniiaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki* 15 (2004): 63-87, at 69-70, 72.

[662]Kollmann, "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus'?" 492. See also eadem, *By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 33-8.

all victims of such crimes. In some cases, these victims included even slaves and indentured servants. For example, if a woman was assaulted, but not actually raped, she received compensation for her *obida*. *Obida* is a polysemic term, the meaning of which in the political narratives will be discussed later. In the legal context, it meant something like "moral damage." An assaulted free woman received forty times more than a female slave, but the law still recognized the slave's *obida*. If a female slave was raped by her master, she received freedom as compensation for the "shame (*sorom*)" that she suffered. In contrast with the socially inclusive understanding of honor in legal sources, the honor of the chronicles, frequently paired with glory (*slava*), was "directed not so much at basic human dignity as at elite status and martial valor."[663] According to Kollmann, this situation is reminiscent of pre-modern Western Europe: Western literary texts create an impression that honor was associated "with medieval chivalry or aristocratic dueling and politesse, not with ... the common man or woman," but the legal sources show that "nonelite groups ... defended their honor with a vigor equal to that of noblemen."[664]

A comprehensive and thorough analysis of the usage of the word *chest'* (honor) in Rusian literary sources was performed by P. S. Stefanovich. He demonstrated that the meaning of the word was different in secular and religious contexts. In religious texts, "honor" is primarily used as something owed to God and saints; in relation to humans, it is connected with piety and Christian virtues. In a secular context, the main meanings of "honor" are "respect paid to the person by society, reputation," as well as "rank, status, power." *Chest'* could also refer to external signs of respect, such as bows, gifts, or a big entourage.[665] These observations led Stefanovich to the conclusion that Rusian *chest'* was profoundly different from either medieval Western or our contemporary notions of honor. He believes that what he calls "chivalric"

---

[663]Kollmann, "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus'?" 486, 490.
[664]Kollmann, *By Honor Bound*, 2.
[665]Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti," 65, 67, 86-7.

or "feudal" - that is, Western medieval - honor was practically identical with the modern understanding of honor as inner virtue or "personal dignity resulting from following certain norms of behavior (code of honor)."[666] Kollmann describes "Kiev's concept of honor" as "evocative of a medieval European ethos of military valor," but she also thinks that Rusian honor was characterized by "greater religiosity and less personal heroism."[667]

In fact, Western medievalists have traditionally traced the origins of chivalry to the ecclesiastical influence on the nobility, and they have recognized importance of the religious aspect for chivalric honor. Recent scholarship tends to pay more attention to the role of the lay military traditions in the development of chivalry, but these traditions are viewed as complementing, rather than excluding, religious ideas.[668] Western chivalry was a product of a complex interplay between religious and secular ideas; these ideas were often contradictory and, therefore, they never blended completely. A degree of tension between the secular and religious components of the ideology that guided the behavior of the aristocracy existed throughout the medieval period.

The chivalric concept of honor was also affected by this tension. The difference between secular and religious understandings of honor is not unique to Rus, as Stefanovich seems to believe, but is well-attested in the medieval West as well. J. G. Peristany and Julian Pitt-Rivers describe "the dual nature of the notion of honor"

---

[666]Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti," 64, 86.

[667]Kollmann, "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus'?" 491.

[668]On the role of the church in the origins of chivalry and courtliness, see Stephen Jaeger, *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939-1210* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); for a review of the literature on chivalry and on the role of secular and religious elements in its development, see Kate McGrath, "The Politics of Chivalry: The Function of Anger and Shame in Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Anglo-Norman Historical Narratives," in Belle S. Tuten and Tracey L. Billado, eds., *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate. 2010), 55-70, at 58-60.

resulting from the difference between the religious and lay noble worldviews: "In keeping with its definition of honor, the Church expected a sentiment of guilt to be aroused by recognition of dishonorable conduct ..., while the nobility tended to defend itself from being put to shame by drawing a sword."[669] By noting this distinction, Peristany and Pitt-Rivers argue against the division of cultures into those based on either "guilt" or "shame." The proponents of this classification contrast the personal internalized feeling of guilt with public external shame. According to Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, every culture combines elements of both, as is exemplified by medieval society where the religious concept of honor based on the internal feeling of guilt coexisted with the lay concept based on external shame. Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers write about the societies of the Mediterranean region, but a similar dualism existed in Rus as well. Thus, the *Primary Chronicle* compares the murderers of St. Boris with demons and comments,

> demons (*besy*) always trick man to do evil (*na zloe vsegda loviat*), envying him because they see that man is honored by God (*vidiat cheloveka Bogom pocheshchena*; variant reading: *pochtena*) ... An evil man, eager to do evil (*tshchiasia na zloe*), is worse than a demon, because the demons [at least] fear God, but an evil man neither fears God nor is ashamed before men (*ni chelovek sia stydit*).[670]

Apparently, a good man abstains from evil deeds for two reasons: because of his fear of God, a religious sentiment connected with the notion of inner guilt, and also because he wants to avoid shame, the external and secular character of which is stressed by the reference to "men" before whom it is proper to be ashamed.

This passage also contains a rather unusual statement that man is honored by God, while normally Slavic medieval texts express the idea that man ought to honor God.[671] The English translators of the *Primary Chronicle* apparently were

---

[669]J. G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers, Introduction to J. G. Peristiany and Julian Pitt-Rivers, eds., *Honor and Grace in Anthropology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 7; see also ibid., 4, 6-8.

[670]PSRL 1, 135.

[671]See Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti," 66-7.

uncomfortable about this statement because they rendered it as "devils ... hate man, since they behold him honored of God," as if "God" had been in the genitive case, while in the original "God" is in the instrumental (*Bogom*).[672] Stefanovich does not discuss this passage in his otherwise thorough review of the uses of "honor" in religious contexts; to my knowledge, no other scholar has analyzed this passage either. The chronicler seems to offer an interesting "psychological" explanation for the behavior of demons: men are "honored by God," that is to say, they are higher in the eyes of God than demons, and the latter want to bring men down out of envy so that men will be at the same level as demons. It is to achieve this goal that demons teach men to do evil.

This little digression on the peculiar usage of "to honor" (*poshestiti, pochtiti*) in the passage about Boris's murderers illustrates the complicated and multifaceted nature of honor in Rus (as, indeed, it is in any culture),[673] and it also shows how understudied Rusian honor is. I am not going to discuss further the religious aspects of *chest'*, but will rather concentrate on the notions of honor and shame in the secular contexts analyzed by Stefanovich. The concept of honor that he has found in Rusian sources is known in Anglophone scholarly literature as "outer" or "external" honor, with "inner" or "internal" honor being what Stefanovich describes as the "modern understanding of honor."[674] The "outer" or "external" understanding prevailed in medieval Western Europe; scholars think that the concept of honor as inner virtue emerged no earlier than the Renaissance, and thus it has nothing to do with any "knightly" or "feudal" values.[675] In fact, Frank Stewart's definition of honor (*êre*) in

---

[672]Samuel Hazzard Cross and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, eds. and translators, *The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian Text* (Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1953), 128.

[673]See Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, *Honor and Grace*, 4.

[674]Frank Hendersen Stewart, *Honor* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 11-12.

[675]Stewart, *Honor*, 11, 16, 40-41; Peristiany and Pitt-Rivers, *Honor and Grace*, 4; Pieter Spierenburg, "Masculinity, Violence, and Honor: An introduction," in Pieter Spierenburg, ed., *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America*

high medieval German texts and Stefanovich's definition of Rusian *chest'* are almost identical: *êre* meant "something like reputation, prestige, renown, standing, or worth in the eyes of others."[676]

Rusian honor also included signs of respect, such as gift-giving or a big entourage.[677] This meaning is present in the Western sources as well. Thietmar of Merseburg refers to various persons being "honored by gifts" in passing,[678] but when writing about a noble youth who honored his family with his good character and "celebrated deeds," he provides an explanation: "as we read: 'misdeeds dishonor good birth'."[679] Thietmar obviously expected his readers to be well familiar with the connection between honor and gifts, but he felt that they might need an explanation for the connection between honor and good character. The explanation, moreover, is taken from Horace,[680] indicating that this concept of honor belonged not to Ottonian society, but rather to classical antiquity. This passage about the noble youth is one of only two references by Thietmar to honor that is defined by inner virtue. The other one is about a woman who endured malicious slander while preserving "her innate honor."[681] These passages suggest that the notion of "internal" honor might be not as entirely unfamiliar to pre-Renaissance Europe as the scholars cited above believe, but it is also easy to see that in Thietmar's world "internal" understanding of honor was an exception rather than the rule. Normally, Thietmar's honor is connected with military victories, social status, gifts, entourages, and splendid banquets.[682] Thus, both Rusian and pre-modern Western honor was predominantly "external."

(Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1998), 5-7.

[676]Stewart, *Honor*, 34.

[677]Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti," 86-7.

[678]David Warner, ed., *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2001), 79, 184, 234, 291, 345.

[679]Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 179.

[680]Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 179, note 114.

[681]Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 120.

[682]In addition to the passages cited in note 678, see Warner, *Ottonian Germany*, 70, 150, 179, 182, 216.

However, noting this basic similarity is not sufficient for a meaningful comparative analysis: "external" honor is a very broad notion, and its manifestations vary from society to society. For example, Kollmann, while seeing many similarities between the concepts of honor in early modern Western Europe and Russia, also describes some important practices that were unique to Russia. First of all, there was *mestnichestvo*, the precedence system of status ranking among the members of the landed elite based on genealogy and record of government service. This system was central for the sense of honor of elite Muscovites, but it had no parallels in either contemporary Western Europe or Rus.[683] On the other hand, the early modern European practice of dueling was unknown in Muscovy. Thus, even though "Russia was part of pan-European culture in which reputation and status, codified as personal honor, were basic building blocks of community and identity," some important manifestations of elite honor set Russia apart from the West.[684]

The task of this chapter is to see whether the same was true for Rus and contemporary Western Europe. We will look at the discourse of lay male honor in Rusian literary sources in order to find out to what social group(s) they ascribed honor, what an individual had to do to maintain and enhance his reputation and status and, conversely, what were the causes for shame and dishonor. We will then compare the results of our investigation with the findings of Western medievalists.

5.1   Honor in Monomakh's *Instruction*

There is more than one aspect to honor in any society. Probably, the least common facet of Rusian elite honor is expressed in Monomakh's advice to his sons,

> Do not forget what good things you know, and learn what you do not know, like
> my father [Prince Vsevolod], who staying at home [in his own country], knew five

---

[683]Kollmann, *By Honor Bound*, 1, 3, 10, 131-67.
[684]Kollmann, *By Honor Bound*, 4.

languages. For this brings honor from [people of] other lands (*v tom bo chest' est' of inekh zemel'*).[685]

Monomakh connects honor with the level of education (as is indicated by the reference to Vsevolod's "staying at home," that is, learning languages deliberately, not merely picking them up while traveling abroad). Such a connection is highly unusual for a Rusian secular text. Another feature of Monomakh's *Instruction* is, by contrast, rather typical. This feature is a contradictory attitude to "honor and glory" in the sense of worldly reputation. On the one hand, Monomakh wants his sons to follow the precept of St. Basil who taught "to disregard what brings honor from all (*ni v kuiu zhe imeti ezhe oto vsekh chest'*)."[686] This religious understanding of worldly honor as something worthless contradicts the passage about the foreign languages, where "honor from other lands" is presented as worth attaining; it also contradicts another passage where Monomakh advises his sons to care about their reputation:

> Above all (*bole*), honor a guest from wherever he may come to you, whether common, or noble (*ili prost ili dobr*), or an envoy. If you are not able to honor him with a gift, then [do so at least] with food and drink, for they, while traveling, spread either good or bad fame about you (*proslaviat' cheloveka po vsem zemliam liubo dobrym liubo zlym*) in all lands.[687]

What I have translated as "spread fame" is expressed by the verb with the root *slav*-from *slava. Slava* signifies "glory," but it also has the meaning of "honor," as well as "repute," "opinion," "talk," and "rumor," and thus it is close to the semantic field of the Latin *fama*. The meaning of *slava* as "repute" or "talk" must have been primary: if somebody had a good reputation, if people talked about him, this meant that he attained glory. Thus, Monomakh gives his sons recommendations on how to achieve this kind of glory "in all lands" after teaching them to despise "what brings honor from all."[688] His *Instruction* reflects a tension between religious and secular

---

[685]PSRL 1, 246.

[686]PSRL 1, 243.

[687]PSRL 1, 246.

[688]On honor in the texts by Monomakh, see also Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti," 74.

understandings of honor typical of medieval culture in both Rus and the West.

5.2   Honor and Combat

In the secular Rusian texts, honor is most frequently mentioned in connection with military victories: princes normally return from victorious battles "with great honor" or "with great honor and glory."[689] In this respect, they are no different from Fantosme's Henry II to whom the victory at Alnwick brought "grant honur."[690] In general, success on the battlefield was one of the most conspicuous aspects of honor for secular upper-class males in both Rus and the West.[691]

The role of military victory for generating honor can be best seen in a paradoxical, from a modern perspective, explanation of the crusaders' motives for sacking Constantinople in the account of the Fourth Crusade found in the *First Novgorodian Chronicle*. According to this account, the German emperor and the Pope commanded the crusaders

> not to make war on Constantinople, 'but since Isaac's son [Alexius Angelus] says, "All the people of Constantinople want me as their emperor (*ves grad Kostiantin khotiat moego tsarstva*)," therefore, having placed him on the throne, go to Jerusalem to render assistance. If the people do not accept (*voskhotiat*) him, bring him back to me, but do not do any harm to the Greek Land.'[692]

After Alexius Angelus and the crusaders plundered the city and its vicinities, Alexius was deposed; the crusaders then told the new emperor, Alexius Doukas Mourtzouphlos, "Give us Isaac's son [Alexius Angelus], and we will go [with him] to the German emperor who has sent us [on the crusade]." When they learned that Alexius Angelus

---

[689]E.g. PSRL 1, 376, 469; PSRL 2, 312, 327, 441, 454.

[690]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 144-9.

[691]For the West, see White, "Politics of Anger," 142-3; Stewart, *Honor*, 35.

[692]*N1L*, 46. "Bring him back to me" – to the German emperor Philip, who is presented as giving instructions to the crusaders on behalf of himself and the Pope, after he consulted with the Pope.

was dead,

> the Franks became sad on account of their disobedience (*pechalny byvshe za pres-lushanie svoe*), for they did so much harm to Constantinople, and this was contrary to what the German emperor and the Pope had commanded them. And they all said to one another, 'If we cannot have Isaac's son with whom we came here, let us better die at Constantinople than leave with shame.' And after that they started the siege of the city.[693]

Thus, the Franks are sad and ashamed because they did harm to Constantinople. To remedy the situation, they decide to do *more* harm. What is the logic here? Why would the Franks be shamed if they simply left, but not if they sacked the city first? How would sacking Constantinople help get rid of the shame of the Alexius affair? The only possible explanation is that a military victory, regardless of the circumstances, brought honor and glory to the victors and thus "canceled" any shame that they might have suffered before. In another version of the same account, the Franks do not want to "leave with fear and shame."[694] Did the chronicler mean that storming the city would prove the Franks' bravery and thus they would not be shamed anymore? Interestingly, the chronicler refers to the crusaders' greediness as the main motif for the plundering that they did with Alexius's consent: "The Franks loved the gold and silver that Isaac's son had promised to them, and they forgot the instructions of the [German] Emperor and the Pope."[695] However, the main motive for attacking the city after Alexius's deposition and murder is not love of gold and silver, but the desire not to "leave with shame": safe plundering is associated with greed, but fighting – even if followed by looting – is always about honor.

Correspondingly, military defeat was the leading cause of shame. The most well-known example of chivalrous military honor is, of course, Roland's refusal to sound his horn and to call for assistance against the overwhelming numbers of the

---

[693] *N1L*, 48-9.
[694] PSRL 25, 102.
[695] *N1L*, 46.

enemy.[696] He would "rather die than suffer disgrace"; his men likewise express their readiness to die alongside their lord, but not to flee (82.1047-8; 86.1091).[697] As we remember, Sviatoslav and his men in a similar situation expressed exactly the same sentiment: advancing against the overwhelming strength of the enemy and dying in battle was the only alternative to disgrace for "the dead are not disgraced, but we shall be disgraced if we flee."[698]

Fleeing from the enemy was the worst disgrace, but surviving any defeat was shameful regardless of the circumstances. Thus, in Chrétien de Troyes's romance *Yvain* (*The Knight with the Lion*), Calogrenant is disgraced by suffering defeat from a physically stronger and better equipped knight on a better horse:

> I was smaller than he, and his horse was better than mine. I am telling you the truth ... to explain the cause of my shame (*ma honte*). I dealt him the mightiest blow that I could ... and my lance shattered to pieces. But his remained unbroken, since it was not light at all ... I'd never seen a thicker one. And the knight struck me such a blow that it knocked me over ... flat upon the ground; he left me shamed and defeated (*honteus et mat*) there ... and I returned [from this combat] in shame (*honteuseman*).[699]

Calogrenant did not retreat even when he saw the stronger physique and better horse and lance of his adversary; he fought as best he could without any trickery or cowardice, but his defeat was still shameful simply because it was a defeat. In Rusian chronicles, the defeated princes also "receive shame" or return from the battle "with great shame."[700]

The nature of this shame is illustrated in the story about the bravery of the young prince Andrei, the future Bogoliubskii. Once, while he was participating in his

---

[696]Brault, *The Song of Roland*, 66-70.

[697]Brault, *The Song of Roland*, 66, 68.

[698]PSRL 1, 70.

[699]Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain ou Le Chevalier au Lion*, edited by Pierre Kunstmann, available as an electronic text at http://atilf.atilf.fr/gsouvay/dect/download/Yvain.xml, lines 522-58, accessed 06.20.2013; Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian Romances*, ed. and trans. by William W. Kibler (New York: Penguin Books, 1991), 301-2.

[700]E.g., PSRL 1, 426; PSRL 2, 401, 433.

father's campaign, "a terrible panic (*popolokh zol*)" arose in the camp at nighttime

> so that all the [allied] Cumans ran to the rear with their general Zhiroslav. Andrei was in the front part of the camp (*sushchu Andreevi na perede*), and his brother Rostislav was standing right behind him, and he was calling Andrei to come to him, but Andrei did not listen to him and endured that panic. And Andrei's men (*druzhina*), having come to him, complained, 'What are you doing, Prince? Go away, Prince, or else we will receive shame (*azhe li dobudem soroma*).' However, Andrei did not listen to them, but placed all his hope onto God [and] stayed there until dawn. Having seen that all the Cumans had fled before dawn, Andrei gave praise to God who strengthened him, and he rode to his brother and to the Cuman princes. When they all came together, they, having discussed the matter (*sdumavshim*), retreated and stood near [the town of] Dubno, [where they] waited for help from their father, because they received the news that [he] was coming.[701]

The chronicler does not explain what caused the panic, but the context suggests that the men in the camp thought that there was a surprise attack on them which they would not be able to withstand. Apparently, this turned out to be a false alarm. This passage shows that there were unwritten, yet rather precise, rules regarding the circumstances which made a retreat shameful. Thus, Andrei's men insist that they should retreat in order to avoid shame. Presumably, they could retreat honorably before they were engaged with the enemy, but once the battle started, they had to stand their ground or suffer disgrace. Andrei's men apparently had to stay with their lord in the front while everyone else left, and they worried that they would be defeated and thus would "receive shame." In contrast to them, those who retreated before they even saw the enemy would not suffer any shame because technically they would not be defeated in battle. Similarly, Andrei, Rostislav and the Cumans could retreat to Dubno without any disgrace because they were not facing any enemies when they did so. The chronicler stresses that Andrei joined the others only at dawn when, presumably, it became clear that the alarm was false and that there were no enemies in sight. The same idea is probably reflected in the tale about the heroism of Sviatoslav who told his men that they "already" or "at this point" (*uzhe*) had no

---

[701]PSRL 2, 389.

choice but to fight. This occurred when "Sviatoslav advanced against the Greeks, and the Greeks went out to fight against the Rusians."[702] It was only then that the Rusians saw that they were outnumbered one to ten. Sviatoslav's *uzhe* seems to indicate that they could have retreated without shame had they known about the Greek numbers before they went out to battle.

The same unwritten rules are present in the *Song of Roland*. There is a shady area of under what circumstances a knight can call for help without being disgraced, but there is no ambiguity about a retreat: Roland and Oliver disagree about sounding the horn and calling Charlemagne for help, but both of them would "rather die than avoid battle after they are on horseback and are armed. (87.1095-6)"[703] Apparently, being armed and on horseback meant that the knight has already started the battle, and after that point there was no turning back. In the words of Prince Igor, the leader of the unfortunate anti-Cuman campaign of 1185, "If we go back without fighting, the shame will be worse than death."[704] Thus, the French and Rusian military narratives display a virtually identical understanding of what constitutes honorable behavior on the battlefield.

5.3   Honor, Vengeance, and Social Status

Of course, in real life, not everyone was a Roland or Sviatoslav. Most, if not all, nobles suffered the shame of defeat more than once. However, the stain on their honor did not have to last permanently: there were ways to restore one's honor after a defeat and to "put shame off oneself," in the words of the Rusian chronicles. This is how Iurii Dolgorukii explained what he was going to do about the shame inflicted on him by Iziaslav Mstislavich:

---

[702]PSRL 1, 70.
[703]Brault, *The Song of Roland*, 70.
[704]PSRL 2, 639.

> Iziaslav, having advanced against me, devastated and burned my *volost*, and on top of this he drove my son away from the Rus Land[705] and did not give a *volost* to him, and he put shame on me. So, I will either put shame off me and avenge my land, I will win (literally "will find": *nalezu*) my honor, or else I will lay down my head [*golovu svoiu slozhiu*].[706]

Thus, to get rid of the shame resulting from his land being devastated, Iurii had to take revenge on the perpetrator, which he did by defeating Iziaslav and driving him out of Kiev.[707] Similarly, the French tenth-century historian Richer, who, according to Barthélemy, was "very aware of the values of vengeance and honor," uses expressions such as "to erase one's shame" and "to clean up the insult." Barthélemy examines Richer's account of the emperor Otto III "erasing the shame," that he suffered when Aix-la-Chapelle was raided by King Lothar. Otto's shame was erased by "a German pillaging expedition" into Francia.[708] A shamed noble acted similarly, albeit on a smaller scale.

In fact, this situation was so common that White included it among the "political scripts" most often found in the eleventh- and twelfth-century French and Anglo-Norman political narratives. White coined the term "script" to describe "a relatively stable, enduring discourse of disputing, feuding, and political competition." According to White, the "competition for honor" plays the central part in this discourse, while the emotions displayed by the players "are often signs of a disputant's honor or shame."[709] White's "scripts" have remarkable similarities with the patterns of princely behavior found in the Rusian chronicles. Thus, "when a noble is successful in the competition for honor, he should have joy and show it." However,

---

[705]The Rus Land here means the area on the Middle Dnieper with its center in Kiev.

[706]PSRL 2, 375-6.

[707]PSRL 2, 380-83.

[708]Dominique Barthélemy, "Feudal War in Tenth-Century France," in Hyams and Throop, *Vengeance in the Middle Ages*, 105-13, at 111, 112.

[709]White, "Politics of Anger," 142. On the role of emotions in narratives of disputes and feuding, see also Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 160; Roche, "The Way Vengeance Comes," 125, 127.

when nobles lose honor by losing land, friends, or battles, by enduring damage or loss, by suffering insults and injuries that they have yet to avenge, their joy should turn to shame, which they display as grief or anger ... The people shamed and angered should then unleash their anger at the enemies who shamed them and for whom they display hatred and loathing. The anger is expressed in different ways and in varying degrees of intensity. In eleventh-century Western France, the anger of lay litigants against their enemies takes such forms as plundering livestock, verbal abuse, assaulting peasants, destroying mills and other aggressive acts.[710]

We will look at the Rusian ways to celebrate success in the "competition for honor" later. For now, let us notice that the reasons for "losing honor," the ways to restore it, and the emotional expressions associated with such a loss in the Rusian chronicles are the same as in the texts examined by White. In the French narratives, anger was so closely associated with avenging oneself militarily that the expression "anger arose" could be used to signify that a war between two nobles broke out.[711] Similarly, the chronicle account of a conflict between the Monomakhovichi senior Iaropolk and the Olgovichi reports that "there was a great dispute (*pria*) and anger (*zloba*) between them." Consequently, the angry Olgovichi assaulted the population and plundered livestock in the Monomakhovichi territory.[712] This was a common way for princes to avenge a perceived wrong. For example, the *Kievan* entry for 1196 reports that Roman Mstislavich, believing that his senior Riurik had wronged him, broke a treaty with Riurik and launched a raid into his *volost*. In response to this act, Riurik sent his junior princes against Roman. They "went and ravaged [*povoevasha*] Roman's *volost* and burned it near Kamenets, and thus, having captured prisoners and livestock and having avenged themselves, they returned home."[713]

In addition to similarity with White's "scripts," the Rusian accounts of inter-princely conflicts display features similar to those described by Hyams in his study of

---

[710]White, "Politics of Anger," 142-3, 143-4.
[711]White, "Politics of Anger," 144.
[712]PSRL 2, 296-7.
[713]PSRL 2, 698; see also ibid., 702.

the English medieval feud. In the English sources, "emotions both fuel the response and help to determine its quantum and nature," according to Hyams. The question of quantum and nature is very important: to be "legitimate and honorable," the response to a perceived wrong "is open to public view," while "the level of response is constrained by a notion of rough equivalence, requiring the keeping of a 'score'."[714] One of the best examples of a similar attitude in the Rusian sources is an episode in the struggle between Iurii Dolgorukii and Iziaslav Mstislavich recorded in the *Kievan* entry for 1152. When Iziaslav burnt Iurii's fortress of Gorodets, Iurii "sighed from his heart and began to gather soldiers."[715] Thus, first of all, Iurii displays his grief by sighing, and the chronicler finds it important to record this sighing. Then, he gathers soldiers and declares his intention to make a legitimate and adequate response to Iziaslav's act. To stress the strictly reciprocal nature of his vengeance, Iurii is reported as using a very expressive and hard to translate construction: "If they have burned my Gorodets ... I *sia otozhgu protivu* that."[716] The unusual phrase *otozhgu sia*, which, to my knowledge, is not recorded anywhere else, is formed by adding the prefix *oto-* and the reflexive particle *sia* to the first person singular form of the verb "to burn" in the future. *Oto-* expresses reciprocity. Normally, this prefix is not used with "to burn," but it is common with the words signifying actions such as "to pay," "to give," "to take" and the like. With *oto-* attached to them, they receive the meanings of "to pay back," "to give back" and so on. Thus, Iurii is presented as employing an unusual word, possibly coined specially for the occasion, which literally means "I will burn back." *Sia-* means "self," and when used with verbs, it makes them reflexive. Because Iurii clearly does not mean that he is going to burn himself, this reflexive particle appears to equate Iurii's intended burning with vengeance: "I will burn myself back" in the sense "I will avenge myself by burning." Finally, to make the reciprocity crystal clear, he adds the preposition *protivu*, which conveys

---

[714]Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 160.

[715]PSRL 2, 455.

[716]"*Ozhe este moi Gorodets' pozhgli ..., to ia sia tomy otozhgu protivu,*" PSRL 2, 456.

the meaning of exchange, as in a description of the trade with the tribal people of the North: "If someone gives them an iron item, a knife or an ax, they give *protivu* with furs," that is, apparently, they pay its value in furs.[717] Thus, Iurii borrows the language of trade to convey the message of fair exchange of aggressive acts between himself and Iziaslav, and his declaration can be translated as something like, "I will avenge myself by burning in equal measure."

Not all vengeful princes in the chronicles provide such precise justifications for their acts, but what Hyams calls "keeping of a 'score'" is present, in a more or less elaborate form, throughout all the accounts of princely conflicts. This "score" was kept in the same way that Roche has noted in his analysis of Orderic Vitalis: "More than a strict alternation of hits, the process seems to keep the balance of honor."[718] A desire to keep this balance can explain the seemingly irrational action of Prince Vsevolod Olgovich reported in the *Kievan Chronicle* under 1141. When the Novgorodians chose a son of Iurii Dolgorukii over Vsevolod's son as their prince, Vsevolod "got angry on account of that (*pro to razgnevasia*)," and therefore he attacked and captured a fortress belonging to Iurii.[719] Taking Iurii's fortress in no way helped Vsevolod to install his family member in Novgorod; it did no harm to the Novgorodians who made the decision that angered Vsevolod. However, Vsevolod's behavior makes sense from the perspective of keeping the balance of honor. The Novgorodians said to Vsevolod, who was the Olgovichi senior prince: "We want a Monomakhovich (*plemeni Volodimiria*), but neither your son, nor brother, nor anyone from your clan (*plemeni*)"; then they dispatched envoys to Iurii, "and having received [his son] from him, the Novgorodians put him on the throne in Novgorod with great honor."[720] In other words, a prominent member of the rival clan made a great gain in honor at the expense of the Olgovichi. Vsevolod's anger signaled his

---

[717]PSRL 2, 226.
[718]Roche, "The Way Vengeance Comes," 123.
[719]PSRL 2, 308. This was the same Gorodets Osterskii that was later burned by Iziaslav.
[720]PSRL 2, 307-8.

determination to fight for his honor. If he could not make the Novgorodians change their decision, he could, at least, do something to the detriment of Iurii's honor. Thus, taking the fortress served to keep the "score" even in the competition between the two princes and their respective clans.

If a prince was not able to avenge his loss of honor himself, he followed another "script" described by White: "If the shamed, grieving, angry victim needs help from a superior in taking vengeance against his enemies, he should approach him dolefully, tearfully, and deferentially and, in this way, try to make him angry."[721] This is exactly what Rostislav, the son of Iurii Dolgorukii, did after he suffered dishonor from Iziaslav: he "prostrated himself (*udar' pered nim chelom*)" before his father and said, "[Iziaslav] dishonored us, launch a campaign against him (*poidi na n'*)!" Iurii, "having pity for his son's shame," did what Rostislav requested.[722]

If vengeance was an important means to keep the balance of honor, the connection between anger and vengeance may explain the exclusive "right" of princes to be angry, which has been discussed above. According to Freedman, late medieval literary sources do not represent peasants as angry because, for the authors of these texts, peasants did not have honor. A person who did not need to defend his honor and, correspondingly, to avenge his shame, could not be properly angry.[723] In the Rusian narratives of secular politics, honor and shame are associated mostly with princes.

The predominantly princely nature of military honor may explain the difference between the formulaic expressions used to describe battles in the *Novgorodian First* and in other chronicles. The *Novgorodian* pays much less attention to princes than the *Kievan*, *Galician-Volhynian*, and *Laurentian*, which are, to a large extent, based on the chronicles of individual princes. In contrast with them, the *Novgorodian*

---

[721]White, "Politics of Anger," 144.

[722]PSRL 2, 373-4.

[723]Freedman, "Peasant Anger," 171.

focuses on the city community and on church affairs, while the princes are mentioned in passing, on par with other prominent men. Correspondingly, the *Novgorodian* chronicler rarely uses the word "honor," and when he does, he uses it mostly in the context of greeting or inviting some prominent persons "with honor," or giving an "honorable" leave to someone.[724] The *Novgorodian* describes battles as often as any other chronicle does, but it does not ascribe honor to the victors and shame to the defeated. The account of the splendid victory of the Novgorodians over the joint forces of several princes states that those enemies who were not killed or captured "took flight badly (*zle otbegosha*)."[725] It is hard to imagine the *Kievan* chronicler not gloating over the enemies' shame on such an occasion, but the *Novgorodian* mentions neither the shame of the defeated princes nor the honor and glory gained by the Novgorodians. This supports the suggestion that honor was associated, first and foremost, with princely politics, in regards to which the chronicler of the "republican" Novgorod was, to some degree, an outsider.

In other chronicles, a prince's men share his honor in the case of military victory and his shame in the case of defeat.[726] Thus, even if it is not quite fair to state that in the world of the Rusian chroniclers honor belonged to princes only, it was certainly very limited in respect to non-princes. Most importantly, the honor of nonprincely combatants is collective rather than individual: it is always "we" or "they" who are honored or shamed. In the discourse of honor, the chronicles apply "he" or "I" only to princes. A prince may be honored or shamed either as a member of a group, such as an army, or as an individual. However, chronicle characters who are not princes do not suffer individual disgrace. Accounts of humiliations inflicted on non-princes

---

[724]*N1L*, 40, 42, 48, 51.

[725]*N1L*, 33.

[726]See PSRL 1, 324, 327; PSRL 2, 389, 639. The speech of Iziaslav Mstislavich to his men before battle contains probably the most inclusive interpretation of honor in all the chronicle narratives: "God has never held the Rus Land and the sons of Rus in dishonor, but they have won (*vzimali sut'*) their honor in all places," PSRL 2, 448-9.

never present the victims as being shamed.

One such case is found in the *Kievan* account about the conflict between An-
drei Bogoliubskii and the three brothers Rostislavichi in the entry for 1174. We will
discuss this conflict in detail later; for now it suffices to know that Andrei sent to
the Rostislavichi a message that they found insulting and that contained threats.
In response to these threats, the oldest Rostislavich, Mstislav, who "from his youth
was accustomed to be afraid of nobody and to fear God alone, ordered Andrei's
envoy to be taken and his hair and beard to be cut in his presence."[727] The *Rusian
Law* included cutting off a mustache or beard among the articles dealing with what
Kollmann describes as "affronts that appear to be personally humiliating." The per-
petrator had to pay twelve grivnas to the victim whose mustache or beard had been
damaged, the same compensation as for a blow with the flat or hilt of a sword, and
more than for a severed finger, which merited the compensation of only three grivnas.
The article about the sword explains that the high compensation is to be paid for
the *obida* of the victim. *Obida* in the legal context was used in the same meaning as
sorom (shame): both terms connoted assaults on personal dignity.[728] The compen-
sation of twelve grivnas indicates that the cutting of the beard was also perceived
as an *obida*. Thus, Andrei's envoy suffered the act which Rusian law considered to
be personally humiliating. However, the chronicle mentions neither his shame, nor
obida, nor any emotional reaction. It is Andrei's reaction that matters: when he
saw his beardless envoy and heard the Rostislavichi's message, "the image of his face
became pale (*byst obraz litsa ego popusnel*)," he "burned with anger," and he sent
his troops against the Rostislavichi with the order to "capture Mstislav and bring

---

[727]PSRL 2, 573.

[728]Kollmann, "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus?" 482.

him to me."[729]

Thus, the whole story is about Andrei and the Rostislavichi, and Mstislav's treatment of the envoy exemplifies what Hugh Thomas calls "proxy humiliation," that is, humiliation of someone's men and dependents as a means to express hostility against their lord.[730] The unfortunate envoy does not have a personality; the chronicler represents him not as an individual capable of suffering disgrace, but merely as a medium used by the Rostislavichi for sending a symbolic message to Andrei.

The *Kievan* entry for 1152 contains another story about a humiliated envoy. This envoy, by the name of Peter Borislavich, most certainly has a personality. The chronicler gives a detailed and very sympathetic account of not only his acts, but also his thoughts and feelings. Iziaslav Mstislavich of Kiev sent Peter Borislavich to Prince Vladimir of Galich with the task of prompting Vladimir to fulfill his oath sworn after his defeat by Iziaslav and Géza II of Hungary. Vladimir promised to return to Iziaslav certain territories that he had captured before. Because he had a record of breaking his promises, Iziaslav and Géza made Vladimir seal the oath by kissing the Cross of St. Stephen of Hungary, believed to be the True Cross.[731] They were mistaken in thinking that nobody, perfidious Vladimir included, would be able to perjure an oath sworn on such a cross. When Peter Borislavich came to Galich to arrange the transfer of the captured lands back to Iziaslav, Vladimir refused to fulfill his oath point blank and made a disrespectful remark about the cross that he had kissed.[732] A shocked Peter started a speech about the significance of the True

---

[729]PSRL 2, 573-4. According to White, references to a face becoming pale or darkened were common in the French medieval accounts of angry nobles, White, "Politics of Anger," 136. In the Rusian chronicles, the pale face of an angry prince is, to my knowledge, unique to this passage.

[730]Thomas, "Shame, Masculinity, and the Death of Thomas Becket," 1057. Thomas describes "proxy violence" and "proxy humiliation" in the context of disputes between lay nobles and ecclesiastics in twelfth-century England.

[731]PSRL 2, 452.

[732]When Peter reminded Vladimir that he had kissed the cross, the latter answered,

Cross, but Vladimir interrupted him with, "You (plural) have talked about that to your heart's content [when they made him kiss the cross], now get out of here and go to your prince." Peter

> went out, and they gave him neither horses nor travel supplies (*povoz*) [as was customary to give to an envoy]. Thus, Peter rode back on his own horses, and when Peter was leaving the courtyard, Vladimir went to the Church of Our Savior to Vespers, and when he was on the gallery leading to the church, he saw Peter leaving, and he derided him, saying, 'The man of Rus[733] is going, having taken all the *volosts*!' ... After vespers, Vladimir was walking from the church, and as he was at the same place, on the same step, where he had derided Peter, he said, 'Did somebody strike my shoulder?' - and he could not move at all from that place and almost fell down ... [he] became very ill, and thus Vladimir, Prince of Galich, passed away. ... And [while Peter was on his way back], a retainer (*detskii*) galloped to Peter from Galich and said, 'My prince tells you, 'Do not go any further, but wait here until I call for you.' Peter did not know that [Vladimir] had died, and the retainer did not tell him. Because of that, Peter was very sad that he had to go back, and he expected to be tortured even more (*priiati muku pushche togo*).[734]

Not only does the chronicler use a very strong word, *muka* (pain, torture, torment) to describe Peter's moral suffering, but he also hints that God himself avenged Vladimir's treatment of Peter. Of course, Vladimir's blasphemy and perjury were the main targets of the divine vengeance, but the place where the fateful striking on the shoulder occurred indicates that mocking Peter was a significant aspect of Vladimir's crimes. The quoted passage refers to "that place" twice; later, when Vladimir's men tell Peter about his death, they again explain that "somebody touched him on the shoulder, and after that he started to feel ill."[735] Such a framing of the divine punishment of Vladimir gives a great significance to Peter's humiliation at Vladimir's hands. The chronicler pays attention to Peter's emotions, describing his sadness when he expected "more torture," and his bewilderment when he, not knowing about Vladimir's

---

"Was not it this little *krestets* (*ne sei li krestets malyi*)?" *Krest* means "cross," and -*ets* is a diminutive suffix. An approximate English equivalent would be something like, "this little cross thingy." PSRL 2, 462.

[733]Rus here is used in the narrow sense of the middle Dnieper area.

[734]PSRL 2, 462-3.

[735]PSRL 2, 464.

death yet, saw that his son was crying and his men were wearing black garments.[736] Nonetheless, the chronicler does not describe Peter as being shamed or dishonored by his treatment in Galich, which supports once again the suggestion that, for the chroniclers, individual dishonor was the "privilege" of princes.

5.4   *Obida*, Dishonor, and a "Notion of Undifferentiated Wrong"

Correspondingly, princes are the only ones who suffer *obida* in the chronicles. This polysemic word plays a very important role in the accounts of princely politics. Its basic meaning is "offense"; "to be in *obida*" is to be offended, and the verb *obideti* means to "commit an offense." However, in different contexts, *obida* takes a variety of other meanings, which are not always easy to capture. Overall, it appears to be an East Slavonic equivalent of the Latin term *offensio* as described by Althoff: "After analyzing a great many cases, we can ... say that *honor* and *offensio* represent opposite concepts, but the subtleties of these terms are still lost to us."[737] Similarly, Kollmann has noted that *obida* is often contrasted with honor.[738] Correspondingly, it serves as a parallel to "shame" or "dishonor." For example, Viacheslav thus characterized the actions of the junior Monomakhovichi who had deprived him of the Kievan throne to which he had the right as the most senior prince: "You committed a grave *obida* against me (*pereobidela*) ... and put dishonor on me." Viacheslav then claimed that he did not fight for his right (*togo vsego ne pravil*) because of his love of peace.[739] Thus, *obida* here is paired with dishonor, on the one hand; and it refers

---

[736]Ibid.

[737]Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 9-10.

[738]Kollmann, "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus?" 482.

[739]PSRL 2, 429-30. The prefix *pere-* attached to verbs other than verbs of motion serves to intensify their meaning; it functions as an equivalent of "very much." Thus, if *obidela* is

to a violation of one's right, on the other. The verb used by Viacheslav to convey the idea of fighting for his right has the same root, *prav-*, as "justice," *pravda*, and it is very close to the verb signifying rendering justice, *opravlivati*. Indeed, in addition to being an opposite of honor, *obida* is also often contrasted with justice.[740]

The message of Riurik Rostislavich to the head of the Monomakhovochi, Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo [the "Big Nest"] of Suzdalia, reported in the *Kievan Chronicle* under 1196, exemplifies the usage of *obida* as a concept opposite to both justice and honor. Vsevolod was conducting negotiations with the Olgovichi on behalf of all the clan of the Monomakhovichi. In the meantime, the Olgovichi made an agreement with the leader of the southern Monomakhovichi, Riurik Rostislavich, not to start any hostilities before the end of their talks with Vsevolod. The agreement was sealed by kissing the Cross. Therefore, "Riurik, trusting the oath on the Cross, gave leave to his brethren and to his men (*rospustiv brat'iu svoiu i druzhinu svoiu*)." However, the senior Olgovich, Iaroslav Vsevolodich, "broke his cross-kissing" and made a surprise attack on the southern Monomakhovichi. In the ensuing battle, Riurik's nephew Mstislav was taken prisoner.[741] Riurik informed Vsevolod about the Olgovichi's treacherous attack and urged him to come with his troops without delay "so that we may join our forces at some place and avenge our shame and our *obida*, and free our nephew, and win justice for ourselves (*pravdu svoiu nalezle*)."[742] In this account, *obida* goes together with shame, and thus it appears to signify "disgrace" or "dishonor." On the other hand, avenging shame and *obida* is connected with justice (*pravda*), and this gives *obida* the meaning of "wrong." Fredric Cheyette describes a similar connection between the notions of wrong and dishonor in medieval French literature: "In the *chansons de geste*, when a character had been wronged, what

---

"committed an *obida*," *pereobidela* means the same action but in a greater degree; therefore, I have translated it as "committed a grave *obida*."

[740]See Kollmann, "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus?" 482.

[741]PSRL 2, 689-92.

[742]PSRL 2, 694-5; cf. PSRL 2, 429.

sentiment did the poet put on his lips? *Honte*, shame."[743] Another example, where *obida* seems to signify both dishonor and wrong, is the message of Iziaslav Mstislavich to Iurii Dolgorukii and Viacheslav in the entry for 1150. Iziaslav accused Iurii and Viacheslav of not fulfilling the terms of their peace treaty, and he threatened to break the peace using the argument, "I cannot be in *obida*." When he did break the peace, he justified this by repeating the reference to the *obida* that he had suffered.[744]

In the contexts where *obida* is connected with the notion of justice or where it is used to justify the actions of someone who perceives himself as being wronged, this word describes a concept very similar to "an undifferentiated notion of wrong," which, according to Hyams, existed in England before the Angevin law reforms, and even for some time after them.[745] The English practice of conflict and dispute resolution coalesced around this "core underlying notion" of wrong which lacked the modern distinction between public and private:

> Men pleaded conflicts of all sorts, from property claims to personal grudges to external wars and Crusades, very largely in terms of licit redress (vengeance, if you prefer) for the wrongs that the other side committed against them as individuals, and through them against the social group of which they were members.[746]

We have seen that the conflicts between Rusian princes were likewise centered on "licit redress" for *obidas* which included damage done to one's *volosts*, depriving the senior prince of his right to Kiev, and violations of treaties. Some of these cases concerned individual princes, others were perceived as wrongs committed through a prince against a larger social group. Such a group might be a princely clan, a community of a *gorod* or a land, or prince's men. For example, the *obida* of which Iziaslav Mstislavich complained in the *Kievan* entry for 1150 was committed against

---

[743]Fredric L. Cheyette, "Suum cuique tribuere," *French Historical Studies* 6 (1976): 287-99, at 294.

[744]PSRL 2, 393-5.

[745]Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 157; idem, *Rancor and Reconciliation in Medieval England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), 111-241.

[746]Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 157, 158.

both him and his men. Iziaslav's peace treaty with Iurii Dolgorukii included the provision to return to the owners the property captured in the course of their conflict. Therefore, he

> sent his men (*muzhi*) and his stewards to take back his property and his cattle, which he had lost, and some of his men went there themselves for the sake of their property, and others sent their stewards. Thus they came to Iurii and started to identify their property, but Iurii did not return anything to them, and Iziaslav's men came back to Iziaslav having recovered nothing of what was theirs.[747]

The narrative emphasizes the loss of Iziaslav's men more than that of Iziaslav himself; nonetheless, Iziaslav declares, "*I* cannot be in *obida*." Thus, the wrongs committed against a prince and his men are not differentiated.

Another account describes a case when a prince wants to avenge an *obida* committed before he was even born, and not against him, but against the Novgorod Land. Mstislav Rostislavich, invited by the Novgorodians to be their prince, decided to go against Vseslav of Polotsk, because Vseslav's grandfather had waged a campaign against Novgorod, in the course of which he took some church vessels and conquered one rural district (*pogost*). According to the chronicler, "Mstislav wanted to restore justice in regards to the Novgorodian *volost* and *obida* (*vse to opraviti Novgorodskuiu volost i obidu*)."[748] Restoration of justice in this case apparently meant conquering back the district which Vseslav's grandfather had attached to the Polotsk Principality. To this end, Mstislav gathered troops and advanced on Polotsk, but when he was on his way, his older brother Roman sent a message telling him not to attack Vseslav because "there has been no *obida* to you on his part (*obidy ti do nego netuti*)." Mstislav then canceled his expedition, but not because he agreed that there was no *obida* that would have justified the war on Vseslav, but rather because he "did not want to upset (*verediti serdtsa*) his older brother."[749] Here, we see again

---

[747]PSRL 2, 393-4.
[748]PSRL 2, 608.
[749]PSRL 2, 609.

the nature of *obida* as an undifferentiated wrong: there is no distinction between Mstislav as a private individual and Mstislav as a Novgorodian prince, between his personal feelings and the wrongs supposedly committed against the Novgorodians.

This account also shows that a military response was a common way to deal with a princely *obida*: according to Roman, Mstislav should not begin a war because there is no real *obida*. Presumably, Roman would not have objected to the expedition against Polotsk if he had believed that Mstislav had suffered an *obida* from the Polotsk prince.

However, not every *obida* necessarily led to a military conflict, and, more importantly, most conflicts did not lead to a complete destruction of one party and to an absolute triumph of the other. Compromise and peace-making existed side-by side with violent vengeance.

5.5 Honor and Peace-Making

Vladimir Monomakh, in the autobiographical part of his *Instruction*, presented the alternatives available to a prince involved in a conflict. He gave an account of the actions of which he apparently felt particularly proud, for his sons to emulate. The account includes descriptions of Monomakh's acts of swift and violent vengeance, such as his account of how

> Vseslav [of Polotsk] burned some of Smolensk (*ozhzhe*), and I rode there together with the men of Chernigov with a spare horse each, but we did not catch him in Smolensk. In this pursuit of Vseslav, I burned the countryside [of the Polotsk Land] and ravaged (*povoevav*) as far as Lukoml and Logozhsk, then I attacked Driutsk, and returned to Chernigov.[750]

The conflict between Monomakh and Vseslav, and the attitude displayed by Monomakh on this occasion, fit Barthélemy's description of the conflicts between the

---

[750]PSRL 1, 248.

French nobles, who "took vengeance indirectly by pillaging the peasants of other lords." Barthélemy quotes a tenth-century description of two warring nobles pillaging each other's peasants: "they plundered *each other* (emphasis original)."

> By failing to even mention violence done to peasants, this type of verbal formula euphemized indirect vengeance and constituted the creation of downright symbolic violence that was at the heart of feudal war ... The discourse with which [noble men] regulated themselves (and their conflicts) ... was also the discourse with which they legitimized noble violence and failed to recognize peasant suffering.[751]

This is what we see in the passage from the *Instruction* quoted above. Vseslav burns the town of Smolensk in Monomakh's land, Monomakh responds by ravaging the countryside and attacking the town of Driutsk in Vseslav's land: all these actions are going on between the two princes, while the suffering of those who inhabited the burnt and ravaged places does not count.

However, the same text contains an example of a very different approach:

> Oleg, supported by the [whole] Cuman Land, attacked me in Chernigov. My troops (*druzhina*) fought with him for eight days by the small rampart and did not let them inside the outworks. I took pity on the souls of the Christians, and upon the burning villages and monasteries, and I said, 'May the pagans not glorify themselves!' And I gave to [Oleg] his father's princely seat [in Chernigov], and left for the place where my father had been a prince (*vdakh bratu otsa svoego mesto a sam idokh na otsa svoego mesto*).[752]

From the way Monomakh presents his conflicts with Vseslav and Oleg, both courses of action appear equally honorable: Monomakh acquitted himself well when he burned Vseslav's land, and he also did the right thing when he stopped defending the city, which was the bone of contention, and gave it over to Oleg. He does not explain why he took pity on the Christian souls in one case, but not in the other. The participation of the Cumans in the second conflict cannot account for the difference: Monomakh supposedly did not want Oleg's Cumans to glorify themselves in killing and capturing Christians, but he himself used Cuman allies in his wars with other Rusian princes,

---

[751]Barthélemy, "Feudal War in Tenth-Century France," 105, 109.
[752]PSRL 1, 249.

as he records in his *Instruction*.[753] A possible argument for pursuing the conflict with Vseslav, but not with Oleg, may have been Vseslav's blatant aggression as opposed to the legitimacy of Oleg's claim to "his father's" Chernigov - although this still does not explain why Monomakh had been fighting for eight days before he recognized Oleg's hereditary right. On balance, the legitimacy of Oleg's claim probably was one of the factors that compelled Monomakh to stop the war. There must have been other reasons about which he is silent.

A similar, only more elaborate, justification for making peace on the opponents' conditions is described in the *Kievan* and *Laurentian* under 1137. The Olgovichi made war on the Monomakhovichi senior and the Kievan prince Iaropolk after the latter granted to his younger brother a territory which the Olgovichi considered rightly theirs. While attacking the population in the Monomakhovichi's lands, they proclaimed, "All this is your [the Monomakhovichi's] fault, and this blood will be on you" because "you started ruining us first."[754] By assigning guilt for the bloodshed, the Olgovichi implicitly recognized the suffering of the victims of their "indirect vengeance," but they apparently considered this suffering as a kind of collateral damage in a just war and continued to inflict it. In contrast with them,

> Iaropolk had gathered soldiers against them from all the lands,[755] and, having deliberated in his heart (*priem rasmotrenie v serdtsi*), did not advance against them, nor did he make bloodshed, but, fearing God's judgment, made himself the least among them [*stvorisia m'nii v nikh*], receiving abuse [*khulu*] and reproach from his brethren and from all, according to what is said, 'Love your enemies.' And he made peace with them on January 12, and they kissed the Cross between themselves, while the venerable Metropolitan Michael walked with the Cross between them, and Iaropolk gave to the Olgovichi their paternal inheritance (*otchinu*), which was what they wanted, and thus the prudent [*blagoumnyi*] prince Iaropolk stopped that cruel war [*uteshi bran' tu liutu*].[756]

---

[753]PSRL 1, 247, 248.

[754]PSRL 2, 296-7.

[755]The *Laurentian* account of the same events adds, "and would be able to fight against them." PSRL 1, 304.

[756]PSRL 2, 299-300.

The same two factors are used to explain Monomakh's peace with Oleg and Iaropolk's peace with Oleg's descendants. One reason to stop a war is a Christian sentiment expressed as pity for the conflict's victims in one case and the aversion to bloodshed in the other. The second reason is an implicit recognition of the legitimacy of the opponents' cause based on hereditary right: Vladimir gave to Oleg his father's princely seat, and Iaropolk gave to the Olgovichi their paternal inheritance.

Apparently, Iaropolk's men and "brethren" were not convinced by these arguments. They behaved according to another "script" described by White: "Those who fail to show anger when they have been shamed are open to criticism and are liable to being shamed by their friends and goaded into anger."[757] The *Laurentian* quotes a saying apparently used for such a goading: "A glorious war is better than a shameful peace (*bran' slavna luch'shi est' mira studna*)."[758] However, Iaropolk did not respond to "goading," having a choice between the two alternative "scripts": protecting his honor by fighting in accordance with the traditional warrior ethos or making concessions to achieve peace. Iaropolk's behavior is presented as rather controversial. Thus, the chronicles contain countless accounts about interprincely treaties sealed by kissing of the Cross, but the participating churchmen are almost never mentioned. In this case, the chronicler apparently felt the need to justify the peacefulness of his prince, and he used the authority of the head of the Rusian church for this purpose.

Giving up violent retaliation did not always bring about "abuse and reproach." The same Iaropolk received praise for peacefulness during another conflict of his with the head of the Olgovichi clan, Vsevolod of Chernigov. Vsevolod captured some of the Monomakhovichi's lands; Iaropolk responded by gathering a huge army and advancing on Chernigov against Vsevolod.

When Vsevolod heard that Iaropolk had a lot of soldiers, he was afraid, and the

---

[757]White, "Politics of Anger," 143-4.
[758]PSRL 1, 405.

> people of Chernigov (*liudie Chernigovtsy*) cried to Vsevolod, 'You hope to flee to the Cumans, but you will ruin your *volost*, and will have nowhere to return (*k chemy sia opiat vorotish*). You better abandon your arrogance and ask for peace, for we know that Iaropolk is merciful and that he does not rejoice in bloodshed, but he will want peace for the sake of God, for he takes good care of the Rus Land.' And Vsevolod, having heard that, came to his senses (*vnide v sia*) and began to send to Iaropolk with a supplication asking for peace. Iaropolk, being good (*blag*) and merciful by character, having the fear of God in his heart, just like his father [Vladimir Monomakh], deliberated about all this, did not want to cause bloodshed, and made peace with him ... They made an agreement (*vladivshesia*), kissed the Venerable Cross and returned each to his land.[759]

In this passage, the people of Chernigov display an attitude towards Iaropolk's readiness to make peace, which is a direct opposite to that expressed by "his brethren and all" in the account of his previous conflict with the Olgovichi. The difference may reflect the different social status of those who evaluated Iaropolk's course of action. The latter passage in both the *Kievan* and the *Laurentian* contains an unusual expression, *liudie Chernigovtsy*, instead of simply *Chernigovtsy*, normally used to signify the people of Chernigov.[760] The term *liudie*, literally meaning "people," sometimes, although not always, referred to the general population as opposed to princes and their men.[761] It is possible that by referring to *liudie Chernigovtsy* the chronicler means the non-elite population who must have valued peace more than the warrior elite did. "The people of Chernigov" would, of course, appreciate a peaceful prince all the more in a situation when they were about to suffer from a prince's war.

On the other hand, it would be wrong to assume that the elite attitude to peacemaking and concessions was predominantly negative. Consider an account reported in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* under 1220. Prince Alexander of Belz used lies and slander to incite hostilities between Mstislav the "Lucky (*Udatnyi*)" of Galich,

---

[759]PSRL 2, 301-2. In another redaction, Iaropolk "is merciful and humble (*smiren*)" and "takes good care of the Rus Land by his humility (*sobliudaet Russkuiu* (sic) *zemliu smiren'em svoim*)," PSRL 25, 34.

[760]PSRL 1, 30; but see PSRL 25, 34.

[761]See Lukin, "Veche: Sotsialnyi sostav," 44-64, 74-7.

and his son-in-law Daniel. Later, the slander was exposed, and Mstislav and Daniel reconciled. Since Mstislav had suffered losses in the conflict with Daniel, for which Alexander was responsible, "all the princes" advised Mstislav to avenge his shame by capturing Alexander's *volost* ("*priimi vsiu volost ego za sorom svoi*"). "However, he did not take his *volost* because of brotherly love (*za bratoliubie*), and all praised him for that."[762] Not only does Mstislav refuse to avenge his shame, but he also acts contrary to the advice of "all the princes" – and still they praise his "brotherly love," which, as we remember, was a conventional expression for interprincely peace and cooperation.

Western political narratives display similar ambiguity in respect to the appropriateness of violent versus reconciliatory courses of action. On the one hand, according to Kate McGrath, "ready willingness to grant mercy and make peace" was part of the political discourse: "The way in which ecclesiastical authors scripted the expression of anger allowed, if not required, negotiation, arbitration, and reconciliation."[763] Both ecclesiastical influence and developments within lay aristocratic culture led to the emergence of more humane standards of warfare. On the other hand, these "humane standards still left much room for violence, as the nature of these standards was not always clear or consistent. In addition, these standards often involved, if not required, displays of force and use of violence." McGrath argues that a fuller understanding of chivalric ideology is needed in order to understand "how contemporaries explained violence and how they distinguished between appropriate and inappropriate manifestations of it."[764]

A full understanding will probably never be achieved. Hyams thinks that even in such a well-documented, by medieval standards, society as England historians can recover information on disputes and feuding "only with difficulty from written

---

[762]PSRL 2, 746.

[763]McGrath, "The Politics of Chivalry," 58.

[764]McGrath, "The Politics of Chivalry," 59-60.

materials often quite distant from the acts themselves," and the "true oral discourse" of conflicts remains "way beyond our reach."[765]

Hyams writes about local "micropolitics," an area absolutely out of reach for historians of Rus, but even princely politics are known to us through records which ostensibly reflect only pieces and fragments of their true oral discourse. One aspect of peace-making, which can be glimpsed from the chronicles, is the effort of the princes to avoid the suspicion that they act out of weakness and fear. Reports of reconciliation are typically preceded by references to the military strength of the party that grants mercy and makes concessions. Thus, Monomakh stresses that his men had successfully defended Chernigov for eight days before he decided to concede it to Oleg, but he does not provide similar details about his other battles. Iaropolk's chronicler provides an impressive list of the troops ready to fight against Vsevolod before Iaropolk agreed to the latter's plea for peace:

> Iaropolk joined forces with his brethren, and his nephews joined him, and the troops from Suzdal, Rostov, Polotsk, and Smolensk, and the king of the Hungarians sent assistance, [there were also] thirty thousand Berendei, and troops from Turov.[766]

This list is apparently intended to leave the reader in no doubt that Iaropolk agreed to peace not because he could not avenge himself on Vsevolod, but exclusively because he was "good and merciful and did not want to cause bloodshed." The words of Iziaslav Mstislavich reported in the *Kievan Chronicle* under 1149 describe a prince's strength as a precondition for an honorable peace with his enemies: "It is good for me to make peace with them [if it is made] from [a position of] strength (*dobro mne s nimi ot sily miriti*)."[767]

There was a good reason for the chronicler to put an effort into convincing readers that his patron's peacefulness was not a sign of weakness, because references

---

[765]Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 152, 155.
[766]PSRL 2, 301. The Berendei were an allied Turkic ethnic group.
[767]PSRL 2, 378.

to Christian mercy and to a desire to avoid bloodshed were, indeed, used as face-saving rhetoric by princes when they were unable to fight. In one case, the *Kievan Chronicle* provides two entirely different explanations for why Prince Viacheslav urged his ally Iurii Dolgorukii to make peace with their common adversary Iziaslav. Vladimir of Galich was mediating the talks between Iziaslav and Iurii, and Iurii's men and allies split over whether they should continue the war or make a peace agreement.

> Viacheslav listened to ... Vladimir and took his words to heart. He was inclined (*potknulsia*) towards an agreement and love, for Prince Viacheslav did not have an angry heart (*biashet nezlobiv serdtsem*), praising the most glorious God and remembering the Scripture: If you have faith as small as a mustard seed and you say to this mountain, 'Move,' it will move; and moreover, remembering the saying, 'I love God, but hate my brother – this is a lie; if you love God, love your brother.' (John 4, 20) And Viacheslav began to say to his brother Iurii, 'Brother, make peace. If you want to leave without making an agreement, Iziaslav will burn my *volost* after you leave.'[768]

The difference between the beginning and the concluding parts of this passage is so stark that it is likely that it was based on the combination of two or more sources. Viacheslav's words revealing his inability to defend himself are probably taken from a different text than his elevated portrayal as a pious Christian prince who wants to make peace out of the goodness of his heart.

When Viacheslav, on another occasion, claimed, "I have troops, and I have strength," and then explained that he did not fight for the Kievan throne "for the sake of the Rus Land and for the sake of the Christians," this is a lie, plain and simple. In fact, he made attempts to win Kiev for himself, but failed, because he was no match for his powerful rivals.[769] However, we should not conclude from such examples that a prince's love of peace was necessarily hypocritical and served only to mask his inability to fight. There are other accounts that describe princes making peace or arguing for peace in circumstances which do not suggest weakness. We have

---

[768]PSRL 2, 393.

[769]See above, p. 178.

seen Iaropolk giving up vengeance and making peace while he has a huge army under his command. During the talks between Iurii Dolgorukii and Iziaslav mediated by Vladimir, one of Iurii's sons, Rostislav, was against the peace, but the other son, Andrei, argued for a peace agreement. Both of them were still young and, while already fighting and participating in councils, they did not conduct any independent politics yet. The two brothers took opposite positions at their father's council which discussed how to proceed with Iziaslav:

> Rostislav, Iurii's son and [Iurii's ally, another] Iurii Iaroslavich did not want them to reconcile, while Iziaslav implored for peace more. And God put this into Andrei's heart, because he was merciful towards his kin, and even more towards the Christians [=ordinary people], and he began to implore his father, saying, 'Do not listen to Iurii Iaroslavich, make peace with your nephew [Iziaslav], peace lasts [here there is a lacuna in the manuscript] ... saying to him, 'Father, remember the word of the Scripture, How good it is for brothers to live in unity! (Ps.43.1)'[770]

It is difficult to see any selfish motives behind Andrei's advice to make peace. Furthermore, the same chronicle narrative that contains Andrei's peace-loving speech describes with relish Andrei's bravery on the battlefield, which he displayed in the course of the same war with Iziaslav. Andrei, the future Bogoliubskii, is the hero of this part of the chronicle; the apparent intention of the chronicler is to represent him as a model young prince, brave but also merciful, valiant in battle and willing to make a peaceful agreement during negotiations. The ideology behind such a representation is similar to that described by McGrath for the Anglo-Norman "politics of chivalry."

In general, the repertoire of honorable behavioral practices[771] of Rusian princes involved in a conflict included both the use of violence and a "ready willingness to grant mercy and make peace," to borrow McGrath's phrase. No exact rules for

---

[770]PSRL 2, 391-2. The unfinished sentence interrupted by the lacuna is apparently the proverb "Peace lasts until war, and war lasts until peace," sometimes used as an encouragement to make peace, see ibid., 364, 444.

[771]On the notion of a "repertoire of practices," see Hyams, "Was There Really Such a Thing as Feud?" 157.

what response is appropriate in any particular situation are explicitly formulated in either Rusian, or Anglo-Norman, or French texts. Decisions of Rusian princes and Western lords as to whether to perpetrate bloody vengeance or to show mercy, and evaluations of such decisions by contemporaries, were made in contexts which we can know and understand only partially, if at all. Even contemporaries often differed in their understanding of what constituted the appropriate course of action under particular circumstances. However, there is one main thread consistently present in the sources. Anglo-Norman political narratives represented "a de-escalation of anger and aggression" as "the conventional and appropriate response to an overture of peace."[772] In the *Song of Roland*, Duke Naimes states that if King Marsile asks Charlemagne for mercy, continuing the war against him would be a sin. All agree that "the Duke has spoken well" (16.240, 243).[773]

Rusian chronicles display a similar attitude. Iaropolk's decision to "stop the cruel war" by conceding the contested territory to the Olgovichi may have provoked "abuse from all" because it was made in the middle of fighting, and not as a response to an "overture of peace" or a plea for mercy. When Vladimir of Galich acted as a mediator between Iziaslav Mstislavich and his adversaries Iurii Dolgorukii and Viacheslav, he stressed that Iziaslav "does not claim that he is in the right, but he bows down and seeks your mercy." To stop the war when the opposing party bows down and seeks mercy was apparently considered an appropriate thing to do. To convince Iurii and Viacheslav, Vladimir poses a rhetorical question, "How can we pray to our Creator, 'Father, forgive our sins just as we forgive those who sinned against us (*iako zhe my ostavliaiem pregresheniia nasha*)'?"[774]

It should be noted that Iziaslav's "bowing down" in no way was an unconditional

---

[772]McGrath, "The Politics of Chivalry," 58.

[773]Brault, *The Song of Roland*, 16.

[774]PSRL 2, 392. In this chronicle passage, "Sviatoslav" stands instead of "Iziaslav" apparently because of a scribal error.

surrender, but rather it signified what McGrath calls an "overture of peace." "Mercy" in this case did not mean sparing his life and limb, which, as we have seen, was pretty much guaranteed to a prince under any circumstances, but rather entering into negotiations and making a peace agreement. Even though Iziaslav "did not claim that he was in the right," the agreement that Iurii and Viacheslav finally concluded with him satisfied his interests as well as theirs: "Iziaslav conceded (*sostupi*) Kiev to Iurii, and Iurii returned to Iziaslav all the Novgorodian rents and payments (*dani*), which was what Iziaslav wanted."[775]

On another occasion, it was Iziaslav Mstislavich who deliberated how to respond to the "overture of peace" extended to him by the brothers Davidovichi with whom he was at war. Iziaslav's consultation with his younger brother Rostislav Mstislavich reflects the same basic principles that we have seen in the speeches of Vladimir and Andrei at the council held by Iurii Dolgorukii. This is how the *Kievan Chronicle* reports the exchange between Iziaslav and Rostislav:

> 'Behold, brother, [the Davidovichi and their ally] have sent [their men] to me asking for peace, and I am consulting with you (*gadaiu s toboi*) about what would suit (*budet godno*) both of us. Does peace look good to you (*godno li ti*)? Although they did harm to us, now they are seeking peace from us. Or would it be more suitable [to continue] war (*paky li rat godno*)? I entrust the decision to you.' And Rostislav answered his brother Iziaslav thus, 'Brother, I bow down to you: you are older than me, whatever you decide, I am ready to carry it out (*v tom gotov esm*). But if you, brother, put this honor on me, I would say thus, for the sake of the Rus Land and for the sake of the Christians: Brother, I prefer peace (*libliu mir leple*). They had made war [on us], and what did they achieve? Now, brother, make peace for the sake of the Christians and all the Rus Land, if they [give up their hostile plans. If not,] it would be better to fight with them.'[776]

Again, the key point is that if the enemies are asking for peace, it is appropriate to grant it. On the other hand, there is room for different opinions. Rostislav's statement that he prefers peace, but would be ready to continue the war if his

---

[775]PSRL 2, 393.

[776]PSRL 2, 365.

brother chooses war, reveals the element of subjectivity present in such decisions: the question of war and peace is presented as a matter of personal preference.

When a prince in a position of power chooses to end a war or to resolve a conflict situation with an agreement of peace and friendship, the *Kievan Chronicle* sometimes uses the formulaic expression also found in medieval French texts, according to White: to "forgive one's anger" (*otdati gneva* in East Slavonic). White describes a "script" when a disputant's anger abates after he makes peace with his enemies, "in which case anger and enmity should turn into love."[777] A good example is found in the account about the peaceful outcome of the confrontation between Rostislav Mstislavich and Iurii Dolgorukii. Rostislav had supported his older brother Iziaslav in his wars over the Kievan throne against Iurii, the wars which ended, as we remember, when Iziaslav arranged the "duumvirate" consisting of himself and the senior Monomakhovich Viacheslav. After Iziaslav died, Rostislav took the position of Viacheslav's co-ruler and the de-facto Kievan prince. When Viacheslav died in 1154, Iurii became the senior prince among the Monomakhovichi, and as such, he had the right to the Kievan throne. Since Rostislav remained in Kiev after Viacheslav's death, Iurii advanced against Rostislav with his troops. Rostislav also gathered his troops, but when the two armies met and were ready to fight, Rostislav declared his recognition of Iurii's seniority and asked him to "forgive his anger."

> Letting go of the memory about his brother's [Iziaslav's] evil, Iurii forgave his anger at Rostislav, and thus they kissed the Cross between themselves swearing to be in perfect love [*tselovasta mezhi soboiu khrest na vsei liubvi*].[778]

Thus, anger and enmity turned into love, just as in White's "script."[779]

All the conflicts that we have discussed so far were about *volosts* and princely seats, that is, land and status. When princes resolved such conflicts by peace settle-

---

[777]White, "Politics of Anger," 144.

[778]PSRL 2, 477-8.

[779]For more examples of the accounts about peace settlements and the use of the expression *otdati gneva*, see PSRL 2, 418, 687-8, 697.

ments, they employed ideology based on the mixture of lay aristocratic and ecclesiastical values. Vladimir of Galich stressed the religious basis of princely peace-making in his speech to Iurii Dolgorukii and Viacheslav when he tried to convince them to stop the war and start negotiations with Iziaslav: "I am not an ordinary mediator between you (*ne prost khodatai mezhi vami*). God would not send down an angel, and there are neither prophets nor apostles nowadays."[780] This unusual statement is unique to the *Hypatian* redaction of the *Kievan Chronicle*; it is not recorded in any other account of the same events and, to my knowledge, it does not have any parallels. Vladimir appears to indicate that his peace-making mission is divinely inspired, and he seems to imply that trying to stop a war between Iziaslav and his uncles Iurii and Viacheslav is a task for an angel, an apostle, or a prophet. This is, probably, the most extreme expression of the Christian aspect of the ideology behind the peaceful resolution of interprincely conflicts. Other accounts of peace-making do not contain statements similar to Vladimir's, but they represent princes as quoting the Scripture and referring to Christian love and mercy. On the other hand, the same princes stress their military strength and their adversaries' weakness and invoke such lay values as love for one's kin and the good of the Rus Land. The same narrative about the talks of Iurii and Viacheslav with Iziaslav mediated by Vladimir, along with elevated Christian rhetoric, also contains quite mundane and practical arguments, such as Viacheslav's concern for the safety of his *volost*. An honorable peace settlement displayed an interaction between the mentality of the lay elite and Christian ideas, an interaction typical of medieval aristocratic honor in general.

A different situation is presented in the peace offer made by Vladimir Monomakh in his letter to Oleg Sviatoslavich. Vladimir and Oleg, the founders of the Monomakhovichi and Olgovichi clans, had complicated territorial disputes, the accounts of which take a prominent place in the later part of the *Primary Chronicle*. As was typical of such disputes, they were conducted by means of both negotiating

---

[780]PSRL 2, 392.

and fighting. On top of the conflicts between his father and Oleg, Monomakh's son Iziaslav attempted to capture the town (*gorod*) of Murom, which belonged to Oleg, but was defeated and died in battle. After his victory over Iziaslav, Oleg went on and conquered some territories that belonged to another of Monomakh's sons, Mstislav.

Monomakh was apparently expected to avenge his son's defeat and death, which he did not. Instead, he wrote to Oleg, declaring his intention not to seek revenge and proposing negotiations about the lands captured by Oleg. In his letter, Monomakh recognizes that Iziaslav was in the wrong in attacking Oleg's Murom and blames his action on the bad advice of his council:

> [Iziaslav] should not have sought what was not his nor brought me to sorrow and shame (*ni mene v sorom ni v pechal vvesti*), for it was his retainers (*paroptsi*) who taught him [to attack Murom]. They sought gain for themselves, but gained evil for him (*da bysha sobe nalezli, no onomu nalezosha zlo*).[781]

However, the acknowledgment of the fact that Iziaslav died in a battle, in which he was an aggressor, apparently was not seen as an adequate justification for not avenging him. To be able to give up vengeance for a kinsman as close as a son, Monomakh had to reject the secular notion of honor entirely and to take a purely religious position. He starts his letter to Oleg with the description of his inner struggle between his heart, which appears to represent worldly aspect of his personality, and his Christian soul, and he continues with a string of Scriptural quotations:

> Oh me, much-suffering and sorrowful! My soul, you wrestle with my heart much, and you have conquered my heart. Since we are all mortal, I reflect, how may we stand before the dread Judge without repenting and being reconciled with one another? For whoever says, 'I love God, but do not love my brother,' this is a lie (John, 4.20). And also, 'If you do not forgive your brother's trespasses, neither will your heavenly father forgive you' (Matt., 4.15). The Prophet says, 'Fret not yourself because of evildoers; be not envious of wrongdoers' (Ps. 37.1). 'How good and beautiful it is for brothers to dwell in unity!' (Ps. 84.1) But this was all from the teaching of the devil. There were wars in the days of our wise (*umnykh*) grandfathers and our good and blessed fathers, for the devil wants no good for humankind and sows discord among us (*svazhivaet*

---

[781]PSRL 1, 254.

ny).

Furthermore, Monomakh's Christian soul might not have prevailed over his vengeful heart, were it not for the advice, and even pressure (as indicated by the verb *ponudil*), from his oldest son Mstislav:

> I have written this to you because my son ... made (*ponudil*) me do so. He sent me his man with a letter, saying, 'Let us negotiate and make peace (*ladimsia i smirim-sia*). [God's] judgment has come to my little brother (*brattsu*), and let us not be his avengers, but let us leave this to God (*vozlozhive na Boga*). They will stand before God; let us not ruin the Rus Land.' Seeing my son's humility, I felt sorry [for the intention to avenge Iziaslav?], and, fearing God, I said, 'In his youth and lack of wisdom (*bezumii*), he is so humble and leaves this to God, while I am a man more sinful than all humans.' I listened to my son and wrote this letter.

In the final analysis, neither quotations from the Scripture, nor the good of the Rus Land, nor placing the responsibility for the decision on Mstislav are sufficient to justify Monomakh's peace with Oleg after his son died in battle against the latter. In order not to pursue vengeance, Monomakh has to condemn the worldly aristocratic notion of "honor and glory" expressly and to refer to the example of no less than Jesus:

> Our Lord is not a man, but the God of the whole universe; he can do whatever he wants in the wink of an eye, [but] he suffered reviling, spitting, and blows, and delivered himself up to death, while having the power over (*vladeia*) life and death. And what are we, sinful and wretched (*lisi*) men? Today alive, tomorrow dead; today in glory and honor, tomorrow in the grave and forgotten, and others will divide our treasure (*sobranie nashe*). Look, brother, on our fathers. What did they carry away, and for what do they need their garments?[782] Only what they had done for their souls [is with them].[783]

Thus, Monomakh implicitly compares the situation of a prince who does not avenge his son with the ultimate humiliation of Christ who suffered "reviling, spitting and blows." The necessity for a prince to reject worldly "honor and glory" entirely in

---

[782]The word that I have translated as "garments" is *porote* in the original. O. V. Tvorogov amended it to *porty*. See "Pouchenie Vladimira Monomakha," BLDR 1 at http://www.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4874#_ednref86 accessed 06.21.2013.

[783]PSRL 1, 252-3.

order to reject the idea of revenge for his son's death displays the close connection between honor and vengeance.

Monomakh's letter to Oleg also shows that ecclesiastical influence had a significant impact on the value system of the lay elite. The presence of Christian ideas in political discourse was strong enough to allow princes sometimes to act contrary to the lay norms of honorable behavior. This apparently happened on rare occasions only; Monomakh clearly presents his decision as exceptional. Normally, as we have seen, a making of honorable peace was based on a mixture of the Christian and lay aristocratic ideals, a mixture that was at the heart of Western chivalric and Rusian princely honor.

5.6   Honor as Rank, Office, Prerogative, and Landed Property

We have seen close parallels between Rusian and Western understandings of honor in the military context. This is the most important context in regards to the medieval lay elites who were, first and foremost, warriors. However, the Latin *honor* and its vernacular equivalents were used also to signify social rank, public office, and landed property.[784] These aspects of Western honor have no direct East Slavonic correspondence. I have tried to show that *volost/vlast* is the closest Rusian analogy to *honor* as "the term which encompasses the holding of land with the personal standing derived from its holding."[785]

While the Rusian *chest'* never referred to land, there is a passage in the *Kievan Chronicle* where *chest'* has connotations of rank or office: Viacheslav suffered dis-

---

[784]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 495-6.
[785]Ashe, *Fiction and History in England*, 98.

honor when he was driven out of Kiev; then Iziaslav Mstislavich "put honor on" him and gave him the Kievan throne, which belonged to Viacheslav by right of seniority.[786] Thus, the "honor" here refers to the position of the Kievan prince and to the rights of the senior member of the dynasty. Such understanding of *chest'* is somewhat similar to the usage of *honestas* in the famous letter of Fulbert of Chartres to William V of Aquitaine about the mutual obligations of a lord and his man. A man must not "do any harm to his lord in regards to his rights of justice or other things which seem to pertain to the lord's honor (*ne sit ei in dampnum de sua iustitia vel de aliis causis quae ad honestatem eius pertinere videntur*)."[787] Frederick Behrends translated *aliis causis* as "other prerogatives."[788] Indeed, the lord's *honestas* in Fulbert's statement appears to be the sum total of his rights and prerogatives, and thus it is similar to Viacheslav's *chest'* signifying his rights as the senior prince. An understanding of honor as a prerogative is also found in the account about the consultation between Iziaslav Mstislavich and his younger brother Rostislav about peace-making with the Davidovichi discussed above. Iziaslav "put honor on" his younger brother when he entrusted Rostislav with the decision about how to respond to the Davidovichi plea for peace.[789] Normally, to make such decisions was a prerogative of the older brother; to transfer this prerogative to someone else was tantamount to "putting honor on" this person.

The narrative about the Viacheslav-Iziaslav "duumvirate" contains another similarity with Fulbert's injunction. When the two princes made an agreement to co-rule in Kiev, their men (*muzhi*) had to swear an oath to both of them "to maintain good will between them, to guard the princes' honor and not to sow any discord between them."[790] In these passages from Fulbert and from the *Kievan Chronicle*,

---

[786]PSRL 2, 399, 417-418; see also PSRL 25, 53.

[787]*The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, ed. and trans. Frederick Behrends (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 92.

[788]*The Letters and Poems of Fulbert*, 93.

[789]PSRL 2, 365.

[790]"*Muzhi eiu tselovasha khrest ako mezhi ima dobra khoteti i chest'i eiu sterechi, a ne*

the honor is something that has to be guarded not just by the lord or prince himself, but by his men as well.

Thus, the Rusian notion of honor could occasionally take on overtones reminiscent of the Western understandings of honor as rank, office, right, or prerogative, but these were not regular meanings of *chest'*.

5.7   Outward Markers and Expressions of Honor and Shame

We have seen that Rusian princes and Western nobles used similar means to win honor for themselves and to put their enemies to shame. We will now discuss outward manifestations that signified one's honor or shame.

In terms of publicly displayed emotions, the most common marker of honor was joy. White describes a "script," which he derived from the French and Anglo-Norman high medieval narratives, but which is also present in the Rusian chronicles: "When a noble is successful in the competition for honor, he should have joy and show it ... At the beginning of *Roland*, Charlemagne's joy is clearly the by-product of the honor he gains when his army takes Cordoba."[791]

We have already encountered the connection between joy and the "honor and glory" of a prince returning from a victorious battle or entering a city where his rightful princely throne is located. On such occasions, the prince himself, his men, and the population display "great joy." Another way to show joy and to celebrate one's success in what White calls the "competition for honor" was to have a public feast. This is how Iziaslav Mstislavich celebrated honor, which he received when

---

svazhivati eiu," PSRL 2, 399.

[791]White, "Politics of Anger," 142-3.

the Novgorodians invited him to lead a campaign against Iurii Dolgorukii, at that moment Iziaslav's and Novogorod's common enemy:

> The Novgorodians heard that Iziaslav was coming and rejoiced with great joy and thus they went out to meet him at the distance of a three-day journey, and others eagerly [or: in full force - *vsimi silami*] met him at the distance of a one-day journey, and thus he entered Novgorod on Sunday with great honor. And his son Iaroslav with Novgorodian boyars met him there, and they went to the Holy Sophia to mass. Then Iziaslav with his son Iaroslav sent heralds (*biriuchi i podvoiskie*) to call in the streets inviting all, great and small, to dinner with the prince, and thus they had dinner and rejoiced with great joy and returned to their homes with honor. [792]

This passage clearly indicates the connection between honor and joy. The city of Novgorod was a powerful ally, and the position of the prince of Novgorod, which at that moment belonged to Iziaslav's son, was a coveted prize in interprincely struggle. Joy at the dinner shows Iziaslav's success in the "competition for honor." When Iurii, in turn, found a powerful ally, Prince Sviatoslav, he also celebrated the alliance with a great feast for Sviatoslav and his men, during which Iurii and Sviatoslav "affectionately kissed each other and were joyous."[793]

The normative dimension of joy displayed during such feasts is clearly seen from the detailed account about the participation of Prince David in the celebration of his brother Riurik's victory in the struggle for the Kievan throne:

> Riurik sat on the throne of his father and grandfather with glory and with great honor, and all the Rus Land[794] rejoiced at Riurik's rule: the Kievans, the Christians and the pagans ... Riurik sent an invitation to his brother David to Smolensk, saying to him, 'Behold, oh brother, now we remain the most senior of all in the Rus Land. Come to me to Kiev, let us settle whatever matters there are in the Rus Land and whatever is pertaining to our brethren, the descendants of Vladimir [Monomakh] [*chto budet na Ruskoi zemle dumy i o brat'i svoei o Volodimere plemeni*], and let us see each other safe and sound.' ...And David came to Riurik to dinner, and they were in great love and in much joy, and having presented David with many gifts, Riurik gave him leave.

---

[792]PSRL 2, 369

[793]PSRL 2, 340.

[794]"Rus Land" here is used in the narrow sense, as the area on the Middle Dnieper around Kiev.

> After that ... David invited his brother, Great Prince Riurik with his children for dinner and they remained in great joy and in much love there, and having presented his brother Riurik with many gifts, David gave him leave. Then David invited all the monasteries for dinner and was joyous with them, and gave great alms to them and to the paupers, and gave them leave. And then David invited all the Black Caps[795] and all the Black Caps got drunk there at his place, and, having presented them with many gifts, he gave them leave. And the Kievans started inviting David for a feast, giving him great honor and many gifts. David, however, invited the Kievans to his dinner, and he was there in much joy and in great love with them, and then gave them leave.[796]

The joy is mutual when David feasts with his brother and with the "Kievans." On the other hand, at the dinner for "all the monasteries" only David is represented as joyous; no joy on the part of the monks is mentioned. To rejoice at a dinner was probably not befitting a monk. Finally, neither dinner nor gifts make the Black Caps joyous, and David does not rejoice while dining with them either. Should we infer that David and the Black Caps did not have a good time during the dinner or that the Black Caps were less pleasant company than the Kievans? Rather, the absence of "joy" shows that the Turkic *federati*, in the eyes of the author of this passage, were not a part of the relationships based on the shared notion of honor that bound Rusian Christian upper classes; therefore, White's imperative "to have joy and to show it" did not apply to them. In contrast with the Black Caps, all other parties mentioned in the passage followed the "script" identified by White for Western nobles.[797]

---

[795]Black Caps was a common name for pagan *federati* of various Turkic ethnicities.

[796]PSRL 2, 681-682.

[797]For more information on the chronicle accounts about feasts and their political significance, see P. V. Lukin, "Prazdnik, pir i veche: k voprosu ob arkhaicheskikh chertakh obshchest'vennogo stroia vostochnykh i zapadnykh slavian," in *Feodalizm: poniatie i realii*, 163-79. This essay combines an excellent analysis of the Rusian sources with the view, not supported by any arguments, that feasts were an "archaic" feature of Slavic political culture. On the significance of feasts in pre-modern societies see Michael Dietler and Brian Hayden, eds., *Feasts: Archeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001); Pauline Wilson Wiessner, Polly Wiessner and Wulf Schiefenhövel, eds., *Food and the Status Quest: An Interdisciplinary*

A prince's honor was celebrated by displays of joy when he entered a city, and also at feasts and dinners. Another important marker of a prince's honor was his entourage. According to Stefanovich, *chest'* was used as a Slavonic translation of the Greek *doruforia*, which means "cortege, bodyguards."[798] An entourage was a sign of honor in the medieval West as well. The connection between aristocratic honor and numerous retinue is evident from the passage in *The History of the English Kings* by William of Malmesbury about a disagreement between King Edward and Godwine, earl of Wessex (under 1042). The king summoned Godwine and his son Harold to a council to be convened in London. Since relations between the king and the earl at that time were strained, Godwine and Harold were told to hand over their troops to the king and to arrive in London unarmed and accompanied by twelve men only. They replied that they

> would be ready [to obey] their lord in surrendering their troops and in all else besides what endangers their *gloria* and safety (*in omnibus preter gloriae et salutis periculum*): if they come unarmed, they would fear the loss of their life; if they have few retainers (*stipatores*), this would be a disgrace (*obprobrium*). (ii.199.6-7)[799]

Thomas includes *opprobrium* among the words such as *dedecus* and *dehonestatio* that comprised "the rich Latin vocabulary of shame."[800] One of the meanings of *gloria* in medieval Latin was "mark of esteem."[801] R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom translate *gloria* in this passage as "reputation," and *obprobrium* as "a stain on their honor."[802] Thus, the number of followers accompanying an English lord was a matter of honor, and for Godwine and Harold it had the same importance

---

[798]"*doruforia* – 'eskort, telokhraniteli'," Stefanovich, "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti," 71, 75.

[799]William of Maslmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 358.

[800]Thomas, "Shame, Masculinity, and the Death of Thomas Becket," 1050.

[801]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 470.

[802]William of Maslmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, 359.

as the question of life and death.

Not only great magnates, such as Godwine and Harold, but any noble was supposed either to be accompanied by his men, or to be a part of the entourage of a greater lord, as is evident from the words of Calogrenant, Chrétien's character in *Yvain*: "I, alone like a peasant (*seus come païsanz*), was riding along in search of adventures."[803] Calogrenant was a young knight, but apparently it was unusual for him to travel alone. Interestingly, it was due to this unusual circumstance that his "shame" of being defeated by a stronger knight remained unknown to anyone until he shared his story with other members of Arthur's court.

The importance of a proper retinue for a Rusian prince can be inferred from the account about the scene between the two princes, Iziaslav Mstislavich and Rostislav, the son of Iurii Dolgorukii found in the *Kievan Chronicle* under 1149. Rostislav proclaimed Iziaslav his senior and entered his service as a junior prince, but soon after that he was accused of spying. Iziaslav was on an island in the Dnieper when he heard the accusations against Rostislav. He sent a boat (*nasad*) to fetch Rostislav to him, and allowed him to be accompanied by only "as many men as were able to get into the boat (*chto s nim druzhiny vleze v nasad, s temi zhe i perevezosha i*)." As soon as Rostislav arrived, Iziaslav presented the accusations to him and sent him back to his father. "And thus they led him and put him into a boat (*vedshe vsadisha i v nasad*) with four junior retainers (*otroky*), and captured his men and took his property (*a druzhinu ego izoimasha, a tovar otiasha*)." According to Rostislav, Iziaslav dishonored both him and his father. Iurii shared Rostislav's sentiment and "had pity for his son's shame." [804] The forced ride in a boat in a company of four was apparently a part of the dishonor. The *Laurentian* account of the same events stresses the small number of those accompanying Rostislav: Iziaslav "put him in

---

[803]Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain*, line 174; the English translation is from Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian Romances*, 297.

[804]"*Nas est obeschest'voval*," PSRL 2, 372-4.

a boat with *only* four others (*vsadi v lodiu* toliko *samogo li chetverta*) (emphasis added)."[805] Furthermore, when Iurii Dolgorukii came to avenge his son's dishonor, he defeated Iziaslav, and the latter "fled ... accompanied by three men only."[806]

All chronicle accounts of this episode are critical of Iziaslav. Iziaslav submitted Iurii's son to shameful treatment for no sufficient reason; the chronicler implies that Iurii fought a just war when he states that Iurii went against Iziaslav "placing his hope onto God." Most importantly, the bishop of Pereiaslavl "shedding tears, implored [Iziaslav], 'Oh Prince, make peace with your uncle [Iurii], and you will receive a great reward (*mnogoe spasenie primeshi*) from God and will save your land from a great disaster,'" but Iziaslav did not listen.[807] The degree of negativity in the representation of Iziaslav's behavior on this occasion varies in the *Laurentian* and in the different redactions of the *Kievan Chronicle.* In some versions, Iziaslav "fled after he saw his troops defeated" and thus presumably was the last to leave the battlefield; the chronicler uses stylistically neutral verbs, such as "went" to describe Iziaslav's subsequent movements. The accounts more unfavorable to Iziaslav stress Iurii's victory; Iziaslav not only flees from the battlefield, but "runs into Kiev," and then "flees" from there to Luchesk.[808] The version most critical of Iziaslav stresses the extremely small number of retinue, which accompanied him during his flight from Iurii, by referring to it twice:

> Iurii defeated Iziaslav, and Iziaslav fled with three men only (*toliko sam tretei*), and he ran into Kiev (*vbezhe*) with three men only ... Iurii entered Pereiaslavl, giving praise to God, and after staying there for three days, he went to Kiev, and Iziaslav ...

---

[805]PSRL 1, 320.

[806]"pobezhe i perebrede na Kanev tolko sam tretii," PSRL 2, 383.

[807]PSRL 2, 374, 380. What I have translated as "a great reward" is literally "much salvation." However, because "salvation" cannot be quantified so that one receives "much" or "little" of it, I chose to translate *spasenie* here as "reward." Probably a better, although even less literal, translation would be "reconciling with your uncle will be good for your soul." The scene between Bishop Euphemius and Iziaslav takes place in Pereiaslavl, near which he and Iurii gathered their troops, hence the involvement of the bishop of Pereiaslavl.

[808]Cf. PSRL 1, 322; PSRL 2, 383; PSRL 23, 36; PSRL 25, 46.

fled to Luchesk with his wife and children.[809]

The structure of the narrative also gives significance to the numbers of the princely retinue: the episode of the struggle between Iziaslav and Iurii described in the entry for 1149 starts with Iurii's son being forced to travel to his father in a company of four, and it ends with Iziaslav fleeing from Iurii in a company of three. These numbers appear to underscore Iurii's success in avenging his son's shame.

The shame inflicted on Rostislav, which started this round of hostilities, might have consisted not only in the lack of an entourage befitting a prince, but also in the mode of transportation. Princes are sometimes represented as riding in boats, but in this case the word choice of the *Kievan Chronicle* might bear overtones dishonorable for Rostislav. The two words normally used in the chronicles for "boat" are *lodia* and *nasad.* The difference between them is unclear; sometimes they are used interchange-ably.[810] However, the compiler of the *Hypatian* redaction of the *Kievan Chronicle* appears to privilege *lodia* as the transportation of a prince. It is possible that, for this author, *nasad* and *lodia* referred to different types of boat, and that the latter was more prestigious. Besides the entry for 1149, there are eight passages in the *Kievan Chronicle* describing princes traveling by boats; in the *Hypatian* codex, six of them use *lodia*, and the two passages using *nasad* describe emergency situations for the princes in question. In the entry for 1150, Iziaslav attacked Iurii Dolgorukii, "and Iurii could not do anything (*ne mozhe sobe nichim zhe pomochi*), he got into a *nasad* and fled to the other side [of the Dnieper]."[811] Iurii appears to jump into the first boat that was nearby, not caring whether it was suitable for a prince or not. In the context, where Iurii is presented as helpless and fleeing, it is possible that the mention of *nasad* was meant as derogatory. The other *Kievan* passage depicting a prince in a *nasad* does not have any derogatory connotations. However, in this

---

[809]PSRL 25, 46.

[810]E.g. PSRL 2, 423-4; see also Nasonov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, 95.

[811]PSRL 2, 416.

passage, *nasad* may refer to a makeshift transportation which a prince had to use in an emergency. The entry for 1194 reports that Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich got sick while traveling. Therefore, he had to ride first in a sledge and then in a *nasad*.[812] Before that, he had apparently ridden on horseback; the ride in a boat had not been planned in advance, and it is possible that there was no *lodia* in his expedition.

Another interesting detail of the account about the transportation of the sick Sviatoslav is that, before riding in a *nasad*, he was put in a sledge, even though it was summertime (*ekhasha lete na sanekh*).[813] A sledge could have been used because the ride in it is less bumpy than in a cart, or maybe because a sledge was considered more prestigious. At least, this was the case in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Muscovy, where sledges were used for ceremonial occasions even in summer.[814] It is also worth noting that the blinders of Vasilko, after taking his eyes, transported him in a cart, and the chronicler stresses this fact: "they went on with him [Vasilko] in the cart and on a bumpy road (*na kolekh a po grudnu puti*), because it was the month of *gruden'* then, that is to say November."[815] This passage refers to the traditional East Slavonic name of the month of November *gruden'*, which was derived from the word "bumpy" and apparently described the state of the soil that was hard with frost, but not yet covered with snow. The chronicler had already informed the readers that Vasilko was captured on November 4.[816] If he draws attention to the month of the year again, there must be a reason for it. Probably, it was unusual to travel by cart in November, when it was already possible for a light sledge to glide along the frozen soil, or maybe forcing a person in pain to have a "bumpy" ride stresses the blinders' cruelty. In any case, it appears that the cart was not a default transportation in this

---

[812]PSRL 2, 679.

[813]PSRL 2, 679.

[814]M. I. Vasil'ev, *Russikie sani: istoriko-etnograficheskoe issledovanie* (Novgorod: Novgorodskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet, 2007), 15-16.

[815]PSRL 1, 261.

[816]PSRL 1, 258.

situation, and the fact that the blinders chose it had some significance.

Finally, there is an account that specifically connects a cart with an outrageous dishonor done to the dead body of Igor Olgovich after he was lynched in Kiev: "They put [the dead Igor] on a cart and brought him to ... the marketplace and desecrated [his body] (*povergosha poruganiu*)." Two other versions of the same event state that the mob first dragged Igor's body by the feet and then put it on the cart. When the prince sent two men to bury Igor, they gave orders "to take him and to carry (*nesti*) him to the church of St. Michael."[817] The word *nesti* used for "carry" implies carrying the object manually, with one's arms and hands. Thus, the first thing that the men in charge of Igor's burial did was taking his body off the cart.

The question of whether there were "honorable" and "dishonorable" means of transportation in Rus is of some interest because the type of ride affected the honor of characters in medieval French texts. Thus, Lancelot suffers dishonor when he rides in a cart, even though this is the only way for him to reach Guinevere who needs to be rescued from captivity. According to Chrétien, in the time of King Arthur, carts were used as pillories so that a person guilty of a crime was led through the streets in a cart. After that, he "lost all his honor (*s 'avoit totes enors perdues*)." Because of such a use of carts, riding in them came to be seen as dishonorable. Therefore, Lancelot hesitated before jumping into the cart: "Thus Reason ... admonished and counselled him not to do anything for which he might incur disgrace or reproach (*ait honte ne reproche*)." However, Lancelot did not listen to the voice of reason: "Since Love ruled his action, the disgrace did not matter (*de la honte ne li chaut*)" - but it still remained a disgrace.[818] Even though Chrétien describes not his contemporary

---

[817]PSRL 1, 318; PSRL 2, 353; PSRL 25, 42.

[818]Chrétien de Troyes, *Lancelot ou Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, ed. by Pierre Kunstmann, lines 321-36, 365-76, available as an electronic text at http://atilf.atilf.fr/gsouvay/dect/download/Lancelot.xml accessed 06.28.2013; Chrétien de Troyes, *Arthurian Romances*, ed. and trans. by William W. Kibler (New York: Penguin Books, 1991), 211-12.

society, but the mythical era of King Arthur, the idea that a mode of transportation has the ability to dishonor a person using it must have existed in Chrétien's own time. We see the same idea in another French poetic text written down in the twelfth century. In the *Song of Roland*, the treacherous envoy Ganelon incites King Marsile's fear and hatred of the French when he says that Charlemagne would capture Marsile and bring him to Aix to execute and, moreover, Marsile would be given "neither a palfrey nor a war-horse, neither a mule nor a jenny," but would have to ride to Aix on a "bad packhorse (*malvais sumer*)" (36.479-81).[819] Thus, the type of ride was an outer marker of honor or shame in the French medieval texts. There are some hints in Rusian chronicles that this might have been the case in Rus as well.

While there is no conclusive evidence whether there were parallels in the attitude towards a mode of transportation in the French and Rusian texts, another marker of honor, gifts, apparently played a very similar role in Rus and in the medieval West. It is impossible to discuss the immense topic of medieval gift-giving here in detail. We will only note that gifts bestowed honor both on the giver and on the receiver. Monomakh describes this dual function of gifts in their relations to honor when he advises his sons to "honor" visitors from other lands with gifts so that these visitors, in turn, spread good fame about his sons' generosity and thus bring honor to them.[820] The obituary of Monomakh in the *Laurentian Chronicle* and the praise for William V of Aquitaine in the *Chronicle* by Adémar of Chabannes both show that giving gifts was more important than receiving them. Monomakh "did good to his enemies and sent them away with gifts"; the gifts that Monomakh himself received from others are passed over in silence.[821] William received precious gifts from the kings of Spain, Navarra, and England, and in return sent "even more precious gifts" to them. He and the German emperor Henry II "mutually honored each other with

---

[819]Brault, *The Song of Roland*, 30.
[820]PSRL 1, 246.
[821]PSRL 1, 294-5.

gifts (*muneribus alterutrum se honorarent*)," but Adémar describes only the golden sword that William sent to the emperor "among many other presents" without giving any details about what Henry sent to William (III.41).[822] The gifts that Monomakh gave to his enemies apparently signified his superiority over them, while William's gifts to the powerful royal figures prove Adémar's thesis that the ruler of Aquitaine "was thought to be more a king than a duke (*potius rex quam esse dux putabatur*)" (III.41).[823] On the other hand, when the chronicler is not vehemently partisan, we see the parties maintaining the balance of honor in their gift-giving: upon receiving gifts, princes usually presented counter-gifts so that "there were ... gifts between them," an expression from the *Kievan Chronicle* reminiscent of Adémar's *alterutrum* in his description of the gift exchange between William V and Henry II. [824]

In sum, our analysis of Rusian and Western sources has revealed that honor was expressed through demonstrative joy, feasts, gifts, and entourage both in Rus and in the medieval West. French texts express honor and shame through various modes of transportation as well; Rusian chronicles might assume that some types of ride were more honorable than others, but there is not enough evidence to come to a conclusion as to whether the mode of transportation was a marker of honor in Rus.

---

[822]*Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, 161-2.

[823]Ibid.

[824]PSRL 2, 498; see also PSRL 25, 34, 45. For more information on gift-giving in Rus, see I. Ia. Froianov, *Kievskaia Rus* (Leningrad: Izdatelstvo Leningradskogo Universiteta, 1980), 147-9. For a review of literature on gift-giving in medieval Europe and on theoretical approaches to gift-giving in general, see Florin Curta, "Merovingian and Carolingian Gift Giving," *Speculum* 81 (2006): 671-99, at 671-7.

5.8 Conclusions and a Postscript: Some Remarks on the Later Evolution of the Notion of Honor

We have seen that the understandings of princely honor in Rus and aristocratic honor in the West were essentially the same. Both Rusian princes and Western nobles gained honor, first and foremost, through military victories and received shame when they were defeated. They used similar ways to clear away shame and to restore the "balance of honor." Rusian and Western approaches to what constituted an honorable peace were also similar. The external markers of honor, such as gifts, feasts, and a big retinue were the same in Rus and in the West, with the possible exception of the mode of transportation. The only difference between the East Slavonic *chest'* and the medieval Latin *honor* is that the latter, in addition to its other meanings, could refer to landed property and an office, while in East Slavonic this meaning was normally expressed through the word *volost.*

Both in Rus and in the West, the notion of elite honor stressed balance and reciprocity. There was, so to speak, an economy of honor: an exchange of commensurate acts of violence between enemies, and exchange of gifts, services, and hospitality between friends. A guest was honored because he received gifts, but the host at the same time was honored because he received praise for his generosity. There was neither any single source, nor a single universally recognized arbiter, of honor. Cheyette describes the role of arbiters in the peace settlements of property disputes in eleventh- and twelfth-century France whose task was to reach a compromise that would keep the honor of all those involved in the conflict:

> The status of the arbiters as great lords, colleagues, friends, and relatives, allowed them to perform this task, assured the parties ... that public opprobrium would not follow upon their recognition of wrongful claim: for the arbiters *were sometimes themselves this very public* (emphasis added).[825]

---

[825]Cheyette, "Suum cuique tribuere," 295. Cf. a discussion of Rusian culture of dispute-

The honor of Rusian princes, as we have seen, also depended on public op-
probrium or praise, with the "public" being described sometimes as the princes'
"brethren," sometimes as "people," and sometimes simply as "all."

The situation was different in Muscovy, where the society was organized as "a
community of honor" centered on the tsar who was both the source and the highest
arbiter of honor.[826] According to Kollmann, the role of the tsar and the state in
matters of honor constituted the major difference from Western Europe:

> In Muscovy, more than in the European states contemporary with it, the state was
> closely identified with the defense of honor. The tsar's administration ... provided
> court venues, whereas in Europe venues were myriad ... Finally, in Russia, the state
> itself was imbricated in the rhetoric of honor; the tsar and his representatives stood
> at the apex of the community of honor.[827]

This aspect of the discourse of honor, which differentiated Muscovy both from Rus
and from medieval and early modern Western Europe, resonates with the profound
change in the understanding of princely honor immediately after the Mongol inva-
sion. This period is out of the chronological scope of my dissertation; however, the
difference between the usage of *chest'* in the pre-1236 and in the 1240s chronicle
entries is so sudden and so fundamental that it should be at least briefly noted, if
only for the purpose of better understanding the pre-Mongolian concept of honor
through the contrast with the post-invasion one.

Starting with the entry for 1242, the *Laurentian Chronicle* focuses the discourse
of honor on the court of the khans. The first striking feature of this new discourse
is the application of the traditional formula "returned with great honor" not only to
princes returning from a victorious battle, but also to those coming back from the
Horde where they submitted themselves to the khan and received his permission to

---

settlement in Shepard, "Orthodoxy and Northern Peoples," 184.

[826]Kollmann, *By Honor Bound*, 187-91, 248-50.

[827]Kollmann, *By Honor Bound*, 4.

hold their *volosts*.[828] Before the Mongol invasion, a prince had to win a battle in order to be described as "returning with great honor and glory." (The second component of the formula - "glory" - is absent from the 1240s-1250s annals.) Those receiving gifts, splendid welcoming, and so on could be represented as "honored" or being "sent away with honor," but the phrase "returned with honor" was reserved for military victories exclusively. There was no person, a visit to whom and receiving favors from whom would systematically confer "great honor" on the recipients. Furthermore, in the pre-Mongolian texts, a prince honored by gifts, a feast, or a splendid reception reciprocated by returning honor. In the accounts of the princes' visits to Khan Batu and his successors, honor is always unilateral, such as:

> In the year 1243 ... Batu honored Grand Prince Iaroslav and his men with honor and gave him leave, saying, 'Iaroslav, be the most senior among all the princes of the people of Rus.' And Iaroslav returned to his land with great honor. In the year 1244. [Three princes] with their men went to the Tatars, to Batu, on account of their lands (*pro svoiu otchinu*). And Batu honored them with worthy (*dostoinoiu*) honor and gave them leave, appointing each to his paternal inheritance (*rassudiv im kogozhdo v svoiu otchinu*), and they arrived in their regions (*na svoiu zemliu*) with honor.[829]

There is no indication that the princes "honored" by Batu reciprocated in any way. Also, there is no explanation of what constituted the "honor" bestowed on the princes except the permission to continue to hold their lands. In the next chapter, we shall see that the pre-Mongolian chronicles sometimes describe the hierarchical relations among the Riurikids, when a senior prince "granted" to a junior the latter's own *volost*. However, such granting is not presented as an "honor" to the junior.

The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* displays a completely different attitude to the "honor" received at the khan's court. In its entry for 1250, the reference to the "honor" that Prince Daniel received from Batu appears to be intended as a bitter irony, and the word *chest'* probably should be put in quotation marks:

> Oh, the Tatar 'honor' is more evil than evil itself (*zlee zla*)! Daniel Romanovich, who

---

[828]PSRL 1, 470-73.
[829]PSRL 1, 470.

> was a grand prince and had power (*obladavshu*), together with his brother, over the Rus Land, over Kiev, and Vladimir, and Galich, and over other lands (*stranami*), now he kneels and calls himself a slave (*kholopom*), and tribute is demanded from him, and he fears for his life (*dani khotiat i zhivota ne chaet*) ... Oh, evil Tatar 'honor'! His father was an emperor (*tsesar*) in the Rus Land, who subjugated the Cuman Land and made war on all other lands. If the son of such a father did not receive honor from them, who would (*syn togo ne priia chest'i, to inyi kto mozhet priiati*)? ... [Daniel] spent twenty-five days there, and was given leave; and the land, which had been his, was granted to him. He returned to his land ... and there was a lament about his dishonor (another manuscript: about his misfortune) and great joy that he returned unharmed (*plach obide/o bede ego i bolshaia zhe be radost o zdravi'i ego*).[830]

There is no reason to think that Batu treated Daniel differently from the Suzdalian princes, whose visits to the Horde are reported in the *Laurentian*. Thus, what the *Laurentian* describes as "worthy honor," is called "dishonor (*obida*)" in some copies of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, and "misfortune (*beda*)" in others.

Such a radical dissimilarity between the chronicles in their interpretation of honor is a post-invasion novelty: the pre-Mongolian chroniclers may stress different aspects of this multifaceted concept, but they share a fundamental understanding of what constitutes honor and shame. The difference between the *Laurentian* and *Galician-Volhynian* in their treatment of "Tatar honor" must have reflected the difference in the circumstances of the Suzdalian and Galician-Volhyanian lands. The part of the *Laurentian* covering the second half of the thirteenth century concentrates on Suzdalia, the region which was hit by the Mongols the hardest, and the princes of which, therefore, were the first to give up any idea of resistance and to submit to Batu. Unlike the Suzdalian princes, who were surprised by the Mongol invasion, and either died in battle or submitted to the khan to save their lands from further destruction, Daniel of Galich fled to Hungary and for some time entertained plans of organizing an international anti-Mongol alliance. This, of course, did not

---

[830]PSRL 2, 808. Even though the entry is under 1250, it is more likely that it describes the events of 1245. See Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 164; O. P. Likhacheva, Introduction to *Galitsko-Volhynskaia letopis*, BLDR 5, available as an electronic text at http://pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4961#_ednref318 accessed 07.03.2013.

happen, and Daniel finally found himself before the alternative: to submit to Batu or lose his domain. He chose the former, but even after his formal submission, he made attempts at anti-Mongol resistance. Although his attempts ultimately failed, the Galician-Volhynian land did not suffer such a severe disruption from the Mongol troops as Suzdalia did.[831] In other words, the *Laurentian* account of relations between the princes and the khan reflected the complete acceptance of Mongol domination by the elite of the devastated and terrorized Suzdalia. The *Galician-Volhynian* chronicler, on the other hand, wrote in a region which was more remote from the Horde than Suzdalia, which did not experience severe disruption from the conquest, and where the elite still had hopes of overthrowing the Mongols.

If we now look at the representations of the Rusian princes "honoring" the khan – rather than being "honored" by him – we will see that the two chronicles differ in this respect as well. At the same time, neither representation has any parallels in the pre-Mongolian accounts of "honoring" important figures. Thus, according to the *Laurentian* entry for 1257, "Princes Alexander, Andrei, and Boris went to the Tatars and, having honored Ulagchi (*Ulavcheia*), returned to their land (*otchinu*)."[832] In 1257, the little boy Ulagchi became the nominal ruler of the Golden Horde after Batu's death, and the "honoring" apparently consisted in performing rituals of submission to the new khan.[833] In pre-Mongolian texts, no character ever travels to somebody in order to honor this person. A prince was supposed to "honor" those visiting him, as Monomakh instructed his sons; when he visited someone else, he, in turn, was "honored" by the host. The *Laurentian* account presents the "honoring" of Ulagchi matter-of-factly, without any comments. In contrast with that, in the *Galician-Volhynian* entry for 1245, Prince Michael describes the honor owed to the khans as God's punishment of the Rusian princes. When Batu ordered him

---

[831]See Martin, *Medieval Russia*, 161-74.

[832]PSRL 2, 474.

[833]See V. L. Egorov, "Aleksndr Nevskii i Chingizidy," *Otechest'vennaia istoriia* 2 (1997): 48-58.

to "bow down before the law of our forefathers (*poklonisia otets nashikh zakonu*),"
which apparently entailed performing some pagan rituals, Michael is represented as
saying,

> Since, on account of our sins, God gave us and our domain (*vlast*) over to you, we
> bow down before you and honor you (*chest'i prinosim ti*), but we do not bow down
> before the law of your forefathers and [do not fulfill] your impious commandment.[834]

"Honoring" an important person as a punishment for one's sins is a concept com-
pletely unknown to the pre-Mongolian chronicles.

These are only a few examples, but I think that they provide sufficient evi-
dence to suggest that the Rusian notion of honor underwent a profound change in
the immediate aftermath of the Mongol invasion. The association between honor
and joy, a feature that the pre-Mongolian chronicles shared with Western literary
sources, disappeared, and so did the pairing of honor with glory. A military victory
still brought honor to the victor, as can be seen from the accounts of battles with
enemies other than the Mongols. The Rusian princes still "returned with honor"
after their victories over the Teutonic knights, the Lithuanians, or the Finnic peo-
ples of the North.[835] However, the battlefield ceased to be the main source of honor,
especially in Suzdalia. The *Laurentian Chronicle* represents the khan as the source
and the primary focus of honor. This view of the khan may be later transferred to
the tsar. This is all the more likely because Suzdalia, of course, became the heart-
land of Muscovy, and the dynasty that ruled Russia until the end of the sixteenth
century traced its origin to the princes of the Suzdalian city of Moscow, who rose to
prominence thanks to, among other factors, their close cooperation with the khans.
The *Laurentian* entries for the 1240s-1250s might signify the beginning of the de-
velopment that later resulted in the central role of the tsar in the "community of
honor" described by Kollmann.

---

[834]PSRL 2, 795.

[835]E.g., PSRL 1, 469, 470, 474; PSRL 2, 826, 862.

Chapter 6

Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations: Social and Political Bonds Created by Interpersonal Agreements

In the two previous chapters, we have discussed some elements of political culture and social relations, such as honor and publicly displayed emotions, which loom large in the sources, but which have only recently become a subject of scholarly analysis. Until the late twentieth century, the political and social history of the medieval West was dominated by studies of interpersonal bonds subsumed under the broad notion of "feudalism." As we have seen, the absence of the relations traditionally described as feudal is often named as the defining characteristic of the "special path" that sets Rus apart from Europe. We have also seen that modern scholarship sees interpersonal relations within the elite of the medieval West as much more diverse and complicated than the uniform bond between lord and vassal described in the classic

works on feudalism. In this chapter, we will look at the personal bonds between the members of the elite represented in the Rusian sources and will compare them with the description of interpersonal relations in Western political narratives and with the recent findings of Western medievalists.

The most common words that the Rusian chronicles use in reference to the relations among the princes, and among the members of the upper social strata in general, are "love" (*liuby, liubov'*), and "cross-kissing" (*krestotselovanie*). The meaning of the latter is quite straightforward: it signifies an oath on the Cross. Thus, when a Rusian author states that someone "transgressed his cross-kissing," he means that this person broke his oath on the Cross. Such a perjurer is normally called *krestoprestupnik*, "a cross-transgressor." "To kiss the Cross to somebody on something" is to make a sworn promise; for two or more parties to kiss the Cross "between themselves" or "to each other/to one another" is to make a sworn agreement; "to lead" or "to bring" (*voditi*) someone to the Cross is to make this person give a sworn promise. The meaning of "love" in political narratives is more complicated and ambiguous, and it needs to be discussed at some length.

6.1 Political Meanings of "Love"

We have already encountered "love" in our discussion of the representations of emotions, and we remember that the Rusian political narratives present "brotherly love," *bratoliubie* as the ideal state of relationships within the dynasty and as the cornerstone of peace and prosperity in Rus. Indeed, the chronicles often give the impression that princely politics knows only two states of affairs: princes can be either "in love," or at war, with one another. Sometimes "love" is explicitly opposed to peace, as in the message of Viacheslav to Iurii Dolgorukii reported under 1149. At that time, Viacheslav, who would later become the co-ruler of Iziaslav Mstislavich

in Kiev, was Iurii's ally. In his message, Viacheslav describes his difficulties with Iziaslav, at the moment his and Iurii's common enemy:

> "Either give to Iziaslav what he wants from you (*chego ti khochet'*), or come to me with your troops and protect (*zastupi*) my *volost.* Iziaslav said thus to me, 'Be in the father's place for me; go and sit on the Kievan throne, for I cannot get along with Iurii (*siadi zhe v Kieve, a s Gurgem ne mogu zhiti*). If you do not want to accept me into love (*v liubov' priiati*) and will not take the Kievan throne (*ni Kievu poideshi sedeti*), I will burn (*khochu pozhechi*) your *volost.*'"[836]

These few short lines encompass several themes important for an understanding of Rusian political culture. One of them is the Kievan "duumvirate" discussed above. We see that Iziaslav has already come up with the idea of putting Viacheslav on the Kievan throne, but this idea has not yet taken the form that would eventually make it work. As we know, in the end, Iziaslav persuaded Viacheslav not by threats but by making an apology and by showing signs of outward respect. We have also encountered the formula "to be in the father's place" describing the relations between older and younger brothers in a princely family. Viacheslav and Iziaslav, of course, were not brothers, but an uncle and a nephew. We will discuss the meanings of the terms "father" and "son" as applied to interprincely relations later. For now, we will concentrate on the meaning of "love," which Iziaslav seeks from Viacheslav.

It is quite obvious that this "love" is not personal affection or emotional attachment. "Accepting" or "receiving" (*priiati*) Iziaslav "into love" is the alternative to a war with him. Another passage that presents love as an opposite of war is the *Kievan Chronicle*'s discussion of the bad relationships between Mstislav Iziaslavich and other princes, which serves to explain their joint expedition against him resulting in the notorious sack of Kiev in 1169. After describing conflicts between Mstislav and several other princes, the chronicler adds, "At the same time Andrei Giurgevich [Bogoliubskii] was a prince in Suzdal, and he did not have love for Mstislav (*be ne imeia liubvi k Mstislavu*)." The next thing we know about Andrei is that he is or-

---

[836]PSRL 2, 386.

ganizing a large-scale campaign against Mstislav.[837] Unlike other princes discussed in the same entry, he is not presented as having any particular disagreement with Mstislav. Apparently, "not to have love" for somebody is the same thing as to be hostile against this person.

If the absence of love means war, it is only logical that love is closely connected, and at times directly identified, with peace. The *Novgorodian First Chronicle* thus describes the end of interprincely strife when Iurii Dolgorukii was universally recognized as the lawful Kievan prince after Viacheslav's death: "Iurii accepted his nephews into peace (*priia v mir*) with love, and he gave an appropriate *volost* to each of them (*volosti im razdaia dostoinyia*), and there was quiet (*tishina*) in the Rus Land."[838] *Tishina*, that is "calm" or "quiet," is sometimes used in the chronicles as a synonym for "peace."[839] "Love" is also used as another word for "peace" and "quiet": when Sviatoslav Olgovich of Chernigov asked Iurii Dolgorukii "to accept into love (*priiati v liubov'*)" Sviatoslav's nephew, Iurii agreed and "gave peace" to the latter (*mir dast'*).[840] This passage employs the expressions "to give peace" and "to accept into love" as synonymous. A similar usage can be seen in the *Novgorodian First* entry for 1216 describing a conflict between the Novgorodians and Prince Iaroslav Vsevolodovich. Iaroslav occupied Torzhok, a town in the Novgorodian land, and he kept some Novgorodians there as prisoners. The Novgorodians invited another prince, Mstislav Mstislavich the "Fortunate (*Udatnyi*)." Mstislav sent a Novgorodian priest as an envoy to Iaroslav, asking him to leave Torzhok, to release the Novgorodians, and "to take love" with Mstislav (*a so mnoiu liubov' vozmi*). However, Iaroslav "did not like that [and he] sent the priest back without peace (*pusti pop bez mira*)."[841] The refusal "to take love" means sending the envoy back "without peace."

---

[837]PSRL 2, 543.

[838]*N1L*, 29.

[839]See e.g. PSRL 2, 500, 616, 735, 737.

[840]PSRL 1, 344.

[841]*N1L*, 55.

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

However, love did not always mean "peace." For example, when Oleg Svia-toslavich of Novgorod-Severskii "entered into love with Iziaslav Davidovich of Chernigov (*vstupi u liubov' k Iziaslavu*)," the next thing they did together was to attack Iziaslav's rival Rostislav Mstislavich.[842] In this case, "love" is apparently a synonym for "alliance," and when the chronicler reports that Iziaslav's envoys came to Oleg "with love, whith the speech of love (*s liboviu, s liubnoiu rech'iu*)," it means that they came with the proposal for Oleg to become Iziaslav's ally.

In other cases, the meaning of "love" is closer to "agreement" or "treaty." In the *Novgorodian First* entry for 1190, "love" describes an agreement of the princes and elites of Novgorod and Polotsk to make a joint raid into the neighboring territories:

> Prince Iaroslav [Vladimirovich] went to [the town of] Luki, having been called there by the princes and the people of Polotsk (*polot'skoiu kniazh'eiu i polotsiany*), and he took the best men of Novgorod with him (*novgorodets' pered'niuiu druzhinu*). They had a conference (*sniashasia*) on the border [between the Novgorod and the Polotsk territories], and established (*polozhisha*) love between themselves: [namely] that they will all gather in the winter and go against either the Lithuanians or the Chud (*iliubov' ako na zimu vsem sniatisia liubo na Litvu liubo na Chud'*)... And in winter, Prince Iaroslav ... went against the Chud and took the city of Iuriev, burned their land and took an innumerable multitude of captives (*polona beshchisla*).[843]

In a literal, word-by-word translation, the parties who met in Luki established "love between themselves that all would gather in the winter against either the Chud or the Lithuanians." In other words, they made an agreement to gather in the winter. Similarly, "love" is connected with *riad*, that is "agreement" or "treaty," in the *Kievan Chronicle* entry for 1196. This entry contains a very interesting and informative account of an interprincely conflict which involved the top Olgovichi and Monomakhovichi. We will discuss other aspects of this account later; for now we will concentrate on the message that Iaroslav Vsevolodovich of Chernigov sent to

---

[842]PSRL 2, 513-14, under 1161.

[843]*N1L*, 40. Chud was the name used in the Rusian chronicles for Finnic ethnic groups living in present-day Estonia and Northern Russia. Iuriev is the Rusian name for what is nowadays the city of Tartu in Estonia.

Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo after Vsevolod had invaded the Olgovichi's lands:

> You took our inheritance (*otchinu*) and our livelihood (*khleb*). In case you like to have a just agreement with us and to be in love with us (*azh' liubish' s nami riad pravyi i v liubvi s nami byti*), we do not seek to avoid love (*liubvi ne begaem'*) ... However, if you have contrived something else, we do not seek to avoid that either, and may God do his judgment between us and you (*paky li chto esi umyslil, a togo ne begaem zhe da iako ny Bog rasudit' s vami*).[844]

Apparently, the gist of this message is that Iaroslav, on behalf of the Olgovichi, proposes to start negotiations, but at the same time he makes it clear that the Olgovichi are not afraid to fight Vsevolod if need be. The outcome of a war or a battle was often referred to as "God's judgment." Thus, the Olgovichi's readiness to accept God's judgment signifies their readiness to fight, and "something else" that Vsevolod might have contrived is an indirect way to refer to his possible plans of a full-scale war with the Olgovichi. On the other hand, Vsevolod and the Olgovichi will be "in love" if they manage to conclude an agreement. Thus, this passage demonstrates the connections of "love" with both peace and an agreement, the two aspects that we have encountered separately in other accounts.

Another example of the connection between love, peace, and agreement is the passage about the peace talks between Iziaslav Mstislavich and his uncles Iurii Dolgorukii and Viacheslav. The talks were mediated by Vladimir of Galich. Vladimir was trying to persuade Iurii and Viacheslav to make peace with Iziaslav. Viacheslav "listened to ... Vladimir, accepted his words into his heart, and inclined towards an agreement (or: treaty) and towards love (*potknusia k riadu i k liubvi*)."[845] "Love" here is synonymous with "peace," because Viacheslav's inclination towards love is the result of hearing Vladimir's argument for making peace. In this passage we again see "love" standing next to *riad*, that is "agreement" or "treaty." Probably, the best translation for *potknusia k riadu i k liubvi* is "he wanted to conclude a peace treaty."

---

[844]PSRL 2, 698-9.
[845]PSRL 2, 393.

Indeed, the account of the talks mediated by Vladimir ends with the report of a peace treaty, which all the parties sealed by kissing the cross. As we know, this is how treaties and agreements were normally sealed; hence the expressions such as "to kiss the Cross on love/with love" or "to kiss the Cross to be in love with someone/to have someone in love" used by the chroniclers.[846] The meaning of such expressions is that those who kissed the Cross made a sworn agreement. We will discuss such agreements in detail later, and we shall see that some of them were alliances between equal partners, but others imply a subordinated position of one party.

We should not assume, however, that every time we see a reference to "love" between princes, this means that they have entered into an alliance or an agreement. This cannot be the case in the passage representing the reaction of the men (*druzhina*) of Mstislav Iziaslavich to the slander that their prince was planning to capture David and Riurik Rostislavichi:

> 'This is a work of some evil men who, out of envy for your love that you have for your brethren, uttered this evil speech (*tse* (sic) *da budut' zlii chelovetsi zavidiache tvoei liubvi iuzhe k bratt'e imeeshi, vlozhili budut' zlo slovo*) ... You could not have planned or done that [capturing David and Riurik] without us, and we all know your true love for all your brethren.'[847]

It is inconceivable to suppose that Mstislav had alliances or agreements with all his "brethren," that is, with all the princes. In fact, the same chronicle entry reports that Andrei Bogoliubskii "did not have love for Mstislav." Mstislav's "true love for all the brethren" apparently signifies something like goodwill and basic decency in his relations with other princes. Mstislav "was terrified in his mind (*uzhasesia mysl'iu*)" when he heard that David and Riurik were afraid to have dinner with him and that they accepted his invitation only on the condition that he would take an oath on the Cross not to capture them during this dinner.[848] The point of Mstislav's men,

---

[846]E.g. PSRL 2, 318, 345, 445, 477, 482, 498.

[847]PSRL 2, 542.

[848]Ibid.

when they talk about his "love," is that he is incapable of such treachery. Similarly, when a eulogy or an obituary of a prince states that "he had love for all,"[849] this, of course, does not mean that he was bound to "all" by treaties or that he never had a war with anyone. Rather, this is a reference to Christian love for one's neighbor and/or the claim that the praised prince treated everyone fairly and with goodwill.

Thus, "love" can take multiple meanings in political narratives; in other contexts it has yet more meanings, including those of personal affection or sexual love, as, for example, in Monomakh's recommendation for his sons to love their wives.[850] "Love" may have signified personal affection in some of the chronicle narratives as well. When the *Kievan Chronicle* reports that Iziaslav Mstislavich and his ally King Géza of Hungary "embraced with great love,"[851] it is hard to tell whether "great love" signifies the strength of their alliance or their feelings toward each other. Similarly, we do not know the exact meaning of the statement that Andrei did not have love for Mstislav. Probably, the chronicler wants to say that there was no agreement which would prevent a war between them, or that Andrei was about to start hostilities with Mstislav, but it is also possible that, on top of all the political circumstances, Andrei and Mstislav personally disliked each other.

We have seen that the semantic field of "love" in the Rusian chronicles is rather large. Therefore, it is all the more remarkable that it is identical with the semantic field of the verb *amer*[852] and of the noun *amor* in the *Song of Roland*, as described by George Jones. According to Jones, *amor* and *pais* (peace) "are practically synonymous."[853] *Amer* "does not always imply personal affection or emotional attachment. To be sure, it sometimes implies such affection, but this can not be assumed; for in

---

[849]E.g., PSRL 2, 550, 696.

[850]PSRL 1, 246.

[851]PSRL 2, 447.

[852]The East Slavonic expression corresponding to *amer* is "to have love (*imeti liubov'*)."

[853]George Fenwick Jones, *The Ethos of the Song of Roland* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1963), 40.

many cases *amer* means 'to keep peace with' or 'to make peace with,' or 'to form alliance with.'" Conversely, not to love someone means to have hostilities with this person. Jones thus comments on Ganelon's statement, "I will not love Roland as long as I live": "To be sure, Ganelon will hate his stepson, but that is not the crux of the matter. More important is the legal notice that he is proclaiming the state of hostility." Not only *Roland*, but also "other *chansons de geste* frequently use *amer* in its sense of 'to cease hostilities.'" For example, Gautier, a character in *Raoul of Cambrai*, "sears [sic] that he will not *amer* Bernier until he has destroyed or exiled him."[854] This, of course, does not mean that Gautier will feel any affection for Bernier *after* he destroys him. What he means is that he will only stop his hostilities when Bernier is dead or exiled.

In addition to signifying peace and agreements in general, *amer* can sometimes mean a more specific type of agreement, that between a lord and his man. Jones notes a connection between the notions of *amer* and *servir* (to serve), and he illustrates it with an example from a *chanson de geste*: "When the author of *Renaus de Montalban* says that Charlemagne was aided by *li baron qui l'amerent* ..., this need mean no more than that he was aided by his vassals or *ami*." The barons who "love" the emperor are contrasted with a character who used to be Charlemagne's man, but who later defied him. Thus, "loving" Charlemagne amounts to serving him faithfully. This type of relations is often signified by the term *amistié*, which means both "love" and "friendship."[855]

Such an understanding of "love" is in no way limited to the French *chansons de geste* examined by Jones. We see similar expressions in the Anglo-Norman *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*. For example, when Fantosme states that the count of Tancarville "does not love [Henry II] by oath (*ne l'aime pas de fei*)" (9.105), this means that he is fighting against Henry. Johnston translates *icil de Tankavrile ne*

---

[854]Jones, *The Ethos of the Song of Roland*, 36-7.
[855]Jones, *The Ethos of the Song of Roland*, 37-8.

l'aime pas de fei as "the count of Tancarville is his sworn enemy."[856] Thus, "not to love" someone means to be in a state of open hostility with this person. The main meaning of "love" in Fantosme is not personal affection, but rather "alliance" or "agreement." Thus, when Henry the Young King wants to make an alliance with William of Scotland so that they fight jointly against Henry II, he writes to William, "King Henry the Young sends to you with love (*vus mande par amur*)" (24.256).[857] This corresponds to both Jones's observations about the meaning of "love" in the *Song of Roland* and to the Rusian expressions "sending with love" or dispatching "messengers with love," signifying an invitation to join an alliance.[858] William did not respond to the "love" of Henry the Younger right away, but first he sent his envoy to Henry II. "Love" looms large in the exchange between William's envoy and the English king. The envoy says, "[William] is your kinsman whom you should love greatly (*parent cil devez mult amer*)." The next few lines explain what this means in practice: "[William] will serve you ... before a month is up with a thousand knights in armor and thirty thousand men without armor" on the condition that he receives Northumberland. Thus, "to love greatly" here means to conclude an agreement about military assistance in exchange for a land grant. Henry answers William through the envoy that he refuses to give any lands before "you do love and kinship" (*ferrez amur e cusinage*) (30, 33).[859] We will discuss *cusinage* later. For now, let us note that the gist of Henry's response is that he wants to get William's military help first and to reward him with a land grant afterward, if ever. Thus, *amur* here stands for an alliance, for military assistance, or maybe for service and loyalty in general. According to Fredric Cheyette and Howell Chickering, "loyalty" was the

---

[856] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 10-11.

[857] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 20. The main meaning of *par* is, of course, "through" or "by," but it can also mean "with." *The Anglo-Norman Dictionary* at http://www.anglo-norman.net/cgi-bin/form-s1 accessed 07.21.2013.

[858] E.g. PSRL 2, 503, 513-14.

[859] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 24, 28.

primary meaning of "love" in political contexts.[860]

Henry also expresses his surprise (*s'esmerveille*) that William, who "loved him much (*plus amot*)," refuses to come to his help before he gets Northumberland (33.368).[861] This is one of the instances where the meaning of *amer* is not immediately clear. On the one hand, this line may express an idea associated with the modern understanding of love: one should help unconditionally the person whom one loves. On the other hand, by describing William as somebody who "loved him much," Henry II may be referring to the service which William owes to him and which he presumably used to render in the past. In other passages of his poem, Fantosme uses *amer* in connection with the faith and service owed to a lord. For example, one character encourages another to persevere in a difficult situation by saying that "if he loves Henry [II], his good lord (*seignur*), he has an obligation (*deit*) to endure pain and suffering for him (156.1516)."[862] At the beginning of the *Chronicle*, Fantosme states that Henry II has *seignurie* over William, thus depicting Henry as William's lord (1.12). He also represents William as thinking about the "homage, service, and true allegiance" which he owes to Henry II (25.23).[863] Therefore, when Henry II expresses his surprise at William's attitude, his words that William "loved" him may mean that in the past the Scottish king fulfilled his obligations to his lord Henry.

This is all the more probable because William not simply "loved" Henry, but he did so "without showing any [intentions of doing] harm to him (*plus amot senz mustrer nul damage*) (33.368)."[864] *Damage* appears to be the vernacular equivalent

---

[860]"In its routine use in political contexts, 'love' signified political and personal loyalty, a layer of meaning that the troubadours continually drew upon when they used 'love' in an erotic sense." Fredric Cheyette and Howell Chickering, "Love, Anger, and Peace: Social Practice and Poetic Play in the Ending of Yvain," *Speculum* 80 (2005): 75-117, at 84.

[861]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 28.

[862]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 112. See also ibid., 18 (21.225), 40 (56.524).

[863]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 2, 22. On the relations between William and Henry II and on William's homage to Henry for the English lands that he held, see Duffy, "Henry II and England's Insular Neighbours," 131-4, 151.

[864]Jonston translates this as "loved him most dearly without offering him any hurt."

of the Latin *dampnum* - damage, harm. Fulbert of Chartres stresses that "he who swears fidelity to his lord (*qui domino suo fidelitatem iurat*)" has an obligation not to do any harm to him.[865] High medieval French oaths that a man swore to his lord typically included the promise not to do any harm to the lord; it is likely that at least in some cases the lord swore a similar promise to his man.[866] Norman England, of course, had close cultural and political ties with France; it is possible that *damage* in Fantosme refers to William's obligation not to do harm to his lord. If this is true, then Henry II's response to William's request of Northumberland may be construed as the following: William used to fulfill his obligations towards Henry without asking any more lands than he already held from him; why is he asking for Northumberland now? In any case, however we interpret the nuances of "love" in Fantosme, it appears to belong to the same semantic field that covers the meanings of "love" and related words in the French *chansons de geste* and in the Rusian chronicles.

If we turn from literary to diplomatic sources, we will see that they use "love" in a similar way. Débax starts her discussion of the notion of "love and friendship" in the Languedocien oaths by a statement that should by now sound very familiar to readers of this chapter: "*Amor* and *amicitia* are not to be understood in their modern psychological sense." Then she proceeds to explain that these words predominantly described agreements.[867] We will now concentrate on this particular meaning of

---

Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle, 28-9.

[865]"Ne sit in dampnum domino de corpore suo ... ne sit ei in dampnum de secreto suo uel de municionibus ... ne sit ei in dampnum de sua iustitia ..." *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres*, 90-92.

[866]Stephen White, "Stratégie rhétorique dans la *Conventio* de Hugues de Lusignan," *Histoire et société: mélanges offerts à Georges Duby* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1992), 147-57, at 148, 152; idem, "A Crisis of Fidelity in c. 1000?" in Isabel Alfonso, Hugh Kennedy, and Julio Escalona, eds., *Building Legitimacy: Political Discourses and Forms of Legitimacy in Medieval Societies* (Boston: Brill, 2004), 27-49, at 43; Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 101.

[867]Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 126. For more on "love" and on the relations between its meanings in political narratives, diplomatic sources, and courtly literature, see also Cheyette and Chickering, "Love, Anger, and Peace," and Huguette Legros, "Le

"love." We have seen that this word was used in the sense of "agreement" in the French and English, as well as in the Rusian, texts. Now let us look at other terms that signified an agreement, and then at the contents of agreements between members of the elite. What kind of relations did they establish, and how do they compare in the Rusian and Western sources?

6.2 Love, Friendship, and Other Terms for Contractual Interpersonal Relations

It appears that political "love" has not been studied *per se*, but rather it has been included in works on the medieval notion of "friendship" (*amicitia* in Latin). Normally, scholars discuss these two concepts together, talking about "friendship and love."[868] For some authors, it is self-evident that the two are identical. For example, Klaus van Eickels illustrates his thesis about the connection between "friendship and feudo-vassalic faith" in the twelfth century with a reference to *Roland*, the author of which "employs ... *par amur et par feid* (through love and loyalty) as a standing formulaic phrase."[869] Thus, for Eickels, the usage of *amur* is indicative of the connotations of "friendship." Althoff argues that in many cases it is, indeed, quite legitimate to identify "love" with "friendship": according to him, "Gregory of Tours was clearly describing a friendship alliance when he described a promise of mutual loyalty (*fides*) and affection (*caritas*) between two parties."[870]

---

vocabulaire de l'amitié, son évolution sémantique au cours du XIIe siècle," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 90 (1980): 131-9.

[868]The only work known to me where "love" in a political sense is analyzed without being put together with "friendship" is Cheyette and Chickering, "Love, Anger, and Peace," at 84, 113.

[869]Klaus van Eickels, "'Homagium' and 'Amiticia': Rituals of Peace and their Significance in the Anglo-French Negotiations of the Twelfth Century," *Francia* 24 (1997): 133-40, at 137.

[870]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 69.

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

Overall, there appear to be good reasons to view political "friendship" and "love" as a single category. To begin with, the words for both of them have the same root *am-* (from the Latin *amare*), and thus they are grammatically related in Old French, as well as in Latin - although in Latin this is true only for *amor*, and not for other terms signifying different varieties of love. Moreover, in Old French the same word *ami/amie* stands for "friend," "kinsman/kinswoman" and "beloved."[871] More importantly, "friendship" and "love" are often put together in medieval sources. To give just a few examples: "any who take their love and friendship from you"; "[being] linked by ties of sworn friendship, we do not wish to break the bonds of our concord and love"; "we will be allied by a strong bond of love and friendship."[872] Apparently, the authors of those passages do not differentiate ties of love from ties of friendship. A close examination of the usages of *amicitia*, *amistié*, *amur*, and of various Latin words signifying "love" in political contexts across many medieval texts may reveal nuances of meanings specific for each term; however, such a task would require a separate study. For the purpose of the present dissertation, we will follow those scholars who do not differentiate between the relations described in the sources by either of these words.

That said, I would like to note that there seems to be a difference between the usages of "love" and "friendship" in political contexts, but it is related not to the contents of the agreements that these words describe, but to the character of the

---

[871]Hindley, Langley, and Levy, *Old French-English Dictionary*, 29.

[872]Ki de vus departirunt amur ne druerie," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 2 (1.10); "Ego et Arnulfus, conjuratae amicitiae intricati copula, nolumus concordiae et dilectionis ... nostra ... scindere," Jules Lair, ed., *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum auctore Dudone Sancti Quintini decano*, Extrait des Mémoires de la Société des Antiquaires de Normandie 23 (Caen: Le Blanc-Hardel, 1865), 204 (III.59); "firmo dilectionis et amicitie (sic) vinculo confederavimus," an unpublished manuscript of the agreement between the two bishops, Philip von Heinsberg of Cologne and Ulrich of Halberstadt, as quoted in Claudia Garnier, *Amicus amicis, inimicus inimicis: Politische Freundschaft und fürstliche Netzwerke im 13. Jahrhundert*, Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 46 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2000), 18.

sources where the usages occur. It appears to me that "love" is the primary word of choice in texts written in the vernacular or connected with an oral tradition, while the learned Latin authors prefer "friendship." To prove or disprove this suggestion, more research is needed, but my general impression is that Fantosme, Wace, and the author of the *Song of Roland* use mostly "love" and occasionally "love and friendship," while the Latin historiographers of the same period use "friendship" and occasionally "friendship and love." Indeed, the works on medieval political friendship have shown that the term with which it was signified, *amicitia*, is rooted in the classical tradition. According to Althoff, it is hard to tell "how much the medieval bond of *amicitia* owed to its ancient predecessor, because the medieval bond had similarities with the Germanic *amicitia* too."[873] However, he does not explain what Germanic term signified this bond because he discusses all alliances of love and friendship summarily, concentrating on their contents and not on the terminology. The essence of the relations described in the sources as *amicitia* may well "not demonstrably owe any more to one tradition than the other,"[874] but the word has profoundly classical connotations.

Claudia Garnier notes that the notion of friendship in antiquity was very multi-faceted, and it included the meaning later to be used by medieval authors: pragmatic, politically motivated *amicitia* based on the principle of *do-ut-des*.[875] It is likely that the medieval learned authors applied this term to the relations which in oral discourse were known as "love." Indeed, the Rusian chronicles, blissfully unaware of Sappho or Catullus, did not see any problems with statements such as that two princes "made a great love with each other (*stvorista liubov' mezhi soboiu veliku*)."[876] Similarly, the *Chanson de la Croisade* could describe the king's men as his "lovers,"[877] and the

[873]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 68.

[874]Ibid.

[875]Garnier, *Amicus amicis*, 5.

[876]PSRL 2, 403.

[877]William of Tudela, *Chanson de la croisade*, 1:70, as quoted in Fredric L. Cheyette,

author of the *Conventum Hugonis*, who, to put it mildly, was not very well versed in classical Latin, could write that Hugh did not marry a certain girl "because of his love for the count (*propter eius amorem*)."[878] This means that the count wanted to prevent an alliance between Hugh and the girl's father; therefore, he commanded Hugh to take back his promise to marry the girl. Hugh obeyed, even though this deprived him of a chance to obtain a politically useful connection through marriage. The author and the audience of the *Conventum* apparently never thought that Hugh could love the count in any other sense than showing him the obedience due to a lord. By the same token, the poet and the audience of the *Chanson de la Croisade* understood the king's "lovers" as his faithful companions. However, for authors more familiar with the classical tradition, such statements may have looked awkward. Therefore, they either used Latin terms signifying spiritual love, such as *caritas* and *dilectio*, or, more often, described as *amicitia* that which was probably called "love" in the vernacular. The bottom line is that whatever were the reasons for each particular medieval author to choose one or another term in each particular case, the relations that they labeled "love" and "friendship" were essentially the same.

The Rusian chroniclers, while preferring "love" by far, occasionally use "friendship" as well. To be precise, the abstract nouns signifying friendship - *druzh'ba* and *priiatel'stvo* - are found very rarely, if ever, in political narratives, but once in a while the chroniclers use "friend" and "to be friends" in political contexts. The East Slavonic words for "friend" are *drug* and *priiatel'*. The first of them is mostly used in quotations from the Scripture or in reference to the relations between private ordinary people, such as "a brother was separated from his brother and a friend from

---

review of *La féodalité languedocienne aux XI-XII siècles: serments, sommages et fiefs dans le Languedoc des Trencavel* by Hélène Débax, *The Medieval Review* 12 (2004) at https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/5661/04.12.14.html?sequence=1 accessed 07.24.2013.

[878]*Conventum Hugonis*, 542.

his friend (*drug or druga svoego*)" by soldiers sacking a town.[879] A rare example
of *drug* used in a political sense is the account about the peace agreement between
General Pretich and the leader of the nomadic steppe people, the Pechenegs: "The
Pecheneg prince said to Pretich, 'Be my friend (*budi mi drug*),' and he [Pretich]
agreed (*tako stvori*)."[880] *Priiatel'* and its related word *priiati* (to be friends with
somebody, to support somebody)[881] are more common than *drug*, but less common
than expressions with "love." The pragmatic and political nature of relations sig-
nified by *priiatel'* is clearly seen from the words of Igor Olgovich addressed to his
older brother Vsevolod, Prince of Kiev, who had a military conflict with Vladimir
Volodarevich of Galich. When the war turned out badly for Vladimir, he "started to
send [messages] to Igor: 'If you reconcile (*umirishi*) me with your brother, I will help
you to get the Kievan throne (*pomogu ti pro Kiev*) after Vsevolod's death." When
Vsevolod refused to make peace with Vladimir, Igor said to him reproachfully, "You
do not wish me well. What is the point of you bequeathing Kiev to me, if you do
not allow me to find friends (*priiatel'i*)?"[882] Vsevolod was convinced, and he made a
peace with Vladimir so that the latter would become his brother's *priiatel'*, that is
a supporter in the struggle for the Kievan throne. Thus, Vladimir and Igor entered
into a contractual agreement based on the same principle of *do-ut-des* as Western
amicitia.

Another good example of political friendship is found in the *Kievan* entry for
1148. This entry describes the attempt of Gleb Giurgevich, a son of Iurii Dolgo-
rukii, to capture the city of Pereiaslavl which at that time was controlled by Iziaslav
Mstislavich. Iziaslav successfully repelled Gleb's attack and forced him to retreat to

---

[879]PSRL 2, 643.

[880]PSRL 1, 67.

[881]The infinitive of this word coincides with the infinitive of "to accept," but these two
verbs conjugate differently: "to accept" is *priiati, priimu*, and "to be friends/to support"
is *priiati, priiaiu.*

[882]"*Ne khoshcheshi me dobra. Pro shto mi obrekl' esi Kiev, a priiatel'i mi ne dasi pri-
imat*i?" PSRL 2, 316, under 1144.

his father's fortress of Gorodok, where Iziaslav besieged him:

> And Gleb sent to Vladimir [Davidovich of Chernigov] and to Sviatoslav Olgovich and
> said to them, 'Iziaslav is advancing on me, send me help.' But they cannot render
> any help. Iziaslav came to Gorodok against Gleb and stayed there for three days.
> [Gleb] Giurgevich became frightened (*uboiavsia*), and he came out of Gorodok and
> bowed down to Iziaslav, and made peace (*umirisia*) with him. Iziaslav then returned
> to Kiev, and [Gleb] Giurgevich sent a message to Vladimir, saying, 'I was forced to
> kiss the Cross to Iziaslav against my will (*po nevoli esm' khrest tseloval*), because he
> besieged me, and there was no help from you. But now I, by all means (*vsiako*), wish
> to be with you (plural), and I am your friend (*priiaiu vama*).[883]

This passage illustrates not only the meaning of *priiati* in the sense of "to be friends
with" or "to support," but also another important issue related to the terminology
of interprincely agreements. Thus, the chronicler reports that Gleb "bowed down"
and "made peace," not that he swore any oath or entered into any sworn agreement
with Iziaslav. However, later it turns out that he, in fact, "kissed the Cross to
Iziaslav." Therefore, when we read general statements that princes "made peace" or
"settled their disagreements (*uladishasia*)," these statements may refer to a sworn
agreement between these princes. Thus, the chroniclers do not employ any fixed
terms to describe agreements or contractual relations. The East Slavonic words for
"treaty," "agreement," or "settlement" are *riad* or *dokonchanie*, but, as we have
seen, "love" and "cross-kissing" are often used in the sense of "agreement" as well.
On the other hand, "love" does not always signify "agreement," but can take other
meanings. Finally, sworn agreements are not necessarily mentioned explicitly, but
may be implied when the chroniclers refer to "making peace."

The terminology for agreements and contractual relations between the members
of the elite is equally ambiguous in the Western sources. The "oath of fealty," which
allegedly created the predominant type of interpersonal bond, is a scholarly construct,
not the term used in the sources other than those written by academic lawyers.
Magnus Ryan has shown that not only is there no consensus among modern scholars

---

[883]PSRL 2, 360. On *priiatel'* and *priiati*, see also Stefanovich, *Kniaz i boiare*, 175.

about what constitutes an oath of fealty, but that "medieval rulers, lawyers, and polemicists reached no consensus either." From his analysis, medieval theoretical works on fealty emerge as "professional legal reactions to a notoriously slippery concept."[884] In fact, recent scholarship displays a strong tendency against using the word "fealty" because of all the "feudal" baggage that it carries. Instead, modern scholars use more literal translations of the Latin *fidelitas*, such as "fidelity" or "loyalty."[885] However, it is not as simple as replacing the "oath of fealty" with the "oath of fidelity" or "loyalty," because "swearing *fidelitatem*" may mean different things in different contexts. Ryan shows how right were the German historians who first argued that "fealty was not a single category of oath and that it was, consequently, neither uniquely associated with, nor even in most cases suggestive of, what a vassal owed his lord."[886] It is difficult to come up with a single meaningful term - be it "oath of fealty," of "fidelity," or of anything else - which would describe all the situations involving *fidelitas*. To complicate the matter further, the sources use a number of different words to describe the relations which traditional scholarship associated with "fealty." We have seen that one of such words is "love"; but it can describe not only the hierarchical relations of lord and man, but also an alliance between equal partners, peace, absence of hostilities, personal affection, and erotic love.

The *Conventum Hugonis* presents a good example of the terminological muddle typical of medieval sources not influenced by Roman law. It concludes with the report that "the count [William V of Aquitaine] and his son received Hugh [IV of Lusignan] as their man in faith and trust (*receperunt Ugonem ad hominem in fide et*

---

[884]Magnus Ryan, "The Oath of Fealty and the Lawyers," in Joseph Canning and Otto Gerhard Oexle, eds., *Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 147 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1998), 211-28, at 211-12.

[885]See Hyams, "The End of Feudalism?" 568; Cheyette, review of *La féodalité langue-docienne*.

[886]Ryan, "The Oath of Fealty and the Lawyers," 217.

in credentia)," and Hugh, in turn, "swore fidelity to them (*iuravit illis fidelitatem*)." This constituted the *conventum* between Hugh, on the one hand, and William and his son, on the other, as far as one can judge from the not altogether clear statement that Hugh, William, and his son acted "*per nomen autem de tali conventu ut sicut finis locuta fuit*."[887] Hyams translates this as "on the strength of the agreement as it was finally pronounced," and Martindale as "in the name of this agreement, just as the settlement was proclaimed aloud."[888] Thus, the two translators interpret the word *finis* differently: Hyams as "at last" and Martindale as "settlement." The author of the *Conventum*, indeed, repeatedly uses *finis* to signify "agreement" or "settlement."[889]

By calling what was concluded between Hugh and William V a *conventum* and maybe also *finis*, the author of the *Conventum Hugonis* represents his protagonists as making an agreement or a settlement. On the other hand, this final agreement or settlement apparently restored the relations that had existed between William and Hugh, but were broken because of William's bad behavior. The whole narrative is essentially a list of William's broken promises to Hugh, juxtaposed with the accounts of Hugh faithfully fulfilling his obligations to William, whom he addresses as "lord."[890] Such an organization of the text strongly suggests that there had been an agreement between Hugh and William before, which delineated their mutual obligations. White convincingly argues that Hugh, at least in one instance, appears to quote an oath which William had sworn to him.[891] However, the text does not refer to any previous agreements or oaths explicitly. The relations between Hugh and William, which had existed before Hugh defied William, are described as "love," "faith," "fidelity," and

---

[887] *Conventum Hugonis*, 548.
[888] Hyams, *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan*; Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 548a.
[889] *Conventum Hugonis*, 541, 542, 543, and passim.
[890] See White, "Stratégie rhétorique," 148-51.
[891] White, "Stratégie rhétorique," 152.

"friendship."[892] In addition, one of William's broken promises to Hugh was, "You will be my friend above everyone else except my son."[893]

What terms should we, then, use to describe the relations between William and Hugh? Should we say that Hugh was William's vassal? Or that he made an oath of fealty (fidelity, loyalty) to William? Or that the two concluded an agreement of love and/or friendship? Were they tied by the bond of *amicitia*? Or did they enter into a "feudal contract"? Each of these expressions would describe some aspect(s) of their relations as they are represented in the *Conventum*, but would contradict other aspects. In the final analysis, it seems that all we can legitimately state is that Hugh and William made a sworn agreement.

I will not repeat the exercise with other accounts of interpersonal relations and agreements in order to show that they are equally imprecise and inconsistent in their usage of terms such as "fidelity," "love," "friendship," "concord," "settlement" and so on. Instead, I will cite the conclusion that Althoff drew after he analyzed many such accounts: "Such are the problems of terminology afflicting the study of different bonds in the middle ages. Conclusions about the nature of treaties or alliances should never be reached too quickly simply on the basis of the terms used."[894] In addition, if some sources use terminology inconsistently, others do not use any terminology at all. This is a case with the source of the utmost importance for a study of interpersonal agreements, the texts of the oaths sworn by the Languedocien aristocrats. Débax divides them into various categories such as "oaths of security," "feudo-vassalic oaths," and others, but she makes it clear that this classification is her own. The original documents do not contain any self-designation.[895] They consist

---

[892]*Conventum Hugonis*, "propter eius [William's] amorem fidelitatemque," 542; Hugh suffered losses "per fidelitatem tuam [William's], 543; "misit se Ugo in credenda et in amicitia comiti seniori suo, et fecisset pro eius amore ...," 546.

[893]"meusque eris amicus super omnes preter filio meo," *Conventum Hugonis*, 542.

[894]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 69.

[895]"Les serments ne s'auto-désignant pas," Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 100.

of descriptions of promises made by one person to another, and it is on the basis of the nature of these promises that Débax assigns them to different categories.

Such a situation with the terminology has a significant implication for a comparative analysis of interpersonal relations and agreements. Apparently, a meaningful comparison is possible only if we concentrate on the contents of the agreements, on the position of the parties in respect to each other, on their mutual, or unilateral, obligations. A comparison on the basis of the terms used in the sources - or, not even in the sources, but in scholarly literature, as is sometimes the case with comparative studies - will not lead us very far. For example, Stefanovich's conclusion about profound differences in the social organizations of the Rusian and the Westen elites is based on his findings about the absence of the "oath of fealty (*kliatva vernosti*)" in Rus.[896] "Fealty," indeed, did not exist in Rus, but it hardly existed anywhere outside of the works of professional lawyers, and even they disagreed about what it was, as Ryan has shown.

Therefore, we will concentrate on what members of the Rusian and Western elites promised to each other when they entered into interpersonal agreements and what were the implications for them if they did not keep their promises. Along the way, we will note similarities and differences in terminology of agreements and interpersonal bonds, but we will not necessarily treat them as indicators of similarities or differences between the types of relations that they describe. In fact, we have already seen similarities between political uses of "love" in Rusian and Western sources. Another parallel is the use of the derivatives of "to finish" in political contexts. *Finis*, as it is used in the *Conventum Hugonis*, directly corresponds to one of the East Slavonic terms for "agreement," *dokonchanie*. This word literally means "finishing," and it is derived from the verb (*do*)*konchati*, the main meaning of which is "to finish," but which also stands for "to settle." On the other hand, *vernost'*, the East Slavonic

---

[896]Stefanovich, "Kniaz' i boiare," 207-9.

equivalent to *fidelitas*, is used in political contexts very rarely.[897] We will continue to compare terms and expressions as we encounter them, but we will also try to see if different terms may describe similar relations, and vice versa.

6.3 The Sources for Contractual Interpersonal Relations

The main problem with the study of interpersonal agreements is that for a long time they were concluded orally. We know about them only from narrative sources which often make no more than brief statements to the effect that X "swore fidelity" to Y, or "became Y's man," or else that X and Y "concluded an accord of love and friendship" or "promised to help each other." Even when accounts are more detailed, we still do not know how fully and/or truthfully they reflect the actual agreements.

Interpersonal agreements began to be put into writing at different times in different regions. Thus, the earliest texts of oaths sworn to each other by aristocrats of Languedoc are dated circa 1000, while in the German Empire "the tentative beginning of fixing *amicitiae* in writing" occurred in the 1150s-1160s, according to Garnier.[898] Since Garnier treats *amicitia* together with *foedus* (agreement) and since she discusses both "vertical" and "horizontal bonds," this amounts to a statement that interpersonal agreements began to be written down around the 1150s-1160s. The Rusian chronicles begin to mention written documents containing oaths sworn on the Cross at about the same time, just a little earlier. The name for such a document was *k(h)restnaia gramota*. The first of these words is an adjective derived from *krest*, "cross," and the second signifies any written document. Thus, the literal meaning

---

[897]See above, p. 71

[898] Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 100; Garnier, *Amicus amicis, inimicus inimicis*, 15.

of this expression is "cross-document," and it may be rendered as a "charter" or "document of the Cross." Such a document is first mentioned in the *Kievan* entry for 1144: Vladimir Volodarevich of Galich and Vsevolod Olgovich of Kiev "quarreled (*roskotorastasia*)," and Vladimir "cast" or "threw" the charter of the Cross "at" or "to" Vsevolod (*vozverzhe emu gramotu khrestnuiu*). This apparently was tantamount to a declaration of war, which broke out between the two princes immediately after the "throwing" of the charter.[899] We do not know when the agreement written on the charter, which Vladimir "threw," had been made, but it is likely that this happened sometime before 1140, because in the entry for 1140 Vsevolod "sends" Vladimir on a campaign.[900] Therefore, in 1140 they either were allies, or more likely, Vladimir was in some way subordinate to Vsevolod, which means that they must have had some type of agreement prior to that. Thus, we know that at least one instance of writing down an agreement sworn on the Cross occurred definitely before 1144, and probably before 1140.[901] Unfortunately, not a single pre-Mongolian "charter of the Cross" survives, and all the information about interprincely agreements comes from rather brief references to them in the chronicles. Unlike the treaties between Rus and Byzantium, the texts of agreements between princes are not copied into the chronicles and are not even quoted at length.

Much information about agreements between members of the aristocracy in the West also comes from historiographical sources. The exception is Languedoc: it has an extraordinarily rich cartulary of sworn agreements made by lay aristocrats between the early eleventh century and 1206, but no narrative sources which would

---

[899]PSRL 2, 314-15.

[900]PSRL 2, 304.

[901]The *Kievan Chronicle* contains chronological mistakes; however, these two entries appear to be chronologically correct: by all evidence, the entry for 1140 describes the events of 1139-40, and the entry for 1144 those of 1144-45. See N. G. Berezhkov, *Khronologiia russkogo letopisaniia* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1963), 146. The "charters of the Cross" are also mentioned in PSRL 1, 412-13 and PSRL 2, 346-7, 461-2, 670, 686, 693. See also Franklin, "Literacy and Documentation," 23-4.

systematically describe the history of the region.

Not all authors of the narrative sources are equally interested in providing the details about relations within the elite, about all these agreements and alliances, shifting allegiances, conflicts and peace settlements, oaths kept and broken ... Out of the Rusian chronicles, the *Kievan* and the *Galician-Volhynian* stand out for their detailed accounts of interprincely relations, and the latter also provides more information about relations between princes and the non-princely elite than other sources. The compilers of both chronicles probably made use of personal accounts about interprincely negotiations made by envoys whom the princes entrusted with conducting these negotiations.[902] Furthermore, the *Kievan* apparently incorporates parts of no longer extant histories of several individual princely houses. The *Laurentian* chronicler, on the other hand, focuses mostly on just one princely family, that of Suzdalia, and he is not very interested in their interactions with other princes. For the author of the *Novgorodian*, the city community, not princes, is the center of attention.

As for the Western sources, the uniquely detailed, albeit very partisan, account of relationships between two members of the high Aquitanian aristocracy is found in the *Conventum Hugonis*. The descriptions of all William's broken promises and of all the "harm (*dampnum*)" and "evil (*malum*)" that Hugh suffered because of William are very reminiscent of some entries of the *Kievan Chronicle*. These entries report speeches made by princes' envoys or by princes themselves. For a meaningful comparison, such passages have to be quoted at length; therefore, I will give only two examples. Since my goal for now is to show structural similarities between the two passages, I will not go into the details of the political situations that they describe. Let us compare the general character of the following statements.

The *Kievan* entry for 1197:

Vsevolod [Bolshoe Gnezdo of Suzdalia] made a peace agreement with Iaroslav [Vsevo-

---

[902]See Franklin, "Literacy and Documentation," 21-2.

lodovich of Chernigov, the head of the Olgovichi clan], and he sent his man to Riurik [Rostislavich of Kiev], informing him: 'I have made peace with Iaroslav.' ... Riurik, having heard about Vsevolod's conference (*snem'*) [with Iaroslav] did not like this, and he was angry at Vsevolod [*pozhalova na n'*], because he did not fulfill what he had promised to him [to Riurik]. And he sent his man to Vsevolod, saying, '[You] kissed the Cross to me that who is my enemy is your enemy also, and you requested a share in the Rus Land [in the narrow sense] from me. I gave to you the best *volost*, not from abundance (*ne ot obil'ia*), but I took it from my brethren and from my son-in-law Roman for your sake. It is only for the sake of you, not anyone else (*ni pro kogo zhe iako zhe pro tia*), that he has become my enemy now. What did you promise to me? To mount your horse and to help me. And you whiled away (*perevel esi*) the last summer and winter [not helping me]. You have mounted your horse now, but how did you help me? You have made your own agreement (*svoi esi riad vzial*). And who was the reason that I had a war (*a pro kogo mi byla i rat'*)? ... What wrong did the Olgovichi do to me (*mne s Olgovichi kotoraiai obida byla*)? ... Because you had hostilities with them (*azhe bylo tebe ne dobro*), I am now in a state of hostility (*esm' ne dobr*), and I had a war with them and had my *volost* burned. Now [I see that] you have not fulfilled anything of what we had agreed (*kako esi so mnoiu umolvil*) and on what you had kissed the Cross to me.'[903]

An excerpt from the *Conventum*:

The count said to Hugh, 'I will not make an agreement (*finis*) with Geoffrey the viscount and with the men of Thouars *castrum* until I hand over (*reddam*) your land to you. ... But the Count made an agreement with viscount Geoffrey and with the men of Thouars, and did not make any agreement (*nihilque finis*) with Hugh, and Hugh did not have his land. And for the offense (*malifacto* (sic)) which Hugh did [to Geoffrey] for the sake of the Count (*pro Comiti*), Geoffrey started hostilities (*accepit contentionem*) with Hugh and burned the *castrum* Mouzeil, captured Hugh's knights (*caballarios*) and cut off their hands, and did enough other [bad] things. The Count in no way helped Hugh (*nihil iuvavit*), nor made a good agreement between them [Hugh and Geoffrey], but Hugh has lost his land [and] still [does not have it] (*adhuc suam terram Ugo perditur*); and because of the Count, he lost other land which he had held

---

[903]PSRL 2, 700-01. As discussed in Chapter Four, *pozhalovati na* has connotations of "to be angry with," "to blame, to find fault with," and "to complain"; therefore, *pozhalova na n'* can also be translated as "Riurik blamed him" and "Riurik complained about him." "To mount one's horse" is a formulaic expression meaning to "lead one's troops on a campaign." Riurik refers specifically to summer and winter because they were seasons of war, as opposed to spring and autumn, when the roads were dirty and the rivers were difficult to cross because they were partly covered with ice.

in peace (*alia terra quam in pace tenebat pro comite* (sic) *amittet*).[904]

Riurik does not mention any cut-off hands, but otherwise his speech to Vsevolod is practically identical to Hugh's complaints about William. Both Riurik and Hugh had conflicts with Iaroslav and Geoffrey respectively not because they had any quarrels of their own, but "on account of, " or "because of," or "for the sake of"[905] the parties with whom they had made agreements. Both were promised help, but did not get it. Both had their lands burned on account of their loyalty to Iaroslav and William respectively. Finally, both Iaroslav and William made separate agreements with those who did this burning, the former without consulting Riurik, and the latter without consulting Hugh.

The *Conventum* provides this and other examples of losses that Hugh suffered on account of William who never rendered him the promised help. The aim of the author is to explain why Hugh eventually "*defidavit comitem*," that is, defied, or formally broke his agreement with, the count. Before doing so, Hugh went to William's court and *misit eum in ratione de sua rectitudine*, but this did not help him (*et nihil illi profuit*).[906] *Misit*, of course, means "sent," but the *Conventum* often uses this word in the sense of "placed one's trust in."[907] *Ratio*, among many other things, signifies "legal cause," "redress," "lawsuit," "claim," and also "righteousness"; the main meaning of *rectitudo* is "justice," but it can also mean "righteousness" and "right."[908] It is hardly possible to translate with certainty the description of what Hugh did at William's court before defying him. Both Hyams and Martindale trans-

---

[904]*Conventum Hugonis*, 542-3.

[905]*Pro tia*, literally "for you" in East Slavonic; *pro Comite*, literally "for the Count" in Latin. (It is, of course, a mere coincidence that these prepositions in both languages should be "pro".)

[906]*Conventum Hugonis*, 547.

[907]E.g. *misitque Ugo in Deum et in illo* (and Hugh put his trust in God and in him [the Count]); *misitque Ugo in credentia seniori suo* (and Hugh put his trust in his lord's faithfulness), *Conventum Hugonis*, 543, 544.

[908]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 883-4, 892. On *ratio*, see also Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 551, note 22.

late this statement as "put his case before him [William] about his [Hugh's] right."[909] Whatever the exact meaning, the phrase *ratione de sua rectitudine* undoubtedly has strong connotations of self-justification, of Hugh demonstrating that he is in the right in regards to his agreement with William.

This phrase seems close to the East Slavonic expressions, which are also difficult to translate, *prav v krestnom tselovanii* and *opravlivatisia v krestnom tselovanii/v krestnoe tselovanie*. The first of these expressions literally means "right in one's cross-kissing," and the second means "to make oneself right" or "to justify oneself in cross-kissing." For example, the same Riurik Rostislavich and Iaroslav Vsevolodovich, who are described in the *Kievan* entry for 1197, made a sworn peace agreement, as reported in the entry for 1195.[910] Soon thereafter Iaroslav advanced against Riurik's brother David. When Riurik heard about this, he sent to Iaroslav, who was on his way against David, a man with the charters of the Cross which apparently contained the text of their mutual promise to keep peace. The envoy said to Iaroslav on behalf of David, "You have already broken our agreement and your oath on the Cross, and here are the charters of the Cross for you." Having heard this, Iaroslav turned home and "sent his envoy to Riurik, justifying himself in the cross-kissing and blaming David." The chronicler describes Iaroslav's arguments that attacking David would not really constitute breaking of the oath, because David had provoked him. Then the chronicler presents Riurik's counterarguments, and he finally concludes, "And thus there was much arguing (*raspre*) between them, and big (*velitse*) speeches, but they did not settle their disagreement (*ne uladishas'*)."[911] Apparently, from Riurik's perspective, Iaroslav was not "right in his cross-kissing."

Another example of "being right in one's cross-kissing" is very close to the

---

[909]Hyams, *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan*; Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 547a.
[910]PSRL 2, 690.
[911]PSRL 2, 693.

situation described in the *Conventum*. In the Kievan entry for 1161, Oleg, who, as a young prince, acts jointly with his father Sviatoslav Olgovich of Chernigov, asks the opinion of his men whether he and his father should keep their agreement with Rostislav Mstislavich of Kiev.

> Oleg's men said, 'Prince, is it good for you that they [Rostislav and his men] wanted to capture you in Kiev? And that they are taking Chernigov from your father in order to give it to someone else (*Chernigov otdaiut' podo ottsem tvoim*)? Your father and you are right in your cross-kissing.'

When Oleg's father Sviatoslav consulted with his men, they repeated the same arguments and added, "You, Prince, have already ruined your *volost* by supporting Rostislav (*volost' svoiu pogubil derzhasia po Rostislave*), and he gives you very little help anyway (literally: "helps you lazily," *on ti vsiako lenivo pomogaet'*)."[912] Convinced by these arguments, Oleg and Sviatoslav joined forces with Rostislav's adversaries. The chronicler does not tell us if they had contacted Rostislav first to present their reasons for ing their agreement with him, as Hugh did in respect to William and Iaroslav in respect to Rostislav. Otherwise, the reasons for breaking a sworn agreement, and considering oneself in the right while doing so, are exactly the same in the Rusian and the Aquitanian texts. Sviatoslav and Hugh "ruined" or "lost" their lands while not being helped by Rostislav and William respectively; both Rostislav and William gave, or allegedly planned to give, to someone else the lands that Sviatoslav and Hugh considered rightfully theirs.[913] The statement of the *Conventum* that *terram Ugo perditur* corresponds to the words of Sviatoslav's men, "ruined your volost, *volost' svoiu pogubil*," almost verbatim: *perdo* means "to destroy, ruin" as well as "to lose."

---

[912] PSRL 2, 513-14. See also PSRL 2, 395.

[913] According to the chronicler, Oleg and Sviatoslav believed a slander against Rostislav who in reality planned neither to capture Oleg nor to deprive Sviatoslav of Chernigov (PSRL 2, 512-14). However, for the sake of our argument, it is irrelevant whether the accusations against Rostislav were true or false. The essential point is that the speeches of Oleg's and Sviatoslav's men demonstrate what reasons were considered valid for hing a sworn agreement.

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

The role of the protagonists' men is also similar in the two accounts. The *Conventum* does not mention any opinions given to Hugh by his men until the point in the narrative where Hugh starts thinking about defying William. Before that, the pattern was "Hugh said," "Hugh did," "Hugh put his trust in his lord," and so on. However, when relations with William reach their lowest point, we are told, "It seemed to Hugh and *ad suos* that the Count was treating him badly."[914] Hyams and Martindale translate *visum fuit Ugoni et ad suos* as "it seemed to Hugh and his men."[915] It is, of course, quite likely that by *et ad suos* the author of the *Conventum* actually meant *et suis*. On the other hand, there is another possibility: *ad suos* may have been grammatically correct and then it would mean "according to his men." In this case, *visum fuit Ugoni et ad suos* might indicate not simply that Hugh and his men were of one opinion about William, but that Hugh was actually influenced by his men. In any case, it is remarkable that Hugh's *sui* appear in the narrative at the moment when Hugh is prepared to defend a disputed *castrum* "against all men (*contra omnes*)," presumably including William.[916] The author of the *Conventum* and the *Kievan* chronicler appear to be equally eager to show that the councilors either influenced, or at least approved, Hugh's and Sviatoslav's decisions to break their respective agreements.

In order to list all the parallels between the *Conventum* and the *Kievan Chronicle*, it would be necessary to reproduce the whole text of the former and a good half of the latter. I cannot think of any other Western narrative that would be as close to a Rusian chronicle as the *Conventum* is. At the same time, Western medievalists see the *Conventum* as a one-of-a-kind text. Barthélemy, apparently lost for words to describe this "most original and most rich" of all the legal notices produced in

---

[914] *Conventum Hugonis*, 546.

[915] Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 546a; Hyams, *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan*.

[916] *Conventum Hugonis*, 546.

the Loire valley, exclaims, "Quel document, pourtant!"[917] Martindale summarizes the common opinion when she describes the *Conventum*'s "form of composition" as "unparalleled" and when she writes that

> the character of the *Conventum* remains a problem. Although it resembles historical narratives of a literary type, in many ways it is unlike anything else which has survived for the first half of the eleventh century from the French kingdom.[918]

Does this mean that Hugh IV of Lusignan and William V of Aquitaine were very different from the French aristocrats described in other sources, but somehow uniquely close to the Rusian princes? This would be very unlikely.

Let us look at another Aquitanian text of the same period, the *Chronicle* by Adémar of Chabannes, where the same William is represented in a way which is very different from the *Conventum* in terms of literary composition. In some passages, he looks very different from the William of the *Conventum* in terms of his political standing as well. The foremost among these passages is the famous portrayal of William, which made him known in French historiography as "Guillaume le Grand."

> The Duke of the Aquitanians ... William was (*extitit*) most glorious and most powerful, friendly to all, great by his counsel, remarkable by his wisdom (*consilio magnus, prudentia conspicuus*), most generous in giving, a defender of the poor, a father of the monks ... He was thought to be more a king than a duke (*potius rex quam esse dux putabatur*) ... Indeed, he not only subjected all Aquitaine to his power (*imperium*) so that nobody dared to raise a hand against him, but, being most friendly with the king of the French (*regem Francorum amicissimus habens*), he was honored in his palace above other dukes. (...) Indeed, many times the Aquitanian magnates who attempted to rebel against this duke were all either subdued or destroyed (*sane multoties qui comiti eidem rebellare conabantur, Aquitanici primores, omnes vel edomiti vel prostrati sunt*) (III.41).[919]

In contrast with this royal-like figure ruling over his Aquitanian subjects and crushing the rebels, William of the *Conventum* operates through a network of agreements

---

[917]Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 452-3.

[918]Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 531.

[919]*Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*,161-3. On Adémar's representation of William, see Bachrach, "'Potius Rex quam Esse Dux putabatur'."

binding him to various individual magnates of Aquitania and of neighboring territories. The *Conventum* does not differentiate the latter from the former in their relations to the "Duke of the Aquitanians" (who is, of course, "count" in the *Conventum*). William's agreements with Hugh and with various other Aquitanians (Ralph, Joscelin, Geoffrey, Aimery, Bernard, Bishop Gilbert, Bishop Ysimbert, William of Angoulême) are treated in exactly the same manner as his agreements with Sancho of Gascony and with Fulk of Anjou.[920]

Indeed, in the *Conventum*, William appears to have no more *imperium* over the Aquitanians than he has over the Gascon or Angevin count. Thus, when a certain Aimery[921] seizes a *castrum*, this is not a question of the "duke of the Aquitanians" enforcing the law and dispatching somebody under his power to return the seized property and to punish the transgressor. Rather, William becomes "sad and angry (*contristavit se*)"[922] with Aimery, just as any Rusian prince would be with anyone who had seized his *volost*. In his anger and sadness, William starts a *contentionem* with Aimery, that is, a dispute or hostility. In this *contentio* against Aimery, "Hugh and William stood together (*steterunt insimul*)." This means that Hugh "helped [William] as best he could (*ut potuit*)," when William was besieging one of Aimery's *castra*. With Hugh's help, he successfully captured this *castrum*, and the *Conventum* explains that William did so "because of the offense which Aimery had committed against him (*pro malifacto* (sic) *quem faciebat ei*)."[923] *Malefactum*, which signifies

---

[920]*Conventum Hugonis*, 545, 546.

[921]The *Conventum* calls Aimery *tribunus* (whatever this might have meant in the eleventh century); Martindale suggests that this may be the same person whom Adémar calls *princeps roconiensis*. Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 543, note 5.

[922]Martindale treats *contristavit* as an example of "the blurring of 'anger' and 'sorrow'" typical of the language used in the eleventh-century Poitevin texts; Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 550-51, note 20. She and Hyams translate *contristavit se* as "became annoyed." Ibid., 544a; Hyams, *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan*.

[923]*Conventum Hugonis*, 544.

"offense" in medieval Latin,[924] plays in the *Conventum* the same role as *obida* (offense, wrong, dishonor) plays in the Rusian chronicles. Seizing or damaging one's land constitutes an "offense"; he who has suffered it should avenge himself by seizing or damaging the offender's land in turn. In this respect, there is no difference between William and the prominent Aquitanians over whom he supposedly has *imperium*: William captures Aimery's property to avenge the *malifactum* committed by Aimery, just as we have seen Geoffrey the viscount burning Hugh's land and mutilating his men to avenge the *malifactum* committed by Hugh. Of course, it does not make any difference for Geoffrey that Hugh was doing the *malifactum* to him on William's orders: for Geoffrey and Hugh, as they are represented in the *Conventum*, William is not a ruler who sends his subordinate to punish a rebel, but just another player in the local aristocratic politics. The very notion of "rebellion" is absolutely alien to the *Conventum*. Correspondingly, when Hugh helps William against Aimery, he does not see himself as punishing a rebel on the ruler's orders, but rather as doing service to a lord with whom he is bound by an agreement. This agreement apparently stipulates mutual obligations: after Aimery was defeated by the joint forces of William and Hugh, "the count promised him [Hugh], as a lord should rightfully promise to his man (*sicut debet Senior promittere suo homini rationem*), not to make any agreement or alliance (*finem vel societatem*) without Hugh." Then he broke this promise and made a *finis* with Aimery "without consulting Hugh (*sine consilio Ugoni*)."[925] From the point of view reflected in the *Conventum*, by doing so, William did not exercise his *imperium* over Hugh and Aimery as their duke, but rather acted towards Hugh as a bad lord.

Because of these features of the *Conventum*, some scholars have interpreted this document as evidence for the "feudal revolution," that is, for the collapse of Carolingian public order. According to them, the *Conventum* shows the emergence of

---

[924]Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*, 630.
[925]*Conventum Hugonis*, 544.

feudal political structures, based on agreements under which erstwhile public officials, such as counts and dukes, acted like private lords who could secure service only in exchange for fiefs.[926] However, Janet Nelson has shown that "patronage in the form of land grants" was an important instrument of Carolingian royal power.[927] Moreover, the Carolingian public order was not static, but it evolved over time, giving more and more prominence to the idea of reciprocity between the ruler and those who serve him, the idea that had already been present in Charlemagne's capitularies anyway.[928] White has convincingly argued that the *Conventum* represents not "a new vassalic régime that came into being ... through a process of feudalization that corrupted an old Carolingian system of public order," but

> a political world in which it was not feudal contracts or the feudal institutions of fief and vassalage, but rather oaths of fidelity, whatever precise form they took, that provided the key terms of discourse in terms of which nobles ... legitimated their own conduct and that of their *amici*, as they represented, evaluated, and tried to control political relations between lords and *fideles* in different way and from different positions in a political field.[929]

Viewed from this perspective, the *Conventum* not so much contradicts, as complements, Adémar. Adémar paints the same political landscape, only he presents it from a different position in a political field, to borrow White's phrase. Barthélemy has argued that the oft-invoked contradiction between Adémar and the *Conventum* is not as irreconcilable as it appears to be.[930] The *Conventum* alludes to some elements

---

[926]Bisson, "The 'Feudal' Revolution," *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6-42, at 21-8. For a review of works that treat private agreements between lord and man as a feature of, and as the main evidence for, the "feudal revolution," see White, "A Crisis of Fidelity?" 29-32.

[927]Janet Nelson, "Kingship and Royal Government," in R. McKitterick, ed., *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, vol.2, *C. 700-900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 383-431, at 384-7, 392-5.

[928]Nelson, "Kingship and Royal Government," 425-30; eadem, review of *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* edited by T. Head and R. Landes, *Speculum* 69 (1994): 163-9.

[929]White, "A Crisis of Fidelity?" 46.

[930]"Cette contradiction, souvent relevée, n'est après tout pas si véhémente." Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 454.

of public order; Adémar mentions acts of homage performed for *castra*, and a close reading of his chronicle shows that what enabled William to "destroy rebels" was a carefully built network of strategic alliances which were not unlike those described in the *Conventum*.[931] Adémar does not provide much detail about this system of alliances because he concentrates on William so much that other members of the aristocratic political network recede into the background.

The same attitude is typical of the *Laurentian* chronicler in respect to Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo the addressee of Riurik's angry speech reported in the *Kievan* entry for 1197. The contrast between the *Kievan* and the *Laurentian* entries for 1197 is not as pronounced in terms of their literary style as is the contrast between the *Conventum* and Adémar's panegyric on William. However, the difference between the images of Vsevolod in the two chronicles is somewhat reminiscent of the difference between the two representations of William. We remember that, according to the *Kievan*, Riurik of Kiev became entangled in the conflict with the Olgovichi and with their leader Iaroslav because of Vsevolod. Moreover, Vsevolod did not render Riurik the help, which he had promised, and made a separate agreement with the Olgovichi to Riurik's detriment. This is how the same events are reported in the *Laurentian*:

> In the year 1197, the ancient evil enemy, the Devil, rose, who never ceases to fight against the Christian people (*rod*), and he induced all the Rusian princes to start hostilities (*vlozhi na vrazhdu*).[932] ... Riurik sent [envoys] to the Grand Prince Vsevolod, saying, 'Brother (*brate i svate*), Roman defected from us and kissed the Cross to the Olgovichi. Brother, send the charters of the Cross to be thrown at them (*poshli gramoty khrestnye poverzi im*), and mount your horse.'[933] In the winter of the same year, David of Smolensk sent his nephew Mstislav, the *svat* of Grand Prince Vsevolod to Vitebsk to help his [David's] son-in-law. [Mstislav was defeated and captured.] Grand Prince Vsevolod ... having waited until the winter was over, mounted his horse in summer on account of his *svat*, and also in order to secure the Kievan throne

---

[931]Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes," 454-7.

[932]The expression "Rusian princes" is apparently used in the narrow sense of the princes of the Dnieper region as opposed to the chronicler's native Suzdalia.

[933]On the "charters of the Cross," see above, p. 284. On the expression "mount your horse," see above, note 903.

> for Riurik (*pod Riurikom tverdia Kiev*), and he advanced on Chernigov [the center of
> the Olgovichi dominion] ... However, Riurik broke his word and defected (*pristupi*) to
> the Olgovichi. And the grand prince, having entered their *volost*, ... devastated their
> land. Iaroslav and [the other] Olgovichi could not resist him, bowed down to him, and
> released his *svat*. The grand prince, having granted them peace, returned to the city
> of Vladimir ... and there was a great joy in the city of Vladimir.[934]

The author of this passage clearly is not interested in other princes for their own sake;
all princely politics is presented from the perspective of "Grand Prince Vsevolod"
who helps some princes, punishes others, grants peace, receives submission (in the
form of "bowing down"), and returns home in triumph. Riurik simply "breaks his
word" to Vsevolod; there is not the slightest hint that, according to Riurik, Vsevolod
had broken *his* word to Riurik first. Instead of the complicated interplay of the
interests of many princes presented in the *Kievan*, we see the shining figure of the
"Grand Prince" conducting a just punitive expedition against the Olgovichi; his just
and reasonable actions are contrasted with the meaningless "hostilities" of all the
other princes incited by the Devil. Only a careful reading of the *Laurentian* reveals
that Vsevolod and other members of the Suzdalian house achieved their political
goals through agreements with other princes and through a network of alliances.
Similarly, the complicated interplay of the Aquitanian magnates' interests can be
seen from the *Conventum* much more clearly than from Adémar. For Adémar, those
who move against William, or fight wars not sanctioned by William, are rebels;
for the author of the *Conventum*, they defend their legitimate interests. For the
Laurentian chronicler, those who move against Vsevolod, or fight wars not sanctioned
by Vsevolod, are incited by the devil; for the *Kievan* chronicler, they defend their
legitimate interests.

The representation of Vsevolod's son Constantine in the *Laurentian* is also
somewhat close to Adémar's panegyric on William. According to the entry for 1206,
Vsevolod "sent" Constantine to rule Novgorod as a prince. In his farewell speech to

---

[934]PSRL 1, 412-13. *Svat* means the father of one's son-in-law.

his son, Vsevolod says,

> God gave you seniority (*stareishinstvo*) among all your brethren, and the principality of Great [as opposed to Severskii] Novgorod has seniority in all the Rus Land (*stareishin'stvo imat' kniazhen'iu vo vsei Rus'skoi zemli*). And I grant seniority to you, go to your city [Novgorod].

When the Suzdalians saw Constantine's departure, they "issued sorrowful and joyous (*zhalost'nyia i radostnyia*) tears."

> The multitude of the pious people wept, seeing that the father and the feeder of the poor and the great comforter of the sorrowful and of the downcast was departing, [and seeing] the light-bearing star setting (*zakhodiashchu*) ... Courage and intelligence were dwelling in him, justice and rectitude (*pravda i istina*) were walking with him, he was a second Solomon by his wisdom. And when he arrived in Novgorod ... a multitude of people went out to meet him with Crosses and with Bishop Mitrophanius ... And when he entered the church of the Holy Sophia, they put him on the throne, and bowed down, and kissed him with honor, as the prophet says, 'Your representative, God, forever and ever (*predstatel' tvoi, Bozhe, v veky veku*), you love justice and hate lawlessness (*bezzakonie*), because of that your God has anointed you' (Hebrews 1:9) ... As the prophet says, 'God, may you give judgment to the king (*tsesarevi*) and rectitude (*pravdu*) to the son of the king (*synovi tsesarevi*) to judge your people justly (*v pravdu*) (Isaiah 32:1).'[935]

Needless to say that neither the prince of Novgorod, nor any other Rusian prince, was anointed, and that nobody, Vsevolod included, could simply "send" his son to Novgorod. The Novgorodians would have been very surprised indeed, if they had heard that Vsevolod described Novgorod to Constantine as "your city." In a similar manner, the *Laurentian* chronicler calls Iurii Dolgorukii "Prince of all Rus."[936] There is no more truth in this claim then in the term "anointed" as applied to Constantine Vsevolodovich in Novgorod.

This does not mean that the *Kievan* is necessarily always more "objective" than the *Laurentian*. An interesting example is the eulogy for the same Riurik Rostislavich, whose falling out with Vsevolod is represented so differently in the *Lauren-*

---

[935]PSRL 2, 422-3.
[936]PSRL 1, 436.

tian and *Kievan* entries for 1197. Throughout the *Kievan* annals for the 1180s-1190s, we see Riurik as just one political player among many, making and breaking agreements, changing alliances, advancing his interests. In the entries for the 1190s and early 1200s, he is also presented as being to some extent subordinate to Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo who was the leader (*stareishii*) of all the Monomakhovichi, while Riurik had authority only over the southern branch of the clan. Such a representation of Riurik suddenly and radically changes in the entry for 1199, which includes the eulogy probably composed as a separate text and at some point interpolated into the chronicle.[937] In the entry for 1199, Riurik suddenly becomes the "pious grand prince" thinking the "emperor's thought (*tsesarskoi mysli ego*)" and belonging to the line of "autocrats," who succeeded to the Kievan throne after the rule of Vsevolod Iaroslavich, the father of Vladimir Monomakh.[938] There is no mentioning of Vsevolod, and of Riurik's subordination to him; indeed, the eulogists mention no other living prince, but only Riurik's illustrious ancestors.

Thus, both Rusian and Aquitanian sources that we have discussed support White's observation about nobles who "represented, evaluated, and tried to control political relations ... in different ways and from different positions in a political field" - only in the Rusian case we need to replace White's "nobles" with "princes." An author who occupies a position in the midst of the "political field" sees multiple players, all intertwined in a complicated way. This is the position of the *Conventum Hugonis* and of the *Kievan* accounts of negotiations, of envoys going to and fro and delivering speeches on behalf of their princes, and of princes and their men discussing what course should be taken in respect to the complicated networks of alliances and agreements. Another position offers a view of the political field as if seen from a high vantage point. An author writing from this position adopts a perspective of one powerful player; he represents the actions of all others as a kind of background

---

[937]On this eulogy, see above, p. 56
[938]PSRL 2, 708-9, 712.

noise in respect to this chosen figure. In the part of the *Laurentian* covering the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, such a figure is Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, in the *Kievan* entry for 1199, this is Riurik, and in Adémar's *Chronicle*, this is William. The authors writing in this manner employ monarchical rhetoric even when the rulers whom they represent as royal-like figures were not actual kings. Just as the author of the eulogy for Riurik does not mention Riurik's subordination to Vsevolod, Adémar never portrays William taking orders from the king of France or acting as his subordinate. The only thing that we know about relations between William and the king is that the king "honored" William in his palace. By the same token, the *Laurentian* chronicler never mentions that the prince of Suzdalia could claim the position of leadership among the Monomakhovichi only, and that the Olgovichi were quite independent of Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo as well as of any other Suzdalian prince.

This is not to say that William, Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, or even Riurik Rostislavich were not powerful and important rulers. Moreover, Adémar's representation of William, or Dudo's representation of the powerful and independent dukes of Normandy, or any other elevated portrayal of a regional ruler by his local historiographer, do not mean that the French king had no significance. Apparently, medieval politics, to some extent, was shaped by the idea of a monarchical ruler exercising his *imperium* over all the population of a certain territory. At the same time, this monarchical ideal interacted with ideas stressing mutuality, reciprocity, and what we may call a system of "private" agreements between lords and their men. From this point of view, a king, a duke, or in the Rusian case, a leader of a princely clan such as Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, was primarily a lord who had to be true to his agreements. On top of this, there was, of course, also the ruled population to reckon with. We have already discussed the role of the population in Chapter Two. In this chapter, we will concentrate on princes in Rus and on royalty and aristocracy in the West.

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

A comparison of the accounts of three English chronicles provides a good illustration of how representations of royalty and of relations between a king and the aristocracy differ in different sources. We will now compare the accounts of the rebellion of Henry the Young King against his father Henry II in works by William of Newburgh, by Robert of Torigni, and by Jordan Fantosme, already familiar to us.

<u>William of Newburgh and Robert of Torigni on the events of 1174-5</u>

The *History of William of Newburgh* covers the period from the Norman Conquest to 1197. William tells us that two years after his coronation, which was not meant as a real transfer of power, Henry the Younger, at the instigation of "certain persons," wrongly decided that he, and not his father, had the right to be the true king of England. The persons who stirred up the son against the father used to their advantage Henry the Younger's growing irritation at the fact that his father did not provide him with sufficient means. Henry the Younger fled to his father-in-law Louis VII of France. The French recognized him as the true King of England and started together with him a war against Henry II. "Contriving evil from everywhere against his father (*malum patri undecunque moliens*)," Henry the Younger also found allies in Aquitaine, Brittany and Flanders (II.27). Some still adhered "faithfully and firmly (*fideliter et firmiter*)" to the true king Henry II, but many magnates (*potentes et nobiles*) in England, as well as in foreign parts, "began to desert the father for the son," either impelled by hatred or attracted by "emptiest promises (*vanissimis pollicitationibus*)"(II.27).[939] Nothing could be more foolish (*nil stultius*) than their attempts to justify their war against Henry II by putting forward the rights of the son. William cannot emphasize enough that in reality they were fighting either out of hatred or because they saw an occasion to gain something for themselves (II.28).[940] Worst

---

[939] Hans Claude Hamilton, ed., *Historia Rerum Anglicarum Willelmi Parvi, Ordinis Sancti Augustini Canonici Regularis in Coenobio Beatae Mariae de Newburgh in Agro Eboracensi*, vol. 1, English Historical Society Publications Series 15 (London: Sumptibus societatis, 1856) [hereafter William of Newburgh, *Historia*], 164-5.

[940]"Re autem vera proprii vel odii, ut rex Francorum, vel emolumenti, ut comes Flan-

of all, Henry the Younger was supported by the ferocious King of the Scots whose "barbarous and blood-thirsty (*sitientis sanguinem*)" people, "more savage than wild beasts (*ferris plus efferae*)," ravaged the English province of Northumberland (II.27, II.30, II.32).[941]

William proceeds to describe the course of the war, which ended with the splendid victory of the rightful king. In spite of the great multitude and fierceness of his enemies, Henry II prevailed over them all and "pacified England" (II.37).[942] Those among his enemies who were not yet defeated in the battlefield were so "terrified and humiliated by his so many illustrious successful deeds (*tot claris ejus successibus territi et humiliati*)" that they asked for peace. Henry II got back what was rightfully his (*quod de jure ejus*). The merciful king, after the peace was concluded, released the captives and restored their "goods and honors (*bona honoresque*)"; however, he destroyed the walls of their castles, "the horns of the proud." He also reconciled with his son. This is how "this more than civil war" ended and the peace of the realm was restored (II.38).[943]

Another account of the same events is found in the *Chronicle* of Robert of Torigni (also known as Robert de Monte). The chronicle covers the period between 1110 and 1183; in 1184 Robert presented his work to Henry II.

According to Robert, Henry the Young King was frustrated because his father took away some knights attending him. He "left his father in anger (*iratus*)" and came to the king of France. A number of nobles deserted the king and followed the son. Queen Eleanor and her sons, Henry the Younger's brothers, did the same.[944]

---

drensis, negotium porrecta occasione agentes," William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 167.

[941]William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 166, 172, 177.

[942]William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 189.

[943]William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 191-3.

[944]Richard Howlett, ed., *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I*, vol. IV, *The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Michael-in-Peril-of-the-Sea*, Rolls Series (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1889) [hereafter *Chronicle*

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

Henry the Younger started a war against his father; he was supported by Louis VII of France, William of Scotland, and a number of other foreign allies and English nobles. Robert discusses the most prominent among these nobles. One of them acted towards Henry II "unfaithfully (*infideliter agens*)," another was motivated by a desire "to disturb the realm of England (*volens turbare regnum Angliae*)."[945] The war ended soon after Henry II's troops captured William of Scotland, who had devastated "the northern parts of England."[946] Peace was established, and "the king's three sons humbly submitted themselves to him; the French king and the count of Flanders returned to the king of England the strongholds (*firmitates*) which they had taken."[947]

It is easy to see that both William and Robert maintain a clear distinction between the one and only legitimate ruler of England, Henry II, and his enemies, who are either foreign invaders or the unfaithful subjects of the English king acting out of hatred and sheer malice or out of desire for personal gain. William neither explains what exactly the rebels hoped to receive by going over to Henry II's enemies, nor does he discuss the nature of Henry the Younger's "emptiest promises." It is very likely that these were promises of land grants, but the subject of land grants is irrelevant for both William and Robert. Both authors mention landed property for the first time when they describe the peace settlement under which Henry II received what was his and generously returned to the defeated their *bona honoresque*, which he presumably had confiscated. There is no ambiguity in William's and Robert's representation of the realm of England as a clearly defined territory under the rule of the monarch to whom all those living within this territory owe service and loyalty regardless of any land grants and of any agreements into which they may have entered.

---

of Robert of Torigni], 255-6.

[945] *Chronicle of Robert of Torigni*, 259, 260.

[946] *Chronicle of Robert of Torigni*, 264.

[947] *Chronicle of Robert of Torigni*, 265.

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

<u>Jordan Fantosme on the events of 1174-5</u>

The same events of 1174-5 are presented in a rather different light in *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle.* This difference is all the more interesting because the position of Fantosme in respect to the conflict is the same as that of the two chroniclers whose works we have just discussed. Like William of Newburgh and Robert de Torigni, Fantosme is on the side of Henry II, the "most honorable" king wronged by his son.[948] However, as we have already seen in Chapter Five, Fantosme, unlike William and Robert, admits that the son, even though he should not have taken arms against his father, had legitimate grievances. Furthermore, Fantosme uses ambiguous terms that have different meanings depending on the context. While explaining the origins of the "cruel war," he addresses Henry II reproachfully: "After this [Henry the Younger's] crowning, you took away from your son some of his authority (*seignurie*)."[949] Henry the Younger fled to France and started hostilities because he found himself being in a difficult situation of the king "senz honur." R. C. Jonston translates this as "without a realm"[950]; however, normally Fantosme uses *regne*, the standard Anglo-Norman word for "realm." *Honur*, just as medieval Latin *honor*, among its many other meanings, signified a high rank or office, a privilege, or a type of land property. It appears that Henry the Younger was without *honur* because his father deprived him of some of his *seignurie*, and Fanstosme thinks that this was a wrong thing to do on the part of Henry II. Thus, from the very first lines of the poem, instead of monarchical power over the realm that can belong to one person only, we have ambiguous *honur* and *seignurie* which apparently can be divided or shared in some way, as is implied by the expression *auques de seignurie – some* authority.

---

[948] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, ed. and trans. R. C. Jonston (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 8, 10.
[949] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 4.
[950] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 5.

Moreover, according to Fantosme, William of Scotland, the great villain of William of Newburgh and Robert de Torigni, sent his troops not to invade "the realm of England," but to recover the territory which, he believed, was rightfully his. Henry the Young King promises to give William *la seignurie* over the territories "that your ancestors had" in exchange for military help against his Henry II.[951] Then Fantosme presents William's difficult dilemma. He did homage to both Henry II and his son after the latter was crowned.[952] Henry the Younger gives him the land that belongs to William's *honur*, and at the same time he reminds William that he owes (*deit*) homage and service to him. However, William owes the same to his father. He decides that it would not be right to take arms against the old king before requesting his inheritance (*eritement*) from him. If Henry II refuses, then William can renounce his homage to him without *achaisunment*.[953] This is another difficult word. Its dictionary meaning is "legal action," but the English king obviously cannot take any legal action against the attack that the Scottish king is contemplating. Jonston translates *senz achaisunment* as "without contestation."[954] The context makes it clear that William is describing a situation in which his renunciation of homage and his attack on Henry II would be justified by Henry's wrongful treatment of him.

William here behaves similarly to a Rusian prince who "justifies himself in his cross-kissing" by assigning blame for the break-off of the agreement to the other party. In fact, the semantic field of *achaisun*, the root of *achaisunement*, is very similar to that of the East Slavonic word *vina* often used in connection with breaking an agreement. For example, when Sviatoslav Olgovich of Chernigov was invited to join an alliance against Iurii Dolgorukii, he answered, "I kissed the Cross to him, and I cannot act against him (*na n' vstati*) without *vina*."[955] *Vina* means, on the one

---

[951] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 18.

[952] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 2, 22.

[953] "Rende lui sun humage senz achaisunement," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 20-22.

[954] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 23.

[955] PSRL 2, 489, under 1158.

hand, "guilt," "blame," "accusation," or "offense," and on the other hand, "reason," "pretext," or "excuse." In the discourse of sworn agreements, all these meanings seem to blend. Apparently, Sviatoslav is saying that he cannot break his oath to Iurii without a sufficient reason, and such a reason would exist if he could level an accusation against Iurii, if there were an offense on the part of Iurii, if Iurii were guilty of not fulfilling his part of the agreement. When Vladimir Volodarevich of Galich and Vsevolod Olgovich of Kiev, bound by a sworn agreement, "quarreled," the chronicler says that they "began to look for each other's *vina* (or: to look for a *vina* between themselves)." Apparently, they started to accuse each other, to look for an excuse to break their agreement; each wanted to blame the breaking on the other party. Their search for *vina* succeeded, because soon thereafter they indeed broke the agreement and started fighting against each other.[956] Another example of the connection between *vina* and the breaking of an oath is found in the words of Riurik Rostislavich to his brother David reported in the *Kievan* entry for 1170. David had heard that Mstislav Iziaslavich wanted to capture them, and he shared this information with Riurik. "And Riurik said, 'But for what reason (*pro chto*), brother? What is our *vina*? Did not he kiss the Cross to us not long ago?'"[957] Obviously, capturing them would constitute a violation of the oath on the Cross on the part of Mstislav unless there had been a *vina* committed by Riurik and David. Riurik's question, "What is our *vina*?' can be rendered as something like, "What offense did we commit? What is his accusation against us?"

Achaisun also means "reason," "pretext," and "excuse," on the one hand, and "accusation," on the other hand.[958] Thus, William argues that if Henry II does not give him Northumberland, William cannot be blamed for renouncing his homage

---

[956]"*Pochasta na sia iskati viny*," PSRL 2, 315.

[957]PSRL 2, 541-2. The entry apparently has a wrong dating; it describes the events of 1168-69, see Berezhkov, *Khronologiia*, 159.

[958] *The Anglo-Norman Dictionary.*

and for withdrawing his fidelity and love/friendship (*druerie*) from him (26.299).[959] The "blame," the "reason for breaking the agreement" - in short, everything that is signified by the Anglo-Norman *achaisun* and by East Slavonic *vina* - will lie with Henry II. This is what William thinks, but he is still unsure. He consults his barons. Earl Duncan gives good advice: request "what is rightly yours (*voz dreitures*)" from Henry II in a nice manner, by way of "bele parole," and not by threats, so that your relations may not be broken and so that you still may continue serving him as his liegeman (*vus le servirez cume ses liges hum*). Act reasonably, and do not seek *achaisun* to do any *ultrage (*27.300-307).[960] The usage of *achaisun* in this passage is virtually identical with that of *vina* in the account of the conflict between Vladimir Volodarevich of Galich and Vsevolod Olgovich. The two princes began "to seek *vina*" when they "quarreled," and this search for *vina* led to the breaking of their relations and to the armed conflict. Earl Duncan does not want William to quarrel with Henry II, and he wants the relations between the two kings to remain unbroken. Therefore, he advises William not to seek *achaisun* to do *ultrage*, which apparently comes down to advice not to seek a reason to breach the agreement with Henry, not to seek grounds for doing anything wrong, insulting, or excessive, which, again, would break the relations between the two kings.

These similarities in vocabulary are very remarkable, but even more so is Fantosme's general perspective. Instead of being an unprovoked attack of a blood-thirsty foreign aggressor, William's involvement in the war in England becomes an episode

---

[959]"[If Henry II does not give me Northumberland,] ne li dei en avant ne fei ne druerie," (26.299), *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 22.

[960]"Li vielz reis est rednable, si li faites raisun/ De faire nul ultrage ne querez achaisun," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 22. The dictionary meanings of *ultrage* are: insult; excess; presumption; sin, transgression. Jonston translates " De faire nul ultrage ne querez achaisun" as "seek no occasion to give him [Henry II] grounds for offense," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 23. However, it seems that the original does not include a specific reference to "him" or to Henry II in connection with *ultrage* which should not be done. This is Jonston's interpretation of what Earl Duncan means, but in the original it remains ambiguous what is the *ultrage* and who should not be doing it.

in the complicated relationships of the men bound by multilateral oaths and exercising authority over regions to which all of them can lay some claim. The envoy who brings Henry II's reply back to William, thus describes William's request: "You demand from him [Henry II] his land as your heritage (*demandez lui sa terre pur vostre heritage*)" (33.370). [961] It turns out that the "realm of England" includes territories that are at one and the same time Henry II's *terre* and William's *heritage*. Henry II turns down William's request, and William joins Henry the Younger. Then we see Louis VII of France joining the enemies of Henry II not out of hatred, but because he should keep the faith which he pledged to William of Scotland.[962]

Analyzing the decision-making of all Fantosme's characters would take too long. We can already see that what William of Newburgh and Robert of Torigni present as "silly" or "foolish" (*stultus*) claims and "emptiest promises" is a matter of much importance for Fantosme. Henry II's enemies are in the wrong, but there is nothing "silly" about their wishes to be true to their agreements or to get the land that they believe is rightly theirs. None of them wages war on Henry II simply out of a desire "to disturb the realm of England"; they defend what they see as their legitimate interests. Fantosme shows how the clash between the interests of many powerful players brings suffering to the land of England, just as the Rusian chroniclers show how the clash between the interests of many princes bring suffering to the Rus Land. We also remember that Fantosme's arguments for Henry II's legitimacy are similar to those used in the Rusian chronicles to show the legitimacy of a prince whom the chronicler supports. Finally, Fantosme's kings, in addition to being monarchs who rule over their respective subjects, are also lords entering into sworn agreements with one another and with their prominent subjects. Fantosme reveals a complicated network of such agreements and alliances, which is completely absent from the writings

---

[961] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 28.

[962] Fantosme describes as "reasonable" the advice given to Louis VII by Count Philip, "Tenez al rei d'Escose la fiance afiee," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 32. Cf. William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 165, where Louis is presented as motivated by hatred.

of William of Newburgh and Robert of Torigni. This network is somewhat similar to the one described in the *Conventum* and in the Rusian chronicles.

Overall, the world of William of Newburgh and Robert of Torigni has very little, if anything, in common with the world of the Rusian chronicles. However, the political landscape of England, as it emerges from *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, has some significant commonalities with that of Rus. In particular, *Fantosme's*, the *Kievan*, and the *Galician-Volhynian* chronicles strike a similar chord in their accounts of negotiations, of kings or princes consulting with their men, of letters and speeches delivered by envoys. What are the reasons for this? What sets Fantosme apart from his two contemporary historiographers, who, moreover, supported Henry II as much as he did? What common features does he have with the Rusian chroniclers? Or with the author of the *Conventum Hugonis*?

One feature that distinguishes the *Conventum*, the Rusian chronicle passages which bear most resemblance to it, and *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, is their connection with oral political discourse. Firstly, all these texts are written either in the vernacular or in Latin that is very close to the vernacular. However, there is more than that. Bennett has convincingly argued that Fantosme's work was intended for singing or reading aloud.[963] The *Conventum* is, most likely, "a succession of complaints voiced, and for the most part literally voiced, by Hugh."[964] The accusatory or conciliatory speeches reported in the Rusian chronicles are, in all probability, close to the speeches actually delivered on behalf of princes; by the same token, when the chronicler reports what a prince's man "said to him," it is likely that he partly represents their actual words. Thus, the three elements that make the title of Martindale's essay on the *Conventum* - dispute, settlement, and orality[965] - are all present

---

[963]Bennett, "La Chronique de Jordan Fantosme," 37.

[964]Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIII, 4.

[965]Janet Martindale, "Dispute, Settlement and Orality in the *Conventum inter Guillelmum Aquitanorum Comitem et Hugonem Chiliarchum*: A Postscript to the Edition of 1969," in eadem, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIII.

in Fantosme and in the Rusian chronicles as well.

The Latin historiographers were apparently much less influenced by oral discourse and much more indebted to the classical literary tradition than Fantosme was. Thus, William of Newburgh describes the Scots as "barbarians driven by the furies" (II.34);[966] and he quotes Horace, "Sicilian tyrants have not found a greater torment than envy," while describing the envy which Henry II's enemies supposedly felt when they saw his great army (II.36).[967] Robert of Torigni was "an avid reader and collector of books," who, in addition to his historical works, wrote a prologue for St. Augustine's commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul and a prologue for Pliny's *Natural History*.[968] When describing aristocratic politics, the monastic Latin scholars often appear to have a feeling expressed by William of Malmesbury, arguably the most learned and the one who had best mastered the classical writing style among all the twelfth-century English historians.[969]

William of Malmesbury

William of Malmesbury does not describe the rebellion of Henry the Young King since he died thirty years before it started. However, his accounts of other political conflicts display the same features that we have observed in the accounts of the rebellion written by William of Newburgh and Robert of Torigni. A good example is the representation of a conflict between William of Normandy, the future "Conqueror," and his relative, "a certain Guy." William gave (*dederat*) Guy two castles (*castella*). Guy must have sworn some kind of oath to William: when later he turned against William, his behavior is called *perfidia*. However, the historian provides no information about Guy's oath, and he does not explain if there were any

---

[966]"Barbari ... tamquam furiis agitati," William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 181.

[967]William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 185; Horace, *Epistles* I.2.57.

[968]Elizabeth Van Houts, Introduction to eadem, ed., *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*, vol.1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), lxxix, xci.

[969]See Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance*, 44-5.

conditions on which the castles were "given." The relations between William and Guy are presented as a friendship (*amicitia*) which was the result of their growing up together as children. There is no explanation of the reasons for Guy's *perfidia* other than a brief remark that he got "estranged" or "separated" from William by means of "invented accusations (or: offenses), by which it would seem that he did this rightly (*affictis criminibus quibus id merito facere videretur abalienavit se a comite*)" (III.230).[970] This cryptic comment makes one think that Guy did the same thing as the Rusian princes who "justified themselves in their cross-kissing" by accusing the other party. It may well be that William had also sworn an oath to Guy and that, from Guy's perspective, William was the one who perjured it first. It is also probable that the Latin *crimina* here represents the vernacular *achaisun*. However, in the absence of any details, we can do no more than make guesses.

Most interestingly, William of Malmesbury explains why he does not want to go into a detailed description of the conflict between William and Guy: "It would be long and unnecessary, if I follow what was done by each side, what castles were captured" (III.230).[971] The historian repeats exactly the same words in his account of another conflict, the one between the same William of Normandy and Henry I of France: brief references to the "broken friendship" and "breach of faith (or: betrayal of trust, *fidei dissimulatio*)" are accompanied by the statement that "it is long and unnecessary to write down all the hostilities (or: disputes) that were between them" (III.234).[972]

Thus, for William of Malmesbury, the degree of detail in his accounts of aristocratic politics is a question of literary style. His goal is to describe the making and breaking of agreements or the outbreaks and settlements of conflicts between

---

[970]William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, vol. 1, 428.

[971]"Longum est et non necessarium si persequar quae hinc inde acta, quae castella capta," William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, vol. 1, 428.

[972]"Longum est et non necessarium referre quantae inter eos contentiones versatae sint," William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, vol. 1, 434.

individual members of the aristocracy as briefly and summarily as he can. Indeed, it would be quite difficult, if not downright impossible, to give a detailed account of such matters in the elegant style of classical Latin historiography for which William of Malmesbury is famous. Conversely, it is hard to think of Latin terms which would have adequately rendered scenes from Fantosme, such as the council of William of Scotland with his men or the exchanges between him, Henry II, and Henry the Young King. By the same token, classical Latin authors can hardly supply vocabulary for an accurate account of the relations between Hugh of Lusignan and William of Aquitaine. William of Newburgh, and especially Robert of Torigni,[973] were not as brilliant Latin scholars as William of Malmesbury was. However, while composing their Latin histories, they still could not help being influenced by the historiographical tradition which went back to classical antiquity. Apparently, they also felt that it would be "long and unnecessary" to give detailed accounts of interpersonal agreements and negotiations, for which no classical antecedents existed and for which it would be difficult indeed to find a suitable quotation from Horace. Therefore, the Western narrative sources on aristocratic politics which are most valuable for a comparative analysis with Rusian princely politics, are those that are closest to oral culture.

6.4 "Vertical" and "Horizontal" Agreements

Until the late twentieth century, historians used to believe that the predominant, if not exclusive, type of interpersonal agreement between members of the medieval elite was the "feudal contract," the agreement that bound lord and man. The pioneering work of Gerd Althoff on "kinship, friendship, and loyalty" published in 1990 showed that "cooperative" or "horizontal" bonds of *amicitia* created by agreements between

---

[973]Van Houts describes him as "no great writer," his Latin being "basic" and "repetitive"; Van Houts, Introduction to *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum*, xci.

equals were at least as common as "vertical" feudo-vassalic bonds and, moreover, "vertical" and "horizontal" ties were not mutually exclusive.[974] In fact, hierarchical relations between lord and man cannot be properly understood if they are isolated from the context of "cooperative" bonds between equals.[975] Eickels has shown that Althoff's conclusions, based mostly on the material from the pre-twelfth-century German Empire, are also valid for the relations between the English and the French kings in the twelfth century.[976] Overall, it appears that in works written since the 1990s, *amicitia* has replaced homage as a key concept for understanding the social organization of the medieval elite.

However, modern scholars stress that neither *amicitia*, nor homage, nor any other term employed in the sources other than late medieval legal treatises, had a fixed meaning that would describe one, and only one, type of relations. According to Althoff, medieval authors "do not always mean the same thing when they describe relationships or alliances as *amicitiae*."[977] Eickels has shown that "doing homage was not a clearly defined legal act, but remained a flexible ritual able to cover a wide variety of relations."[978] We have seen that the same idea has been expressed by Hyams and Roach as well.[979] *Amicitia* and homage appear to have similar ranges of meanings. Thus, *amicitia* could describe not only alliances of equal parties, but also hierarchical interpersonal relations, including those between kings and their most important subjects. For example, King Henry I the "Fowler" of Germany had individual friendship treaties with the leading magnates of the realm.[980] Similarly,

---

[974]Gerd Althoff, *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue: zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im frühen Mittelalter* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), translated into English in 2004 as *Family, Friends, and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe* (see above, note).

[975]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 102.

[976]Eickels, "'Homagium' and 'Amicitia'," 136-40.

[977]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 68.

[978]Eickels, "'Homagium' and 'Amicitia'," 140.

[979]Hyams, "Homage and Feudalism," 21-41; Roach, "Submission and Homage," 364-5.

[980]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 82.

by performing "the ritual of homage so often described at the start of rulers' reigns," the magnates "acknowledged their new sovereign and pledged their loyalty, but did not become royal vassals."[981]

On one occasion, William of Newburgh explicitly states that *amicitia* is the same thing as homage. He describes the peace concluded after Henry II's victory over his son's rebellion in 1174 and the submission of Henry's defeated enemies. One of them, the count of Flanders, returned to Henry what he had captured from him in the course of the war, while at the same time "asking [Henry II to accept his] security of the faithful friendship, or homage (*fidelis amicitiae, sive hominii*), for the future" (II.38).[982] However, this does not mean that *amicitia* and *hominium* were consistently used as synonyms and that there were no occasions when they meant different things.[983] Overall, it appears that medieval authors were not very interested in classifying relations created by interpersonal agreements. *Hominium/homagium*, as well as *amicitia*, *amor*, *fides*, *fidelitas* and their many vernacular equivalents, were all used to describe a whole range of relations: of lord and man, of king and subject, and also of equal partners bound by a treaty of mutual help.

The same is true for the Rusian "love," "cross-kissing," and other terms describing social and political bonds. Sometimes "love" signifies an alliance of equals, such as, for example, alliances of Iurii Dolgorukii with Sviatoslav Olgovich of Chernigov and with Vladimir Volodarevich of Galich directed against their common enemy Iziaslav Mstislavich. To fight against them, Iziaslav, on his part, entered into "love" with Géza of Hungary.[984] As we remember, the agreement between Polotsk and

---

[981]Roach, "Submission and Homage," 364.

[982]"Comes Flandrensis regi Anglorum restituit, quod de jure ejus bellicus ei casus contulerat; fidelis de caetero amicitiae, sive hominii, supererogans cautionem," William of Newburgh, *Historia*, 191.

[983]See Eickels, "'Homagium' and 'Amicitia'." *Homagium*, of course, is another form of *hominium*.

[984]PSRL 2, 340, 403-4, 453-4.

Novgorod about a joint raid on their pagan neighbors is also called "love."[985] In the accounts of these alliances, there is no indication that one party was in any way subordinate to the other. However, the same word "love" describes very different relations in the passage, "The people of Polotsk (*polot'chane*) sent to Sviatoslav Olgovich with love, that they will have him as their father and will walk in obedience to him, and they swore this on the Cross."[986] In this case, "love" and the oath on the Cross play the same role as the homage of the magnates of the German Empire to their new king, as described by Roach. Just like these magnates, the *polot'chane* - in all likelihood, the representatives of the Polotsk elite - "acknowledged their new sovereign and pledged their loyalty" to him.

Finally, "love," often accompanied by cross-kissing, is used for various types of hierarchical relations between princes. Probably, the best example of this kind of "love" is the account of the triumphal journey of Iurii Dolgorukii from Suzdalia to Kiev after Viacheslav died, leaving Iurii the uncontested senior Monomakhovich and the rightful Kievan prince:

> Iurii approached the volost of Rostislav [Mstislavich of Smolensk], and Rostislav ... sent to Iurii asking for peace, saying, 'Father, I bow down to you (*klaniaiu ti sia*) ... an uncle is like a father to me.' And Iurii said, 'Verily (*pravo*), my son, I was not able to be with Iziaslav [Mstislavich], but you are my brother and my son.' Letting go of the memory about his brother's [Iziaslav Mstislavich's] evil [*ne pomiania zloby*], Iurii forgave his anger at him [Rostislav] (*otda emu gnev*), and thus they kissed the Cross to each other, swearing to be in perfect love (*tselovasta mezhi soboiu khrest na vsei liubvi*). And Iurii went to Kiev, and Rostislav to his Smolensk ... Sviatoslav Olgovich came to Radoshch, to Sinin Most to meet Iurii and they had a conference (*sniastasia*). At the same time, [Sviatoslav] Vsevolodich came to Starodub to meet him [Iurii] and, having come to him, he threw himself to his feet (literally: hit his forehead to him, *udari emu chelom*), saying, 'I acted insanely (*izbezumilsia esm'*)' [when he had joined an anti-Iurii alliance in the past]. And Sviatoslav Olgovich started to entreat ... Iurii, urging him (*velia emu*) to accept into love (*priiati v liubov'*) his [Sviatoslav Olgovich's] nephew [Sviatoslav] Vsevolodich. So, Iurii gave him peace, and he kissed the Cross

---

[985] *N1L*, 40.

[986] "*Prislashasia polot'chane ... s liubov'iu, iako imeti ottsem' sobe i khoditi v poslushan'i ego, i na tom tselovasha khrest,*" PSRL 2, 115-16, under 1151.

to Iurii according to Iurii's will (literally: on all Iurii's will, *na vsei voli ego*), and [he also kissed the Cross] to his uncle. Iurii commanded him to go to Kiev with him.[987]

Soon after Iurii established himself in Kiev:

> Rostislav ... with all his armed men (*so vsim polkom svoim*) went to his uncle. And he came to Kiev to his uncle Iurii, and thus they embraced each other with great love and great honor, and thus they remained in joy. Having come to Kiev, Rostislav started to make entreaties to Iurii about his [Rostislav's] [brother and] nephews. Iurii listened to him and sent after (*posla po*) ... Vladimir [Mstislavich] to Vladimir[-in-Volhynia] and after Mstislav and Iaroslav [Iziaslavichi] to Luchesk telling them to come to him. The two of them [Vladimir and Iaroslav] came to their uncle Iurii with their armed men (*s polkoma*), but they left Mstislav back in Vladimir[-in-Volhynia] for Mstislav did not dare to go, saying, 'Iurii will capture me.' Iurii accepted them into love (*priia v liubov'*). As for Mstislav, he sent to him with cross-kissing, and accepted him into love as well. ... Having discussed matters (*sdumav*) with his nephews, Iurii sent to Iziaslav Davidovich, saying, 'Do you wish to come to us to make peace, or [that] we [come] to you?' Seeing that Iurii was together with his nephews (*s synovtsi sovkupivshasia*), Iziaslav [Davidovich] kissed the Cross to them, and after that Iurii gave leave to his nephews ... Then Iurii came to a conference (*snem*) with Iziaslav Davidovich and with Sviatoslav Olgovich, and they convened (*sniashasia*) at Lutava.[988]

Iurii evidently starts to act as a lord of his nephews and great-nephews and of Sviatoslav Vsevolodich as soon as he "accepts them into his love": they bow down to him, call him "father," come to him with their forces, and he gives them leave when their service is not needed anymore. We can also see that the chronicler presents different degrees of subordination: Rostislav "bows down" and "returns to his Smolensk," while Sviatoslav Vsevolodich "throws himself at Iurii's feet," and then he is "commanded" to accompany Iurii. In a greater or lesser degree, all the important Monomakhovichi and Sviatoslav Vsevolodich submit themselves to Iurii. On the other hand, Sviatoslav Olgovich simply "comes to meet" Iurii on the border

---

[987]PSRL 2, 477.

[988]PSRL 2, 476-7, 480-81, under 1154-55; see also PSRL 1, 344. It appears that the chronicler uses the same word *synovtsi* to describe both nephews and great-nephews. Rostislav and Vladimir Mstislavichi were Iurii's nephews, the sons of his older brother, the late Mstislav Vladimirovich; Mstislav and Iaroslav Iziaslavichi were Iurii's great-nephews, the sons of Iurii's nephew, the late Iziaslav Mstislavich.

of Sviatoslav's dominion,[989] and they have what a contemporary Western author would have called a conference at the march. Marches, or borderland territories, were places of meetings between equal parties.

Correspondingly, Sviatoslav Olgovich neither bows down to Iurii, nor receives any orders from him. As we know, he and Iurii had already been "in great love" by the time of their meeting at Radoshch/Sinin Most.[990] Another prominent member of the Olgovichi clan, Iziaslav Davidovich,[991] makes a "peace" and "kisses the Cross to" Iurii when he sees that all the important junior Monomakhovichi are at Iurii's service. Then the two leading Olgovichi - Sviatoslav Olgovich and Iziaslav Davidovich - have a meeting with Iurii at Lutava, located in the borderland between their and Iurii's territories.[992] Apparently the "love" between Iurii and Sviatoslav Olgovich, as well as Iurii's "peace" with Iziaslav Davidovich (who was not at war with Iurii at the time when this "peace" was concluded) signify the same thing: an alliance of peace and friendship between equal parties, none of whom can simply tell the other to come to his court as is indicated by their meetings on the border.[993] These relationships are different from the "love" into which Iurii "accepts" Rostislav and other junior Monomakhovichi. We will now discuss the latter kind of "love," the hierarchical interprincely relations. This type of "love" is of the utmost importance

---

[989]In the mid-twelfth century, Radoshch and Sinin Most were two strongholds located in close proximity to each other at the border of the dominion of the Chernigov princes. A. K. Zaitsev, *Chernigovskoe kniazhestvo X-XIII vv.* (Moscow: Kvadriga, 2009), 62-3.

[990]PSRL 2, 340; see above, p. 314

[991]Technically, Iziaslav Davidovich belonged to a different branch: his father David Sviatoslavich was a younger brother of Oleg, the founder of the Olgovichi clan. However, the descendants of both Oleg and David Sviatoslavichi are usually referred to as "Olgovichi" in the chronicles, all the more so that they all were based in the Chernigov land and more often than not acted jointly.

[992] On the location of Lutava, see Zaitsev, *Chernigovskoe kniazhestvo*, 64.

[993]Such relations with the Olgovichi clearly contradict the statement of the *Laurentian* chronicler that Iurii was "the Prince of all Rus," see above, p. 297. The Olgovichi's Chernigov dominion was part of Rus, even if "Rus" is understood in the most narrow sense, and Iurii apparently had no power over it.

for a comparative analysis of the social organization of the elite, because, as we have seen, the hierarchical relations between lord and man known as "feudo-vassalic" have traditionally been seen, and are still seen, as a unique feature of medieval Western Europe.

6.5 "Father" and "Son" in Political Contexts

We have seen that Rostislav's submission to Iurii was marked not only by his "bowing down," but also by calling Iurii his "father," who, in turn, addressed Rostislav as "son and brother." We already know that princes generally called each other "brother," meaning something like "fellow-prince." "Father" and "son," when used in a sense other than to signify members of a nuclear family, typically appear in the context of hierarchical interprincely relations. While describing the establishment of such relations, the chroniclers sometimes use the expression *nareschi ottsem'*, that is, "to name," or "to pronounce [someone] a father," or else they report that one prince said to another, "You are my father," "I want to have you as my father/in the father's place."

Being a "father" is often connected with dynastic seniority. For example, when Iziaslav Mstislavich recognized Viacheslav's seniority, he said to Viacheslav, "You are my father, I bow down to you," and Viacheslav replied, "If you make me your father, then you are my son." Consequently, they swore an oath on the Cross "not to leave each other's side through good and bad, but always to be together (*ne razluchites ima ni v dobre ne v zle, no po odnomy mestu byti*)."[994] As we remember, Iziaslav recognized Viacheslav's authority only *pro forma*, so that their "son-father" relations might legitimize Iziaslav's position in Kiev. The essence of such relations can be seen better from the account of the negotiations between Iziaslav's son Mstislav

---

[994]PSRL 2, 418.

of Volhynia and Iziaslav's younger brother Rostislav. In 1159, after Iziaslav, Viach-eslav, and Iurii Dolgorukii died, Rostislav became the most senior Monomakhovich. Mstislav Iziaslavich, on his part, was the best on the battlefield. Therefore, Mstislav undertook to fight off the Olgovichi, who attempted to take the Kievan throne. At the same time, Mstislav made an oath on the Cross that he would fight against the Olgovichi on behalf of Rostislav. He promised that as soon as Kiev was free from the Olgovichi threat, he would give it over to Rostislav as the most senior prince.[995] And so he did - after a fashion. According to the chronicler, as soon as Mstislav and his younger brothers fought off the Olgovichi and secured Kiev, they "sent [envoys] to Smolensk to Rostislav, inviting (*vabiache*) him to take the Kievan throne, for they had kissed the Cross that 'We are fighting for it in order to give it to you (*iako tobe ego ishchem*).'" So far, so good. However, Rostislav suspected that Mstislav would treat him in the same way as Iziaslav had treated Viacheslav: that is, he would show him the outward respect due to a senior prince and a "father" in order to mask his own *de-facto* rule in Kiev. Therefore, he answered the invitation,

> 'If you truly invite me with love, I will only go to Kiev on the condition that I have my full free will (*ia vsiako idu Kievu na svoiu voliu*), so that you have me as your father rightfully (*v pravdu*) and walk in obedience to me (*v moem' vy poslushan'i khoditi*).[996]

Thus, to observe "father-son" relations "rightfully," "sons" were supposed to be obedient to their "father." Mstislav did not like Rostislav's reply, because he clearly intended to become Rostislav's "son" only *pro forma*, but eventually he had to agree to Rostislav's conditions.[997]

Another good illustration for the meaning of "father" in a political context can be found in the *Laurentian* accounts of the relations between Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo of Suzdalia on the one hand, and the princes of the Riazan land, the five

---

[995]PSRL 2, 498-503.
[996]PSRL 2, 503.
[997]PSRL 2, 503-4.

brothers Glebovichi and their sons, on the other. According to the entry for 1180,

> Vsevolod and Vladimir Glebovichi sent [envoys] to Vsevolod Iurgevich [Bolshoe Gnez-
> do], saying, 'You are our father, you are our lord (*gospodin*). Our eldest brother
> Roman is taking our *volosts* from us by force ... and he broke the oath on the Cross
> which he had sworn to you.'[998]

Vsevolod responded by going into the Riazan land with his troops. Vsevolod and
Vladimir Glebovichi "came to meet him and bowed down (*sretosta s poklonom*), and
Prince Vsevolod [Bolshoe Gnezdo] accepted them into love." Then he attacked and
defeated the eldest Glebovich, Roman, about whom the two younger brothers had
complained. Another brother Igor, who was helping Roman, was also defeated.

> Prince Vsevolod [Bolshoe Gnezdo] ... made peace with Roman and with Igor. They
> kissed the Cross according to Vsevolod's will (literally: on all Vsevolod's will, *na
> vsei voli Vsevolozhi*), and, having properly arranged all the brothers [Glebovichi] and
> having given (*rozdav*) their *volosts* to them, so that each received a *volost* according to
> his seniority, [Vsevolod] returned to [the city of] Vladimir (*i poriad stvoriv vsei brat'i,
> rozdav im volost' ikh komuzhdo po stareishin'stvu, vozvratisia v Volodimer'*).[999]

Six years later, another conflict broke out among the Glebovichi. The entry for 1186
reports that the devil instigated three older brothers to attack the two youngest,
Vsevolod and Sviatoslav. Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo told the older brothers to stop
their aggression, but they did not listen. Therefore, he sent three hundred of his men
to help Vsevolod and Sviatoslav Glebovichi in their struggle against the older broth-
ers. While the strife among the Riazan princes was going on, Vsevolod Glebovich
went to Vladimir "to attend the council of the grand [prince] Vsevolod [Bolshoe
Gnezdo] (*ide na svet ko Vsevolodu velikomu*)" and left his brother Sviatoslav to
fight alone. While Vsevolod Glebovich was away, Sviatoslav changed sides and went
over to the older brothers. Consequently, he turned over to them the men of both
Vsevolods - of his brother and of Bolshoe Gnezdo.[1000] After hearing this news,

---

[998]"*K tobe krest tseloval i perestupil*," PSRL 1, 387. There is no information about this
oath in the chronicles, and it is unclear what were the actions of Roman that constituted
the violation of his oath to Vsevolod.

[999]PSRL 1, 387-8.

[1000]PSRL 1, 401-3.

[Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo] started to gather soldiers (*voi*), saying, 'Give my men (*druzhinu*) back to me peacefully (*dobrom*), in the same way as you have received them. If you make peace with your brethren, why do you turn my men over (*vydaesh'*)? I sent [them] to you because you had sent your entreaties to me throwing yourself at my feet (*iaz k tobe poslal, a ty u mene vybil chelom, prislav*). ...' When they [the Glebovichi] heard that Vsevolod was going to advance against them, they sent [envoys] to him, saying, 'You are our father, our lord, our brother. If anyone commits a wrong against you, we will lay down our heads for you before you [lay down yours] (*gde tvoia obida budet', my perezhe tobe glavy svoi slozhim za tia*). Do not be angry with us that we fought against our brother; [we did so] because he does not obey us. But as far as you are concerned, we bow down (*a tobe sia klaniaem*), and we release your men.' However, Vsevolod did not want to accept their peace offer (*ne vskhote mira ikh*).[1001]

The entry for the next, 1187 year, reports that two bishops, Luke of Suzdalia and Porphyrius of Chernigov, convinced Vsevolod not to start a war against the Glebovichi and mediated a peace agreement between them.[1002]

The next time we hear about the Glebovichi is in the entry for 1207, when Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo interfered in a conflict between Riurik Rostislavich and the Olgovichi on the side of Riurik. Preparing to support Riurik and gathering his forces, Vsevolod summoned his son Constantine, David of Murom, and the Glebovichi with their junior relatives. The Glebovichi were on their way to Vsevolod, when somebody informed Vsevolod (*byst' emy vest'*) that "the Riazan princes had an agreement with the Olgovichi directed against him, and they are coming to him with a deception (*na l'ste*)." Vsevolod with all his forces went towards the Glebovichi, and they met half-way. When they met, Vsevolod, "having kissed them, ordered them to go into a big tent" while he himself went into a small tent pitched nearby (*povele im sesti v shatre, a sam kniaz' velikii sede v poslstnitsi*). The chronicler goes on to describe what looks like an established procedure - a trial, if you wish - the aim of which was to find out whether the Riazan princes were, indeed, guilty of treason:

The grand prince [Vsevolod] ... sent to them Prince David of Murom and his man

---

[1001]PSRL 1, 403.
[1002]PSRL 1, 404.

> Michael Borisovich in order to expose them (*na oblichen'e ikh*), and they [David and Michael] were going back and forth between them [between Vsevolod and the Riazan princes] for a long time, but they [the Riazan princes] kept swearing that the accusation was not true (*klenushchemsia i potiashchim iako nest' tako*).' However, their own nephews Gleb and Oleg Volodemerichi arrived and exposed them. When the grand prince heard that the truth was revealed, he ordered to arrest (*izoimati*) them and their counsellors (*ikh s svoimi dumtsami*) and to bring them to [the city of] Vladimir.[1003]

After that, Vsevolod entered the Riazan land with his troops, captured the important stronghold of Pronsk and gave it to Oleg Vladimirovich, one of the two junior Riazan princes who testified against their uncles during the trial-like procedure in the tent. Next, Vsevolod placed his governors (*posadniki*) in all the *gorody* of the perfidious Riazan princes, and then moved to Riazan itself (*poide k Riazaniu, posadniky posazhav svoe po vsem gorodam ikh*).

> The people of Riazan sent [envoys] to him and bowed down (*s poklonom*), beseeching him not to attack their city, and their bishop Arsenius sent many entreaties, saying, 'Grand Prince, do not make the holy places empty and do not cause the holy churches to be burnt, in which ... prayers are said for you, and we now will do all your will, whatever you wish (*vsiu voliu tvoiu stvoriaem, chego to* (sic) *khocheshchi*).[1004]

"Being merciful," Vsevolod canceled the attack, but he later sent his son to be the prince of Riazan. In the entry for the next year, the people of Riazan "broke their cross-kissing to Vsevolod" and rose against his son. When Vsevolod arrived with his troops, "the people of Riazan sent to him an impertinent speech, according to their custom of disobedience (*prislasha Riazantsi buiuiu rech' po svoemu obychaiu i nepokorstvu*)." Vsevolod "ordered all the people to leave the city and to take their movable property with them (*s tovarom*)," burned Riazan, and brought the people, with their bishop, to his city of Vladimir.[1005] After Vsevolod's death in 1212, his son Iurii, who became the prince of Suzdalia, released the princes, the bishop, and the

---

[1003]PSRL 1, 430-31.
[1004]PSRL 1, 432.
[1005]PSRL 1, 434.

people of Riazan, and they all "returned home."[1006] They apparently rebuilt their city, because we see later references to Riazan and to its princes in the chronicle.[1007] By 1237, it must have been a rather populous and well-fortified place, because the Mongols had to use their siege engines for three days and nights around the clock before they were able to break into Riazan.[1008]

I have related this rather long story because it is very informative. The first important feature that it reveals is that "father" is used in the same sense as "lord." The Riazan princes call Vsevolod their "father and lord" – and from 1180 to his death in 1212, he indeed behaves as their lord.

We do not know what relations existed between the Riazan princes and Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo before Vsevolod and Vladimir Glebovichi turned to him for help against their older brother Roman. He probably had not been their "father and lord" before, because otherwise it is difficult to make sense out of the statement that Vsevolod "accepted them into love" after they had sent to him their plea for help. It appears that when the two youngest Glebovichi "sent to Vsevolod, saying, 'You are our father, you are our lord'," they, in fact, *asked* him to be their "father and lord," that they commended themselves to him seeking his protection. If this is so, then "accepting into love" would mean that Vsevolod and the two princes performed whatever rituals were necessary to seal their agreement when they met in person; this happened after Vsevolod had accepted in principle the proposal to become "father and lord" sent through an envoy.

As the lord of the two youngest Glebovichi, Vsevolod advances against their older

---

[1006]PSRL 1, 437.

[1007]PSRL 1, 440, 444.

[1008]Rashid ad-Din, *Sbornik letopisei*, ed. and transl. L. A. Khetagurov (Moscow: Iz-datelstvo AN SSSR, 1952), available as an electronic text at http://www.vostlit.info/haupt-Dateien/index-Dateien/R.phtml?id=2057 accessed 08.02.2013; *Povest' o razorenii Riazani Batyem*, BLDR 5, available as an electronic text at http://www.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4956 accessed 08.02.2013.

brothers who allegedly wrongfully deprived Vsevolod's protégés of their *volosts*. After he defeats the older brothers, they "kiss the Cross to him," apparently recognizing his overlordship, because the next thing he does is "giving" their own *volosts* back to them. They must have submitted themselves and their lands to Vsevolod as their "lord and father" to make it possible for Vsevolod to "arrange" the Riazan princes and to grant them their *volosts*. We see that the Glebovichi owe service and fidelity to Vsevolod in exchange for their *volosts* which from now on they apparently hold "from" him. Thus, when he is going to wage a campaign in the south in order to support Riurik Rostislavich against the Olgovichi, he summons the princes of Riazan and Murom along with his own son. There is no indication that the Riazan princes had any common interests with Riurik Rostislavich. If anything, they might have been more connected with the Olgovichi, because Riazan had belonged to the bishopric of Olgovichi's Chernigov before it got its own bishop.[1009]

In addition to their obligation to provide military service to Vsevolod, the Riazan princes apparently had to come to his court and to participate in his council when he summoned them. Vsevolod Glebovich had to attend Vsevolod's council even at a time of war at home. The princes of Murom were at the same council as well, and these are the same princes whom the chronicler represents as being "sent" by Vsevolod on various campaigns.[1010] We do not know if Vsevolod was their "father" and if he granted the *volost* of Murom to them, because the chronicler mentions the Murom affairs only in passing. However, it is clear that both Murom and Riazan princes owed to Vsevolod what in Latin is called *auxilium et consilium* (aid and council), that is, what has been traditionally presented as the cornerstone of the vassal's duties. In the case of the Riazan princes, it is also clear that they provided aid and council in exchange for the grant of their *volosts*. They apparently handed over these *volosts* to Vsevolod in 1180 and received them back from him on the

---

[1009]PSRL 1, 404.
[1010]PSRL 1, 402, 430-31.

condition that they would "lay down their heads" for Vsevolod. This formula, as we remember, was the most common East Slavonic expression for loyalty.

The Riazan princes use this expression when they want to affirm their recognition of Vsevolod as their "father and lord." It is very likely that the promise to "lay down their heads for Vsevolod's *obida*" was part of the oath on the Cross that they swore to him. Otherwise, the message, which the Glebovichi sent to Vsevolod in 1186 when he "started to gather soldiers," does not make much sense. Vsevolod was going to fight the Glebovichi because they kept his men as prisoners. In order to prevent Vsevolod from marching on them, the Glebovichi not only released his men - which, of course, was the most obvious and sensible thing to do - but they also told him, "If anyone commits a wrong (*obida*) against you, we will lay down our heads for you." At the time, nobody committed any wrong against Vsevolod except the Glebovichi themselves. Did they express their readiness "to lay down their heads" defending Vsevolod from themselves? If not, what was then the meaning of their message? The only explanation that I can see is that, taken together with calling Vsevolod "lord and father" and "bowing down" to him, the willingness to "lay down their heads" for Vsevolod's *obida* was an affirmation of fidelity. The older Glebovichi tried to convince Vsevolod that they remained faithful to him, that they were true to all their obligations towards him, and that their internal struggle with their disobedient junior did not affect their recognition of Vsevolod's lordship over them.

We have seen that, after the interference of the two bishops, Vsevolod reluctantly agreed with such an interpretation of the Glebovichi's actions and did not proceed to punish them for their breach of loyalty. It was different in 1207, when the breach of faith on the part of the Riazan princes was established by a due procedure, with the use of testimonies given by their nephews and by the prince of Murom. We have seen that Vsevolod exercised his supreme right to the Riazan land to which he was entitled as "father and lord" of its princes: he confiscates the *volosts* of the perfidious

princes and grants them to those who serve him faithfully.

Change the personal names and toponymics, and the whole story would be indistinguishable from an account of relations between a Western lord and his "vassals." On the other hand, if we had had a document written from the perspective of the Glebovichi, it would probably have looked very much like the *Conventum Hugonis*. We do not know what were their reasons for entering into a league with the Olgovichi (if the accusations against them were indeed true), but it is very probable that they were unhappy about the way Vsevolod distributed the *volosts* among them. In all their internal conflicts, the older Glebovichi try to conquer some lands from the younger. Apparently, from their perspective, the younger brothers hold what of right belongs to the older ones. On one occasion, they claim that they are rightfully punishing their younger brother for his "disobedience"; they also hint that Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo should not have interfered on his side.

Hugh used the same logic as the Riazan princes when he described to William his agreement with Count Fulk who either had been Hugh's lord in the past, or was his other lord simultaneously with William: "When I was Fulk's man, I told him that his men took from me what was rightfully mine (*tollebant mihi rectum meum*) and that if I could take it back from them, I would do so (*si ego valebam ad eos tollere, fecissem*); but I would [still] remain [just] as much in his fidelity (*sed tantum in sua fidelitate tenuissem*)."[1011] Hugh argues that his attack on his lord's men does not constitute a breach of fidelity on his part as long as he has a just reason and only attacks in order to take back what is rightly his. According to the *Conventum*, both Fulk and William agreed with Hugh's argument.[1012] We do not know what arguments the older Glebovichi used to justify their attack on the "disobedient brother" and to show that this did not constitute a breach of faith with their "father and lord" Vsevolod. However, their arguments must have been rather

---

[1011]*Conventum Hugonis*, 546.
[1012]Ibid.

convincing because Bishop Porphyrius of Chernigov apparently was on their side in their dispute with Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo. When Vsevolod rejected their plea "do not be angry with us that we fought against our brother," and when he was preparing a punitive expedition against the older Glebovichi, they turned for help to the Bishop of Chernigov, just as Hugh turned to the Bishop of Limoges to seek advice regarding his problems with William.[1013] The *Laurentian* chronicler, an admirer of Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, is very unhappy about the position of Bishop Porphyrius in regards to the conflicts. According to the chronicler, while acting as a mediator between the Glebovichi and Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, the bishop "perverted" the speech he was supposed to deliver (*shed, inako rech izvorocha k nim*) and acted "not as a church hierarch, but as a traitor and a liar (*ne iako sviatitel'sky, no iako perevetnik i lozh'*)." Vsevolod "left it all to God and to the Holy Mother of God" and neither confronted Porphyrius nor prosecuted his dispute with the Glebovichi, deciding to accept the peace brokered by the bishop.[1014] Such behavior by Porphyrius, and Vsevolod himself, suggests that the older Glebovichi were able to present some arguments to justify their actions.

As for Vsevolod Glebovich, who was unwaveringly faithful to Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, he suffered exactly the same losses in the service of his "father and lord" as Hugh of Lusignan suffered while serving his "senior" and "dominus." Hugh complains that William summoned him to attend an assembly (*placitum*), when Hugh was in the middle of a conflict with a certain Bernard. Hugh tried to argue that it was risky for him to leave his land when Bernard was uttering threats (*minat ut mihi faciat mala*), but William still forced Hugh to accompany him (*ad vim et sine voluntatem eius duxit eum secum*). While Hugh and William were "lingering (*morarentur*)" at the assembly, Bernard besieged Hugh's wife and did "much evil" to Hugh and

---

[1013]*Conventum Hugonis*, 545.
[1014]PSRL 1, 404-5.

his men.[1015] We have seen that Vsevolod Glebovich had to attend the council of Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo while he was in the middle of a conflict with his older brothers. We do not know if he tried to reason with his "father and lord" and to point out to him the risks involved in being away from his land in a time of war. What we do know is that the wife, children, and men (*boyars*) of Vsevolod Glebovich were captured, and his men's property (*imenie*) was plundered, while he was at the council in the city of Vladimir on Vsevolod's orders.[1016]

Finally, Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo acts not unlike William of the *Conventum* when he burns Riazan. Hugh complains that William took one of his *castra* and set it on fire (*tulit ei castrum et igne succendit*).[1017] According to Hugh, this action was totally unprovoked, but, in all likelihood, William saw it in a different way. Judging from Adémar's *Chronicle*, the burning, and subsequent rebuilding, of *castra* was a standard practice of the Aquitanian magnates in their disputes with each other.[1018]

Let us now look at another case of a "father" in conflict with the princes whose "father" he is. This case is especially interesting, because we have two accounts of the same events written from opposing perspectives. We have already touched on the conflict between Andrei Bogoliubskii of Suzdalia and the brothers Rostislavichi, in the course of which Andrei's envoy got his hair and beard cut, and Andrei "placed his hope in the force of the flesh" and "ruined his reason by immoderation." At least, this is what the *Kievan* chronicler tells us. The *Laurentian*, of course, presents the actions of the Suzdalian prince in a very different light. The conflict occurred in 1173-74, not long before Andrei was murdered by his servants. To be able to understand this conflict, we need to turn back in time and to discuss the events of 1169.

[1015]*Conventum Hugonis*, 545.
[1016]PSRL 1, 402-3.
[1017]*Conventum Hugonis*, 545.
[1018]See e.g. *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon*, 156 (III.34), 165 (III.45), 181 (III.60).

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

As we remember, in that year, a vast coalition of princes advanced on Kiev to take it from Mstislav Iziaslavich who occupied the Kievan throne against all the dynastic rules and who, moreover, had hostile relations with many princes for different reasons. The coalition was organized by the most senior Monomakhovich, Andrei Bogoliubskii of Suzdalia. However, Andrei himself did not go on the campaign, but gave the command of his forces to his son. The joint forces of eleven princes under the aegis of Andrei and under the command of his son took and sacked Kiev; however, Andrei did not occupy the Kievan throne, as a victorious senior prince would have normally done. He remained in Suzdalia. His son also returned to Suzdalia after he had "put" (*posadi*) his uncle Gleb, Andrei's younger brother, on the Kievan throne. These events created a new situation in Rus: Kiev stopped being the residence of the most powerful and/or most senior prince. In a sense, it became another *volost*, very valuable and prestigious, to be sure, but still a *volost* to be granted rather than the closest thing to a capital city, which it had been before. Let us now follow the *Kievan* account of what happened after the natural death of Andrei's brother Gleb in 1173.

Andrei "sent to the Rostislavichi [to Smolensk], saying thus, 'You have pronounced (*narekli este*) me a father, and [therefore] I wish you well (*a khochiu vy dobra*), and I give Kiev to your brother Roman.'"[1019] Unfortunately, there is no information about when and how the Rostislavichi "pronounced Andrei a father." We know that when this happened, the Rostislavichi swore oaths on the Cross to Andrei; it is very likely that he also swore an oath to them. This is evident from the account of their falling out: the Rostislavichi explicitly refer to their own oath on the Cross, and they hint that Andrei violated his oath to them. Let us now follow the narrative offered by the *Kievan* chronicler.

> In the same year [1173] Andrei started to present accusations against (or: to lay the blame on) the Rostislavichi (*viny pokladyvati na Rostislavichi*). He sent [his man]

[1019]PSRL 2, 567.

> Mikhno to them, saying thus, 'Hand over to me Grigorii Khotovich and Stepan and
> Aleksei Sviatoslovtsy, because they had caused the death of my brother Gleb (*syt'*
> *umorili brata moego Gleba*), and they are common enemies of us all.' However, the
> Rostislavichi did not listen to that and sent Grigorii away (*pustisha ot sebe*). And
> Andrei said to Roman, 'You and your brothers do not walk in my will; so, you go from
> Kiev (*ne khodishi v moei voli s' brat'eiu svoeiu, a poide s Kieva*), and David [must go]
> from Vyshegorod, and Mstislav from Belgorod. You have your Smolensk, go ahead
> and divide it among yourselves (*ato vy Smolensk, a tem sia podelite*).[1020]

The Rostislavichi obeyed and left Kiev. Andrei then "gave" Kiev to his brother
Mikhalko, who, however, "did not go to Kiev himself, but sent there his brother
Vsevolod [the future Bolshoe Gnezdo] and his nephew Iaropolk." In the meantime,
the Rostislavichi were "sad and angry (*pozhalishasia*)," which showed that they did
not really accept Andrei's decision. Therefore, they sent to him the following mes-
sage:

> '[This is indeed] so, brother (*tako, brate*), we have pronounced you our father rightfully
> (*v' pravdu tia narekli esmy ottsem' sobe*), and we have kissed the Cross to you, and
> we are faithful to our oath on the Cross (*stoim b' krest'nom tselovan'i*), wishing you
> well. But now, behold, you deprived our brother Roman of Kiev (*vyvel esi is' Kieva*),
> and you are driving us out of the Rus land [in the narrow sense] without any offense
> on our part (*put' kazheshi iz' Rus'koi zemli bez nashee viny*). May [we] all rely on
> God and on the power of the Cross (*za vsemi Bog i sila krest'naia*)!'[1021]

The initial words of the Rostislavichi's message, "*tako, brate*," suggest that the Ros-
tislavichi express their agreement with some statement previously made by Andrei.
In all likelihood, Andrei reminded them that they had sworn an oath on the Cross
to "wish him well" and to regard him as their "father." The Rostislavichi agree that

---

[1020]PSRL 2, 569-70. For a chronological commentary on the *Kievan* entries for 1173-
74, see Berezhkov, *Khronologiia russkogo letopisaniia*, 189-91. Vyshegorod and Belgorod
were two strongholds near Kiev of great strategic importance. They effectively controlled
access to Kiev and constituted important units within the Kievan region, which the Kievan
prince normally granted to the princes who were closest to him and whom he trusted most;
often they were his biological sons or brothers. Stepan and Aleksei Sviatoslovtsy are not
mentioned anywhere else; their identity is unknown. Grigorii Khotovich is probably the
same person as Prince Gleb's supreme official in Kiev (*tysiatskii*) mentioned by Grigorii in
the entry for 1173 (PSRL 2, 548).

[1021]PSRL 2, 570.

they, indeed, did all these things, and they also insist that they remain true to their sworn obligations to Andrei. It also appears that they, in turn, accuse Andrei of breaking *his* oath to them. Such an accusation is implied by the Rostislavichi's reference to the "power of the Cross." It is very probable that the oath was mutual and that Andrei also kissed the Cross to the Rostislavichi. Taken together with the invocation of God, the Rostislavichi's reference to the "power of the Cross" becomes a veiled threat to take up arms: the "power of the Cross" was widely believed to avenge perjurers; a battle, of course, was seen as God's judgment.

Andrei gave no answer to this message. Therefore, the Rostislavichi, with the exception of the oldest brother Roman, "placing their trust in God and in the power of the Venerable Cross," made a surprise attack on Vsevolod and his son who had been installed in Kiev by Andrei and Mikhalko. Roman presumably chose to comply with Andrei's orders and stayed in his patrimonial Smolensk. Since the Rostislavichi belonged to the princely line generally favored by the Kievans, it is very likely that they were helped by the population. The chronicler does not report any siege or battle. The Rostislavichi simply "went to Kiev" and "captured (*iasha*)" Vsevolod, Iaropolk, and their men (*boiary*). After that they "gave Kiev to Riurik; and Prince Riurik, son of Rostislav, entered Kiev with great glory and honor and sat on the throne of his forefathers." Next, the victorious Rostislavichi marched on Mikhalko, whose princely residence was in Torchesk.

> They stood near [Torchesk] for six days; on the seventh day, Mikhalko sent [envoys] to them, and they made the following agreement (*uriadishasia tako*). Mikhalko will attach Pereiaslavl to his Torchesk domain (*vokhvati k Torts'komu Pereiaslavl'*); he will abandon (*lishisia*) his brother Andrei and Sviatoslav Vsevolodich of Chernigov, and he will join the Rostislavichi (*k Rostoslavichem' postupi*). ... The Rostislavichi will release Vsevolod, Iaropolk, and all their men (*druzhinu*).[1022]

When Andrei heard about these new developments, he "burnt with anger and sent his sword-bearer (*mechnika*) Mikhno":

[1022]PSRL 2, 570-72.

> Go to the Rostislavichi and tell them, 'You do not walk in my will (*ne khodite v moei voli*). You, Riurik, go to your inheritance (*otchinu*) Smolensk to your brother.' Tell David, 'And you go to Berlad,[1023] I forbid you to be in the Rus Land.' And say to Mstislav, 'You are at the root of it all (*v tebe stoit' vse*), I forbid you to be in the Rus Land.' [1024]

This was the speech that cost Mikhno his hair and beard.[1025] The Rostislavichi told the beardless envoy,

> Go to your prince and tell him, 'Until now, we had you as a father by love (*aki ottsa imeli po liubvi*). But if you have sent [your envoy] with such speeches, not as if to a prince, but as if to your subject and a commoner (*ne aky k' kniaziu, no aky k' podruchniku i prostu cheloveku*), you do what you have contrived (*umyslil esi*), and may God's will prevail in all things (*a Bog za vsem*)![1026]

As we remember, Andrei, whose face became pale when he saw Mikhno and heard the Rostoslavichi's message, sent a huge army against Kiev. This army included the forces of many princes, who were either Andrei's allies, or were in some way subordinate to him. While listing the names of these princes, the chronicler makes an interesting remark: Andrei commanded Roman, the only Rostislavich who remained faithful to him, to send his son with armed men to join Andrei's army, "and thus Roman, against his will, had to send his son and men of Smolensk (*nuzheiu pusti syn svoi so s'molniany*) to fight against his own brothers, for Roman was then in Andrei's hands."[1027]

The forces of Andrei, and of the princes whom he "ordered (*povele*)" to march on Kiev, joined with the forces of the Olgovichi, who had entered into an anti-Rostislavichi alliance with Andrei.[1028] Finally, "Iaroslav [Iziaslavich] of Lutsk arrived to fight against the same Rostislavichi with all the men of Volhynia." The report of

---

[1023]Berlad was a region on the coast of the Azov Sea and in the lower Dnieper and Danube, which, as far as is known, was under no-one's political authority. In the Rusian sources, it is presented as a land of vagabonds and outcasts of all sorts.

[1024]PSRL 2, 572-3.

[1025]See above, p. 220.

[1026]PSRL 2, 573.

[1027]PSRL 2, 574.

[1028]PSRL 2, 572, 574-5.

his arrival is accompanied by yet another interesting remark. The chronicler explains that Iaroslav came to fight against the Rostislavichi, "seeking seniority among the Olgovichi for himself" (*ishcha sobe stareshin'stva v Olgovichakh*)." What is extremely interesting about it is that Iaroslav was not an Olgovich at all - he was a son of Iziaslav Mstislavich and thus a great-grandson of Vladimir Monomakh. The next line explains the meaning of the enigmatic "seniority" sought by Iaroslav: "but they did not concede Kiev to him."[1029] Thus, Iaroslav offered to join the Olgovichi and Andrei Bogoliubskii in their struggle against the Rostislavichi on the condition that he becomes the prince of Kiev after the victory. It remains unclear whether he was going to somehow join the Olgovichi clan and become their senior prince, or that "*v Olgovichakh*" means that he hoped to receive the Olgovichi's support in his bid for seniority among the Monomakhovichi - or, rather, among the southern Monomakhovichi, which would have been a more realistic goal. Be this as it may, after the Olgovichi-Andrei alliance turned down his request, Iaroslav "communicated with the Rostislavichi and made an agreement with them regarding Kiev." Consequently, he changed sides and came over to the Rostislavichi.

The Rostislavichi, with the help of Iaroslav, emerged victorious. In accordance with their agreement, they "put seniority on Iaroslav and gave him Kiev."[1030] What happened soon thereafter is probably the most interesting moment in all this extremely interesting story. When Iaroslav's rule in Kiev proved rather unsuccessful,[1031]

> The Rostislavichi and their brethren sent to Prince Andrei [Bogoliubskii] asking that Roman Rostislavich become the prince of Kiev (*prosiache Romana Rostislavicha kniazhiti v' Kieve*). Andrei said, 'Wait for a while (*malo*), I have sent [envoys] to my brethren in [southern] Rus. As soon as I hear from them, I will give you an answer (*poslal esm' k brat'i svoei v Rus', kak mi vest' budet' ot nikh, togda ti dam otvet*).[1032]

[1029]PSRL 2, 575-6.
[1030]PSRL 2, 578.
[1031]See PSRL 2, 578-9.
[1032]PSRL 2, 580.

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

This exchange occurred about four months after the Rostislavichi defeated Andrei's forces and "placed seniority" on Iaroslav Iziaslavich.[1033] The chronicle reports no more battles, nor indeed any interactions between them and Andrei within these four months. Yet somehow, they managed to repair their relations. The Rostislavichi apparently have "taken seniority off" Iaroslav; they again recognize Andrei's authority over them, as well as his right to grant the Kievan throne to a prince of his choice. Andrei's friendly reply to their request shows that he again considers himself their "father" and that he forgot his plans to drive them out of Rus. and to turn them into outcasts of Berlad. This new stage in the development of the relations between Andrei and the Rostislavichi was interrupted by Andrei's sudden violent death in 1174.

The *Laurentian* account of the relations between Andrei and the Rostislavichi is much more laconic. The entry for 1173 tells us that Andrei "sent his son ... on a campaign against the [Volga] Bulgars. ... In the same winter, Prince Andrei sent Roman Rostislavich to Kiev to be a prince there (*posla Kyevu kniazhiti*)."[1034] The *Laurentian* chronicler simply assumes that Andrei has as much power over Roman Rostislavich as he has over his own son; he does not provide any other information about the nature of the relations between Andrei and Roman. According to the entry for the next year,

> the Rostislavichi did not obey (*nepokorshimsia*) Prince Andrei and did not walk in his will (*v voli ego ne khodiashchim*). Moreover (*pache zhe*), David Rostislavich, prince of Vyshegorod ... with his brethren came to Kiev at night and captured Andrei's brother Vsevolod, and Iaropolk ..., and their men (*druzhinu*). In the same year, Prince Andrei, having heard that his brother was captured by David Rostislavich and his brethren, sent his son [with an army] and twenty other princes with their armed men. ... In the same year they returned home without achieving any success (*ne uspev nichto zhe, vozvratishasia vspiat'*).[1035]

This is all that the *Laurentian* chronicler tells us about the events of 1173-74 before

---

[1033]See Berezhkov, *Khronologiia russkogo letopisaniia*, 190.
[1034]PSRL 1, 364.
[1035]PSRL 1, 364-5.

proceeding to the account of Andrei's murder.

In spite of its brevity, the *Laurentian* version of the events provides valuable information, if we consider it in conjunction with the *Kievan*. Firstly, both chronicles assume that Andrei had a "fatherly" power over the Rostislavichi, and that from 1169 on he had a right to "give" Kiev to princes, or to "send" princes to Kiev, which comes down to the same thing. More importantly, both chroniclers agree that the Rostislavichi had an obligation "to walk in Andrei's will." "Will" looms large in the account of any kind of hierarchical relations. We remember that the people of Riazan promised Vsevolod "to do his will"; princes submitting themselves to the power of another prince "kissed the Cross on all his will"; Rostislav Mstislavich accepted his nephews' invitation to be their "father" on the condition that Rostislav would have "his own will." Thus, "to walk in Andrei's will" was part of the Rostislavichi's obligations as Andrei's "sons." Where the two chroniclers differ is in their evaluation of whether the Rostislavichi fulfilled this obligation. According to the *Laurentian*, they did not, and they had to be punished; according to the *Kievan*, their refusal to hand over to Andrei three men whom he accused of playing an instrumental role in his uncle's death did not constitute a violation of their duties as Andrei's "sons." The Rostislavichi claimed that there was no *vina* on their part, that is they committed no offense, they did not breach their agreement with Andrei, and there was no reason for Andrei to confiscate the *volost* of Kiev that he had given to them. However, the exchanges between Andrei and the Rostislavichi reported in the *Kievan* are based on the assumption that he does have a right to punish them as long as he is doing so legitimately. In other words, if the "sons" really committed a *vina*, the "father" has the right to confiscate the *volosts* that they hold from him.

In his first message to the Rostislavichi, Andrei clearly differentiates between Kiev, over which his 1169 victory gave him overlordship, and the Rostislavichi's Smolensk,which was their own domain inherited from their father Rostislav. Because

the Rostislavichi "do not walk in Andrei's will," he confiscates Kiev, Vyshegorod, and Belgorod from them and grants these places to his own younger brother who apparently "walks in his will." Andrei clearly has no right to deprive the Rostislavichi of Smolensk.

We have seen that the oldest Rostislavich Roman accepted Andrei's verdict and, indeed, left Kiev for Smolensk. He apparently remained Andrei's "son," and as such he provided military service to his "father," even when Andrei ordered Roman to send troops against Roman's own brothers. So, we again see military aid to a "father" as the most essential duty of the "son." The other brothers decided that Andrei confiscated Kiev unjustly, and they took it back. Interestingly, they claimed that they still "had Andrei as their father by love," even when they were wrenching Kiev back from Vsevolod and Iaropolk whom Andrei had installed there. From the Rostislavichi's perspective, the real breach of their relations with Andrei occurred when he attempted to deprive them of *their own* land, the land that they held not from him, but by right of inheritance. According to Andrei, only one Rostislavich may go to Smolensk, while the two others had no right "to be in the Rus Land," which in this context apparently included Smolensk and whatever other *volosts* the Rostislavichi might have had. From the Rostislavichi perspective, by his attempt to confiscate the *volosts* which he did not grant, Andrei overstepped the boundaries of what a "father" could rightfully do to punish his "sons."

The distinction between Kiev and Smolensk made in Andrei's first message, and Andrei's threat to drive the two Rostislavichi from the Rus Land in his second message, is reminiscent of Fantosme's representation of Henry II's threats against Ralph de Fougères, one of the barons of Brittany who went over to Henry the Younger. Henry II states that the barons of Brittany "sunt en mes poestez," which Jonston translates as "are feudally subject to me."[1036] In a literal translation, Henry II says

---

[1036]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 12-13.

that they are "in my power" or "under my control," expressing an idea somewhat close to "walking in one's will," and even closer to another Rusian expression, "to be in one's will."[1037] "But," continues Henry II, "Ralph de Fougères has rebelled against me (*est vers mei revelez*)."[1038] Therefore, this is what Henry II plans to do:

> I will do as I wish (literally: will do my will, *ferai mes volentez*) regarding Ralph de Fougères. I will leave him entirely free within his own domain (*dedenz ses poestez*) by such an agreement that he becomes my faithful man (*iert mis afiez*). If he rises against me again ... he will hold neither fief, nor his inherited land in Brittany (*ne tendrat en Bretaine ne fieus ne heritez*).[1039]

After his first transgression, Ralph will be free "in his own domain," which presumably means that Henry II will take from Ralph whatever he had granted to him, but he will not touch Ralph's own land on the condition that he returns under Henry's "power" or "control" by becoming his *afiez* again. Apparently, this was the arrangement between Andrei and the oldest Rostislavich, Roman: Andrei confiscates Kiev, but he does not touch Roman's own domain on the condition that Roman remains "in Andrei's hands," as the chronicler puts it. Henry threatens that if Ralph rises against him again, then Henry will confiscate Ralph's own land and will drive him out of Brittany. This is exactly what Andrei attempted to do with the two Rostislavichi. In the end, as we know, Henry II did not drive anyone out of Brittany or out of any other part of his dominion: he reconciled with the rebels, and returned to them their *bona* and *honores*.

In the account of Andrei and the Rostislavichi, Smolensk emerges as the same type of land that Fantosme describes as *poestez* or *heritez*, while Kiev plays a role of *fieus*. The bottom line is that the "sons" could hold all their land from their "father," like the Riazan princes did; or else they could have some lands of their own and receive additional *volosts* as their "father's" grant. Apparently, in theory, a

---

[1037]For "to be in one's will," see PSRL 2, 667.

[1038]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 12.

[1039]*Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 18. *Poestez*, which means both "power, control," and "land property" is a term virtually identical with *volost*.

"father" could take back the *volosts* that he had granted, but not the lands that were the "sons'" by right of inheritance. In practice, the "father's" ability to confiscate his grants and the "sons'" ability to protect their land from arbitrary confiscation was affected by their respective military power and by other factors. Also, a "father" was supposed to take his grants back only in the case of a serious transgression on the part of the "sons." The problem was in reaching a consensus about what constituted such a transgression. We have seen the disagreement between the *Laurentian* and *Kievan* chronicler in their evaluations of the Rostislavichi's behavior towards Andrei. Such disagreements over the interpretation of the rights and obligations of parties bound by an agreement, whether equal or hierarchical, were an ubiquitous feature of both Rusian princely and Western aristocratic politics. This is small wonder, since the agreements usually used very general and imprecise language.

6.6 Terminology Used in Rusian and Western Sworn Agreements

According to Althoff, it is very difficult for historians to understand "how power was actually distributed" within the medieval elite, because of the "fundamental problem" stemming from the nature of the sources:

> In the early and high middle ages, all bonds brought with them rights and obligations, but these were defined only in a very general manner, if they were defined at all. For example, a liege lord had to give vague guarantees of protection and shelter to his vassal, and promise to show him favor and loyalty, and the vassal in return was simply obliged to offer his lord 'support' and 'counsel.' In the case of friendship alliances, each party promised the other to behave in future as a friend should 'rightfully' behave towards a friend, nothing more. ... What is more, formulae like these still appeared in the twelfth century.[1040]

In Aquitaine and Languedoc, the agreements appear to be even less specific. Ac-

---

[1040]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 8.

cording to Débax, the reference to "consilium et auxilium" is found only in one of the hundreds of oaths that she examined.[1041] Most documents contain what Fulbert of Chartres describes as the foremost obligation of a man towards his lord: not to do any *dampnum*, that is, "harm" or "damage."

The Rusian formula "to wish well," which we have encountered in the discussions of the "father-son" relations, expresses roughly the same idea. In fact, it can be seen as a positive recasting of the negative injunction "not to do damage." The Anglo-Norman author Wace uses expressions very similar to those of the Rusian chronicles when he explains why a man cannot serve two lords: because it is impossible to "love them equally" and not to "wish for one better than for the other (*dous seignors bien ne servireit/ ne egalment nes ameret ... que a l'un mielz ne volsist*)."[1042] Thus, for Wace, to serve a lord properly means to love him and to wish him well.

Because contractual relations were defined in such vague language, the notion of following the agreement "truly" or "rightfully" (*jure*), as opposed to using *malum ingenium* (trickery), was of immense importance. The agreements made in the German Empire often include promises to act "without being deceitful or disingenuous (*sine fraudo* (sic) *et malo ingenio*).[1043] The same expression is found in the Languedocien oaths where obligations are to be fulfilled "*sine tuo inganno* (vernacularized *ingenio*)."[1044] The Rusian chronicles also use the expressions *v pravdu, s pravdoiu* ("truly" or "rightfully") and its opposite *izvet* (trickery) in their discussions of how agreements should be observed.[1045]

Along with these and other parallels in the accounts of sworn agreements in Rusian and Western sources, there are also some differences. The main difference in

---

[1041]Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 198.

[1042]Wace, *Le Roman de Rou*, 287.

[1043]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 9.

[1044]Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 127.

[1045]*V pravdu, s pravdoiu*, see e.g., PSRL 2, 322, 323, 345, 372, 837, 901. For *izvet*, see e.g. PSRL 1, 323; PSRL 2, 345, 484, 494, 543, 686.

terms of vocabulary is the use of the terms "father" and "son" in Rus for what are apparently relations of lordship. Of course, lords were not called "fathers" either in Old French or in Latin. Another Rusian term - *stareishii* (elder, senior), which was sometimes used instead of, or together with, "father" - has a parallel in at least one Western text: Hugh calls William both *dominus* and *senior*. *Senior* is, of course, related to "seignior"; thus, in a sense, the word for "lord" in Old French went back to "elder" or "senior," and was similar to the East Slavonic *stareishii*.

According to Jones, Oliver occasionally calls Roland "my friend and my father," but the passages that Jones uses as evidence to support this statement are open to different interpretations.[1046] Thus, "father" as "lord" has no unambiguous direct parallels in Western sources. However, it corresponds to the well-attested perception of social bonds created by sworn agreements as "artificial kinship," a perception which existed in the medieval West.[1047] According to Benoît Cursente, political friendship in high medieval Gascony existed in the social space "between kinship and fidelity": it was not uncommon for blood relatives to enter into formal agreements promising fidelity to one another, while agreements between non-relatives were infused by rhetoric of family bonding.[1048] An extremely interesting phenomenon probably related to the perception of a lord as "father" is attested in the Languedocien oaths of fidelity. Like other medieval texts, they give personal names in the form "X, son of Y." Unlike almost any other text - including other Languedocien documents - they use the mother's, and not the father's, name for those swearing fidelity. Various explanations for this anomaly have been proposed, but Débax has convincingly argued that the most plausible one is that the lord took the place of a father for the person

---

[1046]See Jones, *The Ethos of the Song of Roland*, 38.

[1047]For titles of works on "artificial kinship," see Hyams, "Homage and Feudalism," 38; Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 6-64.

[1048]Benoît Cursente, "Entre parenté et fidélité: les 'amis' dans la Gascogne des XIe et XIIe siècles," in Hélène Débax, ed., *Les sociétés méridionales à l'âge féodal: Espagne, Italie et sud de la France, Xe-XIIIe s.: hommage à Pierre Bonnasie* (Toulouse: Editions Méridiennes, 1999), 285-92.

who swore fidelity to him. The use of the maternal, instead of the paternal name, excluded the biological father of the lord's man in order to present the lord as his "virtual" father.[1049]

The usage of "father" for "lord," and of "son" for a person to whom the "father" gives *volosts* in exchange for military aid and general "obedience" and "well-wishing," is the most idiosyncratic feature of Rusian political vocabulary. However, viewed in the light of the concept of "artificial kinship," it is not as much at odds with the political discourse of the medieval West as it may seem at first glance. Rather, it appears that the Rusian usage makes explicit an aspect implicitly present in the Western concept of lordship.

6.7 Mutuality and Reciprocity in "Lord-Man"/ "Father-Son" Agreements and Elements of "Feudal Pyramid"

The reciprocal character of feudo-vassalic relations has long been seen as a feature unique to medieval Western Europe, as an important legacy of Western medieval civilization connected with the subsequent development of democracy and the rule of law. Modern scholars, who do not believe in the "feudal contract" anymore, still

---

[1049]Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 134-5. The terms "fidelity" and "man" belongs to Débax, not to the sources. According to her, the word "fidelity" occurs in the sources "very rarely," and there was no specific term for a person who received a *castrum* from another person on the condition of providing support and/or not doing any harm to the grantor on the *castrum* with the understanding that otherwise the *castrum* will be confiscated. The word "vassal" is never used; sometimes the recipient of the *castrum* is called *homo* or *miles*, but in different contexts these terms signify different things. Many oaths do not use any term at all to describe the recipient of the *castrum*. Débax, *La féodalité languedocienne*, 186-8, 192, 329.

note the mutuality of obligations between lord and man.[1050] This, of course, does not mean that medieval agreements spelled out the lord's and his man's rights and duties in respect to each other: as we already know, early and high medieval people never spelled out anyone's rights and duties in a clear manner until the first attempts to do so were made in the mid-twelfth century. Althoff suggests that early, and many high, medieval sources reflect "a simple inability to construct theoretical norms of behavior."[1051] White thus summarizes the position of recent medieval scholarship:

> Instead of being precisely dictated by the specific terms of the oaths of fidelity, political relations between lords and *fideles* were evidently negotiated ... with reference to two conflicting norms, one privileging the claims of lords on their *fideles* and the other privileging the 'mutuality of obligations' as between lords and their *fideles*. Whereas lords could back up their claims to the loyalty and support of their *fideles* with the threat of confiscating their lands, *fideles* could sometimes back up their claims to rewards from their lords ... by deserting them, rebelling against them, or threatening to do one or the other.[1052]

White sees the *Conventum* as evidence that "a limited feud was an appropriate sanction for a *fidelis* to use against a lord who had violated his obligations to his man."[1053] It may be added that a similar idea is expressed in Fantosme's account of William of Scotland turning against his lord Henry II. As we remember, William and his councilors decide that he could legitimately, *senz achaisunment*, join his lord's enemies because Henry II did not grant him the land which William believed was rightly his. Apparently, for the Scottish court, as it is presented by Fantosme, Henry II's behavior constituted a breach of his obligations towards his man William.

We have observed similar features in the *Kievan* account of the relations between Andrei Bogoliubskii and the Rostislavichi. The Rostislavichi's invocation of the "power of the Cross" in their accusation against Andrei strongly suggests that Andrei "kissed the Cross" to them. Andrei's words to the Rostislavichi, "You pronounced

---

[1050]White, "Crisis of Fidelity?" 33-5, 46; Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 7-8.
[1051]Althoff, *Family, Friends, and Followers*, 9.
[1052]White, "Crisis of Fidelity?" 33.
[1053]White, "Crisis of Fidelity?" 46.

me your father, so I wish you well and give Kiev to Roman," in all likelihood indicate that Andrei promised to "wish well" for the Rostislavichi when they "pronounced him father." It appears that Andrei shows how faithfully he was keeping his "fatherly" obligations. We remember that the Rostislavichi explicitly stated that they had "kissed the Cross to" Andrei and that they were "wishing him well." When this mutual "well-wishing" was broken, the Rostislavichi resorted to a "limited feud." The position of the *Kievan* chronicler in this respect can be best summarized by changing three words in a quotation from White: "a limited feud was an appropriate sanction for a 'son' to use against a 'father' who had violated his obligations to his 'son'." The same notion of mutuality of obligations and of the legitimacy of a limited feud on the part of the wronged "sons" appears to lurk behind the biased *Laurentian* account of the relations between Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo and the princes of Riazan.

The idea of mutuality in interprincely hierarchical relations is also expressed in the *Homily on Princes* composed some time after 1161. The *Homily* presents David Sviatoslavich of Chernigov (died in 1123) as a model senior prince who was just, merciful, and never in his life violated an oath on the Cross. The author of the *Homily* concludes his description of David's princely virtues with the statement, "Seeing him to be like that (*ego vidiashche tako sushcha*), all his brethren [the princes of the Chernigov land] listened to him as to their father and obeyed him as their lord (*slushakhut' ego iaki ottsa n pokoriaiut'sia emu iako gospodinu*).[1054] Here, we see again the synonymy of "father" and "lord," as well as the same verb *pokoriatisia* (to obey, to submit oneself) which we have encountered in the exchange between Andrei and the Rostislavichi and which apparently captures the essence of the due attitude towards one's "father." More importantly, this passage implies that David's "brethren" would not have an obligation to obey him unless he was "like that," in other words, if he did not treat other princes fairly and did not keep his own sworn obligations. The author of the *Homily* repeatedly stresses that David treated

---

[1054]*Slovo o kniaz'iakh.* in BLDR 4, 226-9, at 228.

"everyone" fairly, that "if he kissed the Cross to anyone (*komu li*), he never in his life broke his oath."[1055] The recipients of David's fair treatment and of his unbroken oaths apparently included the "brethren" who obeyed him as their father and lord. The author makes it clear that this is how senior princes need to behave if they want obedience on the part of their "sons" and "juniors."

Let us now look at the *Kievan* account, which arguably expresses the mutuality of "father-son" obligations in the the most explicit way. This is a story of a conflict which took place in the 1190s. The conflict involved our old friends Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo and Riurik Rostislavich, and also Roman Mstislavich of Volhynia. To understand what happened in the 1190s, we need to start in the late 1170s. The murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii was followed by a series of tumultuous events in both Suzdalia and southern Rus, which we will not follow here. Eventually, Andrei's younger brother Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo became the Prince of Suzdalia and the most senior prince among all the northern, Suzdalia-based, Monomakhovichi. By that time, Riurik Rostislavich became the most senior Monomakhovich in the Dnieper region, which included southern Rus and the thriving Smolensk land in the Upper Dnieper, the Rostislavichi's patrimony. As we remember, in 1187, Riurik and Vsevolod united their two respective branches of the Monomakhovichi by marrying Vsevolod's young daughter to Riurik's son.[1056]

The third protagonist, Roman Mstislavich, apparently was Riurik's "son" in a political sense in addition to being Riurik's son-in-law. Thus, Riurik is called not only his *test'* ("father-in-law"), but also his *otets'* (father).[1057] A more important piece of evidence of Riurik's "fatherly" position is that he acts as the lord of Roman and of his brother Vsevolod. This is evident from the entry for 1187, which tells us how Roman, in the hopes of becoming the prince of Galich, left his *volost* of Vladimir-in-Volhynia

---

[1055]Ibid.

[1056]PSRL 2, 657-9; also see above, p. 164-5

[1057]PSRL 2, 661-2.

to his younger brother Vsevolod, "and kissed the Cross to him, that 'I renounce my right to Vladimir from now on (*bole mi togo ne nadobe Volodimer'*).'"[1058] He did so because he was invited to Galich by a party which opposed the Galich prince of the time, Vladimir Iaroslavich. However, ultimately, the supporters of Vladimir prevailed, and they drove Roman out of Galich. He went to his patrimonial Vladimir-in-Volhynia, but his younger brother did not let him in. After trying, unsuccessfully, to return to Galich, Roman found himself a prince without a *volost*. At this point, he turned for help "to his father Riurik."

> Riurik gave him Torchesk, and he sent a threatening message (*nasla s grozoiu na*) to his brother Vsevolod. Out of fear for Riurik, Vsevolod surrendered Vladimir[-in-Volhynia] to his brother Roman. Then Roman went (*ekha*) to Vladimir, and Vsevolod to Belz.[1059]

Thus, Riurik grants a *volost* to Roman, and he clearly acts as lord of the two Volhynian princes.

In the meantime, Roman's erstwhile successful rival Vladimir Iaroslavich found himself battling a lot of other contenders for the princely throne of Galich. Therefore, in 1190, he decided that he needed powerful protectors who would help him to secure Galich. He found two such protectors. One of them was no less a person than Frederick Barbarossa, whom Vladimir promised to pay two thousand grivnas annually.[1060] The other one was Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, to whom Vladimir commended himself and his *volost*:

> He sent to ... Vsevolod to Suzdal, entreating him, 'Father and lord, secure Galich for me (*uderzhi podo mnoiu*), and I will be God's and yours with all [the land of] Galich, and I will always be in your will.' And Vsevolod of Suzdalia sent [his envoys] to all the princes, and to the king [of Hungary] ..., and he made them swear on the Cross

---

[1058]Ibid.

[1059]PSRL 2, 662. Belz was the second most important *gorod* in Volhynia after Vladimir-in-Volhynia; as such it was an appropriate *volost* for the second son of Daniel and Vsevolod's father Mstislav Iziaslavich, who had inherited Volhynia from Iziaslav Mstislavich and passed it to his sons.

[1060]PSRL 2, 666.

(*vodi ia ko krestu*) not to seek to deprive [Vladimir Iaroslavich] of Galich. Thereafter, nobody threatened Vladimir (*ottole ne byst' na n' nikogo zhe*).[1061]

The entry for 1195 represents Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo as saying, "You have pronounced me the senior prince of our Monomakhovichi clan (*narekli mia este vo svoem' plemeni vo Volodimere stareishego*)."[1062] The "pronouncing" apparently occurred at some point before 1195, but the chronicle does not tell when exactly this happened. We know, however, that Vsevolod had been the uncontested "father" of the northeastern Monomakhovichi based in Suzdalia and Riazan since at least 1180. Therefore, it comes down to the question of when the Monomakhovichi of the Dnieper region also agreed to recognize Vsevolod as the most senior prince and thus to place themselves in a position of subordination to him. It seems likely that this happened after Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo had increased his power and resources dramatically by becoming "father and lord" of Vladimir Iaroslavich and thus an overlord of wealthy and strategically important Galich land. Riurik Rostislavich and his "brethren" now found himself sandwiched between Vsevolod's Suzdalia on the east and Galicia, now controlled by Vsevolod, on the west. Probably, this is what Riurik meant when he said, as reported in the same entry for 1195, "It is impossible for us to be without Vsevolod (*bezo Vsevoloda nelzia byti*): we have put seniority on him."[1063] This sounds almost like, "We could not help putting seniority on him."

Vsevolod, on his part, apparently did not feel secure about his seniority over the strong and numerous Monomakhovichi of the Dnieper region. Therefore, he resorted to the same means as William of Aquitaine, whose authority, in the words of Martindale, "was frequently only imposed after one vassal had been played off against another."[1064] He apparently decided to strengthen his position by sowing discord between the two most powerful southern Monomakhovichi, Riurik Rostislavich and

---

[1061]PSRL 2, 667.

[1062]PSRL 2, 683.

[1063]PSRL 2, 685-6.

[1064]Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIIb, 535.

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

Roman Mstislavich. Therefore, he created a complicated situation described in the entry for 1195. In this year, Sviatoslav Vsevolodich died, who was the head of the Olgovichi and Riurik's co-ruler in Kiev. Thus, Riurik remained the sole prince of Kiev and as such he apparently redistributed the *volosts* controlled by the Kievan prince.

> In the same year, Vsevolod [Bolshoe Gnezdo], the Suzdalian prince, sent his envoys to ... Riurik, saying thus to him, 'You (plural) have pronounced me the senior prince of our Monomakhovichi clan. However, now you (singular) have sat on the Kievan throne, and you have not provided me with a share (*esi chasti ne uchinil*) in the Rus Land [in the narrow sense], but you have distributed [everything] among other, junior, princes who are your brethren (*no razdal esi inem' molozhshim' bra'i svoei*).

This statement was followed by a thinly veiled threat of war.

> Riurik started to discuss with his men (*muzhami*) how he could give to Vsevolod the *volost* which Vsevolod was requesting. For Vsevolod requested Torchesk, Trepol, Korsun, Boguslavl, Kanev, which Riurik had given to ... Roman, and had sworn an oath on the Cross to him not to take [these *volosts*] from Roman and not to give them to anyone else (*azh' emu pod nim ne otdati nikomu zhe*). Riurik, wishing to be true to his oath on the Cross (*khotia ispraviti krestnoe tselovanie*), did not want to take the *volost* from Roman, but offered to Vsevolod another *volost*. However, Vsevolod did not care (*ne brezhe*) for another *volost*, but wanted to take the *volost* from Roman, the one which he had requested. There was a great dispute (*raspria*) between them and many speeches, and they were ready to start a war with each other. Then Riurik turned to Metropolitan Nicephoros and told him all.

The metropolitan absolved Riurik from his oath to Roman. Riurik contacted Roman and explained the situation to him. Roman graciously replied that he did not want to be a reason for the break-off of "love" between Riurik and Vsevolod and agreed to cede the contested territory in exchange for another *volost* or monetary compensation.[1065]

> Riurik, having consulted with his brethren and with his men, ... gave the five *gorody* [list of their names] to Vsevolod, and they confirmed their mutual love by the [oath on] the Venerable Cross (*utverdishas' krestom chestnym na vsei liubvi svoei*). And Vsevolod gave Torchesk to his son-in-law [Riurik's son] Rostislav Riurikovich; he sent his governors (*posdniky*) to the other [four] *gorody*. After Roman heard that Vsevolod

---

[1065]PSRL 2, 683-4.

took from Riurik the *volost,* which had been taken from Roman, and that he gave it back (*dal opiat'*) to [Rostislav], Roman started to send [envoys] to his 'father' [Riurik] complaining about the *volost* and thinking that Riurik had taken the *volost* from him for the sake of his son by entering into a conspiracy (*smolvivsia*) with Vsevolod. He started to lay the blame on (*viniti*) [Riurik], reminding him about his oath on the Cross. Riurik said to him [after assuring Roman that he acted in good faith and did not conspire with Vsevolod to provide Torchesk for Rostislav], 'We cannot be without Vsevolod: we, all the brethren, have put on him seniority among the Monomakhovichi. You are [still] my son, here is another *volost* for you, equal to that one.' However, Roman did not care (*ne berezhet'*) for another *volost*, trying to catch [Riurik] in trickery (*lovia izveta*) and not wishing to have love with him. He consulted with his men and started to contact the Olgovichi, sending to Chernigov to Iaroslav Vsevolodich and urging him to attack his father-in-law [Riurik] in Kiev.[1066]

Riurik found out about Roman's communication with the Olgovichi, "sent his men to Roman, exposed (*oblichi*) him, and threw to him (*poverzhe emu*) the charters of the Cross," thus formally breaking their "father-son" relations. Roman turned for help to Leszek II of Poland and to his brother Konrad whom the *Kievan Chronicle* calls *Kazimirovichi*, that is, sons of Casimir II. In reality, Roman must have contacted their mother, Casimir's widow, who acted as regent, because Leszek and Konrad were small children in 1195. According to the chronicler, the "sons of Casimir" and Roman concluded an agreement of mutual assistance: Roman was to help them against their uncle Mieszko who "sought to deprive them of their *volost*"; after that the "sons of Casimir" would help Roman against Riurik.[1067] However, this did not happen because Mieszko crushed the joint forces of Roman and the young Polish dukes; Roman was wounded, and many of his men died in battle. Thus, Roman found himself in a state of open hostility with Riurik at a time when he was recovering from wounds and his army had been decimated.[1068] The only thing to do was to ask for mercy:

[Roman] sent his envoy to his father-in-law Riurik, bowing down and entreating him,

---

[1066]PSRL 2, 585-6.

[1067]PSRL 2, 686. *Volost* here is used in the sense of "supreme power over Poland," because Mieszko was trying to depose Leszek as Duke of Poland.

[1068]PSRL 2, 686-7.

and laying all the blame (*vina*) upon himself. He also sent to Metropolitan Nicephorus, asking him to bow down [to Riurik] on his behalf on account of his offense (*vina*) and to entreat Riurik that he might accept him and might forgive his anger at him.

Nicephorus agreed to undertake a peace-making mission, and he accomplished it most successfully:

> Having listened to the Metropolitan, Riurik forgave his anger at [Roman], not wishing to see a bloodshed. Having consulted with his men, he said to them, 'If he is now entreating me and is repenting his offense (*vina*), I will accept him, and will make him swear an oath on the Cross (*ko krestu vozhiu*), and will give him a grant (*nadelok*). If he is true to his word (*dazhe v tom ustoit'*), and if he starts to have me as a father rightfully (*vo pravdu*) and to wish me well, then I will have him as a son, just as I had had him before and had wished him well.' Having discussed this all with his men, Riurik sent to [Roman] his envoy. He said to Roman, 'I forgive my anger,' and he made him swear an oath on the Cross according to his [Riurik's] will (*na vsei vole svoei*), and he gave him Polonnyi and a half of the Korsun district (*pol tortaka*).[1069]

Riurik's speech to his men about his plans to repair relations with Roman is as close to the "feudal contract" as anything in the Western sources. "Father" and "son" swear oaths to each other, they have an obligation of mutual "well-wishing." The oaths must have also included more specific conditions. Thus, Riurik swore not to take back *volost*, which he had granted to Roman, and to give it to someone else (*otdavati pod nim*). Unfortunately, we do not know if Riurik had a right to take the *volost* back and keep it for himself.

We also see that a "father" could not distribute the *volosts* arbitrarily, but he had to follow certain rules. Otherwise, Roman's accusation of Riurik that he used "trickery" and "conspired" with Vsevolod in order to give Torchesk to Rostislav does not make sense. If Riurik wanted his son to have Torchesk, and if he had been free to distribute the *volosts* as he pleased, he would have simply given Torchesk to his son, and not to Roman, in the first place. There would have been no need for any "conspiracy." Therefore, Riurik was not free to grant any *volost* to whomever he wished. Roman must have had more rights to Torchesk than Rostislav, although we

---

[1069]PSRL 2, 687-8.

do not know how these rights were determined.

It is very likely that a "father" had to observe the relative seniority and hereditary rights of his "sons." Thus, we remember that Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo distributed *volosts* among the Riazan princes "according to their seniority," even though the younger princes were more faithful to him than the older ones. We cannot check this statement of Vsevolod's admirer whose account in the *Laurentian Chronicle* is the only existing source for Riazan affairs in the late twelfth century. In reality, Vsevolod might have violated the principle of seniority - the older Glebovichi appear to think so, at any rate. However, it is still remarkable that the *Laurentian* chronicler wants to stress that Vsevolod granted *volosts* not arbitrarily, but according to the norms of the time.

The existence of such norms is evident from the account about the conflict among the Olgovichi over the *volost* of Starodub. In 1161, Sviatoslav Vladimirovich of Vshchizh and Starodub kissed the cross to Sviatoslav Olgovich of Chernigov "to have him as a father and to walk in obedience to him."[1070] In 1166 or 1167, Sviatoslav Vladimirovich died without heirs. As the "father" of the late prince of Vshchizh and Starodub, Sviatoslav Olgovich had the supreme right to these *volosts*. This is what he did with the *volosts* of Vshchizh and Starodub:

> Oleg [Sviatoslavich of Novgorod - Seversky] requested from him [Sviatoslav Olgovich] a just (or: rightful) granting (*prosiashe v pravdu nadelenia*); however, Sviatoslav did not do so, but he gave the better *volost* [Starodub] to his own brother. ... Rostislav [Mstislavich of Kiev], having seen that Sviatoslav acted contrary to justice and that he had wronged Oleg (*usmotriv pravdu, ozhe Sviatoslav obidit' Olga*), repeatedly sent [envoys] to Sviatoslav, urging him to give a rightful grant to Oleg (*u pravdu nadeliti*).[1071]

The chronicler assumes that a prince who has supreme authority over certain territories cannot grant *volosts* arbitrarily, but has to act v *pravdu*, that is, "rightfully,"

[1070]PSRL 2, 509.
[1071]PSRL 2, 525.

according to "justice" or "law." Unfortunately for us, the author of this passage also assumes that Oleg's right to Starodub is self-evident. He does not explain what constituted the violation of *pravda* (right, law, justice) on the part of Sviatoslav, when he did not grant Starodub to Oleg. What we know is that Starodub once belonged to Oleg's father,[1072] and that in other cases princes sometimes supported their territorial claims by referring to the fact that their father had once held the territory in question.[1073] On the other hand, we see Oleg's name among the princes who are subordinate to Sviatoslav and who go on a campaign with him.[1074] We also know that Sviatoslav confiscated (*ot'ia*) some *volosts* from a prince who "had deserted (*be otstupil*)" him. It seems likely that Oleg was entitled to Starodub because of two factors - hereditary right and faithful service to Sviatoslav.

By the same token, Hugh in the *Conventum* constantly invokes his hereditary rights to various *castra* that should belong to him "by right."[1075] At the same time, he also refers to his faithful service to William as a reason to receive these *castra*. Hugh appears to believe that if a *castrum* belonged to his late kinsman *and* if Hugh fulfilled his obligations towards his lord, it was the lord's duty to grant the *castrum* to Hugh. We remember that William of Scotland also believed that Henry II should grant Northumberland to him because it was William's "inheritance"; but he also

---

[1072]Zaitsev, *Chernigovskoe kniazhestvo*, 66-9.

[1073]E.g. PSRL 2, 296, 384, 444.

[1074]PSRL 2, 521.

[1075]E.g. "hoc castrum rectitudo erat Hugoni sicut fuerat patris suo," *Conventum Hugonis*, 543; "[William] promisit ut benefaceret ei [Hugh] aut de sua rectitudine aut de alia quę ille placuisset." *Conventum Hugonis*, 547; "Ugo ... cogitavit habere [*castrum* of Gençay] rectum, quia fuerat patri suo," ibid. In the first example, *rectitudo* may be used instead of *rectitudine* (just like *Hugoni* is used instead of *Hugonis)*, and in this case it signifies "by right." On the other hand, it is possible that the *Conventum* uses *rectitudo* in the sense of "rightful" or "hereditary possessions." In this case, *hoc castrum rectitudo erat Hugoni* means "this castle was Hugh's rightful/hereditary possession," and William's promise *ut benefaceret ei de sua rectitudine* means that William would grant Hugh a land that was once held by Hugh's father or other relative.

was ready to do military service in exchange for this grant.

Overall, Western lords and Rusian "fathers" alike were expected to act "right-fully" and "justly" while awarding land grants, but the parties often disagreed about what constituted "justice" in a given case.   However, the idea of mutuality and reciprocity is clearly present in both Rusian and Western accounts of hierarchical relations between members of the elite. The account of the conflict between Riurik and Roman provides the most clear evidence for reciprocity between a "fathers" and "son," but the same idea is present implicitly in other chronicle narratives as well.

The account about the complicated relations between Riurik, Roman, and Vsevolod has another extremely interesting feature: it reveals a hierarchical organi-zation of the upper layer of the Monomakhovichi clan. As the chronicler presents it, Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo is at the very top, Riurik is subordinate to him, Roman is subordinate to Riurik. However, Vsevolod does not have direct power over Riurik. Evidently, Vsevolod canot simply order Roman to hand over the contended *volost*. In order to take land from Roman, Vsevolod has to act via Roman's "father" Riurik. Many chronicle accounts show a prince of Kiev distributing the *volosts* in the Mid-dle Dnieper region. Apparently a prince of Kiev has power to grant certain lands to other princes even if he, in turn, acknowledges someone else's "seniority" over himself. Being the "senior" of all the Monomakhovichi, Vsevolod acts as Riurik's overlord: he demands a share in the land over which Riurik has authority, and he threatens to use force against Riurik if he disobeys. However, Vsevolod evidently does not have a power over the lands in the Middle Dnieper region. He cannot simply take Torchesk from Roman and give it to Rostislav. Riurik, who granted Torchesk to Roman, is the only person who can take it back.

Similar examples in the accounts of Western aristocratic politics caused schol-ars to postulate the existence of the "feudal pyramid" based on the principle "a man of my man is not my man." Modern historians know that medieval reality

Chapter 6. Love, Friendship, Lordship, and Other Contractual Relations

was immensely more complicated than the proponents of the "feudal pyramid" used to believe. Western aristocracy was not organized according to the principle of the "pyramid" - or, indeed, according to any other clear and explicit principle(s). Instead of trying to fit medieval reality into clearly defined legal categories, modern medievalists describe aristocratic politics in terms of implicit "cultural models," "rules of play," or "behavioral patterns." This approach has resulted in a better understanding of interpersonal contractual agreements, which were immensely important for holding together the medieval social fabric. I hope to have shown that the "models" and "patterns" that guided contractual relations among the Rusian princes were similar to those that guided contractual relations among the Western aristocrats. Political "love" and "friendship" had essentially the same characteristics in Rus and in the West; the relations expressed in terms of "fathers" and "sons" were hardly different from those of lord and man.

Land property was often used to mediate contractual relations among Western aristocrats and among Rusian princes alike. According to White, in the medieval West, there was no "coherent system of real property law," but rather "different models of what a fief was and how ... it should pass from one person to another."[1076] I have tried to show that models of how a *volost* should pass from one prince to another were similar to the Western ideas about this complicated phenomenon which modern historians call a fief.

[1076]White, "The Discourse of Inheritance in Twelfth-century France," 177, 178.

Chapter 7

Conclusions

In this dissertation, we have compared high medieval political narratives produced in Rus and in several regions of Western Europe. Rus and the medieval West emerge as two radically different types of society as long as one looks at the representations of their social and political organizations which dominate scholarly literature. Out of all places in Western Europe, nothing looks more different from Rus than Norman England. England was a monarchy ruled by a crowned king; by high medieval standards, it had a strong central government, a developed bureaucracy and an advanced legal system. In contrast with that, Rus had no bureaucracy and no central government at all, weak or strong. It was ruled by multiple princes; while the more prominent among them had authority over lesser princes, there was no special title or regalia to express this authority. The only material symbol of princely authority was a sword which the Rusian authors always invoked in their discussions of rule by divine right: "A prince does not bear his sword in vain; he is the servant of God" (Romans 13:1).[1077] Of course, unlike a crown which marked only the supreme ruler of the realm, a sword was something that belonged to every prince, and indeed to every male member of the lay elite. Thus, a sword as a symbol of

---

[1077]PSRL 1, 370, 422, 436; PSRL 2, 592-3. Cf. PSRL 2, 825.

princely rule appears to be a nice illustration for the conventional view expressed in a widely-used college history textbook where the section on high medieval Eastern Europe is entitled "Fragmented Realms."[1078] The textbook, which is a survey of the history of Western Civilization, contrasts Rus and other Eastern European "fragmented realms" with the subjects of the three other sections in the same chapter: "England: Unity through Common Law," "France: Consolidation and Conquest," and "Germany: The Revived Monarchy of Frederick Barbarossa."[1079]

Two twelfth-century artifacts, an English and a Rusian one, offer an interesting commentary on this conventional contrast between the "united" and "consolidated" proper monarchies and the "fragmented realms," the most fragmented of which was Rus. One of these artifacts is the seal of Henry the Young King; the other is the Cathedral of St. Demetrius located near the palace of the Suzdalian princes in the city of Vladimir. The seal portrays the Young King wearing a crown and holding a diminished version of regalia. However, according to Matthew Strickland, he is depicted "without a sword, a key symbol of authority."[1080] Thus, the iconographic program of the seal conveys the idea that the "associate king," although crowned, has no real power. On the other hand, the iconographic program of the reliefs carved on the walls of the Cathedral of St. Demetrius conveys the idea that the Suzdalian prince, although not crowned, rules by divine right and has as much power as any crowned monarch.

The cathedral was commissioned by Vsevolod Bolshoe Gnezdo, whose baptismal name was Demetrius, and the central image on its northern wall has been traditionally interpreted as a portrayal of Vsevolod and his sons. There is also a carving of St. Boris and Gleb, with the image of St. Boris apparently resembling the features

---

[1078]Lynn Hunt et al., *The Making of the West: Peoples and Cultures*, volume A: *To 1500*, 3rd ed. (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2009), 346.

[1079]Hunt et al., *The Making of the West*, 336-46.

[1080]Strickland, "On the Instruction of a Prince," 194. See also Smith, "Henry II's Heir," 304-6.

of Vsevolod's older brother Andrei Bogoliubskii; it is, therefore, probable that the figure of the younger brother Gleb was meant to represent Vsevolod. All these figures, along with the image of St. Demetrius flashing his sword and the image of St. George, the heavenly patron of Vsevolod's father George the "Long Arm," are part of the compositions representing great monarchs. The biblical King David, clad in the vestments of the Byzantine emperor, dominates the reliefs, but they also include Solomon, Alexander the Great, and Constantine the Great. In the greater part of the carvings, these kings are depicted as being anointed, crowned, or taken to heaven. Scholars may have interpreted individual images differently, but all the works on St. Demetrius' Cathedral agree that the reliefs place the Suzdalian princes in the context of rule by divine right which is the dominant theme of all the wall carvings.[1081]

Thus, instead of a contrast between a crown, a symbol of monarchical rule, and a sword symbolizing the collective rule of multiple princes, we see a range of symbolic representations of rulership and authority, which were used in both Rus and England. The only "real" king in Rusian history was Daniel Romanovich of Galich who was crowned and anointed by Pope Innocent IV in 1253. This coronation has been traditionally viewed as an episode in Daniel's frustrated attempts to obtain Western help against the Mongols; a recently proposed interpretation connects the coronation with the talks between Pope Innocent IV and Manuel II, Patriarch of Nicaea, about the unification of the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox churches.[1082] As we know, neither the unification of the churches, nor an international anti-Mongol alliance succeeded. Daniel, crowned and anointed as he was, eventually had to submit himself to Khan Batu. Thus, his coronation did not have much historical significance. Apart from this episode, the rituals of coronation and anointing were absent from Rusian

---

[1081]See M. S. Gladkaia, *Rel'efy Dmitrievskogo sobora vo Vladimire: Opyt kompleksnogo issledovaniia* (Moscow: Indrik, 2009); A. I. Komech, ed., *Dmitrievskii sobor vo Vladimire: K 800-letiiu sozdaniia* (Moscow: Izdate'lstvo RAN, 1997).

[1082]A. V. Maiorov, "Koronatsiia Daniila Galitskogo: Nikeia i Rim vo vneshnei politike Galitsko-Volynskikh kniazei," *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana* 9 (2011): 143-56.

political practice. However, the idea of a crowned and anointed king ruling by divine right was present in Rusian political discourse. This idea is manifest not only in the reliefs of St. Demetrius' Cathedral, but also in the rhetoric of the *Laurentian* chronicler who, as we remember, quoted all the Scriptural passages related to anointing, of which he could think, when he described the enthronement of a Suzdalian prince. We see the same ideas in the eulogies for Riurik Rostislavich of Kiev and for Roman Mstislavich of Galich, which go back to Metropolitan Hylarion's *Sermon on Law and Grace* based on the Byzantine imperial ideology.

In this respect, the Rusian authors are close to the historiographers of the local dynasties ruling the territorial units within the French kingdom. The rulers of Normandy, Aquitaine, or Anjou were never crowned, and, as recent studies have shown, they did not even have any formal titles, with "count," "duke," and other designators being used interchangeably to signify a person who governs a relatively large and well-defined area. Nonetheless, the representations of these local rulers in their charters and in the regional histories and chronicles are permeated with monarchical rhetoric. William V of Aquitaine was, as we remember, "the monarch of all the Aquitanians" whom everybody perceived as "more a king than a duke." According to Dudo, no king, except Henry I of Germany (Henry the Fowler), was as magnificent as William I of Normandy.[1083] To demonstrate William's magnificence, power, and authority, Dudo relates a story about William's followers harrowing the dwellings where Henry the Fowler and his men stayed when they arrived for a meeting with Louis IV of France. The meeting was arranged through the mediation of William, whom Dudo presents as the patron of a weak and helpless Louis. Therefore, William was present at the meeting, and he overheard a disparaging remark about himself made by some members of Henry's retinue. On the next day, William's men burst into the house where Henry stayed, smashed the walls and occupied the house

---

[1083]Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 196.

"by their power and might."[1084] The "innumerable army"[1085] of the German king allegedly could not do anything to protect him from the Normans. A frightened Henry fled to another house and sent his duke Cono to William. William told Cono to give the Normans an order on William's behalf (*ut meo iussu*) to disperse. However, they did not listen, and proceeded to smash other houses. Cono returned to William and besought him again to stop the destruction. William then gave Cono his sword to present to the raging Normans. As soon as Cono repeated the order to stop the destruction while displaying William's sword, the Normans obeyed immediately, and, having bowed down to the sword, they all rushed to leave the dwellings of the German king, crushing each other as they were coming out.[1086] In this story, a sword performs the same function as in the Rusian chronicles and the same as Strickland noted in connection with Henry the Young King's seal: it is a key symbol of authority.

Dudo, of course, tries to make the point that William I of Normandy is more powerful than the two crowned and anointed monarchs whose meeting William arranges and one of whom he punishes for a disrespectful remark. William's sword, a symbol of his "power and might," is more important than the authority of the German and French kings. If Dudo implicitly contrasts William's "real" power, represented by his sword, with the allegedly nominal power of the crowned monarchs, in *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle* a sword symbolizes the authority of the rightful king along with the crown; to some extent, it even overshadows the crown. Fantosme calls Henry II *curuné*, "the crowned one," but Henry II's arguments for the justice

---

[1084]"Willilmidae veri, praecedentes ostia domus, qua rex Heinricus residebat, coeperunt frangere parietes, disrumpere et divellere atque intus vi et potestate residere," Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 197.

[1085]"Erat vero cum innumerablilium frequentia exercituum rex Heinricus," Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 196.

[1086]"... continuo non modo adquiescunt, verum summisso vultu proclivi contra ensem, domos dimiserunt, seseque nimium in exitu opprimentes," Lair, *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum*, 197.

of his cause as represented in the *Chronicle* are based mostly on his assertions that he has "real" physical power to defend his right to the English throne: "I have not grown so old ... that I should lose my land because of my great age"[1087]; "My son wants to take by force revenues from my lands ... such revenues were not [ever] taken from a man of my strength."[1088] This strength is represented by the king's sword and lance: "As long as he can strike with a sword or with a lance," Henry II would rather die than see his son coming to power.[1089] Such a representation of the "real" ruler juxtaposed with the swordless image of the associate king underscores the function of a sword as "a key symbol of authority"; all the more so since Henry II is known to have controlled the making of his son's seal, according to Smith.[1090]

These examples of symbolic representations of power and authority illustrate the main thesis of this dissertation: French, English, and Rusian texts and artifacts operate with the same symbols, but each individual work uses them differently depending on the message that the author wants to convey. They combine the symbols in various ways, on some occasions stressing the importance of the sword at the expense of a crown or vice versa, on other occasions using them in a complementary way. A comparison of the uses of these symbols in the Rusian and Western sources may serve as a metaphor for a comparison of Rusian and Western societies: the social and political structures of the regions discussed in this dissertation were not radically different; rather, they consisted of the same building blocks arranged in dif-

---

[1087] *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 12.

[1088] [Henry the Younger] "renter tut a force volt aver de mes fiez;/ Raisun ne me semblë qu'ele le seit paiez:/ De hume de ma vertu ne fud si estroez," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 18.

[1089] "Mielz volsist mort que vie qu'il [Henry the Younger] eust la puissance,/ Tant cum il pout d'espee ferir u de lance," *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle*, 8. A reference to a sword in the context of military might defending the right cause is much more common than a reference to a lance, see Jean Flori and Georges Duby, *L'idéologie du glaive* (Geneva: Droz, 1983), 90-96. It is likely that Fantosme included *lance* in this passage mostly in order to make a rhyme with *puissance*.

[1090] Smith, "Henry II's Heir," 306.

ferent ways. To approach pre-Mongolian Rus as a regional variation of a European society appears to me more productive than to search for its alleged "special path."

I have tried to show that, at least as far as Rus is concerned, the difference between the Eastern European "fragmented realms" and Western European efficient monarchies partly originates from different translations of the terms that have the same, or close, meanings in the original. The French dukes and counts surrounded by their vassals may look very different from the Rusian princes surrounded by their retainers until one realizes that "vassals" and "retainers" are used to render Old French, Latin, and East Slavonic words which all mean "men," "friends," or "companions." It is true that recent works do not use "vassal" anymore to translate words such as *homo*, *ami*, *suus*, or *cumpaignun*. However, the difference still remains between "so and so's retainers" in the Anglophone works on Rus and "so and so's men/friends/companions" in the studies of the medieval West, a difference for which there are no grounds in the sources. By the same token, there is no reason to present Western lords as "receiving rents," "payments," or "revenues" as opposed to the Rusian princes "extorting tribute" from the population. The difference in the translations of the terms signifying the payments that the population owed to their lords stems from the meaning of the word *dan* in contemporary Russian and has nothing to do with pre-Mongolian Rus. The political narratives that we have analyzed suggest that both a Rusian prince and a Western lord combined the elements of a public ruler and a private landlord in their relations to the population of the lands which they "held." This last word is a direct translation of the Old French and East Slavonic terms, *tenir* and *derzahti* correspondingly, most often used in the sources to describe both lordship and rulership, which the medieval authors often did not differentiate. In Rus, as well as in the West, the relations between the "holder" of a certain territory and the population of this territory included aspects which, to borrow Barthelémy's words, "would look like feudal extortion to us."[1091] At the

---

[1091]Barthélemy, "Autour d'un récit de pactes,"483.

same time, these relations also had a contractual aspect, because the "holder" - who should rather be called a "ruler" in this context - was expected to provide justice, internal order and protection from external enemies in exchange for the payments that he received. Correspondingly, these payments combine elements of the tribute extorted by force, rent paid to the private landowner, and taxes paid to the ruler; a straightforward direct translation into a modern language of the medieval terms for these payments is hardly possible.

The discussion of the Rusian and Western representations of those who "held" land units and received these payments is at the heart of my comparative analysis. I have viewed Rusian princes not as members of an anomalously fragmented ruling dynasty, as a hundred or so petty kings, but as members of the upper social strata analogous to the Western higher nobility. Of course, there was a king above the Western magnates, while Rus knew no single royal figure. This is the most fundamental difference between the political organizations of Rus and the Western kingdoms. However, this difference, although significant, may be not as great as it appears if we consider two factors. Firstly, some Western sources represent kings essentially as members of the aristocratic networks connected with each other and with the most prominent magnates of their realms by bonds of political friendship, "love," and mutual obligations of service and protection; in regional histories kings are often background figures with the local uncrowned rulers dominating the stage. Secondly, Rusian authors often present powerful princes as supreme rulers having authority over the other princes; such powerful princes play essentially the same function in Rusian political narratives as the kings play in some Western sources.

D. A. Carpenter has described "'feudal England,' an England, that is, composed of fiefs and honours existing alongside, and even potentially in conflict with, the structures of the king" as late as in the thirteenth century.[1092] The "structures of

---

[1092]D. A. Carpenter, "The Second Century of English Feudalism," *Past and Present* (2000) 168: 30-71, at 62-3.

the king" do not have direct parallels in Rus, but I have argued that what Carpenter calls "feudal England" can be productively compared with some aspects of the Rusian social organization. I sought to show that the Rusian *volosts* were similar both to the Languedocien and Aquitanian *castra* and to the "fiefs and honours" to which Carpenter refers in his discussion of English feudalism. While I have avoided using the term "feudalism" because of all the baggage that it carries, I do hope that a comparative analysis of the relations among the Western aristocracy traditionally labeled "feudo-vassalic" and of the contractual relations among Rusian princes structured around the grants of *volosts* in return for military service may contribute to a better understanding of the former. For example, one controversial question in the debate on "feudalism" is the nature of the relations between the king and the great men of his kingdom, such as counts and dukes. Before the 1990s, historians tended to portray the magnates controlling territorial units within a kingdom as the king's vassals; Reynolds has argued that they owed service and obedience to the king more as subjects and office-holders to the supreme ruler than as vassals to their lord.[1093]

According to Reynolds, "the noble fief and the feudal pyramid" were products of the rise of the bureaucratic state and of the renaissance of Roman law starting in the twelfth century.[1094] The sources examined in this dissertation suggest that the elements of the "noble fief and feudal pyramid" existed in twelfth-century Rus in no less degree than in its contemporary England and in eleventh-century Aquitaine. In all three places, they were just that – elements, co-existing and interacting with other elements of the social and political structures. In this respect, the results of my comparative analysis are in line with the denial of the existence of "feudalism" as a comprehensive socio-political system. However, the absence of a bureaucratic state and of any knowledge of Roman law in Rus along with the presence of relations looking remarkably "feudo-vassalic" suggests that such relations in the West may

---

[1093]See p. 7.
[1094]Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals*, 73-4, 479.

have more "native" roots than Reynolds' theory allows. It is possible that they were not so much created, as formalized and conceptualized by the academic lawyers.

A comparable systematic theoretical conceptualization of contractual interpersonal bonds among the princes never occurred in Rus. In a sense, this absence of theorizing, along with the use of the vernacular, provides a scholar with the advantage of a somewhat more direct glimpse into social interactions as they were perceived by their participants. A comparison of the Rusian and Western texts has shown that the closer the latter are to the spoken language and oral culture, the more they have in common with the Rusian sources. The parallels between the Rusian and Western vernacular and semi-vernacular political narratives suggest a similarity between the Rusian and Western oral political discourses reflected in these narratives. Many key notions related to Western aristocratic and Rusian princely politics, difficult to render into any modern language, have the same, or almost the same ranges of meanings, in East Slavonic, Old French, Anglo-Norman, and the Latin of the *Conventum Hugonis*. For example, the words for "love," "wrong/offense/dishonor," or for "guilt/blame/pretext" in the context of breaking an agreement are directly translatable from one language to another, as long as the languages are those used in the eleventh- and twelfth-century Rusian, English, and Aquitanian political narratives. However, to convey the meaning of each of those words in a modern language, one needs to go into a long and complicated discussion.

The *Conventum Hugonis* and the accounts of interprincely relations in the *Kievan Chronicle* appear to present an especially fine example of this mutual translatability. Hyams and Martindale describe translating the *Conventum* into English as an extremely difficult task.[1095] To my knowledge, the Translation Series published by the Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature tried, but failed, to produce a translation of the *Kievan Chronicle*. At the same time, these two texts, so dif-

---

[1095]Martindale, *Status, Authority, and Regional Power*, VIII, 27-29; Hyams, *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan*.

ficult to render in a modern language, have a similar manner of expression; many terms and expressions of the *Conventum* have direct parallels in the language of the *Kievan Chronicle*. To think of any Aquitanian influence in Rus is, of course, inconceivable. The parallels between the *Conventum* and the *Kievan Chronicle* may be best explained by similarities between the worldviews of the Aquitanian and the Kievan authors, which, in turn, stem from similarities between the political cultures reflected in the two texts.

Most Western political narratives do not have as pronounced parallels with Rusian chronicles as are found in the *Conventum*; however, an analysis of Althoff's "rules of play" which guided medieval politics in the absence of explicit normative documents shows the common nature of these rules as they emerge from the Rusian and Western sources. We have seen that Rusian and Western authors share their understanding of such key aspects of medieval aristocratic politics as the concepts of honor and shame and the political uses of emotions. It appears that the real difference between Rus and the West is not so much social or political but rather cultural, as long as the "high" learned culture is considered. The classical culture of antiquity was known in Rus much less than either in Western Europe or in Eastern European polities other than Rus. This is a well-known fact, not disputed by anyone with the possible exception of the most extreme Russian and Ukrainian nationalists. I have argued that two implications of this fact are important for a comparative analysis of Rus and the West. First, some perceived differences between the Rusian and Western social and political structures seem to originate from the differences in the background of the authors of political narratives describing those structures. The learned Latin authors, to a greater or lesser degree, reflected their contemporary reality through the prism of classical historiography, stressing the features that would have made sense in the political framework of Livy and Suetonius and de-emphasizing other aspects of social organization – such as those reflected in the *Conventum Hugonis*. Secondly, to the extent that Western societies were indeed dif-

ferent from Rus, the differences were a product of a greater influence of the Roman legacy in the West. If all medieval Europe, Western and Eastern alike, was the result of an interplay between the native traditions and the legacy of the classical Mediterranean world, the former were more conspicuous in Rus. In a sense, Rus may give us an idea of how an indigenous society in Europe north of the Alps would have looked, a society little influenced by any Mediterranean heritage other than Christianity.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Editions of the Hypatian Chronicle:

Shakhmatov, A. A., ed. *Letopis' po Ipat'evskomu spisku*. Vol. 2 of Polnoe so-branie russkikh letopisei (PSRL). St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia Arkheografich-eskaia Komissia, 1908.

Kloss, B. M., ed. Ipatevskaia. *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei* 2. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 1998. Also available as electronic text:
http://www.lrc-lib.ru/rus_letopisi/Ipatius/contents.htm

Editions of the Laurentian Chronicle:

Karskii, E. F., ed. *Letopis' po Lavrent'evskomu spisku*. Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei 1. 2nd edition. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1927.

Kloss, B. M., ed. *Lavrentievskaia*. Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei 1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 1997. Also available as electronic text:
http://www.lrc-lib.ru/rus_letopisi/Laurence/contents.htm

Other chronicles:

Cross, Samuel Hazzard, and Olgerd P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, eds. *The Russian Primary Chronicle: Laurentian Text*. Cambridge, MA: The Medieval Academy of America, 1953.

Dietze, Joachim, ed. *Die erste Novgoroder Chronik: nach ihrer ältesten Redaktion*

Bibliography

(Synodalhandschrift); 1016-1333/1352. Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1971.

Kloss, B. M., ed. *Letopis po Voskresenskomu spisku*. Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopi-sei 7. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2001.

_____, ed. *Ermolinskaia letopis'*. Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei 23. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2004.

Kotliar, M. F., V. Iu. Franchuk, and A. G. Plakhonin, eds. *Galitsko-volynskaia letopis: Tekst, kommentarii, issledovanie*. St. Petersburg: Aleteia, 2005.

Kukushkina, M. V. and G. M. Prokhorov, eds. *Radzivillovskaia letopis'. Tekst, issle-dovaniia, opisanie miniatiur*. Moscow: Glagol, 1994-95.

Nasonov, A. N., ed. *Novgorodskaia pervaia letopis starshego i mladshego izvodov*. Moskow-Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1950.

Ostrowski, Donald, ed. and coll., with David Birnbaum and Horace G. Lunt. *The* Povest' vremennykh let*: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Text Series 10. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Pritsak, Omeljan, ed. *The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volhynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Cetvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices*. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Text Series 8. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990.

Tikhomirov, M. N., ed. *Moskovskii letopisnyi svod kontsa XV veka*. Polnoe so-branie russkikh letopisei 25. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1949. Reprinted Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kultur, 2004.

Library of Old Rus Literature Series:

Likhachev, D. S., L. A. Dmitriev, A. A. Alekseev and N. V. Ponyrko, eds. *XII vek*. Biblioteka literatury drevnei Rusi 4. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1997. Also available as electronic text:
http://www.pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4877

_____.*XIII vek*. Biblioteka literatury drevnei Rusi 5. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1997. Also available as electronic text:

Bibliography

http://pushkinskijdom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4961#_ednref318

Sources in translation published by Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature:

Franklin, Simon, ed. *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'.* Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Translation Series 5. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Heppell, Muriel, ed. *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery.* Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Translation Series 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Hollingsworth, Paul, ed. *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'.* Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Translation Series 2. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Veder, William, and Anatolij Turilov, eds. *The Edificatory Prose of Kievan Rus'.* Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, Translation Series 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

Editions and translations of the Conventum Hugonis*:*

Hyams, Paul, et al. *Agreement between Count William V of Aquitaine and Hugh IV of Lusignan.* Available as electronic text:
http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/agreement.asp

Martindale, Jane. "Conventum inter Guillelmum Aquitanorum comitem et Hugonem Chiliarchum." *English Historical Review* 84 (1969): 528-48.

_____. *Status, Authority and Regional Power: Aquitaine and France, 9th to 12th Centuries.* Variorum Collected Studies Series. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1997.

Editions and translation of Dudo of St Quentin:

Dudo of St Quentin. *History of the Normans.* Edited and translated by Eric Christiansen. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 1998.

Lair, Jules, ed. *De moribus et actis primorum Normanniae ducum auctore Dudone Sancti Quintini decano.* Caen: Le Blanc-Hardel, 1865.

Lifshitz, Felice, ed. *Viking Normandy: Dudo of St. Quentin's Gesta Normannorum.*

Bibliography

Available as electronic text:
http://www.the-orb.net/orb_done/dudo/dudindex.html

Editions and translation of Chrétien de Troyes:

Chrétien de Troyes.*Yvain ou Le Chevalier au Lion*, edited by Pierre Kunstmann. Available as electronic text:
http://atilf.atilf.fr/gsouvay/dect/download/Yvain.xml

Chrétien de Troyes. *Lancelot ou Le Chevalier de la Charrette*, edited by Pierre Kunstmann. Available as electronic text:
http://atilf.atilf.fr/gsouvay/dect/download/Lancelot.xml

Chrétien de Troyes. *Arthurian Romances*, edited and translated by William W. Kibler New York: Penguin Books, 1991.

Other sources:

Adémar de Chabannes. *Chronique.* Edited and translated by Yves Chauvin and Georges Pon. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003.

Barankova, G. S., ed. *Chista molitva tvoia: pouchenie i poslaniia drevnerusskim kniaziam Kievskogo mitropolita Nikifora.* Moscow: Ikhtios, 2005.

Behrends, F., ed. *The Letters and Poems of Fulbert of Chartres.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1976.

Bell, Alexander, ed. *An Anglo-Norman 'Brut' (Royal 13.A.xxi).* Anglo-Norman Texts Series 21-22. Oxford: Blackwell, 1969.

Bourgain, P. R. Landes, and G. Pon, eds. *Ademari Cabannensis Chronicon.* Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 79. Turnhout: Brepols, 1999.

Brault, Gerard J., ed. *The Song of Roland: An Analytical Edition.* University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978.

Chibnall, Marjorie, ed. *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

Damian-Grint, Peter. *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: In-*

venting Vernacular Authority. New York: Boydell Press, 1999.

Hamilton, Hans Claude, ed. *Historia Rerum Anglicarum Willelmi Parvi, Ordinis Sancti Augustini Canonici Regularis in Coenobio Beatae Mariae de Newburgh in Agro Eboracensi.* English Historical Society Publications Series 15. London: Sumptibus societatis, 1856.

Holden, A. J., ed. *Le Roman de Rou de Wace.* Paris: Éditions A. and J. Picard, 1973.

Howlett, Richard, ed. *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II., and Richard I,* vol. IV:*The Chronicle of Robert of Torigni, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Michael-in-Peril-of-the-Sea.* Rolls Series. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1889.

Ianin, V. L., ed. *Zakonodatel'stvo Drevnei Rusi.* Rossiiskoe zakonodatel'stvo X-XX vekov 1. Moscow: Iuridicheskaia literatura, 1984.

Jonston, R. C., ed. *Jordan Fantosme's Chronicle.* New York : Oxford University Press, 1981.

Kaiser, Daniel H., ed. *The Laws of Rus' - Tenth to Fifteenth Centuries.* Salt Lake City: Charles Schlacks Jr., 1992.

Moldovan, A. M., ed. *"Slovo o zakone i blagodati" Ilariona.* Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1984.

Myers, Henry A., ed. *The Book of Emperors: A Translation of the Middle High German Kaiserchronik.* Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University Press, 2013.

Nazarenko, A. V., ed. *Nemetskie latinoiazychnye istochniki IX-XI vekov: Teksty, perevod, kommentarii.* Moscow: Nauka, 1993.

Pichkhadze, A. A., et al., eds. *"Istoriia iudeiskoi voiny" Iosifa Flaviia: Drevnerusskii perevod.* Pamiatniki slaviano-russkoi pismennosti: Novaia seriia 1. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kultury, 2004.

Rashid ad-Din. *Sbornik letopisei.*Translated by L. A. Khetagurov. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1952. Also available as electronic text:
http://www.vostlit.info/haupt-Dateien/index-Dateien/R.phtml?id=2057

Silvas, Anna, ed. *Jutta and Hildegard: The Biographical Sources.* Turnhout: Bre-

pols, 1998.

Tikhomirov, M. N. *Posobie dlia izuchenia Russkoi Pravdy.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta, 1953.

Trillmich, Werner, and Kurt Pätzold, eds. *Thietmari Merseburgensis episcopi Chronicon.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1992.

Van Houts, Elizabeth. *The Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Warner, David, ed. *Ottonian Germany: The Chronicon of Thietmar of Merseburg.* New York: Manchester University Press, 2001.

Weiss, Judith, ed. *Wace's Roman de Brut: A History of the British.* Exeter, UK: University of Exeter Press, 1999.

William of Malmesbury. *Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings.* Edited and translated by R. A. B. Mynors, R. M. Thomson, and M. Winterbottom. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Secondary Sources

Alekseev, A. A. "Koe-chto o perevodakh v Drevnei Pusi (po povodu stat'i Fr. Dzh. Tomsona 'Made in Russia')." *Trudy Otdela drevnerusski literatury* 49 (1999): 278-95.

_____."Po povodu stat'i G. G. Lanta Eshcho raz o mnimykh perevodakh v Drevnei Rusi," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusski literatury* 51 (1991): 442-5.

Alekseev, L. V. *Smolenskaia zemlia v IX-XIII vv. Ocherki istorii Smolenshchiny i Vostochnoi Belorussii*. Moscow: Nauka, 1980.

Althoff, Gerd. *Family, Friends, and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*. Translated by Christopher Carroll. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

_____. *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter. Kommunikation in Frieden und Fe-*

Bibliography

hde Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 1997.

Anglo-Norman Dictionary. Available as electronic text:
http://www.anglo-norman.net/gate/

Anisimov, Evgenii. *Istoriia Rossii on Riurika do Putina: Liudi, Sobytiia, Daty*. Moscow: Piter, 2007.

Ashe, Laura. *Fiction and History in England, 1066-1200*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 68. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Avanesov, R. I., et al. *Slovar' drevnerusskogo iazyka (XI-XIV vv.)*. Moscow: Russkii iazyk, 1990.

Bachrach, B. S. "'Potius Rex quam Esse Dux putabatur': Some Observations Concerning Adémar of Chabannes' Panegyric on Duke William the Great." *The Haskins Society Journal* 1 (1989): 11-21.

Bagge, Sverre, Michael H. Gelting, and Thomas Lindkvist, eds., *Feudalism: New Landscapes of Debate*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011.

Barthélemy, Dominique. *The Serf, the Knight, and the Historian*. Trans. by Graham Robert Edwards. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2009.

_____. "Autour d'un récit de pactes ("Conventum Hugonis"): La Seigneurie châtelaine et le féodalisme, en France au XIe siècle," Settimane di studio/Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 47 (2000): 447-96.

_____. "Une crise de l'écrit? Observations sur des actes de Saint-Aubin d'Angers (XIe siècle)." *Bibliothèque de l'École des chartes* 155 (1997): 95-117.

_____. "Note sur le titre seigneurial, en France, au XIe siècle," *Archivum Latinitatis Medii Aevi* (54) 1996: 131-158.

Bately, Janet. "The Compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle 60 B.C. to A.D. 890: Vocabulary as Evidence." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 64 (1980): 93-129.

Bennett, Brian. "Sign Languages: Divination and Providentialism in the *Primary Chronicle* of Kievan Rus." *Slavonic and East European Review* 83 (2005): 373-95.

Bennett, Judith M. *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, 11th edition. New York:

Bibliography

McGraw-Hill, 2011.

Bennett, Philip E. "La Chronique de Jordan Fantosme: épique et public lettré au XIIe siècle." *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 40 (1997): 37-56.

Berezhkov, N. G. *Chronologiia russkogo letopisaniia*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1963.

Bibikov, M. V. "Rus v vizantiiskoi diplomatii: dogovory Rusi s grekami X v." *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy medievistiki* 19 (2005): 5-15.

Bisson, Thomas. *The Crisis in the Twelfth Century: Power, Lordship, and the Origins of European Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.

―――――. "The 'Feudal Revolution'." *Past and Present* 142 (1994): 6-42.

Bloch, Marc. *Feudal Society*. Translated by L. A. Manyon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bogatova, G. A., et al. *Slovar' Russkogo iazyka XI-XVII vv*. Moscow: Nauka, 1995.

Brandt, William J. *The Shape of Medieval History: Studies in Modes of Perception*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966.

Bredehoft, Thomas A. *Textual Histories: Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.

Brown, Elizabeth A. R. Review of *Feudalism: New Landscapes of Debate*, edited by Sverre Bagge, Michael H. Gelting, and Thomas Lindkvist. *The Medieval Review* 6 (2012). Available as electronic text: https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/14548/ 12.06.10.html?sequence=1

―――――. "The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe." *American Historical Review* 79 (1974): 1063-88.

Brown, Warren C., and Piotr Gorecki, eds. *Conflict in Medieval Europe: Changing Perspectives on Society and Culture*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003.

Bulanin, D. M. *Antichnye traditsii v drevnerusskoi literature XI-XVI vv*. Slavistische

Bibliography

Beiträge 278. Munich: Otto Sagner, 1991.

Burland, Margaret Jewett. *Strange Words: Retelling and Reception in the Medieval Roland Textual Tradition.* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007.

Butler, Francis. "Ol'ga's Conversion and the Construction of Chronicle Narrative." *Russian Review* 67 (2008): 230-42.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. "Jesus as Mother and Abbot as Mother: Some Themes in Twelfth-Century Cistercian Writing." In Caroline Walker Bynum, ed. *Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages*. Berkeley, LA: University of California Press, 1982, 110-69.

Chernaia, L. A. "'Chest': Predstavleniia o chesti i beschest'ii v russkoi literature XI-XVIII vv." In *Drevnerusskaia literatura: Izobrazhenie obshchest'va*, edited by A. S. Demin, 56-84. Moscow, Nauka, 1991.

Cheyette, Fredric L. Review of *La féodalité languedocienne aux XI-XII siècles: serments, sommages et fiefs dans le Languedoc des Trencavel* by Hélène Débax. *The Medieval Review* 12(2004). Available as electronic text: https://scholarworks.iu.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/2022/5661/04.12.14.html?sequence=1

_____. "Georges Duby's Mâconnais after Fifty Years: Reading It Then and Now." *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002): 291-317.

_____. Review of *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* by Susan Reynolds. *Speculum* 71 (1996): 998-1006.

_____. "Suum cuique tribuere." *French Historical Studies* 6 (1976): 287-99.

Cheyette, Fredric, and Howell Chickering, "Love, Anger, and Peace: Social Practice and Poetic Play in the Ending of *Yvain*." *Speculum* 80 (2005): 75-117.

Clanchy, M. T. *England and Its Rulers: 1066-1307*, 3rd edition. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.

Cursente, Benoît. "Entre parenté et fidélité: les 'amis' dans la Gascogne des XIe et XIIe siècles." In *Les sociétés méridionales à l'âge féodal: Espagne, Italie et sud de la France, Xe-XIIIe s.: hommage à Pierre Bonnasie*, edited by Hélène Débax, 285-92.

Bibliography

Toulouse: Editions Méridiennes, 1999.

Curta, Florin. "Merovingian and Carolingian Gift Giving." *Speculum* 81 (2006): 671-99.

Débax, Hélène. *La féodalité languedocienne aux XIe-XIIe siècles: serments, sommages et fiefs dans le Languedoc des Trencavel*. Toulouse: Presses universitaires du Mirail, 2003.

Dendorfer, Jürgen, and Roman Deutinger, eds. *Das Lehnswesen im Hochmittelalter. Forschungskonstrukte - Quellenbefunde - Deutungsrelevanz*. Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2010.

Dietler, Michael, and Brian Hayden, eds. *Feasts: Archeological and Ethnographic Perspectives on Food, Politics, and Power*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, 2001.

Dimnik, Martin. *The Dynasty of Chernigov, 1146-1246*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

_____. "The Title "Grand Prince" in Kievan Rus'." *Mediaeval Studies* 66 (2004): 253-312.

Dubrovskii, I. V. et al. *Konstruirivanie sotsialnogo. Evropa. V-XVI vv.* Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2001.

Elias, Norbert. *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*. Boston: Blackwell, 2000.

Feasts and Gifts of Food in Medieval Europe: Ritualised Constructions of Hierarchy, Identity and Community. Special issue of the *Journal of Medieval History* 37 (2011): 1-124.

Fedotov, George. *The Russian Religious Mind*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. *Kievan Christianity: The Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Flori, Jean, and Georges Duby. *L'idéologie du glaive*. Geneva: Droz, 1983.

Franklin, Simon. "On Meanings, Function and Paradigms of Law in Early Rus'."

Russian History/Histoire Russe 34 (2007): 63-81.

_____. *Writing, Society, and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950-1300*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

_____. "Po povodu 'Intellektualnogo molchaniia' Drevnei Rusi (o sbornike trudov F. J. Tomsona)." *Russia Mediaevalis* 10 (2001): 262-70.

_____. "Literacy and Documentation in Early Medieval Russia," *Speculum* 60 (1985): 1-38.

Franklin, Simon, and Jonathan Shepard. *The Emergence of Rus', 750-1200*. New York: Longman, 1996.

Froianov, I. Ia. *Kievskaia Rus'*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta, 1980.

Froianov, I. Ia., and A. Iu. Dvornichenko. *Goroda-gosudarstva Drevnei Rusi*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta, 1988.

Galkova, I. G. et al., eds. *Feodalizm: poniatie i realii*. Moscow: Institut vseobshchei istorii RAN, 2008.

García de la Puente, Inés. "The Indo-European Heritage in the *Povest' Vremennykh Let*." In *Papers of the First Biennial Conference of the Association for the Study of Eastern Christian History and Culture*, edited by Russell E. Martin and Jennifer B. Spock, 49-62. Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University Press, 2009.

_____. "The Revenge of the Princess: Some Considerations about Heroines in the PVL and in Other Indo-European Literatures." In *Medieval Slavonic Studies: New Perspectives for Research*, edited by Juan Antonio Alvarez-Pedroza and Susana Torres Prieto, 193-204. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 2009.

Garnier, Claudia. *Amicus amicis, inimicus inimicis: Politische Freundschaft und fürstliche Netzwerke im 13. Jahrhundert*. Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 46. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 2000.

Given-Wilson, Chris. *Chronicles: The Writing of History in Medieval England*. New York and London: Hambledon, 2004.

Gladkaia, M. S. *Rel'efy Dmitrievskogo sobora vo Vladimire: Opyt kompleksnogo issle-*

dovaniia. Moscow: Indrik, 2009.

Gorskii, A. A. *Russkoe Srednevekov'e*. Moscow: Astrel, 2009.

_____. "Ob evoliutsii titulatury verkhovnogo pravitelia Drevnei Rusi (domon-gloskii period)." In *Rimsko-Konstantinopolskoe nasledie na Rusi: Ideia vlasti i politicheskaia praktika. IX Mezhdunarodnyi seminar istoricheskikh issledovanii "Ot Rima k Tret'emy Rimu," Moskva, 1989*, edited by A. N. Sakharov et al., 97-102. Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, Institut Rossiiskoi istorii, 1995.

_____. *Drevnerusskaia Druzhina*. Moscow: Prometei,1989.

Gorskii, A. A., et al. *Drevniaia Rus: Ocherki politicheskogo i sotsialnogo stroia*. Moscow: Indrik, 2008.

Gurevich, A. J. *Categories of Medieval Culture*. Translated by G. L. Campbell. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.

Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.

Hallam, Elizabeth M., and Judith Everard. *Capetian France: 987-1328*. 2nd ed. Gate Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, 2001.

Harper-Bill, Christopher, and Nicholas Vincent, eds. *Henry II: New Interpretations*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press, 2007.

Heal, Felicity. *Hospitality in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Helmerichs, Robert. "Princeps, Comes, Dux Normannorum: Early Rollonid Designators and their Significance." *Haskins Society Journal* 9 (1997): 57-77.

Hill, John. *The Anglo-Saxon Warrior Ethic: Reconstructing Lordship in Early English Literature*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2000.

Hindley, Alan, Frederick W. Langley, and Brian J. Levy. *Old French-English Dictionary* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Hinterberger, Martin. "Emotions in Byzantium." In *A companion to Byzantium*,

edited by Liz James, 123-34. Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Historical Personality Website. http://rus-history.ru/feodalnaya-razdroblennost-na-r/rossiiskii-feodalizm-bil-osobi.php

Hosking, Geoffrey. *Russia and the Russians: A History*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2011.

Hrushevskyi, Mykhailo. *Istoriia Ukrainy-Rusi.* Lviv: Naukovo Tovaristvo imeni Shevchnka, 1905.

Hyams, Paul. *Rancor and Reconciliation in Medieval England.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003.

_____. "Homage and Feudalism: A Judicious Separation." In *Die Gegenwart des Feudalismus/Présence du féodalisme et présent de la féodalité/The Presence of Feudalism,* edited by Natalie Fyrde, Pierre Monnet, and Otto-Gerhard Oexle, 13-50. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 173. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2002.

_____. "The End of Feudalism? *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* by Susan Reynolds," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 27 (1997): 655-62.

Ianin, V. L. *Denezhno-vesovye sistemy russkogo srednevekovia: Domongolskii period*. Moscow: Nauka, 1956.

Jaeger, Stephen. *The Origins of Courtliness: Civilizing Trends and the Formation of Courtly Ideals, 939-1210*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

Jaski, Bart. *Early Irish Kingship and Succession*. Portland, OR: Four Courts Press, 2000.

Jones, George Fenwick. *The Ethos of the Song of Roland*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1963.

Karamzin, N. M. *Letters of a Russian Traveler.* Translated by Anderw Kahn and Jonathan Mallinson. Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 2003.

_____. *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskogo v dvenadtsati tomakh*. Moscow: Nauka,

Bibliography

1989.

Kobylin, Igor. *Fenomen totalitarizma v kontekste evropeiskoi kultury*. Available as electronic text:
http://cryptograd.ru/prel/kobylin_igor%27_igorevich_
-fenomen_totalitarizma_v_kontekste_evropejskoj_kul%27tury

Kollmann, Nancy Shields. *By Honor Bound: State and Society in Early Modern Russia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.

_____. "Collateral Succession in Kievan Rus'." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 14 (1990): 377-88.

_____. "Was There Honor in Kiev Rus'?" *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 36 (1988): 293-314.

Komech, A. I. ed. *Dmitrievskii sobor vo Vladimire: K 800-letiiu sozdaniia*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo RAN, 1997.

Kotliar, N. F. "K voprosu o prichinakh udelnoi razdroblennosti na Rusi." *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy Medievistiki* 43 (2011): 5-17.

_____. "Nastuplenie udel'noi razdroblennosti na Rusi (kniaz'ia-izgoi)." *Ruthenica* 10 (2011): 69-77.

Le Goff, Jacques. *The Birth of Europe*. Translated by Janet Lloyd. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.

Legros, Huguette. "Le vocabulaire de l'amitié, son évolution sémantique au cours du XIIe siècle," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 90 (1980): 131-9.

Lenhoff, Gail. *The Martyred Princes Boris and Gleb: A Sociocultural Study of the Cult and the Texts*. UCLA Slavic Studies Series 19. Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 1989.

Lifshitz, Felice. "Translating 'Feudal' Vocabulary: Dudo of Saint-Quentin." *Haskins Society Journal* 9 (1997): 39-56.

Lodge, Anthony. "Literature and History in the Chronicle of Jordan Fantosme."

Bibliography

French Studies 44 (1990): 257-70.

Lotman, Yu. M. *Izbrannye stat'i*, 3 vols. Tallinn: Alexandra, 1993.

_____. "Eshcho raz of poniatiiakh 'slava' i 'chest' v tekstakh Kievskogo perioda." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 5 (1971): 469-74.

_____. "Ob oppozitsii 'chest'–'slava' v svetskikh tekstakh Kievskogo perioda." *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 3 (1967): 100-112.

Lunt, G. G. "Eshcho raz o mnimykh perevodakh v Drevnei Rusi (po povodu stat'i A. A. Alekseeva)." *Trudy Otdela drevnerusski literatury* 51 (1999): 435-41.

Maiorov, A. V. "Koronatsiia Daniila Galitskogo: Nikeia i Rim vo vneshnei politike Galitsko-Volynskikh kniazei." *Studia Slavica et Balcanica Petropolitana* 9 (2011): 143-156.

Makarov, A. I., V. V. Milkov, and S. M. Polianskii. *Poslaniia Mitropolita Nikifora*. Moscow: Institut filosofii RAN, 2000.

Martin, Janet. *Medieval Russia, 980-1584*. 2nd edition. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

_____. *Treasure of the Land of Darkness: The Fur Trade and its Significance for Medieval Russia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Martindale, Jane. *Status, Authority and Regional Power: Aquitaine and France, 9th to 12th Centuries*, Variorum Collected Studies Series. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1997.

Mavrodin, V. M. *Narodnye vosstaniia v Kievskoi Rusi XI-XIII vv*. Moscow: Sotsekgiz, 1961.

McSheffrey, Shannon. *Marriage, Sex and Civic Culture in Late Medieval London*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Melnikova, E. A., ed. *Drevniaia Rus v svete zarubezhnykh istochnikov*. Moscow: Logos, 2001.

Mikhailova, Yulia, and David Prestel. "Cross Kissing: Keeping One's Word in

Bibliography

Twelfth-Century Rus." *Slavic Review* 70 (2011): 1-22.

Miliutenko, N. I. *Sviatye kniazia-mucheniki Boris i Gleb*. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Olega Abyshko, 2006.

Nasonov, A. N. *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI – nachala XIII veka*. Moscow: Nauka, 1969.

Nazarenko, A. V. *Drevniia Rus na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh: Mezhdistsiplinarnye ocherki kulturnykh, torgovykh, politicheskikh sviazei IX-XII vekov*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kultury, 2001.

_____. "Rodovoi siuzerinetet Riurikovichei nad Rus'iu (X-XI vv.)." In *Drevnie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR, 1985 god*, edited by A. P. Novoseltsev, 149-57. Moscow: Nauka, 1986.

Nelson, Janet L. "Kingship and Royal Government." In *The New Cambridge Medieval History*. Vol. 2. *C. 700-900*, edited by Rosamond McKitterick, 383-431. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

_____. Review of *The Peace of God: Social Violence and Religious Response in France around the Year 1000* edited by T. Head and R. Landes, *Speculum* 69 (1994): 163-9.

Niermeyer, J. F. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Noonan, Thomas. "The Monetary History of Kiev in the Pre-Mongolian Period." *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 11 (1987): 383-443.

Novoseltsev, A. P., ed., *Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy: Materialy i issledovaniia, 1992-1993 gody*. Moscow: Nauka, 1995.

Novoseltsev, A. P., V. T. Pashuto, and V. L. Cherepnin. *Drevnerusskoe gosudarstvo i ego mezhdunarodnoe znachenie*. Moscow: Nauka, 1965.

Pagden, Anthony, ed. *The Idea of Europe: From Antiquity to the European Union*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Pashuto, V. T. *Vneshniaia politika Drevnei Rusi*. Moscow: Nauka, 1968.

Pavlov-Silvanskii, N. P. *Feodalizm v udelnoi Rusi*. St. Petersburg: Tipografia M. M.

Bibliography

Stasiulevicha, 1910. Reprinted in Russian Reprint Series 21. The Hague: Europe Printing, 1966.

Peristiany, J. G,. and Julian Pitt-Rivers, eds. *Honor and Grace in Anthropology.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Perrie, Maureen, ed. *The Cambridge History of Russia*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Petrukhin, V. Ia. ed., *Iz istorii russkoi kultury.* Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kultury, 2000.

Poe, Marshall T. *The Russian Moment in World History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Poly, Jean-Pierre and Eric Bournazel. *La mutation féodale, Xe-XIIe siècles*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1980.

_____. *The Feudal Transformation: 900-1200*. Trans. by Caroline Higgitt. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1991.

Prestel, David. "Plody provideniia: iazycheskaia i sviashchennaia istoriia v Povesti vremennykh let," *Rossica Antiqua* 4 (2011): 23-42.

Priselkov, M. D. *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI-XV vv*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta, 1940.

Pritsak, Omeljan. *The Origins of Rus*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Prochazka, Helen Y. "On Concepts of Patriotism, Loyalty, and Honour in the Old Russian Military Accounts." *Slavonic and East European Review* 63 (1985): 481-97.

Raffensperger, Christian. *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World*. Harvard Historical Studies 177. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012.

Rapov, O. M. *Kniazhaskie vladeniia na Rusi v X - pervoi polovine XIII v.* Moscow: Izdatel'stvo MGU, 1977.

Reuter, Timothy. *Medieval Polities and Modern Mentalities*. New York: Cambridge

Bibliography

University Press, 2006.

_____. "Debate: The 'Feudal Revolution' III," *Past and Present* 155 (1997): 177-95.

Reynolds, Susan. *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

_____. *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900-1300*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas V., and Mark D. Steinberg. *A History of Russia*. 8th edition. Cambridge, MA: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Roach, Levi. "Submission and Homage: Feudo-Vassalic Relations and the Settlement of Disputes in Ottonian Germany." *History* 97 (2012): 356-7.

Rosenwein, Barbara. "Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions." *Passions in Context: International Journal for the History and Theory of Emotions* 1 (2010): 1-32.

_____. *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.

_____. "Even the Devil (Sometimes) Has Feelings." *Haskins Society Journal* 14 (2005): 1-14.

_____. "Eros and Clio: Emotional Paradigms in Medieval Historiography." In *Mediävistik im 21. Jahrhundert; Stand und Perspektiven der internationalen und interdisziplinaren Mittelalterforschung*, edited by Hans-Werner Goetz and Jörg Jarnut, 427-41. München: Fink, 2003.

_____, ed. *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.

Ryan, Magnus. "The Oath of Fealty and the Lawyers." In *Political Thought and the Realities of Power in the Middle Ages*, edited by Joseph Canning and Otto Gerhard Oexle, 211-28. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 147. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1998.

Shchapov, Ia. N., ed. *Pis'mennye pamiatniki istorii Drevnei Rusi: letopisi, povesti,*

Bibliography

khozhdeniia, poucheniia, zhitiia, poslaniia: annotirovannyi katalog-spravochnik. St. Petersburg: Russko-Baltiiskii informatsionnyi tsentr "BLITS", 2003.

Shepard, Jonathan. "Orthodoxy and Northern Peoples: Goods, Gods and Guidelines." In *A Companion to Byzantium*, edited by Liz James, 171-86. Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

_____. "The Viking Rus and Byzantium." In *The Viking World*, edited by Stefan Brink and Neil Price, 496-516. New York: Routledge, 2008.

_____. "Slav Christianities, 800 -1100." In *The Cambridge history of Christianity. Vol. 3. Early Medieval Christianities, c.600-c.1100*, edited by Thomas F. X. Noble and Julia M. H. Smith, 130-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

_____. "Rus'." In *Christianization and the Rise of Christian Monarchy: Scandinavia, Central Europe and Rus' c.900-1200*, edited by Nora Berend, 369-416. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

_____. "Crowns from the Basileus, Crowns from Heaven." In *Byzantium, New Peoples, New Powers: The Byzantino-Slav Contact Zone*, edited by Miliana Kaĭmakamova, Maciej Salamon, and Małgorzata Smorąg Różycka, 139-60. Cracow: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze Historia Iagellonica, 2007.

_____. "Yngvarr's Expedition to the East and a Russian Inscribed Stone Cross." *Saga Book of the Viking Society* 21 (1982): 222-92.

Smith, R. J. "Henry II's Heir: The Acta and Seal of Henry the Young King, 1170-83." *English Historical Review* 116 (2001): 297-326.

Soloviev, A. V. "'Reges' et 'Regnum Russiae' au Moyen Age." *Byzantion: Revue internationale des études byzantines* 36 (1966): 143-73.

Spierenburg, Pieter, ed. *Men and Violence: Gender, Honor, and Rituals in Modern Europe and America*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1998.

Stalin, I. V. "O dialekticheskom i istoricheskom materializme." *Sochineniia* 14 (1997): 253-82.

Stefanovich, P. S. *Boiare, otroki, druzhiny: Voenno-politicheskaia elita Rusi v X-XI*

Bibliography

vv. Moscow: Indrik, 2012.

_____. "'Bolshaia druzhina' v Drevnei Rusi." *Srednie veka: Issledovaniia po istorii Srednevekovia i rannego Novogo vremeni* 73 (2011): 27-57.

_____. "'Vernost' v otnosheniiakh kniazia i druzhiny na Rusi XII-XIII v." *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy medievistiki* 37 (2009): 72-82.

_____. "Drevnerusskoe poniatie chesti po pamiatnikam literatury domongolskoi Rusi." *Drevniaia Rus: Voprosy medievistiki* 15 (2004): 63-87.

_____. "Krestotselovanie i otnoshenie k nemu tserkvi v Drevnei Rusi." In *Srednevekovaia Rus* 5, edited by A. A. Gorskii et al., 86-113. Moscow: Indrik, 2004.

Strakhova, Olga B. Review of *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Mediaeval Russia* by F. J. Thomson. *Russia Mediaevalis* 10 (2001): 245-61.

Stuard, Susan Mosher. *Women in Medieval Society*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Sverdlov, M. B. *Domongolskaia Rus: Kniaz'ia i kniazheskaia vlast' na Rusi VI-pervoi treti XIII vv.* St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2003.

Swanton, Michael, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.* New York: Routledge, 1998.

Tatishchev, V. N. *Istoriia Rossiiskaia.* Moscow: AST, 2003.

Thomas, Hugh M. "Shame, Masculinity, and the Death of Thomas Becket." *Speculum* 87 (2012): 1050-88.

Thomson, Francis J. *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Mediaeval Russia.* Brookfield, VT: Ashgate, 1999.

_____. "'Made in Russia.' A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia," in *Millenium Russiae Christianae: Tausend Jahre Christliches Russland*, edited by Gerhard Birkfellner, 295-354. Cologne: Bőhlau Verlag,1993.

Throop, Susanna A., and Paul R. Hyams, eds. *Vengeance in the Middle Ages: Emotion, Religion and Feud*. Farnham, U. K.: Ashgate, 2010.

Tikhomirov, M. N. *Krest'ianskie i gorodskie vosstaniia na Rusi X-XIII vv*. Moscow:

Bibliography

Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1955.

Tolochko, P. P. *Kochevye narody stepei i Kievskaia Rus.* Kiev: Abris, 1999.

————. *Kniaz' v Drevnei Rusi: vlast', sobstvennost', ideologiia.* Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1992.

Tolstoy, A. K. Sobranie sochinenii. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1963.

Tuten, Belle S., and Tracey L. Billado, eds. *Feud, Violence and Practice: Essays in Medieval Studies in Honor of Stephen D. White.* Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.

Tvorogov, O. V. *Drevniaia Rus: Sobytiia i liudi.* St Petersburg: Nauka, 1994.

Van Eickels, Klaus. "'Homagium' and 'Amicitia': Rituals of Peace and their Significance in the Anglo-French Negotiations of the Twelfth Century." *Francia* 24 (1997): 133-40.

Vasil'ev, M. I. *Russikie sani: istoriko-etnograficheskoe issledovanie.* Novgorod: Novgorodskii Gosudarstvennyi Universitet, 2007.

Venckeleer, Theo. "Faut-il traduire VASSAL par vassal?" In *Mélanges de linguistique, de littérature et de philologie médiévales, offerts à J. R. Smeets,* edited by Q. I. M. Mok et al., 303-16. Leiden: Université de Leiden, 1982.

Vodoff, Wladimir. "La titulature princière en Russie du XIe au début du XVIe siècle: Questions de critique des sources." *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 35 (1987): 1-35.

————. "La titulature des princes russes du Xe au début du XIIe siècle et les relations extérieures de la Russie kiévienne." *Revue des études slaves* 55 (1983): 139-50.

————. "Remarques sur la valeur du terme le 'tsar' appliqué aux princes russes avant le milieu du XV siècle." *Oxford Slavonic Papers* 11 (1978): 1-41.

White, Stephen D. "A Crisis of Fidelity in c. 1000?" In *Building Legitimacy: Political Discourses and Forms of Legitimacy in Medieval Societies,* edited by Isabel Alfonso, Hugh Kennedy, and Julio Escalona, 27-49. Boston: Brill, 2004.

————. Review of *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* by

Bibliography

Susan Reynolds. *Law and History Review* 15 (1997): 349-55.

_____. "Debate: The 'Feudal Revolution'." *Past and Present* 152 (1996): 205-23.

_____. "The Discourse of Inheritance in Twelfth-Century France: Alternative Models of the Fief in Raoul de Cambrai." In *Law and Government in Medieval England and Normandy*, edited by George Garnett and John Hudson, 173-97. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

_____. "Stratégie rhétorique dans la Conventio de Hugues de Lusignan," *Histoire et société: mélanges offerts à Georges Duby*, edited by Georges Duby, 147-57. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 1992.

Wiessner, Pauline Wilson, Polly Wiessner, and Wulf Schiefenhövel, eds. *Food and the Status Quest: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1996.

Worth, Dean S. "Was There a 'Literary Language' in Kievan Rus'?" *The Russian Review* 34 (1975): 1-9.

_____. "([Church] Slavonic) Writing in Kievan Rus'." In *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs*, edited by Boris Gasparov and Olga Raevsky-Hughes 141-53. Berkeley, LA: University of California Press, 1993.

Zaitsev, A. K. *Chernigovskoe kniazhestvo X-XIII vv*. Moscow: Kvadriga, 2009.

Zimin, A. A. "O statie Iu. Lotmana 'Ob oppozitsii *chest'–slava* v svetskikh tekstakh Kievskogo perioda.'" *Trudy po znakovym sistemam* 5 (1971): 464-8.

Zimin, A. A., and V. T. Pashuto, eds. *Mezhdunarodnye sviazi Rossii do XVII v*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1961.