

Andrzej Poppe

WORDS THAT SERVE THE AUTHORITY On the Title of "Grand Prince" in Kievan Rus'*

The origins of the title of "Grand Prince" in Old Rus' are still unclear. Divergent opinions have been expressed on this topic despite the fact that for decades V. O. Ključevskij's assertion that "from the middle of the 11th century the highest dignitary—the prince of Kiev—was called Grand Prince" was a point of reference for most experts.¹ During the 1960s and 1970s the view that this title was applied to the rulers of Kiev as early as the 9th century

* Since the modern meaning of the word Russia (Russian) concerns only one (Great-Russian) but not two other Eastern Slavic nations (Ukrainians and Byelorussians) the medieval term Rus' (and adj. Russian) which embraces all Eastern Slavs in Middle Ages is used here for the sake of greater accuracy. Kievan Rus' (or Kievan Russia) is a learned term used for dominated by the Eastern Slavdom, multinational statehood under the hegemony of Kiev between the 9th and the 13th centuries. The communication on the title of Kievan ruler was presented in 1974 in München (Kommission für die Geistesgeschichte der östlichen Europa) and 1976 in Moscow (Institut Istorii Akademii Nauk). The Polish version of the present paper was published in: "Przegląd Historyczny", vol. LXXV, 1984, No. 3, p. 423—439.

For contribution on the English wording of this text I am obligated to my learned friends and colleagues Henrik Birnbaum from Los Angeles, Richard Bosley from Düsseldorf and Simon Franklin from Cambridge.

¹ V. O. Ključevskij, *Sočinenija*, vol. VI, Moskva 1959, p. 136. J. P. Arrignon took this point of view as the basis for his own reflections: *Usage et valeur du titre de Grand Prince (Velikij Knjaz) dans la Russie du nord-est aux XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, in: *Les Principautés au Moyen Age* Bordeaux 1979, pp. 176, 178. W. Vodoff has recently presented two articles of rulers' titles in medieval Rus'. His views, which are in keeping with mine, form an appropriate background for the thoughts presented here; see: W. Vodoff, *La titulature des princes russes du X^e au début de XII^e siècle et les relations extérieures de la Russie Kieviennne*, "Revue des Etudes Slaves", vol. LV, 1983, pp. 139—150; *idem*, *La titulature princière en Russie du XI^e au début du XVI^e siècle. Questions de critique des sources*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas", vol. XXXV, 1987, pp. 1—35.

found increasing acceptance.² Nearly eighty years ago L. K. Goetz attempted to trace the origin of this title to the second half of the 12th century; although his work still offers the most lucid overview of the sources, the limitation of his inquiry to the text of three chronicles prevented him from providing a satisfactory answer to the question.³

Certain historians, aware of the chronological and semantic difficulties, accepted that the grand princely title was used to elevate Kievan ruler, but denied that it had any fundamental importance, and emphasized instead the institution of the eldest among the princes of Rus'.⁴ Some even categorically denied that the grand princely title had any official status in the 11th and 12th centuries.⁵ To a certain extent the difference of opinion is attributable to the different views of the political organisation and supremacy in the Kievan state. Yet it also results from an underestimation of the need to verify the textual transmission: thus

² This opinion, which has remained unchanged in the face of criticism for years, is held by B. A. Rybakov; see most recently his *Kievskaja Rus' i russkije knjazestva XII—XIII vv.* Moskva 1982, pp. 328, 416, 476; see also, for example: V. P. Šušarin, *Sovremennaja buržuaznaja istoriografija drevnej Rusi*, Moskva 1964, p. 158; J. Frojanov, *Kievskaja Rus'*, Leningrad 1980, p. 24f; M. B. Sverdlov, *Genezis i struktura feodalnogo obščestva v drevnej Rusi*, Leningrad 1983, p. 32ff; P. Toločko, *Drevnjaja Rus'*, Kiev 1987, pp. 37, 42—43, 49, 76, 216—218; Ju. Limonov, *Vladimiro-Suzdalskaja Rus'*, Leningrad 1987, pp. 27, 32, 35—36, 73. Also for both last authors (who ignore my own and Vodoff's studies mentioned here) the grand princely title of Kievan ruler seems to be self-evident; cf. further the academic text books such as: *Istorija SSSR s drevnejših vremën do konca XVIII v.*, ed. B. A. Rybakov, Moskva 1983, pp. 56, 93ff. *Istorija gosudarstva i prava SSSR*, vol. I, ed. O. Čistjakov and I. Martysevič, Moskva 1985, pp. 28—30.

³ L. K. Goetz, *Der Titel "Grossfürst" in den ältesten russischen Chroniken*,—"Zeitschrift für Osteuropäische Geschichte", vol. I, 1911, pp. 23—66, 177—213. See also K. R. Schmidt, *Soziale Terminologie in russischen Texten des Frühen Mittelalters bis zum Jahre 1240*, Copenhagen 1964, pp. 293 f., 524.

⁴ B. D. Grekov and subsequently V. T. Pašuto and L. V. Čerepnin referred, albeit inconsistently, to the senior of Kiev as Grand Prince. G. Stoekl also appears to share this view, although he is aware that this title was accepted quite late; see *Die Begriffe Reich, Herrschaft und Staat bei den orthodoxen Slaven*, "Saeculum", vol. V, 1954, p. 108; idem, *Der russische Staat in Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit*, Wiesbaden 1981, p. 78. For comments on the right of the eldest, see L. V. Čerepnin *K voprosu o haraktere i forme drevnerusskogo gosudarstva X—načala XIII v.*, "Istoričeskie Zapiski", vol. LXXXIX, 1972, p. 369 ff.

⁵ V. L. Janin, *Aktovyje pečati drevnej Rusi X—XV vv.*, vol. I, Moskva 1970, p. 22.

adjective *velikiyi*, which accompanies the word *knjaz'*, is interpreted exclusively as one of the standard epithets of the Kievan prince, as his official title. No one has reflected on the semantic subtleties of the attribute *velikiyi*, which, in the Middle Ages, was equivalent to the Greek *megas* and Latin *magnus*.⁶

The earliest references to "Grand Prince" are found in the Byzantine-Russian treaties of the 10th century, which are preserved in manuscripts from the 14th—15th centuries. For this reason L. K. Goetz was prepared "to consider these treaties spurious in the form in which they are preserved, solely because of the use the term *velikiyi knjaz'*, of which we find no other examples from such an early period".⁷ The textual form of this passage as it has been transmitted to us is admittedly not perfect, and one can identify small omissions or interpolations made at the beginning of the 12th century, that is, at the time when these treaties were first added to the *Primary Chronicle*. Yet the sceptical opinion of this accomplished historian of the Russian Middle Ages does not seem well-founded.⁸ By the same token, however, one must add that the view is unfounded according to which the treaties prove that already in the 10th century a "Grand Prince" was at the head of the old Russian state.⁹ Neither point of view takes into account

⁶ See P. Schreiner, *Zur Bezeichnung "Megas" und "Megas Basileus" in der byzantinischen Kaisertitulatur*, "Byzantina", vol. III, 1971, pp. 175—192; W. Kienast, *Magnus, der Ältere*, "Historische Zeitschrift", vol. CCV, 1967, pp. 1—14; R. Macrides, *What's in the Name "Megas Komnenos"?*, "Archeon Pontou", vol. XXXV, 1979, pp. 328—345; P. Bühner, *Studien zu den Beinamen mittelalterlicher Herrscher*, "Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte", vol. XXI, 1972, pp. 205—236.

⁷ L. K. Goetz, *Der Titel...*, p. 26. See the objections raised by G. Stoekl (*Die Begriffe...*, p. 108, note 21), who views *velikiyi knjaz'* in the treaties as a laudatory expression "great prince". A. Kužmin, *Náčal'nye etapy drevnerusskogo letopisaniya*, Moskva, 1977, p. 83, considers the adjective "great" appended to the princely title in the treaties an interpolation of the 12th century.

⁸ For the current state of research see J. Bardach, *Traktaty [Treaties]* in: *Słownik Starożytności Słowiańskich*, vol. VI, 1977, pp. 130—133; S. M. Kaštanov, *Russkije knjažeskie akty X—XIV vv.*, "Archeografičeskij Ežegodnik za 1974", Moskva 1975, pp. 94—99.

⁹ In addition to those works mentioned in footnote 2 see A. N. Saha-rov, *Diplomatija drevnej Rusi*, Moskva 1980, p. 239, where the author concludes that "the treaty of 944 makes use of the title officially recognized in Rus', "Grand Prince". G. Vernadsky, —see his *Kievan Russia*, New Haven 1948, (7th ed., 1973), pp. 31, 36,—expressed a similar opinion.

the irrefutable fact that the Slavic text of the treaties is a translation from Greek;¹⁰ but this fact must form the point of departure of all further studies.

In Byzantine practice it was common to call the ruler of Rus' *archōn*. The custom of translating *knjaz'* as *archōn* had taken root during the centuries of constant contacts between Byzantium and the Southern Slavs. From the forms of address listed in the book *De caerimoniis* authorized by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, we learn that in the 10th century (that is, in the very period in which the Byzantine-Russian treaties were concluded) imperial letters were addressed to Russian princes with the simple phrase *pros ton archonta Rhōsias* without the addition of any established *epitheta ornantia*. The author of the book is clearly unaware of the term "Grand Prince" when he speaks about particular rulers of Kiev: Igor is called *archōn Rhōsias*, Olga *archontissa Rhōsias* and once *hēgemōn kai archontissa tōn Rhōs*.¹¹ The Russian princely seals with Greek inscriptions from the 11th and the beginning of the 12th centuries testify to the fact that the members of the Rurikid dynasty were satisfied with the title *archōn Rhōsias*.¹²

The Byzantines, on the other hand, who were aware of the multitude of semantic possibilities of this contemporary term, which was also used by the officials of the Empire's provincial administration, complemented the title *archōn* directed at the

¹⁰ The fundamental study of the linguistic dependence of the treaties on the Greek original remains N. Lavrovskij, *O vizantijskom elemente v jazyke dogovorov russkich s grekami*, St. Petersburg 1853, reprinted Warszawa 1904.

¹¹ *De caerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, vol. II, ed. Bonn 1830, pp. 511, 596, 691; see also G. Ostrogorsky, *Die byzantinische Staattenhierarchie*, "Seminarium Kondakovianum", vol. VIII, 1936, p. 49 ff.; J. Ferluga, *Die Adressenliste für auswärtige Herrscher aus dem Zeremonienbuch Konstantin Porphyrogennetos* in: idem, *Byzantium and the Balkans*, Amsterdam 1976, p. 261 ff.

¹² See A. Soloviev, *Archōn Rhōsias*, "Byzantion", vol. XXXI, 1961, pp. 237–248; vol. XL, 1970, p. 435 f. Reprinted in idem, *Byzance et la formation de l'Etat russe*, Variorum, London, 1979; V. L. Janin, *Aktovye pečati...*, vol. I, p. 14 ff. The titles of the extant diplomas are equally modest: the ruler's name is placed first, sometimes without any title at all. Only in the 13th century did the mention of the title before the name of the prince take precedence. Cf. S. M. Kaštanov, *Intitulacija russkich, knjažeskih aktov X–XIV vv.*, "Vspomogatel'nye istoričeskie discipliny", vol. VIII, Leningrad 1978, pp. 69–83.

princes of Rus' with various epithets. It is known that in the practice of the imperial chancery the epithets were more significant than the title itself. Indirect evidence permits us to conclude that one of the epithets used by Byzantine emperors and patriarchs in their correspondence, with princes of Rus' was *eugenestatos* and possibly *paneugenestatos*. Given the monodynastic nature of the princely dignity this tautological addition to the princely title did not take immediate root in Rus'. Proof of this is seen in the fact that works written in old Russian avoided its use even in titles with many epithets, favouring instead terms which accentuated the Christian nature of the prince's power. One example of this is found in the canonical responses of the Kievan metropolitan Johannes II: the expression *tou eugenestaton archontos* was translated as *blagovernago knjazja* in which the Christian epithet was considered more suitable.¹³

In the treaty of 911 the Kievan ruler Oleg is called *veliki knjaz' russkyi*, *svetlyi knjaz' russkyi* and *naša svetlost'*.¹⁴ The last, a typical Byzantine title, is a calque of *hē periphaneia* (or *lamprotēs*) *hēmōn* and corresponds to the familiar *cesarstvo naše* (*hē basileia hēmōn*) of the treaties.¹⁵ Oleg's successor, Igor, was called six times *veliki knjaz' russkyi* in the treaty of 944 and *knjaz' russkyi* equally often. In the treaty of 971 (or rather in the declaration intended for Johannes Tzimiskes) Igor's son Svjatoslav is called *veliki knjaz' russkyi* in the third person in the preliminary protocol but *Az Svjatoslav knjaz' russkyi* in the disposition in the first person. In the report on the preliminary negotia-

¹³ *Kirchenrechtliche und kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands*, ed. L. K. Goetz, Stuttgart 1905, p. 138 f. See also A. Poppe, *The Rise of Christian Russia*, Variorum, London 1982, IX, p. 111 f.; A. Soloviev, *Byzance...*, No. VI, pp. 241—248.

¹⁴ Among the many editions of the treaties, the editions in the *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisej* [hereafter PSRL] must be considered the basic one: vol. I, Leningrad 1926 (reprinted 1962), cols. 32—38 (Treaty of 911), cols. 46—54 (Treaty of 944), cols. 71—73 (Declaration of 971); and vol. II, St. Petersburg 1908 (reprinted 1962) corresponding cols. 23—28, 35—42, 60—61. For a translation into English which primarily follows the text of the Laurentian MS see *The Russian Primary Chronicle, Laurentian Text*, transl. and ed. by S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor, Cambridge, Mass. 1953, pp. 64—65, 73—77, 89—90: A. Zimin offers an emended text based on that in the PSRL with variants from several MSS in: *Pamjatniki russkogo prava* [PRP], vol. I, Moskva 1952, pp. 3—63.

¹⁵ See Lavrovskij, *O vizantijskom elemente...*, pp. 104—107.

tions and in the document itself Tzimiskes is called *cēsar'*; only once is he called *velikyj cēsar'* when he is mentioned together with "Basil and Constantine, the emperors enlightened by God". This turn of phrase reflects precisely the situation at that time: as was customary, Tzimiskes, being the eldest and the true holder of power, was called the *megas basileus*. The plural *velicyj cēsari* occurs in the treaties of 911 and 944 when, according to the common practice of the imperial chancery, the names of the joint emperors were mentioned together with the name of the true emperor-autocrat.¹⁶

From the text of all three documents we can clearly infer that *velikyj/megas* was not part of an official title for the Kievan ruler, but was rather an adjectival epithet which was used by the Byzantines not only for the princes of Kiev but also for their own emperors. On the contrary, the full title of the Kievan ruler in these texts is *knjaz' rus'kyj/archōn Rhōsias*, whereas other princes are mentioned without reference to the country.

It appears that the meaning of the epithet *megas* added to *archōn Rhōsias* does not differ from that found in Byzantine documents in the phrase *megas basileus*. This is supported by the very clear use of *megas* by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the sense of "elder", "principal", "chief" in the report about the ruler of Moravia (*ho Morabias archōn*) Svetopluk who divided his country among his three sons, with the eldest to be the chief prince *ton prōton kataleipsas archonta megan*.¹⁷ The term *megas archōn/velikyj knjaz'* should, therefore be translated as "chief prince", since it is less likely that the Byzantine dictating the document intended *megas archōn* to mean "famous" or "important prince". The information contained in the treaties themselves appears to support the interpretation "chief prince" (keeping in mind many Grecisms left by translator, the complex MS tradition

¹⁶ See Fr. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, Ettal, 1953 (reprinted 1976) pp. 286 f., 312; G. Ostrogorski, *Vizantija i Stovienie*, Beograd 1970, pp. 285—288, 290—292, 302; P. Schreiner, *Zur Bezeichnung...*, pp. 179 f.

¹⁷ *De administrando imperio*, ed. Gy. Moravcsik, Washington 1967, p. 181 (cap. 41, see also cap. 37, 38 and 40). *Ibidem*, pp. 166 f., 172 f., 178 f., where the leader of the Pečenegs and the Magyar ruler Arpad are consistently called *archōn* and only once *ho megas Tourkias archōn*.

of the texts, and the clear traces of corrections made by a Russian bookman).¹⁸

In the treaty of 911 the Russian envoys appear in the name of Oleg as well as *ot vseh iže sut' pod rukoju jego svetlyh i velikyh knjaz' i jego velikyh bojar*. According to the treaty of 944 the envoys are sent by Igor as well as "by all the princes" (*ot vsjakaja knjazija*); later on, however, the text mentions the ruling prince and "his princes and boyars" or only "his boyars". The document of 971 mentions, in addition to Svjatoslav, only his boyars. From this we see that the terms "princes and boyars", "princes" or simply "boyars" were used indiscriminately in the treaties to designate one and the same social group close to the Kievan prince. This observation led H. Łowmiański to conclude that the terminological confusion in the Byzantine-Russian treaties of the 10th century reflects the "transformation of the clan chieftains into an early feudal aristocracy. The former, deprived of the title prince, which was reserved for members of the ruling dynasty, was fused into the group of boyars".¹⁹ It is difficult to agree with this ingenious interpretation of the inconsistent use of social terminology in the treaties, in view of the fact that the form of the documents is a product of the Byzantine side. An examination of the MS tradition of the treaties reveals the tendency (undoubtedly of the old Russian bookman-chronicler) to replace the "princes" subordinated to the Kievan prince by boyars. One can see the clear traces and at the same time results of these corrections in the two edited versions of the treaty of 911:

Laurentian MS (PSRL I, p. 33)

poslani ot Olega velikogo knjazja rus'kago i ot vseh iže sut' pod rukoju jego svetlyh i velikih knjaz' i jego velikih bojar

Hypatian MS (PSRL II, p. 24)

poslani ot Olega velikago knjazja ruskago i ot vseh iže sut' pod rukoju jego svetlyh bojar

¹⁸ See A. A. Šahmatov, *Povest' vremennykh let i eë istočniki, Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury*, vol. IV, 1940, pp. 111–122; B. A. Larin, *Lekcii po istorii russkogo literaturnogo jazyka X—seredina XVII v.*, Moskva 1975, pp. 24–52.

¹⁹ H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski [The Beginnings of Poland]*, vol. III, Warszawa 1967, p. 481. The influence of this thesis is clearly seen in the studies mentioned in footnote 2.

In view of the MS tradition, in particular the wording of the treaty of 944, it is impossible to accept the simplest explanation, namely that *i velikih knjaz' i jego velikih* is a later interpolation intended to complement the original wording *svetlyh bojar*.²⁰ On the contrary, it appears that marginal notes were present in the common protograph of both versions, which attempted to lend precision to the terminology by substituting "boyars" for the enigmatic "princes" who were subordinated to the prince of Kiev. The scribe of the version transmitted in the *Laurentian Chronicle* mistakenly treated these marginal notes as a completion and thus interpolated the word "boyars". In contrast the scribe of the version in the *Hypatian Chronicle* correctly understood the intention of the writer of the MS, which he copied, and eliminated the word "princes". In the original version of the translation they figured as Oleg's subordinates: *pod rukuju* is a literal translation of *hypocheirioi* or *hoi hypo cheira*.²¹

It must seem surprising that these subordinate princes were furnished with two epithets *svetlye i velikye* whereas the chief prince Oleg had to be content with one. It cannot be excluded that the Greek original read *lamproi kai megaloi archontes* and that the second epithet had to be interpreted in another manner than when referring to Oleg; perhaps it was translated as "recognized", "respected" or simply as "many".²² Another poss-

²⁰ A. A. Zimin proposed such an emendation in PRP I, pp. 6, 25. Compare also with Cross's translation, p. 66: "...sent by Oleg, Great Prince of Rus', and by all the serene and great princes and the great boyars under his sway". It is perplexing to encounter the view that the *svetlye knjazi* of the treaty of 911 are closely analogous to *Svet* (-*malik*), the ruler of the Slavs mentioned in an Arabic source from the 9th century. This exercise in popular etymology serves to support the thesis that Kievan Rus' possessed a feudal structure roughly a century before Oleg; see B. Rybakov, *Kievskaja Rus'*..., pp. 274—276. In fact it is not clear whether the Arabic source contains the name or the title of the Slavic ruler. The original account cannot be older than the last third of the 9th century. Unfortunately B. Rybakov has not familiarized himself with the present state of research; see Fr. Kmiotowicz, *Die Titel der Slavenherrscher in der sog. "Anonymen Mitteilung"—einer orientalischen Quelle (Ende des IX. Jahrhunderts)*, in: "Folia Orientalia", vol. XIX, 1978, pp. 13—34.

²¹ Cf. N. Lavrovskij, *O vizantijskom elemente...*, pp. 93—96.

²² Constantinos Porphyrogenitos (De adm. imp. 32, p. 154) relates the imprisonment by the Serbians of the son of the Bulgarian ruler together with twelve distinguished boyars: *meta kai boiladōn dōdeka megalōn*. For *bojare velicii* in the sense of distinguished, noble boyars, see PSRL II, cols: 724, 730, 910. Cf. also *velikie i menšie bojare* in the church Statute of

ibility is that the two Slavic adjectives were equivalent to a composite Greek superlative of one of the epithets with which Byzantine dignitaries were honoured; the text might have read *archontes periphaneistatoi* (*splendissimi, illustrissimi*), *lamprotatoi* (*clarissimi, illustrissimi*), *peribleptotatoi* (*spectabilissimi*), *megaloprepeistatoi* (*magnificentissimi*).²³

We can gain an insight into the sense of the passage in question in the treaty of 911 by comparing the Greek text of the decisions of the council of Chalcedon of 451 with its Slavic version found in the *Nomocanon* translated in Bulgaria in the first half of the 10th century. The oldest extant MS *Efrem's kormčaja*, was copied in Rus' at the beginning of the 12th century. The members of the council, *oi megaloprepeistatoi kai endoxotatoi archontes kai hē hyperhyēs synklētos* were translated as *velelepotnii i slavnii knjazi i velicii boljari*.²⁴ The Slavic translator rendered the second *kai* as a connective "i/and" whereas it is actually the equivalent of "namely", "indeed". The church fathers attending the council were first called "magnificent and glorious archontes" and thereafter their gathering was termed an "extraordinary senate".²⁵ In

the 13th century attributed to Yaroslav the Wise (*Drevnerusskie knjažeskie ustavy XI—XV vv.*, ed. Ja. Ščapov, Moskva 1976, p. 86). See also the frequent phrase of *mala i do velika*, that it to say, from all walks of life: the lower and the noble upper classes (PSRL II, pp. 192, 348, 369, 639, 710). Georgios Hamartolos reports that Mohammed's wife came from a "famous" family: *velika* [*periphaneēs*] *bo rodu i bogata*; see *Hronika Georgia Amartola v drevnem slavjanorusskom perevode*, ed. V. M. Istrin, vol. I, Petrograd 1920, p. 449. For the use of the adjective *velik, velii* for the Greek *polys* [*numerous*] and *mnog* [*many*] for *megas*, see *ibidem*, vol. III: *Lexicon*, Leningrad 1930 (reprint 1972), pp. 120, 152; *Slovník Jazyka Starosloveského*, vol. I, Praha 1966, (henceforth SJS), p. 171 f.

²³ For the translation of Greek compound adjectives into simple words in Slavic see A. Budilovič, *Issledovanie jazyka drevneslavjanskogo perevoda 13 slov Grigorija Bogoslova po rukopisi XI v.* St. Petersburg 1871, p. 101 ff., and the Greek-Slavic dictionary in *Hronika Georgia Amartola...*, ed. V. M. Istrin, vol. III, Petersburg 1920. *Megaloprepēs* (magnificent) is translated as *velmi lep* or *velmi česten*. *Lampros* is translated as *svetl* or *slaven* and *periphaneēs* as *slaven, svetl, velik*.

²⁴ *Drevneslavjanskaja Kormčaja XIV titulov bez tolkovaniij*, vol. I ed. V. N. Beneševič, St. Petersburg 1906, p. 129. It is not unusual to call the bishops *archontes*; (cf. Apostolic Constitutions 2, 28).

²⁵ *Synkletos* means frequently the senate which assisted the emperor in Constantinople and was usually translated as *boljare*, sometimes as *boljarskij čin, boljarskij sbor*. *Hronika Georgia Amartola...*, vol. III, p. 172, 210, S—S I, p. 136 f. Cf. further S. Zavadskaja, "Boljarin"—"Bojarin" *v drevnerusskikh pišmiennyh istočnikah*, in: *Drevnejsie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR (za 1985 god)*, Moskva 1986, pp. 89—94.

two other places in the same resolutions, when the members of the council are called *archontes*, the Slavic translator used alternatively as *knjazi* and *boljari*.²⁶

Consequently the assumption appears justified that the preliminary protocol of the treaty of 911 employed similar alternating terms for the entourage of the ruler of Kiev. The translator who preferred verbatim rendition, had difficulties with the text. This was noted by the editor of the *Primary Chronicle*, who attempted to make corrections, when included the texts of the treaties in his work.

The preceding discussion suggests a number of possible solutions in order to emphasize more strongly the groundlessness of mechanically applying foreign socio-political terminology to the East Slavic society.

The oldest translations demonstrate that *archōn* was translated as *knjaz'* to designate not only the ruler but also various subordinate dignitaries.²⁷ Byzantine sources also use the term *archontes*, together with *dynastoi* and *megistanes* to designate representatives of the Slavic ruling class; the magnates who appear in South Slavic sources are usually referred to by the generic term *boljary*, whereas Latin sources refer to them as *principes*, *primates*, *maiores*, *optimates*, or *meliores*. The identification of *archōn* with *knjaz'* must have been deeply rooted in the language of those Slavs who were within the Greek sphere of influence, since the Hellenized author of the *vita* of Constantine-Cyril, the apostle of the Slavs, designated those belonging to the entourage of Moravian prince Rostislav as *knjazi* (cap. XIV: "Rostislav bo, Morav'skij knjaz'... svet stvori s knjazi svoimi i s Moravlanj")²⁸.

²⁶ *Drevneslavjanskaja Kormčaja...*, p. 126, 127. The phrase *hoi megaloprepestatoi kai endoxotatoi archontes* was first translated as *velelepnotnii i slavnii boljari* and later as *vellepii slavnii knjazi*.

²⁷ See SJS, vol. I, p. 136 f., vol. II, p. 94; J. Ferluga, *Byzantium on the Balkans...*, p. 311—319 and index; idem, "Archōn" in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. I, 1970, p. 911; H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski*, vol. III, pp. 474—476. On p. 480 the author does not share A. Presnjakov's skepticism of the value of the treaties as a source of social terminology. However, this terminology cannot be considered in the abstract but is a translation of a well-known and commonly used Greek terminology. See the semantic diversity of the word *archōn* in Constantine Porphyrogenitos, *De administrando imperio*, ed. 1967, in the Index.

²⁸ *Vita Constantini*, ch. 14, ed. P. Lavrov in *Materialy po istorii*

By contrast the Latin sources use terms such as *primates*, *primores*, *comites*, *seniores* when referring to the mighty of Moravia. The semantic freedom in the use of the term *knjaz'*/*knęź* is without doubt derived from an older period, when the title was not reserved exclusively for members of a single hereditary ruling dynasty. As is shown by history of Rogvold, prince of Polock, and by that of Mal, prince of the Drevljane, the clan chieftains of ancient Rus' disappeared together with the independence of their territories, over which the dynasty of Ryurik extended its rule.

The conviction that the princely title was of the highest order and applicable to the sovereign ruler is clearly confirmed in the second "Miscellany" of Svjatoslav, a collection of various texts translated from the Greek and compiled in 1076. The term *ho basileus* is translated here as *cesar'* when it refers to a specified Roman or Byzantine emperor, but as *knjaz'* when referring to a ruler as such. The term *archōn* which appears in the original in the sense of ruler is translated by the more general term *vlastel'*.²⁹ It is characteristic that the Russian translator of Georgios Monachos rendered *archōn* as *knjaz'* when the subject was the Bulgarian ruler, but in other cases, depending on the context, as *boljarin*, *vlastel'* or *starejšina*.³⁰

Summing up, we have established that the text of the treaties provides no grounds for the supposition that the official title "Grand Prince" existed in Rus' in the 10th century, or that a group of nobles close to the Russian ruler—barring his relatives—used the princely title. Clear testimony to the fact that

vozniknovenija drevnejšej slavjanskoj pis'mennosti, Leningrad 1930, p. 26, H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski... [Poland's Beginnings...]*, vol. III, p. 470, views this account as the complete confirmation of his thesis of "the dynastic origin of the magnates". However, he underestimates the literary nature of the work which is closely related to Byzantine hagiography. The absence of ties between the noble families and the Mojmir dynasty, which would give them the right to ascend the throne, has been pertinently underlined in the relevant literature; see T. Wasilewski, *Morawskie państwo [Moravian State]*, in: SSS III, p. 292.

²⁹ See *Izbornik 1076*, Moskva 1965, p. 296/715, 367/776, 335/777, 515, 517, 518/741, 674, 675/816 and Index. The notes refer to both Slavic and Greek text.

³⁰ *Hronika Georgia Amartola*, vol. III, p. 33. Similarly, in an 11th century MS of the homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus *archōn* corresponds to *knjaz'*, *vlastel'*, *boljarin*; see A. Budilovič, *Issledovanie jazyka...*, p. 71. See also SJS, vol. I, p. 136, 199; vol. II, p. 94 ff.

the title "Grand Prince" did not even exist in Byzantium in the middle of the 10th century is given by the Emperor himself who concluded the treaty of 944 with the "great", that is the chief, prince of Rus' Igor' and who received later Igor's widow Olga in his palace on the Bosphorus. When he wanted to emphasize the sovereignty of Olga's power he added *hēgemōn* to her title *archontissa Rhōsias*. Nor can one find any confirmation for the suggestion that the princely titles of the Byzantine-Russian treaties of 911 and 944 is due to the influence of Scandinavian terminology: *yfirkonungr/veliki knjaz'* and *smalkonungr/knjazi* —subordinate princes.³¹

Recourse to the first "Miscellany" of Svjatoslav of 1073, as proof that the ruler of Kiev used the grand princely title in the 11th century is also misguided. In the colophon Svjatoslav is indeed given the title *veliki knjaz'* and *veliki v knjaz'eh knjaz'*; however no one has noted in this connection that the miscellany was translated from the Greek for the Bulgarian ruler (*veliki v cesar'eh*) Symeon (893—927), and that the Russian scribe copied the rhetorically inflated colophon substituting the name of his patron for the name of Bulgarian tsar. Similarly, therefore, the colophon of the Kievan bookman who wrote "this miscellany for the great prince Svjatoslav", should be seen as another specimen of such adaptation, influenced by the panegyric for Symeon.³² The influence of the epithet *megas* in Byzantine encomia to praise the ruler also plays a role here. The term had the same semantic import not only in the Bulgarian but also in

³¹ A. Soloviev, *Byzance...*, No. I, p. 252; No. VIII, p. 148, advanced this hypothesis. In view of the Scandinavian origins of the Russian envoys, he endeavored to show that *rex Russiae* in the Latin sources was inspired by the title *yfirkonungr/veliki knjaz'*. However, in the texts which Soloviev himself produces in his article "Reges" et "Regnum Russiae" (reprinted in his *Byzance...*, No. VIII, pp. 143—173) the title *knjaz'* was the exact equivalent of the Latin *rex*. Perhaps the clearest proof of this is found in Abbot Daniel who addressed Balduin I, King of Jerusalem, as *knjaže moi (my king!)*; see A. Poppe, review of K. Seemann, *Abt Daniil, Wallfahrtsbericht*, in: *Russia Mediaevalis*, vol. II, 1975, p. 172.

³² *Izbornik Svjatoslava 1073 goda. Faksimil'noe izdanie*, Moskva 1983, folium 2v., 263v.; E. F. Karskij, *Slavjanskaja kirillovskaia paleografija*, Moskva 1979 (reprint of the edition of 1928), p. 282. See also B. St. Angelov, *Pohvala carju Simeonu*, in: *Izbornik Svjatoslava 1073 g. Sbornik statej*, Moskva 1977, p. 247 ff.

the old Russian translated literature. The colophon of 1076 miscellany, proves that the epithet was not part of the princely title: the Kievan ruler Svjatoslav is given the simple title *knjaz' rus'sky zemlja*.³³

Not even the text of the Chronicles from the 11th and beginning of the 12th century, contrary to some assertions, furnishes proof that the lord of Kiev used an expanded title: in all three chronicle entries the adjective *veliki* added to the princely title carries a distinctly panegyric characterisation. The entries for 1054, 1093 and 1125 are drawn from the necrologies of the Kievan princes Yaroslav, his son Vsevolod and his grandson Vladimir Monomach. We know of Byzantine examples from the time of the Comneni of the use of *mezas* for a recently deceased ruler.³⁴ To assume however on the basis of the necrology of Yaroslav for the year 1054 that this usage was known on the Bosphorus even earlier would be too risky, since the entire entry for 1054 shows signs of subsequent editing, dating to the end of the 11th century. One must note that this epithet is not used in the necrologies of other Kievan rulers of the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century. From this we may conclude therefore that the Byzantine model was adopted only in the milieu of Vladimir Monomach, no doubt with the intention of emphasizing the special rights of the descendants of Vsevolod to the throne of Kiev. That the title "Grand Prince" was unknown to the ruler of Kiev in the last quarter of the 11th century is proven clearly by the period in which Prince Vsevolod reigned alone (1078—1093). After the death of his brother Izjaslav, Vsevolod ascended the throne of Kiev "having assumed sovereignty over all Rus'" (*priim vlast' rus'skuju vsju*). At that time, resisting the centrifugal tendencies in the land, Vsevolod added the title "Prince of all Rus"/*archōn pasēs Rhōsias* to the legend of his seal to emphasize his sovereign rights.³⁵

³³ *Izbornik 1076*, Moskva 1965, p. 701.

³⁴ See: PSRL I, cols. 161, 215, 293; II, cols. 149, 207, 289. See also S. A. Vysockij, *Drevnerusskie nadpisi Sofii Kievskoj*, Kiev 1966, p. 18 (graffitto No. 4); P. Schreiner, *Zur Bezeichnung "Mezas"*, p. 179.

³⁵ See: A. Soloviev, *Byzance...*, No. V, p. 435 f., V. L. Janin, *Aktovye pečati*, pp. 168—170. See also A. Poppe, *Pieczęć ruska z Kruszwicy [A Russian Seal from Kruszwica]*, "Slavia Antiqua", vol. XXVI, 1979, pp. 121—126.

Even when Vladimir Monomach “took over the rule over all the Russian land” (*preja knjaženie vseja russky zemlja*),³¹ (1113–1125) there is no evidence for the title of “Grand Prince” in Kiev. The best demonstration of this is epistle of the Greek metropolitan of Kiev Nikephoros, in which he addresses the Kievan ruler more than twenty times, comparing his power with that of the emperor, yet calling him simply “my prince” (*knjaže moi*). Not once do we find the word *velikyi* among the *epitheta ornantia* which accompany the title.³⁷

The adjective *velikyi* also appears before the names of deceased princes in expressions equivalent to those containing *mezas* characteristic of a deceased Byzantine emperor. The epithet “the Great” is used to embellish the name of the Baptiser of Rus’, Vladimir, very late and then inconsistently. In the entries in the *Hypatian Chronicle* under the years 1149 and 1229 we read: “Vladimir the Great, who baptised the land of Rus’.” However, in the entries for 1169 and 1173 in the *Hypatian* as well as in the *Laurentian Chronicle* we read: “Vladimir, who baptised the land of Rus’.”³⁸ This panegyric epithet was certainly added to Vladimir’s name as a result of comparing him with Constantine the Great.³⁹ One can not, however, positively determine whether the accompanying epithet *velikyi*, when added to the names of other deceased princes, signifies praise and recognition, or is used in the sense of “former”, “old”, “elder”. In the 12th century this epithet is applied particularly to the descendants of Vladimir Monomach and doubtless served in many cases to

³⁶ *Die altrussischen hagiographischen Erzählungen und liturgischen Dichtungen über die heiligen Boris und Gleb*, (after 1916 edition of D. Abramovič, chosen by L. Müller), München 1967, p. 64.

³⁷ Published in *Russkie dostopamjatnosti*, vol. I, Moskva 1815, pp. 61–75 and by A. Dölker, *Der Fastenbrief des Metropoliten Nikifor an den Fürsten Vladimir Monomach*, Tübingen 1985, pp. 16–73 (with German translation). The Lenten epistle is preserved in three MSS, the oldest being from the end of the 15th century or beginning of the 16th. However, Vladimir is called “Grand Prince” only in the heading, which from the 15th century on was typical of the additions to the titles of rulers of the Kievan era.

³⁸ PSRL I, col. 357; II, cols. 383, 554, 758; cf. col. 821 under the year 1254, where Vladimir is already called *svjatyi*. See also PSRL I, col. 479 under the year 1263.

³⁹ See *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede auf Vladimir den Heiligen*, ed. L. Müller, Wiesbaden 1962, p. 117: *podobniče velikago Konstantina*.

distinguish them from their namesakes who were the chroniclers' contemporaries.⁴⁰ The oldest use of *velikiyi* occurs in the *Primary Chronicle* in the entry for 1030 concerning the death of the Polish prince (*umre Boleslav velikiyi v Lasěh*), and is generally understood to mean "the Great". However this event was recorded in the Kievan Caves Monastery only in the 1070s, when Boleslav's namesake reigned in Poland, and it was a matter of distinguishing the well-known Boleslavs. Consequently the Kievan scribe called the first of them "Boleslav the elder".⁴¹

Princes were also given the epithet *velikiyi* during their lives. When the *Novgorod Chronicle* reports that *Svjatoslav velikiyi Vsevolodič* entered Novgorod in 1180—1181 he uses the epithet to distinguish the eldest prince from other contemporary princes with the same name. Svjatoslav was indeed prince of Kiev from 1176 until 1184 but precisely in the time between September 1180 and the summer of 1181 he was driven from throne by his rival Rurik.⁴² On the other hand the author of the *Lay of the Host of Igor* uses epithet *Velikiyi Svjatoslav* to designate the position of this Kievan senior.⁴³ However, Svjatoslav did not use the title "Grand Prince" as a senior of Kiev. Two isolated exceptions are the traces of a later redaction of the text of the *Kievan Chronicle* by Moisej, abbot of Vydubiči, in 1200. This panegyrist of Rurik, Svjatoslav's successor in Kiev (1194 until 1202 and with interruptions until 1210) very frequently bestowed the grand princely

⁴⁰ This is how one should interpret the references to Mstislav and Yuriy Dolgorukij although gradually the term was linked with their role as the founders of two princely lines, the senior and junior lines of the Monomachoviči. See PSRL II, col. 303 under the year 1140, col. 525 (year 1164) cols. 609, 619, 702 (under the years 1179, 1180, 1197); PSRL I, cols. 379, 406 (under the years 1177, 1188); *Novgorodskaja 'pervaja letopis' staršego i mladšego izvodov*, ed. A. Nasonov, Moskva—Leningrad 1950; (hereafter LN I), p. 37 (year 1182).

⁴¹ PSRL I, col. 149; II, col. 137.

⁴² "Vnide Svjatoslav velikiyi Vsevolodič Novgorodu", L. N. I, p. 36. Several lines above the chronicler distinguishes him as "the grandson of Oleg". It is clear that the compiler of the chronicle copilation, who worked at the beginning of the 13th century, took pains to distinguish between this Svjatoslav and the other Svjatoslav, who was also Vsevolodovič, but the grandson of Yuriy Dolgorukij and who became prince of Novgorod in 1200 (LN, I, p. 44).

⁴³ Cf. A. Poppe, *On the Title of Grand Prince in the Tale of Ihors' Campaign*, in: *Eucharisterion: Essays to Omeļjan Pritsak*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", vol. III—IV, 1979—1980, pp. 684—689.

title upon his protector, even when he wrote about the time when Svjatoslav reigned in Kiev.⁴⁴

The first Russian prince who regularly made use of the grand princely title was Vsevolod, prince of Vladimir-Suzdal', son of Yuriy Dolgorukij, later given the sobriquet "The Big Nest". L. K. Goetz' observation remains to the point, that Vsevolod is the first prince to whom "Grand Prince" is systematically applied during his life as an official title.⁴⁵ To this one must add that the systematic use of the grand princely title is not found from the first years of his rule in Vladimir (1176—1212) but only from the end of the 12th century. Apart from the isolated references from the 1180s, which could be the result of a later reworking of the chronicle, the consistent application of the grand princely title to Vsevolod begins in 1190 and becomes predominant after 1195.⁴⁶ The references to *velikiy Vsevolod*, on the contrary, under the years 1179, 1181, 1186 and 1187 could be interpreted as hints of Vsevolod's preeminence over other princes; but at least in a few cases the chronicler simply wanted to emphasize Vsevolod's age

⁴⁴ See PSRL I, col. 397, under the year 1186; II, col. 651 under the year 1185. A good example of the editorial zeal of the panegyrist of Rurik Rostislavič are the entries under the year 1183 and 1185 in which Rurik is mentioned after the current senior of Kiev but given the title of "Grand Prince": "The Lord God gave victory to the princes of Rus', to Svjatoslav Vsevolodovič and to Grand Prince Rurik Rostislavič". PSRL II, col. 630; see also col. 636.

⁴⁵ L. K. Götzt, *Der Titel Grossfürst...*, p. 59, A similar view was advanced by M. Hrushevsky in 1905, as well as by A. Shakhmatov and M. Prislkov in 1940. For the author of the monograph devoted to Vladimir-Suzdal' principality the grand princely title of Vsevolod is obvious (cf. Ju. Limonov, *Vladimiro-Suzdalskaja Rus'*, p. 106), but the whole issue of adoption of this title by the ruler of Suzdalia does not exist. That this title was still not instituted before 1176 is evident from the Chronicle-records about prince Mihalko (PSRL I, col. 373—379), elder brother and predecessor of Vsevolod. Mihalko is named without title or simply as *knjaz'* and only once it is mentioned that the townspeople at Vladimir were happy to see *velikogo knjazja vseja Rostovskija zemla* (PSRL I, col. 377). Since the second prince after Mihalko in "the whole land of Rostov" (older description of Vladimir-Suzdal' principality) was Vsevolod, it is clear that Mihalko is called here *velikiy knjaz'* in the sense "chief prince".

⁴⁶ See the almost consistent use of the grand princely title in the chronicle of Vladimir-Suzdal' after the year 1196 (PSRL I: col. 412 ff.). This title is also found in the Kievan chronicle but one notes the tendency to call Vsevolod simply "Prince of Suzdal'". In many other references worded in the customary manner the prince is named but not given a title; see PSRL II : 694 ff. Cf. also W. Vodoff, *La titulature...*, p. 23.

vis-à-vis other princes with the same name.⁴⁷ We should consider the appearance of the "Grand Princess" in the chronicles as an important indication of the permanence of the grand princely title among Vsevolod's titles.⁴⁸

The recognition of Vsevolod's grand princely title in other Russian lands must have been met with certain reservations. We can observe in the Kievan Chronicle writing that Vsevolod was inconsistently called "Grand Prince" in the south; the chronicler's reservation reflects the inconstancy of the political influence of the ruler of Suzdal'. Novgorod took an unusual position: local chroniclers clearly avoided calling Vsevolod "Grand Prince", undoubtedly because they rightly assumed that they would not only be recognizing a fact but also Vsevolod's right to suzerainty over the city. The reality of their mutual relations, however, compelled them to be flexible: the Novgorod envoys who arrived in Vladimir in the autumn of 1199 knew full well that they could not permit themselves a breach of protocol and therefore addressed Vsevolod *Ty gospodine knjaže velikyi Vsevolod Gjurgevič*.⁴⁹

The use of the grand princely title by the sovereigns of Kiev has a markedly secondary character and is much more a response to the ambitions of Vladimir on the Kljazma River and an emphasis of the traditional position of Kiev. The title of "Grand Prince" was not the official title of the Kievan ruler Svjatoslav (d. 1194). However the situation changed during the reign of his

⁴⁷ See PSRL II, cols. 658, 659, 613, 624, 653. Only once does the chronicler clearly state that he is referring to Vsevolod as to the elder of the Prince of Pronsk Vsevolod, son of Gleb: *Vsevolod že ide s nimi na svet ko Vsevolodu velikomu Jurgeviču*, PSRL I, col. 402 (under the year 1186).

⁴⁸ See the entries for 1202, 1205, 1206 (PSRL I, cols. 417, 421, 424). The last reference is the necrology. It is not clear whether the title *knjagini velikaja*, applied to Roman's widow, reflects his grand princely title or to her role as regent. See the entries in the chronicle of Halič-Volhynia under the years 1208, 1209, 1213, 1215, (PSRL II, cols. 726, 727, 733—735). Cf. W. Vodoff, *La titulature...*, p. 20, n. 117. It is obvious at any rate that *velikaja* did not denote the "elder princess" or "princes mother" since none of her sons, all of whom were minors, could have been married. An example of *velikaja* used in this sense appears to be the reference under the year 1258 to the widow of Prince Constantine, who died in 1230, as "Grand Princess" See PSRL I: col. 475.

⁴⁹ PSRL I, col. 415; see also LN I, p. 49. Vsevolod is given the title of "Grand Prince" once under the year 1205, but the political change in Novgorod in 1210 was such, that even the death of this influential ruler was not noted. Cf. also W. Vodoff. *La titulature...*, pp. 21, 23.

successor, Ryurik Rostislavič, the nominal sovereign of Kiev, who clearly adapted himself—albeit inconsistently—to the situation created by Vsevolod. Even Roman, the Prince of Halič-Volhynia, who took possession of Kiev shortly before his death in 1205 appears to have acquired the new title.⁵⁰ In the 13th century the rulers of other Russian principalities, but above all the sons and successors of Vsevolod, followed his footsteps.⁵¹

Yet another view is erroneous, namely that, which maintains that the grand princely title was originally used by the ruler of Kiev, and that the rulers of other principalities already assumed the title in the first half of the 12th century. Evidence for this is found in the inscription on a drinking bowl which belonged to Prince Volodimir of Černihov, who was killed in battle in May of 1151: *a se čara knjazja, Volodimirova Davidoviča, a kto iz neš p'et', tomu na zdorov'e a hvalja Boga svoego ospodarja velikogo knazja* ("this is the drinking bowl of Prince Vladimir Davidovič, and this is to the health of him who drinks from it, praising God

⁵⁰ See PSRL II: col. 715 under year 1201 where the grand princely title is linked with the dominion over all of the land of Rus'. However, this entry was made after Roman's death in June of 1205, PSRL II, col. 716 f., 721 (*velikago Romana*), 726. Once again in the Chronicle of Vladimir-Suzdal' we see the clear tendency to ascribe to Roman the recognition of Vsevolod's supremacy, even though the chronicler admits that both of these princes acted in unison to occupy the throne of Kiev in 1202 (PSRL I: col. 418 ff.).

⁵¹ Although the title is not used consistently hereafter, this can be explained by the nature of the chronicle account which has been abridged. On the other hand, the facts of the chronicle should be carefully analyzed, since the author of the study on the grand princely title in Vladimir-Suzdal' in the 13th—14th century devoted most of his attention to the 14th century: see J. P. Arrignon, *Usage et valeur du titre de Grand Prince*, pp. 173—184. One must also take account of the information in western sources. In his chronicle covering the years 1186—1227, written in 1227, Heinrich of Lettland titled the prince of Rus' as *rex* and *rex magnus*. This adjective appears to be less a part of the title than to mean "the elder" or "the late" when applied to the deceased. The terminology used by John de Plano Carpini, *Ystoria Mongalorum*, Florence, 1929 is clearer: once he calls Yaroslav Vsevolodovič, Grand Prince of Vladimir-Suzdal' and Kiev, *magnum ducem Ruscie* (p. 46) but later simply *ducem Ruscie* (pp. 112, 128). He also appears to hint at the grand princely title when he refers to Michael of Černihov as *qui fuit unus de magnis ducibus Ruscie* (p. 38). He calls the ruler of Halič-Volhynia *rex Daniel Ruscie* (p. 128). One must also consider the custom of the Halič-Volhynian chronicle to refer to several of the Polish princes of the 13th century as *veliki knjaz'*, undoubtedly in the sense of "main prince" or "senior"; see PSRL II, cols. 754, 756, 809, 880, 897.

and the lord of the house, the great prince").⁵² The wording of this panegyric inscription is somewhat contradictory: The prince appears at the beginning without an epithet, and at the end with the term *velikiyi*, which can refer to *ospodar* (here in the sense of host, lord of the house) as well as to *knjaz'* and which evidently is used in the sense of "famous, glorious".⁵³

It is tempting to answer the question of what role Byzantine customs played in the origin of the grand princely title in Rus'. The first bearer of the title, who was born in 1154, spent his formative years in Byzantium (1162—1168), where he and his mother, who was probably Greek, had been banished by his older brother Andrej Bogoljubskij. Vsevolod's stay in the empire must have influenced his views on imperial ideology even though the actual idea of expanding the titles of the mightiest prince, must have matured earlier.

It is unfortunate that Byzantine-Russian correspondence of the 11th—12th centuries is no longer extant, since it would permit us to determine whether the imperial chancery continued the 10th century custom of applying the title *megas archōn* to the princes of Rus'. The seals with reading *archōn Rhōsias*, from the 11th and the beginning of the 12th century, including those of the monarchs of Kiev from Yaroslav the Wise to Vladimir Monomach permit us to conclude that the princes of Rus', even when they were confronted with the epithet *megas*, did not take it as a part of their

⁵² V. F. Ržiga, *Očerki iz istorii byta domongolskoj Rusi*, Moskva 1929, pp. 51—53 and 4 photographs of the inscription. B. A. Rybakov, *Russkie datirovannye nadpisi XI—XIV vekov*, Moskva 1964, No. 24, S. 28 f., plate XXIX. Rybakov treats the abbreviation *knja* which appears twice, as a suspension, which permits him to read the first one as (*čaša*) *knja[ža]* and the second as *knja[zja]*. It is to assume, however, that both are a common contraction from genitive of substantive *kn[jaz]ja*.

⁵³ For *ospodar'*—*gospodar*, in the sense of "lord of the house", see *Pravda Russkaja*, vol. II, Moskva—Leningrad 1947, pp. 477 f., 486, 609, I. Sreznevskij, *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka*, vol. I, col. 563; vol. II, col. 735. In view of the subject of the inscription on the drinking bowl, it appears likelier in this case that *velikiyi* belongs with *ospodar'* in the sense of "great host". For the title of ruler *gospodar/gosudar'*, see G. Stoekl, *Die Begriffe*, pp. 114 ff.; W. Vodoff, *La titulature...*, pp. 5—19, 31; to Vodoff's observation we add that this title originated on the beginning of the 14th century in the bilingual chancery of the last prince of Halič (*gospodar' zemli russkoj* as translation of *Dominus terrae Russiae*) and was adopted in turn by rulers of Poland, Lithuania, Moscow and other Russian lands.

stock of titles but considered it to be only an occasional epithet. Otherwise they would have included it in the Greek inscriptions on their seals. Had *megas* belonged to their stock of titles they would have used it in the opening formulae as the issuers of diplomas.⁵⁴

There is one well-known exception to this: the seal with the likeness of the Apostle Andrew and the clearly legible inscription: *Mestisthlabos megas archōn Rhōsias*.⁵⁵ This seal very likely belonged to Mstislav-Andrej, grandson of Igor and great-grandson of Yaroslav the Wise, who is mentioned several times in the *Primary Chronicle* at the turn of the 11th—12th century and who died in 1116. He was probably a prince—*izgoi* (his father is unnamed): that is to say, a prince without land, who was constantly on some campaign. In the year 1100 fate brought him to the coast of the Black Sea, to the Byzantine possessions on the northern coast, or to Tmutorakan'. Other attempts to attribute this seal, which assume that the *megas archōn* could only refer to the ruler of Kiev and which therefore consider other Kievan princes named Mstislav, are difficult to accept for two reasons. Firstly, none of these other princes named Mstislav bore the Christian name Andrew; and secondly, the seal exhibits no features which could permit us to date it later than the second half of the 11th century or the first quarter of the 12th century. In view of these considerations one may suppose that Prince Mstislav-Andrej, a nomadic

⁵⁴ The diploma of "Grand Prince" Izjaslav Mstislavovič recording a gift to the Monastery of St. Panteleimon in Novgorod (PRP, vol. II, Moskva 1953, p. 104) is no exception. The diploma is conventionally dated 1146—1154, precisely because of this title: that is, to the period in which Izjaslav was senior in Kiev. This date was convincingly rejected by V. L. Janin, *Iz istorii zemlevladenija v Novgorode v 12 v.*, in: *Kultura drevnej Rusi, Festschrift for N. N. Voronin*, Moskva 1966, pp. 313—324. Janin proposes that the diploma was written in 1134 and suggests the possibility that the title was modernized by a later copyist (p. 321). Although the date of this otherwise trustworthy diploma remains a moot point, its presence in a copy from end of the 16th century permits us to suppose that we are confronting the tendency, apparent already in the 15th century, to supplement the title of old princes. Confirmation of this is found in the diplomas of Izjaslav's brother Vsevolod, prince of Novgorod from 1125 to 1167. In contrast to the original diploma for the Monastery of St. George from 1130 the two others diplomas in late 16th century copies call Vsevolod "Grand Prince" even though he never ruled in Kiev; see PRP, vol. II, pp. 102 f. Cf. further K. R. Schmidt, *Soziale Terminologie*, p. 442.

⁵⁵ V. Janin, *Aktovye pečati...*, vol. I. No. 31, pp. 20—23, 172.

prince who stood on the lowest rung of the princely dynasty, recommended that the epithet *mezas* with which he had probably been honored in correspondence, be repeated in the inscription of his seal. Vladimir Monomach acted similarly, causing the inscription *sphragis Basileion tou paneigenestatou archontos Rhōsias tou Monomachou* to be engraved on one of his seals.⁵⁶ Regardless of the accuracy of the attribution to the landless Mstislav (once can consider two other princes with the same name: Mstislav Izjaslavič, who died in 1061, and Mstislav Svjato-polkovič who died in 1097, neither of whom ruled in Kiev), it is difficult to have any doubts as to the dating of the seal. This would seem to indicate that the Byzantines tended to add the epithet *mezas* to the Russian princely title, regardless of the political position of the bearer. The Russian princes could have interpreted this epithet in particular as “famous”, “glorious”, “powerful”, since the adjective *velikyj* is used in this sense in contemporary Old Russian literature.⁵⁷

Perhaps the entire matter is much simpler. Possibly *mezas* on the seal should not be linked with the title *archōn* but with the name Mstislav. *Mezas* after the name would be odd in Greek if the inscription were not a translation from the Old Russian: *Mstislav velikyj*. For among the living princes of the same name, Mstislav, the grandson of Igor and the great grandson of Yaroslav the Wise was the elder. Perhaps Mstislav, who was something of an out-cast, used this epithet to compensate for his position. The *Novgorod Chronicle* furnishes a good example of the occasional

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, No. 25, pp. 16, 170.

⁵⁷ See, for example, PSRL I, col. 124: *Volodimir že velikim mužem stvoril togo; velikyj* frequently occurs in the sense of “famous”, “powerful”, “noble” in the *Kievan Caves Patericon*, several times alone in the tale about Moisej. Cf. *Das Patericon des Kiever Höhlenklosters nach der Ausgabe von D. Abramovič*, ed. D. Tschizewskij, *Slavische Propyläen*, vol. II, Munich, 1964, pp. 142—147. See also footnote 22 supra; see PSRL II, col. 807 ff. under the year 1250, which reads: “o zleje zla čest’ tatarskaja: Danilu Romanoviču knjazju byvušu veliku, obladavšu Rus’skoju zemleju... nyne sedit’ na kolenu i holopom nazyvajetsja”. This is not an allusion to the grand princely title; *velik* is used here in the sense of “powerful” or “famous”. About different meanings of *velikyj* see also: V. Peretz, *K izučanju Slova o polku Igoreve*, IV: *Epitety v “Slove” i v ustnoj tradicii*, in: *Izvestija otdelenija ruskogo jazyka i slovesnosti*, vol. XXX, Moskva 1926, pp. 155—158.

emphasis of age-seniority : in the account of the construction of the Church of the Savior at Neredica the donor, who is mentioned frequently, is called *velikiy knjaz' Jaroslav, syn Vladimirov, vnuk Mstislavov* only once. The chronicler clearly intended to distinguish between this Jaroslav, the brother-in-law of Vsevolod, Prince of Suzdal', and Vsevolod's son Jaroslav who was younger and well-known in Novgorod.⁵⁸

In the 14th century the imperial chancery always used the title *rex* or *megas rex* for the ruler of Rus' in its correspondence ; this was equivalent to the title *knjaz'* or *velikiy knjaz'* which was common in Rus'. These latinized titles, applied to the princes of Rus', cannot be traced beyond the second half of the 13th century, and must, therefore, be associated with the experience of the Latin (i.e. Western) domination of Byzantium.

Henceforth the Byzantines took into consideration the previously institutionalized nature of the grand princely office in Rus' and, without sparing other decorative epithets, reserved the epithet *megas* exclusively for the grand princely title.⁵⁹

This information from the 14th century cannot, therefore, be applied retrospectively to the period before the Tatar invasion of Eastern Europe and the Latin conquest of Constantinople. The situation in the second half of the 12th century is nevertheless, somewhat illuminated by the 17th century copy, which contains signs of authenticity, of the old Russian translation of an epistle of the Patriarch Lukas Chrysoberges to the Prince of Vladimir and Suzdal' Andrej Bogoljubsky, from about 1168. The patriarch, restraining the ambitious prince from the idea of founding a new metropolitan bishopric in Vladimir, calls him *preblagorodivyi knjaže (paneugenestate archōn)*, as opposed to the prince of Kiev whom he calls *velikiy knjaz' vseja Rusi (megas archōn pasēs*

⁵⁸ LN I, p. 44 ; see also pp. 35, 37, 51, 53 ff.

⁵⁹ See the extant Greek diplomas from the 14th century in *Pamjatniki drevnego russkogo kanoničeskogo prava*, vol. I, St. Petersburg 1880, Appendix Nos. 3, 20, 21, 28, 29, 40, 41, 46. The Byzantine-Russian term *megas rex/velikiy knjaz'* influenced the *intitulatio* and *inscriptio* in the chancery of the Polish kings ; see, for example, Casimir's diploma from the year 1351 *...velikogo korola krakovskogo i gospodarja ruskoje zemle* and Jagiello's from the year 1388 *velikiy korol polskoi*, see : A. Sobolevskij, S. Ptašycki, *Paleografičeskie snimki s russkih gramot preimuščestvenno XIV v.*, St. Petersburg 1903, Nos. 6, 7, 9, 10, 23.

Rhōsias). The jurisdictional rights of the metropolitan of all Rus' were also emphasized.⁶⁰ The substitution of *pasēs Rhōsias* for the brief *Rhōsias* in the title of the prince and the metropolitan had a specific political implication and expressed not only the position of the patriarch but also the policy of the Empire towards Rus'. It was precisely in the second half of the 12th century that the titles of the metropolitans of Kiev—documented in particular by their seals—accentuated their ecclesiastical sovereignty over all of Rus'. The princely feuds of the 1140s and 1150s, the political and ecclesiastic chaos, clearly underlined the danger that the archdiocese of Rus' would disintegrate, and that the jurisdictional dependence on Constantinople be broken. The Byzantines naturally understood the necessity of repeatedly recognizing and supporting sovereignty of the metropolitan and the prince of Kiev over all of Rus'. This policy did not fully succeed owing to overpowerful centrifugal tendencies. However, its partial success meant the maintenance of the ecclesiastical unity of Rus'—thanks to the support of her clergy—until the end of the 13th century.

The epistle of the Patriarch to the Prince of Vladimir and Suzdal' contains a trace of the Empire's diplomatic initiative at that time. In this context the epithet *megas/velikyj*, combined with an emphatic emphasis of the extent of the Prince of Kiev's dominion, acquired a clearly, political content and was intended to mean that the *megas archōn pasēs Rhōsias* was the chief prince, the foremost ruler of Rus'. This title, whose use was dictated by concern for the centrifugal tendencies in Rus', undoubtedly was constantly used in Byzantine correspondence with Rus' during that period. From here it was only one step to transforming the adjective *velikyj* into a permanent element of the Russian ruler's title. As it turned out it was not the Kievan senior who first adopted this title, but the ruler of the dynamically developing northeastern region of Rus'.⁶¹ The fact that Andrej Bogoljubsky's

⁶⁰ *Pamjatniki* No. 3, cols. 63, 66, 68; cf. with P. Sokolov, *Russkij arhieriej iz Vizantii*, Kiev 1913, (repr. 1971), pp. 98 ff., 136 ff. N. N. Voronin, *Andrej Bogolubski i Luka Hrizoverg*, "Vizantijskij Vremennik", vol. XXI, 1962, pp. 29—50. A thorough study of this epistle is found in L. K. Götze, *Staat und Kirche in Altrussland*, Berlin 1908, pp. 175—195.

⁶¹ See V. A. Kučkin, *Rostovo-suzdal'skaja zemlja v pervoj tret'i XIII v.*, "Istorija SSSR", 1969, No. 3, pp. 76—94. M. Hellmann,

troops conquered and sacked Kiev in March of 1169 and that Andrej placed a man loyal to himself on the throne of Kiev is characteristic of this change. Andrej, who was the brother and predecessor of Vsevolod, had ambitious political plans to "acquire the right of the eldest in Rus' ". However, contrary to the view based on isolated chronicle accounts edited shortly after the prince's death, these plans did not include assuming the grand princely title.⁶² The attempts to reestablish the unity of the lands of Rus' with Kiev at the center failed despite the fact that during the entire second half of the 12th century attempts were made to preserve at least the appearance of unity.

The origin of the grand princely title is not, therefore—contrary to a widely held opinion—to be found in the period in which the Kievan dominion grew, its internal structure strengthened and in which the international position of its ruler was enhanced. From the time that the Kievan state was founded, expanded and grew powerful, to the era when the Kievan monarchy was at its height, that is, from the reign of Vladimir the Great at the end of the 10th century until the era of Vladimir Monomach and his son Mstislav, that is, until 1132, the rulers of Kiev were satisfied with an inalienable hereditary title to which only the members of the ruling dynasty were entitled. It included the concrete and exhaustive notion, established by custom, of sovereign power and therefore did not require any semantic elaboration. The addition of various *epitheta ornantia* could not occur without foreign influence, and when necessary one relied upon precise terms by making use of already developed Byzantine terminology. Con-

Wandlungen in staatlichen Leben Altrussland und Polens während des 12. Jahrhunderts, in: *Vorträge und Forschungen*, vol. XIII, 1968, 279—282. D. Wörn, *Studien zur Herrschaftsideologie des Grossfürsten Vsevolod III Bolšoe Gnezdo von Vladimir (1176—1212)*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Ost-europas", vol. XXVII, 1979, pp. 1—40, with extensive bibliography.

⁶² The term *velikiy knjaz* in the necrology of Andrej Bogoljubskij (see PSRL I col. 367) has another meaning, known at least from the turn of the 11th—12th centuries. That the Byzantine custom was commonly used in Rus' is evident from the Russian chronicles' treatment of the German King Philipp of Swabia, who never formally became emperor. While Philipp was alive the chronicler refers to him as *nemečskim cesarem*, LN I, pp. 46—47. However, after Philipp had died, the chronicler wrote: *Ubien byst' cesar' velikiy Filip Rimskiy* (PSRL II col. 723).

temporary sources call those princes of Kiev who exercised power over all of Rus' "autocrat" and "sole ruler" (*samoderžec, edinoderžec, edinovlastec*). The Russian princes did not aspire to the imperial title even though the thesis that imperial and princely power were equal is found in old Russian literature of the 11th—12th centuries. The view that certain princes assumed the imperial title is the result of an excessively literal interpretation of the sources in which a prince is in fact given the title *cesar'*. These isolated references from the 11th—12th centuries provide, on the contrary, interesting information regarding the literary influence on, and views of the nature of princely power common to court and ecclesiastical circles. By contrast the verb *cesarstvovati*, a translation of *basileyō* was employed to accentuate the sovereign nature of princely power.⁶³

The necessity of expanding the ideological content of the title of the ruler of all Rus', which perhaps first became apparent beyond the borders of Rus'—on the Bosphorus—appeared in the era of the declining authority of the princes of Kiev, of the diffusion of the dynasty, of the growth of centrifugal forces and of the devaluation of the title itself. The title "Grand Prince" could not take on the function of a connecting link for the disintegrating Kievan Rus'. On the contrary, it served those princes who, while solidifying their own principalities, strove to acquire influence on matters of common concern. However, they were not backed by the throne of Kiev but by the "right of the eldest in the land of Rus'". The new title was intended to ensure the lasting nature of their success; even though it was not originally intended for them, it accurately expressed their own aspirations and the position which they had in fact assumed. Therefore, it was not by

⁶³ W. Vodoff proved that this view of the imperial title of the princes of Rus' is untenable. See his *Remarques sur la valeur du terme tsar appliqué aux princes russes avant le milieu du XV^e siècle*, "Oxford Slavonic Papers", N. S., vol. XI, 1978, pp. 1—41; idem, *La titulature...*, pp. 28—30. One should note that the term *car'* derived from *cesar'* is not evident in Rus' before the 13th century. The paleographic reception—a contraction with a superscript letter c(s) and then its omission—certainly contributed to the phonetic transformation. However, for a long time thereafter, translations from Greek rendered *basileus* for *cesar'*. See also G. Stoekl, *Die Begriffe*, pp. 109—111.

chance that it was the ruler of the vigorous state between the Oka and Volga who was first to usurp the title of "Grand Prince". In a period in which the various lands and principalities of Rus' were rapidly growing apart, the spread of the title of "Grand Prince" was only a question of time.⁶⁴

⁶⁴ See in detail W. Vodoff, *La titulature...*, pp. 5—12, 17—19, 21—27, where also the "inflation" of this title specially during the 15 c. is good shown.