



The President and Fellows of Harvard College

The Sack of Kiev of 1169: Its Significance for the Succession to Kievan Rus'

Author(s): JAROSLAW PELENSKI

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 3/4 (December 1987), pp. 303-316

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41036277>

Accessed: 19/10/2014 06:10

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Harvard Ukrainian Studies.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The Sack of Kiev of 1169: Its Significance for the Succession to Kievan Rus'

JAROSLAW PELENSKI

The sack of Kiev of 1169, conducted under the auspices of Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij, has received relatively little attention in historical scholarship. Particularly its significance in the contest for the inheritance of and the succession to Kievan Rus' has remained essentially unexplored. For most Russian historians and those who have followed the tradition of Russian national historiography, it has remained a difficult and inconvenient topic which does not fit into the framework of the Kiev–Suzdal'–Vladimir–Muscovy continuity theory.¹ And even those who, like Myxajlo Hruševs'kyj (1866–1934), for example, vehemently opposed this particular paradigm of Russian national history and countered it with one of their own theories, that is, the Kiev–Galicia–Volhynia–Lithuania–Ruthenia–Ukraine succession theory, and who regarded the Rostov–Suzdal'–Vladimirian area as the embryo of the Russian national state and Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij (1157–1175) as the first truly “Russian” ruler, reconstructed the sack of Kiev of 1169 from the chronicles as primarily a historical event.²

The two crucial accounts (*skazanija*) about the sack of Kiev of 1169 are contained in two principal sources, namely, the Kievan Chronicle (1118–1198 [1200])³ and the Suzdal'–Vladimirian Chronicle(s).⁴ To the best of my knowledge, the two accounts, which can best be described as two narrations about the taking of Kiev, have not been analyzed insofar as their ideological significance for the topic under consideration and for the history of political thought of Old Rus' is concerned. Characterized by a number of factual similarities, the two accounts also contain considerable

¹ For the background on the Kiev–Suzdal'–Vladimir–Muscovy continuity theory, and the literature on the subject, see J. Pelenski, “The Origins of the Official Muscovite Claims to the ‘Kievan Inheritance,’” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* (hereafter *HUS*), 1, no. 1 (1977): 29–52; idem., “The Emergence of the Muscovite Claims to the Byzantine–Kievan ‘Imperial Inheritance,’” *HUS* 7 (1983): 520–31.

² M. Hruševs'kyj, *Istorija Ukrajinj-Rusy*, vol. 2 (1905/1954), pp. 196–97.

³ Concerning the text of the *skazanie* of the Kievan Chronicle, see *Ipat'evskaja Letopis'* published in *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej* (hereafter *PSRL*), 2 (1908/1962), cols. 543–45.

⁴ The text of the *skazanie* of the Suzdal'–Vladimirian Chronicle(s) is contained in the so-called *Suzdal'skaja Letopis'*, *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), cols. 354–55.

political and ideological divergencies. A comparison of the two texts (in my own translation) makes these points apparent.

The Kievan Chronicle

The same winter [1168/9] Andrej sent from Suzdal' against the Kievan Prince Mstislav Izjaslavič his son Mstislav with his host and with the Rostovians, and the Vladimirians, and the Suzdali-ans, and eleven other princes, and Boris Židislavič: Glěb Jur'evič of Perejaslav, Roman of Smolensk, Volodimer Andrejevič of Dorohobuž, Rjurik of Ovruč, David of Vyšhorod, his brother Mstislav, Oleg Svjatoslavič and his brothers Igor', Vsevolod Jur'evič, Mstislav, grandson of Jurij. . .

In the year [1169], the brothers gathered in Vyšhorod, and, having arrived [in the vicinity of Kiev], they encamped on Dorohožyči at the foot [of the monastery] of Saint Cyril on the first Sunday of Lent, and beginning with the same week of Lent, besieged the entire borough of Kiev at the time when Mstislav fortified himself in Kiev, and they fought for the city. And everywhere the battle was fierce. And when in the city Mstislav was losing strength the Berendeis and the Torks deceived him. And when the city was besieged for three days, the retinues of all the princes came down [by way of] the Serxovycja, and [the Berendeis and the Torks] attacked Mstislav from the rear, beginning to shoot arrows from bows. Then Mstislav's retinue began to tell him: "What are you waiting for, Prince? Abandon the city. We shall not be able to overcome them." And God helped Mstislav Andrejevič and his brothers, and they took Kiev. And Mstislav Izjaslavič fled from Kiev toward Vasyliv. And the [pursuing] Bastej's tribe caught up with him, and began to shoot [arrows] in his back, and took captive many of his retinue. And they captured Dmytr Xorobryj,

The Suzdal' -Vladimirian Chronicle(s)

The same winter [1168/9] Prince Andrej sent from Suzdal' against the Kievan Prince Mstislav his son Mstislav with the Rostovians and the Vladimirians, and the Suzdali-ans, and eleven other princes: Glěb of Perejaslav, Roman of Smolensk, David of Vyšhorod, Volodimer Andrejevič, Dmitr, and Jurij, Mstislav and Rjurik with his brother Igor'. Mstislav Izjaslavič fortified himself in Kiev and fought hard for the city. And they besieged the city for three days. And God and the Holy Mother of God, and his father's and grandfather's prayers helped Prince Mstislav Andrejevič. And with his brothers he took Kiev, which has never happened before. And Mstislav Izjaslavič, together with his brother and a small retinue, fled to Volodymyr[-Volyns'kyj]. And they captured the prince's wife and his son, and his retinue. And for three days they plundered the entire city of Kiev with churches and monasteries. And they seized icons and books and chasubles. And that happened because of their sins, and, moreover, because of the unlawfulness of the Metropolitan, who at that time interdicted Polikarp, the Abbot of the Monastery of the Caves, on account of our Lord's holy days. He forbade him to eat either butter or milk on the holy days of our Lord, falling on Wednesdays and Fridays. And Antonios, the Bishop of Černihiv, stood by the [Metropolitan] and repeatedly prohibited the Prince of Černihiv to eat meats on the holy days of our Lord. But Prince Svjatoslav, ill-disposed to him, removed him from the bishopric. So, we must note, everyone of us, that no one may oppose God's law. Now let us return to the

Oleksa Dvorskyj, Sbyslav Žyrosłavič, Ivanko Tvorimirič and Rod, his steward, and many others, while [Mstislav] and his brother Jaroslav joined together beyond the Unova and both went to Volodymyr[-Volyns'kyj]. And so Kiev was taken on March the 8th [12th] in the second week of Lent, on Wednesday. And for two days they plundered the entire city, both the *Podol* and the Hill, and the monasteries, and the [churches of] St. Sophia and the Mother of God, [namely] the Tithe [Church]. And mercy came from nowhere to no one, while the churches were burning and the Christians were being killed, the others being bound, the women being taken into captivity, separated by force from their husbands. The children were crying, seeing their mothers being taken away. And a multitude of property was taken, and churches were stripped of icons, and of books, and of chasubles, and all [church] bells were taken away by the Smoleniens, Suzdaliens, and Černihovians, and Oleg's retinue. And all the shrines were taken. And the Monastery of the Caves of the Holy Mother of God was set on fire by the heathens, but was saved by God from such disaster, because of the prayers of the Blessed Mother of God. And moaning and suffering, and unconsolated sorrow, and unending tears befell all the people of Kiev. And all this happened because of our sins.

The beginnings of the princely rule of Glěb in Kiev

Mstislav Andrejevič installed his uncle Glěb on the throne in Kiev on March the 8th [12th]. Glěb gave Perejaslav to his son Volodimer, and Mstislav Andrejevič went to Suzdal' to his father Andrej with great honor and fame.

aforesaid. Mstislav Andrejevič installed his uncle Glěb in Kiev, and returned to Volodymyr[-Volyns'kyj], together with his retinue. In the year 1169, Mstislav Andrejevič installed his uncle Glěb in Kiev, and he himself returned to Vladimir. And Glěb gave Perejaslav to his son.

The two accounts display similarities in providing factual descriptions of the military campaign undertaken at the order of Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljub-skij against Kiev and its lawful ruler, Prince Mstislav Izjaslavič. They both talk of the forces involved in the campaign, mentioning the names of most of the eleven princes participating in it, of some aspects of the battle for the city of Kiev, of its conquest, of the capture of Mstislav Izjaslavič's wife and his son, of the sack of the city itself and its plundering, specifically of churches and monasteries, and of the removal of icons, books and chasubles, and, finally, of the installation of Glěb in Kiev by Mstislav Andrejevič, who himself returned to Vladimir in the North.

Of the two accounts, the *skazanie* of the Kievan Chronicle is much more elaborate and detailed in describing the facts surrounding the battle for Kiev and its ultimate sack. For example, its author/editor provided the exact date (Wednesday, March the 8th [12th]) for the sack of Kiev, specifically named the plundered churches (St. Sophia and the Tithe Church), and mentioned the fact that the Monastery of the Caves was spared. He also designated the lands from which the perpetrators of the sack came (Smolensk, Suzdal', and Černihiv), mentioned the taking of the shrines, and reported on the "deceitful" role and performance of the steppe peoples (the Berendeis and the Torks) in the Kievan campaign. The account in the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) simply omitted all references to the steppe peoples.

The ideological differences between the two accounts are striking. The author/editor of the Kievan account clearly identified with the city of Kiev, the fate of its inhabitants, and with their suffering. As far as the ideological explanation of the sack is concerned, he, in accordance with the Christian tradition, accepted the sack of Kiev as a just punishment inflicted upon its people for unspecified transgressions (*grex radi našix*). This explanation is reinforced in the Kievan account by the device of lamentation, artfully and appropriately couched in biblical terms. In this context, the notion of the throne of Kiev is also utilized in the Kievan version, whereas it is excluded from the Suzdal'-Vladimirian account. There is only one reference in the account of the Kievan Chronicle that deviates from its general line of interpretation empathetic to Kiev and its ruling dynasty of Mstislaviči, namely, that Mstislav Andrejevič returned to Suzdal' and to his father Andrej Jur'evič "with great honor and fame."

The Suzdal'-Vladimirian account, on the other hand, treats Kiev as a hostile entity which is deservedly sacked and punished for the sins of its inhabitants. At the same time, its author/editor remarked that the sack of Kiev was an event that had never occurred before (*egože ne bylo nikogdaže*). The author's expression of amazement at the sack of Kiev is articulated even more emphatically in another Suzdal'-Vladimirian

skazanie, namely, the account about the sack of Kiev of 1203, undertaken by other Rus' princes at the instigation of Vsevolod (III) Jur'evič (1176–1212). There the relevant phrase reads: *i sotvorišja veliko zlo v russtej zemli jakogo že zla ne bylo ot kreščenja nad Kievom* (and a great evil befell the Rus' land, such as has not been since the baptism of Kiev).⁵ This revealing reference to the time of the baptism of Kiev in connection with the sack of 1203 could have been made to minimize the impact of the commentary on the sack of Kiev of 1169. The most important justification for the sack of Kiev of 1169 in the Suzdal'-Vladimirian account, however, is offered in conjunction with the controversy over fasting on major holy days of the Lord. By blending the materials about the controversy and the interdiction of Polikarp, the Abbot of the Monastery of the Caves, by the Metropolitan of Kiev Constantine, the author/editor of the Suzdal'-Vladimirian account succeeded in advancing an interpretation which fitted well into the framework of Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij's political and ideological design. In fact, the information on the controversy in the Suzdal'-Vladimirian *skazanie* could have been only a projection of an earlier controversy concerning fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays whenever these days coincided with the major holy days of the Lord, which is attested as having taken place in Suzdal' in 1164.⁶ The Suzdal'-Vladimirian account, which was designed to substantiate the position of the Suzdal'-Vladimirian branch of the dynasty in the struggle for control over Kiev, displays an obvious anti-Kievan bias.

The differences between the two accounts reflect the divergencies between the two sources in which they were incorporated, that is, the Kievan Chronicle and the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s). For the history of Kievan Rus' in the period from 1118 to 1198 (1200), that is, the period encompassing the sack of Kiev of 1169 and the time of Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij's policies vis-à-vis Kiev, the Kievan Chronicle, which constitutes the second major component of the Hypatian Chronicle (columns 284–715 of vol. 2 of *PSRL*—a total of 431 columns), is in both quantitative and qualitative terms superior to the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s)—the second major component of the Laurentian Chronicle. However, contrary to the well-researched Primary Chronicle, for example, which constitutes the first major component of both the Laurentian and Hypatian Chronicles, and which amounts to 283 columns in each of the printed editions and embraces the period from the year 852 to 1110 (a total of 258 years), the Kievan Chronicle, amounting to 431 columns (a content

⁵ *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), col. 418.

⁶ *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), cols. 351–52; *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), cols. 520–21.

ratio of 60 to 40 percent) and covering a period of about 80 years (a chronology ratio of approximately 20 to 80 percent), has received inadequate scholarly attention.⁷ It deserves to be noted here, that a text of the Kievan Chronicle, prepared and translated into English over a prolonged period of time by the late Tatjana Čyževska, will soon be published.⁸ Whereas some of the components of the Kievan Chronicle have been identified by scholars over the last 120 years, many important problems of its difficult and complex text remain unresolved. Like any other chronicle or codex of this magnitude, the Kievan Chronicle provides, in addition to factual historical material, a multitude of source materials with diverse political and ideological orientations. Its principal ideological tenets with respect to Kievan Rus' are the following:

1. The capital city of Kiev, the Kievan land, and what we perceive as "Kievan Rus'"⁹ are at the center of attention.

2. The authors/editors were committed to the conception of the preeminence of Kiev in Old Rus', regardless that various branches and sub-branches of the dynasty were competing for the succession to the Kievan throne.

3. They adhered to the notion of continuity from the origins of Rus' to the post-Monomax Rus'.

4. They advocated a concept ideologists have defined as the unity of the Rus' lands. This attitude explains their selective, but nonetheless all-embracing incorporation and integration into the Kievan Chronicle of materials from various parts of Old Rus', which at times were even in conflict with and hostile to the concept of the unity of Rus' lands under Kiev.

5. The concepts of the historical continuity of Kievan Rus' and the inheritance of and succession to that entity were so evidently perpetuated by the authors/editors of the Hypatian Chronicle in its third major component—the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle—that at least one historian

⁷ For a concise description of the Hypatian Chronicle, especially its component the Kievan Chronicle, and selected literature on the subject, see O. P. Lixačeva, "Letopis' Ipat'evskaja" in "Issledovatel'skie materialy dlja 'Slovarja knižnikov i knižnosti drevnej Rusi (Drevnerusskie letopisi i xroniki)," *Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* (hereafter *TODRL*), 39 (1985): 123–28.

⁸ Information by courtesy of Professor Omeljan Pritsak and Dr. Paul A. Hollingsworth. Another English translation of the Kievan Chronicle has been provided by Lisa Lynn Heinrich in her unpublished doctoral dissertation, "The Kievan Chronicle: A Translation and Commentary" (Vanderbilt University, 1977).

⁹ The concept "Kievan Rus'" was not used literally in contemporary Old Rus' sources. It has been applied by scholars to denote the period of Old Rus' history in the age of Kiev's preeminence.

has hypothesized that the Kievan Chronicle (the second major component of the Hypatian Chronicle) was continued to the year 1238 and that its last part (embracing the years 1200–1238) was integrated into the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle.¹⁰ Even if one questions this hypothesis, there is no doubt that the main objective of the authors/editors of the Hypatian Chronicle was to present a very complete account of Kievan Rus' history, embracing a period of approximately eighty years (1118–1198 [1200]), and to emphasize their concept of historical and political continuity from Kievan to Galician Rus', as evidenced by their prefacing the entire Hypatian Chronicle with a special "Introduction," which deserves to be quoted here in full:

These are the names of the Kievan princes who ruled in Kiev until the conquest of Batu who was in [the state of] paganism: The first to rule in Kiev were co-princes Dir and Askold. After [them followed] Oleg. And following Oleg [came] Igor'. And following Igor' [came] Svjatoslav. And after Svjatoslav [came] Jaropolk. And following Jaropolk [came] Volodimer who ruled in Kiev and who enlightened the Rus' land with the holy baptism. And following Volodimer, Svjatopolk began to rule. And after Svjatopolk [came] Jaroslav. And following Jaroslav [came] Izjaslav. And Izjaslav [was succeeded] by Svjatopolk. And following Svjatopolk [came] Vsevolod. And after him [followed] Volodimer Monomax. And following him [came] Mstislav. And after Mstislav [followed] Jaropolk. And following Jaropolk [came] Vsevolod. And after him [followed] Izjaslav. And following Izjaslav [came] Rostislav. And he [was followed] by Mstislav. And following him [came] Glëb. And he was [followed] by Volodimer. And following him [came] Roman. And after Roman [followed] Svjatoslav. And following him [came] Rjurik. And after Rjurik [followed] Roman. And after Roman [came] Mstislav. And after him [followed] Jaroslav. And following Jaroslav [came] Volodimer Rjurikovyč. Danylo installed him in his own place in Kiev. Following Volodimer, [when Kiev was governed by] Danylo's governor Dmytro, Batu conquered Kiev.¹¹

The Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s), which constitutes the second major component of the Laurentian Chronicle (columns 289–437 of vol. 1 of *PSRL*), deals with a period of approximately 100 years, that is, from 1111 to 1212. It therefore covers twenty more years of history than the Kievan Chronicle (a ratio of 55 to 45 percent), but occupies a total of only 148 printed columns,¹² in comparison with 431 printed columns of the Kievan Chronicle (a content ratio of about 26 to 74 percent). Whereas the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) has received considerable coverage in

¹⁰ V. T. Pašuto, *Očerki po istorii galicko-volynskoj Rusi* (Moscow, 1950), pp. 21–67.

¹¹ *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), cols. 1–2.

¹² Concerning a discussion of the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s), and the literature on the subject, consult Ju. A. Limonov, *Letopisanie Vladimiro-Suzdal'skoj Rusi* (Leningrad, 1967) and Ja. S. Lur'e, "Letopis' Lavrent'evskaja" in "Issledovatel'skie materialy," *TODRL* 39 (1985): 128–31.

historical literature, the relationship between the various original chronicles and codices that have been integrated in its text has not been clearly established. The same can be said about the relevant material (up to the year 1203) in the Radziwiłł Chronicle and the (Suzdal'-)Perejaslav Chronicle (or the Chronicle of the Russian Tsars), the text of which for the years 1138–1214 coincides with that for the same period of the Radziwiłł Chronicle.¹³ In particular, the interconnection between the hypothetical Chronicles of Jurij Dolgorukij and Andrej Bogoljubskij, as well as the hypothetical Vladimirian Codices of 1177 (1178 [?]) and 1189, which presumably were used by the authors/editors of both the Laurentian and Hypatian Chronicles, and the hypothetical Chronicle of 1212 have not been sufficiently investigated.¹⁴

The political and ideological orientation of the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) with regard to the problem of the Kievan inheritance or succession (as reflected in the text of the Laurentian Chronicle) is as follows:

1. The capital city of Kiev, the Kievan land, and "Kievan Rus'" are treated from the Suzdal'-Vladimirian perspective.

2. The authors/editors devoted relatively limited space to the discussion of the protracted struggle for Kiev in 1146–1162, particularly the one conducted by Jurij Dolgorukij until 1157 for the Kievan throne and supremacy over Rus' from Kiev.¹⁵

3. They advocated the preeminence of the Rostov-Suzdalian branch of the dynasty over other branches of the dynasty and of the northern centers over the city of Kiev and the Kievan coreland.

4. They advanced justifications for downgrading and even outrightly subordinating Kiev to Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma.

5. They promulgated policies and ideological justifications beneficial to the Rostov-Suzdalian branch of the dynasty and disadvantageous to Kievan interests.

In order to better understand the historical context in which the sack of Kiev of 1169 took place and its significance for the contest for the inheritance of and the succession to Kievan Rus', one has to look at the policies

¹³ For a brief description of the Radziwiłł Chronicle, and the relevant literature, see Ja. S. Lur'e, "Letopis' Radzivilovskaja" in "Issledovatel'skie materialy," *TODRL* 39 (1985): 141–43. A short bibliographical note on the "Letopisec Perejaslavlja Suzdal'skogo" was provided by O. V. Tvorogov, *ibid.*, p. 110.

¹⁴ A convenient summary of the discussion of these interconnections, and especially two useful schemata of these hypothetical codices and chronicles, on the basis of research conducted until the mid-1960s, has been provided by Limonov, *Letopisanie*.

¹⁵ The discussion of that contest for succession is limited in the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) to 40 columns (cols. 312–51 in *PSRL*, 1 [1926/1962]).

and some relevant ideological undertakings sponsored by Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij and his protagonists with regard to Kiev prior to the sack and following it.

I. Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij's initial involvement in Kievan affairs dates back to the years 1149–1155. During that time he appeared in Kiev in connection with Jurij Dolgorukij's quest for the Kievan throne and its takeover, following the defeat of Izjaslav Mstislavič of Volhynia in 1149.¹⁶ He participated in the successful battle of Luck, but, apparently unenthusiastic about the continued military campaign, he attempted to mediate a truce between Jurij and Izjaslav.¹⁷ According to the Suzdal'-Vladimirian version, Andrej intended to return to the Suzdal' land in 1151, but his father evidently "detained him for a while."¹⁸ This is one of the rare instances in the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) where Andrej Jur'evič is criticized. Apparently he had participated in his father's Kievan campaign of 1154–1155,¹⁹ and, following Jurij's takeover of Kiev, received Vyšhorod in 1155.²⁰ This placed him in line for the Kievan succession.²¹ However, uninterested in making use of that opportunity, he left Vyšhorod for the Suzdal' land.²² By making that decision, "he had abandoned sacred tradition. Never before had the promise of inheritance of the Kievan throne been so unequivocally rejected."²³

Andrej's break with the Kievan tradition is highlighted in the accounts of the two chronicles. They blend the information about his departure from the Kiev area with a brief *skazanie* about the prince's removal of the Icon of the Blessed Mother of God from Vyšhorod, an icon which was to make an extraordinary ideological career in Russian history as the famous Icon of Our Lady of Vladimir.²⁴ A comparison of the relevant accounts in the two chronicles will reveal different approaches of their authors/editors:

¹⁶ *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), cols. 323–26; *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), cols. 386–92. For the most recent treatment of Andrej Bogoljubskij's career, and the relevant literature, see E. S. Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij: The Man and the Myth* (Florence, 1980).

¹⁷ *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), col. 329; *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), cols. 404–405.

¹⁸ *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), col. 335.

¹⁹ Indirectly *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), col. 480.

²⁰ *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), col. 478.

²¹ Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij*, p. 12.

²² *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), col. 482.

²³ Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij*, p. 12.

²⁴ For the recent treatments of the icon's career, and the relevant literature, see N. N. Voronin, "Iz istorii russko-vizantijskoj cerkovnoj bor'by XII v.," *Vizantijskij vremennik* (hereafter *VV*), 26 (1965): 190–218; D. B. Miller, "Legends of the Icon of Our Lady of Vladimir: A Study of the Development of Muscovite National Consciousness," *Speculum* 43, 4 (1968): 657–70; Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij*, pp. 54–59.

The Kievan Chronicle

The same year [1155] Prince Andrej went from his father from Vyšhorod to Suzdal' *without his father's permission* [my italics—J.P.] and *he took* from Vyšhorod the Icon of the Blessed Mother of God which was brought from Cesarjagrad on the same ship with the Pirogošča [icon]. And he had it framed in thirty-grivny-weight-of-gold, besides silver, and precious stones, and large pearls, and having thus adorned [the icon], he placed it in his own church of the Mother of God in Vladimir.²⁵

The Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s)

The same year [1155] Prince Andrej went from his father to Suzdal', and he brought with him the Icon of the Blessed Mother of God which was brought from Cesarjagrad on the same ship with the Pirogošča [icon]. And he had it framed in thirty-grivny-weight-of-gold, besides silver, and precious stones, and large pearls, and having thus adorned [the icon], he placed it in his own church in Vladimir.²⁶

The two accounts are similar, except for several, crucially important differences in wording. According to the Kievan Chronicle, Andrej Jur'evič Bogoljubskij acted improperly and even unlawfully, by leaving Vyšhorod without his father's permission and by taking with him the icon of the Blessed Mother of God. The authors/editors of the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s), on the other hand, omitted the phrase "without his father's permission" and eliminated mention of Vyšhorod, the original domicile of the icon in Rus'. The authors/editors of some sixteenth-century Muscovite chronicles were even more uninhibited, as far as the elimination of Vyšhorod and the Kievan land, that is, the original Rus' domicile of the icon, from their accounts was concerned: they simply stated that "the pious prince Andrej Bogoljubskij brought from Constantinople the miraculous icon, the image of the Blessed Mother of God."²⁷ A comparison of the relevant accounts supports the conclusion that the removal of the icon from Vyšhorod was viewed from the Kievan perspective as a hostile and even illegal act, and from the Suzdal'-Vladimirian and later Muscovite perspective as an act of breaking away from Kiev and not of succeeding to it.

II. Once he departed from the Kievan area, Andrej Jur'evič embarked on the policy of creating a strong patrimonial territorial state in the principality of Rostov-Suzdal' and of elevating Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma as its princi-

²⁵ *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), col. 482.

²⁶ *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), col. 346.

²⁷ See the Voskresensk Chronicle (*PSRL*, 8, p. 254) and the Second Sofija Chronicle (*PSRL*, 6, p. 254). Cf. also I. U. Budovnic, *Obščestvenno-političeskaja mysl' drevnej Rusi (XI–XIV vv.)* (Moscow, 1960), p. 242, fn. 25. Another tradition in sixteenth-century Muscovite political thought, which placed great emphasis on the Kievan domicile of the icon, was represented by the *Pověst'* included in the *Kniga stepennaja* (*PSRL*, 21, 2 [1913/1970]), pp. 424–40.

pal center and that of the entire Rus'. That policy extended from 1157, when Andrej Jur'evič was installed in Rostov and Suzdal', to 1167, when he became involved in the contest for Kiev. During that period Andrej Jur'evič's interests in and activities vis-à-vis Kiev were limited, and from 1161 to 1167 he practically did not interfere into Kievan affairs.²⁸ He did, however, conduct during 1157–1169 ecclesiastical policies aimed at establishing direct princely control over the see of Rostov, at separating it from the jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Kiev, and at creating a new metropolitan see of Vladimir, completely independent of Kiev and subordinated directly to the Patriarchate of Constantinople.²⁹

Andrej Bogoljubskij's ecclesiastical policies have been analyzed in scholarship primarily from the Vladimirian and Byzantine perspectives.³⁰ They have received limited attention insofar as their significance for the inheritance of and succession to Kiev is concerned. As is well known, Andrej Jur'evič's attempts to create the metropolitan see of Vladimir in direct opposition to the Kievan metropolitanate was firmly rejected by the Byzantine patriarch Lukas Chrysoberges in about 1168 and resulted in Andrej's major political defeat.³¹ It can be concluded, therefore, that if he wanted to continue his quest for supremacy over all Rus', Andrej faced two options: (1) to perpetuate the political tradition to rule Kiev and Rus' from Kiev, as did his father Jurij Dolgorukij, among others; or (2) to destroy Kiev as the center of power and prestige in Rus', and to subordinate it as a dependency in his new system of Rus' lands, ruled from Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma. The campaign of 1168, the sack of Kiev of 1169, and the installation of Glěb in Kiev attest to his choice of option two.

III. By sacking Kiev in 1169 and installing his brother as prince in the city, Andrej Jur'evič succeeded, at least for a brief time (less than two years), in bringing option two to realization. However, he was unable to keep Kiev in a subordinate position following Glěb's death in 1171. A coalition of

²⁸ Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij*, p. 16.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

³⁰ For the four related treatments, and the literature on the subject, see N. N. Voronin, "Andrej Bogoljubskij i Luka Xrizoverg: Iz istorii russko-vizantijskix otnošenij XII v.," *VV* 21 (1962): 29–50; I. Ševčenko, "Russo-Byzantine Relations after the Eleventh Century," *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies*, ed. J. M. Hussey, D. Obolensky, S. Runciman (London, 1967), pp. 93–104; W. Vodoff, "Un 'parti theocratique' dans la Russie du XII^e siècle," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 17, 3 (1974): 193–215; Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij*, pp. 23–36.

³¹ Concerning the Russian translation of Lukas Chrysoberges's letter to Andrej Bogoljubskij, see *Russkaja Istoričeskaja Biblioteka*, 6 (2nd ed., 1908), cols. 63–68. The Nikon Chronicle's "additions" (cols. 68–76) must be treated with caution, because they are representative of sixteenth-century Russian political thought.

Rostislaviči of Smolensk and Mstislav of Volhynia opposed Andrej's plans for Kiev and his candidate to rule in Kiev, Mixail Jur'evič. Andrej, on his part, began, as in 1168, to organize a coalition of princes to settle the contest for Kiev. The Olgoviči of Černihiv temporarily sided with him. By 1173, he again managed to assemble a major army with 20 princes which, according to the apparently inflated information of the Kievan Chronicle, amounted to 50,000 men.³² The huge army conducted operations in Southern Rus' and the Kievan area, but was decisively defeated by the Volhynian-Smolensk coalition. The Kievan Chronicle commented that the "entire force of Prince Andrej of Suzdal", which had assembled from all the lands and which amounted to a countless multitude of warriors, arrived haughtily and departed humbly."³³ Thus, Andrej's second attempt at conquering Kiev had failed. However, that defeat did not quell his efforts to take Kiev, because he again made plans to impose his control over that city. Only Andrej's death on 29 June 1175, at the hands of his political opponents, saved Kiev from his further destructive designs.

IV. A discussion of Andrej Bogoljubskij's attitudes toward Kiev would be incomplete without mention of the *Povest' ob ubienii Andreja Bogoljub-skogo*, a narration written by his protagonists following his death. The *Povest'* can best be described as a eulogy and a political-ideological treatise glorifying Bogoljubskij and his achievements. Paradoxically enough, its most extensive version was included in the Kievan Chronicle, which, with a few minor exceptions, was critical of and even hostile to him.³⁴ The author(s) of the *Povest'* juxtaposed Kiev to Vladimir, Vyšhorod to Bogoljubovo ("and as far as Vyšhorod was from Kiev, so far was Bogoljubovo from Vladimir"), the Golden Gates of one capital city to the other, the martyrdom of Andrej to that of Saints Boris and Glěb; they also glorified Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma. Their purpose was obvious: besides glorifying Bogoljubskij, they intended to enhance the image of Vladimir-on-the-Kljaz'ma at the expense of Kiev, by elevating its status at least to that of the latter capital. Why, then, was this *Povest'*, so favorably predisposed to Bogoljubskij and his political designs, included in the Kievan Chronicle? The editors of the latter apparently incorporated it because it had relevance to Kievan history. Evidently their general attitude was to integrate in the

³² *PSRL* 2 (1908/1962), col. 573.

³³ *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), cols. 577–78.

³⁴ For the text of the extensive *Povest'*, see *PSRL*, 2 (1908/1962), cols. 580–95 (nearly 15 columns). The text of the short version, included in the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) (*PSRL*, 1 [1926/1962], cols. 367–69), amounts to one and a half columns, therefore a ratio of nearly 10 to 1.

chronicle all the Kiev-related material, regardless of its contents. It follows that the editors of the Kievan Chronicle, similarly to those of the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle, did not hesitate to accept the entire Kievan inheritance, because they considered themselves to be its rightful heirs, whereas the editors of the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) used materials selectively and adapted them to their political and ideological needs.

Russian historiography is characterized by two contradictory approaches in the evaluation of Andrej Bogoljubskij's reign and his policies vis-à-vis Kiev. On the one hand, Russian historians have tended to view Bogoljubskij's policies toward Kiev as a break with the history of Old Rus', and his reign and endeavors in Rostov-Suzdal' and his capital city of Vladimir as the beginning of a new period in Russian history that laid foundations for the establishment of a national centralized Russian state in the Muscovite age. (A. E. Presnjakov and N. N. Voronin modified somewhat the thesis concerning the innovative and "proto-Muscovite" nature of Bogoljubskij's reign and policies.) At the same time, Russian historiography, with the exception of Presnjakov and a few of his followers, has continued to adhere to the late medieval/early modern theory of continuity from Kiev through Rostov-Suzdal'-Vladimir to Muscovy, developed by Muscovite chroniclers, bookmen, and ideologists in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, even though this theory has been qualified by the thesis concerning the feudal fragmentation of Old Rus'. The sack of Kiev of 1169 and the policies of Andrej Bogoljubskij vis-à-vis Kiev serve as primary evidence against the Muscovite Russian continuity theory.

1. The sack of Kiev of 1169 was a logical outcome of Andrej Bogoljubskij's Kievan policies, aimed not at the "neutralization" of the ancient capital of Old Rus', but at its subordination to Vladimir. The fundamental differences between Bogoljubskij's attitudes with respect to the contest for the Kievan succession and those entertained by other competitors, as well as those displayed by his father Jurij Dolgorukij, were manifested in his decisions (a) not to personally take charge of the military campaigns designed to take over Kiev, (b) to sponsor the sack of Kiev of 1169, an unprecedented act of violence against the mother of the Rus' cities, (c) not to be installed on the Kievan throne, (d) to attempt to establish a separate metropolitan see in Vladimir, in opposition to the metropolitan see of Kiev, (e) to advance claims to reign over all Rus' from Vladimir.

2. The sack of Kiev of 1169 fundamentally changed the perception of Kiev and the Old Rus' polity in the minds of the Rostov-Suzdalian and later Vladimirian branch of the dynasty, as well as of other branches of the dynasty and their elites. This perception was at first characterized by a dichotomy of approaches, that is, (a) to tentatively retain lineal dynastic

connection and selective identification with Kiev, on the one hand, and (b) to downgrade its status and subordinate it completely to Vladimir, on the other. This dual approach to Kiev is reflected in the political programs advanced by Vsevolod (III) Jur'evič, Jaroslav Vsevolodovič, and Aleksandr Jaroslavič Nevskij, who, independently or with the help of Mongol-Tatars, attempted to obtain the title of Kiev. Aleksandr Nevskij, for example, is credited by the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s) with having succeeded in obtaining from the Mongols "Kiev and the whole land of Rus'."³⁵ However, the lineal dynastic connection to Kiev was simply eliminated in the *Vita* of Aleksandr Nevskij, written from a devotional point of view. It provides a dynastic lineage reaching back only to Nevskij's father Jaroslav Vsevolodovič and his grandfather Vsevolod (III) Jur'evič, both of Suzdal'-Vladimir, and extolls the image of the Suzdal' land, but it refrains from mentioning Kiev and the land of Rus', thus breaking the link with the Kievan tradition.³⁶

3. The sack of Kiev of 1169, the ensuing policies of the Rostov-Suzdal'-Vladimirian branch of the dynasty toward Kiev, and the evolution of its ideological programs undermine the validity of the theory of continuity from Kiev through Rostov-Suzdal'-Vladimir to Muscovy. They show that from 1155/1157 the Suzdal'-Vladimirian branch of the dynasty and the influential elements of northeastern Rus' aimed first at breaking away from Kiev, then at subordinating it to Vladimir, and, finally, at eradicating it from historical memory.

University of Iowa

³⁵ *PSRL*, 1 (1926/1962), col. 472.

³⁶ Concerning the most recent critical edition of the *Žitie Aleksandra Nevskogo*, see Ju. K. Begunov, *Pamjatnik russskoj literatury XIII veka: "Slovo o pogibeli russskoj zemli"* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1965), pp. 159–80, especially pp. 159, 165, 178.