

Latin Christians in the Literary
Landscape of Early Rus, c. 988–1330

Catherine Philippa Sykes

Newnham College, University of Cambridge

October 2017

This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Name:

Catherine Sykes

Title:

Latin Christians in the Literary Landscape of Early Rus, c. 988–1330

Summary:

In the wake of the recent wave of interest in the ties between Early Rus and the Latin world, this dissertation investigates conceptions and depictions of Latin Christians in Early Rusian texts. Unlike previous smaller-scale studies, the present study takes into consideration all indigenous Early Rusian narrative sources which make reference to Latins or the Latin world. Its contribution is twofold. Firstly, it overturns the still prevalent assumption that Early Rusian writers tended to portray Latins as religious Others. There was certainly a place in Early Rusian writing for religious polemic against the Latin faith, but as I show, this place was very restricted. Secondly, having established the considerable diversity and complexity of rhetorical approaches to Latins, this study analyses and explains rhetorical patterns in Early Rusian portrayals of Latins and Latin Christendom. Scholars have tended to interpret these patterns as primarily influenced by extra-textual factors (most often, a text's time of composition). This study, however, establishes that textual factors—specifically genre and theme—are the best predictors of a text's portrayal of Latins, and explains the appearance and evolution of particular generic and thematic representations. It also demonstrates that a text's place of composition tends to have a greater influence on its depictions of Latins than its time of composition. Through close engagement with the subtleties and ambiguities of Early Rusian depictions of Latins, this study furthers contemporary debate on questions of narrative, identity and difference in Rus and the medieval world.

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution.

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Simon Franklin, for his unfailing insight, generosity and interest in my work.

Thanks are also due to my family and friends, especially to Anne Sykes for proofreading; to David Turner for his support; and to my fellow Cambridge graduate medievalists for their companionship.

Finally, I would like to thank the Centre for East European Language-Based Area Studies (CEELBAS) for generously funding my doctoral research.

Contents

Note on Transliteration and Orthography	1
Introduction.....	2
<i>Rus, Latins and the ‘confessional border’</i>	3
<i>Interpreting texts and contexts</i>	9
<i>Who are the Latins?</i>	13
<i>The scope of the thesis.....</i>	17
Time.....	17
Place.....	19
Texts	19
Themes.....	21
<i>Outline of the thesis.....</i>	22
Chapter One: The Place of Anti-Latin Polemic in the Writing of Early Rus.....	25
<i>Sources.....</i>	27
Lists and epistles.....	28
Erotapokriseis	29
<i>Byzantine polemic or Rusian polemic? The problem of authorship.....</i>	30
<i>Adapting anti-Latin lists, epistles and erotapokriseis in Rus</i>	35
<i>The relevance of polemic in Rus.....</i>	41
Why did polemic circulate in Rus? Some previous arguments.....	41
Canon law: Defining orthodoxy.....	43
Polemic beyond lists, epistles and erotapokriseis?.....	45
<i>Polemic and orthodoxy: Credo, nego.....</i>	48
Chapter Two: Conceptualising Latins in the Chronicles of Early Rus.....	53
<i>The chronicles of Early Rus</i>	54
The Laurentian, Hypatian and Novgorod First chronicles	55
<i>Polemic against Latins?</i>	58
<i>Unspeakable Latins?</i>	60
<i>Latins as pagans?.....</i>	63
<i>Manipulating Latin similarity and difference.....</i>	66
Latin religious ambiguity.....	66
Ethnic and political difference	70
<i>Latins as Other: The Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii.....</i>	72
Chapter Three: Genre and Theme in Early Rusian Depictions of Latins	77
<i>Locating Latins.....</i>	77
Latins in the liturgy, hagiography and sermons: A conspicuous absence	78
<i>The Patericon: The Caves Monastery in the Christian world.....</i>	80
The tale of Shimon.....	81
Religious difference in paterica	83
<i>Travel narratives: Structural and personal conceptions of Latins.....</i>	89
<i>Hagio-biographies: Latins and princely panegyric</i>	95

Chapter Four: Evolving Representations? Chronological Variation in Early Rusian Depictions of Latins	99
<i>The Schism and its aftermath</i>	100
The eleventh century	100
The twelfth century	101
<i>The thirteenth century: A century of hostility?</i>	102
Anti-Latin polemic	104
The Sack of Constantinople	107
The Baltic crusades	109
<i>The fourteenth century: Closing the literary borders</i>	111
Chapter Five: Regional Conceptions of Latins and the Latin World in Early Rus.....	114
<i>Regionality</i>	115
<i>Latins: Part of the fabric of Rusian society?</i>	118
Vladimir-Suzdal	118
Novgorod	120
Kiev	123
Galicia-Volynia	125
<i>Rus and the Latin world: Isolation or collaboration?</i>	127
Churches and their construction	128
Rusian princes and the Pope	132
<i>The borders of Rus</i>	136
The northern border	137
The southern border	139
Conclusion	143
Appendix One: Anti-Latin Polemical Sources	147
Appendix Two: Anti-Latin Polemical Accusations	152
Appendix Three: Latins in the Chronicles of Early Rus	158
<i>Novgorod First Chronicle</i>	159
<i>PVL (Povest vremennykh let, Primary Chronicle), Laurentian Codex</i>	165
<i>Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle</i>	168
<i>Kiev chronicle</i>	170
<i>Galician-Volynian chronicle</i>	174
Bibliography	185

Note on Transliteration and Orthography

In line with MHRA guidelines, I use the modified Library of Congress system for transliteration from Cyrillic. However, I make two exceptions for transliterated words in the main body of the text: I do not employ the apostrophe denoting palatalisation of the previous consonant in the modern East Slavonic languages (hence Rus not Rus'), and neither do I use the apostrophe or double apostrophe representing the Old Slavonic ultra-short vowels (hence *latinin* not *latinin''*, etc.).

Slavonic proper names are transliterated according to the modified Library of Congress system, hence Feodosii not Theodosius, etc. Non-Slavonic names of people active in Rus are given in their Slavonic forms, hence Metropolitan Nikifor not Nikephoros, etc. Otherwise, I use the form given in the Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium (for Greek names) or Oxford Dictionary of the Middle Ages (for other names).

I preserve the orthography of editions of Old Slavonic texts, but bring down all superscript letters and strip all diacritics except the titlo.

Introduction

On the morning of the 16th of July 1054, just before the Divine Liturgy began, papal legates marched into Constantinople's St. Sophia and placed a bull on the holy table. This bull excommunicated the Patriarch of Constantinople and his ecclesiastical associates, accusing them of disseminating heresy. Eight days later, on the 24th of July, the Patriarch retaliated by burning the bull and anathematising its authors.¹ This event, known retrospectively as the 'Great Schism', was neither the trigger for nor the culmination of the process by which the branches of the Church centred in Rome and Constantinople grew apart. Linguistic and customary divisions within the Church had arisen almost simultaneously with the Church itself, and differences of theology and liturgical practice between Rome and Constantinople had been a subject of debate since at least the eighth century.² Nevertheless, the Schism was a milestone in this slow and uneven process of estrangement.

Rus had officially converted to Christianity some 66 years earlier, under the auspices of Byzantium. After 1054, polemic directed against the so-called 'Latins' began to circulate in Rus. When an Early Rusian chronicler, probably working in the late eleventh or early twelfth century, described the instruction Vladimir received on his conversion in 988, he did not fail to note that the teachings of the Latins were 'corrupt' and to be avoided.³ Yet the political, economic, cultural and indeed religious ties between Rus and the Latin lands were many and strong. Contemporary scholarship continues to uncover ever more evidence for these ties, from marriages, political alliances and burgeoning trade links to shared saints' cults, liturgical practices and ecclesiastical structures. Unlike many of its neighbours, Rus may have officially accepted Christianity from Constantinople rather than Rome, but even after the conversion, it looked to the Latin world as well as to Byzantium.

This thesis examines how Early Rusian writers navigated this situation. Many scholars have held the opinion that Rusian writers tended to be hostile to Latins. After all, Rusian writers were generally ecclesiastics, and ecclesiastics surely knew that Latins were not entirely orthodox Christians. One of the aims of the present study is to challenge this characterisation of Early Rusian writing as generally anti-Latin. Moves have already been made in this direction, but discussions of depictions of the Latin faith and Latins still tend to be based on selective observations drawn from just a handful of Early Rusian texts. Nor have scholars attempted to understand the underlying principles governing what

¹ Andrew Louth, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681–1071* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007), pp. 309–10.

² Tia M. Kolbaba, *Inventing Latin Heretics: Byzantines and the Filioque in the Ninth Century* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2008), pp. 52–53.

³ *Lavrent'evskaia letopis' i suzdal'skaia letopis' po akademicheskomu spisku*, ed. by E.F. Karskii, *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, 1 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury, 1962), col. 114. Henceforth PSRL 1.

seems to be wild variation in portrayals of Latins—as unclean heretics, noble brothers in the faith, or simply as familiar faces around Rusian towns. The question this study asks of Early Rusian texts is therefore: where, when, how and why are Latins depicted as different from, or similar to, Orthodox Rus?

Rus, Latins and the ‘confessional border’

The myth that the events of 1054 triggered an immediate breakdown of relations between the Latin ‘West’ and the Orthodox ‘East’ has been thoroughly debunked. Scholars have rightly criticised it as over-simplistic and anachronistic, relying on dichotomies which the eleventh-century participants in the ‘Great Schism’ would not have recognised.⁴ Yet this myth continues to cast a shadow over scholarship on Rusian relations with, and attitudes to, Latins. In his introduction to the proceedings of a conference on the subject of ‘Rus and the West’, V.M. Kirillin states what some might consider a self-evident fact: ‘From the time of the Great Schism of 1054, Rus’s confessional stance on the West was consistently negative, and what’s more, it was tending to become more negative still.’⁵ Thomas S. Noonan had argued the same some twenty years earlier in a still influential article: ‘Ever since the schism between the Eastern and Western churches in 1054, the Russian church adopted an increasingly antagonistic attitude towards the Catholic West.’⁶

More often, the assumption of generalised anti-Latin hostility in the ecclesiastical culture of Rus remains unspoken. It lurks in the background of scholarship on Rus, the self-evident (yet unproven) rule against which so-called exceptions are measured. Take, for instance, work on the relations between Rusian princes and the Pope in the thirteenth century. For Günther Stökl, the chronicle account of the negotiations between Danilo of Galicia and the Pope s.a. 1255 is ‘astoundingly free of confessional resentment’;⁷ M.Iu. Liustrov suggests that it was Aleksandr Nevskii’s apparently hostile rejection of the Pope at around the same time that was ‘usual and traditional’ in Rusian culture, not

⁴ Recent restatements of this position are found in e.g. Louth, *Greek East*, p. 316; Roger Haight, *Christian Community in History: Volume One: Historical Ecclesiology* (New York: Continuum, 2004), pp. 289–90.

⁵ ‘на Руси [...] конфессиональное отношение к Западу от времени Великого Разделения 1054 г. было последовательно негативным и вместе с тем меняющим в сторону усиления негатива.’ V.M. Kirillin, ‘K chitateliam’, in *Drevniaia Rus’ i Zapad: Nauchnaia konferentsiia: Kniga reziume*, ed. by V.M. Kirillin (Moscow: Nasledie, 1996), pp. 6–8 (pp. 7–8).

⁶ Thomas S. Noonan, ‘Medieval Russia, the Mongols, and the West: Novgorod’s Relations with the Baltic, 1100–1350’, *Mediaeval Studies*, 37 (1975), 316–39 (pp. 319–20).

⁷ ‘Sie ist erstaunlich frei von konfessionellen Ressentiments.’ Günther Stökl, *Das Bild des Abendlandes in den altrussischen Chroniken* (Köln: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1965), p. 28.

Danilo of Galicia's willingness to negotiate.⁸ Anti-Latin sentiment is taken to be the 'traditional' norm in Early Rus, rendering accounts of close bonds and political ties between Rus and Latins exceptional.

This trend continues in A.S. Demin's recent work on representations of 'western peoples' in eleventh- and twelfth-century Russian texts, particularly the *Povest vremennykh let* ('Tale of the Years of Time', one of the two extant chronicles covering the earliest period of Russian history; henceforth PVL).

Demin makes it quite clear that, in his opinion, all 'foreigners' in Early Russian sources are Other.⁹ Russian sources are therefore largely uninterested in Latin affairs, and chroniclers' accounts of Latins are characterised by 'covert feelings of scepticism and disapproval'.¹⁰ Demin is right to remind us that Latin doings were not always of great concern to chroniclers, but his insistence on Latin Otherness is misleading. It obliges him to somehow explain away the many positive portrayals of Latins in eleventh- and twelfth-century texts. The chronicler apparently praises the Crusaders as martyrs only because the Crusaders, as Christians, are at least slightly superior to their 'Hagarene' enemies;¹¹ the hegumen and traveller Daniil depicts Baldwin, the Crusader king of Jerusalem, positively and as a pious man of the Church only because Daniil himself is a pious churchman of a relentlessly sunny disposition.¹² Like many scholars, Demin takes anti-Latin hostility as the rule in Early Russian culture.

This approach sits uneasily with the recent wave of scholarship on the manifold ties between Early Rus and the Latin world. Recognition of these ties is not novel, but new work continues to reveal the extent of their strength and profundity. Studies such as Christian Raffenberger's *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World* have insisted on Rus's full participation in the political, economic and cultural life of what would become Europe.¹³ Most importantly for the purposes of this study, there is also no shortage of evidence for ecclesiastical and literary exchange between Rus and the Latin world. Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon saints found their way into Russian texts; eleventh- and twelfth-century Russian menologia contain Latin feast-days not recognised in Byzantium; and the development of certain saints' cults in Rus seems to be connected to the propagation of the same cults

⁸ M.Iu. Liustrov, 'Evropa i evropeitsy v Galitsko-Volynskoi letopisi', in *Drevnerusskaia literatura: Tema Zapada v XIII–XV vv. i povestvovatel'noe tvorchestvo*, ed. by O.V. Gladkova (Moscow: Azbukovnik, 2002), pp. 9–25 (p. 16).

⁹ 'иноземцы — это «не свои».' A.S. Demin, *Poetika drevnerusskoi literatury (XI–XIII vv.)* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 2009), p. 286.

¹⁰ 'Иностранцы [...] вызывали у летописцев скрытые скептические и осудительные чувства.' Demin, *Poetika*, p. 286.

¹¹ Demin, *Poetika*, pp. 265–66.

¹² Demin, *Poetika*, p. 264.

¹³ Christian Raffenberger, *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012).

in the Latin world.¹⁴ Baptismal practices, liturgical formulae and trends in sacred architecture crossed the so-called confessional border.¹⁵ The chronicles of Rus have their closest parallels in the Anglo-Saxon chronicles; hagiography could draw on Latin models; and there are significant similarities between Russian and Germanic law codes.¹⁶ According to the current state of the scholarship, then, contact and exchange between Rus and the Latin world seems to have taken place in all spheres of life—and yet anti-Latin hostility (or at least textual expressions of such hostility) was widespread.

The most prevalent explanation for this gap between reality and representation has the virtue of simplicity: it insists that the ecclesiastics who were responsible for the composition of Russian texts tended to be hostile or disdainful towards the spiritually corrupt Latins, while the laypeople had no such scruples (and little or no hand in composing texts). The written and ecclesiastical culture of Rus was therefore anti-Latin, but close cooperation with Latins was perfectly acceptable for princes, merchants and the rest of the laity.¹⁷ E.A. Melnikova puts this argument particularly clearly when

¹⁴ John H. Lind, 'The Martyria of Odense and a Twelfth-Century Russian Prayer: The Question of Bohemian Influence on Russian Religious Literature', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 68 (1990), 1–21; O.V. Loseva, 'Prazdniki zapadnogo proiskhozhdeniia v russkikh i iuznoslavianskikh mesiatseslovakh XI–XIV vv.', in *Slavianskii mir mezhdurimom i Konstantinopolem: Khristianstvo v stranakh Tsentral'noi, Vostochnoi i Iugo-Vostochnoi Evropy v epokhu rannego srednevekov'ia*, ed. by B.N. Floria (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 2000), pp. 73–79; Ildar H. Garipzanov, 'Novgorod and the Veneration of Saints in Eleventh-Century Rus': A Comparative View', in *Saints and their Lives on the Periphery: Veneration of Saints in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe (c. 1000–1200)*, ed. by Haki Antonsson and Ildar H. Garipzanov (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), pp. 115–45.

¹⁵ Ildar H. Garipzanov, 'Wandering Clerics and Mixed Rituals in the Early Christian North, c. 1000–1150', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 63 (2012), 1–17; L. Müller, 'Eine westliche liturgische Formel in Ilarions Lobpreis auf Vladimir den Heiligen', *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves*, 18 (1966), 299–305; Alexandr Musin, 'Two Churches or Two Traditions: Common Traits and Peculiarities in Northern and Russian Christianity Before and After 1054 through the Archaeological Evidence: A View from the East', in *Rom und Byzanz im Norden: Mission und Glaubenswechsel im Ostseeraum während des 8.–14. Jahrhunderts*, ed. by Michael Müller-Wille, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997), II, 275–95.

¹⁶ T.V. Gimon, *Istoriopisanie rannesrednevekovoi Anglii i Drevnei Rusi: Sravnitel'noe issledovanie* (Moscow: Universitet Dmitriia Pozharskogo, 2012); Norman W. Ingham, 'Czech Hagiography in Kiev: The Prisoner Miracles of Boris and Gleb', *Die Welt der Slaven*, 10 (1965), 166–82; Ferdinand Feldbrugge, *Law in Medieval Russia, Law in Eastern Europe*, 59 (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2009), pp. 53–57.

¹⁷ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 8; E.A. Mel'nikova, *Drevniaia Rus' v svete zarubezhnykh istochnikov* (Moscow: Logos, 1999), pp. 260–62; Jukka Korpela, *Prince, Saint and Apostle: Prince Vladimir Svjatoslavič of Kiev, His Posthumous Life, and the Religious Legitimization of the Russian Great Power* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001), p. 121; Vladimir Vodoff, *Naissance de la chrétienté russe: La conversion du prince Vladimir de Kiev (988) et ses conséquences (XIe–XIIIe siècles)* (Paris: Fayard, 1988), pp. 310–15.

accounting for chroniclers' seeming unwillingness to discuss the ties between Latins and Rus: 'Old Russian princes were in extremely close contact with Catholic countries (Poland, Germany, Hungary, Czechia, the Scandinavian kingdoms, France). The church disapproved, and as we know, chronicle-writing—indeed all writing—was essentially in the hands of ecclesiastics.'¹⁸

This study questions the idea that texts composed by ecclesiastics either shy away from discussing Latins or else berate them as impious. There was certainly a place in Russian literary culture for the expression of anti-Latin sentiment, as I argue in Chapter One, but it was a very restricted place, at least in the Early Russian period. Scholars such as Melnikova and Raffensperger portray Russian narrative texts as frustratingly silent about or dismissive of Latins in order to motivate their own, very fruitful, work on alternative sources for Russian culture and history—but the picture they paint is misleading. Russian texts have plenty to say on the subject of Latins, even if they do not always say what contemporary historians wish to hear. What's more, their portrayals of Latins are extremely varied, but not consistently along some (problematic) 'ecclesiastical–lay' axis, with more 'ecclesiastical' texts portraying Latins as heretics while texts more concerned with princely culture portray them as partners and good Christians.

The fact that Latins are not consistently portrayed negatively in Russian writing is no revelation in itself, although it has not yet received the degree of consideration it merits. Serhii Plokyh, Andreas Kappeler and B.N. Floria all remind their readers that Latins were not the principal religious or cultural Other in Rus:¹⁹ an observation which might seem obvious—many of Rus's neighbours were pagan—but which has been disputed. (Noonan, for instance, baldly states that only Russians, not Latins, are considered Christians, and implies that Latins were seen as no less 'pagan' and 'godless' than the Cumans or Lithuanians.²⁰) Vladimir Vodoff has explicitly pointed to the currency of notions

¹⁸ 'Древнерусские князья находились в теснейших связях с католическими странами (Польшей, Германией, Венгрией, Чехией, скандинавскими королевствами, Францией). Церковь смотрела на них с неодобрением, а ведь летописание, да и вся письменность, в сущности находились в руках духовенства.' Mel'nikova, *Drevniaia Rus'*, p. 260.

¹⁹ Serhii Plokyh, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 63; Andreas Kappeler, 'Ethische Abgrenzung: Bemerkungen zur Ostslavischen Terminologie des Mittelalters', in *Geschichte Altrusslands in der Begriffswelt ihrer Quellen: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Günther Stökl*, ed. by Uwe Halbach, Hans Hecker, and Andreas Kappeler (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1986), pp. 124–38 (p. 135); B.N. Floria, *U istokov religioznogo raskola slavianskogo mira (XIII vek)* (Saint Petersburg: Aleteia, 2004), p. 200.

²⁰ Noonan, 'Medieval Russia', pp. 332, 333.

of ecumenism in Early Rus, reminding us that Rus and Latins could be portrayed as part of one Christian world.²¹

Most recently, Anti Selart has published a thorough study of relations between Rus and Livonia in the thirteenth century, in which he finds little evidence for ‘ideological antagonism between the Eastern and Western world’. Selart’s focus is on political relationships between Russian and Livonian groups in the Baltic, but his conclusions are also based on analysis of texts, which offer little proof of ‘intense rivalry between the Catholic and Orthodox churches [...] said to manifest itself in political developments or even the language found in the sources’.²² Floria too finds no indication that most Early Russian writers felt the Latin world to be a unified and hostile entity. He provides numerous examples of positive representations of Latins in Russian chronicles, repeatedly noting that local political struggles such as Aleksandr Nevskii’s conflicts in the Baltic tended not to provoke the expression of religious hostility towards Latins.²³

That these arguments can coexist with quite opposite analyses, in which anti-Latin hostility is widespread in Early Russian texts and attitudes, suggests a great deal of variation in Early Russian representations of Latins. Indeed, tracts warning Orthodox Rus not to eat out of the same vessel a Latin has used for fear of pollution circulated along with texts portraying Latins as brothers in the faith; the PVL highlights the corruption of the Latin faith yet includes passages in which Latins have the moral upper hand. It is this variation which has given rise to such disparate scholarly assessments, and which prompts the principal question posed by this thesis: why are Early Russian depictions of Latins so varied, and is there order in the seeming chaos? If a ‘sense of religious affinity and commonality’ reigned between Rus and Latins, why was anti-Latin polemic copied, reworked and perhaps composed in Rus?²⁴ Conversely, if hostility towards Latins was dominant within Russian culture, why are a majority of Early Russian references to Latins neutral or positive in tone?

Previous attempts to answer these questions have been largely unconvincing. In an article on the ‘image of Western Christianity’ in Rus, Michele Colucci expresses surprise at the coexistence of violently anti-Latin texts alongside texts which uncomplicatedly portray Rus and Latins as part of a single Christian community. Attempting to understand this situation, he simply restates the problem, arguing that Rus was ‘quite capable of shaping her own particular ideological stance that allowed for

²¹ Vladimir Vodoff, ‘Aspects et limites de la notion d’universalité dans l’ecclésiologie de la Russie ancienne’, in *Il battesimo delle Terre russe: Bilancio di un millenio*, ed. by Sante Graciotti (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1991), pp. 143–65.

²² Anti Selart, *Livonia, Rus’ and the Baltic Crusades in the Thirteenth Century*, trans. by Fiona Robb (Leiden: Brill, 2015), pp. 12, 27.

²³ Floria, *U istokov*, pp. 130–31, 199–207.

²⁴ Plokhy, *The Origins*, p. 63.

a variation in trends and allowed, at times, for a significant degree of openness'.²⁵ This is perfectly true and entirely unsurprising: we are, after all, dealing with half a millennium of cultural history, so 'variation in trends' is to be expected. But what, if anything, governed this variation? Why was Rus 'open' to Latins in some circumstances and some texts, but not in others?

Selart similarly suggests that 'attitudes [to Latins] depended very much on individual circumstances: there were no rigid ideological positions'.²⁶ Unlike Colucci, who admits that his article is only an overview of the topic, Selart's monograph provides many examples of individuals and individual texts either insisting upon or (more often) ignoring the so-called confessional frontier between Rus and Livonia. However, Selart's focus on local groups in one small area of Rus and the Baltic inevitably means that broader trends are outside of his purview. In general, a narrow focus on individuals and individual circumstances can obscure broader patterns in attitudes and representations. While studies focused on individual personalities or texts are eminently revealing and necessary, they are complemented by studies which make connections between the ideological positions adopted in particular texts.

Many scholars understand historical events, particularly political and ecclesiastical conflicts, to be one of the principal factors determining Russian attitudes to and portrayals of Latins at any given moment. Numerous studies suggest that particular events (the Schism itself, the sack of Constantinople, the Union of Lyons, etc.) triggered increased anti-Latin feeling in Rus.²⁷ The idea that historical events, particularly conflicts, could harden public opinion and produce outpourings of anti-Latin sentiment is perfectly reasonable. However, not only is 'public opinion' extremely difficult to reconstruct, it is often hard to discern a mechanistic cause-and-effect at play in responses to historical events: as this thesis will demonstrate, conflicts often seem to fail to trigger hostile responses. Aside from historical events, the other two factors believed to be particularly significant in determining attitudes to Latins and their faith are time and place: anti-Latin hostility is said to have increased over time and, depending on which study one is reading, to have been either more or less prominent in the west of Rus, where contact with Latins was more common.²⁸ These factors are not insignificant, and I return to them in Chapters Four and Five.

What all of these explanations for variation have in common is their insistence on *extra-textual* factors (change over time, regional specificities, conflicts, individual circumstances and opinions) as the

²⁵ Michele Colucci, 'The Image of Western Christianity in the Culture of Kievan Rus', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12–13 (1988–89), 576–86 (p. 586).

²⁶ Selart, *Livonia*, p. 22.

²⁷ See Chapter Four for more details and references.

²⁸ For an example of the former contention, see Stökl, *Das Bild*, p. 25; for the latter, see Liustrov, 'Evropa'.

principal factors dictating a variation which reveals itself to us largely *textually*. This approach is not inherently flawed: texts certainly can be shaped by the historical context for their creation and transmission, and can reflect attitudes current at their time of composition and circulation (although this is hard to prove, as we have no access to ‘attitudes’ independently from texts). However, this thesis contends that there is a factor governing Early Rusian depictions of Latins that is just as significant as historical or sociocultural context, and yet almost entirely overlooked. It is the internal dynamics of a text—the kind of narrative structure it imposes on its subject matter, often determined by its theme or genre—that play the most significant role in determining its treatment of Latins.

Unlike many historians, Selart does at least gesture towards the importance of considering the rhetorical features and narrative structure of a text when analysing its representation of Latins. According to Selart, there were two traditions of writing about Latins, a ‘judgemental literary tradition’ and an ‘everyday’ tradition ‘in which religious differences are not prominent’.²⁹ This statement raises more questions than it answers. Which texts take the ‘literary’ approach and which the ‘everyday’ approach? Are the two ‘traditions’ always distinct, or can they coexist in a single text? How did these ‘traditions’ develop, how do they evolve over time, and how do they function within Rusian writing and culture? Clearly, there is more at issue here than a simple divide between two distinct types of writing about Latins. This study takes up the issue of ‘traditions’ of writing about Latins in Early Rus, examining inter- and intra-textual patterns in depictions of the Latins and their faith across a broad spectrum of Early Rusian sources.

Interpreting texts and contexts

My focus in this study is therefore on narrative: on the meaningful stories that Early Rusian texts tell about Latins, and on the narrative frameworks and generic expectations which influence the nature of these stories. However, I do not read Early Rusian texts simply as free-floating ‘stories’, in isolation from their literary, cultural and social contexts. In this respect, I follow Gabrielle M. Spiegel and her concept of the ‘social logic of the text’.³⁰ Spiegel defines the ‘social logic of the text’ as ‘a term and concept that seeks to combine in a single but complex framework a protocol for the analysis of a text’s social site—its location within an embedded social environment of which it is a product and in which it acts as agent—and its own discursive character as “logos”, that is, as itself a literary artifact composed of language and thus demanding literary (formal) analysis.’³¹ The concept of the ‘social

²⁹ Selart, *Livonia*, p. 34.

³⁰ Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), pp. 3–28.

³¹ Spiegel, *The Past*, p. xviii.

logic of the text' is attractive because it stresses the importance of taking texts on their own terms, not simply as reflections of the extra-textual, but does not deny the influence of the extra-textual on the nature and circulation of texts.

Recent years have seen an increasing interest in narratives and the contexts for their creation and transmission, both among medievalists such as Spiegel and among medieval Slavists specifically.³² T.L. Vilkul's 2009 monograph on princes and their subjects in Early Rusian chronicles is enriched by a chapter on the 'narrative modelling' of accounts of interactions between princes and the people.³³ Alexander Pereswetoff-Morath's study of the anti-Jewish literature of Rus evinces a similar interest in narrative, although his approach is not identical to Spiegel's or Vilkul's. Pereswetoff-Morath's work warns against the facile reading of sociocultural 'attitudes' out of texts without proper consideration of the generic and rhetorical aspects of the texts themselves. Rusian anti-Jewish polemic, he argues, does not reflect the reality of Jewish life in Rus or the attitudes of Rusian Christians to Jews. Anti-Jewish polemic does not necessarily have 'an origin extraneous to the texts', but is a 'traditional or exegetical topos'; that certain homilies, for instance, traditionally included denunciations of Jews does not mean that anti-Jewish feeling was rife in Rus.³⁴

My own approach has something in common with Pereswetoff-Morath's in its focus on the internal workings of texts. However, I feel that in the case of Latins, extra-textual factors influencing textual representations must also be considered. A focus on texts—the meanings they create, their rhetorical approaches and their links to other texts—is not in itself sufficient to explain representations of Latins. Of course, Latins often have a symbolic function in Rusian writing, as do Pereswetoff-Morath's Jews. However, to a much greater extent than Jews, Latins are also an everyday presence in Rusian writing. They are fellow rulers, allies or enemies, churchmen and monks, merchants and architects. There was more or less contact between Rus and Latins at different periods and in different regions. A thorough analysis of a text's depiction of Latins will therefore consider the external circumstances of the text's composition (principally time and place of composition) alongside its inner workings and intertextual relationships: its 'social logic', to use Spiegel's term.

³² For discussion of these developments, see the introduction to *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Ross Balzaretti and Elizabeth M. Tyler, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 16 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006).

³³ T.L. Vilkul, *Liudi i kniaz' v drevnerusskikh letopisiakh serediny XI–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Kvadriga, 2009), pp. 113–225.

³⁴ Alexander Pereswetoff-Morath, *A Grin Without a Cat, 1: 'Adversus Iudaeos' Texts in the Literature of Medieval Russia (988–1504)*, Lund Slavonic Monographs, 4 (Lund: Lund University Press, 2002), pp. 28–29.

In analysing representations of Latins, I therefore consider factors both internal and external to the source texts, attempting to determine which of these factors have the most influence on depictions of Latins within Russian narratives. I focus on three principal factors:

1. Genre and theme. What kind of influence do particular genres or themes exert on a text's depiction of Latins? What are the features of particular generic or thematic depictions of Latins, and how can they be explained?
2. Time of composition. Do representations of Latins become more hostile over time? What evidence is there that particular noteworthy events (e.g. the Schism of 1054 itself, or the capture of Constantinople by the Franks in 1204) had a negative effect on representations?
3. Place of composition. Do portrayals of Latins vary by region? Are Latins and the Latin world depicted more or less frequently, or in different ways, in different regions of Rus?

The bulk of this thesis (Chapters One to Three) is devoted to the first (and most often overlooked) of these factors, considering the effect of the intra- and inter-textual workings of texts on their representations of Latins. Chapters Four and Five deal with the influence of the second and third factors, which have to do with the external context for the production of texts.

This dual focus on the internal workings of narratives and on the external contexts for their creation inevitably gives rise to the question of the link between the two. If narratives are an attempt to create meaning out of history, and to impose a moral framework upon it,³⁵ what might the kind of meaning and moral structure imposed tell us about the self-understanding of the individuals or communities which impose them? This is a fraught question. Even at the level of individual texts and their composers, there is no transparent link between a text's pronouncements and the convictions of its composer: literary conventions influence the expression of thought in writing. The bulk of this thesis explores the conventions which shaped written depictions of Latins in Rus. Yet it acknowledges that behind these conventions are people, their convictions and their identities, even if we see them only through the distorting prism of narrative.

The 2011 multi-author volume edited by Ildar Garipzanov was conceived as a discussion of similar issues of narrative and identity (particularly religious identity) in the medieval Slavonic and Scandinavian lands. Laying out his conception of the interplay between historical narratives and identity, Garipzanov suggests that 'Christian rituals and written and liturgical discourses were directed towards defining and redefining in-group Christian identification and its juxtaposition with out-groups

³⁵ Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore, London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), pp. 1–25.

such as pagans, Jews, or deviant Christians.³⁶ Here, identity-formation is understood as a process driven by narratives and rites which defined Christians against religious Others. Unfortunately, only one of the three contributors to write about Rus in fact discusses narrative and identity with any degree of theoretical sophistication, and the ‘out-group’ on which he focuses is pagans, not ‘deviant Christians’.³⁷ However, other scholars have recognised that Latins could play precisely this role within Rusian texts. As Jonathan Shepard notes, ‘chroniclers and authors of prescriptive texts tended [...] to pick on variant forms of Christian worship and lifestyle, treating them as foils against which to contrast the virtues of total religious correctness, “orthodoxy”. “Latins” (western Christians) made an easy target.’³⁸

Chapter One elaborates upon the symbolic role of Latins as a religious Other (or not-quite-Other) within Rusian texts concerning the definition and maintenance of orthodoxy. In such texts, Latins can justifiably be interpreted as the ‘foil’ against which a Rusian Orthodox identity is constructed. But Latins are not always the religious Other in Rusian texts and Rusian culture, and Rusian religious identities are not always constructed against them. One of the questions underlying this thesis is therefore: which of the identities constructed and reflected in Rusian texts either exclude or include Latins? Which identity-defining narratives juxtapose Rus and Latins, and which unite them in opposition to a greater Other? The concept of identity is problematic, of course, particularly in relation to the medieval world: like the terms ‘mentality’ and ‘ideology’, it is a generalising term, involving the assumption of uniformity within groups which most likely contained a diversity now largely lost to us. Still, the notion of identity provides a conceptual bridge between communities of individuals and the texts which ‘both shape and are shaped by communities’ dynamic self-understanding’.³⁹

³⁶ *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe (c. 1070–1200)*, ed. by Ildar H. Garipzanov (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), p. 1.

³⁷ Donald Ostrowski, ‘Pagan Past and Christian Identity in the *Primary Chronicle*’, in *Historical Narratives*, ed. by Garipzanov, pp. 229–53.

³⁸ Jonathan Shepard, ‘Concluding Remarks’, in *Early Christianity on the Way from the Varangians to the Greeks (Ruthenica: Supplementum 4)*, ed. by Ildar H. Garipzanov and Oleksiy P. Tolochko (Kiev: Natsional’na akademiia nauk Ukraini, 2011), pp. 133–46 (p. 140).

³⁹ Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), p. 27.

Who are the Latins?

The concept of a ‘Latin’ church within Christendom is largely a creation of the eleventh century. Although the Greek term *latinos* existed well before 1054, it was primarily used in a linguistic sense to refer to speakers of the Latin language. It was only from 1054 that the term began to be used ‘as a generic appellation of Westerners’ and took on a religious sense in certain contexts.⁴⁰ In the centuries that followed, *latinos* continued to possess a constellation of shades of meaning. For instance, it could be used to refer to Romance speakers or to adherents of the ‘Latin’ faith, or employed in a geopolitical sense.⁴¹ According to Johannes Koder, theologians tended to employ the term in a religious sense, while the Byzantine chronicles ‘largely adopt the general meaning of “Western”’.⁴² It was certainly not a consistently condemnatory term.⁴³ Indeed, the adjective *latinus* and the noun *latinitas* were employed as self-designations by Latins themselves. Orderic Vitalis, the Benedictine chronicler of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, employs the phrase *tota latinitas*, ‘the entire Latin world’.⁴⁴ As Robert Bartlett notes, the notion of the *gens latina*, ‘the Latin people’, ‘helped lend a kind of conceptual cohesion to groups of very varied national origin and language’.⁴⁵

Many of the meanings of *latinos* persist in Old Slavonic. The Old Slavonic term *latina* (‘the Latin church’) and related words (*latinin*, ‘a Latin’; *latinskyi*, ‘of the Latins’, etc.) were used in various categories of Rusian text, from canon law to chronicles to trade treaties. The term’s various shades of meaning can be hard to distinguish, but the religious meaning is often uppermost in Rusian writing. In

⁴⁰ Alexander Kazhdan, ‘Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century’, in *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*, ed. by Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), pp. 83–100 (p. 86); Johannes Koder, ‘Latinoi: The Image of the Other According to Greek Sources’, in *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo): Atti del Colloquio Internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz o.p., Venezia, 1–2 dicembre 2000*, ed. by Chryssa Maltezou and Peter Schreiner (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia; Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani, 2002), pp. 25–39 (p. 30).

⁴¹ Koder, ‘Latinoi’, p. 39.

⁴² Koder, ‘Latinoi’, p. 31.

⁴³ B.I. Chibisov, ‘Termin «latiniane» v vizantiiskikh i drevnerusskikh pis'mennykh istochnikakh (do nachala XIII v.)’, *Drevniaia Rus': Vo vremeni, v lichnostiakh, v ideiakh*, 1 (2014), 73–98 (p. 86).

⁴⁴ Discussing the appointment of a new Holy Roman Emperor in 1125, German princes say: ‘the whole Latin world hangs on our decision’, ‘ad nostrum tota latinitas suspirat arbitrium’. *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, Volume VI: Books XI, XII, and XIII*, ed. & trans. by Marjorie Chibnall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), p. 364.

⁴⁵ Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950–1350* (London: Penguin, 1994), p. 19.

his account of his travels to the Holy Land, Hegumen Daniil uses ‘Latin’ to refer to monks, ecclesiastics, rites etc. but ‘Frankish’ to refer to laymen and non-ecclesiastical institutions.⁴⁶ Outside of polemic, where ‘Latins’ are defined by their adherence to a set of corrupt beliefs and customs, there is generally little to suggest that this use of the term is anything other than neutral.

The term ‘Latin’ can also be used more broadly in Old Slavonic, as what B.I. Chibisov calls a ‘super-ethnic construct’.⁴⁷ In this case, ‘Latins’ are anybody from a region in which the Latin church held sway. In treaties between Novgorod and its trading partners made between the late twelfth and early fourteenth century, a common formula states that a peace has been made with ‘all the *nemtsi* [broadly, ‘Germanic’] sons, and with the Goths [of Gotland], and with all the Latin people [or ‘tongue’]’.⁴⁸ A Smolensk treaty of 1229 uses a similar formula, and goes on to refer to the inhabitants of Riga and Gotland as Latins, *latine* (singular *latinin*).⁴⁹ Here, the relevant ‘Latins’ are Germanic-speaking merchants, and the term ‘Latin’ evidently has no negative force. This usage is akin to the Latin term *gens latina*, an extremely broad concept which united people of different languages, ethnicities and cultures.

However, this thesis does not restrict itself to considering passages of text which employ the specific term ‘Latin’ (*latina/latinin/latinskyi*). Instead, I consider all references to people, places and objects that might be considered part of the *gens latina*. Old Slavonic uses a multitude of terms for these people and things. Some broad terms, like ‘Latins’ and *nemtsi*, refer to members of various linguistic and ethnic groups. *Nemtsi* are generally, but not consistently, speakers of Germanic languages; sometimes their ethnic and linguistic background is not clear, as in the case of the ‘*nemtsi* sent by the Pope’ who attempt to convert Vladimir to their faith (cast as a different faith to that of the Greeks).⁵⁰ The term ‘Varangian’, which falls out of use after the twelfth century, refers specifically to Scandinavians (who could also be *nemtsi*).⁵¹ ‘Frank’ is often used to refer to Crusaders and to

⁴⁶ See p. 93.

⁴⁷ ‘надэтнический конструктор’. Chibisov, ‘Termin «latiniane»’, p. 86.

⁴⁸ ‘съ всѣми нѣмьцкыми сыны, и съ гты, и съ всемъ латиньскымъ языкомъ’. S.N. Valk, *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova* (Moscow, Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1949), pp. 55, 57, 58; also pp. 62 and 63–64 for a similar formula.

⁴⁹ *Smolenskije gramoty XIII–XIV vekov*, ed. by R.I. Avanesov (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1963), p. 21.

⁵⁰ ‘Нѣмьци [...] послании ѿ папежа’. PSRL 1, col. 85.

⁵¹ John H. Lind, ‘Christianity on the Move: The Role of the Varangians in Rus and Scandinavia’, in *Byzantium and the Viking World*, ed. by Fedir Androshchuk, Jonathan Shepard and Monica White (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2016), pp. 409–40 (p. 410).

Romance-speakers.⁵² Old Slavonic texts also use a plethora of narrower terms to refer to Latins of a particular ethnicity or provenance, from ‘Poles’, ‘Swedes’ and ‘Hungarians’ to ‘Rigans’ and ‘Gotlanders’. I list all of these terms in Appendix Three. All could be the object of further study to determine their sphere of reference, but it is evident that their connotations are largely neutral: these are not marked terms.

What is a ‘Latin’, in the sense in which I use the term? Broadly, a Christian who originates from a region under the religious control of the Latin church. But which areas were under the control of the Latin church? Perhaps all of the areas where Latin was the language of the liturgy—but even this seemingly uncontroversial definition admits of exceptions. As Julia Verkholtantsev notes, the Roman curia could make exceptions to its language policy, as in the case of the Croatian communities who were permitted to use Slavonic rather than Latin in the liturgy from the tenth century right up until the eighteenth century.⁵³ There were similar exceptions made in other parts of the Slavonic world, within certain Czech and Polish monastic communities.⁵⁴ Attempting to define the Latin church as the branch of the Church under the religious jurisdiction of the Pope is equally problematic. Discussing the outcome of Danilo of Galicia’s negotiations with the Pope in the mid-thirteenth century, his chronicler makes it clear that Danilo expected to receive a crown from the Pope whilst remaining part of the ‘orthodox Greek faith’.⁵⁵ Does submission to the Pope make Danilo a ‘Latin’ and Galicia-Volynia a ‘Latin’ land, even though there is no suggestion that Danilo agreed to accept Latin rites?

Indeed, the Slavonic-speaking regions to the west of Rus pose something of a problem for the concept of the ‘Latin people’. Certain Russian sources make it quite clear that these regions perform Latin rites and owe allegiance to the Pope: Nikifor, the early twelfth-century metropolitan of Rus, notes that the Poles, Rus’s ‘neighbours’, have joined the Latin church and begun to use azymes,⁵⁶ and Danilo of Galicia is pressed to submit to the Pope by his Polish allies.⁵⁷ However, certain sources seem reluctant to categorise them as ‘Latin’: the early fifteenth-century *Tolstovskii sbornik* is aimed at the

⁵² E.Iu. Zubareva, ‘Etnonim “franki” v kul’turologicheskom plane’, *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serii 19: Lingvistika i mezhkul’turnaia kommunikatsiia*, 3 (2007), 111–23.

⁵³ Julia Verkholtantsev, ‘St. Jerome, Apostle to the Slavs, and the Roman Slavonic Rite’, *Speculum*, 87 (2012), 37–61 (p. 37).

⁵⁴ Verkholtantsev, ‘St. Jerome’, pp. 48–60.

⁵⁵ The Pope is said to condemn ‘those who slander the orthodox Greek faith’, ‘хоулащимъ вѣроу Грѣцкоюу. правовѣрноую’. *Ipat’evskaia letopis’*, ed. by A.A. Shakhmatov, *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, 2 (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul’tury, 1998), col. 827. Henceforth PSRL 2.

⁵⁶ ‘Poslanie Iaroslavu kniaziu Muromskomu o vere latinskoi’, in *Tvoreniia mitropolita Nikifora*, ed. by S.M. Polianskii (Moscow: Nauka, 2006), pp. 152–70 (p. 153).

⁵⁷ PSRL 2, col. 826.

‘denunciation of Poles and Latins’, as if the Poles were not quite ‘Latin’, or at least a special class of Latin.⁵⁸

Not only is the term ‘Latin’ hard to define, its implications are misleading. The *gens latina* was far from a homogenous unity, in ethnic, political, cultural and even religious terms. The idea of Latin Christendom as an institution with geographical borders and unified policies was only beginning to emerge in the period this thesis considers, and there remain Latin–Orthodox border phenomena, such as the Eastern Catholic churches, to this day. The Latin world may have come to constitute a more cohesive and coherent entity between the eleventh and fourteenth centuries,⁵⁹ but it remained a flexible construct, not amenable to firm definition. Still, I use the term ‘Latin’ (and ‘the Latin world’ or ‘Latin Christendom’) because it seems to me the least anachronistic option. Certain writers, both Russian and Latin, evidently had a conception of the Latin church and the geographical area it covered as a sort of unity, even if this unity was more theoretical than actual.

The term ‘Orthodox’ is perhaps even more problematic than ‘Latin’. I employ it to refer to the Christian community of which Rus was a part, the rites of which were Byzantine in origin and which looked to Byzantium in ecclesiastical matters, in theory if not always in practice. This community was multiethnic and multicultural, like Latin Christendom; but, unlike the vast majority of the Latin world, it was also liturgically multilingual. What’s more, while Latins could and did refer to themselves as Latins, the situation in Early Rus was more complicated. Early Russian writers might have called themselves ‘orthodox’, but it is misleading to commute ‘orthodox’ to ‘Orthodox’, with its implications of confessional belonging rather than simply religious correctness. Yet there was a sense of ecclesiastical community between Rus and Byzantium: Early Russian writers were well aware that Rus had accepted and maintained what they most often called the ‘Greek faith’. The difficulty is in finding a term to designate this community. Calling the Rus ‘Greeks’ (by analogy with ‘Latins’) is the least anachronistic option, but sounds absurd (adopting the Greek faith did not make the Rus linguistically or culturally Greek!); the term ‘Byzantine-rite Christian’ is clear but unwieldy.⁶⁰ We are left with the traditional, if imperfect, designation ‘Orthodox Christianity’ to refer to the religious community of which Byzantium and Rus, but not the Latin world, considered themselves to be part. I use ‘orthodox’ (not ‘Orthodox’) when discussing ideas of correct Christian belief more generally.

⁵⁸ ‘на посрамлениѣ лѣховомъ [sic] и латынамъ’. Andrej Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor drevne-russkikh polemičeskich sočinenij protiv latinjan: XI–XV v.* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1972), p. 155.

⁵⁹ Bartlett, *The Making of Europe*, pp. 243–44, 254.

⁶⁰ See the forthcoming article by Yury Avvakumov, ‘Western “Confessions” and Eastern Christianity’, in *Cambridge History of Reformation Theology, c.1500–c.1675*, ed. by Kenneth Appold and Nelson Minnich (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).

To make a final point about nomenclature, I prefer to avoid the terms ‘Europe’ and ‘the West’ to refer to the geographical, political and cultural extent of Latin Christendom. In recent times, scholarly use of the term ‘medieval Europe’ (sometimes understood to include Rus) and the concept of ‘Europeanisation’ (as a result of, say, the Baltic crusades) has become widespread.⁶¹ The idea of Europe as a political unity with clearly defined borders is modern, and I do not believe its use is helpful in a medieval context—although I am sympathetic to attempts to write Rus back into the history of what was to become Europe. Neither do I employ the term ‘the West’. The idea of a ‘West’ as separate from ‘Rus’ is both ideologically questionable and geographically misleading: the Latin world lay to the north and south of Rus as well as to the west. Of course, the concept of a ‘Latin Christendom’ as distinct from an ‘Orthodox Christendom’ shares some of these flaws: it implies that the ‘Latin’ and ‘Orthodox’ worlds were separate and maybe even opposed entities, and that they conceived of each other as such. I attempt to counteract this implication by taking every chance to discuss representations of the Latin world as fundamentally similar to Rus as well as different from it. Indeed, this thesis demonstrates the flexibility and mutability of the conceptual borders between the two.

The scope of the thesis

Unlike previous studies, this thesis examines the entirety of the ‘literary landscape’ of indigenous Early Russian narratives about Latins, aiming to find patterns in texts’ varied portrayals of Latins. This section explains and justifies the inclusion and exclusion of particular classes of text.

Time

All the sources for this study are texts believed to have been circulating between 988 and 1330 in Rus. The first of these dates, 988, is symbolic: this is the date given in the PVL for the conversion of Vladimir and the entry of Rus into the Christian world. It seems unlikely that any of the texts I consider might actually date from the tenth century, but it is at least possible that the PVL and

⁶¹ Examples are Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*; John H. Lind, ‘The Concept of “Europeanisation” on the Baltic Rim as Seen from the East’, in *The European Frontier: Clashes and Compromises in the Middle Ages: International Symposium of the Culture Clash or Compromise (CCC) Project and the Department of Archaeology, Lund University, Held in Lund, October 13–15 2000*, ed. by Jörn Staecker (Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2004), pp. 41–44.

Novgorod First chronicle contain remnants of very early historiography.⁶² The second date, 1330, does not have the symbolic significance of 988. Indeed, it might seem odd for a study of Early Rus not to stop at the convenient date of 1299, when Metropolitan Maksim moved the seat of the metropolitanate from Kiev to Vladimir.

However, this is a study of texts and ideas rather than of historical events. First of all, and most importantly, continuing into the early fourteenth century rather than stopping short at 1299 should bring into sharper focus the changes in representations of Latins which took place towards the end of the Early Russian period. One of the arguments this study will make is that it is only in the early fourteenth century (not the thirteenth century, as is often argued) that depictions of Latins undergo significant changes. Considering these later changes should shed light on convictions and depictions in the earlier period too. Secondly, the chronicles of Early Rus are among the richest sources for this study, and all come to some sort of end in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century: the last entry in the Galician-Volynian chronicle is s.a. 1292, the last entry in the Vladimir-Suzdalian chronicle is s.a. 1305, and the only extant copy of the Older Novgorod First chronicle comes to a halt in the 1330s.⁶³ 1330 is the date of the final continuous yearly entry in the Synodal copy of the Novgorod First chronicle, the only witness to the Older version of the chronicle. Pushing on into the fourteenth century thus allows the principal chronicles of Early Rus to be considered in full.

The majority of texts believed to be Early Russian are extant only in manuscripts which postdate the Early Russian period. This is a major factor contributing to the problem of dating Early Russian texts: often, the date of extant manuscript witnesses is the only more or less fixed point in a text's history, while a text's dates of creation, compilation or redaction remain a matter of hypothesis. As this study is not primarily textological, I largely rely on other scholars' judgements as to the likely dates of composition and redaction of the texts I consider, bearing in mind that many of these dates are conjectural. I incorporate scholarship on the textual history of my sources when this has a bearing on my argument.

⁶² See e.g. A.A. Gippius, 'Do i posle Nachal'nogo svoda: raniiaia letopisnaia istoriia Rusi kak ob'ekt tekstologicheskoi rekonstruktsii', in *Rus' v IX-X vekakh: Arkheologicheskaia panorama*, ed. by N.A. Makarov (Moscow, Vologda: Drevnosti severa, 2012), pp. 37–63.

⁶³ Admittedly, the Novgorodian annals on which the Older Novgorod First chronicle is based continue to be updated throughout and after the 1330s, giving rise to what is known as the Younger Novgorod First chronicle. However, the Younger Novgorod First chronicle includes some newer readings which the Older version does not have, taken from the Novgorod-Sofia compilation. For instance, the Younger Novgorod First chronicle includes extracts from the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, whereas the Older Novgorod First chronicle bears no traces of the *Tale of the Life*. A.A. Gippius, 'K istorii slozheniia teksta Novgorodskoi pervoi letopisi', *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik*, 6 (16) (1997), 3–72.

Place

My focus in this study is on representations of Latins in texts composed either by Rusians or for Rusians. In other words, this is not a study of *all* the writing about Latins which circulated in Rus, whether Russian or Byzantine in origin, but of Russian contributions to this writing—although any convincing analysis of the latter will necessarily take the former into account, as much indigenous Russian writing borrows themes, structures, formulae and content from Late Antique and Byzantine models. The vast majority of this study's sources are therefore texts indigenous to Rus: that is, they are texts composed either by a Russian or, in a few cases, by a Byzantine resident in Rus who was involved in Russian political and ecclesiastical life; and they circulated in Old Slavonic. I make only one exception to this rule, for a text which was not composed in or for Rus, but which circulated in Rus at the behest of a prominent Russian figure. Chapter One discusses this exception and tackles the question of 'indigenous' versus 'translated' texts in more detail.⁶⁴

Texts

Aside from the temporal and geographical criteria outlined above, there are two more criteria for texts included in this study. Firstly, they must contain some reference either to Latins themselves or to Latin objects, ideas or institutions. This might seem obvious, but it is important to bear in mind that many indigenous Russian texts contain no such references and are entirely unconcerned with Latins. Secondly, this study includes only texts which take positions on the spiritual or moral qualities of the Latin world and of Latins, or which include Latins in their narratives. I therefore exclude diplomatic and commercial documents (*gramoty*) from consideration. A number of *gramoty* containing treaties between Rus and Latins survive, and are in some ways very valuable sources for Rus–Latin relations, testifying to the intensity of contacts between them. What's more, in certain treaties, Latins are mentioned in almost every clause.⁶⁵ However, the content of *gramoty* was agreed between the two parties involved: they do not reflect Russian norms alone. Nor, being neither narratives nor dogmatic texts, do they reflect Russian attitudes to Latins (beyond a willingness to do business, perhaps).

One of the aims of this thesis is to explore the extent to which the genre or theme of an Early Russian non-documentary text influences its depictions of Latins. Much of this thesis therefore organises and interprets sources in groups according to their genre or subject matter, beginning with anti-Latin polemic (Chapter One) and chronicles (Chapter Two). However, while scholars routinely classify texts by their time and place of composition, methods of categorising Old Slavonic texts into genres

⁶⁴ See p. 27 and pp. 30–35.

⁶⁵ See e.g. *Smolenskie gramoty*, ed. by Avanesov, pp. 20–25.

or other similar categories remain contentious. There was no rigid taxonomy of genres in Early Rus. Stylistic conventions and topoi migrated between different genres;⁶⁶ what appear to be generic designations in Old Slavonic sometimes overlap (what distinguishes a *pouchenie*, ‘instruction’, from a *slovo*, ‘dialogue’ or ‘sermon?’);⁶⁷ and what we now designate as a single ‘work’ could include components which seem to belong to various genres (chronicles being the most obvious example of such a ‘multi-generic’ genre).⁶⁸ Nevertheless, the concept of genre retains its value for scholarly purposes.⁶⁹ As Mary Franklin-Brown puts it in her book on thirteenth-century encyclopaedism, ‘a Linnaean system of genres is still indispensable, for it provides the terminology needed for any nuanced comparison of texts [...] but it is purely heuristic, without historical reality or intrinsic value.’⁷⁰

Besides genres, I also recognise overarching categories which might include texts of various genres, but which are unified by their broad theme: anti-Latin polemic, say, or hagiography. The importance of a work’s theme has been noted before. In his *Poetika drevnerusskoi literatury*, D.S. Likhachev suggests that it is generally subject matter and not genre which motivates the use of particular topoi

⁶⁶ Riccardo Picchio, ‘Models and Patterns in the Literary Tradition of Medieval Orthodox Slavdom’, in *American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists, Volume II: Literature and Folklore*, ed. by Victor Terras (The Hague: Mouton, 1973), pp. 439–67.

⁶⁷ Norman W. Ingham, ‘Genre Characteristics of the Kievan Lives of Princes in Slavic and European Perspective’, in *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Volume 2: Literature, Poetics, History*, ed. by Paul Debreczeny (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1983), pp. 223–37. For Ingham, admitting that ‘apparently generic words in titles were not used consistently, and that bookmen did not conceive of them as referring to established types’ is ‘tantamount to admitting there were no genres’ (p. 226).

⁶⁸ See D.S. Likhachev, *Poetika drevnerusskoi literatury* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1967), p. 61, for the distinction between *perovichnye*, ‘primary’, and *ob’ediniashchie*, ‘unifying’, genres.

⁶⁹ I prefer to speak of genres and not protogenres, Gail Lenhoff’s neologism. Her critique of the aptness of the concept of genre in Early Rus is compelling, but I am unconvinced that a genre’s function within a cultural system can fully account for its verbal conventions. Monks may have had the importance of humility pressed upon them, but this does not explain their use of an identical verbal formula (‘I the sinful...’) in some classes of text (Lives, for example) but not in others (chronicles). I prefer Hans Robert Jauss’s model, in which genre and *Sitz im Leben* (‘basis in life’) have a reciprocal relationship. See Gail Lenhoff, ‘Towards a Theory of Protogenres in Medieval Russian Letters’, *Russian Review*, 43 (1984), 31–54; Hans Robert Jauss, ‘Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature’, in *Modern Genre Theory*, ed. by David Duff (Harlow: Longman, 2000), pp. 127–47 (p. 138).

⁷⁰ Mary Franklin-Brown, *Reading the World: Encyclopedic Writing in the Scholastic Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), p. 10.

and formulae.⁷¹ In his discussion of writing on the subject of the holy prince, Norman Ingham similarly argues that the theme of the holy prince created its own set of topoi and verbal conventions which ‘transcended the genres’.⁷² In this study, I employ both the concept of genre and the concept of theme (or subject matter), on the basis that either can affect representations of Latins. At times, subject matter is more relevant than genre: texts of various genres (lists, epistles, erotapokriseis, etc.) approach the errors of the Latins in similar ways. Elsewhere, genre plays a greater role: both *paterica* and the Lives of individual saints concern the doings of holy men and women, but their treatment of Latins is quite different. This study therefore examines the patterns which emerge when representations of Latins are considered as a function both of genres and/or of thematic categories.

Themes

The principal concern of this thesis is Rusian conceptions and representations of Latins, and the extent to which ideas of religious difference do or do not figure in these conceptions and representations. In considering religious difference, I do not restrict myself to examining only passages which discuss the Latin faith in terms of doctrine, liturgy or ecclesiology. Religious difference cannot be reduced to doctrinal and liturgical difference. In the PVL’s account of Vladimir’s testing of the faiths and eventual conversion, practices surrounding marriage and food play at least as important a role in defining a faith as do doctrinal considerations; anti-Latin polemic contains vehement condemnations of priests’ vestments or the length of men’s beards side-by-side with accusations of theological error and liturgical malpractice. In Rusian texts, religious difference and what a modern reader might categorise as cultural difference are rarely disaggregated.⁷³ The medieval religious Other is a cultural Other, and perhaps also an ethnic and political Other.

My focus is therefore on religion, broadly conceived, as one factor which both unites and distinguishes Rus and the Latin world; but I do not neglect the broader conceptions of difference by which religious difference is often framed (or indeed overshadowed). For example, in the ‘hagiobiography’ of Aleksandr Nevskii, the thirteenth-century prince who defended north-western Rus against successive attacks by Swedes and Teutonic Knights, Aleksandr rejects the Pope’s legates and their teachings. However, he also excoriates the Latins for overstepping the boundaries of their

⁷¹ ‘Не жанр произведения определяет собой выбор выражений, выбор «формул», а предмет, о котором идет речь.’ ‘It is not the genre of a work which dictates the choice of expressions and “formulae”, but the subject under discussion.’ Likhachev, *Poetika*, p. 85.

⁷² Ingham, ‘Genre Characteristics’, p. 234.

⁷³ This is a prominent strand of Tia M. Kolbaba’s argument in Tia M. Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000).

divinely-allotted land, and for their desire to subdue the ‘Slavonic people’.⁷⁴ Here, resistance to the Latins has not only religious, but also political and ethnic overtones. What’s more, in certain texts, particularly the chronicles of Kiev and Galicia-Volynia, Latin difference is in fact presented more as a question of ethnicity and political belonging than of faith.⁷⁵ This thesis might concentrate on questions of religious belonging, but I do not wish to overemphasise the importance of faith as a factor dividing or unifying Rus and Latins when other factors are equally, or more, significant.

Neither do I focus on representations of difference between Rus and Latins at the expense of similarities. The tendency of a study which (artificially) contrasts Rus and Latin Christendom will be to emphasise difference, but I aim to resist this tendency as much as possible. In practice, this means analysing rhetorics of similarity as well as rhetorics of difference; looking, for instance, for examples of Latins portrayed as pious Christians as well as depictions of Latins as heterodox or indeed pagan. The recognition of the existence, and indeed the predominance, of these rhetorics of similarity casts those relatively few texts which insist on Latin *difference* in a new light: they become exceptions to be explained rather than simply instances of a rule or cultural norm. The coexistence within the literary culture of Rus of these multiple and apparently opposing conceptions of Latins and the Latin world is the problem at the heart of this thesis.

Outline of the thesis

This study will begin by considering the class of texts containing the most explicit and vituperative pronouncements about Latins: polemic denouncing Latin ‘errors’. If some see anti-Latin polemic in Rus as a Byzantine irrelevance, mechanically reproduced by Slavonic copyists, others consider it to have been actively propagated and reworked in Rus, as either the consequence of or the stimulus for Russian anti-Latin sentiment. Chapter One negotiates between these positions, considering the evidence—relatively slight, but nonetheless significant—for the adaptation of Byzantine anti-Latin polemic in Rus. If anti-Latin polemic was adopted and adapted in Russian, and not just Byzantine,

⁷⁴ When citing from the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, I refer to the redaction found in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle where possible (only part of the *Tale* is extant in the Laurentian codex). If the relevant passage is not extant in the Laurentian codex, I refer to Begunov’s critical edition of the text on the basis of the Pskov Second chronicle’s version. I do not refer to the version in the Younger Novgorod First chronicle because this thesis considers only the Older version. For the passages on the Latins’ desire to subdue the Slavs and the Pope’s offer, see ‘Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo (pervaia redaktsiia)’, in *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII veka: «Slovo o pogibeli russkoi zemli»*, ed. by Iu.K. Begunov (Moscow, Leningrad: Nauka, 1965), pp. 169, 175–76; for the expansionist tendencies of the Latins, see PSRL 1, col. 478.

⁷⁵ See pp. 70–72.

culture, what was its relevance within Rus? The paucity of evidence for engagement with the terms and concepts of anti-Latin polemic outside of polemical texts suggests that polemic was never intended as a guide to everyday dealings with Latins. Instead, this chapter focuses on the circulation of anti-Latin polemic within canon law compendia, arguing for its real (but restricted) significance as part of the edifice of orthodoxy within Early Rus.

The other major source for representations of Latins is the chronicles of Early Rus. Chapter Two provides a close analysis of the Early Rusian chronicles as a (complex) whole, focusing on issues of rhetoric and representation (Latins as ‘pagans’ or ‘Christians’; Latins as friends, foes or foreigners; conceptions of the differences between Rus and Latins). It also challenges the still current conviction that chroniclers deliberately avoided mention of Latins in matters such as Rus–Latin marriages and other political and cultural ties. The bulk of this chapter is devoted to an exploration of the ways in which chroniclers manipulated Latin ambiguity—the not-quite-Otherness of Latins—for rhetorical and political ends.

Chapter Three opens by considering the distribution of references to Latins across the entirety of the textual landscape of Early Rus (excluding the few exceptions noted above, p. 19). Such references are relatively few, and they pattern according to the genre or thematic category of the text containing them. There are some surprises here, most notably concerning the assumption that texts discussing ‘ecclesiastical’ or ‘monastic’ affairs will be more fiercely anti-Latin than texts concerned with ‘princely’ culture. Two minor Early Rusian genres which are particularly forthcoming about Latins are the *patericon* and the travel narrative. In this chapter, I read the *Patericon* of the Kievan Caves monastery in the light of the Late Antique *paterica* which are its principal models, drawing parallels between the treatment of religious difference in the former and the latter, in order to explain both the prominence of Latins in the Kievan Caves *Patericon* and the ambiguities inherent in their roles in the narrative. The final section of this chapter considers two Early Rusian travel narratives, reading their subtle representations of Latins as shaped by the demands of the travel narrative as a genre.

Chapters One to Three are thus concerned with the influence of the inner workings of texts on their representations of Latins. Chapters Four and Five change focus to examine the external circumstances which also affect these representations, concentrating on time of composition and place of composition. A consensus has emerged that time is the most important factor determining the tone of portrayals of (and actual dealings with) Latins, and that it was the thirteenth century which saw the most dramatic deterioration in these relations and representations. Chapter Four questions both of these hypotheses. I then turn to the question of the impact of a text’s geographical provenance on its depiction of Latins. Representations of Latins, and of the relationship between Rus and the Latin world, differ markedly in texts from the north-east, north-west, south and south-west of Rus. As I show, texts from different regions of Rus have quite disparate traditions of representing the

connections and exchange between Rus—traditions which can either reveal or obscure the complexities of relations ‘on the ground’.

Chapter One: The Place of Anti-Latin Polemic in the Writing of Early Rus

At the turn of the twenty-first century, the study of heresiological texts was undergoing something of a renaissance. The pioneering work of Alain Le Boulluec in 1985 had made the case for reading texts about heresies and heretics less as sources for reconstructing heresies as socio-religious realities than as sources for conceptions and representations of heresy.¹ These conceptions and representations functioned to construct ‘orthodox’ identities by labelling, defining and excluding a religious Other—often an Other which in actual fact was ‘not [...] very Other at all’.² Previously neglected as dull and unenlightening, by the early 2000s, heresiology had been pronounced ‘the Cinderella of late antique and Byzantine literature’.³

This wave of interest prompted Tia Kolbaba to re-examine a little-studied class of heresiological texts: Byzantine lists of Latin ‘errors’, which spread to Rus not long after 1054. The lists had previously been dismissed as trivial, combining theological and liturgical objections with equally emphatic denunciations of the length of priests’ beards or the Latins’ objectionable habit of drinking their own urine.⁴ Yet by taking their religious content seriously and considering it in the context of Byzantine culture and society, Kolbaba convincingly demonstrated the relevance of these apparently intractable texts within the Byzantine world.

In the light of these developments in the study of heresiology and of anti-Latin texts in particular, a reassessment of the anti-Latin polemic of Rus is surely overdue. The textual history of Rusian anti-Latin polemic continues to be studied: the past couple of decades have seen the appearance of A.V. Barmin’s monograph on anti-Latin texts in Byzantium and Rus from the ninth to the twelfth

¹ Alain Le Boulluec, *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque, IIe–IIIe siècles*, 2 vols (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1985), I.

² Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Ethics of Identity*, quoted in Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin, ‘Making Selves and Marking Others: Identity and Late Antique Heresiologies’, in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*, ed. by Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 1–27 (p. 1). This edited volume includes a number of excellent studies which employ the concept of identity-construction to interpret heresiological texts.

³ Averil Cameron, ‘How to Read Heresiology’, *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 33 (2003), 471–92 (p. 471).

⁴ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 3–4.

centuries,⁵ editions and analyses of two previously little-studied anti-Latin texts,⁶ and a number of articles of relevance to the topic.⁷ A great deal of progress has been made since the publication of the excellent but inevitably dated nineteenth-century monographs on anti-Latin polemic in Rus by A.N. Popov and A.S. Pavlov.⁸ Given the improvement both in our knowledge of the textual history of originally Byzantine anti-Latin works and in the theoretical frameworks available for examining them, there is scope for a reevaluation of the history and role of anti-Latin polemic in Rus.

This study is not textological, although it draws on scholars' insights into the textual history and relationships of the texts it considers. Instead, it investigates the function of anti-Latin polemic in Rus, arguing that this polemic possessed real significance—just not the kinds of significance with which scholars have tended to invest it. Contemporary approaches to heresiology point towards new answers to this question of significance, and are a particularly good fit for anti-Latin polemic: after all, these texts clearly have more to tell us about their composers and audience than about the Latins themselves. Perhaps it is the double difficulty of studying anti-Latin polemic in Rus that has so far militated against this endeavour: if it is hard to discern the role and reception of anti-Latin polemic in its culture of origin, it is even more difficult to define its function in the context of Rus, where it is received in translation.

Nevertheless, the attempt is worth making. Despite its Byzantine origins, anti-Latin polemic did not exist in isolation from the rest of the written culture of Rus, as a type of writing cultivated only by a distant Greek-speaking elite. One of the most ideologically significant sections of the PVL, the tale of Vladimir's conversion, contains not one but two passages of anti-Latin polemic.⁹ Feodosii, one of the first hegumens of the Kievan Caves Monastery, is believed by many scholars to be the composer of

⁵ A.V. Barmin, *Polemika i skhizma: Istorii greko-latinskikh sporov IX–XII vekov* (Moscow: Institut filosofii, teologii i istorii sv. Fomy, 2006).

⁶ Igor Čičurov, 'Ein antilateinischer Traktat des Kiever Metropoliten Ephraim', *Fontes Minores*, 10 (1998), 319–56; Angel Nikolov, "'A Useful Tale About the Latins': An Old Bulgarian Translation of a Lost Byzantine Anti-Latin Text of the End of 11th – Early 12th Century', *Scripta & E-Scripta*, 1 (2003), 99–119.

⁷ E.g. I.S. Chichurov, 'Skhizma 1054 g. i antilatinskaia polemika v Kieve (ser. XI – nach. XII v.)', *Russia Mediaevalis*, 9.1 (1997), 43–53; G.S. Barankova, 'Tekstologicheskie i iazykovye osobennosti antilatinskogo apokrificheskogo pamiatnika «Skazanie o dvenadsati apostolakh, o latine i o opresnotsekh»', *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo sviato-tikhonovskogo humanitarnogo universiteta, I: Bogoslovie. Filosofii*, 27 (2009), 67–92.

⁸ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*; A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty po istorii drevneishei greko-russkoi polemiki protiv latinian* (Saint Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademiia nauk, 1878).

⁹ PSRL 1, cols 86–87, 114–16.

one of the most vicious anti-Latin tracts circulating in Rus.¹⁰ No study of representations of Latins in Early Rus could avoid discussion of these texts.

In this chapter, after a brief discussion of the types of anti-Latin polemic circulating in Early Rus, I begin by considering the desirability and indeed possibility of making a distinction between ‘Rusian polemic’ and ‘Byzantine polemic’ in Rus. I suggest that, rather than repeating previous, ultimately fruitless, attempts to discover ‘native’ Rusian (rather than Byzantine) composers of polemic or specifically Rusian (not Byzantine) anti-Latin accusations, it is more productive to examine the changes which originally Byzantine polemic undergoes in translation and transmission within Rus. The first half of this chapter thus presents evidence for the active adaptation of anti-Latin polemic in the cultural context of Rus; the second half asks why this adaptation occurred. What was the relevance of anti-Latin polemic to the culture of Rus?

Sources

This chapter discusses anti-Latin polemical texts of three genres: lists of Latin ‘errors’, epistles, and erotapokriseis (canonical questions and answers). Texts like the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* and the *Patericon*, which betray some anti-Latin sentiment but are neither lists, epistles nor erotapokriseis, are considered elsewhere. Out of this set of polemical texts, I include only works which fall within the scope of this thesis as defined in the Introduction: that is, texts which were composed between 988 and 1330, circulated in Old Slavonic, and were composed or compiled by someone with a connection to Rus, whether a native of Rus or a Byzantine resident in Rus. Here, I make an exception for the Serbian *kormchaia* (nomocanon), probably compiled in Serbia in the early thirteenth century and copied in Rus in the mid-late thirteenth century.¹¹ The *kormchaia* includes anti-Latin texts composed by Byzantines with no link to Rus; I do not consider these individual texts in any detail. However, the *kormchaia* entered into circulation in Rus on the orders of Metropolitan Kirill II of Kiev, and is thus of real importance for the study of the diffusion of polemic in Rus.

These criteria for inclusion are not entirely objective. One might argue over what it means to have a ‘connection to Rus’, for instance: was a Greek-speaking Byzantine ecclesiastic who happened to be Metropolitan of Kiev but did not speak any Slavonic languages really ‘connected’ to Rus in any meaningful way? At least for the purposes of this chapter, he was. The corpus as defined above also excludes some texts which played an important role in the history of anti-Latin polemic, such as the

¹⁰ See p. 31 for a discussion of the identity of Feodosii.

¹¹ Ia.N. Shchapov, *Vizantiiskoe i iuzhnoslavianskoe pravovoe nasledie na Rusi v XI–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1978), pp. 122–23, 135–39, 146–52.

first substantial anti-Latin list, composed in 1054 by the Patriarch of Constantinople Michael Keroularios (who had no connection to Rus, although his list was translated into Slavonic at some point before the fourteenth century)¹². What's more, it unites some very different texts: for instance, both erotapokriseis and lists include anti-Latin elements, but they have quite different formats, histories, models and contents. Appendix One provides information on the authorship, dates and content of all the primary sources for this chapter; this section restricts itself to providing a brief introduction to the genres of text the chapter considers.

Lists and epistles

The most common format for anti-Latin polemic in Rus is the anti-Latin list. In Rus as in Byzantium, lists generally consist of a number of short accusations about Latin wrongdoing, not accompanied by any detailed refutations. These accusations range from doctrinal questions such as the Latins' addition of the *filioque* to the Creed, to condemnations of Latin customs, such as the fact that their priests wear rings or the time at which the Eucharist is celebrated. Kolbaba notes that classifying these errors into doctrinal, liturgical or 'ethnic' objections is very difficult: most often, the significance of an error is multiple.¹³ The accusation that Latins use unleavened bread, for example, is a liturgical question with doctrinal significance (can unleavened, 'incomplete' bread become the body of Christ?)¹⁴. I do not focus on interpreting the content of particular accusations in this study, although I do provide a cross-referenced list of accusations found in the sources I consider (see Appendix Two). The accusations contained in Russian lists are almost always borrowed from Byzantine lists, which have been studied in detail elsewhere.¹⁵

Many anti-Latin lists circulating in Rus form part of epistles and tracts attributed to ecclesiastics active in Rus. These include epistles by Metropolitan Ioann II, who remonstrated with antipope Clement III in the 1080s;¹⁶ Metropolitan Nikifor, who warned princes Vladimir Monomakh of Kiev and Iaroslav Sviatopolchich of Volodimer-in-Volynia against Latin teachings some three decades

¹² Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, pp. 47, 50–51.

¹³ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 88–99.

¹⁴ For the reference to azymes as 'incomplete' or 'imperfect' (несъвършени), see Nikifor's epistle in 'Poslanie Iaroslavu', ed. by Polianskii, p. 160.

¹⁵ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 23–171.

¹⁶ 'Poslanie mitropolita Ioanna k rimskomu pape Klimentu III', in *Epistoliarnoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: XI–XIII: Issledovaniia, teksty, perevody*, ed. by N.V. Ponyrko (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 1992), pp. 30–37.

later;¹⁷ and Feodosii, hegumen of the Caves, who rails against Latin infamies and the foolishness of the Orthodox who consort with them.¹⁸ Anti-Latin lists also exist outside of epistles, devoid of the salutations and more discursive passages which characterise epistles. A list known as the *Dispute with the Latins* is now generally attributed to Georgii, Metropolitan of Kiev in the 1060s and 1070s.¹⁹ The PVL adopts various anti-Latin ‘errors’ often included in lists into its two sections on the falsity of Latin teachings, s.a. 986 and 988.²⁰ I exclude from consideration the Greek tract on azymes attributed to Lev, the mid-eleventh century metropolitan of Pereiaslavl, because there is no firm evidence it was ever translated into Slavonic;²¹ the same goes for the Greek tract which Igor Chichurov attributes to the Efrem who was Metropolitan of Kiev in the 1050s.²²

Erotapokriseis

Erotapokritic texts originate in a much earlier period than anti-Latin lists and epistles, and were known in Rus from an early date. A Slavonic translation of the erotapokriseis attributed to Timothy of Alexandria is included in the earliest *kormchaia* to have circulated in Rus, while the *Izbornik* of 1073 includes a great deal of material from the erotapokriseis of pseudo-Anastasios of Sinai.²³ Unlike anti-Latin lists, erotapokriseis are not polemical texts. Rather, they contain questions about orthodoxy and

¹⁷ ‘Poslanie Vladimiru Monomakhu o vere latinskoi’, in *Tvoreniia mitropolita Nikifora*, ed. by Polianskii, pp. 124–51; ‘Poslanie Iaroslavu’, ed. by Polianskii. Iaroslav Sviatopolchich was named as the addressee of the latter epistle only in one, no longer extant, manuscript; other manuscripts give Iaroslav Sviatoslavich of Murom as Nikifor’s correspondent. The question has no bearing on this chapter’s conclusions, but I prefer the former attribution: Nikifor tells Iaroslav that his land neighbours Poland, which is true of Volodimer-in-Volynia but only in the loosest sense of Murom.

¹⁸ ‘Poslanie o vere latinskoi’, in *Epistoliarnoie nasledie*, ed. by Ponyrko, pp. 16–20.

¹⁹ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, pp. 83–90 contains the content of the accusations but is not strictly an edition of the text. See A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*, p. 50 for the argument that the text is a later reworking of Nikifor’s epistle to Vladimir Monomakh. Barmin, *Polemika*, pp. 236–38, prefers the attribution to Metropolitan Georgii, but also calls Pavlov’s objections ‘well-founded’. A.A. Turilov, ‘Otvety Georgiia, mitropolita Kievskogo, na voprosy igumena Germana: drevneishee russkoe «voproskanie»’, in *Slavianskii mir*, ed. by Floria, pp. 211–62 (p. 213), considers the list to be Metropolitan Georgii’s work.

²⁰ PSRL 1, cols 86–87, 114–16.

²¹ André Poppe, ‘Le traité des azymes Λεοντος μητροπολιτου της εν Ρωσσια Πρεσθλαβας : Quand, où et par qui a-t-il été écrit?’, *Byzantion*, 35 (1965), 504–27.

²² Čičurov, ‘Ein antilateinischer Traktat’.

²³ V.N. Beneshevich, *Drevne-slavianskaia kormchaia XIV titulov bez tolkovanii* (Saint Petersburg: Otdelenie russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1906), pp. 541–46; *Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073 goda*, ed. by B.A. Rybakov (Moscow: Kniga, 1983).

(more often) orthopraxy, answered by authoritative ecclesiastical figures who provide a series of prescriptions for correct belief and behaviour, and sometimes also penances for incorrect behaviour. Interestingly, all of the extant erotapokriseis composed in Rus contain questions concerning Latins. These texts are the questions posed by Hegumen German to the same Metropolitan Georgii who may have composed the *Dispute with the Latins*; the set of canonical answers attributed to Metropolitan Ioann II (1076/7–1089), also the composer of one of the epistles mentioned above,²⁴ and the twelfth-century Novgorodian work known as the *Questions of Kirik*.²⁵ The latter contains a number of questions posed by the Novgorodian clerics Kirik, Savva and Ilia, most of which are answered by the then archbishop of Novgorod, Nifont (1130–1156).

Byzantine polemic or Rusian polemic? The problem of authorship

The vast majority of anti-Latin texts circulating in Rus were originally composed by Byzantines. Even my corpus, chosen largely on the basis of a connection between the texts' composers and Rus, reflects this. Ioann II, Nikifor, Georgii—all were Byzantine ecclesiastics, and the forms and content of the anti-Latin polemic they perpetuated were of Byzantine origin. By contrast, only a few Early Rusian names are associated with the composition of anti-Latin polemic in Old Slavonic, and most of them only tenuously: Feodosii of the Caves (perhaps); the composer of the PVL's account of Vladimir's conversion (perhaps); and Nifont and Kirik of Novgorod, who do not compose extended anti-Latin polemic but do include two questions about the status of Latins in their canonical questions and answers. What's more, the anti-Latin polemic in the PVL and Feodosii's tract is clearly modelled on Byzantine polemical lists, and both texts share almost all their anti-Latin accusations with Byzantine polemical texts.

If this is the case, is it justifiable to speak of 'Rusian anti-Latin polemic'? Scholars have tended to insist that it is, although their definitions of what might constitute 'Rusian polemic' have varied. For Pavlov, any ecclesiastic who is based in Rus writes Rusian polemic, including Byzantine metropolitans of Kiev. Yet in Pavlov's view, Feodosii's tract possesses a particular significance because its composer is 'природно-русский' ('a native Russian') and some of its contents might therefore be 'собственно-русское' ('specifically Russian').²⁶ M.Iu. Neborskii makes a different

²⁴ 'Kanonicheskie otvety mitropolita Ioanna II', in *Pamiatniki drevnerusskogo kanonicheskogo prava*, ed. by A.S. Pavlov, Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, 6 (Saint Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia komissiiia, 1880), cols 1–20.

²⁵ V.V. Mil'kov and R.A. Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets: Uchenyi i myslitel'* (Moscow: Krug, 2011), pp. 358–412.

²⁶ A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*, pp. 45, 47.

distinction. He distinguishes between ‘local’ and ‘translated’ polemic, with Byzantine metropolitans’ work counting as translated rather than local.²⁷ However, once a ‘translated’ text shows evidence of reworking by a Slav, even if this reworking consisted simply in combining two translated texts into one, it becomes a ‘local’ text, despite the fact that its contents evidently remain a product of translation.²⁸ Pavlov and Neborskii draw the line between ‘Rusian’ or ‘local’ polemic and ‘Byzantine’ or ‘translated’ polemic in different places. Yet both implicitly uphold the idea that there should be a line, and that it is the ethnic and political identity of those who composed or compiled the text which should define a text’s position on one side of the line or the other. But how productive is this approach?

As textological work on anti-Latin polemic continues, the perennial problem of establishing the authorship of polemical texts seems to become more, rather than less, prominent. In recent decades, attributions which were previously taken for granted have been brought into question. Barmin, for instance, casts doubt upon the attribution of two anti-Latin epistles to Metropolitan Nikifor, quite reasonably questioning why Nikifor would write two quite different epistles on the same subject, seemingly composing the second without consulting the first.²⁹ Along with other scholars, he has also raised once again the question of whether Metropolitan Georgii actually composed the *Dispute with the Latins*—a question which Pavlov appeared to have settled definitely in the nineteenth century.³⁰

In the search for polemic ‘native’ to Rus, two potential authors of anti-Latin tracts acquire paramount importance. The first is Feodosii. Despite over a century’s debate, the identity of this Feodosii remains uncertain. Some believe the text’s composer to be Feodosii ‘of the Caves’, a native of Rus, hegumen of the Caves between 1057 and 1074. Others believe that the tract is in fact the work of a mid-twelfth-century Byzantine hegumen of the Caves, known as Feodosii ‘the Greek’.³¹ I.P. Eremin, who strongly favours Feodosii of the Caves as the most likely candidate, suggests between 1069 and

²⁷ M.Iu. Neborskii, ‘Traditsii vizantiiskoi antilatinskoi polemiki na Rusi: Vtoraia polovina XIII–nachalo XV veka’, in *Drevniaia Rus’: Peresechenie traditsii*, ed. by V.V. Mil’kov (Moscow: Skriptorii, 1997), pp. 371–94 (p. 373).

²⁸ Neborskii, ‘Traditsii’, p. 382.

²⁹ Barmin, *Polemika*, pp. 293–95.

³⁰ See n. 19, p. 29.

³¹ For references to previous work on the subject, see Gerhard Podskalsky, *Khristianstvo i bogoslovskaia literatura v Kievskoi Rusi (988–1237 gg.)*, trans. by A.V. Nazarenko (Saint Petersburg: Vizantinorossika, 1996), pp. 295–96; I.P. Eremin, ‘Iz istorii drevne-russkoi publitsistiki XI veka: Poslanie Feodosiia Pecherskogo k kniazii Iziaslavu Iaroslavichu o latinianakh’, *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury (TODRL)*, 2 (1935), 21–38 (pp. 26–27); Barmin, *Polemika*, pp. 223–25; Konstantin Kostromin, ‘Problema atributsii «Slova Feodosiia, igumena Pecherskogo, o vere krest’ianskoi i o latyn’skoi»’, *Khristianskoe chtenie*, 36.1 (2011), 6–97 (pp. 6–57).

1074 as a likely period of composition.³² If this were the case, Feodosii's tract would be both one of the very earliest polemical works to circulate in Rus and perhaps the only extant anti-Latin list to be composed by a native of Early Rus. In contrast, if Feodosii the Greek were the composer, the tract would be simply another example of translated Byzantine polemic circulating in Early Rus. The history of anti-Latin polemic in Rus looks quite different depending on the attribution one favours.

The manuscript evidence, studied most extensively by Eremin, points to Feodosii of the Caves as the composer of the tract. Most manuscripts identify the composer simply as Feodosii, but one relatively late manuscript (Eremin's 'subgroup C') unambiguously refers to the composer as Feodosii of the Caves.³³ However, three main considerations militate against this conclusion. Firstly, Feodosii would have had to know Greek, a fact which is nowhere mentioned or implied in his *Life*: there is no evidence that multiple anti-Latin tracts were translated into Slavonic in the few decades immediately following the Schism. Secondly, in some redactions, Feodosii mentions that his parents taught him to reject Latin ways. If the composer is Feodosii of the Caves, then his parents would have to have held anti-Latin views even before the Schism, which seems unlikely.³⁴ Thirdly, Feodosii would have to have been more virulently anti-Latin than his contemporaries: some of the more outlandish accusations in the tract are shared only with Constantine Stilbes' list of 1204.³⁵ Attributing the tract to Feodosii the Greek removes the first two of these objections, but the third remains.

Recent work on the text has not solved the problem of authorship. Barmin has made some significant textological advances in his study of the tract, but he comes to no definite conclusions about the identity of its composer.³⁶ On balance, he prefers to attribute at least one redaction (Eremin's redaction 'b') to Feodosii of the Caves, but acknowledges that this attribution brings new textological questions in its wake.³⁷ Barring any new discoveries, three attributions will remain plausible. The tract may indeed be the work of Feodosii of the Caves (but a Greek-speaking, violently anti-Latin Feodosii quite different to the gentle, humble Feodosii portrayed in Nestor's *Life of Feodosii*); it may be the work of Feodosii the Greek; or it may even constitute another case of the common medieval phenomenon of false attribution to an authoritative figure, in this case, Feodosii of the Caves.

The publication by Chichurov in 1998 of a previously unpublished anti-Latin list bearing the name of 'Efrem of Rus' also has a bearing on the question of polemic composed by natives of Rus.³⁸

³² Eremin, 'Iz istorii', p. 33.

³³ Eremin, 'Iz istorii', pp. 23–24.

³⁴ Barmin, *Polemika*, p. 225.

³⁵ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, p. 178.

³⁶ Barmin, *Polemika*, pp. 222–35.

³⁷ Barmin, *Polemika*, pp. 234–35.

³⁸ Čičurov, 'Ein antilateinischer Traktat'.

According to Chichurov, the composer of this Greek text is most likely Efrem, Metropolitan of Kiev from 1054/5 to 1065, in which case this is another (early) example of anti-Latin polemic composed by a Byzantine. However, Barmin prefers to attribute the text to Efrem, Metropolitan of Pereiaslavl in the late eleventh and early twelfth century. Barmin believes Efrem to have been a Russian who acquired his Greek in Constantinople.³⁹ Scholars are by no means in agreement about the origins of Efrem of Pereiaslavl. D.G. Khrustalev, for instance, believes him to have been Greek.⁴⁰ Yet the intriguing possibility remains that Efrem of Pereiaslavl, like Feodosii, might have been a Russian writer who composed anti-Latin polemic (although apparently in Greek and not Slavonic).

There are just two more texts, or parts of texts, which might suggest the involvement of natives of Rus in the composition of anti-Latin polemic. The first is the anti-Latin sections of the PVL, included under 986 and 988 but probably composed much later, after the Schism of 1054. One of these sections is included in the Philosopher's Speech, the account of Christian history related to the still pagan Vladimir by a 'Greek philosopher'. The philosopher admits that the Latin faith is only 'slightly different from our faith', but warns Vladimir that the Latins use azymes rather than leavened bread.⁴¹ A longer list of errors is included in and after an account of the ecumenical councils s.a. 988. This list includes accusations about Latin disrespect for the cross and icons, polygamy among priests, and indulgences. This section of the chronicle also includes the tale of 'Peter the Stammerer', the legendary false Pope and initiator of 'Latin' errors, whose tale circulated widely among the medieval Slavs.⁴²

Popov was certain that the anti-Latin sections of the chronicle were not the chronicler's own work, but came from another source.⁴³ The source for the chronicle's version of the Creed is Michael Syncellus's *On the Orthodox Faith*,⁴⁴ but no exact source for the anti-Latin accusations has yet been found. Most of the accusations, including the condemnation of azymes, Latin disrespect for icons and the cross, and priestly concubinage are found in various lists,⁴⁵ but one is unique to the PVL: the odd

³⁹ Barmin, *Polemika*, pp. 264–65.

⁴⁰ D.G. Khrustalev, *Razyskaniia o Efreme Pereiaslavskom* (Saint Petersburg: Evraziia, 2002), pp. 27–28.

⁴¹ 'маломъ с нами разъвращена'; literally, 'slightly different from us', with the implication that it is the Latins who have deviated from 'our' faith. PSRL 1, col. 86.

⁴² PSRL 1, cols 115–16; see Agnes Kriza, 'Petr Gugniviy i Papessa: Antilatinskaia tserkovnoslavianskaia polemicheskaia literatura v Tsentral'noi Evrope', *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 53 (2008), 397–405, for an analysis of the Peter the Stammerer topos in Slavonic anti-Latin polemic.

⁴³ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, p. 5.

⁴⁴ M.I. Sukhomlinov, 'O drevnei russkoi letopisi, kak pamiatnike literaturnom', *Sbornik otdeleniia russkogo iazkyia i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk*, 85 (1908), 1–238 (pp. 70–77).

⁴⁵ See Appendix Two; also Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 190, 193, 194, 191.

accusation that Latins ‘call the earth their mother’.⁴⁶ Popov considered this accusation to be almost certainly of Rusian provenance, partly because of its resemblance to Slavonic pre-Christian ideas of the earth as mother.⁴⁷ It may well be the case that this accusation is Rusian in origin; it is also possible that this is another Byzantine accusation which has simply not survived in other sources. There is much more that could be said about the form and content of the PVL’s anti-Latin passages, and I will return to them below. For now, suffice it to say that, while there may be hints of Rusian composition of anti-Latin accusations in the PVL, the evidence is once again inconclusive.

There is just one more text which could shed light on the question of Rusian composition of anti-Latin texts: the *Questions of Kirik*. The *Questions* are not polemical as such. They have therefore received little attention from those interested in anti-Latin polemic in Rus. However, although only two of the more than one hundred questions they contain concern Latins, they are some of the best evidence we have that natives of Rus were thinking and legislating about Latins as a group different to the Orthodox. The evidence they provide for Rusian understandings of Latin Christianity is both extremely useful and difficult to interpret. Neither their condemnation of mothers bringing their sick children to ‘Varangian priests’ nor their discussion of how to receive Christians who were formerly Latins into the church is straightforward, as I will discuss in the following section.⁴⁸ Nor are the *Questions* straightforwardly hostile to Latins: after all, the *Questions* are not a work of polemic, but erotapokriseis. They may testify to the acceptance, at least among some Rusian ecclesiastics, of the notion of Latin difference, but they have little in common with the virulent anti-Latin lists, or indeed with Feodosii’s tract or the PVL’s polemical passages.

The fundamental issue here, whether or not ‘Rusian polemic’ might be said to exist as a category to be treated separately from ‘Byzantine polemic’, is an important one. However, reducing the issue to the question of whether or not any natives of Rus composed their own polemic is simply not productive. One cannot be certain whether the tracts attributed to Feodosii and Efrem are the work of natives of Rus or Byzantines; the accusation unique to the PVL may or may not have been composed by the chronicler himself, a native of Rus. More fundamentally, even (what may be) ‘Rusian’ polemic uses Byzantine forms and content, and ‘Byzantine’ polemic in Rus has already undergone change by virtue of its very translation into Old Slavonic. In short, attempting to maintain a dichotomy between Byzantine and Rusian polemic on the basis of their composers’ identities is a difficult and perhaps counter-productive endeavour. The remainder of this chapter therefore takes a different approach, focusing less on composers’ identities than on the texts themselves, and on the changes which anti-

⁴⁶ ‘землю глѣть мѣри’. PSRL 1, col. 114.

⁴⁷ Попов, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, p. 17.

⁴⁸ Mil’kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, pp. 410, 363.

Latin texts undergo as a result of the translation of their forms, styles and content from Byzantine culture to the culture of Rus.

Adapting anti-Latin lists, epistles and erotapokriseis in Rus

What evidence is there for the uptake and development of Byzantine polemical content and forms in the culture of Rus? As far as content is concerned, looking for ‘new’ accusations unique to Russian texts is only slightly more worthwhile than looking for native Russian composers of polemic. The content of Byzantine lists is adopted wholesale in Rus. Almost every ‘error’ in every list I consider here is found in other Byzantine lists (see Appendix Two). There are one major and two minor exceptions to this rule. The major exception is the PVL’s enigmatic condemnation of Latins who call the earth their mother. There are also two cases in which Russian lists expand on a point made in Byzantine lists. Firstly, Georgii notes that, not only do Latin monks themselves eat meat, they also accuse Orthodox monks of eating unclean dairy products and pig fat.⁴⁹ Secondly, Georgii, Feodosii and Nikifor all extend the accusation, found in John of Claudiopolis’s eleventh-century tract,⁵⁰ that Latin children are not given saints’ names at their baptism. Georgii and Feodosii state that the child’s parents choose a name, while Nikifor complains that children are given the names of animals.⁵¹ Chichurov may be correct to see in this a reflection of Russian naming practices,⁵² which Byzantine ecclesiastics might conceivably have understood as Latin-influenced. However, given the paucity of obviously ‘Russian’ accusations, looking for specifically ‘Russian’ content found only in lists from Rus, not Byzantium, is not the most productive way forward. The rest of this chapter looks instead at the way in which Russian texts employ polemic, adapting it to a new literary and cultural context.

The PVL does something quite unusual with the format of the anti-Latin list. Rather than simply reproducing a list of errors, the chronicle intersperses errors with two separate accounts of the first seven ecumenical councils. This section of the chronicle recounts the instruction Vladimir received at his conversion, beginning with the Creed. The version of the Creed contained in the chronicle is presented as orthodox, but is in fact Arian: it refers to Christ using a Slavonic term equivalent to *homoiousios*, ‘of similar essence [to the Father]’, rather than *homoousios*, ‘of one essence [with the Father]’.⁵³ The chronicle then lists the ecumenical councils, noting their locations, number of

⁴⁹ See Appendix Two, p. 153 and p. 157.

⁵⁰ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 177, 198; *pace* Chichurov, ‘Skhizma’, p. 48, who maintains that this accusation is not found in any Byzantine lists.

⁵¹ See Appendix Two, p. 154.

⁵² Chichurov, ‘Skhizma’, p. 48.

⁵³ The term as found in the chronicle is ‘подобень сущень’. PSRL 1, col. 112.

participants and the heresies they condemned.⁵⁴ Immediately after the account of the seventh council, which ‘condemned those who do not venerate icons’,⁵⁵ the chronicler warns against the corrupt teachings of the Latins and introduces the first two Latin ‘errors’: Latins’ refusal to venerate icons and their custom of drawing crosses on the floor which they kiss before rubbing away. There follows a short and rather confused defence of iconodulia, citing Basil the Great. The next ‘error’ is then introduced: Latins call the earth their mother, and yet they spit on the earth and so defile their ‘mother’. Both of the errors noted here relate to Latins’ refusal to venerate what is worthy of veneration and, conversely, their veneration of objects which are not holy. By placing these accusations after his account of the seventh ecumenical council, the chronicler implicitly equates Latin practices with the practices of the iconoclasts, who also refuse to venerate holy objects.

The chronicler then writes that the ‘Romans’ used to be orthodox; indeed, he emphasises that participants in the ecclesiastical councils came ‘from Rome and from all the seats [of the patriarchs]’.⁵⁶ There follows another list of the ecumenical councils, this time listing the names of each council’s most authoritative participants. After the seventh council, the chronicler writes, came Peter the Stammerer, who seized Rome and corrupted the faith by introducing his own teachings.⁵⁷ Two more examples of Latin wrongdoing follow: priests taking as many as seven ‘wives’, and clerics’ granting of indulgences in return for money. This section focuses on the fact of Rome’s previous orthodoxy and the importance of authoritative orthodox figures as bearers of Christian tradition. Peter the Stammerer, who illicitly introduces his own teaching, departs from the tradition established by the fathers of the church and so paves the way for the appearance of corrupt ecclesiastics, who indulge in practices such as polygamy and the granting of indulgences.

This section of the chronicle containing the Creed, accounts of the councils and warnings against Latin errors might seem rather chaotic at first sight, but is in fact quite tightly structured. It links all the Latin errors it mentions to its accounts of the councils and to the tale of Peter the Stammerer, highlighting Latin devotional malpractice (related to iconoclasm) and corruption among ecclesiastics (initiated by Peter the Stammerer). In this respect, it is nothing like a typical anti-Latin list, which includes only anti-Latin accusations, generally in no particular order,⁵⁸ with little historical

⁵⁴ PSRL 1, cols 112–16.

⁵⁵ ‘проклаша иже са не поклонат. иконамъ.’ PSRL 1, col. 114.

⁵⁶ ‘ѿ Рима. и ѿ всѣх прстль’. PSRL 1, col. 115.

⁵⁷ ‘оученье свое’. PSRL 1, col. 116.

⁵⁸ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, p. 33.

background and few attempts to relate the Latins to other heretics condemned at the ecumenical councils.⁵⁹ What's more, it mentions only four errors, making it an unusually short list.

Nor is this section of the PVL very similar to other texts which set Latin errors in their ecclesiastical and historical context. Various anti-Latin tracts, including the epistles of Metropolitan Nikifor, take this approach, but the most relevant text in this case is the originally Byzantine work known as the *Useful Tale About the Latins*.⁶⁰ The *Useful Tale* paints a detailed picture of the Latin church's gradual fall from grace, and includes a list of Latin errors. While there are no specific points of convergence between the *Useful Tale* and the relevant PVL entry, the *Useful Tale* is perhaps its closest known parallel. Both the PVL and the *Useful Tale* set their analysis of Latin errors in the context of ecclesiastical history, and specifically the struggle against iconoclasm. However, the contexts they describe are quite different: for instance, the *Useful Tale* makes no mention of Peter the Stammerer, instead blaming Charlemagne and Pope Formosus for the spread of the Latin heresy. What's more, unlike the PVL, the *Useful Tale* does not draw a parallel between the attitudes of Latins to holy images and the attitudes of iconoclasts. The PVL also integrates specific Latin errors into the historical narrative to a greater extent than the *Useful Tale*, in which the vast majority of Latin errors are set apart in a discrete section of the text with the format of a list.

Angel Nikolov recently argued that the *Useful Tale* was one of the sources for the introductory section of the PVL, to which it possesses some textual parallels.⁶¹ Various scholars have since cast doubt upon this argument. Ivan Biliarsky and Dmitry I. Polyvyanny note that the *Useful Tale*, dated by Nikolov to the late eleventh century,⁶² would have had to exert influence on the PVL 'at lightning speed';⁶³ Barmin has urged scholars not to discount Shakhmatov's original theory that the *Useful Tale* did not directly influence the introduction to the PVL, but shared a common source with it.⁶⁴ In any case, there are no textual parallels between the *Useful Tale* and the anti-Latin sections of the PVL, and

⁵⁹ Latin practices are often condemned as 'Judaizing', however. Sometimes the association made between Latin and Jewish practices (fasting on the Sabbath, for example) is logical; at other times, it is not (as in the case of the consumption of pig fat and strangled meats).

⁶⁰ Angel Nikolov, *Mezhdurim i Konstantinopol: Iz antikatolicheskata literatura v Bŭlgariia i slavianskiia pravoslaven sviat (XI–XVII v.)* (Sofia: Fondatsiia «Bŭlgarsko istoricheskoto nasledstvo», 2016), pp. 208–66.

⁶¹ Nikolov, 'A Useful Tale', p. 108.

⁶² Although cf. Barmin, *Polemika*, pp. 118–19, who considers Nikolov's arguments unfounded and prefers to provisionally date the *Useful Tale* to the thirteenth century.

⁶³ Ivan Biliarsky, *The Tale of the Prophet Isaiah: The Destiny and Meanings of an Apocryphal Text* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), pp. 55–56; Dmitry I. Polyvyanny, 'Bulgarian Polemical Literature in the Confessional Strife between Rome and Constantinople', *Slověne*, 2 (2016), 370–76 (p. 372).

⁶⁴ Barmin, *Polemika*, p. 118.

so no reason to suspect that the *Useful Tale* might be a source for these sections in particular. It is of course possible that this section of the PVL is based on a different Byzantine source which itself interspersed an anti-Latin list with accounts of the councils; no such source has yet been found. In any case, this extract from the chronicle is remarkable among Russian polemic for its close integration of a discussion of Latin errors into a broader account of ecclesiastical history.

This is not the only way in which Russian texts modify the content and style of Byzantine anti-Latin polemic. Both Feodosii's and Nikifor's epistles to princes contain clear indications that they are written for a Russian audience. In his epistle to Iaroslav Sviatopolchich, Nikifor mentions that Iaroslav's 'neighbours', the Poles, have accepted Latin teachings and begun to use azymes.⁶⁵ The Poles' transgressions serve as a pretext for Nikifor's epistle, which contains both an anti-Latin list and a description of how Rome fell away from orthodoxy. In most redactions, Feodosii's tract has nothing that would suggest its connection to Rus. In the version included in the Second Cassian redaction of the *Patericon*, however, the spread of the Latin 'heresy' is blamed not on Peter the Stammerer or the *nemtsi*, but specifically on the Varangians: 'They defiled the whole world with the extent of their heresy, because there are Varangians all over the world.'⁶⁶ This odd explanation of the origin of Latin errors appears quite independent of Byzantine explanations, reflecting the cultural and geographical proximity of Rus to Scandinavia and its 'Latin' Varangians. Both Feodosii's and Nikifor's texts thus impart local significance to anti-Latin polemic, emphasising Rus's proximity to its Latin neighbours.

That Nikifor's and Feodosii's epistles were addressed to princes is also significant. In Byzantium and sometimes in Rus, anti-Latin epistles were generally composed by high-ranking ecclesiastical figures and sent to other ecclesiastics of similar standing. Ioann II, for example, composed a respectful epistle to the antipope Clement III in the 1080s. However, certain Russian texts adopt the format of the epistle (including salutations, using the second person of the verb, etc.), but address themselves not to ecclesiastics but to princes. Nikifor writes to Vladimir Monomakh and Iaroslav Sviatopolchich, while Feodosii's epistle, at least in some redactions, is addressed to Iziaslav. This is a development restricted to the political and ecclesiastical context of Rus, in which princes and ecclesiastics cooperated in the business of ruling the land and defending the faith.

⁶⁵ 'Poslanie Iaroslavu', ed. by Polianskii, p. 153.

⁶⁶ 'Множеством ереси их всю землю онечествоваша, понеже по всей земли Варязи суть.' *Киево-pechers'kyi paterik*, ed. by Dmitro Abramovich (Kiev: Chas, 1991), p. 191. The Second Cassian redaction dates to 1462, but we cannot exclude the possibility that this version of the tract might have been circulating as part of certain redactions of the *Patericon* at an earlier date. I refer to the Abramovich edition here because the edition by Olshevskaia and Travnikov does not contain Feodosii's tract.

The extremely valuable testimony of erotapokriseis to the adoption of Byzantine anti-Latin thought in Rus has been largely overlooked: neither Popov, Pavlov nor Barmin discuss them. Yet the very appearance of questions about Latins within Rusian erotapokriseis is an unmistakable reflection of the period and cultural context in which they were written. The answers of Georgii, Ioann and Nifont of Novgorod betray their composers' familiarity with the genre of erotapokriseis, both in their form and in their content: the *Questions of Kirik*, for instance, cite canonical answers given by Timothy of Alexandria and Basil the Great, among others.⁶⁷ Yet the erotapokriseis which serve as sources and models for these Rusian erotapokriseis were composed in the Late Antique period and so make no reference to Latins. The very fact that Rusian erotapokriseis include questions about Latins is thus a departure from their models. Earlier erotapokritic texts do, however, include questions about the treatment of groups considered to be heretical. One question included in Timothy of Alexandria's erotapokriseis, for example, reads: 'Is it right for a cleric to say a prayer when there are Arians or other heretics present?'⁶⁸ The erotapokriseis of Georgii and Ioann and the *Questions of Kirik* are therefore not introducing an entirely new type of question: practical questions about the permissibility of dealings with religious 'Others' were no novelty. What is novel is their focus on Latins in particular.

All three Rusian texts warn against religious dealings with Latins. Ioann states that it is unacceptable for Orthodox Christian princes to marry their daughters to husbands who live in countries 'where they use azymes and do not reject unclean foods';⁶⁹ he does not forbid eating with 'those who use azymes and eat meat in Cheesefare Week, and [eat] blood and strangled animals', but suggests that this might be avoided 'for the sake of purity or because of infirmity'.⁷⁰ Anti-Latin polemic informs Ioann's answers: his Latins are defined by their use of azymes and consumption of unclean or inappropriate food, two of the accusations most often made in anti-Latin lists. The same is true of Georgii, who is similarly preoccupied with the danger of pollution from unclean substances. In one answer, he warns that it is not fitting to accept food or drink from Latins, or to drink from the same vessel as them, or to offer them *panagia* (bread dedicated to the Mother of God); elsewhere, he advises that anyone who

⁶⁷ Ivan Žužek, *Kormčaja Kniga: Studies on the Chief Code of Russian Canon Law*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 168 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1964), pp. 135–36.

⁶⁸ 'Аще подобаетъ клирикоу мѣтвѣи творити пришъдъшемъ арианомъ. или инѣмъ еретикомъ.' Beneshevich, *Drevne-slavianskaia kormchaia*, p. 543.

⁶⁹ 'идеже служить опрѣснокъы и съкверноѣдненью не ѡмѣтаются'. 'Kanoniczeskie otvety', ed. by A.S. Pavlov, col. 7.

⁷⁰ 'иже опрѣснокомъ служить и в сыръную недѣлю маса ѡдаты в крови [read и кровь?] и давлению'; 'Аще кто хошетъ сего оубѣгати, извѣтъ имѣя чистоты ради или немощи, ѡбѣгнеть.' 'Kanoniczeskie otvety', ed. by A.S. Pavlov, col. 3.

drinks out of a vessel belonging to a Latin should first offer a prayer.⁷¹ In other answers, both Georgii and Ioann warn the Orthodox against eating the meat of unclean or strangled animals, a reproach often directed against Latins in anti-Latin lists.⁷² The anti-Latin slant of these texts is the result of interplay between an overarching concern for ritual purity, common to all three erotapokriseis, and the convictions of Latin impurity conveyed in anti-Latin lists. The concepts set out in anti-Latin lists find their way into a quite different genre, the erotapokriseis.

Georgii, Ioann and Nifont also note the dangers of Orthodox involvement in the liturgical and pastoral life of the Latin church. Georgii warns against receiving a prayer from a Latin, noting that ‘it is not fitting to stand in a Latin church and listen to their singing’,⁷³ while Ioann warns against communing with Latins or celebrating the liturgy with them.⁷⁴ In a statement which clearly reflects the cultural context of twelfth-century Novgorod, Nifont condemns women who bring their children to a ‘Varangian priest’ for prayers to the same six-week penance as those who go to sorcerers.⁷⁵ (This is not to imply that Nifont sees Latins as equivalent to pagans: in another answer, unlike some later Muscovite clerics, he recommends not rebaptism but simply chrismation for Latins wishing to join the Orthodox church.)⁷⁶ Once again, what is interesting here is the appearance of ‘Latins’ and ‘Varangians’ in what are otherwise relatively standard erotapokritic questions about the permissibility of contact with heretics. Late Antique erotapokriseis may have had nothing to say about Latins, but questions about contact with heretics could be adapted by Rusian ecclesiastics more concerned about contact with Latins than contact with, say, Arians.

Like Rusian anti-Latin lists and epistles, Rusian erotapokriseis testify to the existence of hard-line anti-Latin thought amongst men connected to Rus. There may be little evidence for native Rusian involvement in the composition of polemic or in debate on the nature of Latin errors, but this does not mean that anti-Latin polemic was simply mechanically copied in Rus as an obscure Byzantine genre. On the contrary, anti-Latin polemic in its various formats was not only circulating in Rus, but was being employed in Rusian texts and adapted to the cultural context of Rus. The results of this adaptation varied, from the PVL’s unusual merging of an anti-Latin list with accounts of church history, to Nikifor’s and Feodosii’s references to Rus’s own Latin neighbours, the Poles and the

⁷¹ Turilov, ‘Otvety Georgiia’, p. 240.

⁷² Turilov, ‘Otvety Georgiia’, p. 250; ‘Kanonicheskie otvety’, ed. by A.S. Pavlov, col. 3.

⁷³ ‘Не достоить в латыньстѣи цркви стоюти и пѣнїа и(х) слоушати.’ Turilov, ‘Otvety Georgiia’, p. 241.

⁷⁴ ‘сообщатиса с ними или служити не подобають’. ‘Kanonicheskie otvety’, ed. by A.S. Pavlov, col. 3.

⁷⁵ Mil’kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 410.

⁷⁶ Mil’kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 363; Kallistos Ware, ‘The Rebaptism of Heretics in the Orthodox Canonical Tradition’, in *Heresy and the Making of European Culture: Medieval and Modern Perspectives*, ed. by Andrew P. Roach and James R. Simpson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 31–50 (p. 44).

Varangians, to the way in which Georgii, Ioann and Nifont employ the format of erotapokriseis to warn clerics against contact with Latins. These texts testify not simply to an acceptance of anti-Latin polemical thought in Rus, but to a degree of engagement with it.

The relevance of polemic in Rus

Anti-Latin polemic was not only circulating in Rus, then; it was also undergoing relatively minor yet significant transformations at the hands of men working within the geographical and cultural space of Rus. This very fact demonstrates that, for at least some elements of Rusian society, anti-Latin polemic was meaningful; it was worth copying, adapting, and including in texts like the PVL. The question of why and how polemic was significant in Rus, of the role it played within the culture of Rus, is a problem that has exercised most who have worked on the topic. The attempt to find causal links between extra-textual events and attitudes and these arcane texts has so far dominated the scholarship on anti-Latin polemic in Rus. The rhetorical workings of the texts themselves, and the significance of their circulation within canon law compendia, have provoked much less interest. Yet, as this chapter will demonstrate, our understanding of the relevance of anti-Latin polemic in Rus cannot be complete without an appreciation not just of the socio-political context in which these texts were transmitted, but also of their textual context (the texts with which they were transmitted) and their rhetorical aims.

Why did polemic circulate in Rus? Some previous arguments

Hypotheses about the relevance of polemic in Rus are many, but few are entirely convincing. For example, for K. Viskovaty, the existence of anti-Latin polemic in pre-Mongol Rus is evidence for nothing less than a sustained campaign on the part of Byzantium to indoctrinate Rus against the Latins by flooding it with ‘Greek propaganda’.⁷⁷ However, as numerous scholars have since objected, there is no evidence whatsoever that Byzantine metropolitans consistently promoted anti-Latin sentiment in Early Rus.⁷⁸ Indeed, given that the Schism of 1054 was by no means the final nail in the coffin of Christian unity, there is little reason even to hypothesise that they might have done so.⁷⁹ John

⁷⁷ K. Viskovaty, ‘K voprosu ob avtore i vremeni napisaniia »Slova k Iziaslavu o Latinekh«’, *Slavia*, 16 (1938), 535–67 (p. 538).

⁷⁸ John Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino–Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 26–27; John Fennell, *A History of the Russian Church to 1488* (London: Routledge, 1995), p. 100.

⁷⁹ But cf. A.M. Lidov, ‘Obrazy Khrista v khramovoi dekoratsii i vizantiiskaia khristologiya posle skhizmy 1054 g.’, in *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo: Vizantiia i Drevniaia Rus’. K 100-letiiu Andreia Nikolaevicha Grabara (1896–*

Meyendorff's notion of a 'creeping estrangement' between Orthodox and Latins over the eleventh and twelfth centuries is more true to what we know of the facts than the idea of a dramatic break in 1054 followed by organised propaganda campaigns.⁸⁰

Others have interpreted the continued circulation, reworking and composition of polemical texts in Rus as a series of reactions to political and ecclesiastical events which created tensions between Rus and the Latin world.⁸¹ There is nothing inherently unbelievable about this hypothesis, and I consider it in detail in Chapter Four. For now, however, it is worth noting that there are long stretches of time in the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries in which anti-Latin polemic *might* have appeared as a reaction to political or ecclesiastical tensions, but did not. For example, despite the sack of Constantinople in 1204, Vladimir Riurikovich's expulsion of Dominicans from Kiev in 1233, Galician princes' repeated negotiations with the Pope, and the sending of a papal embassy to Aleksandr Nevskii, new or reworked polemic in Rus in the first sixty years of the thirteenth century is conspicuous by its absence.⁸² There may be some relationship between increased tensions between Rus and the Latin world and increased circulation of polemic, but it is evidently not mechanistic.

Other scholars take a quite different view, insisting on the Byzantine nature of the phenomenon of anti-Latin polemic in Rus. John Fennell, for example, insists that it was largely Byzantines, not Rus, who promoted anti-Latin polemic. In his opinion, anti-Latin polemic existed in Rus simply because all but two of Early Rus's metropolitans were Byzantines, some of whom naturally took part in intellectual debates of interest in Byzantium. Since Byzantines were at the top of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in Rus, a 'certain amount of anti-Latin feeling' might have trickled down to Russian priests and monks, but Fennell considers it doubtful that it reached any of the laity, who, he suggests, would neither have believed the lurid accusations of Feodosii's tract nor understood the theological argumentation of anti-Latin polemic.⁸³ Fennell thus conceives of anti-Latin polemic as fundamentally a Byzantine concern, of interest to only a very few indigenous Russian ecclesiastics. This sober view has its merits. Fennell does not pretend that anti-Latin polemic is Byzantine 'propaganda', and it is hard to disagree with his notion that anti-Latin polemic was primarily a concern of certain elite ecclesiastics.

1990), ed. by E.S. Smirnova (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1999), pp. 155–77, for the possibility that the events of 1054 might have had some influence on church decoration.

⁸⁰ Meyendorff, *Byzantium*, p. 27.

⁸¹ Neborskii, 'Traditsii'.

⁸² Neborskii, 'Traditsii', p. 379.

⁸³ Fennell, *A History*, pp. 96, 101–02.

Nevertheless, Fennell's position fails to provide any framework for considering those polemical ideas and texts which *did* play a role in the indigenous culture of Rus. Even if one attributes all the anti-Latin polemic in the PVL to a Byzantine composer (or one of Fennell's rare Russian ecclesiastics who take an interest in polemic), the fact of its presence within one of the most important texts of Early Rus remains. So does the fact of its influence on later texts like the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, in which Aleksandr, like Vladimir, rejects the 'teachings' of the Latins. Denying that Russian polemic had any real relevance in Rus, as Fennell does, leaves one with an awkward mass of apparently irrelevant, insignificant texts, which were nevertheless copied, modified and composed on Russian soil.

Canon law: Defining orthodoxy

As the previous section demonstrated, among those interested in Russian anti-Latin polemic there is a general unwillingness to accept that polemical texts are significant in the way that they claim to be significant. Polemical texts might purport to concern religious beliefs and practices, but in modern scholarly accounts, these texts are always something other than what they seem to be, whether Greek propaganda, reactions to Latin incursions into Rus, or the intellectual pastime of a distant Byzantine elite. Polemical texts might be all of these things, to some extent. Fundamentally, however, anti-Latin texts are quite transparently concerned with questions of *religious* import: specifically, the definition and condemnation of heterodox thought and practices.

They have this in common with much of the canon law which circulated in Rus. Anti-Latin lists, epistles and erotapokriseis were not necessarily composed specifically for inclusion in canon law collections, but the manuscript evidence demonstrates that, at least by the thirteenth century, lists, epistles and erotapokriseis were largely circulating within compendia of canon law. The Serbian *kormchaia* includes anti-Latin lists and epistles, while the Russian *kormchaia* also includes erotapokriseis and, in some of its redactions, additional lists and epistles (see p. 104).⁸⁴ Some anti-Latin texts are also included in other compendia such as monastic florilegia (*sborniki*) and chronicles, whether monastic (the *Patericon* of the Caves) or princely (the PVL). However, they are very rarely included in collections intended for active liturgical use, such as *trebniki*. Popov includes one fifteenth-century *trebnik* in his seminal account of anti-Latin material in Rus, but Pavlov dismisses it as extremely unusual.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Shchapov, *Vizantiiskoe i iuzhnoslavianskoe pravovoe nasledie*, pp. 118, 163.

⁸⁵ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, pp. 134–54; A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*, pp. 73–74.

This is important for an understanding of the role of anti-Latin polemic in Rus. Canon law collections were not used in the liturgical life of the church. Anti-Latin polemic, then, was not generally visible: it was not being proclaimed in the churches, but tended to be hidden away in canon law compendia and florilegia. What's more, Russian ecclesiastics cannot often have had reason to consult or absorb the more arcane material contained in canon law collections. Ioannis M. Konidaris's study of familiarity with canon law in Byzantium concludes that 'in the ranks of the clergy a sound knowledge of canon law was a rare commodity'.⁸⁶ There is no reason to believe that it was any better known in Rus.

Nevertheless, canon law possessed vital significance as a record of previous authoritative judgements which prescribed orthodox actions and attitudes and proscribed acts and ideas unworthy of the orthodox. Its significance was definitional and structural; it established and maintained the totality of correct belief and practice. Plenty of texts circulating in Rus *exemplified* orthodox belief and practice. Canon law, however, contributed to the *definition* of orthodoxy, rather than simply providing examples of what orthodoxy might look like. Of course, in practice, this definition was sprawling, shapeless and sometimes self-contradictory. What's more, not all canon law was equally authoritative: when Kirik shares a dubious canonical ruling he found in a suspicious nomocanon, Nifont tells him, 'That kind of book should be burned.'⁸⁷ In theory, however, canon law established ever more precisely the boundaries of orthodoxy and orthopraxy.

While the existence of canon law was vital, it was never expected that all the orthodox would behave in a manner consistent with canonical prescriptions at all times. Human fallibility was acknowledged and mistakes expected. The *Questions of Kirik*, for example, follows a long-established tradition of specifying penances for failure to follow the prescriptions it establishes, in the manner of a penitential. Nifont might rule that his parishioners should not turn to Varangian priests, but he recognises that some will do so all the same, imposing a six-week penance.⁸⁸ Moreover, canon law rulings did not have to be consistently applied by clerics. Konidaris argues that, unlike secular law, which is 'of relative validity but absolute power', canon law is 'of eternal and absolute validity, but of relative power'.⁸⁹ The substance of canon law rulings is unchangeable, but interpretations of these rulings can vary, and the concept of *oikonomia* permits flexibility in their application. Anti-Latin polemical

⁸⁶ Ioannis M. Konidaris, 'The Ubiquity of Canon Law', in *Law and Society in Byzantium: Ninth–Twelfth Centuries*, ed. by Angeliki E. Laiou and Dieter Simon (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1994), pp. 131–50 (p. 140).

⁸⁷ 'а ты кнѣгы годатьс сжечи.' Mil'kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 386.

⁸⁸ Mil'kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 410.

⁸⁹ Konidaris, 'The Ubiquity', p. 134.

injunctions could be absolutely and eternally valid, and yet not consistently applied, even by metropolitans and bishops.

Polemic beyond lists, epistles and erotapokriseis?

Is there any evidence, then, that the strict injunctions and violent accusations of anti-Latin polemic influenced the actions and attitudes of the Rus? Did polemic resonate at all outside of texts intended to maintain and uphold orthodoxy? Judging by some of the more recent work on Rus and the Latin world, the short answer to this question is that there is very little evidence that anti-Latin polemic was heeded by any Rus, apart from perhaps some high-ranking ecclesiastics. Fennell, for instance, admits that some native priests and monks might have subscribed to anti-Latin views under the influence of their Byzantine superiors, but rhetorically demands: ‘How much of this polemical literature filtered down to the people themselves? And, if it did, how intelligible to them was the significance of even the simplest differences in practice between the Latins and the Greeks?’⁹⁰ Raffensperger similarly argues that anti-Latin feeling was widespread among monks but not among princes, noting that Ioann II’s condemnation of princely marriages to Latins is not heeded by the princes of Rus, who continue to marry Latins despite Ioann’s polemical injunctions.⁹¹

As Fennell and Raffensperger affirm, it is clear that few Rus followed the more fanatical injunctions in anti-Latin polemic like Feodosii’s tract, which warns Orthodox Christians away from even eating from the same vessel a Latin has used. In this respect, the influence of polemic was evidently limited. However, the distinction that Fennell and Raffensperger draw between the convictions of (some) monks and clergy on one hand and of laypeople (princes and the rest of the laity) on the other is questionable. Both Fennell and Raffensperger suggest that many ecclesiastics subscribed to anti-Latin views, while the laity did not. Yet there is evidence that high-ranking ecclesiastical figures could be both outspoken defenders of orthodoxy and no strangers to dealings with Latins. Anti-Latin opinions need not have dictated anti-Latin actions.⁹²

Take, for instance, Metropolitan Kirill II. Kirill is often supposed to have been involved in the composition or circulation of two works with anti-Latin elements, the Serbian *kormchaia* and the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*. He is also the composer of the *Pravilo Kirilla*, a set of canonical injunctions intended for circulation in Rus. One might therefore be tempted to attribute to him anti-Latin sentiment and a desire to propagate anti-Latin texts, especially given his proven commitment to

⁹⁰ Fennell, *A History*, pp. 101–02.

⁹¹ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, pp. 8, 174.

⁹² *Pace Floria*, among others, whose ecclesiastics are paragons of consistency in thought, word and deed. Floria, *U istokov*, pp. 12–14.

canon law and the enduring scholarly assumption that he abandoned Danilo of Galicia in protest at Danilo's negotiations with the Pope, taking refuge with the more Orthodox Aleksandr Nevskii.⁹³

Yet despite his close involvement with canon law, according to the entry s.a. 1250 in the Galician-Volynian chronicle, it is none other than Kirill who began the negotiations which resulted in the marriage of Danilo's son to the daughter of the (Latin) king of Hungary, Bela IV.⁹⁴ Kirill's actions here run counter to Ioann II's strict injunction that Rusian princes should not marry Latins. What's more, there is no evidence that Kirill particularly promoted anti-Latin writing, let alone insisted upon upholding it in practice. If Kirill did move northwards as a reaction to Danilo of Galicia's willingness to negotiate with the Pope, he must have been disappointed: Aleksandr Nevskii too was in communication with the Pope, responding to a papal epistle in a manner sufficiently cordial and encouraging to merit a friendly response.⁹⁵ (Mari Isoaho has also convincingly demonstrated that the very idea that Kirill was involved in the composition of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is an assumption without a great deal of evidence behind it.⁹⁶) Moreover, Kirill's own work, the *Pravilo*, has nothing to say about Latins, even though a number of its accusations concern un-Christian, 'pagan' practices.⁹⁷ Finally, although the Serbian *kormchaia* does indeed include anti-Latin articles, it seems extremely unlikely that Kirill would have acquired the new *kormchaia* simply for its few anti-Latin texts.

The conclusion to be drawn here is not that Kirill was a covert Latin sympathiser, but rather that most dealings with Latins did not trigger anti-Latin rhetoric. Rusian ecclesiastics might well have been aware of and indeed approved of anti-Latin polemic without feeling the need to reproduce it at every possible moment. Indeed, Kirill was a political actor as well as a religious one, and had political dealings with prominent Latins. Constant denunciation of Latins would hardly have been politically expedient for Kirill and his colleagues, whether they firmly believed in Latin sinfulness or not. It was

⁹³ Fennell calls Kirill 'a man who had every reason to be antagonistic to the West, particularly to the Catholic West'. John Fennell, *The Crisis of Medieval Russia, 1200–1304* (London: Longman, 1983), p. 103. See also *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi: XI – pervaiia polovina XIV v.*, ed. by D.S. Likhachev (Leningrad: Nauka, 1987), pp. 225–26.

⁹⁴ PSRL 2, col. 809.

⁹⁵ A.A. Gorskii, 'Dva «neudobnykh» fakta iz biografii Aleksandra Nevskogo', in *Aleksandr Nevskii i istoriia Rossii: Materialy nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii 26–28 sentiabria 1995 goda*, ed. by V.A. Kuchkin, A.N. Kirpichnikov, and V.L. Egorov (Novgorod: Novgorodskii gosudarstvennyi ob''edinennyi muzei-zapovednik, 1996), pp. 64–75 (pp. 64–69).

⁹⁶ Mari Isoaho, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy in Medieval Russia: Warrior and Saint* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 103–23.

⁹⁷ 'Pravilo Kiurila, mitropolita rus'kago', in *Pamiatniki*, ed. by A.S. Pavlov, cols 83–102.

not only princes who did not always heed the accusations and prescriptions contained in canon law. Again, this does not mean that Russian ecclesiastics did not consider anti-Latin polemic to be significant. Otherwise, why should polemic have been employed and elaborated upon by Russian writers, and integrated into Russian texts?

There is one exception to the rule that accusations in anti-Latin lists tended to be ignored outside of lists, epistles and erotapokriseis (and texts influenced by one of these genres, like the PVL's account of the teaching Vladimir received on his conversion s.a. 988). Azymes are mentioned and condemned in two Early Russian texts which are not primarily concerned with the definition and maintenance of orthodoxy and orthopraxy: Daniil's travel account and the PVL s.a. 986. Daniil almost never implies that the Latins with whom he travels are anything less than good Christians. However, when he visits the cave of Melchizedek and describes the bread and wine offered by Melchizedek in the presence of Abraham, he notes: 'And that was the beginning of the celebration of the Eucharist with bread and wine, *and not azymes*.'⁹⁸ In the PVL too, azymes are the only aspect of Latin difference that is mentioned outside of the section on Vladimir's instruction. The composer notes that the Latins' faith is similar to that of the Orthodox, but that they use azymes, which are not part of Orthodox tradition.⁹⁹

Why the focus on azymes specifically? On one level, the prominence of the question of azyme use is unsurprising: the Eucharistic bread was the body of Christ, no less, and at the very centre of the liturgy. The debate over the acceptability of azymes was therefore hugely consequential for the Church. However, as a focus of anti-Latin polemic, the question of azymes was relatively recent. Passed over in silence by Photios in the ninth century, debate on azymes had come to the fore in the events surrounding the Schism of 1054.¹⁰⁰ After the Schism, many Byzantine ecclesiastics saw the problem of azymes as the single weightiest issue dividing the churches.¹⁰¹ There are traces of this attitude in the ecclesiastical culture of Rus. Nikifor and Ioann II, writing for Russian princes, both make the use of azymes the defining feature of a Latin (along with the consumption of unclean food,

⁹⁸ 'И то бысть начатокъ литургиам хлѣбом и вином, *а не опръсноком.*' My italics. «*Khozhenie*» igumena Daniila v Sviatuiu Zemliu v nachale XII v., ed. by O.A. Belobrova and others (Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Olega Abyshko, 2007), pp. 110–12.

⁹⁹ PSRL 1, cols 86–87.

¹⁰⁰ Louth, *Greek East*, p. 311.

¹⁰¹ Georgij Avvakumov, 'Die Fragen des Ritus als Streit- und Kontroversgegenstand: Zur Typologie der Kulturkonflikte zwischen dem lateinischen Westen und dem byzantinisch-slavisches Osten im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit', in *Religions- und Kulturgeschichte in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa, vol. 2: Kirchen- und Kulturgeschichtsschreibung in Nordost- und Ostmitteleuropa: Initiativen, Methoden, Theorien*, ed. by Rainer Bendel (Berlin: Lit, 2006), pp. 191–233 (pp. 207–08).

in Ioann's canonical answers),¹⁰² and it is possible that certain of the eleventh-century frescoes of St. Sophia in Kiev were conceived as a restatement of the Byzantine position on the azyme debate.¹⁰³

The prominence of azymes in Early Rusian writing seems likely to be, at least in part, a reflection of the privileging of this issue in the higher echelons of ecclesiastical culture in Byzantium and Rus. However, this is perhaps not the whole story. In Rusian writing, two words are used for 'azymes': *opresnoki* and *oplatki* (from Latin *oblatum*). At least to the composer of the PVL entry for 986, the second term is apparently more comprehensible: he glosses *opresnoki* as *oplatki*.¹⁰⁴ It is the term derived from Latin and most likely adopted into Slavonic via Poland that seems to him to be the more natural designation, not the term used in most anti-Latin polemic. This suggests that Rusian awareness of azymes might have derived not from anti-Latin polemical texts alone, but from the cultural proximity of Rus to the Latin world. After all, the issue of azyme use was both easily comprehensible (at least on a basic level) and immediately visible to any Rus who might be present at services at Latin churches. In any case, azymes are the only Latin error to be expounded both inside and outside of lists, epistles and erotapokriseis. In the vast majority of cases, polemic expressed in these three genres appears not to have resonated at all outside them.

Polemic and orthodoxy: Credo, nego

As I discussed above, anti-Latin polemic tended to circulate within canon law compendia. The role of canon law was important, but restricted. Canon law texts set out orthodox ideals, thereby contributing to the definition of orthodoxy; yet these ideals were neither consistently followed nor consistently enforced. This renders more comprehensible the fact that anti-Latin polemic was composed and transmitted yet apparently rarely applied in daily life in Rus. Like canon law in general, anti-Latin polemic had to exist; this did not mean it had to be widely known or consistently heeded.

What does it mean for anti-Latin polemic to function as part of the definition of orthodoxy?

Orthodoxy implies a single set of correct beliefs and a single set of correct practices. Even apparently trivial errors, then, can possess real significance as a departure from orthodoxy. Many Rusian anti-Latin texts makes this abundantly clear. The PVL states that Latins have deviated from orthodoxy only 'slightly',¹⁰⁵ and yet devotes more space to them than to any other religious group. Nikifor repeatedly stresses that the Latins, despite their geographical (and, implicitly, cultural) proximity to

¹⁰² 'Kanonicheskie otvety', ed. by A.S. Pavlov, cols 3, 7; 'Poslanie Iaroslavu', ed. by Polianskii, p. 153.

¹⁰³ Lidov, 'Obrazy Khrista'.

¹⁰⁴ 'служать бо впрѣсноки рекше вплатки.' PSRL 1, col. 86.

¹⁰⁵ 'маломь'. PSRL 1, col. 86.

the land of Rus, have ‘distanced themselves from the holy, ecumenical, orthodox and apostolic church’.¹⁰⁶ Many other epistles also stress Rome’s previous orthodoxy, presenting its current fallen state as the result of deviation from tradition, or combine anti-Latin accusations with accounts of the ecumenical councils, simultaneously highlighting Rome’s recent fall from grace and implicitly comparing Latins to the heretics condemned at the councils. Errors which distance a group from ecumenical tradition cannot be trivial. A single deviation from orthodoxy leads to heterodoxy.

When it comes to defining orthodoxy in the chronicle, it is Latins who matter. The orthodox teaching Vladimir receives is composed of three elements: the Creed, the rulings of the councils and the denunciation of the rival teachings of the Latins. Jews and Muslims, who might seem to be more obvious targets for polemic, have only walk-on parts in the Tale of the Choosing of the Faiths s.a. 986; their faiths are quickly dismissed.¹⁰⁷ Paganism is not condemned at all as a system of beliefs rather than simply the absence of belief. In the PVL, orthodoxy is defined against incorrect belief rather than lack of belief. Latins’ incorrect belief and corrupt teachings are structurally necessary to orthodoxy; without them, orthodoxy would lose its meaning.

The entire section on Vladimir’s instruction has the tenor less of a joyful affirmation of orthodoxy than of a dire warning against heresy. The Creed is introduced with the words: ‘May none of the heretics cause you to sin, but believe, saying the following.’¹⁰⁸ The Creed is thus figured primarily as a safeguard against heresy. The accounts of the councils, too, are less about what to believe than about what not to believe, less *credo* (‘I believe’) than *nego* (‘I do not believe, I reject’). The same goes for the anti-Latin list which follows. The cataloguing of (apparently) minor errors of the sort made by heretics and Latins allows for the construction of an ever more precise definition of orthodoxy, as the kernel of belief that is left when all heterodox deviations are eradicated. The PVL’s condemnation of heresy is thus simultaneously an affirmation of orthodoxy.

In their edited volume on heresy and identity in Late Antiquity, Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin suggest that ‘ancient heresiological discourses re-read similarity as difference: they turned religious formations akin to their own into utterly different configurations.’¹⁰⁹ In Rus as in the Late Antique world, minor deviations can be more troubling than major ones. An absolute Other can be less threatening than an almost-but-not-quite Other; Latins can pose more of a threat than pagans, Muslims or Jews. Certain Russian texts, however, do not simply ‘re-read similarity as difference’, but

¹⁰⁶ ‘ѿ стѣа собѣрныа правѣрныа апсльскїа цркѣ ѿстѣпиша’. ‘Poslanie Iaroslavu’, ed. by Polianskii, p. 153.

¹⁰⁷ PSRL 1, cols 84–86.

¹⁰⁸ ‘да не прельстатъ тебе нѣции ѿ еретикъ. но вѣруи сице гла.’ PSRL 1, col. 112.

¹⁰⁹ Iricinschi and Zellentin, ‘Making Selves’, p. 20.

simultaneously dwell on the troubling similarities between Latins and Orthodox. Numerous Rusian anti-Latin texts exemplify this: take the PVL, which devotes so much attention to Latins and yet admits that they have deviated only slightly from orthodoxy. The Serbian *kormchaia* contains a short extract from a tract by the eleventh-century archbishop Leo of Ohrid; it includes a denunciation of those who ‘call themselves Christians’ and yet use azymes: ‘They are like a lynx’s coat, the fur of which is neither black nor entirely white.’¹¹⁰ Leo, using the topos of azyme use as Jewish or Judaizing, considers azymites to be a worrying hybrid, ‘neither Jews nor pure Christians’.¹¹¹ Their sin is their very hybridity as well as their mendacity: they call themselves Christians, but are not (quite).

In certain Rusian polemical texts, however, the heart of the problem is not Latins themselves so much as their influence on the Orthodox. Towards the end of his tract, Feodosii begins to denounce not only Latins but even those who maintain that it is possible to accept both one ‘faith’ and the other. ‘Do you think that God is a double-believer?’, he instructs the prince to object.¹¹² The tract attacks not only the existence of the Latin heresy, but also the existence of Orthodox Christians who are themselves insufficiently orthodox. Nifont of Novgorod too employs the concept of ‘double-belief’. He castigates the women who bring their children to Varangian priests as ‘like double-believers’.¹¹³ Traditionally, ‘double-belief’ was thought to refer to Christian-pagan syncretism in Rus, but Stella Rock finds very little evidence for this definition in medieval Slavonic sources.¹¹⁴ In this case, it seems likely that the two ‘faiths’ involved are the ‘Latin’ or ‘Varangian’ faith and the ‘Orthodox’ faith, as in Feodosii’s tract.¹¹⁵ This use of the term ‘double-belief’ to denote wavering between two faiths seems to be a Slavonic innovation: none of the originally Greek texts which Rock examines in their Slavonic translations use the term in this way.¹¹⁶

The spectre of a failure to maintain the boundary between the Latin and Orthodox churches (and between Latins and Orthodox themselves) also motivates the inclusion of anti-Latin answers in the erotapokriseis of Georgii and Ioann: both metropolitans forbid or express concern about marriage to Latins, eating and drinking with Latins, and worshipping alongside Latins. Given their focus on

¹¹⁰ ‘подобно соуще кожи рѣсии [...] ѹи же серть ни черна ѹсть ни ѡтноудь бѣла’. Попов, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, p. 125.

¹¹¹ ‘ни жидове ни хрстѣкане чисти соуть’. Попов, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, p. 125.

¹¹² ‘мниши ли Бога двовѣрна!’ ‘Poslanie o vere latinskoi’, ed. by Ponyrko, p. 17.

¹¹³ ‘акы двовѣрци’. Mil’kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 410.

¹¹⁴ Stella Rock, *Popular Religion in Russia: ‘Double Belief’ and the Making of an Academic Myth* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), p. 86.

¹¹⁵ Rock favours this interpretation, claiming that ‘the balance of evidence [...] suggests that the word *Varangian* here is used to signify “Roman Catholic”’. Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 75.

¹¹⁶ Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 61.

proscribing actions unworthy of the orthodox and on preventing ritual impurity, erotapokriseis are a particularly suitable venue for the expression of fears about uncleanness resulting from the practice of ‘double-belief’. Within all three erotapokriseis, and also in Feodosii’s tract, the problem is not so much Latin corruption itself as the way that Latins corrupt the Orthodox. Latins are a kind of hybrid in themselves, neither entirely Christian nor entirely un-Christian, but they can also lead the Orthodox astray, into a different kind of hybridity which the sources call double-belief.

*

This framework for understanding the significance of anti-Latin texts in Rus has focused on interpreting texts and their formal and conceptual relationships to other texts. The broader, much more difficult, question of what readers and writers personally made of the accusations contained in anti-Latin polemic remains to be answered. It evidently mattered that polemic against Latins existed in Rus, for the reasons I have presented above. But this does not prove that any inhabitants of Rus had strong personal opinions about Latins, or even understood the details of the debate. It is worth remembering that the PVL’s version of the Creed is in fact Arian, a rather dramatic oversight which no composer or copier of the Laurentian version of the PVL seems to have caught. Somebody involved in the composition of the PVL thought it worthwhile to include passages on Latins, just as they included the Creed—but did they understand the detail of what they were writing, or why it was important? Perhaps not.

This is not to imply that anti-Latin polemic was simply mechanically copied in Rus. The above examples of adaptation of anti-Latin polemic demonstrate that this was not (always) the case. Russian composers did not simply reproduce Byzantine polemical forms and concepts, but engaged with them, altered them (often in such a way as to reflect the sociocultural context of Rus), and included them in genres in which anti-Latin content was traditionally absent (erotapokriseis). Yet the anti-Latin polemic composed and copied by inhabitants of Rus never functioned as a guide to real-life dealings with actual Latins. Anti-Latin polemic clearly mattered to some composers and copyists in Rus—but its significance was more symbolic than intellectual, more structural than personal. The simple act of preaching against Latins seems to have been more important than ensuring the people of Rus (high-ranking ecclesiastics included) practised what was preached.

In other words, anti-Latin polemic was significant because it was part of the edifice of orthodoxy on which the written culture of Rus was founded. The apparently trivial and exaggeratedly censorious accusations made against Latins in lists and epistles reflected the threatening proximity of the ‘Latin faith’ to orthodoxy. Affirmation of the differences, acknowledged to be slight, between Latins and Orthodox constituted an affirmation of orthodoxy itself. Outside of the sphere of canon law and texts concerned with defining orthodoxy, there was simply not the same impetus to portray Latins as religiously Other. This study will therefore now turn to Latins represented as culturally and religiously

different, certainly, but not as the deceitful, corrupt yet worryingly familiar heretics of Russian anti-Latin polemic.

Chapter Two: Conceptualising Latins in the Chronicles of Early Rus

In his 2012 book on relations between Early Rus and the Latin world, *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World*, Raffensperger admits that the chronicles have posed him something of a problem. Composed and compiled by monks, they reflect (Raffensperger suggests) an anti-Latin worldview which was not widely shared outside the Russian church. He continues:

‘This problem surfaces in every chapter of this book, in particular in regard to the growing schism between the Latin and Orthodox churches, which the monastic authors of the Russian chronicles are much more concerned about than the rulers of Rus seem to be from their actions. The monks also, I believe, deliberately avoided mention of the West and Western contacts of Rus’, either because of anti-Latin feeling (as seen in the numerous anti-Latin polemics included in the *PVL*), or because of a narrow parochial attitude focused on church affairs and local Russian affairs, probably in that order.’¹

For Raffensperger, then, chroniclers and their chronicles are hostile towards Latins. What’s more, their frustrating reticence on contacts between Rus and the Latin world is largely the result of a deliberate policy of silence on Latins, symptomatic of anti-Latin feeling.

There is something to be said for this view. It is true that chronicle statements about contacts with Latins tend to be short and not especially frequent. It is also true that the single explicit statement about the Latins as a religious group in the chronicles is a virulent condemnation included in perhaps the most ideologically significant passage in any Russian chronicle, the tale of the conversion of Vladimir to Christianity. This chapter does not deny any of this. Neither does it aim to minimise the significance of the (rare) anti-Latin passages in the chronicles. It does, however, challenge many of the assumptions traditionally made about the chronicles as broadly anti-Latin sources, about their ideologically-motivated silence on the subject of Latins, and about the prevalence of anti-Latin polemic within them. The polemic included in the conversion narrative has its own significance, as I argued in the previous chapter, but it should not be used as a prism through which to read the rest of the chronicles.

Increasingly subtle analyses of chronicle representations of Latins have begun to emerge in the past few decades. Raffensperger himself notes that although monks tended, in his view, to be anti-Latin—or at least to produce anti-Latin works²—they did not explicitly denounce princes who spent time among the Latins.³ Both Selart and Kappeler have questioned and nuanced the idea, elaborated by

¹ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 8.

² Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 169.

³ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 8.

Noonan in an article from 1975,⁴ that anti-Latin hostility was the norm in chronicles from an early date.⁵ In both cases, however, this is only a minor component of a much broader argument; neither treats the question in great detail. Floria and Plokhy have also contributed a number of counter-examples to the prevailing assumption that chronicles tended to portray Latins negatively, in which Latins are accepted as fellow Christians or praised as good men rather than denounced as schismatics or pagans.⁶

This chapter takes a critical stance on both the majority position (that chronicles tended to be anti-Latin) and the minority view (that Latin difference is largely overlooked in the chronicles). The first half of this chapter assesses the evidence behind some of the scholarly claims that have been made about Latins in the chronicles; the second half moves beyond binary statements about the chronicles as largely ‘anti-Latin’ or ‘pro-Latin’, investigating chroniclers’ rhetorical manipulation of the ambiguous religious and political status of Latins.

The chronicles of Early Rus

The chronicles of Early Rus are the product of compilation. They unite passages of text composed over centuries in various regions of Rus and Byzantium. They include extremely diverse types of text, from short annalistic records to extended tales, from hagiography to trade treaties. Small wonder, then, that chronicles are not ideologically consistent in every respect, just as they are not stylistically consistent or consistent in the content they include. Some chronicles are admittedly more consistent than others. The Novgorod First chronicle, for instance, contains mostly relatively short entries composed in Novgorod, while the Kiev chronicle contains numerous lengthy entries which amalgamate brief records, tales and other material from various regions of Rus. The Kiev chronicle’s form of compilation can produce seemingly odd results: Andrei Bogoliubskii is arrogant and overbearing in 1174, but a virtuous martyred prince the very next year.⁷ Yet despite the great diversity and occasional incoherence of chronicles, there are patterns in chronicles’ depictions of Latins: patterns of representation, patterns of lexical usage, *topoi*. That chronicles are not always ideologically consistent makes the existence of such patterns particularly significant.

Of course, portrayals of Latins can also differ substantially from one chronicle (or part of a chronicle) to the next. The geographical provenance of a chronicle or part-chronicle is one of the principal

⁴ Noonan, ‘Medieval Russia’.

⁵ Selart, *Livonia*, pp. 21–22; Kappeler, ‘Ethnische Abgrenzung’, pp. 133–35.

⁶ Floria, *U istokov*, pp. 130–31, 199–207; Plokhy, *The Origins*, p. 63.

⁷ PSRL 2, cols 569–95.

factors influencing its representations of Latins, as Chapter Five will demonstrate. The north-east of Rus (Vladimir-Suzdal) lay almost a thousand miles from the south-west of Rus (Galicia-Volynia) as the crow flies, and this shows. It shows not so much in the tenor of different chronicles' mentions of Latins, but in their frequency. The Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle has next to nothing to say about Latins, whereas the Galician-Volynian chronicle discusses Latins almost more frequently than other Rus. There is no need to assume that the north was therefore more hostile to Latins than the south: the south-west of Rus was simply closer to the Latin world than the north-east, making political exchange more viable and more likely. In the same way, southern Russian chronicles have little to say about the Volga Bulgars, while the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle mentions them quite frequently. This is surely the result of a lesser degree of familiarity with the Volga Bulgars in the south of Rus, rather than the consequence of a deliberate southern policy of contemptuous silence about the very existence of the Volga Bulgars. In what follows, I pay more attention to chronicles which have more to say about Latins, a bias which I will correct in Chapter Five.

The Laurentian, Hypatian and Novgorod First chronicles

This chapter analyses three chronicles of Early Rus, the Laurentian, Hypatian and Novgorod First chronicles.⁸ Scholars conventionally divide each of these three chronicles into two or three smaller chronicles, often representing chronicle-writing from a particular time and place. The Laurentian, Hypatian and Novgorod First chronicles all begin with an account of Christian history from the creation of the world, followed by an account of the earliest history of Rus and its first rulers. All come to some sort of end in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. All have the same chronological structure, with entries organised under year headings. They use the same language, although with some regional linguistic variation, and share numerous topoi. They also occasionally share whole entries, with the same entry appearing in multiple chronicles.

The Laurentian chronicle takes its name from the Laurentian codex of 1377. The Laurentian chronicle consists of two chronicles, the PVL and the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle. The PVL is a piece of early Kievan chronicle-writing, also found in the Hypatian codex and various other manuscripts. It relates the early history of Rus in the context of Christian history, covering its creation, its first rulers, its conversion to Christianity and the events of the century after the conversion. It contains a particular variety of types of text, including numerous long narratives about episodes in the earliest history of Rus. The Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle begins s.a. 1111, where the PVL leaves off, and continues to 1305. Its conventional title is something of a misnomer. In the first half of the twelfth century, its

⁸ PSRL 1; PSRL 2; *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis' starshogo i mladshogo izvodov*, ed. by A.N. Nasonov, *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, 3 (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1950), henceforth PSRL 3.

focus is not on the region of Vladimir-Suzdal but on Kiev. In this period, it is an ‘all-Russian’ chronicle, incorporating material from various areas of Rus. In the later twelfth century, its focus switches to the north-east of Rus.

The oldest manuscript of the Hypatian chronicle dates to 1425. The Hypatian chronicle incorporates three chronicles: the PVL, in a version slightly different to the Laurentian chronicle’s version; the Kiev chronicle; and the Galician-Volynian chronicle. The Hypatian version of the PVL continues to 1117, where the Kiev chronicle begins. The Kiev chronicle is an expansive all-Russian chronicle which continues to 1199. Its continuation, the Galician-Volynian chronicle, is a piece of regional historiography focusing on south-western Rus from 1200 to 1299. It has the distinction of having started life not as a chronicle, maintained annalistically with entries for each year, but as a history, a continuous piece of historiography without year headings. The chronological framework it possesses in the Hypatian chronicle (but not in all its manuscript exemplars) was added later.⁹ Its style is colourful, with unusually elaborate syntax.¹⁰

The final chronicle I consider, the Novgorod First chronicle, exists in two versions, the Older and the Younger. The Older version comes to a halt in the 1330s, and is the version to which I will principally refer. It is extant in only one manuscript, the oldest manuscript of any Russian chronicle, dating partly to c. 1234 and partly to c. 1330, with some sporadic additions for the 1340s and 1350s.¹¹

Unfortunately, this manuscript is missing a number of folia, so that it begins only with the entry for 1016 and is missing the years 1273–1298. It is almost certain that it contained a text very similar to the Younger Version’s text for before 1016 and 1273–1298,¹² and I therefore refer to the Younger Version for entries within those periods. The Younger Version is extant in numerous manuscripts and continues into the fifteenth century. As the Older Version mostly likely did, the Younger version begins with an account of Christian history and the pre-history of Rus. This account is not identical to the PVL’s account, although it covers much of the same ground. It is most likely a different but related piece of early Kievan historiography with Novgorodian additions.¹³ Both versions of the

⁹ Alexei P. Tolochko, ‘Proiskhozhdenie khronologii Ipatievskogo spiska Galitsko-Volynskoi letopisi’, *Palaeoslavica*, 13 (2005), 81–108 (p. 81).

¹⁰ D. Tschizewskij, ‘Zum Stil der Galizisch-Volynischen Chronik’, *Südost-Forschungen*, 12 (1953), 79–109.

¹¹ T.V. Gimón, ‘Pripiski na dopolnitel’nykh listakh v Sinodal’nom spiske Novgorodskoi I letopisi’, in *Norna u istochnika sud’by: Sbornik statei v chest’ Eleny Aleksandrovny Mel’nikovoi* (Moscow: Indrik, 2001), pp. 53–60 (p. 54).

¹² A.A. Gippius, ‘K istorii’, p. 54.

¹³ The problem of the so-called *nachalni svod* (‘Initial Compilation’), a Kievan forerunner of the PVL which Shakhmatov believed to be reflected in the Novgorod First chronicle, remains contentious, as does the relationship between the PVL and the early sections of the Novgorod First chronicle. For a clear discussion of

Novgorod First chronicle are based on the archiepiscopal chronicle of Novgorod, which was maintained as annals by Novgorodian clerics.¹⁴

The Laurentian, Hypatian and Novgorod First chronicles might be the best-known chronicles of Early Rus, but they are not the only chronicles of Early Rus. Many Russian and Muscovite chronicles contain entries about the period this thesis covers. The First and Second Pskov chronicles, for instance, contain original Pskovian entries on events in Pskov from 1238, according to A.N. Nasonov.¹⁵ My reasons for not including the Pskov chronicles and other chronicles with entries on Early Rus are twofold. Firstly, there is a great deal of material in the Laurentian, Hypatian and Novgorod First chronicles alone; including all chronicles with entries on Early Rus would be almost unworkable. Secondly, there is the problem of later editing. One cannot be sure even that the Early Russian chronicles which I do consider in this chapter have not undergone repeated redactions which considerably altered their original content. Thankfully, A.A. Gippius's recent work on the Novgorod First chronicle has demonstrated that this is very unlikely to be the case, at least for the Novgorod First chronicle between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries.¹⁶ The Laurentian and Hypatian chronicles still await similar studies, but the sheer heterogeneity of their content and style suggests that they were not subject to thorough-going rewriting with the aim of rendering them formally or ideologically uniform. The First and Second Pskov chronicles, however, were evidently heavily redacted at a date later than 1330, the end point for this thesis: both begin with a synopsis of noteworthy events and characters of Early Russian and Pskovian history, including parts of the early-mid fourteenth-century *Tale of Dovmont*.¹⁷

The Laurentian, Hypatian and Novgorod First chronicles are the closest we can get to the chronicle-writing of Early Rus, but we cannot be sure quite how close this is. However, we can assume that

the role of early Kievan historiography in the formation of the Novgorod First chronicle, see A.A. Gippius, 'K istorii'; on the debate about the links between the PVL and the Novgorod First chronicle, see Alexey A. Gippius, 'Reconstructing the Original of the *Povest' vremennykh let*: A Contribution to the Debate', *Russian Linguistics*, 38 (2014), 341–66, in which Gippius argues that the text of the Novgorod First 'goes back to a protograph which is more ancient than the archetype of the six full copies of the PVL' (p. 343) and provides references on the evolution of the debate.

¹⁴ A.A. Gippius, 'K kharakteristike novgorodskogo vladychnogo letopisaniia XII–XIV vv.', in *Velikii Novgorod v istorii srednevekovoi Evropy: k 70-letiiu Valentina Lavrent'evicha Ianina* (Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1999), pp. 345–64.

¹⁵ *Pskovskie letopisi*, ed. by A.N. Nasonov, *Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei*, 5, 2 vols (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2000), I: 37. Henceforth PSRL 5a and 5b.

¹⁶ A.A. Gippius, 'K kharakteristike', pp. 351–55.

¹⁷ PSRL 5b, pp. 16–18; for the dating of the *Tale*, see V.I. Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte: Issledovanie i teksty* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1985), pp. 47–56.

most of the entries in Early Russian chronicles were composed not long after the events they discuss, even if potentially redacted at a later date. In this study, I therefore assume that an entry for, say, the early thirteenth century was composed in or soon after the early thirteenth century, unless there is reason to believe otherwise. There are some notable exceptions to this general rule. I consider the PVL to be an early twelfth-century text, most likely with some sections composed before the twelfth century.¹⁸ Another exception is the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, which is included (in part) under the year of Aleksandr's death in the Laurentian chronicle.¹⁹ The *Tale of the Life* must have been composed after Aleksandr's death and included in chronicles retrospectively.

Polemic against Latins?

Raffensperger supports his contention that chronicles and chroniclers tended to be anti-Latin with the argument that the PVL contains 'numerous anti-Latin polemics' directed against Latins.²⁰ However, he does not list these supposedly numerous polemical passages, or discuss the polemical content of other chronicles. While the definition of what might constitute a 'polemic' is evidently subjective, the three chronicles this chapter considers contain only three passages which condemn Latins as a religious group. Two of these are the passages s.a. 986 and 988 discussed in the previous chapter, in which Vladimir rejects the *nemtsi* from Rome who introduce him to their form of Christianity, is then warned that the Latins 'differ slightly' from Orthodox Christians in their use of azymes, and is finally introduced to some Latin 'errors'.²¹ The third is the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, in which Aleksandr rejects the unspecified 'teachings' of two papal envoys and repels the attacks of a 'king of the Roman land [lit. 'Roman part']'.²²

There is a small number of other episodes which treat Latins as a single political and religious unity under the religious leadership of the Pope, but do not condemn them as such. Chief among these is the account of the Fourth Crusade in the Novgorod First chronicle, known as the *Tale of the Taking of Constantinople by the Franks*.²³ The composer of this account is adamant that the 'Franks' who took

¹⁸ The question of the early history of the PVL is, of course, extremely difficult and contentious. A.A. Gippius, 'Do i posle', provides both a persuasive contribution to and a thorough summary of recent work on the topic.

¹⁹ Only the first half of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is extant in the Laurentian Codex; the folia on which the second half was written are missing. PSRL 1, cols 477–81.

²⁰ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 8.

²¹ PSRL 1, cols 84–87, 112–16.

²² 'король части Римьское'. PSRL 1, col. 478.

²³ PSRL 3, pp. 46–49.

Constantinople in 1204 were renegades who ‘forgot the commands of Tsar and Pope’.²⁴ He thereby places the blame squarely on the crusaders and not on their nominal political and religious overlords, the ‘Tsar’ and the Pope.²⁵ Elsewhere, the ‘Tsar of the *nemtsi* and all his land’ are in fact lauded as Christian martyrs for their part in the Third Crusade.²⁶ There are just a couple of other passages which suggest a political and religious relationship between Latins and the Pope. First is the entry s.a. 1300 in the Novgorod First chronicle, in which Swedes attack Novgorod, bringing craftsmen ‘from Great Rome, from the Pope’.²⁷ If the Pope and his flock are condemned at all here, it is only indirectly, as associates of the Swedes. Secondly and finally, there is the complex series of entries in the Galician-Volynian chronicle which describe Danilo of Galicia’s negotiations with the Pope and the pressure which his Polish allies bring to bear on him to accept coronation. I consider this section in depth later in the chapter.

Beyond these few condemnatory or acclamatory mentions, references to Latins as a single religious and political group are few and far between. Mentions of ‘Poles’, ‘Swedes’, ‘Hungarians’ etc. are far more common than references to ‘Latins’ or ‘*nemtsi*’. Terms meaning ‘the Latins’ or ‘a Latin’ and their derivatives (*latina*, *latinin*, etc.) appear only five times in the three chronicles I consider. ‘Latins’ (*latina*) occurs s.a. 1174 in the Kiev chronicle and 1175 in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, when Iziaslav imposes a punitive tax on ‘all of Kiev, the hegumens and priests, the monks and nuns, the Latins and the hermitages and the merchants and all the Kievans’.²⁸ ‘Latin’ (*latinin*) occurs three times: once in the account of Vladimir’s conversion, when he is warned not to accept Latin teachings; once s.a. 1175 in the Kiev chronicle, when ‘a Latin’ is listed as one of the visitors to Vladimir who might marvel at its splendid architecture; and once in the *Tale of the Taking of Constantinople*, when Baldwin, Count of Flanders, is described as ‘a Latin’.²⁹

Nemtsi and its derivatives appear more often, although it is frequently unclear whether these terms possess religious connotations. Most often, *nemtsi* appears to be simply a geopolitical designation, as in the entry for 1285 in the Galician-Volynian chronicle, which notes that floods damaged 111 stone churches in the territory of the *nemtsi*.³⁰ There are just a few entries in which *nemtsi* refers explicitly to a religious group as well as a group defined by political belonging and geographical location: the

²⁴ ‘цесарева велѣния забыша и папина’. PSRL 3, p. 46.

²⁵ See pp. 107–109.

²⁶ ‘црѣ Немѣцкѣи со всею своею землею’. PSRL 2, col. 667.

²⁷ ‘из великого Рима от папы’. PSRL 3, p. 91.

²⁸ ‘попрода весь Къевъ. игумены. и попы. черньци. и черници. Латину. и затворы. и гость. и всѣ Къичны.’ PSRL 1, col. 367; PSRL 2, col. 579.

²⁹ PSRL 1, col. 114; PSRL 2, col. 591; PSRL 3, p. 49.

³⁰ ‘в Нѣмцихъ’. PSRL 2, col. 896.

PVL entry for 986, when ‘*nemtsi* [...] sent by the Pope’ present their faith to Vladimir,³¹ the PVL entry for 1075, when ambassadors from the *nemtsi* condemn Sviatoslav with references to Scripture for vaunting his earthly wealth,³² and perhaps the account of the Third Crusade, which praises the *nemtsi* ‘Tsar’ and his land for their Christian valour.³³

Unspeakable Latins?

I will return to many of these passages. They provide important testimonies to a Rusian conception of the Latin world as a religious entity as well as a geopolitical one. For now, however, what is significant is that such passages are few and far between. Chronicles simply do not have a great deal to say about Latin Christianity or about Latins as Christians. Some scholars go further than this, arguing that the chronicles are largely silent not only on the topic of Latin Christendom as a religious entity, but about *all* contacts and links between Rus and the various ethnic and political units of the Latin world. According to this view, marriages, political diplomacy and religious exchange between Rus and its Latin neighbours all tend to be passed over in silence because they contradict the anti-Latin prescriptions contained in canon law. Rus’s many links to the Latin world thus become unspeakable.

Two exponents of this view are Stökl and, more recently, Raffensperger. Stökl argues that Rusian chronicles deliberately conceal relations with Latins, particularly in the tenth and eleventh centuries. As far as he is concerned, ‘anyone interested in Old Russian representations of the West is restricted to simply recording the fact of deliberate concealment.’³⁴ To support his claim, Stökl notes that Ioann II had condemned marriages between Rus and Latins, and implies that chroniclers’ response to this obvious disjunction between theory and practice was silence. Raffensperger resurrects this idea in his work to explain why the chronicles remain stubbornly silent on questions of interest to him. In a formulation similar to Stökl’s, he notes: ‘The monks also, I believe, deliberately avoided mention of the West and Western contacts of Rus.’ Raffensperger explains this as the result of ‘anti-Latin feeling’, exemplified in ‘many polemics’, or as the consequence of the chroniclers’ ‘narrow parochial attitude’.³⁵

³¹ See n. 50, p. 14.

³² PSRL 1, cols 198–99.

³³ PSRL 2, col. 667.

³⁴ ‘[...] wem es um die altrussischen Vorstellungen vom Westen geht, der kann nur die Tatsache eines absichtlichen Verschweigens registrieren.’ Stökl, *Das Bild*, p. 10.

³⁵ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 8.

Rusian texts' silence on apparently awkward issues of cultural exchange has become something of a trope among scholars of Rus. Raffensperger's and Stökl's assertion that the chronicles remain silent on questions of contact with Latins recalls an argument first made by Charles Halperin. Halperin suggested that chronicles testify to an 'ideology of silence' which prevented Rusian writers from discussing the political ties and cultural exchange between Rus and the Mongols. This 'ideology of silence' is a 'resolution of the tension between belief and reality', 'a ubiquitous method of mitigating the conflict between theoretical hatred and practicing tolerance' employed in numerous medieval frontier societies.³⁶ Commenting on and criticising Halperin's work, Donald Ostrowski suggests that what we observe in representations of Rus–Mongol relations is less an ideology than a full-blown conspiracy of silence.³⁷ Stökl's and Raffensperger's arguments similarly posit a conspiracy, the deliberate and conscious avoidance of mentions of Rus–Latin contacts as a means of tackling (or not) the gap between anti-Latin theory and everyday practice. When faced with delicate issues concerning religious belief and practice, these scholars suggest, chroniclers deal with Mongols and Latins in the same way: by avoiding the issues altogether.

But just how silent are the chronicles? The chronicles of Early Rus as a whole might not be consistently forthcoming about political contacts between Rus and Latin Christendom, but if their aim was to avoid all mention of Latins, their success was patchy at best: Appendix Three lists hundreds of chronicle references to Latins. Both Stökl and Raffensperger single out marriage to Latins as one of the topics which chroniclers avoid. Yet, as Appendix Three demonstrates, there are at least fifteen records of marriages between Rus and Latins in the chronicles of Early Rus, making up around a fifth of the total number of recorded marriages. This is indeed a smaller fraction than one might expect: Raffensperger has established that, of 52 known Rusian marriages between the late tenth and early twelfth century, 40 were to Latins.³⁸ However, this finding does suggest that chronicle mentions of Rus–Latin marriages were neither exceptional nor taboo. What's more, when chroniclers do discuss Rus–Latin marriages, their reports use the same topoi and are generally given the same prominence as reports of marriages to Orthodox Christians, as an entry for 1104 in the PVL neatly demonstrates: 'Volodar's daughter was led to Constantinople to [marry] the tsarevich, Alexios's son, on the 20th of July. In the same year, Peredslava, the daughter of Sviatopolk, was led to the Hungarians to [marry]

³⁶ Charles J. Halperin, 'The Ideology of Silence: Prejudice and Pragmatism on the Medieval Religious Frontier', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 26 (1984), 442–66 (p. 443).

³⁷ Donald Ostrowski, *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier, 1304–1589* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 146.

³⁸ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 71.

the prince, on the 21st of August.³⁹ There is no hint that chroniclers are having to defy a ‘conspiracy’ in order to report Rus–Latin marriages.⁴⁰

Familial and diplomatic links between Rus and Latins too are quite frequently discussed in the chronicles. The Kiev chronicle s.a. 1149 reports that Iziaslav Mstislavich sent messengers to plead for aid from his relatives by marriage among the Hungarians, the Poles and the Czechs.⁴¹ Here, the chronicler makes no attempt whatsoever to hide the fact of Iziaslav’s many familial links to the Latin world. The topos of the defeated or threatened prince turning to Latin allies for aid is also very common. The Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle entry for 1119 provides a typical example, noting simply that ‘Iaroslavets Sviatopolchich fled from Volodimer to the Poles’.⁴² An 1191 entry from the Kiev chronicle describes how a Rusian prince asks the ‘Tsar of the *nemtsi*’ for aid, which he receives as a relative of Vsevolod ‘Big Nest’: ‘[He went] to the Tsar of the *nemtsi*. When the Tsar discovered that he was the nephew of Grand Prince Vsevolod of Suzdal, he received him with love and great honour.’⁴³ Neither the fact that Rusian princes had dealings with the Holy Roman Emperor nor the fact that the chronicler recorded this should surprise us.

Not all chronicles are equally forthcoming about marriage and diplomacy with Latins. From the twelfth century, chronicles which focus on events in the south of Rus report dynastic and political contacts with the Latin world much more often than chronicles which concentrate on the north of Rus. For instance, there are no reports of marriages to Latins in the twelfth-century entries in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, but seven such reports in the Kiev chronicle. (The PVL contains three mentions of marriages between Christian Rus and Latins, but it is much less forthcoming about marriages in general than later chronicles.) This fact is not consistent with the assumption of a Rus-wide ‘ideological silence’ on Latins. Firstly, an ideological silence would surely operate more uniformly across the entirety of Rus—yet from the twelfth century, some regions were far more silent than others. Secondly, one would expect it to be observed more strictly as relations between the Latin and

³⁹ ‘Ведена дщи Володарева за црѣвичъ за Гюлексиничъ. Цсрюгороду. мсца июлиа въ .к. томъ ж лѣт ведена Передьслава дщи Стополча. в Угры. за королевичъ. августа. въ .ка. днѣ.’ PSRL 1, col. 280.

⁴⁰ One wonders whether marriage would in fact have been ideologically significant enough to warrant a ‘conspiracy’. Marriage was, after all, transactional, and not necessarily ideologically fraught. Perhaps gender also figures here: it was largely women who left Rus for Latin Christendom, not the male princes to whom the chroniclers devoted most of their attention.

⁴¹ PSRL 2, col. 384.

⁴² ‘Бѣжа Іарославецъ Стополчичъ из Володимера в Ляхы.’ PSRL 1, col. 292.

⁴³ ‘ко црѣви Нѣмѣцкому. цсрь же оувѣдавъ вже естъ сестричичъ великому князю Всеволоду Соуждальскому. и приид его с любовь [sic] и с великою чстью.’ PSRL 2, col. 666.

Orthodox churches worsened over time, when in fact there is no clear Rus-wide decrease in mentions of dealings with Latins.⁴⁴

What's more, the very assumption that chroniclers deliberately passed over particular topics brings a host of problems in its wake. The chronicles are concerned with a limited range of events, and so omit a great deal of information of interest to scholars. How are we to decide which of these omissions are conscious and premeditated, especially as much of what we believe we know about the culture of Rus is extrapolated from these very texts which omit so much? How could the existence of a conspiracy of silence ever be proved or disproved, save by a chronicler's direct admission that he avoided mentioning Latins? Indeed, what evidence could there be to support these conspiracy theories, save negative evidence?

Positing deliberate concealment also means making a host of assumptions about the audience for the chronicles and the process of chronicle composition and compilation. Who needed to have Russian contacts with the Latin world concealed from them? Who was insisting that no chronicler mention Latins, and how would this have been enforced? Raffensperger solves this problem by conjuring up pro-Byzantine 'supervisors' who insisted that chroniclers toed the pro-Byzantine—and so, at least in Raffensperger's work, implicitly anti-Latin—line.⁴⁵ The chronicles themselves, in which anti-Latin polemics are found side-by-side with (far more frequent) discussions of marriages and diplomacy with the Latins, offer no justification for such suppositions, nor for any single hypothetical chronicle 'policy' towards Latins.

Latins as pagans?

The chronicles might not be silent on the topic of the Latin world, but neither do they have a great deal to say about Latins *en masse*. As for individual Latins, chronicles rarely suggest that they are defined by their religion. When Mstislav's inebriated Hungarian troops boast of their strength before losing catastrophically to Volodimerko's men in 1151, this is not because they are immoral Latins.⁴⁶ When the Poles kill Roman of Galich in battle in 1205, the chronicler makes no attempt to brand them evil heretics.⁴⁷ In the vast majority of cases, Latins' religious beliefs and practices are simply not relevant. Most often, a Pole is just a Pole.

⁴⁴ See Chapters Four and Five for more examples of the relative insignificance of variation over time compared to geographical variation.

⁴⁵ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 66.

⁴⁶ PSRL 2, cols 441–42; PSRL 1, cols 335–36.

⁴⁷ PSRL 1, col. 425.

However, this is significant in itself. Other groups of non-Rus *are* defined, at least in part, by their religion (or lack of it). The Cumans, for example, can be simply Cumans, *polovtsi*, but in all the Early Rusian chronicles, they are also often described as ‘pagan Cumans’, *poganii polovtsi*, or ‘godless Cumans’, *bezbozhnii polovtsi*. The same goes for the Mongols, the Lithuanians, and other less prominent groups such as the Berendei, all of whom are referred to as ‘pagan’ and/or ‘godless’. In the Laurentian version of the PVL alone, the term ‘pagan’, *poganyi*, is used 30 times.⁴⁸ Six occurrences refer to the Rus themselves before the conversion in 988. The remaining 24 refer to non-Christian groups, most often Cumans. In his article on Novgorod and the Baltic from 1100 to 1350, Noonan argues that the ‘Germans’ (his translation of *nemtsi*) too were ‘pagans’ in Orthodox chroniclers’ eyes:

‘The fact that pagans and Catholics belonged to the non-Orthodox world may explain why the Novgorod and Pskov chroniclers use the same adjectives for the Cumans, Mongols, Lithuanians, and Germans. All four are referred to as pagan and godless.’⁴⁹

He goes on to advocate making the assumption that ‘other Russian areas also perceived the fundamental distinction between their Orthodox society and that of the non-Orthodox West.’⁵⁰

Noonan’s claims are misleading, but if we admit them for the time being, what would it mean to say that chroniclers call *nemtsi* ‘pagans’? There is undoubtedly a religious component to the Old Slavonic meaning of *poganyi*. In the PVL, the Rus are ‘pagans’ until the conversion but never afterwards. However, the religious meaning of ‘pagan’ cannot be entirely separated from its other meanings. *Poganyi* can also signify ‘unclean’ or ‘impure’, as it does in the *Questions of Kirik*, when Nifont asks Kirik if he thinks a woman is *pogana*, ‘unclean’.⁵¹ What’s more, even the religious meaning of the term is far from clear-cut. Generally, the term is applied to groups who are neither Christians, Jews nor Muslims, yet the Muslim Volga Bulgars and the Mongols after their conversion to Islam are also sometimes called ‘pagans’ by Early Rusian chroniclers. While it is reasonable to assume that chroniclers’ use of *poganyi* is motivated, at least in part, by a sense of religious (and so also cultural) difference, it is worth keeping in mind that ‘pagan’ is not a straightforward, clearly defined religious label. Nor could it be: ‘paganism’ is not a religion, but a marked term denoting lack of religion, employed by non-pagans for rhetorical effect.

It is therefore all the more striking that, in the three chronicles I consider, Latins are never ‘pagans’ and only rarely ‘godless’. The chronicles contain a handful of examples of Latins and Rus as

⁴⁸ As a search for the lemma *поганьи* in the lemmatised version of the PVL at <https://nestor.uit.no/sources/47> [accessed 07/02/18] demonstrates.

⁴⁹ Noonan, ‘Medieval Russia’, p. 333.

⁵⁰ Noonan, ‘Medieval Russia’, p. 339.

⁵¹ Mil’kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 399.

‘godless’: one in the Kiev chronicle entry for 1143,⁵² which describes how a group of Rusian princes join together with ‘godless Poles’ against Vsevolod, and a few in the Galician-Volynian chronicle, where it is Galician boyars who are ‘godless’.⁵³ ‘Pagan’, however, is never used either for Rus (after the conversion) or for Latins. All but one of Noonan’s examples of ‘pagan Germans’ come from the chronicles of Pskov, with the final example taken from the Novgorod Fourth and Sofia First chronicles, both later Novgorodian ‘all-Rusian’ chronicles. As I noted above (see p. 57), while the Pskov chronicles do include some older chronicle material, they are less reliable witnesses to earlier traditions of chronicle-writing. The Novgorod First chronicle, on the other hand, does not seem to have been repeatedly redacted and is extant in an early manuscript. It reports on many of the same events as Noonan’s examples from later chronicles, but without ever referring to *nemtsi* protagonists as ‘pagans’.

Later Rusian chronicle-writing about Latins looks very different. Writing from later than 1330 is outside of my purview in this thesis, but a brief examination of later changes in chronicle depictions of Latins should demonstrate that there is nothing inevitable about earlier portrayals of Latins. In the Younger version, the Novgorod First chronicle continues seamlessly on into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, when its representations of Latins begin to change quite dramatically. The turning-point is the mid-fourteenth century, when Novgorodian chroniclers begin to speak of the faith of the Latins as a different faith to that of the Rus. When Magnus of Sweden invades north-western Rus in the Younger Novgorod First chronicle’s entry for 1348, he attempts to impose ‘his own faith’ on the Izhera.⁵⁴ Not only has the Latin faith become distinct from the Orthodox faith, it is now the object of overt hostility: in 1349, the king of Krakow introduces the ‘Latin liturgy, hateful to God’ into Russian lands.⁵⁵

By the early fifteenth century, it has become possible for Novgorodian chroniclers to routinely speak of Latins as ‘pagans’. In the Younger Novgorod First chronicle’s entry for 1406, the men of Pskov are afforded divine aid against the ‘pagan *nemtsi*’.⁵⁶ Chapter Three considers this rhetorical shift as a development presaged by the hagio-biographical *Tales* of Aleksandr Nevskii and Dovmont of Pskov; Chapter Four interprets it in the context of a broader literary (and perhaps historical) shift in attitudes towards Latins in the fourteenth century. For now, it is important simply to recognise that these later developments in chronicle rhetoric about Latins are quite foreign to the period on which this thesis focuses. Certain isolated passages may call the purity of the Latin faith into question, but chroniclers

⁵² PSRL 2, col. 314.

⁵³ PSRL 2, cols 758–59.

⁵⁴ ‘свою вѣру’. PSRL 3, p. 360.

⁵⁵ ‘латыньское богумерзьское служение’. PSRL 3, p. 361.

⁵⁶ ‘пособи богъ [...] над поганымы Нѣмцѣ.’ PSRL 3, p. 399.

do not claim that this faith is fundamentally different from their own. The term ‘pagan’ is ubiquitous in Early Rusian chronicles, but never applied to Latins.

Explicit references to Latins as *Christians*, on the other hand, are numerous, particularly in the southern chronicles. Vasilko encourages Danilo of Galicia to marry his son to the daughter of the Hungarian king Bela IV ‘because he [Bela IV] is a Christian’;⁵⁷ the Polish and Hungarian allies of Iziaslav Mstislavich attempt to reconcile Iziaslav Mstislavich and Iurii Dolgorukii by appealing to the faith they all share, as well as to their kinship ties: ‘We are all Christians in God, and all one brotherhood.’⁵⁸ Elsewhere, chroniclers rhetorically align Latins not with pagans, but with Christian Rus. The Novgorod First chronicle s.a. 1237 reports on an alliance between the *nemtsi*, the Rus and the Chud. While it does not explicitly call the *nemtsi* Christians, it does refer to their common enemy, the Lithuanians, as ‘godless pagans’, with the implication that the coalition between the Rus, *nemtsi* and Chud is a Christian one.

Indeed, Latins can be not simply rank-and-file Christians, but saints, martyrs and wise men. Under the year 1207, the Galician-Volynian chronicle records that the niece of the late Holy Roman Emperor is a pious woman who served God and whom the people now believe to be a saint.⁵⁹ The Kiev chronicle s.a. 1190 likens the crusaders of the Third Crusade to the holy martyrs, explaining that those of them who die in this Christian campaign against the ‘impious Hagarenes’ will rise again after three days.⁶⁰ Finally, in the PVL s.a. 1075, *nemtsi* ambassadors arrive at Sviatoslav’s court in Kiev, where he flaunts his great wealth. Unimpressed, the Christian ambassadors rebuke him, telling him, ‘This counts for nothing; it just lies there, dead.’⁶¹ The chronicler evidently agrees with their assessment, concluding this episode with a reference to Hezekiah, who boasted of his riches and was left with nothing, and adding that Sviatoslav’s riches too were scattered after his death.

Manipulating Latin similarity and difference

Latin religious ambiguity

Chroniclers might acknowledge Latins to be Christians, but this need not prevent them from portraying the Christian faith of the Latins as subtly (or not so subtly) different from their own faith. Chroniclers can perfectly well emphasise religious similarity without denying that there are

⁵⁷ ‘Ідко крстыѣнъ есть’. PSRL 2, col. 809.

⁵⁸ ‘мы есмѣ по Бозѣ все крстыѣне вдна братѣ собѣ.’ PSRL 2, col. 387.

⁵⁹ PSRL 2, col. 723.

⁶⁰ ‘богостодудными тыми Агараны’. PSRL 2, col. 667.

⁶¹ ‘се ни въ чтоже юсть. се бо лежить мертво.’ PSRL 1, col. 198.

differences between the faith of the Rus and that of the Latins, or emphasise difference without denying similarity. Unfortunately, chronicles are not forthcoming about the precise nature of either the affinities or the disparities between the faith(s) of the Rus and their Latin neighbours. Still, an analysis of chroniclers' careful balancing and occasional manipulation of these affinities and disparities should help us move beyond oversimplistic characterisations of the chronicles as anti- or pro-Latin.

The Novgorod First chronicle provides a curious example of chroniclers' simultaneous affirmation of Latin similarity and difference. Three times, the chronicle incorporates similar reports of fire damage to Novgorodian churches. These reports are all in the same format, despite being separated by many decades.⁶² The entry for 1152 is the first to use the formula: 'Eight churches burned down, and a ninth, a Varangian church.'⁶³ The entries for 1275 ('Seven wooden churches burned down, and four stone churches, and a fifth, a church of the *nemtsi*')⁶⁴ and 1311 ('Six stone [...] churches burned down, and a seventh, a Varangian church')⁶⁵ follow suit, although in 1275 the church is said to belong to the *nemtsi* and not to the Varangians.

The Old Slavonic term used for 'church' can vary depending on the religious affiliation of the church's congregation. By the fifteenth century, the anonymous Suzdalian composer of the *Journey to Florence* makes an entirely consistent distinction between an Orthodox *tserkov* and a Latin *bozhnitsa*.⁶⁶ The Early Russian chronicles are not so consistent: as I will discuss in Chapter Five, there are examples of chronicle references to Latin churches as both *tserkov* and *bozhnitsa*.⁶⁷ What is interesting here is that the chronicler (or the original composer of the reports on damage to churches) chooses neither of these terms. Instead, he compromises, referring to the church as a *tserkov* but simultaneously insisting on its difference as a 'Varangian' church. He both includes the Latin church in the list of *tserkvi*, and distinguishes it from the other items on the list.

A weightier example of chroniclers' careful balancing of Latin sameness and difference is provided by the Galician-Volynian chronicle's entry on Danilo of Galicia's negotiations with the Pope, under

⁶² A fact which is interesting in itself: were separate records kept of the state of Novgorodian buildings or the money spent repairing them, some of which were then incorporated into the chronicle, *topoi* and all?

⁶³ 'церквии съгоре 8, а 9-я Варязьская.' PSRL 3, p. 29.

⁶⁴ 'сгорѣ церкви 7 деревяных, а каменных 4 огорѣша, а 5-я нѣмѣчкая.' PSRL 3, p. 323.

⁶⁵ 'церквии [...] каменыхъ 6 огорѣ, 7-я Варязьская.' PSRL 3, p. 93.

⁶⁶ 'Khozhenie na Florentiiskii sobor Neizvestnogo Suzdal'tsa', in *Antologiiia khozhenii russkikh puteshestvennikov XII–XV veka: Issledovanie, teksty, kommentarii*, ed. by E.I. Maletko (Moscow: Nauka, 2005), pp. 315–27.

⁶⁷ See p. 128.

the year 1255.⁶⁸ For some, this passage constitutes a surprising departure from chronicle tradition: the chronicler is quite happy to discuss the political and religious alliance between Danilo and the Pope, while the roughly contemporaneous hagio-biographer of Aleksandr Nevskii lauds Aleksandr's refusal to even begin to discuss the possibility of cooperation.⁶⁹ In fact, the episode is certainly more ambiguous than this assessment would suggest.

Danilo does not take the decision to accept a crown from the Pope lightly. He rejects the offer once. Even when promised military aid, he entertains the possibility of rejecting it a second time. Only after a great deal of persuasion from his mother and the Poles, and after acquiring a promise of papal support against the Mongols, does he agree to accept the crown. The chronicler takes Danilo's coronation equally seriously as an event with both religious and political ramifications. He explains that Innocent IV 'would condemn those who slandered the orthodox Greek faith'⁷⁰ and wanted to convene a council to discuss orthodoxy and the unification of the Church,⁷¹ thereby casting Innocent as a defender of the orthodox faith. After describing how Danilo received a crown from his 'father' the Pope, and from 'God, the church of the holy apostles and the seat of St. Peter',⁷² he goes on to consistently refer to Danilo as *korol*, 'king', rather than employing the Russian title *kniaz*, 'prince'. Danilo's coronation thus has lasting political significance as well as constituting a step towards Christian unity.

Yet the chronicler's portrayal of the Pope and the religious implications of Danilo's acceptance of the crown is highly equivocal. On the one hand, the Pope is a powerful Christian ally against pagans. He is part of the ecumenical 'church of the holy apostles' and the successor of St. Peter. What's more, he both supports ecclesiastical unity and defends the 'orthodox Greek' faith. Who could possibly object to Danilo receiving a crown from him? On the other hand, the chronicler makes it quite clear that there *is* an 'orthodox Greek' faith and that the Pope is not part of it. The chronicler is perfectly aware that the Church stands in need of unification and that not all Christians are Christians in the same way. In the chronicler's account, there is both *a* Church and multiple branches of the Church, which have diverged significantly enough that they are now in need of reunification.

Eventually, political considerations seem to trump religious ones. Once the Pope has agreed to provide aid against the Mongols on the condition that Danilo accept the crown, the Pope's proposal is

⁶⁸ PSRL 2, cols 826–27.

⁶⁹ Liustrov, 'Европа', p. 16.

⁷⁰ 'кльнаше тѣхъ. хоулашимъ вѣроу Грѣцкоюу. правовѣрноую.' PSRL 2, col. 827.

⁷¹ 'хоташоу емоу. сборъ творити. в правои вѣрѣ. в воединеньи црѣкви'. PSRL 2, col. 827.

⁷² 'внѣ же вѣнѣць ѿ Баї приид. ѿ црѣве стѣхъ апостолѣ. и ѿ стола стѣго Петра. и ѿ вѣа своего папы Некѣнтиа.' PSRL 2, col. 827.

an offer Danilo cannot really refuse. The chronicler is aware of the awkward religious implications of an alliance between an ‘orthodox Greek’ prince and the Pope, the head of the Latin church, but he manages to allay these difficulties by casting Danilo’s decision as a step towards Christian unity and the tantalising possibility of the unification of the Church, which the Pope is said to desire. This is an interesting move. The chronicler does not simply insist that the Pope is a perfectly good Christian, turning a blind eye to Latin difference. He recognises the ambiguous status of Latins, and represents Danilo and the Pope as wishing to overcome their differences in the service of Christian unity—although his insistence that the Pope supported the ‘orthodox Greek faith’ suggests that the chronicler’s version of Christian unity would look rather like universal Greek Orthodoxy.

In the chronicles, invoking current or potential Christian unity is generally a rhetorical manoeuvre intended to add weight to political decisions. Three years before Danilo’s coronation, the chronicler had already portrayed Danilo as adopting the trope of Christian unity to whip up support for a military campaign: his cry of ‘Now is the time for Christians [to fight] against the pagans!’⁷³ casts Rus and Poles as natural allies against their shared religious enemy, the ‘pagans’. However, it is interesting to note that just three years later, Danilo’s insistence on Christian unity against the pagans falls on deaf ears: the Poles inform him that they will fight alongside him against the pagans only if he receives a crown from the Pope, an implicit challenge to the concept of a single Christian identity shared by Poles and Rus.⁷⁴ Declarations of either Christian unity or confessional difference are not neutral descriptors. Rather, chronicle protagonists wield them as political tools.

It is the very fact that the status of Latin Christianity is ambiguous in Rusian chroniclers’ eyes (‘only slightly different’ from the Orthodox faith, as the composer of the tale of Vladimir’s conversion has it)⁷⁵ that allows for the many and varied depictions of Latin in the chronicles: as brother Christians, as Christians but not quite Orthodox Christians, as deluded followers of the Pope, and even as descendants of the immoral schismatic Peter the Stammerer. When a chronicler wishes to defend a military alliance between Rus and Latins, Latins can be brothers and fellow Christians; when a chronicler wishes to explain what it means for Rus to have received Christianity ‘from the Greeks’, Latins can be ignorant innovators who have fallen away from the true orthodox faith.

The difference between representations of Latins in canon law and chronicles, then, is not that Latins are heretics in canon law but simply Christians in chronicles. In both canon law and chronicles, Latins represent something of a grey area: as I mentioned in Chapter One, Leo of Ohrid compared Latins to a

⁷³ ‘время есть. христьянонь. на поганѣѣ.’ PSRL 2, col. 815.

⁷⁴ PSRL 2, col. 827.

⁷⁵ See n. 41, p. 33.

lynx's coat, 'the fur of which is neither black not entirely white'.⁷⁶ However, whereas canon law portrays the ambiguous nature of Latins as a threat, chronicles tend to accept and manipulate this ambiguity, often emphasising either similarity or (rarely) difference according to the political situation they are recording. Latin religious indeterminacy is repellent in canon law, but generally not in chronicles, where this same indeterminacy allows for great flexibility in portrayals of Latins.

Ethnic and political difference

This chapter has so far focused on chronicle depictions of *religious* similarity and difference between Rus and Latins, highlighting the variety of rhetorical possibilities permitted by the indeterminate status of Latins as Christians, but not quite the same Christians as the Rus. In some respects, this approach involves reading against the grain of the chronicles, which are resolutely uninterested in questions of doctrinal difference between Rus and Latins: the very notion that Latins have specific 'teachings' appears only in the tale of Vladimir's conversion and the reconstructed Laurentian version of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*. Yet chronicles do in fact address the question of how the Latins are different from the Rus. There is no 'ideology of silence' here. However, awkwardly for those who believe in the prevalence of anti-Latin religious hostility in Rus, their answers have little or nothing to do with religion.

Rather, chroniclers tend to reach for ideas of political identity and dynastic belonging when they wish to emphasise the division between Latins and Rus. One particular statement of Russian separateness from the Latin world is common enough, at least in the Kiev chronicle, that it constitutes a topos. It occurs in two slightly different forms with similar content, and is always put in the mouths of Russian princes. The entries for 1150 in both the Vladimir-Suzdal and the Kiev chronicles contain the first form, employed by Iziaslav Mstislavich, who wishes to acquire Kiev: 'I have no patrimony in Hungary or Poland [lit. 'with the Hungarians or the Poles'], but only in the land of Rus.'⁷⁷ In the Kiev chronicle's entry for 1174, Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich, angry that Iaroslav Iziaslavich has taken the Kievan throne for himself, rebukes him using the second form: '[I am] neither a Hungarian nor a Pole; rather, we are grandchildren of the same grandfather.'⁷⁸ Iaroslav Vsevolodovich and the Olgovichi of Chernigov use the same phrase when negotiating with their erstwhile enemies, the Rostislavichi, in 1195.⁷⁹ In each of these cases, princes emphasise their genealogical ties to Rus, simultaneously

⁷⁶ See n. 110, p. 50.

⁷⁷ 'мнѣ ѿцины въ Оугрѣхъ нѣтуть. ни в Лахохъ токмо въ Рускои земли.' PSRL 2, col. 405; PSRL 1, col. 329.

⁷⁸ 'не Оугринъ ни Лахъ. но единого дѣда есмы внуци.' PSRL 2, col. 578.

⁷⁹ PSRL 2, col. 689.

acknowledging the close political links between Rus, Poland and Hungary and representing Rus as the dynastic possession of Rusian princes.

These expressions of distinctively Rusian (not Polish, Hungarian, etc.) identity always serve a political purpose. Rusian princes only rhapsodise about their 'patrimony' or their Rusian heritage when they are hoping to gain land out of it. For example, when Danilo of Galicia and his brother Vasilko arrive in Berestia (now Brest, in Belarus) on campaign, they insist, 'It is not right for the Knights Templar, who are called Solomon's [knights], to have possession of our fatherland.'⁸⁰ When it is more expedient to forget about the political and cultural borders of the fatherland, princes are quite capable of this: a few years before Danilo's campaign to recapture Brest, Mstislav Mstislavich had been persuaded to give both Peremyshl and Galich away to a Hungarian, only expressing remorse about his dealings with a 'foreigner' (*inoplemennik*; literally 'one of another tribe') when he fought alongside Danilo of Galicia once more.⁸¹ Borders such as the political border between Rus and Poland mean very little until they are summoned into significance as a rhetorical weapon in a prince's arsenal.

Elsewhere, 'foreigners' are called into existence to provide a common enemy for Rusian princes. In 1189, Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich and Riurik Rostislavich, co-rulers of Kiev, are in conflict over Sviatoslav's decision to send his son to the Hungarian king without informing Riurik first. The Metropolitan attempts to reconcile them by turning their attention to Galicia, which is in political turmoil. He tells the princes: 'Look, foreigners have taken away your patrimony!'⁸² Here, rhetorical necessity dictates that Galicia is no longer a frontier land with shifting political allegiances, but an inalienable part of a Rusian ruler's 'patrimony', captured by 'foreigners'. As is so often the case in the chronicles, boundaries and cultural difference are invoked for rhetorical effect. The term 'foreigner' carries more subjective than objective weight.

When politically expedient, the Latin world might be represented as exterior to the Rusian land and dynasty; as inhabited by politically and ethnically different inhabitants of a different 'land'; and even as culturally different, with 'customs' not shared by the Rus: the entry for 1152 in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle notes that, unlike the Rusian troops, the Hungarian king would not make war on Sundays, 'according to his custom'.⁸³ Yet the chronicles provide little evidence of a significant *confessional* as well as political and cultural divide between the chroniclers' own land and the lands

⁸⁰ 'не лѣпо есть держати нашеє вѣчинѣ. крижевникомъ Тепличемъ. рекомѣмъ. Соломоничемъ.' PSRL 2, col. 776.

⁸¹ PSRL 2, col. 752.

⁸² 'се иноплемьнници ꙗли вѣчиноу вашю.' PSRL 2, col. 663.

⁸³ 'по своѣму вѣычаю'. PSRL 1, col. 336.

of the Latin world. When Latin difference is at issue—which it is only rarely—this difference is more political than religious.

Latins as Other: The *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*

Chronicles allow for many and varied representations of Latins. Yet there is generally a limit to this representational flexibility. No matter what the context, Latins are not entirely Other, either as a religious group or as a cultural and political one. However, there is a partial exception even to this rule: the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*. This work of hagio-biography depicts Aleksandr as a brave warrior, a just prince and a saint, drawing on elements of various types of Russian text, from the military tale to princely panegyric to hagiography. Aleksandr Nevskii's military exploits against *nemtsi* and his refusal to enter into negotiations with the Pope are the basis for a new form of anti-Latin polemic with little connection to the esoteric lists of Latin 'errors' found in canon law.

The *Tale of the Life* is found under the year 1263 in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle (Laurentian codex), but only in part: the folia which originally contained the latter half of the *Tale* are missing.⁸⁴ Neither the Galician-Volynian chronicle nor the Older Novgorod First chronicle includes it, although the Younger Novgorod First chronicle inserts sections of the *Tale* s.a. 1240, 1242, 1246 and 1251.⁸⁵ The text itself was most likely composed in the 1280s,⁸⁶ but we do not know for certain when the *Tale* was first included in a chronicle. Iu.K. Begunov maintains that it is 'probable' that the *Tale* was only included in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle in 1377, by Lavrentii himself.⁸⁷ If this were the case—and Begunov's argument on the basis of the textual history of the chronicle is plausible—then the *Tale* could safely be excluded from a discussion of the Early Russian chronicles. However, as both the date of composition of the *Tale* and the date of its inclusion in chronicles remain hypothetical, I consider the *Tale* in this chapter, on the grounds that it *may* have found its way into a chronicle as early as the thirteenth century.⁸⁸

Perhaps the most significant polemical section of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is the passage in which Aleksandr dismisses two cardinals sent by the Pope, telling them that he is in no

⁸⁴ PSRL 1, cols 477–81.

⁸⁵ PSRL 3, pp. 289–94, 295–97, 303–04, 305–07.

⁸⁶ Iu.K. Begunov, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII veka: «Slovo o pogibeli russkoi zemli»* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), pp. 56–61.

⁸⁷ Iu.K. Begunov, 'Kogda Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo voshlo v sostav Lavrent'evskoi letopisi?', *Die Welt der Slaven*, 16 (1971), 111–20 (p. 120).

⁸⁸ See e.g. M.D. Priselkov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI–XV vv.* (Leningrad: Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1940), pp. 98–99.

need of instruction from them. This passage is not extant in the partial version of the *Tale of the Life* in the Laurentian codex, but there is every reason to believe it was originally present. Aleksandr's explicit refusal to accept 'teachings' from the cardinals recalls the PVL passage in which Vladimir is warned not to accept the 'teachings' of the Latins.⁸⁹ The brief summary of Christian history which Aleksandr then gives may have no direct textual relationship with the Philosopher's Speech given to Vladimir before his conversion (it is taken from the *letopisets vskore*, the Slavonic translation of the ninth-century *chronicon syntomon* of Patriarch Nikephoros)⁹⁰; but it nevertheless demonstrates that Aleksandr has assimilated the knowledge of Christian history which Vladimir obtained during his conversion. There are evident parallels between Vladimir and Aleksandr Nevskii as Christian rulers and defenders of the Orthodox faith.

However, Latin difference in the *Tale* is not only, or even principally, religious. Latins' religious affiliation is only one element of a total Otherness, like the Otherness sometimes attributed to pagan groups such as the Mongols and the Cumans. Within the chronicles of Early Rus, the Mongols and the Cumans are two of the principal groups who are represented not only as religiously different but also as ethnically and politically different: they are not simply 'pagans', but 'pagan foreigners' (the Mongols) and 'godless sons of Ishmael' (the Cumans).⁹¹ Before the *Tale of the Life*, Latins are never represented as entirely Other in this way. As I discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the concept of Latin Christendom as a single entity was not entirely foreign to Russian chronicles, but the *Tale of the Life* takes this concept further, juxtaposing it with ideas of ethnicity, political belonging and power.

The language of ethnicity, and of collective identity and difference more broadly conceived, figures prominently in the *Tale of the Life*. According to Oleksiy P. Tolochko, the polysemantic term *iazыk* (very broadly, 'tongue' or 'people') emphasises the 'linguistic aspect of ethnicity', but also 'bears a strong implication of a people being heathen (hence *iazыchnik*, a pagan)'.⁹² Thus, although the implications and semantic nuances of the term can of course vary according to context, it generally suggests both cultural and linguistic difference. *Iazyk* is used repeatedly within the *Tale of the Life* to refer to both *nemtsi* and Rus. Most memorably, the *nemtsi* opponents of Aleksandr cry 'Let us

⁸⁹ 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, pp. 175–76; PSRL 1, col. 114.

⁹⁰ D.S. Likhachev, 'Galitskaia literaturnaia traditsiia v zhitii Aleksandra Nevskogo', *TODRL*, 5 (1947), 36–56 (pp. 38–42).

⁹¹ 'иноплемьниции погании'; 'безбожныя сыны Измаиловы'. PSRL 3, pp. 75, 62.

⁹² Oleksiy P. Tolochko, 'The Primary Chronicle's "Ethnography" Revisited: Slavs and Varangians in the Middle Dnieper Region and the Origin of the Rus' State', in *Franks, Northmen, and Slavs: Identities and State Formation in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. by Ildar H. Garipzanov, Patrick J. Geary, and Przemysław Urbańczyk (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 169–88 (p. 171).

conquer the Slav people [*iazыk*]!'.⁹³ Here, the bellicose *nemtsi* oppose themselves to a single 'Slav people' conceived of as a unified, alien entity. Later in the text, Aleksandr appeals to God to help him liberate Pskov 'from the aliens [literally 'other tongue/people']',⁹⁴ just as He helped David defeat the 'foreigners'.⁹⁵ Aleksandr's battles with Swedes and *nemtsi* are not simply petty border conflicts; they are clashes between fundamentally distinct and mutually opposed cultures.

The *Tale of the Life*'s conception of the *nemtsi* and the Rus as two distinct 'peoples' is linked to the *Tale*'s portrayal of the Latin lands as a homogeneous political whole, the 'western' or 'Roman' land. Aleksandr's enemy, the Swedish king, is not simply 'from the northern land', but is 'a king of the Roman land [lit. 'part']'.⁹⁶ The leader of the Teutonic knights too is 'somebody powerful from the western land'.⁹⁷ Swedes and Teutonic Knights are thus not isolated threats to Aleksandr's Rus, but hostile representatives of the same, 'western' or 'Roman', world. Latin Christendom in the *Tale* is a single political and cultural entity composed of 'Romans' from the 'West' under the ultimate authority of the Pope, who sends his envoys to Aleksandr.

The scale of the *Tale of the Life*'s vision of two separate and powerful lands pitted against each other may well be connected to its portrayal of Aleksandr himself as a ruler of unquestioned power and authority, whose rule is likened to the rule of Old Testament monarchs as well as Aleksandr's namesake, Alexander the Great. For instance, the Teutonic Knight Andreash's visit to Aleksandr's court is likened to the Queen of Sheba's audience with Solomon; Andreash declares that despite having 'traversed lands and peoples', he has never seen a ruler like Aleksandr.⁹⁸ Here and elsewhere, protagonists in the *Tale of the Life* are described as and likened to the rulers of great 'lands'. The portrayal of the Latin world as a single 'land' rivalling Aleksandr's Rus and ruled over by various powerful rulers under the aegis of the Pope in Rome imparts a sense of epic scale to the *Tale of the Life*, and an Old Testament dignity to Aleksandr. After all, a massed army of 'Romans' from the 'western land' makes a more formidable foe than separate bands of Teutonic Knights and Swedes.

Perhaps surprisingly, despite all this, Latins in the *Tale of the Life* are not fundamentally *religiously* Other. The one passage in the tale which deals with religious difference, Aleksandr's rejection of the Pope's envoys, certainly portrays the Latins' attempt to convert Aleksandr as blameworthy, but does not pretend the Latins are entirely different to the Christians of Rus. Aleksandr tells the envoys that he

⁹³ 'Укоримъ Словеньскый языкъ ниже себе'. 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, p. 169.

⁹⁴ 'от иноязычникъ'. 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, p. 172.

⁹⁵ 'иноплемьники'. 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, p. 172.

⁹⁶ 'ѿ полунощныа страны', 'король части Римское'. PSRL 1, col. 478.

⁹⁷ 'нѣкто силенъ ѿ западныа страны'. PSRL 1, col. 477.

⁹⁸ 'прошед страны и язъки'. PSRL 1, col. 478.

already knows everything they could tell him about Christian history, not that they have it entirely wrong.⁹⁹ He insists on Rus Christian independence from the Latin world, but recognises a degree of religious similarity between Latins and Rus. What's more, neither of Aleksandr's two battles against *nemtsi* are described as battles against 'pagans'. In some versions of the *Tale*, the *nemtsi* are not even 'godless'.¹⁰⁰ This is worth remembering given that the *Tale of Dovmont*, a similar but later hagio-biography of a prince of north-western Rus, does not hesitate to refer to Dovmont's enemies as 'pagan Latins'.¹⁰¹ The *Tale of Dovmont* takes the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*'s tendency to represent Latins as Other to its logical conclusion, insisting not only on their political and cultural alterity, but also on their religious alterity.¹⁰²

Even if its depiction of the Latin faith is not as radical as we might expect given its insistence on Latin alterity, the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is still a significant departure from previous chronicle representations of Latins. Yet within the chronicles of Early Rus, it remains an isolated anomaly. It has no immediate rhetorical effect on subsequent chronicle entries about princes' battles with *nemtsi*, either in the Novgorod First chronicle or in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle: outside of the *Tale of the Life*, *nemtsi* are never explicitly depicted as agents of the 'Roman' West. Fascinating though the *Tale of the Life*'s depiction of Latins as a cultural and political Other might be, it had very little rhetorical influence on chronicle-writing until centuries after its composition.

*

The chronicles of Early Rus do not adhere to a single formula when it comes to portrayals of Latins and their faith. They are too diverse and too complex for that, amalgamating a great variety of types of text written at different times and in different places. Subsequent chapters will analyse the influence of time and location on chroniclers' depictions of Latins in more depth. However, some general conclusions can be drawn which go beyond simply noting the evident diversity of representations. For one thing, we should be wary of assuming a general ideology of silence preventing chroniclers from discussing Latins. Not only does the presumption of imposed chronicle silence involve some problematic assumptions about censorship and rely entirely on negative

⁹⁹ 'сии вся добръ съвѣдаемъ'. 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, p. 176.

¹⁰⁰ This episode is not extant in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle. The Younger Novgorod First chronicle uses neither the term 'godless' nor the term 'pagan'. Many chronicle versions of the tale do include the term 'godless' to describe the *nemtsi*, however, including the versions in the Pskov First and Second chronicles. See e.g. 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, p. 169.

¹⁰¹ Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, pp. 191–92.

¹⁰² See pp. 95–97 for more on hagio-biography.

evidence, the evidence is in fact not all that negative: there are many counter-examples in which chroniclers do discuss Latins, both as individuals and (less often) as a group.

When chroniclers do bring up Latins, what do they say? What they do not say, even for rhetorical effect, is that Latins are not Christians. Calling Latins ‘pagans’ or denying that they are Christian is a later development, a fact which scholars rarely make clear.¹⁰³ Even in the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, where Latins are Other for the first time, their *religious* alterity is not absolute: Aleksandr Nevskii dismisses the Pope’s envoys with the message that he already knows what they want to teach him, not that their faith is entirely corrupt.¹⁰⁴ He is suspicious of their ‘teachings’, but does not deny that Rus and Latins share the same essential understanding of Christian history.

The *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is certainly not alone in implying that Latins are different to some degree. Latins in the chronicles can fall anywhere on the spectrum from good Christians to heretical Christians. At times, Latin difference is noted and condemned. More often, however, it is either simply not at issue, or else it is played up or down for rhetorical ends. In general, chroniclers invoke a shared Christian faith when they wish to emphasise the ties between Rus and Rus’s Latin allies; when they wish to emphasise difference, they tend to assert not the existence of a confessional boundary, but rather political or ethnic difference. In other words, in the chronicles of Early Rus, religion more often unites Rus and Latins than it divides them.

¹⁰³ Noonan, ‘Medieval Russia’, p. 333; also Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 14.

¹⁰⁴ ‘Zhitie’, ed. by Begunov, p. 176.

Chapter Three: Genre and Theme in Early Rusian Depictions of Latins

By this point in the thesis, it should be evident that Rusian writers did not toe a single line when it came to writing about Latins. The prescriptive nature of canon law dictated the uncompromising approach to Latin difference characteristic of anti-Latin polemic, while the voluminous and only loosely unified chronicles permitted the expression of a range of attitudes to Latins, with different themes and rhetorical priorities allowing for different approaches. However, some representational constants have emerged. First of all, Latins are never straightforward religious Others in Early Rusian writing. Even in anti-Latin polemic, when Latins are construed as threatening, it is because they are not quite Other enough, not because of their fundamental religious alterity. Secondly, and relatedly, Latins as seen from Orthodox Rus are an ambiguous category—but while polemicists attack this ambiguity as a source of impurity, chronicles either ignore it or capitalise upon it, at times praising Latins as Christians and brothers, at times condemning them as foreigners or schismatics.

The present chapter builds on these observations, looking at depictions of Latins outside of chronicles and canon law. I begin by analysing where these other references are found, and what this might tell us about how genre and theme influence not only the *nature* of representations of Latins, but whether Latins appear at all. I then consider the pressure which specific Early Rusian genres and themes exert on Early Rusian writers' approaches to the ambiguous status of Latins in the Christian world. This chapter thereby makes explicit the question underlying Chapters One and Two: how do the generic and thematic conventions of Early Rusian writing shape depictions of Latins, leading writers to choose certain rhetorical possibilities for writing about Latins over others?

Locating Latins

Aside from canon law and chronicles, which other classes of Early Rusian text include references to Latins? In fact, only a small number of other extant Early Rusian narrative texts accord Latins so much as a mention. Two of these texts are travel narratives: Latins are a frequent presence in the twelfth-century Holy Land as described by Hegumen Daniil, and Archbishop Antonii of Novgorod (also known as Dobrynia Iadreikovich) mentions Latin liturgical customs in his account of his time in Constantinople.¹ Two are hagio-biographies: Latins are the principal enemies of Aleksandr Nevskii and Dovmont of Pskov in the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* and the *Tale of Dovmont*.² The

¹ «Khozhenie», ed. by Belobrova and others; 'Khozhenie v Tsar'grad Dobryni Iadreikovicha', in *Antologiya*, ed. by Maletov, pp. 221–35 (p. 226). Maletov's edition of Antonii's narrative is a reprint of Kh.M. Loparev's edition of 1899. The more recent edition by O.A. Belobrova is of a heavily edited and shortened redaction of the text.

² 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, pp. 188–230.

Tale of Igor's Campaign contains a single reference to the *nemtsi* and a few references to Latin-made weaponry.³ The *Tale and Passion and Praise* of Boris and Gleb contains a single mention of Georgii, Boris's faithful Hungarian servant; two eleventh-century sermons also touch on the Latin world.⁴ Finally, the complex and unique source that is the *Patericon* of the Kievan Caves monastery includes a number of tales in which Latins feature prominently.⁵

Latins in the liturgy, hagiography and sermons: A conspicuous absence

Where else might we have expected to find Latins? Not in the stable parts of the liturgy: anti-Latin polemic in Byzantine Christian culture was a relatively late development, so it is small wonder that the comparatively conservative liturgy failed to reflect it. Hagiography might seem a more likely vehicle for anti-Latin polemic. If we believe the dictum that monastic culture tended to be anti-Latin,⁶ we might expect to find anti-Latin polemic in Russian Lives of monks or former monks such as Feodosii of the Caves or Avramii of Smolensk. Yet, if we discount the *Tale and Passion and Praise of Boris and Gleb* and the *Patericon*, which are works of hagiography but not Lives, there are no Latins at all in Early Russian hagiography. Byzantine hagiography was not a vehicle for anti-Latin polemic either: as Martin Hinterberger demonstrates, 'in terms of numbers, anti-Latin hagiography, in the sense of hagiographical texts promoting saints who had struggled against the Latins, virtually does not exist. In most texts in which Latins do appear, they are merely mentioned and are not really the centre of attention.'⁷ We have too few extant Russian Lives to be in a position to make firm conclusions about typical Russian hagiographical representations of Latins, but the few Lives we do have imitate their Byzantine models in eschewing anti-Latin polemic.

As works of hagiography (broadly understood as writing about holy men and women), the *Tale and Passion and Praise of Boris and Gleb* and the *Patericon* are therefore anomalous in their treatment of

³ Iu.V. Podlipchuk, «*Slovo o polku Igoreve*»: *Nauchnyi perevod i kommentarii* (Moscow: Nauka, 2004), pp. 21, 26, 27.

⁴ Georgii the Hungarian is mentioned in the *Tale and Passion and Praise* and in the chronicle account of Boris and Gleb's martyrdom, but goes unnamed in the other early text on Boris and Gleb: in the *Reading (chtenie)* about Boris and Gleb, he appears simply as 'a servant'. *Zhitiia sviatykh muchenikov Borisa i Gleba i sluzhby im*, ed. by D.I. Abramovich, *Pamiatniki drevnerusskoi literatury*, 2 (Petrograd: Otdelenie russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1916), pp. 35, 11.

⁵ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by L.A. Ol'shevskaia and S.N. Travnikov (Moscow: Nauka, 1999), pp. 7–80.

⁶ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 8; Mel'nikova, *Drevniaia Rus'*, p. 260.

⁷ Martin Hinterberger, 'A Neglected Tool of Orthodox Propaganda? The Image of the Latins in Byzantine Hagiography', in *Greeks, Latins and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, ed. by Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), pp. 129–49 (p. 131).

Latins. Aspects of both texts are more reminiscent of historiography than of hagiography: indeed, both an account of the martyrdom of Boris and Gleb and some of the tales included in the *Patericon* are also found in the PVL.⁸ I treat the complex *Patericon* separately below. As for the narrative on Boris and Gleb, it shares its focus on the political relations of the princely elite with Early Rusian chronicle-writing, in which mentions of Hungarians and their relations with Rusian princes are no rarity. The same might be said of the *Tale of Igor's Campaign*, which is of course no hagiography, but is similarly concerned with the broader political world in which Rusian princes operate: Sviatoslav's praises are sung by 'the *nemtsi* and Venetians, the Greeks and Moravia', and the *Tale's* protagonists carry 'Polish spears' and wear 'Latin helmets'.⁹ Even outside of chronicles, composers of works praising (southern) Rusian princes evidently feel no compulsion to hide the extent of their protagonists' influence beyond the borders of Rus.

Sermons are only slightly more forthcoming than hagiography when it comes to Latins. The sermons of Kirill of Turov and Klim Smoliatich are devoid of all mention of Latins, but there exist two eleventh-century sermons which concern the Latin world and yet eschew anti-Latin hostility entirely, portraying the Christian world as a single unified Church. The first is Ilarion's *Sermon on the Law and Grace*. Ilarion, probably writing before the Schism had made itself felt, makes a positive reference to Rome as one of the lands which have reason to praise their teachers in the orthodox faith.¹⁰ The second is the sermon on the transfer of St. Nicholas's relics to the town of Bari, 'in the region of the *nemtsi*'.¹¹ Again, there is no sense that the Church is divided. The people of Bari are overjoyed at the arrival of St. Nicholas's relics, and send to the 'Roman Pope'.¹² The Pope, his bishops and the townspeople all rejoice, celebrating and giving alms to the poor. In sermons as well as hagiography and liturgical rites, Latins are largely absent; when they are present, it is as part of the one Church.

⁸ PSRL 1, cols 132–39, 183–98.

⁹ 'Нѣмци и Венедици [...] Греци и Моравѣ', 'подъ шеломы Латиньскыи', 'сулицы лѣцкыи'. Podlipchuk, «*Slovo*», pp. 21, 26, 27.

¹⁰ 'Proizvedeniia Ilariona po spisku ser. XV v. GIM. SIN. No. 591', ed. by T.A. Sumnikova, in *Ideino-filosofskoe nasledie Ilariona kievskogo*, ed. by A.A. Bazhenova, 2 vols (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1986), I, 11–41 (p. 26).

¹¹ 'нѣмчеськыи вѣласти'. I. Shliapkin, *Russkoe pouchenie XI veka o perenesenii moshchei Nikolaia chudotvortsia i ego otnoshenie k zapadnym istochnikam*, Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti, 10 (Saint Petersburg: Obshchestvo ljubitelei drevnei pis'mennosti, 1881), p. 6.

¹² 'к римскому папѣ'. Shliapkin, *Russkoe pouchenie*, p. 8.

The Patericon: The Caves Monastery in the Christian world

Not all Early Rusian texts are so unequivocal. Poised between hagiography and historiography, and compiled in multiple redactions over many centuries, the *Patericon* contains both praise for and vitriol directed against Latins, sometimes in a single narrative. The ‘nucleus’ of the *Patericon*, as identified by L.A. Olshevskaia and S.N. Travnikov,¹³ contains three narratives concerning Latins. The tale of Moisei the Hungarian relates the ascetic career of Moisei, a Caves monk who is captured and tortured by a Polish princess before returning victorious to the Caves with the power to conquer the passions; the tale of the founding of the Caves’ first stone church recounts the role of Shimon the Varangian, who is shown the church in a vision and aids in its construction; and the tale of the first monks of the Caves describes the nefarious activity of a demon dressed as a Pole, whom one keen-sighted monk observes throwing flower petals at monks in church to make them fall asleep.¹⁴ The fifteenth-century Second Cassian redaction also includes the *Epistle on the Latin Faith* by Feodosii,¹⁵ although no other early redactions include this text.

In the tale of Moisei the Hungarian, the Latin origins of the protagonists are simply irrelevant. One of its Latin protagonists, Moisei, is a virtuous monk who becomes a respected elder of the Caves; the other Latin is a lust-crazed princess who tortures and castrates him. There are many oppositions at play here (male/female, monastic/lay), but Latin/Orthodox is not one of them. Neither does Moisei’s Hungarian background appear to pose any obstacle whatsoever to his integration into the Caves or his posthumous status as one of the Caves’ most venerable monks. As in the case of his brother Georgii, Boris’s loyal servant, Moisei’s ethnicity is mentioned only in passing, and plays no role in his tale. As far as his faith is concerned, there is no hint that Moisei is religiously any different from the other monks of the Caves. Indeed, he can be considered a ‘Latin’ only by virtue of his ethnicity. As for the Polish princess, her violence is not blamed on her cultural or religious Otherness; she is simply a sinful woman.

Scholars interested in the representation of Latins in the *Patericon* have tended to overlook the tale of Moisei, in which the backgrounds of Moisei and the princess have no bearing on the plot, in favour of the more ambiguous episode of the imp dressed as a Pole. The imp has been made to carry a greater burden of meaning than he can reasonably bear. Some have suggested that his Polish appearance reflects anti-Latin hostility at the Caves; others have countered that he might simply have been trying to blend in, as Polish monks were likely not unknown at the Caves.¹⁶ Both hypotheses are reasonable,

¹³ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaia and Travnikov, pp. 257–58.

¹⁴ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaia and Travnikov, pp. 48–53, 7–10, 76–77.

¹⁵ See p. 31 for a discussion of the epistle and its composer.

¹⁶ Demin, *Poetika*, p. 279; Vodoff, *Naissance*, p. 321.

and this short episode gives no grounds for choosing one in preference to the other. Perhaps it would be wise not to read too much into a monk's short account of a mischievous imp when the *Patericon* includes far more substantial narratives about Latins.

The tale of Shimon

Perhaps the most problematic yet revealing of these narratives is the tale of Shimon the Varangian. Many manuscripts of the *Patericon* open with a passage on Shimon's ancestry and his time as a mercenary in the hire of the princes of Rus.¹⁷ Before a battle with the Cumans, Shimon goes to Antonii of the Caves for a blessing. Antonii prophesies that Shimon will survive the battle and be buried at a Caves church which is yet to be founded. Returning unharmed to the Caves after the battle, Shimon tells Antonii of a large sculpture of Christ which his father made. When Shimon was exiled from his Scandinavian homeland, he took the golden belt and crown from this sculpture. Christ then appeared to Shimon twice, first telling him to take the crown and belt to the place where his Mother's church was to be built, and then giving him the dimensions of the church and confirming that he would be buried there. When Antonii hears Shimon's tale, he praises God and tells Shimon that from now on, his name will be not Shimon, but Simon (surely an allusion to Simon Peter, the rock on which the Church will be built).¹⁸ Feodosii duly builds the church, using the golden belt to measure the foundations, and Shimon is buried there, having received a blessing from Feodosii for himself and his ancestors—and having abandoned his 'Latin' faith and become a 'Christian'.

Throughout the tale, no attempt is made to hide Shimon's Varangian background, or to obscure the Varangian origins of the golden belt used to measure the foundations of the church. The subsequent series of tales which tell of Byzantine influence on the development of the Caves—the arrival of Byzantine craftsmen, the translation of Byzantine relics to place in the walls of the Caves' church—balance but do not cancel out Shimon's tale, which tells quite clearly of Scandinavian influence on the Caves. Vladimir Iakovlev even suggested that the use of a belt to measure the church's foundations is related to the practice of *investitura per corrigiam*, the claiming of land using a belt, known to

¹⁷ See D.I. Abramovich, 'O redaktsiiakh i spiskakh Pecherskogo paterika', in *Issledovaniia o Kievo-pecherskom paterike kak istoriko-literaturnom pamiatnike* (Saint Petersburg: Otdelenie russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1902), for descriptions of the contents of numerous manuscripts of the *Patericon*. Of the two best-known redactions of the *Patericon*, the Second Cassian begins with Shimon's tale, while the Arsenian redaction begins with material on Feodosii.

¹⁸ See M.F. Mur'ianov, 'Zametki k Kievo-Pecherskomu pateriku', *Byzantinoslavica*, 31 (1970), 42–49.

Iakovlev through the eighteenth-century *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae latinitatis*.¹⁹ It is thus possible that both one of the actors in this tale and the events described in it have their origins in the Latin world.

However, the tale also includes some clearly polemical anti-Latin passages of an unusual kind. First of all, the sculpture of Christ from which Shimon takes the belt and crown is described as ‘a new thing, like the Latins venerate’.²⁰ The use of the term ‘new’, implying departure from tradition, may well suggest the composer’s disapproval; the sudden introduction of the term ‘Latins’, *latina*, seems incongruous in a tale in which the protagonist is a Varangian and which has so far made no mention of religious difference between Shimon and the monks to whom he donates the belt and cross. Yet more incongruous is the passage in which Shimon apparently accepts Christianity, ‘converting’ from the Latin faith. The passage explicitly states that Shimon was Latin, but that he leaves the ‘Latin folly’ behind when he converts to ‘Christianity’, which is presented as a different religion.²¹

This is odd. Needless to say, there is no evidence for (re)baptism of Latins in eleventh-century Rus, the period when the events of Shimon’s tale are supposed to have taken place. By the mid-twelfth century, one former monk of the Caves, Nifont of Novgorod, was prescribing chrismation and confirmation, but not baptism, for Latins wishing to join an Orthodox church.²² Given that the Schism was only beginning to take shape over the eleventh century, it is hard to believe that Latins were being baptised into the Orthodox church as converts only ten or twenty years after the events of 1054. What’s more, in the tale as it is preserved in the *Patericon*, both Antonii and Feodosii bless Shimon and promise to bury him on holy ground *before* Shimon converts, finally convinced to abandon the Latin faith ‘because of the miracles of the holy fathers Antonii and Feodosii’.²³ Two Christian holy men would seem unlikely to make such promises to a man who had not yet accepted the true faith. Even if one reads the tale as saying that Shimon ‘converted’ and was promised burial on holy ground at roughly the same time, the tale of Shimon’s ‘conversion’ remains puzzling.

¹⁹ Vladimir Iakovlev, *Drevne-kievskie religioznye skazaniia* (Warsaw: Sovet Imperatorskogo Varshavskogo universiteta, 1875), p. 130.

²⁰ ‘нов дѣло, якоже латина чтут’. *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaiia and Travnikov, p. 8.

²¹ ‘Бывѣ преже варягъ, нынѣ же христианѣ благодатию Христовою [...] оставив латинскую буеть, истиннѣ вѣрова в Господа нашего Иисус Христа’. *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaiia and Travnikov, p. 10.

²² Mil’kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 363.

²³ ‘чюдесь ради бывающих святою отецъ Антониа и Феодосиа’. *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaiia and Travnikov, p. 10.

Sophia Senyk, Muriel Heppell and John Lind all see multiple layers of composition here, with the mention of Shimon's conversion constituting a later addition to the tale.²⁴ Heppell dates this addition to the thirteenth century, arguing that anti-Latin sentiment was typical of the thirteenth century but not the eleventh; she attributes the addition to Simon, bishop of Vladimir-Suzdal and a former Caves monk. The *terminus ante quem* for the addition of anti-Latin passages to the Shimon tale is 1406, the date of the first manuscript containing the *Patericon*,²⁵ but Heppell attributes the changes to Simon because the tale falls in a section of the *Patericon* believed to have been composed by him. The essence of this argument, that the anti-Latin features of Shimon's tale postdate the eleventh century, is convincing. However, as I will argue in Chapter Four, it is only in the middle of the fourteenth century that Rusian writers seem to have begun to represent the Latin faith as a different faith to the Orthodox.²⁶ This is about a century after Simon was working on the *Patericon*. If Simon was indeed composing such drastic anti-Latin passages in the early thirteenth century, he was ahead of (what we can reconstruct of) his time. It seems more probable that the anti-Latin additions were made at an unspecified point during the fourteenth or early fifteenth century, when convictions of Latin religious alterity become more widespread in Rusian writing. If this is the case, the anti-Latin elements of Shimon's tale are most likely not Early Rusian at all.

Religious difference in paterica

The textual history of Shimon's tale thus remains a matter of assumptions. An equally significant and perhaps more satisfyingly resolvable question is: what is it about the *Patericon* that allows for such complex portrayals of Latins? Latins appear more often and in more ambiguous roles in the *Patericon* than in other Kievan texts, so the specificity of the *Patericon* is not primarily regional. The fact of the *Patericon*'s redaction over many centuries and by many individuals probably contributed to the apparent incoherence of its treatment of Latins, who can be both holy men and non-Christians; but as the above analysis demonstrated, there is little that can be said with any degree of certainty about the composition and redaction of the *Patericon*'s passages on Latins before the fifteenth century. An

²⁴ Sophia Senyk, *A History of the Church in Ukraine: Volume I: To the End of the Thirteenth Century*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 243 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1993), p. 322; Muriel Heppell, *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*, 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 5; John H. Lind, 'Christianity on the Move', pp. 428–29.

²⁵ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol'shevskaia and Travnikov, p. 257.

²⁶ With the one exception of Feodosii's tract, which interprets the 'Latin faith' as distinct from the 'Orthodox'. Might Simon have been influenced by this Caves precedent? Perhaps, but this need not mean that the Caves as an institution particularly promoted anti-Latin sentiment. 'Poslanie o vere latinskoi', ed. by Ponyrko, p. 17.

examination of the *Patericon*'s models, however, casts a new light on the *Patericon*'s treatment of religious difference in general and Latins in particular.

The *Patericon* has a clear generic link to the group of Late Antique texts known as paterica. Its short narratives on colourful episodes from the lives of holy men find their closest structural and thematic parallels in these earlier paterica.²⁷ Numerous collections of Late Antique paterica circulated in Slavonic translation in Early Rus. Friedrich Bubner has demonstrated that Simon, one of the composers of the *Patericon*, must have been familiar with the *Sinaitic Patericon* (a translation of an unknown redaction of the *Spiritual Meadow*) and at least some of the *Sayings of the Fathers*.²⁸ Judging by the motifs employed in their tales, Simon and Polikarp also knew the *Egyptian Patericon*, which included much of the *History of the Monks in Egypt* and the *Lausiac History*.²⁹ I draw my subsequent arguments and examples from these paterica because of the compelling evidence that they were known (in some form) to the composers of the *Patericon*. Editions of the Slavonic texts of the *Sinaitic Patericon* and the *Scete Patericon* (a version of the *Sayings of the Fathers*) exist,³⁰ but as far as I am aware, the *Egyptian Patericon* is still awaiting an edition (although Eremin has published a list of incipits).³¹ I therefore cite from the *Sinaitic Patericon* and *Scete Patericon* in their Slavonic editions, but refer to the *Patrologia Graeca* editions of the paterica which made up the *Egyptian Patericon*.

While the Late Antique paterica evidently exerted a strong influence on the Kievan Caves' *Patericon*, the *Patericon* is not a slavish imitation of these earlier texts.³² Indeed, in some respects, the *Patericon* might be more accurately conceived of as a monastic chronicle. A number of its narratives concern the evolution of the Caves itself and the events which shaped the Caves as an institution, while the Late Antique paterica focused not on the development of individual communities, but on the flourishing of asceticism and monasticism across many regions and institutions. Like the chronicles of

²⁷ See e.g. Muriel Heppell, 'Slavonic Translations of Early Byzantine Ascetical Literature', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 5 (1954), 86–100.

²⁸ Friedrich Bubner, *Das Kiever Paterikon: Eine Untersuchung zu seiner Struktur und den literarischen Quellen* ([Heidelberg]: Dissertationsdruck- und Verlagsanstalt Werner Blasaditsch, 1969), p. 89.

²⁹ Bubner, *Das Kiever Paterikon*, pp. 94–111.

³⁰ *Sinaiskii paterik*, ed. by V.S. Golyshenko and V.F. Dubrovina (Moscow: Nauka, 1967); *The Scete Paterikon [Скитский namepuk]*, Volume 3, ed. by William R. Veder, Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies, 14 (Amsterdam: Pegasus, 2012).

³¹ I.P. Eremin, 'K istorii drevne-russkoi perevodnoi povesti', *TODRL*, 3 (1936), 37–57.

³² See e.g. Richard Pope, 'O kharaktere i stepeni vliianiia vizantiiskoi literatury na original'nuiu literaturu iuzhnykh i vostochnykh slavian: Diskussii i metodologiiia', in *American Contributions*, ed. by Terras, pp. 469–93.

Early Rus but unlike the Late Antique *paterica*, the *Patericon* is local in emphasis. The Caves Monastery's monks are recognisably part of the same political and cultural world as the princes depicted in the chronicles: Feodosii advises and rebukes the Grand Princes of Kiev,³³ and the former prince Sviatosha becomes a monk.³⁴

However, the chronicles of Rus have relatively little to say about people from outside of Rus. Whether Christians or pagans, non-Rus tend to have only walk-on parts in chronicle narratives. This is much less the case in the *Patericon*. In most of its redactions, the *Patericon* opens with a description of the tribulations of a Scandinavian dynasty, one of whose members will be instrumental in the Caves' growth, and goes on to include tales of a Hungarian holy man and his Polish nemesis, healers from Syria and Armenia whose faith in medicine proves less well-grounded than Caves monks' faith in God, and, of course, an imp that looks like a Pole.³⁵ The Caves is portrayed as a place where Christian men of different ethnicities and cultures meet, sometimes clashing, but more often simply co-existing. The Caves is not merely a bastion of Russian Orthodoxy: it is a spiritual centre of the Christian world.

In this respect, it is reminiscent of the 'desert' (*eremos*, 'solitary place') as it is represented in the Late Antique *paterica*. Peripheral to the inhabited world, yet central to the spiritual world of early Christian monasticism, the desert draws Christians of many ethnicities and cultures. The Slavonic *Egyptian Patericon* includes tales of Stephen the Libyan, Gaddanes the Palestinian, Makarios the Alexandrian, Moses the Ethiopian, and more.³⁶ Coming out to the desert, holy men from throughout the Christian world entered a new 'city', receiving a new kind of 'citizenship', as Athanasios explains in his *Life of Anthony*: 'And so monastic dwellings came into being in the mountains and the desert was made a city by monks. Having left their homes, they registered themselves for citizenship in heaven.'³⁷ The original ethnic and cultural affiliations of these solitaries are worthy of mention in *paterica*, perhaps as indications of the cosmopolitan nature of the desert-as-city, but they pale in significance compared to their newly-acquired heavenly citizenship.

³³ *Kyievo-pechers'kyi paterik*, ed. by Dmitro Abramovich, pp. 66–69. I refer to Abramovich's edition because the Olshevskaja and Travnikov edition does not contain the *Life of Feodosii*.

³⁴ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol'shevskaja and Travnikov, pp. 28–32.

³⁵ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol'shevskaja and Travnikov, pp. 7–10, 48–53, 29–31, 39–42, 76–77.

³⁶ Eremin, 'K istorii'.

³⁷ 'καὶ οὕτω λοιπὸν γέγονε καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι μοναστήρια, καὶ ἡ ἔρημος ἐπολίσθη ὑπὸ μοναχῶν, ἐξελθόντων ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων, καὶ ἀπογραψαμένων τὴν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς πολιτείαν.' J.P. Migne, 'Vita et conversatio S.P.N. Antonii', in *Patrologia Graeca*, 161 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1857), xxvi, 835–976 (col. 865). Translation from *The Life of Antony: The Coptic Life and the Greek Life*, trans. by Tim Vivian and Apostolos N. Athanassakis (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2003), p. 93.

A melting-pot of men from various lands and cultures, the desert united Christians in faith and asceticism. The Kievan Caves monastery was not a desert or ‘solitary place’ in the literal sense. Its monks took up residence near one of the centres of Rus; they advised and condemned princes, healed, taught and ministered to rich and poor, and sometimes found themselves travelling in other lands and embroiled in larger political conflicts. Still, the monastery’s situation on a hill outside Kiev, rather than in the centre of the town, was symbolic. By virtue of its monastic status, the Caves was indeed a desert, and a place not entirely of this world: it hung half-way between heaven and earth.³⁸ The desert paterica were perhaps the most significant model for the Caves’ self-image as a remote yet cosmopolitan centre of orthodoxy and asceticism.

The tale of Moisei the Hungarian takes on fresh significance when seen through this prism. Reference to holy men by their first name and ethnicity, citizenship or geographical provenance (Makarios the Alexandrian, Stephen the Libyan, etc.) is common in paterica, as we have seen: despite their membership of a new ‘city’, holy men retain markers of their former, worldly ties. It would seem too much of a stretch to argue that references to Moisei by his ethnicity (‘Moisei the Hungarian’, rather than, say, ‘Moisei the Long-Suffering’)³⁹ are influenced by the Late Antique paterica, were it not for the existence of an interesting parallel between the tale of Moisei the Hungarian and the tale of his namesake Moses the Ethiopian, which is included in the Slavonic *Egyptian Patericon*.⁴⁰ After Moisei the Hungarian’s ordeal at the hands of the Polish princess, he is given the power to aid other monks battling carnal temptation—by hitting them in the ‘loins’ or ‘lap’ (*lono*) with a stick, causing them to lose all feeling.⁴¹ This unusual technique is the surely the same as that to which Moses the Ethiopian is subjected when a demon hits him between the legs with a cudgel, rendering him senseless but also, as a welcome and presumably unintended side-effect, never again prey to lust.⁴² This parallel suggests that at least one of the composers or redactors of Moisei the Hungarian’s tale was influenced by the tale of Moses the Ethiopian. Like Moses the Ethiopian, Moisei the Hungarian comes from far away to

³⁸ David K. Prestel, ‘The Kievan Caves Monastery: What Do Monks Have to Do with the World?’, *Russian History*, 33 (2006), 199–216.

³⁹ See *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaia and Travnikov, pp. 48, 53, for examples of Moisei referred to as ‘Moisei the Hungarian’.

⁴⁰ Eremin, ‘K istorii’, p. 42.

⁴¹ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaia and Travnikov, p. 52.

⁴² In the *Patrologia Graeca* edition, the demon brings his cudgel ‘down upon the genitals’, ‘κατὰ τῶν φυῶν’—suggesting that James L. Rice is quite right to want to dispense with euphemisms in translating *lono*. ‘Historia Lausiaca’, in *Patrologia Graeca*, ed. by J.P. Migne, 161 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1857), xxxiv, 991–1262 (col. 1067); James L. Rice, ‘The Therapeutic Method of Moses the Hungarian: A Semantic Nicety’, *Russian History*, 33 (2006), 173–77.

become a legendary member of a community which celebrates the memory of pious Christian ascetics of all ethnicities and cultures.

However, the welcome extended by both Late Antique and Russian ascetics to all (Christian) comers does not mean that, theologically, anything goes. Unsurprisingly, there is some variation in the desert fathers' professed attitudes to the un- or insufficiently orthodox. More than one father counsels or practises total avoidance of heretics.⁴³ Many others, however, do consort with unbelievers and heretics, generally succeeding in converting the former and correcting the latter. Their methods of instruction tend to emphasise demonstration rather than debate: a holy ascetic dramatically and often miraculously demonstrates his piety or his opponent's impiety, rather than employing theological debate alone. (Tales of ascetics who immobilise groups of pagans or pass unscathed through fire in order to convert their astounded opponents are particularly vivid examples of this technique, but almost all conversion tales in the *paterica* involve miracles worked through a holy man.) In a persuasive article on religious tolerance in the *Sayings of the Fathers*, Nicholas Marinides notes that conversion and correction in the *Sayings* are not carried out with violence, either verbal or physical.⁴⁴ With some caveats, the same could be said of the Late Antique *paterica* in general. Some *paterica* are more concerned with heresy and unbelief than others, but in most cases, conversion and correction are the result of bonds of respect and love created between a holy man and an unbeliever, who is in awe of the miraculous power and extraordinary piety of the ascetic.

Many of these tales of the redemption of religious Others were known in Slavonic translation. For example, in the *Sinaitic Patericon*, the Slavonic translation of the *Spiritual Meadow*, Abba Cyriacos is visited by Theophanes, a 'stranger from the land of Dara', who eventually admits he is a Nestorian.⁴⁵ Cyriacos urges him to abandon his heresy, whereupon Theophanes respectfully asks him for a sign to help him establish where the truth lies. Thanks to Cyriacos's prayers, Theophanes is granted a vision of heretics (including Nestorios) burning in hell, and is warned to 'join the holy catholic and apostolic

⁴³ In the *Sinaitic Patericon*, Olympios tells his listeners not to sit with heretics, and Cosmas (who is dead and buried) attempts to ward off a heretical bishop who has been buried next to him. In the *Scete Paterikon*, both Chame and two anonymous desert fathers recommend avoiding heretics. *Sinayskii paterik*, ed. by Golysenko and Dubrovina, pp. 52, 90; *The Scete Paterikon*, ed. by Veder, pp. 40, 42, 55.

⁴⁴ Nicholas Marinides, 'Religious Toleration in the *Apophthegmata Patrum*', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 20 (2012), 235–68 (pp. 242–47).

⁴⁵ 'къ семоу приде братъ стороньникъ. ѿ страны доринъ. именемъ оеофанъ.' 'To this man [Cyriacos] came a brother, a stranger from the country of Dorin, whose name was Theophanes.' 'азъ въ земли мои съ несторианы причащаѣ сѧ.' 'In my land, I am in communion with the Nestorians.' *Sinayskii paterik*, ed. by Golysenko and Dubrovina, pp. 63–64.

church in which the elder teaches'.⁴⁶ He accepts the orthodox faith as a result of the aid and spiritual efforts of the holy man.

The monks of the Caves monastery adopt the desert fathers' methods in their dealings with heretics and waverers. The tale of the prince-turned-monk Sviatosha relates at length Sviatosha's relationship with a Syrian healer, whose belief in medicine and moderation turns out to be less efficacious than Sviatosha's simple faith and strict asceticism. Sviatosha repeatedly exhorts the Syrian to put more faith in God and less in medicine, eventually saving him from death by warning him not to take medications when he falls ill, but to trust in God. Strengthened by his love and respect for Sviatosha, and persuaded by miraculous demonstrations of Sviatosha's piety, the Syrian repents and becomes a monk.⁴⁷ Meanwhile, Agapit the healer overturns a jealous Armenian doctor's plot to kill him, continuing to receive him in his cell even after the murder attempt. When Agapit discovers the Armenian is a heretic, he throws him out of his cell (perhaps obeying the command to avoid the company of heretics?), but he continues to exhort the Armenian even after his death. Finally, persuaded by Agapit's posthumous apparitions and the miracles performed through Agapit in his lifetime, the Armenian too converts to Orthodoxy and joins the Caves.⁴⁸

The postscript to Shimon's tale should be read in this literary context. Shimon abandons the Latin faith 'thanks to the miracles of the holy fathers Antonii and Feodosii',⁴⁹ and as a result of the instruction of Feodosii, to whom he is personally devoted. His conversion is the result of his respect for and closeness to a miracle-working elder, in the tradition of the paterica. This reading of the postscript does not resolve the contradiction between the body of Shimon's tale, in which Shimon appears perfectly Christian, and the tale's coda, in which he unexpectedly 'becomes a Christian' after abandoning his 'folly'. There almost seem to be two tales here. In the first, Shimon (like Moisei the Hungarian) is a virtuous Christian from the outset, drawn to the holiness of the Caves from afar by God's will, just as many of the Late Antique 'fathers' came to the desert from all over the Christian world. In the second, Shimon plays the role of the heretic or unbeliever who is virtuous in everything save his doctrine, and who is eventually converted thanks to the efforts of a powerful and devoted orthodox figure. One might justifiably see two stages of composition here, each of which casts Shimon in a slightly different role. This conception ties in neatly with the possibility that an earlier version of Shimon's tale was redacted in the thirteenth century or later, as discussed above.

⁴⁶ 'приди къ сѣи кафолики и аплѣсѣи цркѣви. еи же и старѣць оучить.' *Sinaiiskii paterik*, ed. by Golyshenko and Dubrovina, pp. 65–66.

⁴⁷ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol'shevskaia and Travnikov, pp. 29–31.

⁴⁸ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol'shevskaia and Travnikov, pp. 39–42.

⁴⁹ See n. 23, p. 82.

Analysing the role of Latins in the *Patericon* thus involves consideration of both the textual history of the *Patericon* and its models. In its fifteenth-century redactions, the earliest redactions known to us, the *Patericon* is contradictory in its treatment of Latins, who can be pious or impious. This may be the result of the *Patericon*'s compilation over many centuries, with the anti-Latin elements constituting later accretions; it may be a consequence of anti-Latin sentiment among members or alumni of the Caves during one of the periods of composition or redaction of the *Patericon*. However, what appears to be an oddly incoherent treatment of Latins comes to look less odd when understood in the light of the *Patericon*'s models. Sometimes tolerated, sometimes condemned, the 'stranger' and the religious Other are a constant presence in the Late Antique paterica which were the primary influence on the *Patericon*.

Travel narratives: Structural and personal conceptions of Latins

Certain Rusian writers do not simply accept 'strangers' and Others into their world; they go out to meet them. The history of the Rusian travel narrative begins with Hegumen Daniil's account of his travels in the Holy Land in the first decade of the twelfth century.⁵⁰ Daniil's report establishes many of the stylistic markers of the travel narrative as a genre: he intersperses inventories of holy sites and the legends associated with them with first-person accounts of his experiences and expressions of gratitude for being permitted to see the wonders of the Holy Land with his own eyes. Composed almost a century after Daniil's narrative, Archbishop Antonii's shorter text on his time in Constantinople at the beginning of the thirteenth century has some fundamental similarities to Daniil's account. Written by a high-ranking ecclesiastic, Antonii's account similarly places inventories and tales of Constantinople's holy sites, icons and relics in a first-person framework. However, Antonii's narrative is both shorter and stylistically drier than Daniil's: whereas Daniil describes the environment he journeys through, the people he meets and his own religious experiences, Anthony's account is more impersonal, more concerned with providing directions from one Constantinopolitan site to another and relating legendary miracles and edifying historical tales than with conveying the particularities of his journey.

By their very nature, travel narratives are a fruitful source of accounts of religious, cultural and linguistic difference. Daniil and Antonii travel outside of Rus to lands where people of different faiths and cultures rub shoulders. Daniil meets Orthodox monks, Saracens and Latin Christians (including Baldwin, the Crusader king of Jerusalem). Antonii relates legends concerning Jews and Christian heretics and compares Greek and Latin liturgical customs. Of course, these texts are not perfect

⁵⁰ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others.

reflections of the personal experiences of Daniil and Antonii, even if their use of the first person would seem to encourage such an illusion (lending their texts an aura of ‘authenticity’, as Klaus-Dieter Seemann argues).⁵¹ What Daniil and Antonii write is conditioned by the demands of the genre of text they are writing, in this case, the travel narrative. Despite many decades of research on the topic, we know relatively little about the models for Russian travel narratives. They seem to owe something of their style to Byzantine *proskynetaria* (descriptions of holy Christian sites), although no direct textual parallels have been found;⁵² the influence of Christian pilgrim narratives in Latin is possible, but again, no clear parallels are known.⁵³ Nevertheless, there is much we can deduce about their treatment of difference, providing a context for considering their representations of Latins in particular.

In Daniil and Antonii’s texts, difference is most often downplayed or simply ignored. Unlike many other, mostly later, composers of travel narratives (Marco Polo, Afanasii Nikitin), Antonii and Daniil are not purveyors of exotica. They do not record strange and exotic customs or faiths. Indeed, on some level, the lands they visit are profoundly familiar: Constantinople and the Holy Land are centres of the Christian world, and the relics, wonders and legends Daniil and Antonii encounter there are not shockingly different, but known to them as part of Christian tradition. Both Daniil and Antonii also record previous visits by Rus to the areas in which they are travelling: Daniil notes that Oleg Sviatoslavich of Chernigov spent two years on Rhodes,⁵⁴ and one of the marvels which Antonii sees in St. Sophia is the liturgical plate associated with ‘Olga of the Rus’, who was baptised in Constantinople.⁵⁵ Both composers make it clear that they are following in the footsteps of other Christians (and other Rus), and that the sites they visit are Christian sites.

What’s more, neither composer dwells on the difficulties and dangers of their travels. Both complete their journey by ‘God’s mercy’ and ‘divine grace’:⁵⁶ with such aid, Daniil and Antonii can hardly fail to have safe and spiritually enriching travels. Daniil mentions in passing that his group was attacked and robbed by corsairs, and hints of the dangers of traversing the mountainous land inhabited by

⁵¹ Klaus-Dieter Seemann, *Die altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur: Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Genres* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976), p. 76.

⁵² V.V. Danilov, ‘O zhanrovnykh osobennostiakh drevnerusskikh «khozhdenii»’, *TODRL*, 18 (1962), 21–37 (pp. 22–27).

⁵³ Seemann, *Die altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur*, pp. 193–98.

⁵⁴ «Khozhenie», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 20.

⁵⁵ ‘Khozhenie v Tsar’grad’, ed. by Maleto, p. 221.

⁵⁶ ‘Божиимъ милосердиемъ’, ‘Khozhenie v Tsar’grad’, ed. by Maleto, p. 221; ‘Божиею благодатию’, «Khozhenie», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 120.

‘pagan Saracens’,⁵⁷ but he makes nothing of such minor inconveniences. Indeed, in Palestine, he thanks God that he ‘saw no pagans or wild animals anywhere, nor did I happen to see any other evil thing at all, nor did I feel the slightest sickness in my body; rather, like an unburdened eagle, I was continuously protected by God’s grace and strengthened by the power of the Most High.’⁵⁸ Almost all the people he meets, whether Christians or Saracens, are friendly and welcoming: a Saracen elder obligingly accompanies him all the way to Bethlehem.⁵⁹ Antonii is less forthcoming, but makes no mention of any problems or dangers encountered in Constantinople. There seems to be no room for such complaints in accounts of journeys undertaken with divine protection and approval.

Frightening or unpleasant encounters with real-life Others do not make the cut—and yet both Daniil and Antonii’s texts contain numerous accounts of religious Others, from impious heretics to blasphemous Jews. These heretics and Jews are not real people whom Daniil and Antonii encounter, but characters in the legends associated with Constantinople and the Holy Land; they are archetypal enemies of orthodoxy encountered at a safe distance, within the framework of the legendary Christian past. Daniil relates the tale of the Jew who attempted to interfere with Mary’s burial and points out the cave in which Nestorios was interrogated;⁶⁰ Antonii includes forceful accounts of the treatment of ‘heretics’ who spat and stamped on the Host in St. Sophia and of the iniquities of the Jews, who saw miracles and yet did not repent.⁶¹ This condemnation of the Other is perhaps linked to the edificatory function of the travel narrative, which instructs as well as provoking religious awe and wonder in readers.⁶² In any case, while real-life difference is passed over in near-silence, the abstract difference of groups opposed to the orthodox is noted and sometimes deplored in Daniil and Antonii’s texts.

Similar dynamics are at play in the texts’ treatment of Latins. Daniil has much more to say about Latins and their faith than does Antonii, whose narrative contains only one mention of Latins in most of its redactions. (A single seventeenth-century manuscript of the narrative contains a sentence on the sack of St. Sophia in 1204: ‘They took all these noble, expensive ecclesiastical objects and carried

⁵⁷ ‘погании срацини’. «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 112.

⁵⁸ ‘не видѣх нигдеже поганых, ни лютаго звѣри, ни пригоди ми ся видѣти иного зла ничтоже, ни немощи малы не почютих в тѣлѣ моем, но всегда, яко орель облегчеваем, Божию благодатию съблюдаем и силою Вышняго укрѣпляемъ.’ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 120.

⁵⁹ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 82.

⁶⁰ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, pp. 42, 20.

⁶¹ ‘*Khozhenie v Tsar’grad*’, ed. by Maleto, p. 223.

⁶² Seemann, *Die altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur*, p. 71.

them off to Rome; it was for our sins that this this happened.’⁶³ As this sentence seems more likely to belong to a later editor than to Antonii himself, I do not consider it here.) At this point in the thesis, the reader will not be surprised to learn that both Daniil and Antonii treat Latins as Christians. Neither writer employs the adjective *poganyi*, ‘pagan’, to describe them, even though Daniil writes of ‘pagan Saracens’ and Antonii denounces the ‘pagan Jews’.⁶⁴ Moreover, neither composer includes extended passages of anti-Latin polemic in their text, despite the fact that polemic plays a significant role in Antonii’s work in particular: his anti-Jewish diatribe is one of the longest sections of his account of St. Sophia.

Daniil becomes acquainted with many Latins on his travels, and has nothing but praise for their kindness and humility. Baldwin, the Crusader king of Jerusalem, repeatedly shows Daniil honour and offers him protection. Daniil in turn paints him in the best possible light. In Daniil’s eyes, Baldwin combines the virtues of love, piety and humility with the strength befitting a ruler. Baldwin commands great power, travelling with ‘imperial troops’, and yet remains full of humility, ‘a virtuous man, extremely humble and not proud in the slightest’.⁶⁵ He has the place of honour at the Holy Saturday ceremony, yet still sheds reverent tears during worship.⁶⁶ Daniil also relates how, at the residence of a Latin bishop, the inhabitants ‘showed us a great deal of honour, with food and drink and everything’.⁶⁷ This site had been ‘restored and done up nicely’ by the ‘Franks’.⁶⁸ Even the guardian of Christ’s tomb, who initially has to be persuaded to admit Daniil, eventually sees his piety and presents him with a piece of the tomb as a relic.⁶⁹ Daniil’s Latins are shining examples of Christian virtue and sincere piety.

Yet Daniil and Antonii make it abundantly clear that the Latin faith is not equivalent to the Orthodox faith. As far as nomenclature is concerned, whilst Daniil and Antonii refer to Latins as Christians, both also employ the terms *latina*, *latini*, and/or *latinskyi*. What’s more, Daniil makes a consistent

⁶³ ‘Взяша бо вся сія благая церковныя драгія вещи и отвезоша въ Римъ. грѣхъ ради нашихъ тако сотворися.’ I.I. Sreznevskii, ‘Skazanie o Sofiiskom khrame Tsaregrada v XII v. po dvum spiskam’, *Sbornik otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk*, 12 (1875), 340–52 (p. 348).

⁶⁴ ‘погании срацини’, «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 112; ‘поганья жидове’, ‘*Khozhenie v Tsar’grad*’, ed. by Maletov, p. 224.

⁶⁵ ‘с вои царьскими’, ‘есть мужъ благодѣтель и смѣрен велми и не гордить нимала’. «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, pp. 92, 122.

⁶⁶ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 126.

⁶⁷ ‘И почѣстиша нас добръ питием и ядениемъ, и всѣмъ’. «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 116.

⁶⁸ ‘нынѣ же фрязи обновили мѣсто то суть и устроили добръ’. «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 116.

⁶⁹ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 132.

distinction between ‘Latin’ priests and ‘Orthodox’ ones: on Holy Saturday, the hegumen of the Monastery of St. Sabbas stands ‘with the Orthodox priests’ while the ‘Latin priests’ stand at the altar.⁷⁰ To both Daniil and Antonii, then, the Christian world is divided. This is not a contrast that is drawn in most Early Rusian writing outside of canon law. The chronicles rarely use the term ‘Latin’, let alone oppose ‘Latins’ to ‘Orthodox’: as Chapter Two demonstrated, in the vast majority of cases, both Latins and Rus figure in the chronicles simply as Christians.

Indeed, for Daniil, the Latin faith is not only different, but demonstrably spiritually inferior to the Orthodox faith. Twice, Daniil discusses the lamps in Christ’s tomb. The ‘Greek’ lamp hangs at the head of the tomb, with the Rusian lamp and the lamp of St. Sabbas’s monastery below it, symbolising their adherence to the ‘Greek’ faith. All three of these lamps light and burn brightly. The Frankish lamps, hung elsewhere, initially fail to light at all and then burn only reluctantly.⁷¹ Daniil devotes a good deal of space to the two passages on the lamps, and his point is clear: the fire of faith burns brighter in the Orthodox church than in the Latin church.

It might seem strange that Daniil praises the Christian virtues of individual Latins, yet evidently considers the Latin faith to be different from the Orthodox faith. Previous scholars have noted both Daniil’s lack of hostility towards individual Latins and his evident conviction of Orthodox superiority, but have been content to leave the question there.⁷² However, there is more that can be said. Daniil makes a fundamental distinction between the merits of Latins as individuals and the merits (or demerits) of the Latin church as a branch of Christianity. The latter bears no relation to the former. In this respect, Daniil’s approach to Latins and their faith departs from that of the composers of some of the more violent anti-Latin polemic. Feodosii’s tract, for instance, claims that individual Latins are so fundamentally unclean that it is a sin for the Orthodox even to eat from the same vessel a Latin has used: the corruption of the Latin church renders all Latins similarly corrupt.⁷³ Daniil does not profess this view. Indeed, careful reading demonstrates that he tends to use different terms to speak of individual (lay) members of the Latin church and elements of the Latin church as an institution. The former are ‘Franks’; the latter are ‘Latins’ (*latina, latinskyi*). Bishops, priests and monasteries are therefore ‘Latin’, but it is ‘Franks’ who hold, abandon or renovate towns, create statues of Christ and hang lamps in Christ’s tomb.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ ‘с правовѣрными попы’, ‘латиньстии [...] попове’. «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, pp. 126, 128.

⁷¹ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, pp. 124, 130.

⁷² Colucci, ‘The Image’, pp. 582–83.

⁷³ ‘Poslanie o vere latinskoi’, ed. by Ponyrko, p. 16.

⁷⁴ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, pp. 116, 124, 128 and 110 for ‘Latins’, pp. 90, 88, 28 and 124 for ‘Franks’.

Given this distinction, it is striking that all of the differences between Latins and Orthodox noted by both Daniil and Antonii concern the Latin church as an institution and, more specifically, the conduct of their church services. At the level of politics, culture and individual morality, Rus and Latins are essentially similar: Baldwin and his *druzhina* follow codes of etiquette which are familiar and praiseworthy to Daniil. However, on visiting the cave of Melchizedek, Daniil notes in passing that the practice of using bread and wine, ‘and not azymes’, in the liturgy originated there.⁷⁵ His description of the Holy Saturday service is largely neutral, but a hint of hostility (or at least discomfort) slips into his account of the Latin priests singing Vespers. While the Orthodox priests simply ‘sing’, the Latins at the high altar begin to ‘wail in their own fashion’.⁷⁶ It seems to be the conduct of the Latin liturgy in particular which affronts Daniil. Antonii’s single mention of Latin difference similarly has to do with church services: he notes that Latin churches have bells to call people to worship, whilst the Greeks use a *bilo* (a small drum), ‘according to the angelic teaching’.⁷⁷ Both Antonii’s note on church bells and Daniil’s comment on azymes suggest that the inferiority of the Latin church is the result of its tendency to innovate—the crux of most anti-Latin polemic. Minor deviations from angelic and apostolic teachings have weakened the Latin church, as Daniil’s discussion of the lamps in Christ’s tomb demonstrates.

Daniil’s representation of Latins has certain resonances both with polemic and with chronicle-writing, as I interpreted them in Chapters One and Two. Like those who composed and promulgated polemic, Daniil recognises the *structural* inferiority of the Latin church and its difference from the Orthodox church, to which Byzantium and Rus belong. As I argued in Chapter One, however, this recognition need not imply *personal* hostility to Latins, or indeed a personal devotion to realising the letter of anti-Latin polemic. The chroniclers of Rus could perfectly well juxtapose the anti-Latin polemic of the entries concerning Vladimir’s baptism (and acceptance of the ‘Greek’ faith as an institution) with many references to Latins as pious Christians and ‘brothers’. Daniil does something similar: his writing demonstrates both the corruption of the Latin church and the piety of individual Latins, without implying that one might affect the other. As I have demonstrated, travel narratives tend to paint a rosy picture of the journeys they describe, undertaken by God’s will and with divine protection; there is no room for anything but the briefest mention of those who are not so hospitable and fundamentally familiar. At the same time, criticism of other faiths (but not their real-life followers) constitutes part of the edificatory purpose of the travel narrative. The nature of the travel

⁷⁵ ‘И то бысть начатокъ литургиям хлѣбом и вином, а не опрѣсноком.’ ‘And that was the origin of the liturgy with bread and wine, and not azymes.’ «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, pp. 110–12.

⁷⁶ ‘верещати свойскы’. «*Khozhenie*», ed. by Belobrova and others, p. 128.

⁷⁷ ‘по аггелову учению’. ‘*Khozhenie v Tsar’grad*’, ed. by Maleto, p. 226.

narrative permits Daniil to demonstrate the inferiority of the Latin church whilst singing the praises of individual Latins.

Hagio-biographies: Latins and princely panegyric

The hagio-biographies of Aleksandr Nevskii and Dovmont of Pskov pose a rather different challenge to those interested in representations of Latins in Early Rusian texts. Here, the question is not so much how to explain multiple and apparently contradictory portrayals of Latins within a single text, as it was in the case of the *Patericon* and travel narratives. There is nothing contradictory about the uncompromising positions adopted by Aleksandr and Dovmont towards the *nemtsi* who invade their princedoms in north-western Rus. Instead, the question this chapter poses is: how did such anomalous representations arise in the first place? No other Early Rusian texts, even polemical texts, insist on the Otherness of Latins. There are no obvious precedents for the violent anti-Latin rhetoric of the *Tale of Aleksandr Nevskii* and the *Tale of Dovmont*. How, then, to explain its appearance?

Chapter Two introduced the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* as a rhetorical anomaly within the Rusian chronicles.⁷⁸ The present chapter considers the *Tale of the Life* alongside the *Tale of Dovmont*, its closest analogue in terms of form and content. The Lithuanian prince Dovmont, or Daumantas, became prince of Pskov in 1266, three years after the death of Aleksandr Nevskii. He led a number of successful campaigns against the Lithuanians and, later, the Livonian Order; like Aleksandr, he is now venerated as a saint. The *Tale of Dovmont* was most likely composed in the early fourteenth century,⁷⁹ and is included in the Pskov First, Second and Third chronicles as well as various other compendia. Following V.I. Okhotnikova's argument that the redaction in the Pskov First chronicle is the closest to the fourteenth-century protograph, I cite from Okhotnikova's edition of the Pskov First redaction.⁸⁰ In all its chronicle redactions, the *Tale* focuses largely on Dovmont's military campaigns against the *nemtsi*.

The *Tale of Dovmont* bears many resemblances to the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, in style and substance. Its rhetoric, however, is significantly harder-hitting. (Its resemblances are mostly to a later redaction of the *Tale of the Life*, which tends to eliminate the many Old Testament references of

⁷⁸ See pp. 72–75.

⁷⁹ See n. 17, p. 57.

⁸⁰ Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, pp. 188–93. See Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, p. 44, for the argument that the Pskov First redaction is closest to the protograph.

the earlier redaction and emphasise Aleksandr's heroic rulership.)⁸¹ Certain redactions of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* contain a single reference to 'godless *nemtsi*', but stop short at calling them 'pagans', or even implying they are un-Christian by using topoi generally limited to pagan invasions. The composer of the *Tale of Dovmont* has no such scruples. While the *Tale of the Life* portrays conflicts with *nemtsi* as epic clashes between 'peoples' (the *nemtsi* of the 'Roman land' and the 'Slavonic people' with their own divinely established land), the *Tale of Dovmont* simply castigates Dovmont's enemies as 'pagan Latins' or 'pagan *nemtsi*' whose offences Dovmont refuses to tolerate.⁸² Like the pagan Cumans and Mongols, the *Tale of Dovmont's nemtsi* invade Rus as a divine punishment 'for the multiplication of our sins'.⁸³ In different ways, the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* and the *Tale of Dovmont* represent conflicts between Rus and the *nemtsi* of the Baltic as a longstanding clash of cultures between 'peoples' who are fundamentally ethnically, politically and religiously opposed.

What is it about the hagio-biography of the warrior-prince that made this class of text a suitable vessel for the kind of anti-Latin polemic eschewed by other contemporary texts? The answer lies in the models for the hagio-biographies of Aleksandr and Dovmont. The conception of the Russian prince as a Christian defender against pagans is widespread in princely panegyrics included in the chronicles.⁸⁴ These panegyrics, generally included in chronicle 'obituaries' for princes, have clearly influenced the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* on a stylistic level. For example, the Metropolitan's lament that 'Suzdal's sun has set' on Aleksandr's death is also found in the panegyric to Mstislav Rostislavich s.a. 1179 in the Kiev chronicle.⁸⁵ One of the princely virtues which panegyrics tend to highlight is the prince's ability to defend his land and faith from enemies, often 'pagans'. For example, Mstislav Vsevolodovich is lauded in the Kiev chronicle for his defence of Novgorod from pagans; the chronicle describes how Mstislav declaims: 'Behold how the pagans offend us [...] We should liberate the Novgorodian land from the pagans.'⁸⁶ Vladimir Monomakh too is lauded as a powerful prince who was 'terrifying to pagans'.⁸⁷ Even princes known for their non-violence can be petitioned

⁸¹ V.I. Okhotnikova, 'Povest' o Dovmonte i kniazheskie zhizneopisaniia XI–XIV vv.', in *Istochnikovedenie literatury Drevnei Rusi*, ed. by D.S. Likhachev (Leningrad: Nauka, 1980), pp. 115–28 (pp. 121–22).

⁸² 'погании латыня', 'погании немцы'. Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, pp. 191, 192.

⁸³ 'за умножение грех наших'. Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, p. 191.

⁸⁴ A.A. Turilov, 'Obraz pravitelia v letopisnykh «nekrologakh» XI–XIII vv.', in *Anfologion: Vlast', obshchestvo, kul'tura v slavianskom mire v srednie veka: K 70-letiiu Borisa Nikolaevicha Flori*, ed. by G.G. Litavrin (Moscow: Indrik, 2008), pp. 195–209 (p. 200).

⁸⁵ 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, p. 178; PSRL 2, col. 610.

⁸⁶ 'се вбидать ны погании [...] свободилѣ бѣхомъ. Новгородскоую землю ѿ поганыхъ'. PSRL 2, cols 607–08.

⁸⁷ 'бѣ страшень. поганымъ.' PSRL 2, col. 289.

for aid against ‘pagan’ enemies: the PVL’s entry on the murder of Boris and Gleb ends with a prayer entreating Boris and Gleb to ‘subdue the pagans under the feet of our princes’.⁸⁸

Given the emphasis of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* and especially the *Tale of Dovmont* on the military prowess of their protagonists, it is unsurprising that these texts adopt pre-existing conceptions of the prince as Christian defender against hostile outsiders. What is novel about the two tales is the fact that these hostile outsiders are not pagans in the sense of non-Christians, but Latins. Historical context undoubtedly plays a role here. As Isoaho reasonably notes, as far as we can reconstruct, the historical Aleksandr Nevskii never came into significant conflict with pagans: he placated the Mongols rather than engaging in warfare against them, and his other known conflicts were against Latins. Dovmont fought against both Lithuanians and Latins, but it is the latter conflicts which dominated his career in Pskov. It would therefore have required a considerable departure from the facts of Aleksandr’s and Dovmont’s biographies to have portrayed them primarily as defenders of Rus against non-Christians.

Instead, a compromise between literary concerns (the need to portray Aleksandr and Dovmont as defenders of the realm and faith against outsiders) and historical ones (the facts of the princes’ biographies) takes place. The composers of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* and the *Tale of Dovmont* adopt the familiar topos of the prince as military and religious protector of Rus, but introduce a new enemy, the ‘godless’ (and, in the *Tale of Dovmont*, ‘pagan’) Latins. Of course, the concept of Latins as a religious threat was not entirely novel. When Aleksandr Nevskii refuses to accept Latin instruction, he is following the advice given to Vladimir on his baptism: ‘Do not accept teaching from the Latins, whose teaching is corrupt.’⁸⁹ Nevertheless, the hagio-biographies of Aleksandr and Dovmont constitute a new class of text with a new and unusually hostile attitude to Latins—an attitude which becomes more explicable when one considers the interaction between the literary precedents and the historical context of these hagio-biographies.

*

The genre or thematic category of an Early Russian text is perhaps the principal factor determining the text’s portrayal of Latins. Certain classes of text, such as hagiography, make almost no references to Latins; others, most obviously polemic but also, say, travel narratives or chronicles, contain a relatively large number of such references. What’s more, in texts which do contain mentions of

⁸⁸ ‘покорита поганѣицъ подѣ нозѣ княземъ нашимъ’. PSRL 1, col. 139. The process by which Boris and Gleb came to be associated with the phalanx of Byzantine military saints who acted as defenders of Russian princes’ patrimony has been studied extensively by Monica White. See Monica White, *Military Saints in Byzantium and Rus, 900–1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 132–66.

⁸⁹ ‘Не преимаи же оученьи ѿ Латѣинъ. ихъже оученье разъвращено.’ PSRL 1, col. 114.

Latins, the nature of their portrayal is dictated by the rhetorical prerequisites of their genre or thematic category. Religious difference between Rus and Latins can be entirely overlooked (as in much chronicle-writing, which tends to emphasise the religious similarities between Rus and Latins) or hysterically denounced (as in the more feverish anti-Latin polemic, the *raison d'être* of which is to warn against deviations from orthodoxy). Religious Others in general and Latins in particular might be welcomed, instructed and perhaps converted by Kievan monks according to the tradition of the desert, or condemned as 'godless pagans' by the composer of a hagio-biography praising a prince's ability to defend his land and faith. As the first three chapters of this thesis have argued, depictions of Latins are more predictable and more meaningful when considered within a text's rhetorical framework.

Chapter Four: Evolving Representations? Chronological Variation in Early Rusian Depictions of Latins

Significant and often overlooked though they are, genre and subject matter are not the only factors influencing Early Rusian texts' portrayals of Latins and their faith. As I argued in the previous chapter, the hagio-biographies of Aleksandr and Dovmont represent a compromise between literary demands (the need to portray princes as defenders of Rus against 'pagans') and historical fact (the anti-Latin, not anti-pagan, policies of Aleksandr and Dovmont). Any attempt to explain hagio-biographical depictions—or indeed most depictions—of Latins by reference only to textual factors will inevitably be partial. What of the historical period in which these texts were composed, the era of the so-called Baltic crusades and perhaps concomitant anti-Latin hostility? And what of the fact that the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* was composed, not in Novgorod or southern Rus, but in Vladimir-Suzdal, far from the notional border with the Latin world? The final two chapters of this thesis turn to these questions, considering the relative significance of time and place of composition for Early Rusian depictions of Latins in hagio-biography and beyond.

In their attempts to understand the variation in Early Rusian representations of Latins, scholars of Early Rus have privileged time of composition above all other explanatory factors. A consensus has emerged that Early Rusian relations with and attitudes to Latins worsened over time from 1054 onwards, so that relative closeness and cordiality in the eleventh century were gradually replaced by estrangement and hostility. The thirteenth century in particular is frequently painted as a period in which relations between Latins and Rus (or the Orthodox world more generally) broke down, as Constantinople was sacked by crusading Franks, Aleksandr Nevskii led epic attacks to repulse Swedes and Teutonic Knights in the north-west of Rus, and Lithuania increasingly looked West, not East.¹ Alexandr Musin might be a little hyperbolic in his assessment of the thirteenth century as the period of the 'final separation' between the 'Western' and 'Eastern' churches, but few would question the essence of his argument.²

This chapter challenges the premise that attitudes to and representations of Latins became steadily more negative between the eleventh and the fourteenth centuries. The extant texts, our main sources for reconstructing attitudes, provide little evidence for this. The present chapter also questions the effect which particular events and historical phenomena, from the Schism itself to the sack of Constantinople and the Baltic crusades, had on contemporary depictions of and opinions about Latins.

¹ Fennell, *A History*, pp. 97, 103–04; Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 63; Francis Dvornik, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1962), p. 213.

² Musin, 'Two Churches', p. 289.

These events and phenomena may have assumed retrospective importance in later historiography, but how did these apparent turning-points influence (or not) contemporary portrayals of Latins and their faith?

The Schism and its aftermath

The eleventh century

In recent years, scholars have tended to downplay the contemporary significance of the events of 1054. In a 2007 article, Jean-Claude Cheynet went as far as to ask whether the Schism constituted an ‘event’ in Byzantine history at all, or whether it should be relegated to the status of a ‘non-event’.³ The discovery of points of contention between branches of the Church was no novelty: Photios had condemned the Latin ‘addition’ of the *filioque* and various other ‘errors’ back in the ninth century. Moreover, there is good reason to believe that the events of 1054 had only the most minimal of effects on relations between Rome and Constantinople, let alone on broader political and ecclesiastical dealings. Most contemporary Byzantine sources are silent on the topic of the Schism of 1054,⁴ and in 1089, when a Constantinopolitan synod investigated the reason for the exclusion of the Pope’s name from the diptychs, they could find no evidence that a schism had even taken place.⁵

However, Cheynet notes that, while Byzantine narrative sources largely pass over the Schism in silence, ecclesiastical sources are slightly more forthcoming—particularly in Rus. Here, Cheynet leans heavily on the tract attributed to Metropolitan Efrem, which Chichurov dates to not long after the Schism, as evidence that the Schism had at least some immediate resonance in the Orthodox community beyond the ecclesiastical actors personally involved in it.⁶ Apart from the obvious point that neither the date nor the identity of the composer of this tract are certain, I have no objection to this argument. Indeed, there is a reasonable amount of evidence suggesting that certain Russian ecclesiastics were composing polemic in the few decades after the Schism, and that this polemic was influenced by the particular controversies that took centre stage in 1054, notably the problem of azyme use. Questions of dating and authorial identity are particularly troubling in this case, but at least some of Feodosii of the Caves, Metropolitan Efrem, Metropolitan Georgii, Metropolitan Lev of

³ Jean-Claude Cheynet, ‘Le schisme de 1054: un non-événement?’, in *Faire l’événement au Moyen Âge*, ed. by Claude Carozzi and Huguette Taviani-Carozzi (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l’Université de Provence, 2007), pp. 299–312.

⁴ Cheynet, ‘Le schisme’, pp. 305–08.

⁵ Louth, *Greek East*, p. 317.

⁶ See pp. 32–33.

Pereiaslavl and Metropolitan Ioann II seem to have been composing polemic in the eleventh century (even if most were composing in Greek rather than Slavonic).

As the previous chapters have made clear, the post-1054 Rusian interest in Latin ‘errors’ was largely confined to texts concerned with the definition and maintenance of orthodoxy. The events of 1054 make no more of an impression on most Rusian sources than they do on most Byzantine sources—although, of course, there are few extant eleventh-century Rusian texts on which the Schism *could* have made an impression, and even fewer texts from before 1054 with which to compare them. The exception is Ilarion’s *Sermon on the Law and Grace*, composed not long before the Schism. In his list of regions which have cause to praise God, Ilarion includes ‘the Roman land’ as a centre of Christian orthodoxy which has reason to praise Peter and Paul, its teachers in the faith.⁷ The significance of this should not be overstated. This kind of ecumenical thinking did not disappear after 1054, either in Byzantium or in Rus: witness the recurrent concept of the Pope as defender of orthodoxy in Rusian chronicles.⁸

In short, the Schism does seem to have opened up new rhetorical possibilities for discussing Latins in Rus. As far as we can tell, it is only after 1054 that Rusian ecclesiastics began to write about Latin ‘errors’, particularly the ‘error’ of azyme use, which came to prominence at the time of the Schism. On the other hand, there is no evidence that it made itself felt in most of the writing or broader culture of eleventh-century Rus. The Schism can only be conceived of as a ‘turning-point’ in a very restricted sense. Not quite a ‘non-event’, then, but hardly a watershed moment in the history of Rus–Latin relations.

The twelfth century

The twelfth century appears to be a period of relative stability as far as ties between Rus and the Latin world are concerned: it sees none of the political and ecclesiastic turbulence of either the eleventh century or of the thirteenth. For Lind, however, the twelfth century possesses a particular significance as the period in which indigenous Rusian ecclesiastics belatedly became aware of the rift between the churches. As a result, Lind suggests, hostility towards ‘the Latin rite’ ‘began to creep in from the mid-twelfth century in Novgorod’, although it may have been more prevalent from an earlier date in Kiev, where Byzantine ecclesiastics were apparently more influential and numerous.⁹ Does the twelfth century then qualify as a turning-point in Rusian (especially Novgorodian) attitudes to Latins? The

⁷ ‘римьскаа страна’. ‘Proizvedeniia Ilariona’, ed. by Sumnikova, p. 26.

⁸ PSRL 1, col. 27; PSRL 2, col. 827.

⁹ John H. Lind, ‘Christianity on the Move’, p. 428.

historical evidence might suggest so: contacts between Rus and Scandinavia became considerably less frequent and intensive from the middle of the twelfth century, when Rus–Scandinavian marriages came to a virtual halt¹⁰ and Scandinavian saints and rites were no longer adopted by the Rusian church.¹¹

However, there is little to suggest rhetorical change in twelfth-century depictions of Latins, which brings the likelihood of a sudden shift in attitudes into question. Lind cites the *Questions of Kirik*, with its two questions concerning Latins, as testimony to a new-found Novgorodian consciousness of the divisions between the Latin and Orthodox churches.¹² But why assume that the *Questions of Kirik* represent a *new* attitude to Latins, a sudden realisation of Latin difference? There are no earlier, similar Novgorodian texts with which to compare the *Questions*, so no way of establishing Nifont's predecessors' sentiments about Latins. What's more, as we have seen, questions about Latins are entirely standard for other Early Rusian erotapokriseis.¹³ It is of course within the realms of possibility that Kirik and Nifont's work is the spontaneous expression of a Novgorodian clerical epiphany about the rift between the churches; but it seems more likely that Kirik and Nifont were simply working within a pre-existing Early Rusian rhetorical tradition which sanctioned, indeed prescribed, the expression of anti-Latin sentiment within erotapokriseis. Their work tells us little about the evolution of attitudes to Latins in twelfth-century Rus—certainly not enough to permit us to class the twelfth century as a turning-point in either rhetoric about or conceptions of Latins.

The thirteenth century: A century of hostility?

Much recent scholarship quite rightly eschews the idea of a single Great Schism in 1054 followed by profound Orthodox hostility towards Latins and the erection of denominational borders. In place of an Orthodox 'East' ranged against a Latin 'West', scholars increasingly see a shared Christian culture, often (perhaps misleadingly) characterised as 'European' and enduring into the twelfth century, in which denominational borders had little consistent significance and anti-Latin feeling was limited in force and extent.¹⁴ The findings of this thesis largely support (although often qualify) this perspective: while the Schism may have given rise to a new conception of Latins as azymite schismatics, this

¹⁰ Selart, *Livonia*, pp. 36–37; John H. Lind, 'The Concept of "Europeanisation"', p. 43.

¹¹ For religious exchange between Rus and Scandinavia in the eleventh and early twelfth century, see Tatjana N. Jackson, 'The Cult of St Olaf and Early Novgorod', in *Saints and their Lives*, ed. by Antonsson and Garipzanov, pp. 147–67; Garipzanov, 'Wandering Clerics'; Garipzanov, 'Novgorod and the Veneration of Saints'.

¹² John H. Lind, 'Christianity on the Move', pp. 421–22.

¹³ See pp. 39–40.

¹⁴ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*; John H. Lind, 'The Concept of "Europeanisation"'.

conception did not supplant alternative conceptions of Latins as brothers in the faith. Anti-Latin sentiment was the exception, not the rule.

If one believes the scholarly consensus, the events of the thirteenth century put an end to this happy state of affairs. In scholarship both on Rus and on the Latin world, the thirteenth century is notorious as a period of disintegration of the relationships between Rus and Latins. Both Fennell and Stella Rock call the thirteenth century a ‘turning point’ in relations between Rus and Latin Christendom and cite the events of 1204 and the 1240s as aggravating factors.¹⁵ Francis Dvornik argues that the thirteenth century in Rus marked the appearance of an ‘anti-Western mentality’ that was previously absent, while Heppell similarly understands anti-Latin sentiment to be ‘typical’ of the thirteenth century but not the eleventh century.¹⁶ Scholars writing from the Latin perspective observe a similar phenomenon. For Eric Christiansen, writing on the ‘northern crusades’ in the Baltic, the thirteenth century saw the creation of a ‘new religious frontier’ at the edge of (Latin) Christendom.¹⁷ Beyond this frontier, according to Rock, lay ‘a mission territory to be won for the Church like a pagan land’.¹⁸ The thirteenth century apparently marks the appearance of mutual religious hostility, and religious borders, that were previously largely absent.

The idea that relations between Rus and Latins deteriorated in the thirteenth century is reasonable, if unnuanced, and there is some evidence for it. Dynastic marriage to Latins, so common until the twelfth century,¹⁹ had slowed to a trickle by the thirteenth.²⁰ Papal rhetoric about Rus and the need to stamp out the ‘Greek’ liturgy in ‘Latin’ lands hardened (at least in the case of Honorius III; this did not stop Innocent IV from making amicable overtures to Rusian princes, or stop Rusian princes from responding in kind)²¹. However, many scholars take this evidence for the gradual disintegration of previous ties as evidence for something much more nebulous: changes in ‘attitudes’ and ‘mentalities’.²² It is possible that the attitudes of some Rus towards Latins might have hardened over

¹⁵ Fennell, *A History*, pp. 103–04; Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 63.

¹⁶ Dvornik, *The Slavs*, p. 213; Heppell, *The Paterik*, p. 5.

¹⁷ Eric Christiansen, *The Northern Crusades: The Baltic and the Catholic Frontier 1100–1525* (London: Macmillan, 1980), p. 132.

¹⁸ Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 63.

¹⁹ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, pp. 71–72.

²⁰ There is a good deal of regional variation here. For instance, marriages between Rus and Scandinavians did dry up in the mid-twelfth century, but marriages between Rus and Poles continued. Selart, *Livonia*, pp. 36–37; Gotthold Rhode, *Die Ostgrenze Polens: Politische Entwicklung, kulturelle Bedeutung und geistige Auswirkung* (Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1955), pp. 136–37.

²¹ See pp. 132–135.

²² Dvornik, *The Slavs*, p. 213, talks of an ‘anti-Western mentality’; Heppell, *The Paterik*, p. 5, refers to ‘anti-Latin sentiment’; Fennell, *A History*, pp. 97, 103–04, talks of the emergence of hostile ‘attitudes’.

the thirteenth century, but hardly amenable to proof: attitudes and mentalities are impossible to recover, even if we might dimly discern their reflections in contemporary sources. Here, though, is where the problem lies. As this chapter will show, thirteenth-century texts (or what we can reconstruct of them) provide very little evidence for increasingly inimical representations of Latins, and the events of the thirteenth century do not provoke the hostile textual response one might expect.

Anti-Latin polemic

For Neborskii, the thirteenth century sees a significant change in the nature and intensity of anti-Latin polemic. Until the middle of the thirteenth century, he suggests, anti-Latin polemic was not a particularly productive category; but as the struggle against the Latin faith intensified during the thirteenth century, it was accompanied by a commensurate increase in the production of polemic.²³ In practice, in his consideration of polemic in this period, Neborskii follows the lead of Popov and Pavlov, whose analyses of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century polemic focus on the appearance of newly translated or reworked polemic within canon law compendia. The Serbian *kormchaia*, copied in Rus in the 1260s, contained four polemical texts: an extract from an epistle by Peter of Antioch to the Venetian archbishop Dominic; a single sentence from a work by Leo of Ohrid on keeping the Sabbath and the use of azymes; an anti-Latin tract by Niketas Stethatos; and the anti-Latin list known as *On the Franks and Other Latins*. Neborskii also dates four other texts, extant in certain redactions of the Rusian *kormchaia* first compiled in the 1280s, to the thirteenth century.²⁴ These are: the *Teachings of the Seven Councils*, a reworking of the anti-Latin epistles of Nikifor and Ioann;²⁵ the *Tale of the Twelve Apostles* (also known as the *Epistle Against the Romans*), containing extended excerpts from Niketas Stethatos's anti-Latin tract; a reworking of the section of Peter of Antioch's epistle on azymes; and a reworking of Ioann II's anti-Latin epistle, also made to focus on azymes.

Some of these translated and reworked texts undoubtedly were circulating in thirteenth-century Rus. However, it is misleading to suggest (as Neborskii does) that these texts are the direct product of thirteenth-century Rusian culture. The contents of the Serbian *kormchaia* were not influenced by Rusian writers: its contents were fixed in early thirteenth-century Serbia and then copied in Rus.²⁶ As for the Rusian *kormchaia*, most of its redactions do not include the 'new' translations and reworkings which Neborskii dates to the thirteenth century. The two redactions that do contain the four texts in question are not products of the thirteenth century. M.V. Korogodina has convincingly dated the

²³ Neborskii, 'Traditsii', pp. 371, 379.

²⁴ Neborskii, 'Traditsii', p. 383.

²⁵ A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*, pp. 58–59.

²⁶ Shchapov, *Vizantiiskoe i iuzhnoslavienskoe pravovoe nasledie*, pp. 122–23, 135–39, 146–52.

Chudovskaia redaction to the first half of the fourteenth century,²⁷ and considers it likely that it was compiled between 1328 and 1340;²⁸ the Lukashovichskaia redaction probably dates from the sixteenth century,²⁹ and its versions of the ‘new’ anti-Latin texts appear to be based in part on the versions in the Chudovskaia redaction.³⁰ On the evidence available to us, the first period in which a Russian writer made a decision to include fresh anti-Latin polemic in a canon law compendium was therefore not the thirteenth century, but the middle of the fourteenth century, the very end of the period I consider in this thesis. When Kirill II oversaw the creation of the Russian *kormchaia* in the 1280s, he evidently did not demand that new anti-Latin texts be included.

The *contents* of the Chudovskaia redaction could of course date from earlier than the fourteenth century. Neborskii combines several arguments in order to date the ‘new’ texts to between 1274 and 1283, but his principal argument concerns the emphasis the four ‘new’ texts place on the question of azymes. He suggests that the question of azyme use became acute only during the papacy of Urban IV (1261–1264), whose policy on the type of bread used in the Orthodox liturgy was stricter than that of his predecessors.³¹ For Neborskii, the appearance of newly translated or reworked polemic in Rus is a response to the increasingly uncompromising opinions of Urban IV on azymes, and particularly to the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi in 1264 to celebrate the miracle of the transubstantiation of (unleavened) bread in the Eucharist.³²

The texts in question do indeed privilege the issue of azyme use. The *Tale of the Twelve Apostles* includes anti-Latin polemic ‘the main focus of which is the denunciation of Latins for using azymes in Communion’;³³ only the section of Peter of Antioch’s tract which concerns azymes is included; and Ioann II’s epistle is given the title *To the Archbishop of Rome from Ioann, Metropolitan of Rus, on Azymes*.³⁴ However, there is no need to explain this as a reaction to papal policies in the late thirteenth century. As I showed in Chapter One, even in the early twelfth century, the question of azymes is the

²⁷ M.V. Korogodina, ‘O vremeni poiavleniia Chudovskoi redaktsii kormchei knigi’, in *Srednevekovaia Rus*, ed. by A.A. Gorskii (Moscow: Indrik, 2011), IX, 197–206.

²⁸ Maria Vladimirovna Korogodina, ‘Kormchie knigi XIV – pervoi poloviny XVII vv. kak istoricheskii istochnik’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Saint Petersburg State University, 2015), p. 181.

²⁹ Korogodina, ‘Kormchie knigi’, p. 415.

³⁰ Korogodina, ‘Kormchie knigi’, p. 410.

³¹ Neborskii, ‘Traditsii’, p. 380.

³² Neborskii, ‘Traditsii’, pp. 380–81.

³³ ‘главным стержнем которой является обличение латинян за причащение опресноками’. Barankova, ‘Tekstologicheskie i iazykovye osobennosti’, p. 70.

³⁴ ‘К архиепископу римскому от Иоанна митрополита Русского об опресноцех’. Neborskii, ‘Traditsii’, p. 382.

only anti-Latin accusation to resonate outside of canon law.³⁵ For the composer of the PVL entry for 986, it is the principal difference between the Latin faith and the Orthodox faith.³⁶ Azyme use seems to have struck some Rusian writers as more significant than other Latin innovations well before the thirteenth century, so it is unsurprising that later redactions of Byzantine ecclesiastics' polemic should focus on it.

This leaves us no closer to establishing a date for the translation or reworking of the four anti-Latin texts in question. The earliest manuscript containing the texts is the early fifteenth-century *Tolstovskii sbornik*,³⁷ but if the Chudovskaia redaction of the *kormchaia* was created in the early-mid fourteenth century, then the texts must have existed before this date. Most of the Rusian *kormchaia*'s anti-Latin texts await textological and linguistic analysis which might help to establish their dates. The *Tale of the Twelve Apostles*, however, has recently been the object of such study. G.S. Barankova dates the 'short' (and, in her opinion, earlier) redaction of the *Tale* to pre-Mongol Rus on linguistic grounds.³⁸ Korogodina, however, asserts that the text in its entirety could not have appeared before the beginning of the fourteenth century, on the basis of its use of Niketas Stethatos' tract and the Athonian redaction of the gospels.³⁹ Neither scholar concurs with Neborskii in dating the *Tale* to the 1270s or 1280s. As for the remaining three texts, Pavlov hypothesised that they might predate the compilation of the Rusian *kormchaia* in the 1280s, but provides little evidence to support his suggestion.⁴⁰ In short, further work is needed to establish when and where the anti-Latin texts in the Chudovskaia and Lukasevichskaia redactions of the *kormchaia* first appeared, but there is no reason to date them to the second half of the thirteenth century specifically.

There is, however, some evidence for Rusian engagement with polemic in the first half of the fourteenth century, the latest period that this thesis considers. As well as the Chudovskaia redaction of the *kormchaia*, this period also saw the creation in Volodimer-in-Volynia of a redaction of the Statute of Vladimir. According to Ia.N. Shchapov, this redaction promotes the autonomy of the newly-created Galician metropolitanate, emphasising its relative independence from both Rome and Constantinople.⁴¹ It does not contain anti-Latin polemic as such, but it does emphasise the Rusian

³⁵ See p. 46.

³⁶ PSRL 1, cols 86–87.

³⁷ For the dating of the *Tolstovskii sbornik*, see Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, p. 155; A.A. Turilov, *Mezhslavianskie kul'turnye sviazi epokhi srednevekov'ia i istochnikovedenie istorii i kul'tury slavian: Etiudy i kharakteristiki* (Moscow: Znack, 2012), pp. 603, 611.

³⁸ Barankova, 'Tekstologicheskie i iazykovye osobennosti', p. 81.

³⁹ Korogodina, 'Kormchie knigi', p. 132.

⁴⁰ A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*, p. 72.

⁴¹ Ia.N. Shchapov, *Kniazheskie ustavy i tserkov' v Drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), pp. 61–62.

adherence to the Orthodox understanding of the nature of the Trinity—an allusion to the *filioque* controversy, one of the principal bones of contention between the Orthodox and Latin churches. This is not evidence for anti-Latin or pro-Byzantine feeling in fourteenth-century Galicia-Volynia: the Volynian redaction of the Statute also implies that the Metropolitan of Kiev is equal in stature to the Patriarch, suggesting a focus on Galician-Volynian autonomy rather than support for Byzantine leadership of the Orthodox world.⁴² However, it does demonstrate the composer's awareness of the theological divisions between the Orthodox and Latin churches and his conviction of their ecclesiastical significance.

Given all this, there appears to be less solid evidence for the translating, reworking or composition of anti-Latin polemic in the thirteenth century than in either the eleventh, twelfth or fourteenth centuries. The eleventh and early twelfth centuries saw the composition of numerous anti-Latin lists and epistles by ecclesiastics based in Rus. The late twelfth century and the thirteenth century saw the translation and copying of certain items of Byzantine polemic, and perhaps the reworking of some earlier Rusian polemic, but the next piece of evidence for the deliberate propagation of anti-Latin polemical texts in Rus dates to the fourteenth century, when a reference to the *filioque* debate is included in a redaction of the Statute of Vladimir and a Rusian writer inserts a number of anti-Latin texts into a redaction of the *kormchaia*. By the early fifteenth century, after the period on which this thesis focuses, a compendium devoted entirely to anti-Latin polemic has come into existence, dedicated to 'the denunciation of Poles and Latins'.⁴³ Anti-Latin polemic continued to circulate in thirteenth-century Rus, but there is no reason to believe the thirteenth century was a period of particularly intensive production of polemic against Latins.

The Sack of Constantinople

Anti-Latin polemic is not the only place scholars have looked for evidence of increasing antipathy towards Latins in the thirteenth century. Faced with the awkward dearth of named anti-Latin polemicists in the thirteenth century, Pavlov turns instead to other, not strictly polemical, texts 'in which the memory of the Latin world's attitude to Rus and Orthodoxy in general at the time has been preserved'.⁴⁴ First among these, according to Pavlov, is the *Tale of the Taking of Constantinople*. The *Tale* is the only contemporary Rusian text describing the sack of Constantinople by crusading Franks in 1204—an event which, for some scholars, marks the point at which relations between the Orthodox

⁴² Shchapov, *Kniazheskie ustavy*, p. 62.

⁴³ See n. 58, p. 16.

⁴⁴ 'в которых сохранилась память о современных отношениях латинства к Руси и православию вообще'. A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*, p. 68.

‘East’ and Latin ‘West’ finally disintegrated.⁴⁵ It is included under the year 1204 in the Novgorod First chronicle, and was probably composed by a southern Rusian writer, although it also possesses some superficial Novgorodian linguistic features.⁴⁶

The *Tale of the Taking of Constantinople* is in no way anti-Latin, even though the destruction it describes was perpetrated by Latins. As both Floria and Rock note, the *Tale* lays all the blame on the crusading Franks themselves and not on the Latin Church.⁴⁷ Indeed, when ‘Isakovich’ (Alexios IV Angelos, son of Isaac II Angelos) turns to the ‘Tsar of the *nemtsi*’ (Philip of Swabia) and the Pope for aid, the Pope and ‘Tsar’ command their men to help Isakovich regain the throne—if the Constantinopolitans approve—without doing any damage to Constantinople, and then to continue on to Jerusalem. The sack of Constantinople occurs only because the Franks ‘forgot the commands of the Tsar and the Pope’.⁴⁸

Even the disobedient Franks are not roundly condemned. The Franks of the *Tale* are certainly covetous and capable of great violence, but unlike the Greeks, they are also driven by honour. Their determination to die rather than ‘retreat in dishonour’ is a common topos often applied to heroic Rusian princes in chronicles.⁴⁹ Their failure to obey their rulers’ commands grieves them,⁵⁰ and their capture of Constantinople is framed as an act of repentance motivated by honour: they take Constantinople to expunge the shame they feel for having harmed Constantinople and let Isakovich die.⁵¹ The Greeks of the *Tale* are hardly their moral superiors. ‘Oleksa’ (Alexios III Angelos) betrays his brother ‘Isak’ (Isaac II Angelos), despite the aid Isak had previously offered him; Isakovich also betrays Isak, his own father, from whom he takes the throne; and the Constantinopolitan ‘boyars’ betray Isakovich after reassuring him of their support. ‘Murchufl’ (Alexios V Doukas, ‘Mourtzouphlos’) is then unable to rally either the boyars or the people, who flee in terror rather than standing with him. In short, neither the Franks nor the Greeks are heroes or villains: the Franks commit terrible acts of violence, but they are courageous and honourable; the Greeks are cunning, untrustworthy, riven by dissension, and finally unable to resist the Frankish advance.

More than anything, the struggle between Oleksa, Isak and Isakovich, who are all in competition for the imperial throne, is reminiscent of the internecine princely conflicts which are a favourite theme of

⁴⁵ Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 63.

⁴⁶ Alan Timberlake, ‘Older and Younger Recensions of the First Novgorod Chronicle’, *Oxford Slavonic Papers, New Series*, 33 (2000), 1–35 (p. 22).

⁴⁷ Floria, *U istokov*, p. 120; Rock, *Popular Religion*, p. 63.

⁴⁸ See n. 24, p. 59.

⁴⁹ ‘луче ны есть умрети у Цесаряграда, нежели съ срамомъ отъйти’. PSRL 3, p. 48.

⁵⁰ ‘печяльни бывъше за прѣслушание свое’. PSRL 3, p. 47.

⁵¹ PSRL 3, pp. 47–48.

Rusian chroniclers. 1204 is thus a destructive but essentially local conflict between members of the Constantinopolitan elite, in which a group of wayward Franks intervene. It is not a conflict between ‘East’ and ‘West’, or between ‘Orthodox’ and ‘Latins’. Nor is the *Tale*’s account of this conflict a lament for Constantinople, although the composer regrets the destruction of so much beauty,⁵² or a polemical work: the composer’s portrayal of the motivations of both Franks and Greeks is too subtle for that. Rather, it is a cautionary tale describing the terrible consequences of internecine strife among the political elite in Constantinople. We look in vain for depictions of a grand struggle between ‘Latins’ and ‘Orthodox’ in the *Tale*.

The Baltic crusades

To judge by the vast majority of the historiography on the topic, the mid to late thirteenth century was a fateful moment in the history of the relations between Rus and *nemtsi* of the Baltic. Novgorod and Pskov were embroiled in frequent struggles with crusading Latins in the Baltic, including ‘the first great conflict between the Russians and the West’,⁵³ fought by Aleksandr Nevskii and his men in 1240, and the campaigns of Dovmont of Pskov against the Livonian Order (a branch of the Teutonic Knights) between the 1260s and the 1290s. According to this version of events, the thirteenth century was a period of increasing enmity and rivalry between Orthodox Rus and the Latin West, personified in the Teutonic Knights and their ultimate spiritual authority, the Pope. The hostile rhetoric of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* (the next text on Pavlov’s list of works preserving the memory of Latin–Orthodox relations in the thirteenth century)⁵⁴ and the yet more violent language of the *Tale of Dovmont* appear to testify to this conception of the thirteenth century as a period in which Latins became ‘pagans’, the *nemtsi* ‘godless’, and Rus the target of repeated invasions and violent conversion attempts.

This is a compelling but ultimately flawed narrative based on two very unusual texts. Both the actual situation and chronicle representations of this situation were much more equivocal. Selart’s recent monograph on the ‘imaginary medieval frontier’ between Livonia and Rus in the thirteenth century has demonstrated that profitable political and economic exchange between Rus and *nemtsi* in the Baltic made long-term conflict undesirable, while ideas of religious difference were not yet so entrenched as to motivate hostility.⁵⁵ Even the reputation of the ‘Battle of the Ice’ is undeserved: many scholars have come to understand the Battle largely as a construction of later Russian

⁵² PSRL 3, p. 49.

⁵³ Dvornik, *The Slavs*, p. 213.

⁵⁴ A. Pavlov, *Kriticheskie opyty*, p. 68.

⁵⁵ Selart, *Livonia*.

historiography, a relatively run-of-the-mill border skirmish rather than an epoch-defining conflict.⁵⁶ Representations too are more nuanced outside of hagio-biography: there is no straightforward contrast between hostile texts and the realities of quotidian cooperation. Admittedly, within the chronicles, accounts of conflict dominate—chronicles in general are more interested in conflict than in describing the prosaic details of daily life—but these conflicts are local conflicts between Christians, not titanic struggles. Certainly, the *nemtsi* are arrogant and too convinced of their own strength, forgetting that battles are won by divine favour and not strength of numbers,⁵⁷ but so are some Rusian princes: Andrei Bogoliubskii is ‘filled with arrogance’, ‘putting his hope in the strength of the flesh’, s.a. 1174 in the Kiev chronicle.⁵⁸

Nor are the *nemtsi* distant strangers. The Older Novgorod First chronicle might make a single thirteenth-century reference to the Swedes as ‘foreigners’, *inoplemenniki*, s.a. 1240,⁵⁹ but chroniclers make no attempt to hide the close contacts between Rus and *nemtsi*. Reference is repeatedly made to Pskov’s ties to the *nemtsi*, who provide military aid in 1228 and support for the rule of Tverdilo Ivankovich in 1240.⁶⁰ In 1235, the *nemtsi* provide the ransom proffered by Rusian princes in exchange for the freedom of Vladimir Rurikovich, who had been captured by the Cumans.⁶¹ The Novgorod First chronicle even records the fact that not all princes welcomed (potentially unprofitable) conflict with the Baltic *nemtsi*: in 1269, Iaroslav Iaroslavich of Tver complains to the Novgorodians about the men he has lost to bloody conflicts with the *nemtsi*.⁶²

As far as representations of the Baltic crusades are concerned, the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* and the *Tale of Dovmont* are in a rhetorical class of their own. This is not to say that the *Tales* are not products of their time. It is no coincidence that these texts appeared after decades of hostility between Rus and *nemtsi* in the Baltic, and in this respect, the historical context of their creation is undoubtedly relevant. Moreover, the fact that the *Tale of Dovmont*’s rhetoric is more violent than that of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* could be the result of the difference in their dates of

⁵⁶ Isoaho, *The Image*, p. 2; D.G. Lind, ‘Nekotorye sobrazheniia o Nevskoi bitve i ee znachenii’, in *Kniaz’ Aleksandr Nevskii i ego epokha: Issledovaniia i materialy*, ed. by Iu.K. Begunov and A.N. Kirpichnikov (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1995), pp. 44–54; Anti Selart, ‘Confessional Conflict and Political Co-Operation: Livonia and Russia in the Thirteenth Century’, in *Crusade and Conversion on the Baltic Frontier 1150–1500*, ed. by Alan V. Murray (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 151–76 (p. 164); Fennell, *The Crisis*, pp. 103, 105.

⁵⁷ See e.g. PSRL 3, pp. 77, 91.

⁵⁸ ‘исполнивься высокооумьк [...] надѣяса плотной силѣ’. PSRL 2, col. 572.

⁵⁹ PSRL 3, p. 77.

⁶⁰ PSRL 3, pp. 66, 77–78.

⁶¹ PSRL 3, p. 74.

⁶² PSRL 3, pp. 87–88.

composition: the few decades separating them may well have seen a hardening of attitudes to Latins. My point is simply that their portrayals of Rus–*nemtsi* conflicts in the Baltic are rare exceptions, not the norm. For this very reason, the *Tales* should be interpreted from literary and regional perspectives (see Chapters Three and Five), not a historical perspective alone.

The fourteenth century: Closing the literary borders

The findings of this chapter suggest that the fourteenth century has a stronger claim than the thirteenth century to be the century in which anti-Latin hostility both intensified and became more widespread in texts. New anti-Latin polemic is included in the Russian *kormchaia*; Galicia uses the *filioque* controversy to distance itself from Rome; the composer of the *Tale of Dovmont* berates the ‘pagan Latins’. What’s more, as I demonstrated in Chapter Two, by the mid-fourteenth century, the Novgorod First chronicle has begun to routinely present Latins as adherents of a different faith and an existential threat to Russian Orthodoxy.⁶³ The thirteenth century may see signs of rhetorical change to come (the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is first among them), but this change only really materialises in the fourteenth century.⁶⁴

Why should this be? At least by the middle of the fourteenth century, there are certain new historical factors at play which could have provoked or catalysed increasingly negative attitudes to and representations of Latins. Both Poland and Sweden were attempting to expand onto Russian territory, as the Novgorod First chronicle reports in the 1340s.⁶⁵ By 1387, the powerful polity of Lithuania had officially accepted Latin Christianity after decades of wavering between Rome and Constantinople.⁶⁶ However, increasing Latin pressure on Rus’s western borders in the mid to late fourteenth century is probably not the sole reason for increasing hostility. After all, the first hints of rhetorical change in depictions of Latins date to earlier than the middle of the fourteenth century—perhaps to as early as the late thirteenth century if the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is considered to be at the vanguard of these developments.

Perhaps texts were simply slow to change in response to thirteenth-century shifts in attitudes to Latins. As this chapter has repeatedly stressed, we have no access to attitudes or perceptions except as

⁶³ See p. 65.

⁶⁴ A conclusion which Floria also points towards on the basis of the *Tale of Dovmont* and the Novgorod First chronicle’s entry for 1349. Floria, *U istokov*, p. 212.

⁶⁵ PSRL 3, pp. 361, 359–60.

⁶⁶ S.C. Rowell, *Lithuania Ascending: A Pagan Empire Within East-Central Europe, 1295–1345* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 149–304.

divined from historical events or extrapolated from texts. However, it is certainly possible that Rusian perceptions of Latins did in fact evolve in the thirteenth century, but that it took until the fourteenth century for this shift to influence depictions of Latins. It might simply have taken time for increasing hostility to register in writing, and for the (increasingly widespread?) idea of Latins as religiously different or even Other to become the subject of new literary conventions. According to this interpretation, fourteenth-century texts would belatedly reflect a sea change in attitudes to Latins.

The question of changing Rusian perceptions of Latins should also be analysed within a broader context. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries saw shifts in perceptions of the Other, in its many forms, across the Latin world. David Abulafia interprets the later Middle Ages as the period when ‘fuzzy and foggy’ religious frontiers in what is now Europe were ‘replaced by mental barricades’.⁶⁷ Sharon Kinoshita and Geraldine Heng see related thirteenth- and fourteenth-century changes in ways of conceptualising Others. Heng discusses the rise of what she calls medieval nationalism, along with discourses of essential biological and spiritual difference between peoples;⁶⁸ Kinoshita notes the appearance of ‘increasingly disciplinary taxonomies’ of the Other in the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Latin world.⁶⁹

In other words, the solidifying of previously fluid boundaries between religious and political groups in the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was not a phenomenon restricted to Rus. This observation does not constitute an *explanation* for the increasingly antagonistic depictions of Latins in late thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Rus. Most of the institutions and contexts which Abulafia, Heng, Kinoshita and others consider to have been crucibles for thirteenth- and fourteenth-century discursive shifts were irrelevant to Rus. The anti-heretical proclamations of the Fourth Lateran Council and the violence of the Albigensian Crusade were not Rusian affairs; there is little evidence that Rusian writers felt the sack of Constantinople by crusading Franks to be a moment of ‘epistemic rupture’.⁷⁰ More work is also needed to ascertain the extent to which Rusian attitudes to all sorts of Others, not just Latins, hardened in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: after all, the sweeping epistemic changes that Abulafia, Kinoshita and Heng discuss concerned not only conceptions of other Christian groups, but of religious and ethnic Others in general. Still, the Rusian ‘mental barricades’ erected

⁶⁷ David Abulafia, ‘Introduction: Seven Types of Ambiguity, c. 1100–1500’, in *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices*, ed. by David Abulafia and Nora Berend (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 1–34 (p. 33).

⁶⁸ Geraldine Heng, *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), p. 70.

⁶⁹ Sharon Kinoshita, *Medieval Boundaries: Rethinking Difference in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), p. 2.

⁷⁰ Kinoshita, *Medieval Boundaries*, p. 2.

against Latins in the fourteenth century bear a striking resemblance to those being erected in the Latin world.

*

There are only two periods of Early Russian history that might plausibly class as rhetorical turning-points in depictions of Latins. The first is the mid-late eleventh century, the period of the Schism and its immediate aftermath, when the concept of Latins as corrupt Christians seems to have first taken hold in Rus—but only in a restricted group of mostly polemical texts, not in the broader literary or cultural sphere of Rus. The second is the very end of the period this thesis considers, the early-mid fourteenth century, which sees the beginning of a rhetorical shift which will continue throughout the fourteenth century. Russian composers include anti-Latin polemic in their canon law compendia; religious hostility towards Latins begins to spread beyond canon law, infiltrating texts of various genres, including chronicles; and Latins come to be depicted not simply as schismatics or imperfect Christians, but as people of another faith, even (eventually) ‘pagans’.

In Early Rus, then, a text’s time of composition is a relatively poor predictor of its representations of Latins. This may be a negative conclusion, but it is not an insignificant one. Firstly, it brings into question much of the scholarship on depictions of and attitudes to Latins. At least after the Schism, particular events in the history of Rus–Latin relations do not trigger immediate rhetorical change. Scholars’ talk of ‘turning-points’ in Early Russian depictions and perceptions of Latins is therefore misleading. What’s more, on the basis of the evidence available to us, depictions of Latins do not become steadily more hostile throughout the Early Russian period; for those interested in *representations* of Latins (and written representations of Latins have been among our principal sources for relations ‘on the ground’), time of composition does not have the degree of explanatory power with which historians have sometimes endowed it. This conclusion also provides a rationale for the investigation of alternative factors which might affect depictions of Latins: if time of composition does not influence portrayals, what does? Chapters One to Three investigated genre and theme; the final chapter of this thesis turns to place of composition, another promising but little studied predictor of the tenor of Early Russian depictions of Latins and the Latin world.

Chapter Five: Regional Conceptions of Latins and the Latin World in Early Rus

The twelfth century in Rus is often conceptualised as the period of the ‘rise of the regions’.¹ During the twelfth and then thirteenth centuries, various regions of Rus began to gain increasing political and cultural prominence, where previously Kiev had reigned more or less supreme as the political and cultural centre of Rus, rivalled only by Novgorod. In domains as varied as art and architecture, historiography and politics, these regions began to pursue policies and produce works different from those of Kiev and the other regions of Rus. It is in this period of increasing regional cultural production that we first observe regional disparities in depictions of Latins and their faith, and of connections and exchange between Rus and the Latin world.

Chapter Two noted but did not explore the fact that both the frequency of mentions of Latins in chronicles and the tone and content of these mentions vary by region.² Southern Russian chronicles have much more to say about Latins than northern chronicles do. They also tend to be more explicit in their depictions of Latins as good men and Christians. Regional differences in representations of Latins are therefore both quantitative and qualitative. This chapter returns to these differences, focusing on the ways different regions of Rus conceived of the Latin world’s place and status in relation to Rus. I examine three related themes: depictions of Latins as part (or emphatically not part) of Russian society; statements of Russian independence from or cooperation with the Latin world; and conceptions of the borders between Rus and the Latin world.

The extent of regional differences in depictions of Latins has not had the scholarly attention it merits. Insofar as scholars have studied local distinctions in representations of Latins at all, their focus has been on the chronicle of Galicia-Volynia, whose composers are often considered to have displayed unusual tolerance towards Latins. Henryk Paszkiewicz writes: ‘It remains a fact that in contrast to analogous writings of Kiev, of Novgorod, etc., the Chronicle of Halicz-Volynia does not betray any feeling of religious antagonism toward the Catholics.’³ However, if one accepts the conclusions of the second chapter of this thesis, that religious anti-Latin polemic is in fact a rarity within the chronicles, then the Galician-Volynian chronicle suddenly appears less anomalous. This is not to imply that the Galician-Volynian chronicle is, on the contrary, somehow typical of Russian representations of Latins. There are no ‘typical’ representations. Texts from Vladimir-Suzdal, Kiev, Novgorod and Galicia-

¹ See for example Simon Franklin and Jonathan Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200* (London, New York: Longman, 1996), pp. 323–64; Janet Martin, *Medieval Russia 980–1584*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), pp. 105–15.

² See pp. 54–55.

³ Henryk Paszkiewicz, *The Origin of Russia* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1954), p. 99; see also Liustrov, ‘Evropa’.

Volynia all approach Latins differently, with Vladimir-Suzdalian and Galician-Volynian texts displaying particularly clear idiosyncrasies.

These four regions were cultural centres of Early Rus and possessed some of the richest extant traditions of local historiography. More than most other texts, the chronicles of Novgorod, Kiev, Vladimir-Suzdal and Galicia-Volynia make a feature of their regionality. To different extents, they relate local events, champion local princes, invoke local saints and report on local failures and successes. The fortunes of Rus as a nominal whole tend to feature more rarely, particularly in the Novgorod First and Galician-Volynian chronicles. Along with the comparatively high frequency of references to Latins in chronicles compared to other texts, this fact makes chronicles particularly useful sources for a discussion of regional representations of Latins.

I do not entirely disregard Rusian texts not contained in chronicles, but many of these texts simply do not have a great deal to add to our understanding of regional variation in portrayals of Latins. Most anti-Latin lists and epistles, for example, are not at all regional in character: much of their content is originally Byzantine and the warnings and denunciations they contain are intended for the entirety of the Orthodox church. The relatively few mentions of Latins in texts which are neither canon law nor chronicles generally gain little from being viewed through the prism of regionality. Daniil, who describes his travels to the Holy Land, is probably from south-western Rus, whereas Antonii, who relates his time in Constantinople, is Novgorodian; but their different backgrounds do not seem to affect their descriptions of the 'Frankish' or 'Latin' peoples and institutions they encounter. The provenance of a text certainly can influence its depiction of Latins, but need not necessarily do so. The present chapter focuses on Rusian writing with distinct regional characteristics, and so particularly on the chronicles, although I also refer to the Novgorodian *Questions of Kirik* and the Kievan *Patericon* in my analysis.

Regionality

Employing the concept of regionality as a way of categorising Rusian texts is not straightforward. At times, assigning texts to particular regions can be relatively unproblematic. The *Questions of Kirik*, for example, is evidently a Novgorodian text: it possesses Novgorodian dialect features; the authority to whom Kirik refers is Nifont, known from various sources to have been bishop of Novgorod; and Kirik himself states in the colophon to his *Teaching on Numbers* that he is writing in 'Great Novgorod'.⁴ Some texts are considerably harder to categorise by region, however. Texts could

⁴ Assuming the same Kirik wrote both the *Questions* and the *Teaching on Numbers*. Mil'kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 318.

migrate from one area to another: analysis of the *Tale of the Taking of Constantinople*'s linguistic features suggests that it probably originated in the south-west, although it ended up in the Novgorod First chronicle.⁵ Scribes could also migrate: Kuzmishche 'the Kievan', perhaps the composer of some or all of the *Tale of the Murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii*, evidently spent time in Vladimir.⁶ What's more, many texts assumed a supra-regional significance, resonating outside of their area of composition thanks to their inclusion in compendia, chronicles or collections of canon law.

Despite their focus on regional affairs, chronicles too resist attribution to a single region. No Early Rusian chronicle, whether conventionally categorised as 'regional' or 'all-Rusian', contains only entries about events local to the area in which the chronicle was compiled. It is often hard to ascertain the origin of these entries about non-local events. Were they copied from another chronicle? If so, which? Or did local chroniclers hear about events taking place outside of their region and decide to write about them? Sometimes, these questions can be successfully tackled,⁷ but more often than not, they are left unanswered, or else the answers are very complex. In the case of the 'all-Rusian' chronicles—the PVL, the Kiev chronicle and parts of the Vladimir-Suzdal and Novgorod First chronicles—questions of origin are particularly difficult to resolve, and do not always produce very satisfying results. For instance, Vilkul's work on the twelfth-century entries shared between the Kiev chronicle and the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle has demonstrated that the two chronicles shared a source which was itself a compilation of Kievan, Vladimir-Suzdalian and Pereiaslavlian items of interest. This is a valuable conclusion, but one which highlights the difficulty of establishing the regional origins of entries in the 'all-Rusian' chronicles.⁸

Deciding which entries could be called 'Kievan', 'Vladimir-Suzdalian', etc. in the 'all-Rusian' chronicles is therefore a particularly thorny problem. The Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, for instance, mentions Latins in the context not only of happenings in Vladimir-Suzdal, but of events in Kiev, Galicia, Novgorod, Chernigov and so on. For the purposes of this chapter, I consider only a fraction of these mentions. When discussing Vladimir-Suzdalian writing about Latins, I examine only entries which describe events taking place in Vladimir-Suzdal or events in which Vladimir-Suzdalian princes were involved. The same goes for Kievan writing about Latins. My assumption is that accounts of

⁵ Timberlake, 'Older and Younger Recensions', p. 22.

⁶ B.A. Rybakov, *Russkie letopistsy i avtor „Slova o polku Igoreve“* (Moscow: Nauka, 1972), pp. 79–131.

⁷ See for example T.V. Gimon, 'Otrazhenie v novgorodskom letopisanii XII–XIII vv. nenovgorodskikh sobytii', in *Vostochnaia Evropa v drevnosti i srednekvov'e: Kontakty, zony kontaktov i kontaktnye zony: XI chteniia pamiati chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR Vladimira Terent'evicha Pashuto, Moskva, 14–16 aprelia 1999 g.: Materialy k konferentsii*, ed. by E.A. Mel'nikova (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1999), pp. 139–44.

⁸ Tat'iana Vilkul, 'O proiskhozhdenii obshchego teksta Ipat'evskoi i Lavrent'evskoi letopisi za XII v. (predvaritel'nye zametki)', *Palaeoslavica*, 13 (2005), 21–80.

events in, say, Kiev, or accounts of events concerning Kievan princes, are more likely to have been composed in Kiev, whereas accounts of events elsewhere in Rus are more likely to be the product of other regional historiographical traditions. This means that in my analysis of Vladimir-Suzdalian writing about Latins, for example, I include the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle's accounts of the campaigns undertaken by Grand Princes of Vladimir against the *nemtsi* beyond Novgorod, but do not include the chronicle's short account of Roman of Galich's murder by the Poles. Of course, it is perfectly possible that a Vladimir-Suzdalian chronicler independently recorded the murder of Roman of Galich; but the line between what is *probably* Vladimir-Suzdalian and what is *possibly* Vladimir-Suzdalian has to be drawn somewhere. The position of the line may be arbitrary to some extent, but its presence allows patterns to emerge.

I use the same criteria when discussing the 'regional' Novgorod First and Galician-Volynian chronicles, considering only entries about Novgorodian or Galician-Volynian princes or events. Thankfully, the vast majority of entries concerning Latins in the Galician-Volynian chronicle are about events in Galicia-Volynia or the dealings of Galician-Volynian princes. The Novgorod First chronicle is slightly more problematic. Before about 1115, the chronicle contains items written from both a Kievan and a Novgorodian perspective, including a number of entries mentioning Latins in southern Rus.⁹ After this date, the chronicle takes on a more local character, so that when chroniclers mention Latins, it is almost always in the context of local affairs. (The major exception to this rule is the *Tale of the Taking of Constantinople* under the year 1204, which I considered in the previous chapter.)¹⁰ Again, I do not consider entries about Latins outside of Novgorod in my discussion here, because of the possibility that these entries were originally composed outside of Novgorod.

One might raise objections to this method of classifying chronicle entries by their likely origins. Might we not consider *all* entries in, say, the Novgorod First chronicle to be 'Novgorodian'? After all, a Novgorodian chronicler chose to integrate them into his chronicle. Does that not make *every* entry Novgorodian, even if it had its origin elsewhere, in another regional chronicle-writing tradition? This alternative approach would certainly have the advantage of simplicity, permitting a researcher to skirt the thorny issue of establishing the origins of every entry in a chronicle. However, in this case, the stricter definition of a 'Novgorodian' (or Kievan, or Vladimir-Suzdalian, etc.) chronicle entry gives better, more consistent, more revealing results. Including texts like the originally non-Novgorodian *Tale of the Taking of Constantinople* in a discussion of Novgorodian chronicle-writing muddies the waters—although distilling the pure water from the pollutants, so to speak, is evidently an artificial

⁹ For 1115 as the date of the compilation of the Novgorod First chronicle's 'Kievo-Novgorodian' narrative, see Timofey V. Guimon, 'Christian Identity in the Early Novgorodian Annalistic Writing', in *Historical Narratives*, ed. by Garipzanov, pp. 255–75 (p. 255).

¹⁰ See pp. 107–109.

exercise, and one which would likely have held little interest for medieval writers and readers. I do however include all chronicle mentions of Latins, whatever their likely origin, in Appendix Three.

Latins: Part of the fabric of Rusian society?

Latins can play very varied roles in Early Rusian chronicles and narrative texts. In some texts, Latins merit nothing but a passing mention. In others, they play only bit parts. Rarely, they are given equal billing with Rus. This section aims to demonstrate that provenance is one of the principal factors governing how much and what kind of attention a text devotes to Latins. It thereby sets the scene for the rest of this chapter, which contrasts regional approaches to the idea of Rusian isolation and autonomy from the Latin world, as well as the concept of geographical, political and religious boundaries between Rus and Latin Christendom. In this section, I examine Vladimir-Suzdalian, Novgorodian, Kievan and Galician-Volynian depictions of Latins present in Rus or involved in Rusian affairs, asking: are Latins depicted as part of the fabric of Rusian society, or are they distant foreigners? Do texts contain frequent concrete mentions of Latins, or are Latins largely an abstract concept? Are Latins culturally and politically distinct from the Rus, or fundamentally similar? Given the size of Rus and the relative independence of its regions, especially by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it is hardly surprising that texts from different areas of Rus yield quite different answers to all of these questions.

Vladimir-Suzdal

Chapter Two, on Latins in chronicles, largely ignored the chronicle of Vladimir-Suzdal. Compared to the other chronicles of Early Rus, the chronicle of Vladimir-Suzdal contains very few mentions of Latins. The single dramatic exception to this rule is the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, s.a. 1263.¹¹ However, as I discussed in previous chapters, the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is extremely unusual in its treatment of Latins. Aside from anti-Latin polemic and the *Tale of Dovmont*, it is the only extant Early Rusian text that could be called ‘anti-Latin’ and the only text to come close to portraying Latins as ‘Other’. The unusual sparsity of Vladimir-Suzdalian references to Latins, combined with the uniqueness of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, strongly suggests that Vladimir-Suzdalian references to Latins merit analysis on their own terms.

The majority of entries on Latins in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle date to the first half of the twelfth century, when the chronicle was an all-Rusian chronicle focused on Kiev. As none of these entries

¹¹ PSRL 1, cols 477–81.

concern Vladimir-Suzdal or Vladimir-Suzdalian princes, I do not consider them here. After 1161, when the chronicle begins to focus on affairs in north-eastern Rus, mentions of Latins become extremely infrequent. Some of these mentions are notes on affairs outside of Vladimir-Suzdal: Iaroslav's imposition of a heavy tax on all the Kievans, including the 'Latins', s.a. 1175; Roman of Galich's murder by the Poles in 1206; Mstislav Mstislavich's battle with the Hungarians in 1221; and the flight of the princes of Chernigov to the Hungarians in 1239. Only four have any relation to Vladimir-Suzdal or its princes. As well as these four later Vladimir-Suzdalian mentions of Latins in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, there is one possibly Vladimir-Suzdalian reference to Latins in the Kiev chronicle s.a. 1175, within the *Tale of the Murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii*. I consider the *Tale of the Murder* along with Vladimir-Suzdalian texts here because of its setting and the sympathies of its compiler, despite the possibility that the compiler of the 'long redaction' might be Kievan in origin.¹²

Of these five Vladimir-Suzdalian mentions of Latins, two date to the twelfth century and three to the thirteenth and early fourteenth century. The earliest is the passing mention included in the *Tale of the Murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii* s.a. 1175 in the Kiev chronicle. The composer of the *Tale of the Murder* includes 'a Latin', *latinin*, in his list of people (including Constantinopolitan merchants, pagans, Bulgars and Jews) who might arrive in Vladimir and wonder at its splendid architecture.¹³ The next Vladimir-Suzdalian reference to Latins, s.a. 1194 in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, also has Vladimirian architecture as its theme: it denies any *nemtsi* involvement in the renovation of another Vladimir-Suzdalian architectural masterwork, the Dormition Cathedral in Vladimir, specifying that renovations were completed by 'masters from the Servants of the Mother of God and from our own men', 'without searching for masters from the *nemtsi*'.¹⁴ Finally, the three thirteenth- and fourteenth-century references all relate the involvement of Grand Princes of Vladimir or their relatives in Novgorodian battles against *nemtsi*. The entry for 1242 notes the aid Andrei, soon to be Grand Prince of Vladimir, provided to his brother Aleksandr Nevskii, prince of Novgorod, on the request of his father Iaroslav, the current Grand Prince; the entry for 1263 is the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*; and the entry for 1302 is a short note on battles between Aleksei Aleksandrovich, son of Aleksandr Nevskii, with the *nemtsi* in the north-west.¹⁵

It is striking that not one of these references to Latins describes real Latins actually present in Vladimir-Suzdal. Three refer to *nemtsi* near Novgorod, of interest only because of the resistance Aleksandr Nevskii and his relatives offer them. The entry for 1194 insists on the *absence* of Latin

¹² Rybakov, *Russkie letopistsy*, pp. 79–131; Priselkov, *Istoriia*, p. 76; N.N. Voronin, '«Povest' ob ubiistve Andreia Bogoliubskogo» i ee avtor', *Istoriia SSSR*, 1963, no. 3, 80–97 (p. 97).

¹³ PSRL 2, col. 591.

¹⁴ 'мастеры ѿ клевреть сѣое Бѣи и swoichъ', 'иже не ища мастеровъ ѿ Нѣмецъ'. PSRL 1, col. 411.

¹⁵ PSRL 1, cols 470, 477–81, 486.

craftsmen in Vladimir, and the awestruck ‘Latin’ in the *Tale of the Murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii* is a hypothetical, abstract Latin. Chronicles do not represent Latins as part of the social fabric of Vladimir-Suzdal. Latins are overawed tourists at best, distant enemies at worst. Evidently, Latins were geographically more distant from Vladimir-Suzdal than they were from, say, Galicia-Volynia, and this does help to explain the reticence of Vladimir-Suzdalian texts on Latins. Yet Latins were not quite as distant as the chronicles would have them. The many Romanesque features of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Vladimir-Suzdalian architecture testify to this.¹⁶ I return to the question of the disjunction between Vladimir-Suzdalian representations and realities later in this chapter.

It is also worth noting that Latins in Vladimir-Suzdalian texts are always either ‘Latins’ or ‘*nemtsi*’, both broad terms which give no clear indication of which part of the Latin world the subject is from. This preference for the term *nemtsi* is a feature which Vladimir-Suzdalian texts share with Novgorodian texts. This is easily explained: the Latins with whom Novgorod had dealings were largely from the more northerly areas of what is now Europe. These peoples tend to be called *nemtsi*. However, unlike Novgorodian texts, Vladimir-Suzdalian texts make no attempt to differentiate between different groups of *nemtsi*. Where the Novgorod First chronicle has Swedes, Varangians, *nemtsi* of Iurev, *nemtsi* ‘from beyond the sea’ and many more, the Vladimir-Suzdalian texts have only *nemtsi* (or, once, ‘Latins’). In Vladimir-Suzdalian depictions, Latins are more an abstract and imprecise concept than a quotidian presence.

Novgorod

The context for depictions of Latins was quite different in Novgorod. Novgorod was a centre of trade with the Latin world, and became a member of the Hanseatic League. Latin traders and Latin architecture must have been a relatively common sight in its centre: indeed, Varangian and *nemtsi* merchants had their own warehouses and churches in the town. Certain Novgorodians must also have been well acquainted with the Scandinavians, Lithuanians (pagan until the slow process of Christianisation began in the thirteenth century) and various crusading groups settled to its north and west. Henrik Birnbaum characterised Novgorod as a stronghold of what he, following Riccardo Picchio, refers to as *Slavia Orthodoxa*, but simultaneously a town open to the people and cultural influences of the Latin world.¹⁷ Given all this, one might expect the written culture of Novgorod to reflect the ubiquitous presence of Latins in and around Novgorod.

¹⁶ See pp. 129–130.

¹⁷ Henrik Birnbaum, *Novgorod in Focus: Selected Essays* (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers Inc., 1996), pp. 15–40.

To some extent, it does. References to Latins are far more frequent in the Novgorod First chronicle than in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, and most of these references are to Latins present in or around Novgorod. Over the centuries documented in the Novgorod First chronicle, different Latin groups come to prominence, but broadly speaking, the Latins with whom Novgorodian texts are concerned tend to originate from what is now northern and western Europe, and are generally engaged (from a Novgorodian perspective) in either trade or warfare. Not only are Latins a frequent presence in the Novgorod First chronicle, chroniclers use a great variety of terms to define them. Merchants are often ‘overseas men’ or ‘foreigners’, but can also be ‘*nemtsi*’, ‘Varangians’ or ‘Prussians’. Military enemies are mostly ‘*nemtsi*’ or ‘Swedes’, but chroniclers occasionally specify that they are ‘*nemtsi* of Iurev’ or ‘*nemtsi* of Veliad’, for example. ‘Gotlanders’, ‘Danes’ and ‘Rigans’ also make appearances.

Until the early thirteenth century, Varangians are one of the most prominent Latin groups mentioned in Novgorodian texts. These Varangians can be unruly mercenaries or indeed military enemies who do Novgorod harm,¹⁸ but they are also represented as a peaceful Novgorodian presence.¹⁹ An early entry in the Novgorod First chronicle makes a dramatic claim demonstrating the cultural proximity and historical connections that were felt to exist between Novgorod and the Varangians: the chronicler states that Novgorodians, unlike the rest of Rus, are still ‘of Varangian stock’.²⁰ However, the term ‘Varangian’ falls almost out of use after the twelfth century, and references to Novgorodian cooperation and coexistence with Varangians also become scarcer. Scandinavians continue to figure in the Novgorod First chronicle, but most often, these Scandinavians are Swedes in competition with Novgorod for land and influence in the Baltic region, and so enemies rather than partners.

As well as an increasing number of conflicts with Swedes, the thirteenth century also sees the appearance of *nemtsi* enemies in Novgorod’s Baltic hinterland. In this period, the majority of Novgorodian references to Latins relate conflicts between Novgorodian forces and *nemtsi* settlers in the Baltic region. As we have seen, the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*’s depiction of the *nemtsi* near Novgorod as profoundly different, a threat to the ‘Slav people’, is quite foreign to Novgorodian depictions of their enemies.²¹ In the Novgorod First chronicle, these are local conflicts: hostile *nemtsi* are enemies, certainly, but not Others. These *nemtsi* form alliances with the local tribes such as the Chud and the Korel, or even with Pskov, not with a shadowy ‘Rome’;²² they establish ‘districts’ and agree complex treaties parcelling out land between themselves and Novgorod, rather than mounting a

¹⁸ PSRL 3, pp. 39, 174–75.

¹⁹ Maintaining churches and warehouses in Novgorod, for instance. PSRL 3, pp. 37, 57.

²⁰ ‘от рода варяжъска’. PSRL 3, p. 106.

²¹ See pp. 109–111.

²² For examples of *nemtsi* alliances with Pskov, the Chud and the Korel, see PSRL 3, pp. 77–78, 94.

fierce attack and then disappearing when Aleksandr puts them to flight.²³ The *nemtsi* are sometimes an irritant, but hardly an Other.

It would be misleading to suggest that Novgorodian texts tend to depict Latins negatively, even though accounts of conflicts with Latins outnumber accounts of peaceful coexistence. Certain Latin groups might be enemies of Novgorod, but other Latins contribute to the economic and cultural life of the town: ‘people from overseas’ erect churches;²⁴ ‘*nemtsi* from overseas’ save Novgorod from collapse by bringing corn and flour in a famine;²⁵ a ‘Varangian priest’ ministers not only to Varangians, much to Nifont’s dismay.²⁶ Even in the thirteenth century, chroniclers write approvingly of the presence of Latins in Novgorod. In the Novgorod First chronicle’s entry for 1270, Novgorodians are said to have complained to the prince, demanding: ‘Why are you expelling the men from other lands who live among us?’²⁷ Not only do Novgorodian writers seem to feel no compulsion to remain silent on the subject of the presence of various Latin groups in Novgorod, they are also unafraid of noting Novgorod’s dependence on Latins and their role in Novgorod’s economic life.

The ‘Latin world’ in Novgorodian texts is thus very concrete and mostly local. The numerous groups of Latins living and trading in or near Novgorod are pragmatically accepted as elements of the Novgorodian scenery and as an economic necessity. No Latin groups are demonised. Even the occasionally treacherous and often pugnacious *nemtsi* of the Baltic are Christians with whom business can be done. Yet if Latins are not ‘Other’ in Novgorodian texts, neither are they ‘Self’. They might ‘live among’ the Novgorodians, but they are still ‘from other lands’.²⁸ Their churches are *tserkvi* like the other churches of Novgorod, but they are ‘Varangian’ or ‘*nemtsi*’ churches, and Orthodox Novgorodians are to be discouraged from using their priests’ services.²⁹ In short, Novgorodian sources do not hide Latins from view or deny the significance of partnership with (or resistance to) Latins for the economic and political life of Novgorod, but neither do they represent them as an integrated part of Novgorodian society.

What’s more, Latins in Novgorodian texts are almost never individuals: they are almost always discussed as groups. One has to look southwards towards Kiev and the south-west for representations of individual Latins as holy men, brave heroes or ‘brothers’ to Rusian princes. This probably has more to do with the style of the Novgorod First chronicle than with some essentially Novgorodian

²³ PSRL 3, p. 78.

²⁴ ‘заморьстии’. PSRL 3, p. 30.

²⁵ ‘Нѣмьци и-заморія’. PSRL 3, p. 71.

²⁶ ‘варьжьскомоу попоу’. Mil’kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, p. 410.

²⁷ ‘чему выводишь от нас иноземца, котории у нас живутъ’. PSRL 3, p. 88.

²⁸ PSRL 3, p. 88.

²⁹ See p. 67 and p. 40.

mentality. In its older redaction, the redaction this thesis uses, the Novgorod First chronicle is devoid of hagiography and princely panegyrics, and pays much less attention to the personal dealings of princes than other chronicles do. Thus the contexts in which portraits of individual praise- or blameworthy Latins are found in other Russian chronicles are simply absent from the Older Novgorod First chronicle. It is equally possible that narrative sources presenting Latins as part of Novgorod's cultural life have simply not survived. For example, extant hagiographies of Antonii the Roman, the twelfth-century holy man from the Latin world who found himself washed up on the shores of Novgorod, date only to the sixteenth century,³⁰ but could have their origins in a much earlier period. Still, judging by the sources left to us, while Novgorodian composers were perfectly happy to admit the presence of Latins in Novgorod, as both enemies and allies, we must look elsewhere for portraits of Latins as individuals with a significant role to play in the cultural—not just the economic—life of Rus.

Kiev

The Latin world looks quite different from Kiev than it does from Novgorod. The entry for 1111 in the Kiev chronicle offers a panorama of Rus's neighbours as seen from Kiev, describing how the fame of the princes of Rus travelled 'to all the distant countries—the Greeks and the Hungarians and the Poles and the Czechs—until it reached even Rome'.³¹ If *nemtsi* and Varangians dominate in northern texts, southern texts most often make reference to Poles and Hungarians, whose elites had close political ties to southern Rus. Even the Holy Roman Empire, while mentioned only rarely, is in Kievan chroniclers' purview, not as the malevolent 'Roman' force described in the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, but as a Christian force for good—and, on occasion, as a powerful ally to Russian princes such as Volodimer Iaroslavich of Galich, who flees to the Holy Roman Emperor when he falls out of favour in Rus.³² As in Novgorodian sources, Latin Christendom in Kievan sources possesses a certain granularity: it is not a single entity, but a group of distinct Christian polities who can be allies or enemies of Rus depending on the political situation.

Kievan sources share with Novgorodian sources a pragmatic acceptance of the presence of Latins in Kiev, and of their involvement in the political life of the town. When the chronicler reports on the heavy tax Iaroslav Iziaslavich inflicted on a rebellious Kiev in 1174, he lists Latins as one of the

³⁰ N.V. Ramazanova, *Sviatye russkie rimliane: Antonii Rimlianin i Merkurii Smolenskii* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2005), pp. 244–48.

³¹ 'ко всимъ странамъ далнимъ рекуше къ Грекомъ. и Оугромъ и Лахомъ. и Чехомъ. дондеже и до Рима проиде'. PSRL 2, col. 273.

³² PSRL 2, col. 666.

groups affected: ‘He [Iaroslav] imposed a tax on all of Kiev, the hegumens and the priests, the monks and the nuns, the Latins and the merchants and the hermits and all the Kievans.’³³ The chronicler might include ‘Latins’ as a separate category from Orthodox ecclesiastics, but he nevertheless matter-of-factly notes their presence in the town and their share in the burdensome tax Iaroslav imposes. Neither are chroniclers at all reticent about the many political ties between princes of Kiev and (in particular) Poles and Hungarians. Chroniclers frequently report that princes, both worthy and unworthy, have fled to the Poles or Hungarians or asked for military assistance from them. Both Poles and Hungarians therefore play significant roles in Rusian politics. For instance, the support of the Hungarian king and his troops is portrayed as instrumental to Iziaslav Mstislavich’s assumption of the Kievan throne s.a. 1150 and 1151 in the Kiev chronicle, and Polish princes are both a hindrance and a help to Igor Olgovich in his campaign for the Kievan throne s.a. 1145.³⁴

However, there also exists for Kiev the kind of evidence that does not exist for Novgorod: evidence suggesting that Latins were an integral part of the image that Kievan writers created of Kiev and its political and cultural elite. Latins in Kiev can be virtuous warriors (Shimon the Varangian), holy men (Moisei the Hungarian) and loyal servants (Georgii, identified as Moisei’s brother in the *Patericon*)³⁵. While the political or ethnic identity of each of these figures is worthy of mention, it is not their main characteristic. They are good men before they are Varangians or Hungarians. Also striking is the fact that in Kievan sources, Latins are quite often represented as personable individuals involved in the life of the town, unlike the characterless groups of *nemtsi* and ‘overseas merchants’ who figure in Novgorodian texts. Under the year 1150, the Kievan chronicler relates the appearance of a boisterous band of Hungarians at Iaroslav’s court in Kiev, reporting: ‘The Kievans wondered at the multitude of Hungarians, and their warlike looks, and their steeds.’³⁶ Poles too have colourful parts to play. It is, after all, a Polish princess who captures and castrates Moisei the Hungarian, and two Poles who are said to be responsible for the ignominious death of the arrogant Iaroslav Sviatopolchich, who is trapped in a pit and murdered s.a. 1123.³⁷ Again, the styles of extant Novgorodian and Kievan texts might explain some of these differences: the Kievan chronicle and the *Patericon* contain more long narratives of the kind in which Latins might play more developed roles.

Compared to Novgorodian and Vladimir-Suzdalian texts, Kievan texts place much more emphasis on the similarities between Latins and Rus. Although northern Rusian texts do not actually deny that Latins and Rus share a faith, Kievan (and Galician-Volynian) texts repeatedly affirm this—when it is

³³ See n. 28, p. 59.

³⁴ PSRL 2, cols 401–19, 318.

³⁵ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaia and Travnikov, p. 48.

³⁶ ‘Кидне же дивахутса Оугромъ множеству и кметьства ихъ. и комонемъ ихъ.’ PSRL 2, col. 416.

³⁷ *Drevnerusskie pateriki*, ed. by Ol’shevskaia and Travnikov, pp. 48–53; PSRL 2, col. 287.

politically expedient to do so. Latins can also be ‘brothers’, allies linked to Rus by blood ties. As we have seen, in 1149, Iziaslav Mstislavich’s Latin relatives remind Iziaslav and Iurii Dolgorukii that the princes of Rus and their Polish and Hungarian counterparts are all ‘Christians in God, and one brotherhood’.³⁸ Living in peace with all the polities of the Latin world is one of the signs of successful rule: after his conversion, Vladimir the Great ‘lived in peace with the princes around him: Boleslav the Pole, Stefan the Hungarian, and Andrikh the Czech’.³⁹ Yet, once again, highlighting similarity does not imply a refusal to admit difference. It is Kievan sources which employ the trope of the Rusian prince whose patrimony is ‘only in the land of Rus’, and not in Hungary or Poland,⁴⁰ and a Kievan chronicler who lists ‘Latins’ as a separate category to Orthodox ecclesiastics.

Galicia-Volynia

If Kievan texts emphasise the similarities between Latins and Rus and represent Latins as playing considerable roles in Rusian affairs, so does the Galician-Volynian chronicle, but to a much greater extent. In this colourful source, unfortunately the only extant Early Rusian Galician-Volynian source to tell us anything about Latins, Latins figure in the majority of chronicle entries in both the Galician and the Volynian sections of the text. This adds up to hundreds of mentions of Latins, most of which are far more than mere ‘mentions’. Latins are inextricably involved in Galician-Volynian politics and feature prominently in many of the broader narratives of the chronicle (the conflicts over succession after the death of Roman of Galicia, his son Danilo’s attempts to garner support against the Mongols, etc.). Yet not once do chroniclers refer to the peoples to Galicia-Volynia’s west as ‘Latins’. The terms *latinianin* and *latina* are never employed, and references to the *nemtsi* land are clearly references to a specific, restricted geo-political entity, not to the whole of the Latin north-west. In the Galician-Volynian chronicle more than any other source, there is no ‘Latin world’, but a number of distinct polities with whom the regions of Galicia-Volynia maintain separate relationships.

Galician-Volynian chroniclers look west almost as much as they look east. Poland is represented as particularly politically and culturally close to Galicia-Volynia. The chronicle reports in detail on succession conflicts in Poland, as well as in Galicia-Volynia, seemingly because both Rusian and Polish princes tended to become embroiled in these conflicts. For example, after the death of Boleslav in 1280, Lev Danilovich attempts to gain control of part of Poland, but is defeated by his Polish

³⁸ See n. 58, p. 66.

³⁹ ‘Бѣ жива съ князи вколними миромь. съ Болеславомь Ладьскымь. и съ Стефаномь Оугрьскымь. и съ Андрихомь Чешьскымь.’ PSRL 1, col. 126.

⁴⁰ See p. 70.

rivals.⁴¹ Military cooperation with Poland is also common: Danilo of Galicia commands both Rusian and Polish troops as ‘king [and] head of all the troops’ when he goes into battle s.a. 1256.⁴² The deaths of Polish princes are reported in the Galician-Volynian chronicle in the same way as the deaths of Rusian princes; some are even eulogised, such as Kondrat of Mazowie (‘illustrious and very good’) and Boleslav of Krakow (‘good, restrained, meek, humble and kind’).⁴³ Hungarians too are ever-present in the chronicle as allies, enemies and even co-rulers: in 1226, the Rusian prince Mstislav Mstislavich gives Peremyshl (modern-day Przemyśl) and Galich to the Hungarian prince Andrei.⁴⁴ Chroniclers are also aware of happenings further west. Roman, Danilo’s son, acquires Austrian land when he is married to the niece of the Archduke Fridrikh;⁴⁵ Danilo mounts a campaign against the Czechs, as (the chronicler proudly informs us) no Rusian prince had done before;⁴⁶ even the Holy Roman Emperor and the Pope make regular appearances in the narrative.⁴⁷

One striking indication of the distinct outlook of Galician-Volynian chroniclers compared to other Rusian writers is their insistence on the cosmopolitan nature of Galician-Volynian towns. The mixed populations and culture of these towns are a source of pride, and are encouraged by the princes. The most vivid example of this is the account of Danilo’s founding of the town of Kholm (now Chelm in Poland). The churches he builds there are quite clearly represented as blending Rusian and Latin elements, a fact which I consider in more detail later in the chapter (see p. 131): the Church of St. John contains both Kievan icons and ‘Roman glass’ in the windows, while the Church of the Holy Ever-Virgin Mary includes more icons as well as a beautifully decorated Hungarian chalice.⁴⁸ Danilo invites not only Rus, but ‘*nemtsi* and Rus, foreigners and Poles’ to settle in the town.⁴⁹ Kholm, Danilo’s creation, is multicultural by design. Similarly, when Vladimir dies s.a. 1289, he is mourned by all of Volodimer-in-Volynia: ‘*Nemtsi* and Surozhians and people of Novgorodok and Jews wept, as if at the capture of Jerusalem.’⁵⁰ The testament he draws up is read out loud to an audience of both

⁴¹ PSRL 2, col. 881.

⁴² ‘король голова всимъ полкомъ’. PSRL 2, col. 831.

⁴³ ‘славень и предобръ’, ‘добръи тихии. кроткии смиренъи. незлобивый’. PSRL 2, cols 809–10, 880.

⁴⁴ PSRL 2, col. 748.

⁴⁵ PSRL 2, col. 821.

⁴⁶ PSRL 2, col. 826.

⁴⁷ PSRL 2, cols 723, 776, 826, 827.

⁴⁸ PSRL 2, cols 843–44, 845.

⁴⁹ ‘Нѣмцѣ и Роусь. инокъзычники. и Лахы’. PSRL 2, col. 843.

⁵⁰ ‘Нѣмци. и Соуроужьцѣ и Новгородци. и Жидове плакоуся. аки и во взатье Иерслмоу.’ PSRL 2, col. 920.

Rus and *nemtsi*.⁵¹ Chroniclers actually emphasise the cultural mixity of Galicia-Volynia's towns, holding it up as admirable.

Cultural mixity implies distinct cultures. Rus, Poles and Hungarians might cooperate and possess many cultural similarities, but they are not identical. Admittedly, in the Galician-Volynian chronicle there is very little to suggest a sense of *religious* difference between them. The only hint of this is the chronicler's mention of the 'Greek faith' (implying a concomitant 'Latin faith') in the entry on Danilo's negotiations with the Pope.⁵² Elsewhere, Poles and others are perfectly Christian: one Polish prince returns from a battle 'praising and glorifying the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost in the Trinity',⁵³ and the Poles sing 'Kyrie eleison' before battle.⁵⁴ A broader sense of cultural difference certainly does exist, however. Poles have their own 'customs'—some rather unflattering, such as their tendency to rob their enemies' servants⁵⁵—and are sometimes represented as asserting their own difference from the Russian 'longbeards'.⁵⁶ Hungarians are occasionally *inoplemenniki*, 'foreigners', 'people of another tribe'—although only when the political situation calls for a Russian prince to distance himself from them.⁵⁷ Such assertions of difference are relatively rare. Most often, Poles, Hungarians and *nemtsi* are depicted as an inalienable part of the political, social and cultural life of Galicia-Volynia. Galicia-Volynia's Latins are utterly dissimilar to the distant, abstract Latins of Vladimir-Suzdal, who figure at the other end of the spectrum of Russian regional portrayals of Latins.

Rus and the Latin world: Isolation or collaboration?

The attempt to analyse regional difference in the ways writers depict Latins gives rise to an important question. To what extent are these varying representations the consequence not just of different traditions of writing about Latins, but of genuine historical differences between the types of contact different areas of Rus had with Latins? Many of these regional discrepancies can indeed be explained as the result of actual, extra-textual differences in the social makeup and political and cultural fabric of different areas of Rus. Vladimir-Suzdal was hundreds of miles from anything we might call the 'Latin world', while Galicia-Volynia was extremely close to it. It is therefore unsurprising that the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle mentions Latins less than any other chronicle: Latins genuinely were a

⁵¹ PSRL 2, col. 905.

⁵² PSRL 2, col. 827.

⁵³ 'хвала. и слава въ Троци Сѡца и Сна и Сѣго Дха'. PSRL 2, col. 896.

⁵⁴ PSRL 2, col. 803.

⁵⁵ PSRL 2, col. 883.

⁵⁶ 'великыи бороды'. PSRL 2, col. 804.

⁵⁷ PSRL 2, cols 738, 752.

distant people, and the inhabitants of Vladimir-Suzdal probably saw less of them than did the inhabitants of Galicia-Volynia, Kiev or Novgorod. Of course, we will probably never know what the people of Vladimir-Suzdal thought of Latins, if they thought of them at all; but we might well hypothesise that it would be easier to maintain a sense of hostility and suspicion towards a people with whom one only rarely had contact.

However, representations sometimes have little in common with realities. In this section, I consider two examples where regional realities appear to have been similar, but representations turned out to be very different; that is to say, two examples of a narrative which is clearly ‘constructed’, not so much a reflection of reality as a reimagining of it. The first example concerns depictions of churches and Latin involvement in the construction of churches; the second concerns Rusian princes’ reactions to overtures from the Pope. In both cases, I take my principal examples from the Galician-Volynian and Vladimir-Suzdal chronicles, two contemporaneous sources containing quite distinct representations of Latins, and equally different conceptions of Latin Christendom. Is the Latin world a political and religious entity to be emulated, a society with which Rus should collaborate? Or should Rus refuse all exchange with Latins? In reality, collaboration seems to have been not uncommon throughout Rus, even in the north. Yet some areas were more willing to admit and even celebrate this collaboration than others.

Churches and their construction

This is not the first study to remark on the usefulness of written Rusian depictions of churches as a measure of attitudes to Latins. Both Plokhy and Floria comment on Rusian chronicles’ use of the terms *tserkov* and *bozhnitsa*. These terms both have the broad meaning ‘church’, but Rusian sources often describe Latin churches as *bozhnitsi*, with *tserkov* reserved for Orthodox churches. For example, in his fifteenth-century *Journey to the Council of Florence*, the Anonymous Suzdalian begins to see *bozhnitsi* instead of *tserkvi* as soon as he has crossed the sea on his way to Florence.⁵⁸ Both Plokhy and Floria note that, in the Galician-Volynian chronicle, even Latin churches such as Krakow’s Church of St. Francis are referred to as *tserkvi*, the same word as is used for Orthodox churches.⁵⁹ The Galician-Volynian chronicle recognises no Latin *bozhnitsi*. Plokhy and Floria both take this as proof that the Galician-Volynian chronicle is exceptional.

However, the *tserkov/bozhnitsa* distinction is not my focus here, largely because the distinction is not at all clear-cut. In Early Rusian sources, a *bozhnitsa* certainly can be a Latin church: in one of the very

⁵⁸ ‘Khozhenie na Florentiiskii sobor’, ed. by Maleto, p. 315.

⁵⁹ Plokhy, *The Origins*, p. 63; Floria, *U istokov*, p. 202–03.

latest chronicle entries I consider, the Novgorod First chronicle informs us s.a. 1328 that ‘all of Iurev Nemechkoi [modern-day Tartu—C.S.] burned down, and their *bozhnitsi* too’;⁶⁰ in one of the earlier sections of the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, the chronicler notes that the Cumans have destroyed a ‘Polish *bozhnitsa* of the Holy Martyrs’.⁶¹ However, Orthodox places of worship can also be *bozhnitsi*, perhaps best translated as ‘chapels’. In the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle entry for 1147, Igor Olgovich is laid to rest in Kiev ‘in the church of St. Michael, in the Novgorodian *bozhnitsa*’.⁶² Sometimes, it seems that the designation of a Latin place of worship as a *bozhnitsa* has more to do with its function than with its Latin features: the Novgorod First chronicle, which mostly refers to Latin churches as *tserkvi*, describes how fire destroyed ‘all the countless Varangian wares’ in the ‘Varangian *bozhnitsa*’.⁶³ Here, *bozhnitsa* might be best translated as ‘merchant’s church’, a site combining the functions of a warehouse and a place of worship. In short, the semantics of *bozhnitsa* are too complex and its usage too varied, at least in Early Rusian texts, to permit the assumption that an opposition between Orthodox *tserkvi* and Latin *bozhnitsi* was consistently in play.

The *tserkov/bozhnitsa* distinction is not the only notable feature of Early Rusian depictions of Latin or Latin-influenced churches. The Galician-Volynian chronicle is particularly forthcoming and explicit in its depictions of churches, particularly in the case of its beautiful and unusual description of the no longer extant Church of St. John in Kholm.⁶⁴ The Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle conforms to the more typical chronicle tendency to simply note the construction of churches, often remarking on their princely founder or saintly patron and perhaps making some commonplace remarks about their beauty and splendour, without offering any description of their architectural features or analysis of the provenance of the materials and craftsmen employed in their construction. However, both in what Vladimir-Suzdal and Galician-Volynian chroniclers say and in what they do not say about churches, there is useful material for a discussion of representations of Latins and the Latin world, as this section will demonstrate.

Both Galicia-Volynia and Vladimir-Suzdal possessed unique architectural traditions. The churches built on their soil in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries share many features with churches from other regions of Rus and further afield, but also demonstrate the influence of the Romanesque and, by the thirteenth century, early Gothic architecture of the Latin world. There is strong evidence for the involvement of Latins in the design and construction of some of these churches, in the north-east as in the south-west. The extant twelfth-century churches of Vladimir-Suzdal provide an eloquent

⁶⁰ ‘погорѣ Юрьевъ нѣмечкой всѣ и божници ихъ’. PSRL 3, p. 341.

⁶¹ ‘ии [sic] Летъскую божницю. стѣю мѣнку зажгоша’. PSRL 1, col. 344.

⁶² ‘в цркъвѣ стаг Михаила. в Новгородъскую Божницю’. PSRL 1, col. 318.

⁶³ ‘въ Варязьской божници изгорѣ товаръ всѣ варязьскыи бещисла’. PSRL 3, p. 57.

⁶⁴ PSRL 2, cols 843–44.

testimony to this. The Romanesque doorways of many twelfth-century Vladimir-Suzdalian churches, including the beautiful Church of the Intercession on the Nerl; the carved decorations of these churches; the two-storeyed blind arcades on the stair-tower of Andrei's palace and church at Bogoliubovo: all point to Latin influence.⁶⁵

The churches of Galicia have fared less well. Of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century white-stone churches in the area, only the Church of St. Pantaleimon near Galich has survived, and even that has been subject to extensive rebuilding. However, there is sufficient architectural and textual evidence to demonstrate that Galician-Volynian churches too were heavily influenced by Romanesque and then Gothic architecture. Many of their features were shared by Vladimir-Suzdalian churches, including the use of white stone and intricate carvings, sometimes zoomorphic or anthropomorphic. Indeed, the 'monolithic, ascetic' exterior of Iurii Dolgorukii's early-mid twelfth-century white-stone churches may well be the work of Galician craftsmen.⁶⁶ Some have also argued for influence in the other direction: craftsmen involved in the building of Sviatoslav Vsevolodich's Church of St. George at Iurev-Polskii might then have travelled south-west to Galicia-Volynia to work on Danilo's Church of St. John at Kholm, 'of which the description [in the Galician-Volynian chronicle—C.S.] in so many respects resembles the churches of Suzdalia'.⁶⁷

Although Rusian craftsmen may have moved between Vladimir-Suzdal and Galicia-Volynia, craftsmen from outside of Rus were probably also involved. Andrei Bogoliubskii invited 'masters from every land' to work on his churches.⁶⁸ Although they are often assumed to have come from what is now Germany, O.M. Ioannisian has recently demonstrated that the masters are more likely to have come from northern Italy, or more precisely Lombardy.⁶⁹ Galician-Volynian architecture, with its numerous Romanesque and Gothic features, betrays numerous waves of Latin influence. Both Ioannisian and P.A. Rappoport suggest Poland as the likely source of the then-novel white stone used

⁶⁵ For an overview of the architecture of twelfth-century Vladimir-Suzdal, see George Heard Hamilton, *The Art and Architecture of Russia*, 3rd edn (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 51–64.

⁶⁶ O.M. Ioannisian, 'Osnovnye etapy razvitiia Galitskogo zodchestva', in *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo: Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura X–pervoi poloviny XIII v.*, ed. by A.I. Komech and O.I. Podobedova (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), pp. 41–58 (pp. 41, 45).

⁶⁷ Hamilton, *The Art*, p. 79.

⁶⁸ 'изо всех земель мастыры'. PSRL 2, col. 512; also PSRL 1, col. 351, with slightly different wording.

⁶⁹ O.M. Ioannisian, 'Vladimiro-suzdal'skoe zodchestvo i lombardskaia romanika: K probleme proiskhozhdeniia masterov Andreiia Bogoliubskogo', in *Vizantiiskii mir: Iskusstvo Konstantinopolia i natsional'nie traditsii. Tezisy dokladov Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii: Moskva, 17–19 oktiabria 2000 g.*, ed. by L.I. Lifshits, M.A. Orlova, and E.S. Smirnova (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2000), pp. 19–24.

for the first time in Rus in twelfth-century Galician-Volynian churches.⁷⁰ From the end of the twelfth century, Hungarian influence predominated. The capitals in the shape of human heads, described in the entry on the Church of St. John at Kholm s.a. 1259 in the Galician-Volynian chronicle, appear to have been similar to those in the palace chapel at Esztergom.⁷¹ Evidently, in both Vladimir-Suzdal and Galicia-Volynia, the use of Latin styles, materials and craftsmen in the construction of churches was not uncommon, at least among the political elite.

And yet, textual representations of these churches, with their plethora of Romanesque features, are quite different in Galicia-Volynia and Vladimir-Suzdal. The Galician chronicler does not shy away from noting that the churches of Kholm borrow elements of both ‘Kievan’ and ‘Roman’ architecture. He specifically refers to the stained glass in the windows of the Church of St. John as ‘Roman’, and lingers on the beautiful chalice brought ‘from the Hungarian land’ in the Church of the Ever-Virgin Mary.⁷² At the same time, he notes that icons and church bells were brought from Kiev. The chronicler also describes many other Romanesque architectural and decorative features, although without explicitly terming them ‘Latin’ or ‘Roman’. He discusses the sculptures of Christ and St. John at the gates of the Church of St. John, describes the golden stars on the azure ceiling, and remarks upon the ‘four human heads’ on the pillars at the church’s corners. These are hardly typical features of a Rusian church, but the chronicler feels no obligation to pass over them in silence. On the contrary, he celebrates them as wondrous and prestigious elements of the beautiful churches of Kholm. To this end, he borrows elements of his rhetoric and his architectural terminology from John Malalas, George the Monk and the *Alexandriad*, in what is perhaps an attempt to legitimise his unusual ekphrasis with references to authoritative texts.⁷³

Vladimir-Suzdalian chroniclers do not rhapsodise about the abundant Romanesque features of their churches. If it were not for the stunning architectural evidence, we would have little idea that there was anything novel about them. The only remaining hint in an Early Rusian text would be the chronicle note that God brought Andrei Bogoliubskii ‘masters from every land’ to beautify Vladimir.⁷⁴ There also exists a tradition, propagated by the eighteenth-century Russian historian Vasilii Tatishchev, maintaining that Frederick Barbarossa sent masters to aid in the construction of

⁷⁰ Ioannisian, ‘Osnovnye etapy’, p. 45; P.A. Rappoport, ‘K voprosu o slozhenii Galitskoi arkhitekturnoi shkoly’, in *Slaviane i Rus’*, ed. by E.I. Krupnov (Moscow: Nauka, 1968), pp. 459–62 (pp. 461–62).

⁷¹ Ioannisian, ‘Osnovnye etapy’, p. 56.

⁷² ‘стеклы Римскими’, ‘w̄ земля Оугорьскыя’. PSRL 2, cols 843, 845.

⁷³ A.S. Orlov, ‘K voprosu ob Ipat’evskoi letopisi’, *Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti*, 31 (1926), 93–126 (pp. 123, 109, 124).

⁷⁴ See n. 68, p. 130.

Vladimir's churches.⁷⁵ No extant Russian chronicle corroborates this, possible and even likely though it is. All the chronicles of Early Rus have to say about the involvement of Latin craftsmen in the construction of Vladimir-Suzdalian churches is the single enigmatic mention of masters from 'every land'.

However, the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle does have something to say about the *lack* of involvement of *nemtsi* in the building of Russian churches. As I mentioned above, the entry for 1194 insists that no *nemtsi* had been involved in the renovation of the Dormition Cathedral in Vladimir, but only 'masters from the Servants of the Mother of God and our own men'.⁷⁶ The chronicler is surely protesting too much. He is writing in the period just after the creation of some of the loveliest Vladimir-Suzdalian churches, in which Latins almost certainly were involved. Rather than convincing us that only local craftsmen were employed in the creation and renovation of Vladimir-Suzdalian churches, his insistence should suggest to us both that *nemtsi* had indeed had a hand in the development of Vladimir-Suzdalian architecture, and, more importantly, that the Vladimir-Suzdalian chronicler either did not wish to or did not find it necessary to admit this.

This might sound like precisely the kind of conspiracy theory I dismissed in Chapter Two, when discussing the hypothesis that chroniclers avoided mentioning Russian ties with the Latin world (see pp. 60–63). Indeed, if not for the 1194 entry, the only defensible assumption here would be that Vladimir-Suzdalian chroniclers simply did not feel the need to mention *nemtsi* involvement in church-building. However, the 1194 entry's questionable insistence on the *absence* of *nemtsi* involvement provides some grounds for believing that Vladimir-Suzdalian silence on the question of Latin influences was more deliberate than that. (Imagine that a chronicler had insisted that a Russian Orthodox prince would not marry a Latin woman when there was no shortage of Orthodox brides, despite a mass of evidence to the contrary: this would provide at least some evidence suggesting an anti-Latin 'conspiracy of silence' among chroniclers.) In any case, the point remains that, unlike Galician-Volynian sources, Vladimir-Suzdalian sources do not embrace Romanesque architectural features or the use of 'Latin' materials, styles, or craftsmen.

Rusian princes and the Pope

The desirability of collaboration with versus independence and isolation from the Latin world is once again at issue in chronicle entries on negotiations between Russian princes and the Pope. Such entries are not common. Not all the historical examples of princely dealings with the Pope have made it into

⁷⁵ Hamilton, *The Art*, p. 58.

⁷⁶ 'мастеры ѿ клевереть стѣе Бѣи и своихъ'. PSRL 1, col. 411.

the chronicles. For example, Iaropolk Iziaslavich's profession of fealty to Pope Gregory VII on behalf of his father Iziaslav Iaroslavich is not mentioned in the PVL.⁷⁷ Again, it is the unlikely pairing of the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle and the Galician-Volynian chronicle which have the most to tell us about Russian depictions of the Pope, and about the extent to which these depictions were faithful to historical realities. I focus here on two thirteenth-century Vladimirian and Galician narratives about Russian princes and the Pope: the accounts of Aleksandr Nevskii's rejection of the Pope's cardinals and Danilo of Galicia's negotiations with the papal envoys.⁷⁸ I concentrate on these narratives for two reasons: firstly, because both narratives are relatively substantial and detailed; and secondly, because the historical dealings between Aleksandr Nevskii and the Pope's cardinals and Danilo of Galicia and the Pope's envoys have enough similarities that they are usefully comparable.

At first glance, Aleksandr Nevskii's and Danilo of Galicia's negotiations with the Pope's men might not seem remotely similar. After all, Aleksandr Nevskii, a strong Orthodox ruler, rejected the Pope's cunning attempts to corrupt his faith outright, refusing even to listen to the Latin teachings of the Pope's envoys—or so the story goes. Danilo of Galicia, meanwhile, not only agreed to listen to the Pope's envoys, but went as far as to accept a crown from them, becoming a Latin *rex*. For many scholars, this dichotomy still holds. Liustrov, for example, contrasts the two princes, considering Danilo's willingness to 'convert to Catholicism' and be crowned by the Pope as an aberration from the Russian tradition of hostility towards the Latins, a position represented by Aleksandr Nevskii.⁷⁹

This chapter questions this interpretation. Over the past few decades, it has become increasingly clear that the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* is far from a reliable historical source.⁸⁰ Its account of Aleksandr Nevskii's dealings with the cardinals similarly appears to be more fiction than fact.

Aleksandr Nevskii does indeed appear to have been approached by the Pope in 1248, but he did not angrily dismiss the Pope's messengers. Rather, he sent a reply to the Pope's first letter to him—a reply which must have been cordial enough to invite a second letter from the Pope praising his 'zeal', his 'true obedience', his willingness to be received into the one Church, and his suggestion that a Latin cathedral should be built in Pskov!⁸¹ The matter seems to have ended there. No cathedral was built in Pskov, there exists no record of any further correspondence between Aleksandr Nevskii and the Pope, and Aleksandr was never crowned *rex*. What's more, we should not read too much into the tone and content of the Pope's second letter. Did Aleksandr really profess his obedience to the Pope and willingness to erect a Latin cathedral, or had the Pope received a mangled version of Aleksandr's

⁷⁷ For a summary, see Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, pp. 166–69.

⁷⁸ 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, pp. 175–76; PSRL 2, cols 826–27.

⁷⁹ Liustrov, 'Evropa', p. 16.

⁸⁰ See for example Gorskii, 'Dva «neudobnykh» fakta'.

⁸¹ Gorskii, 'Dva «neudobnykh» fakta', p. 64.

response, or misinterpreted its tone?⁸² Unfortunately, while the Pope's two bulls to Aleksandr Nevskii, dating to January and September 1248, are still extant, Aleksandr's reply is not. In any case, it is clear that Aleksandr Nevskii sent a relatively polite and encouraging response to the Pope's first advance, even if he subsequently seems to have broken off communications.

I would argue that Aleksandr Nevskii's approach was therefore not dissimilar to Danilo of Galicia's. Neither prince seems to have really desired an alliance with the Pope, but neither rejected the possibility outright. In fact, it is actually Danilo rather than Aleksandr who is known to have initially refused a meeting with the Pope's envoys. Indeed, Danilo refused coronation not once but twice, firstly during negotiations with the Bishop of Bern and Kamenets, and secondly when the Pope's envoys wished to meet with him in Krakow.⁸³ Even when the Pope's representatives finally arrive in Rus, he is unwilling to accept their offer of a crown. There is no reason to mistrust the Galician-Volynian chronicle's account of Danilo's slow and unwilling change of heart, effected by persuasion from his mother and his Polish allies as well as the growing urgency of the Mongol threat (a threat which Aleksandr Nevskii never had to face in Novgorod). Finally, Danilo agrees to his coronation. Danilo's negotiations with the Pope ended differently to Aleksandr's, but Danilo and Aleksandr seem to have shared a fundamental wariness of the Pope and his offer, coupled with a pragmatic unwillingness to reject the religious leader of the Latin world outright.

If one bears this in mind, representations of Aleksandr's and Danilo's relations with the Pope become interesting for new reasons. As I argued in Chapter Two, *religious* hostility towards Latins is in fact largely absent in the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*.⁸⁴ In it, Latins are Other for the first time in Rusian writing, but their religion is not one of the principal markers of their Otherness. When Aleksandr Nevskii rejects the Pope's envoys, he does not condemn their Latin customs, even though this would seem to be the perfect moment for a reference to anti-Latin polemic, or at least to the falsity of Latin teachings. What he actually asserts is not Rusian religious superiority or Latin corruption, but Rusian self-sufficiency in matters of the faith. Reciting the main events of Christian history, he emphasises that the Rus are already knowledgeable about the faith and are in no need of instruction.⁸⁵ He accepts that the Latins 'know' Christian history too, rejecting not so much their teachings as their patronising assumption of Rusian ignorance. The mythical Aleksandr Nevskii of the

⁸² For sensible hypotheses about the Pope's response to Aleksandr, see Gorskii, 'Dva «neudobnykh» fakta', p. 68.

⁸³ PSRL 2, col. 826.

⁸⁴ See pp. 74–75.

⁸⁵ 'Zhitie', ed. by Begunov, p. 176.

Tale of the Life insists on the religious self-sufficiency of Rus, and so on the importance of independence from Rome, whose instruction is unnecessary to the Rus.

Meanwhile, Danilo's chronicler is obliged to make the best of a difficult situation. Danilo has been pushed into an alliance he would rather have done without, and the chronicler is clearly aware that the Pope, while comparatively sympathetic towards the 'Greek faith', is not exactly the same kind of Christian as Danilo.⁸⁶ Danilo's chronicler makes the opposite move to Aleksandr Nevskii's hagiographer. Rather than having his protagonist insist on Russian independence from Rome, he focuses on the concept of Christian unity and mutual aid and understanding. Danilo's coronation opens the way for the unification of the churches as well as for political co-operation, particularly the creation of a united front against the Mongols. This emphasis on political unity is as illusory as Aleksandr's insistence on absolute Russian self-sufficiency: neither bore much relation to the actual state of affairs. Once again, what we have here are two very different regional constructions of relations between Rus and the Pope, with the Vladimirian construction emphasising Russian independence while the Galician construction highlights potential unity and mutual good will. These two disparate constructions grew out of historical situations which were in fact rather similar, with neither Aleksandr Nevskii nor Danilo of Galicia particularly welcoming nor immediately rejecting a papal alliance.

The same went for the previous example, that of descriptions of churches and church-building. Despite unexpectedly similar historical realities (the existence of churches with Romanesque features in both Vladimir-Suzdal and Galicia-Volynia), chronicle representations of these churches were quite dissimilar. The Galician chronicler displays pride in Galician churches which borrowed from and emulated the Latin world, while Vladimir-Suzdalian chroniclers maintain a strict silence on the topic, broken only by the suspicious assertion that *nemtsi* were definitely not involved in the restoration of the Dormition Cathedral. Of course, no broad conclusions about Galician-Volynian and Vladimir-Suzdalian depictions of Latins can be drawn from just two examples. However, these two examples do suggest that attempting to view every Russian encounter with, and depiction of, Latins through the prism either of anti-Latin hostility or of pro-Latin tendencies is simplistic. In these cases, the difference between Vladimir-Suzdalian and Galician-Volynian representations is not exactly that Vladimir-Suzdalian representations are anti-Latin while Galician-Volynian representations are pro-Latin. Rather, it is that the Vladimir-Suzdalian examples insist, ahistorically, on Russian autonomy and self-imposed separation from the Latin world, while the Galician-Volynian examples advocate and glory in the interconnectedness of Rus and Latin Christendom.

⁸⁶ See p. 68.

The borders of Rus

What conceptual space do these interconnected entities, Rus and the Latin world, occupy? And what happens at the borders between them, where connections are most frequently made or refused? Such questions underlie this chapter's concern with Russian depictions of encounters and exchange between Latins and Rus. This section considers the ways in which Rus's western borders are represented in Russian regional writing, whether as ideally inviolate barriers or as fluid frontier zones. It considers the contexts in which borders take on meaning, and examines depictions of the crossing, redrawing or reaffirming of borders, most often by princes. In so doing, it concludes a chapter on regional representations of connections between Rus and Latin Christendom by looking at the principal locus of such connections, the (geographical, political, cultural) border.

Contemporary scholarship tends to emphasise that medieval borders and frontiers did not function in the same way as modern ones, and often focuses on cross-border encounters and connections.⁸⁷ This is a valid approach. Medieval polities were not modern nation-states, with precisely defined and defended boundaries, citizens with passports, and a widespread rhetoric of nationality. In the absence of such clearly demarcated boundaries, borders could be productive sites of exchange.

Raffensperger's *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World* borrows something from this scholarly approach in its insistence on the existence of numerous connections between Rus and the Latin world, and in its preference for examining individual experiences of encounter and exchange. Indeed, in Raffensperger's work, the political and cultural boundaries between Rus and Latin Christendom are de-emphasised to such an extent that they appear almost non-existent. This is the consequence of Raffensperger's laudable desire to advertise the many political and cultural links between Rus and the rest of what would become Europe.

It is possible to take this approach too far. Medieval polities may not have had borders in the modern sense of the term, but evidently there were conceptions of polities as separate (but interlinked) entities. Rus was not Poland, nor *nemtsi* territory, nor Scandinavia. There were therefore also areas where Rus shaded into all three of these entities. My aim here is not to map these areas, or even to suggest that this is possible or desirable. Nor is it to discuss them as geopolitical realities.⁸⁸ Rather, I want to show that these areas looked very different depending on where a Russian writer was looking

⁸⁷ The literature on medieval borders and frontiers is extensive and growing. See in particular *Medieval Frontiers*, ed. by Abulafia and Berend, particularly the articles by David Abulafia and Ronnie Ellenblum; *Frontiers in Question: Eurasian Borderlands, 700–1700*, ed. by Daniel Power and Naomi Standen (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999).

⁸⁸ Although see Selart, *Livonia*, for an impressive historical analysis of the 'border' between Novgorod and Livonia.

from, and on what he was writing about. In other words, I consider these border zones to be constructions and, often, rhetorical tools which Russian writers employed for effect. Once again, the way that Russian writers employ the notion of borders between Rus and the Latin world seems to pattern by region, although other factors are also involved.

The northern border

It is not Novgorodian texts which insist most fiercely on the existence of a ‘border’ between Novgorod and Pskov and *nemtsi* land, but Vladimir-Suzdalian texts. Admittedly, coming to any firm conclusions about the nature of Vladimir-Suzdalian writing on Latins is difficult because there is so little of it, and because the text that is most vocal about Latins and the northern ‘border’ is the very unusual *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*. Still, it is tempting to see connections between the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* and the entries in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle considered earlier in this chapter. There is a sense of opposition between Rus and *nemtsi* even in the 1194 entry, which contrasts *nemtsi* ‘masters’ with ‘our own men’. The *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* takes this nascent opposition between Rus and *nemtsi* and develops it into a fully-fledged conception of Rus and the Latin world as independent entities separated by borders which should not be violated.

In the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, the crime of the *nemtsi* and Swedes whom Aleksandr beats back and whose religious instruction he rejects is the overstepping of borders which should be sacred. When Aleksandr Nevskii prays to God before his battle with the Swedes, he cries: ‘Oh eternal God, who created the heavens and the earth and set the boundaries of the nations, you ordered us to live without trespassing onto another’s land [lit. ‘lot’; see below]!’⁸⁹ This is the command which Aleksandr’s enemies have disobeyed in attacking Aleksandr’s land. Similarly, as we have seen, when Aleksandr rejects the Pope’s envoys, he implies not that their teaching is wrong, but that there was no need for the Pope to overstep the boundaries of his jurisdiction to tell him something he already knew. The fact of the existence of the *nemtsi*, their religious beliefs and customs, is not at issue here. What Aleksandr objects to is their lack of respect for the borders which separate Rus and Latin Christendom, both as geopolitical and as religious entities.

The language used by the Aleksandr Nevskii of the *Tale of the Life* to talk of borders and their inviolability is Scriptural (or, in some cases, pseudepigraphical). Twice, the composer employs the term *chast*, meaning ‘lot’ in the sense of something allotted: once to condemn the act of trespassing on another’s ‘lot’, and once in a reference to the *rimaskaia chast*, the Roman ‘lot’. This term, *chast*, is

⁸⁹ ‘Бѣ превѣчнѣи создавѣи нбо и .з. и постави предѣлы кзъком. и повели жити не преступаю в чюжую часть.’ PSRL 1, col. 478.

the same term used to describe the lands given to Noah's sons after the Flood. The PVL talks of Shem, Ham and Japheth agreeing to live 'each in his own lot'.⁹⁰ To 'trespass onto another's lot' is a crime against the divine will; it is a crime which Shem, Ham and Japheth attempt to prevent by agreeing 'that nobody should trespass on his brother's share'.⁹¹ Aleksandr Nevskii makes the significance of this act of trespass clear when he speaks of straying outside one's own 'lot' as an act contrary to God's command. Aleksandr's plea to God, who 'set the boundaries of the nations' and 'ordered us to live without trespassing onto others' lands', is highly reminiscent not only of the PVL's account of the aftermath of the Flood, but also of the depiction of the aftermath of the fall of the Tower of Babel in Deuteronomy 32.8: 'When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of men, he fixed the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the sons of God.'⁹² In the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, borders and the 'lots' they separate are divinely established: to fail to respect them is a sin.

Novgorodian chroniclers who write about clashes with *nemtsi* are looking at the same border, but see it differently. In the Novgorod First chronicle, there are no *chasti*, no divinely-allotted lands. Instead, there is a hinterland of peoples and settlements paying tribute sometimes to Novgorod and sometimes to others—*nemtsi*, Lithuanians, Swedes—depending on the outcomes of Novgorodian campaigns. Indeed, the extent of Novgorodian influence is more often measured by Novgorod's ability to extract tribute from peoples (the Chud, the Vod, etc.) than from particular sites. Even when campaigners' focus is on particular settlements like Medvezhia Golova, chroniclers do not represent these settlements as inalienably Novgorodian, let alone Russian. Medvezhia Golova, for example, is a 'Chud town' under the influence sometimes of *nemtsi* and sometimes of Novgorod.⁹³ Campaigns against the *nemtsi* are evidently worthy of mention, but chroniclers do not explain them as attempts to maintain Novgorod's 'borders'; their purpose is simply to increase the reach of Novgorodian influence. In the Novgorod First chronicle's sober account of Aleksandr's 'Battle on the Ice', the battle is not so much an attempt to defend Slavonic borders against 'Roman' attack as it is a particularly successful Novgorodian bid to regain influence in the Baltic at the expense of the *nemtsi*: after the battle, the *nemtsi* agree to return the Vod land, Pskov, Luga and Lotygola to the Novgorodians.⁹⁴

⁹⁰ 'кождо въ своеи части'. PSRL 1, col. 5.

⁹¹ 'не преступати ни комуже. въ жребии братень'. PSRL 1, cols 4–5. Simon Franklin, 'Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Russian Historiography', in *Byzantium – Rus – Russia: Studies in the Translation of Christian Culture*, Variorum Collected Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 1–27 (pp. 6–12), traces the story of the oath sworn by Noah's sons back to the pseudepigraphical *Book of Jubilees*.

⁹² Revised Standard Version.

⁹³ PSRL 3, pp. 52, 57, 72–73.

⁹⁴ PSRL 3, p. 78.

This begins to change in the fourteenth century, after the period on which this study focuses. In the Novgorod First chronicle's fourteenth- and fifteenth-century entries, Latin proselytism on Rusian soil and military incursions into Rusian territory begin to be accompanied by anti-Latin diatribes, suggesting an increasing emphasis on Rusian religious and political independence from the Latin world. The entry for 1348 condemns both Magnus of Sweden's military invasion and his forced conversion of the Izhera to 'his own faith';⁹⁵ in 1349, the king of Krakow is denounced both for his invasion of Volynia and for his introduction of the Latin liturgy into Rusian churches.⁹⁶ As in the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, for later Novgorodian chroniclers, the problem is not that Latins exist: it is that they refuse to be contained, encroaching onto Rusian, 'Orthodox', ground. In the earlier chronicle entries which are the focus of this chapter, however, the religious and political boundaries of Rus are fragile and ever-changing; they are certainly never insisted upon.

The southern border

Kievan and Galician-Volynian writing treats Rus's western frontiers fundamentally similarly to Novgorodian writing. Nowhere is there any reference to the *chast* or to the idea of Rus and the Latin world as independent entities separated by a firm boundary. However, the Galician-Volynian and Kiev chronicles do provide some indication that a relatively stable geographical frontier zone between Rus and Poland was felt to exist. This is not a border, a dividing line, but a frontier, an indeterminate area between two separate geopolitical entities. This Rusian-Polish frontier is known as *Ukraina*, the land 'on the edge'. (It is neither coterminous with nor equivalent to modern-day Ukraine.) For George A. Perfecky, *Ukraina* is a geographical concept: he defines it as the area west of the river Vepr, between Poland and Volynia.⁹⁷ Many references to *Ukraina* and its inhabitants, sometimes called the *liakhove ukrainiane* or 'frontier Poles', support this definition. However, the term *Ukraina* is occasionally employed more loosely. In 1189, the chronicler uses the term 'Galician *Ukraina*' (i.e. 'the Galician borderland') to describe the area from which Rostislav Berladnichich moves to take two Galician towns and then Galich itself.⁹⁸ Evidently, both Galicia and Volynia have 'borderlands'.

The existence of borderlands implies the existence of heartlands too, and sure enough, southern chronicles provide evidence for the currency of this concept. In 1145, Igor Olgovich and his allies travel 'to the heart of the Polish land' in order to make peace with Polish princes Boleslav and

⁹⁵ 'свою вѣру'. PSRL 3, p. 360.

⁹⁶ PSRL 3, p. 361.

⁹⁷ George A. Perfecky, *The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle: An Annotated Translation*, Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, 16, II (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1973), p. 133.

⁹⁸ 'приѣхавшю же емоу ко Оукраинѣ Галичъкои'. PSRL 2, col. 663.

Mzheka [Mieszko].⁹⁹ Rostislav Berladnichich arrives in ‘Galician *Ukraina*’, but has to travel from there to Galich in order to claim authority over Galicia.¹⁰⁰ This is a model of political power which involves centres and peripheries rather than borders. Princely power radiates from centres (Galich, the Polish ‘heartland’), becoming weaker towards peripheries, lands ‘on the edge’ which frequently change hands. Firm borders separating lands with different political allegiances have no place in this model.

Whether it is explicitly referred to as ‘borderland’ or not, the land in the west of Galicia-Volynia is acknowledged to change hands frequently, similarly to the land in Novgorod’s Baltic hinterland. In 981, Vladimir the Great takes a number of ‘Polish towns’ ‘which are under Rusian control to this day’.¹⁰¹ Populations can move too. In 1031, Iaroslav and Mstislav ‘went against the Poles, and took the Cherven towns back [...] and captured many Poles and shared them out. Iaroslav established [his Poles] in Rus, and they are there to this day.’¹⁰² Galician-Volynian land can also be voluntarily given away by princes: Mstislav gives his Hungarian son-in-law Peremyshl and then Galich in 1226.¹⁰³ Like the settlements fought over by Novgorod and the *nemtsi* in the Novgorod First chronicle, the land on Galicia-Volynia’s border is a political prize which frequently and often violently changes hands. When Vladimir Glebovich dies s.a. 1187, he is eulogised as a prince ‘who often gave *Ukraina* cause to moan’.¹⁰⁴

Yet there is simultaneously something fundamentally unchanging about the identity of these frontier towns. The ‘Polish towns’ Vladimir took in the tenth century have not become ‘Rusian towns’; they are simply ‘under Rusian control’. Peremyshl and Galich evidently do not become Hungarian when given to a Hungarian prince, nor do the Polish prisoners become Rusian when settled on Rusian land. A town might fall under a different ruler, but this does not affect the ethnic or cultural identity of its population. Political ‘borders’ do not always line up with cultural ‘borders’, which are more resistant to change. This goes for Novgorod’s hinterland as well as Galicia-Volynia’s: Medvezhia Golova remains a ‘Chud town’ even though it has been captured by Novgorodian forces in the past.¹⁰⁵

In short, in Rusian texts from both north and south, the frontier between Rus and the Latin world can possess great significance or very little significance at all. Novgorodian and Galician-Volynian texts

⁹⁹ ‘на середѣ земли. Ладьское’. PSRL 2, col. 318.

¹⁰⁰ PSRL 2, cols 663–64.

¹⁰¹ ‘иде [...] к Ляхомъ и закъ градъ их [...] еже суть и до сего днѣ подъ Русью.’ PSRL 1, col. 81.

¹⁰² ‘идоста на Ляхы. и закъста градъ Червеньскыи въпять [...] и многы Ляхы приведоста и раздѣливша ю. Ярославъ посадѣ [свою] по Ръси. и суть до сего днѣ.’ PSRL 1, col. 150.

¹⁰³ PSRL 2, col. 748.

¹⁰⁴ ‘w нем же Оукраина много постона’. PSRL 2, col. 653.

¹⁰⁵ PSRL 3, pp. 20, 52.

observe this frontier minutely, recording the constantly shifting political borders of Rus and its neighbours. Cultural divisions prove more stable and significant. Indeed, a shared identity, expressed in terms of brotherhood and belonging, can be invoked as a restraint on the use of frontier towns as pawns in political dealings with outsiders. In an interesting example from the Polish perspective, in 1229, the elders of the Polish town of Kalish beg Kondrat of Mazowie for help against the Rus, demanding of him, ‘Is this not your town? Are we strangers from another [town]? We are your people and your brothers.’¹⁰⁶ However, it is in the Vladimir-Suzdalian *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* that borders are made to carry the greatest weight of meaning. In the *Tale of the Life*, overstepping borders becomes a sin of Scriptural proportions rather than simply a princely misdemeanour.

*

After the eleventh century, it becomes impossible to generalise about ‘Rusian’ conceptions of the Latin world. As regions came to newfound prominence and regional writing proliferated, so did viewpoints from which to observe and write about the Latin world. This chapter has looked at representations of interaction and exchange between Rus and Latins. It has examined both depictions of the Rus and Latins involved in these interactions and ideas about Rus and Latin Christendom as geopolitical and religious entities (the idea of Rusian isolation from or emulation of the Latin world; the nature and stability of the borders dividing them). There have emerged very clear regional disparities in all of these areas, with Vladimir-Suzdal and Galicia-Volynia tending to fall at opposite ends of a spectrum of representations.

Latins appear only rarely in Vladimir-Suzdalian texts, and when they do, they are distant and abstract: there is no mention of Latins actually present in Vladimir-Suzdal, only of the theoretical possibility of their presence or their presence elsewhere, most often beyond Novgorod. Vladimir-Suzdalian writing, particularly the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, privileges the idea of the strict separation of Rus and Latin Christendom, insisting on Rusian self-sufficiency and the significance of the border between the two. Novgorodian texts insist on no such border. Novgorod’s Latins are both a threat (in Novgorod’s hinterland) and a blessing (in times of economic hardship), but the Novgorod First chronicle never denies their presence. While there is certainly a sense that Novgorod’s *nemtsi* are politically and culturally different to the Novgorodians, Novgorodian texts do not insist on the significance of this difference and the importance of the preservation of Novgorodian independence from *nemtsi*. The ‘border’ beyond Novgorod is something of an optical illusion: it looks more solid the further away a writer stands from it.

¹⁰⁶ ‘сии градъ не твои ли есть [...] ци иного странници есмы. но людье твои есмы а ваша братья есмы.’ PSRL 2, col. 757.

Southern texts make reference to a different set of Latins—most often Poles and Hungarians rather than *nemtsi* or Varangians—and discuss them comparatively frequently. In Kievan and Galician-Volynian texts, individual Latins come into focus in a way they do not in northern texts, becoming part of the narrative fabric of Rusian towns. In Galicia-Volynia in particular, Latins are a ubiquitous presence, figuring in the majority of chronicle entries. Their presence and influence is nothing to hide: indeed, Galician-Volynian chroniclers boast of the cosmopolitan nature of their towns and their cultural proximity to the Latin world. As in the Novgorod First chronicle, the political border between Rus and Latin Christendom is acknowledged to fluctuate as land changes hands from Rusian to Latin rulers and vice-versa. If Galician-Volynian chroniclers felt any anxiety about their proximity to a ‘frontier’ with ‘Latins’, they never express it. Indeed, seen up close, there is no unified ‘Latin world’. Rather, it is Vladimir-Suzdalian writers, working hundreds of miles away from any ‘Latin frontier’, who insist most vehemently on its existence and significance.

Conclusion

At the heart of this thesis has been an attempt to take Early Rusian texts on their own terms. Scholarship on Early Rus has traditionally been focused on the extra-textual, pressing texts into service only as more or less reliable evidence for objective historical facts and phenomena. Rather than combing texts for new facts about relations between Rus and Latins, this thesis has instead insisted on the complexity and subjectivity of Rusian writing about Latins. There is no place in this approach for simplistic dichotomies (Rusian texts and their composers as anti- or pro-Latin) or crude links between text and culture (textual hostility as a clear reflection of personal and collective hostility). At no point have I insisted on a single dominant Early Rusian ideological position on Latins, or a single prevalent model for writing about Latins: why should a single set of norms have endured over more than 300 years, across a vast territory, among people of quite different backgrounds? Nor have I assumed a transparent link between the thoughts, words and deeds of Rusian writers: why should medieval people (unlike modern people) always have acted on their beliefs about Latins, or expressed their opinions entirely unfettered by literary convention?

My approach to the study of these complex subjectivities has been holistic: I have analysed all relevant Early Rusian texts concerning Latins, accepting the resultant polyphony rather than assume that a subset of texts can speak for the whole. However, acknowledging multiplicity in this way need not lead simply to the chaotic juxtaposition of attitudes. The study of subjectivities can be systematic. Indeed, I have argued that there is nothing random about representations of Latins. Rather, they pattern, and these patterns have been the principal concern of this thesis.

Representational patterns in Early Rusian texts can be influenced by extra-textual factors, but the effect of these factors (particularly time of composition) has been greatly overstated. Polemic may have circulated within Early Rus from an early date, but it is only in the fourteenth century that we have evidence for the deliberate propagation of anti-Latin polemical texts and for the appearance of new and hostile representations of Latins as members of a different faith. Regional patterns, on the other hand, are more clear-cut—not entirely unexpectedly, given that different regions of Rus had more or less contact with different groups of Latins. In texts from the south of Rus, particularly the Galician-Volynian chronicle, Latins are acknowledged as a frequent presence in Rus. Rus and the Latin world are understood as separate but closely linked communities with a great deal in common; the ‘confessional frontier’ is only rarely in evidence. In the north of Rus, particularly in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, Latins are more elusive. When they do appear in texts, they are more likely to be depicted as essentially different to and distant from the Rus.

The bulk of this study has been concerned with the influence of textual factors (genre and theme) on depictions of Latins. This study began by considering representations of Latins as dictated by writing

aiming to define (not simply exemplify) orthodoxy and orthopraxy. This mode of writing is found mostly in canon law texts, but also exists in other texts or parts of texts which concern themselves with definitions of orthodoxy, such as the PVL's account of Vladimir's conversion to Christianity. Here, the religious difference of Latins is uppermost. Apparently minor differences of faith and praxis take on great significance, providing a sort of inverse definition of orthodoxy: orthodoxy means believing and doing what the heterodox fail to believe and do. Yet the very fragility of the border between orthodoxy and heterodoxy is troubling, giving rise to the spectre of 'double-belief'. According to this mode of writing, which may have its roots in Byzantium but continued to evolve in Rus, Latins are the heterodox foil for the Orthodox Christian community of Rus.

However, an alternative and almost antithetical view of Latins also existed. The Caves Monastery's *Patericon* reveals clear traces of a more ecumenical approach to Latins. In the tale of Moisei 'the Hungarian' and much of the tale of Shimon 'the Varangian', ethnic and cultural differences exist but are rendered insignificant by the religious unity of the Christian monastic world: Moisei and Shimon come from far away, but are welcomed into the cosmopolitan Christian community of the Caves. The model for this narrative treatment of Latins is the monastic literature of Late Antiquity, in which men and women of many ethnicities and cultures dwell together in the desert, earning a heavenly citizenship which renders their earthly ties obsolete. The textual complexities of the *Patericon* obscure this narrative framework slightly: the tale of Shimon simultaneously bears traces of a different narrative structure, also common to Late Antique paterica, in which a heretical Christian is reformed by the spiritual power and love of an orthodox solitary. Still, at least in the earlier period of the Caves' history, Latins could perfectly well be represented as respected and orthodox members of the monastic community.

The narrative constraints of the Early Rusian travel narrative allow for the expression of a more complex point of view on Latin religious difference. In the travel narratives of Daniil and Antonii, individual members of other faiths or other branches of Christianity are welcoming and kind. However, in the legends and tales which Daniil and Antonii relate, there is room for criticism of other faiths, including the Latin faith. Daniil has not a bad word to say about the pious 'tsar' Baldwin, but he is suspicious of the Latin church as an institution; Antonii too distinguishes the 'angelic teachings' of the Byzantine church from the different and perhaps spiritually debased customs of the Latin church. Unlike some of the stricter polemical texts circulating in Rus, travel narratives do not portray individual Latins as tainted by the inadequacies of their church; unlike parts of the *Patericon*, travel narratives do insist on the religious difference, at an institutional if not a personal level, between Latins and Orthodox Christians.

The chronicles of Early Rus include a plethora of material of different forms and genres, making generalisations about chronicle treatments of Latins difficult. However, chronicles do not highlight

the *religious* difference between Rus and Latins as much as some scholars believe. For one thing, the chronicles do not contain ‘numerous polemics’¹: aside from the PVL’s short note on azymes s.a. 986 and the longer polemical passage s.a. 988, plus perhaps the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii* in the Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle, the chronicles refrain entirely from religious polemic against Latins. What’s more, the concept of an ideology of silence governing chronicle representations of contact between Latins and Rus is flawed: the conviction that chroniclers would want or need to avoid discussion of Latins is based on the very hypothesis about generalised ecclesiastical hostility to Latins which this thesis has questioned. When chroniclers wish to emphasise Latin similarity to the Rus, often for political and rhetorical reasons, they cite their shared faith; when chroniclers emphasise Latin difference, they generally conceive of this difference in political and cultural terms. The Russian elite is distinguished more by its shared patrimony and ‘land’ than by its faith, which is most often represented as the same as the faith of the Latins.

The hagio-biographies of Aleksandr Nevskii and Dovmont are the only category of Early Russian text in which Latins are truly Other. If Latins in polemical canon law texts are different but not entirely unrecognisable as Christians, Latins in hagio-biography are culturally, politically and religiously opposed to the Rus. ‘Godless’, ‘pagan’ Latins overstep the boundaries of their land in an attempt to crush the ‘Slavonic people’. The narrative themes and rhetorical techniques of these hagio-biographies owe something to the earlier panegyrics to princes included in chronicles: Aleksandr and Dovmont are depicted as strong and pious princes defending their land from the ravages of ‘pagans’. However, these texts are also products of a particular time and place. They appear relatively late, towards the end of the thirteenth century and the early fourteenth century, when representations of Latins were on the verge of becoming more hostile. The *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, which is the principal model for the *Tale of Dovmont*, originates from the north-east of Rus, where Latins tended to be represented as more distant and different than they were in the south. The hagio-biography is thus a vivid example of the way factors both internal and external to the text combine to influence representations of Latins.

The principal contribution of this thesis has been to demonstrate that, across the Early Russian literary landscape as a whole, it is the genre or subject matter of a text, along with its geographical provenance, that best predicts the tenor of its depictions of Latins. However, a focus on the ways texts shape their content, and on the factors which might combine to influence this shape, can only take one so far. What of the communities who produced and propagated these texts? What can we conclude about the place of Latins in Russian culture more broadly, and about the role of Latins in the creation of Russian Christian identities? A comprehensive answer to this question is beyond the scope of this

¹ Raffensperger, *Reimagining Europe*, p. 8.

thesis, but some preliminary responses suggest themselves. Firstly, the sheer variety of textual depictions of and opinions about Latins suggests a similar variety of individual attitudes to Latins and understandings of the Latin world (both as a conceptual whole and as a series of only distantly related parts). Secondly, depictions of Latins were highly dependent on literary, regional and temporal context. It seems likely that attitudes could be similarly flexible and context-dependent: certainly, an awareness that Latins use azymes and perform the liturgy differently to the Orthodox does not seem to have stopped Hegumen Daniil from developing a respectful relationship with Baldwin of Jerusalem. Identities might be constructed in opposition to Latins in certain respects and contexts, but not in others.

Mental frontiers between Rus and the Latin world thus drifted into and out of being. Religious, ethnic and cultural barriers were not a constant or an ontological fact: they had to be summoned into existence. Historians of Rus have long recognised that the 'confessional border' could be blurred and that Rusian anti-Latin polemic did not necessarily dictate attitudes and behaviours, but scholars have been too quick to assume that this frontier was a given for one group at least: the ecclesiastics who composed Early Rusian texts. Yet these very texts suggest that this was not the case. Early Rusian writers insisted on the reality and solidity of the borders between Latin Christendom and Rus only rarely, in certain limited contexts. For this reason, we cannot explain Early Rusian texts' refusal to tell us what we might want to know about Rusian relations with Latins by reference to 'ecclesiastical hostility' towards Latins. There is much still to discover about the contexts in which religious difference was or was not treated as significant in Rusian culture, and about the material Rusian writers chose to include or exclude when composing or redacting texts; but at least in the case of Latins, silences cannot be read as evidence of hostility.

One thing is certain: Rusian culture was neither 'anti-Latin' nor 'pro-Latin', any more than 'modern European culture' might be said to be 'anti-Islam' or 'pro-Islam', for example. This study has rejected the idea that the ensemble of Early Rusian texts reveal Rusian hostility to Latins, but not in order to insist that Early Rusian texts and communities were consistently sympathetic to Latins. Then as now, communities and individuals negotiated cultural, religious and political difference in subtle ways: a Kievan churchman could perfectly well be seen to broker a marriage between a Rusian prince and a Hungarian princess, while still promoting the diffusion of canon law containing scathing anti-Latin polemic. Rus was not a black-and-white world whose inhabitants were either Christian or pagan, Self or Other, and it did not portray itself as such. There was a place in Early Rusian culture for the expression of hostility towards Latins, but also for the acknowledgement of their fundamental similarity to the Rus and the cultural proximity of Rus to the Latin world.

Appendix One: Anti-Latin Polemical Sources

The layout of Appendices 1 and 2 is based on the layout used in Tia Kolbaba's appendix of Greek anti-Latin lists and accusations.¹

Sources are listed in (necessarily provisional and approximate) chronological order of composition or compilation.

*Epistle on the Latin Faith*²

Author: Hegumen Feodosii (either 'of the Caves' or 'the Greek')

Date: composed either between 1069 and 1074 or in the mid-twelfth century (before 1154), depending on authorship;³ earliest manuscripts from late fourteenth or fifteenth century.⁴

Context: Written by a hegumen of the Caves for a Rusian prince (either Iziaslav Iaroslavich or Iziaslav Mstislavich).

Content: Begins with a fierce instruction not to eat with, socialise with, marry or talk to Latins, because they live in wrong belief and impurity. There follows a list of 17 accusations, most only a sentence long, and taking up only about a quarter of the letter. Then, a passage on Latin damnation and a warning against praising other faiths or falling into 'double-belief'. Culminates in another denunciation of Latins and a short passage on azymes.

*Dispute with the Latins*⁵

Author: probably Metropolitan Georgii (fl. 1070s)⁶

Date: 1070s; only one damaged late fifteenth- or early sixteenth-century manuscript.⁷

¹ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 173–83, 189–202.

² 'Poslanie o vere latinskoi', ed. by Ponyrko.

³ Eremin, 'Iz istorii', pp. 30, 33.

⁴ *Epistoliarnoe nasledie*, ed. by Ponyrko, p. 12.

⁵ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, pp. 81–91; Popov gives the substance of each accusation, but this is not an edition.

⁶ See n. 19, p. 29, for discussion of the identity of the tract's composer.

⁷ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, p. 82.

Content: After a short historical introduction, blaming the *nemtsi* for capturing Old Rome and perverting the faith, there follow 27 accusations. Very similar in content to Nikifor's epistles.

*Canonical Answers*⁸

Author: Metropolitan Georgii

Date: 1070s; known only in a fifteenth-century part of one manuscript.⁹

Context: Questions posed by Hegumen German, perhaps of the Spasskii monastery in Kiev,¹⁰ to Georgii, Metropolitan of Kiev.

Content: Canonical questions and answers, of which three explicitly mention Latins, forbidding the Orthodox to eat and drink with Latins, offer them *panagia* or enter their churches, and advising them to say a prayer before using a vessel which a Latin has drunk out of.

*Epistle to Antipope Clement (in oldest manuscript, entitled 'To the Roman archbishop from Ioann, Metropolitan of Rus, on azymes')*¹¹

Author: Metropolitan Ioann II (d. 1089)

Date: composed between 1080 and 1089; earliest manuscripts date from late fourteenth or early fifteenth century.¹²

Context: A letter to the antipope Clement.

Content: An expansive letter including a short list of errors. Addresses Clement respectfully, assuring him that he believes him to be a Christian, but warning him of the differences between Latin and Orthodox practices. Privileges the questions of the *filioque* and azyme use. Addresses a number of typical anti-Latin accusations, but in more detail than in most lists, with Scriptural justifications. Looks at six accusations in detail, and mentions two others. Closes with the request that Clement turn to the Patriarch of Constantinople for advice.

⁸ Turilov, 'Otvety Georgiia'.

⁹ Turilov, 'Otvety Georgiia', p. 211.

¹⁰ Turilov, 'Otvety Georgiia', p. 213.

¹¹ 'Poslanie mitropolita Ioanna', ed. by Ponyrko.

¹² 'Poslanie mitropolita Ioanna', ed. by Ponyrko, pp. 24, 29.

*Canonical Answers*¹³

Author: Metropolitan Ioann II (d. 1089)

Date: mid-late eleventh century; earliest manuscript is thirteenth-century Russian *kormchaia*.¹⁴

Context: Written by Ioann II and translated into Slavonic for use in Rus.

Content: Canonical questions and answers, including one answer on marriage to Latins and another answer forbidding the Orthodox to commune with Latins or celebrate the liturgy with them (although eating with them is acceptable in some cases).

*Epistle to Vladimir Monomakh on the Latin Faith*¹⁵

Author: Metropolitan Nikifor (fl. 1104–1121)

Date: probably composed between 1113 and 1121; earliest manuscripts from fifteenth century.¹⁶

Context: Couched as a response to Vladimir Monomakh, Grand Prince of Kiev, who wished to know how the Latins fell away from the Church.

Content: Short account of the fall of Rome from orthodoxy (the result of the capture of Rome by *neumsi* and the introduction of ‘Judaizing’ practices) followed by a list of twenty anti-Latin accusations. Concludes with a short exhortation to the prince.

*Epistle to Iaroslav Sviatopolchich on the Latin Faith*¹⁷

Author: Metropolitan Nikifor (fl. 1104–1121)

Date: probably composed between 1113 and 1118; earliest manuscripts sixteenth century.¹⁸

Context: Letter to ‘Iaroslav, Prince of Murom’—but another sixteenth-century manuscript, now lost, gave name of prince as Iaroslav Sviatopolchich, who was prince of Volodimer-in-Volynia.¹⁹ This

¹³ ‘Kanonicheskie otvety’, ed. by A.S. Pavlov.

¹⁴ Shchapov, *Vizantiiskoe i iuzhnoslavianskoe pravovoe nasledie*, p. 163.

¹⁵ ‘Poslanie Vladimiru Monomakhu’, ed. by Polianskii.

¹⁶ ‘Poslanie Vladimiru Monomakhu’, ed. by Polianskii, pp. 126–27, 128.

¹⁷ ‘Poslanie Iaroslavu’, ed. by Polianskii.

¹⁸ *Epistoliarnoe nasledie*, ed. by Ponyrko, pp. 63–65.

¹⁹ ‘Poslanie Iaroslavu’, ed. by Polianskii, p. 152.

attribution seems more likely, as Nikifor mentions Iaroslav's proximity to the Poles. Couched as a response to Iaroslav's request to be told about the Latins.

Content: Begins with an affirmation of Rome's previous orthodoxy, until Rome fell to the *nemtsi* and 'Vandals'. There follows a list of 19 accusations and a long conclusion: readers are instructed that the orthodox should not eat or drink with Latins ('thieves and robbers' who do not enter by the 'doors' of Scripture) or greet them. Azyme use is condemned in detail. Finally, there is a note on Latins' use of pure wine for the Eucharist rather than wine mixed with water, like the Armenian practice.

Comments: Nikifor's *Epistle to an Unknown Prince* is generally considered a shortened version of this letter,²⁰ so I do not consider it as an independent text here.

*Account of Vladimir's conversion in the PVL*²¹

Author: various, unknown.

Date: probably compiled at the beginning of the twelfth century but some of the contents most likely date from the eleventh century.

Context: The PVL's discussion of the conversion of Rus to Christianity.

Content: Entry for 986 notes that the Latin faith is slightly different from the Rus faith and highlights Latin use of azymes. Entry for 988 incorporates some errors generally found in lists into a broader account of the teaching Vladimir received on his conversion.

*Questions of Kirik*²²

Author: Kirik (and possibly also Sava and Ilia) of Novgorod, recording the answers of Nifont, archbishop of Novgorod 1130–1156.

Date: mid-twelfth century; earliest manuscript is thirteenth-century Russian *kormchaia*.

Context: Questions posed by local clerics to Nifont, archbishop of Novgorod.

Content: Canonical questions and answers, of which two concern Latins.

²⁰ *Tvoreniia mitropolita Nikifora*, ed. by Polianskii, p. 171.

²¹ PSRL 1, cols 86–87, 114–16.

²² Mil'kov and Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets*, pp. 358–412.

*The Serbian kormchaia*²³

Author: various. Includes *On the Franks and Other Latins* (twelfth century, composer unknown), the list by Niketas Stethatos (eleventh century), a short extract from an epistle by Peter of Antioch (eleventh century), and a single sentence from an epistle by Leo of Ohrid (eleventh century).

Date: Most likely requested by Metropolitan Kirill II in 1262 and circulating in Rus at least by 1284 (date of Riazan manuscript). Probably compiled in early thirteenth-century Serbia by the Serbian archbishop Sava.²⁴

Content: Includes a series of anti-Latin texts alongside other canonical material.

²³ Popov, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor*, pp. 123–34, has a discussion of the anti-Latin sections of the Serbian *kormchaia* and extended extracts from it.

²⁴ Shchapov, *Vizantiiskoe i iuzhnoslavienskoe pravovoe nasledie*, pp. 122–23.

Appendix Two: Anti-Latin Polemical Accusations

Accusations not found in any of the texts included in Kolbaba's list of Byzantine accusations¹ are in **bold**. Accusations are ordered by frequency of appearance in my corpus, as defined in Appendix One. Page references are to the editions given in Appendix One.

Latins celebrate the Eucharist with azymes (cf. Kolbaba p. 190)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 130, pp. 134–35 (Latins have misunderstood Paul's words about leaven)
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 155, pp. 159–62
3. Georgii, p. 83, p. 89 (a reference to Melchizedek)
4. Ioann II, p. 31, pp. 33–34
5. Feodosii, p. 16
6. Canonical Answers of Ioann II, col. 3, col. 7

Latins forbid priests to marry and will not accept married men as priests; priests are promiscuous (cf. Kolbaba pp. 190–91)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, pp. 132–33 (priests may not marry)
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 157 (clergy are supposed to send their wives away, but in fact take multiple wives)
3. Georgii, p. 85 (married men are not accepted as priests) and p. 86 (bishops marry, priests have concubines)
4. Ioann II, pp. 31, 33
5. Feodosii, p. 16 (priests have children with their servant girls rather than marrying; bishops have mistresses)
6. PVL, col. 116 (priests sometimes take up to seven wives)

Latins eat strangled, unclean or forbidden meat (cf. Kolbaba pp. 189–90)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, pp. 130–31
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 156
3. Georgii, p. 87

¹ Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, pp. 189–202.

4. Ioann II, p. 35
5. Feodosii, p. 16
6. Canonical Answers of Ioann II, col. 3, col. 7

Latins fast incorrectly during Lent (cf. Kolbaba p. 191)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 131
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 156
3. Georgii, p. 86
4. Ioann II, p. 31, pp. 32–33
5. Feodosii, p. 16
6. Canonical Answers of Ioann II, col. 3

Latins fast on the Sabbath (cf. Kolbaba p. 189)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 131
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 155
3. Georgii, p. 86
4. Ioann II, p. 31, p. 32
5. Feodosii, p. 16 (only monks)

Latins do not venerate relics and/or icons (cf. Kolbaba pp. 193–94, 198)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 135 (they do not venerate relics, and some do not venerate icons)
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 156 (they do not venerate icons or keep them in churches)
3. Georgii, p. 88 (they do not venerate relics, and some do not venerate icons)
4. Feodosii, p. 16
5. PVL, col. 114 (combined with accusation that Latins draw crosses on the floor in church; followed by a confused defence of iconodulia)

Latin monks eat lard as well as other forbidden meats (cf. Kolbaba p. 193)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 131 (and ill monks are given meat)
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 158 (if monks become bishops, they start eating meat again; ill monks are given meat)
3. Georgii, p. 87

4. Ioann II, p. 35
5. Feodosii, p. 16

Latins add the filioque to the Creed (cf. Kolbaba p. 191)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, pp. 131–32
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 154
3. Georgii, p. 84
4. Ioann II, p. 31, pp. 34–35
5. Feodosii, pp. 16–17

Latins baptise incorrectly (cf. Kolbaba p. 192)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, pp. 133–34 (with one immersion; they sprinkle salt into the mouths of the newly-baptised)
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 156 (with one immersion and no holy oil; they sprinkle salt into the mouths of the newly-baptised; their confirmation service is also incorrect; **baptismal names are names of animals rather than of saints**)
3. Georgii, p. 88 (only one immersion; they sprinkle salt into mouths of newly-baptised; **baptismal names are not saints' names, but are chosen by the child's mother**)
4. Ioann II, p. 31, p. 33 (confirmation can only be carried out by bishops, not other clerics)
5. Feodosii, p. 16 (only one immersion; **baptismal names are the name of the child's parent, not saints**; they sprinkle salt into the mouths of the newly-baptised rather than anointing with holy oil)

Latin bishops and priests fight in battles (cf. Kolbaba p. 193)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 133
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 155
3. Georgii, p. 86
4. Feodosii, p. 16

Latins misuse the sign of the Cross when entering church (cf. Kolbaba p. 194)

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 156 (Latins prostrate themselves when entering church, whisper to themselves, and draw a cross on the floor)
2. Georgii, p. 89 (they trample on holy images in church)

3. Feodosii, p. 16 (Latins draw a cross on the floor, then trample it when they stand up)
4. PVL, col. 114 (they bow down, draw a cross on the floor and kiss it, then stand on it and wipe it away)

Latins marry within forbidden degrees (cf. Kolbaba p. 192)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 133 (if a Latin's wife dies, he takes her sister in marriage)
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 158 (multiple marriages between the same two families)
3. Georgii, p. 83 (if a Latin's wife dies, he takes her sister in marriage)
4. Feodosii, p. 16 (a pair of brothers will marry a pair of sisters)

Latins do not keep the altar pure and allow everyone to approach it (cf. Kolbaba p. 195)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 135 (failing to maintain a distinction between what is clean and unclean)
2. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 156
3. Georgii, p. 89 (failing to maintain a distinction between clean and unclean)

Latins eat and drink extremely impure substances (cf. Kolbaba pp. 198, 201)

1. Georgii, p. 87 (eating with dogs, letting them lick the plates and then eating off them again)
2. Georgii, Canonical Answers, p. 240 (implicit in Georgii's warning that Orthodox should not share food, drink or vessels with Latins)
3. Feodosii, p. 16 (eating with dogs and cats; drinking their own urine)

Latin bishops wear rings on their fingers (cf. Kolbaba p. 194)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 133
2. Georgii, p. 83

Latin burial practices are incorrect (cf. Kolbaba p. 195)

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, pp. 157–58 (they wait eight days before burying a bishop so that all of his flock can come and give him honour; they do not arrange his arms in the shape of the cross; they fill his eyes, nostrils and ears with wax)
2. Feodosii, p. 16 (they bury corpses facing west, and do not cross arms over chest)

Latins shave their heads and beards (cf. Kolbaba p. 195)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 131
2. Georgii, p. 83

Latin priests kiss other communicants after receiving the body of Christ (cf. Kolbaba p. 195)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 133
2. Georgii, p. 84

Latins celebrate the Liturgy more than once per day in a single church (cf. Kolbaba p. 195)

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 158
2. Georgii, p. 84 (and they perform neither the Great Entrance nor the Little Entrance, and they bury people near the altar, and they perform the liturgy not just at the altar but all around the church)

Latins do not ask for absolution from God, but pay priests to absolve them (cf. Kolbaba p. 200; only in one Byzantine text)

1. Feodosii, p. 16
2. PVL, col. 116 ('this is worst of all')

Latins add the words 'with the Holy Spirit' to the Gloria (cf. Kolbaba p. 196)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 132
2. Georgii, p. 84

Latins do not accept certain of the Fathers of the Church (Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom) (cf. Kolbaba p. 196)

1. Nikifor to Vladimir Monomakh, p. 135
2. Georgii, p. 88

Latins do not sing the Alleluia in Lent (cf. Kolbaba p. 193)

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 157

Latins do not call Mary the Mother of God, just 'Holy Mary' (cf. Kolbaba p. 194)

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 156

Latins make the sign of the Cross incorrectly, with five fingers (cf. Kolbaba p. 194)

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 157

Latins say that only Latin, Greek and Hebrew should be used to praise God (cf. Kolbaba p. 197)

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, p. 157

Latins use pure wine rather than wine mixed with water in the Eucharist, like the Armenians

1. Nikifor to Iaroslav, pp. 163–64 (not included in list of accusations, but added to end of text; this is in the Byzantine tract by Constantine Stilbes, but again, not in the body of the list itself)²

Latins accuse Orthodox monks of eating foods not fit for monks to eat (pig fat, eggs, etc.)

1. **Georgii, p. 90**

Latins call the earth their mother, thereby implying that the heavens are their father; but they spit on their 'mother' and so defile her

1. **PVL, col. 114**

² Kolbaba, *The Byzantine Lists*, p. 135.

Appendix Three: Latins in the Chronicles of Early Rus

- This appendix gives brief details of all entries before 1330 from the Laurentian, Hypatian or Younger Novgorod First chronicles which mention Latins.
 - Under the umbrella term ‘Latin’, I include the Old Slavonic terms: ‘Latins’, ‘Romans’, ‘*nemtsi*’ (‘people of Germanic origin’, roughly), ‘Franks’, ‘Poles’, ‘Hungarians’, ‘Czechs’, ‘Croats’, ‘Moravians’, ‘Prussians’, ‘Rigans’, ‘Swedes’, ‘Gotlanders’, ‘Danes’, ‘Varangians’, ‘Lithuanians’ (from the thirteenth century), ‘Templar Knights / God’s Knights’ (крижевѣникъ тепличь, божии дворянинъ; members of various Latin military orders), ‘foreigners’ (иноплеменьникъ, чужеземьць, when referent is clearly a Latin), ‘from overseas’ (изъ заморія, заморьскыи, when referent is clearly a Latin), ‘from the western land’ (отъ западныя страны).
 - I do not include early chronicle mentions of these groups before they were Christianised. For instance, I exclude ninth- and early tenth-century references to ‘Hungarian’ nomads.
 - I include all mentions of the Varangians from the ninth century onwards, even though the Christianisation of Scandinavia was only in its early stages in this period.
 - I include mentions of Lithuania from the 1250s onwards. This is the period when certain Lithuanians begin to be referred to as Christians in the chronicles.
- I also include chronicle references to Latin individuals and to lands, regions or towns under Latin control.
- All dates are as given in the chronicles concerned, even when these dates are historically inaccurate.
- Page or column numbers are given in brackets.
- Proper names with variant spellings are not standardised (so e.g. ‘Vladimir’, ‘Volodimir’ and ‘Volodimer’ are all used, depending on the spelling used in the relevant chronicle entry). I make an exception for proper nouns affected by *ts’okanie*, where the affected consonant is transliterated as *ch* not *ts*, hence e.g. ‘Volodimir Riurikovich’ not ‘Volodimir Riurikovits’.

Novgorod First Chronicle¹

Younger version

6362 (854): Varangians are driven out by their tributaries, but later invited back. Rurik, Sineus and Truvor take control in Novgorod, Beloozero and Izborsk. Rus received its name from these Varangians, and Novgorodians are ‘of Varangian stock’ to this day (106).

Rurik assumes sole rule. His son Igor and *voevoda* Oleg kill Askold and Dir and assume power in Kiev (107).

6429 (921): Igor and Oleg assemble many troops, including Varangians (108).

6488 (980): Vladimir takes first Novgorod and then Polotsk with Varangian troops (125).

Iaropolk is murdered by two Varangians (127).

The Varangians who helped Vladimir take Kiev demand tribute. Eventually he awards some of them towns, and the rest disperse and settle in the Greek land (127–28).

One of the pagan Vladimir’s wives is Czech (128).

6489 (981): Vladimir attacks the Poles, and takes Peremyshl, Cherven and other towns which remain under Russian control (130).

6491 (983): The tale of the martyred Varangians: two Christian Varangians from Greece are murdered when a father refuses to sacrifice his son (130).

6492 (984): Vladimir conquers the Radimichians, who are ‘of the race of the Poles’ (131).

6494 (986): Vladimir is visited by representatives of various faiths, including *nemtsi* sent by the Pope (132–33). A Greek philosopher warns Vladimir against the Latins, who use azymes (134).

6495 (987): The Testing of the Faiths: Vladimir’s envoys experience the worship of various faiths, including a visit to a church of the *nemtsi*, which leaves them unimpressed (149).

6496 (988): Vladimir converts and is taught the Creed. There follow accounts of the ecumenical councils and a denunciation of Latins (154–55).

6501 (993): Vladimir attacks the Croats (165).

6504 (996): Vladimir is living in peace with the princes around him: Boleslav the Pole, Stepan the Hungarian and the Czech Andrekhl (167).

¹ PSRL 3.

6523 (1015): Iaroslav, ruling in Novgorod, hires Varangians to defend him from his father Vladimir (168).

Georgii, Boris's loyal Hungarian servant, is murdered along with his master, who is killed by two Varangians in the pay of Sviatopolk (171).

6524 (1016): Sviatopolk flees to the Poles (174).

Iaroslav is responsible for the many Varangians in Novgorod, who are doing violence to married women. The Novgorodians attack the Varangians, and Iaroslav takes revenge upon them for this (174).

Iaroslav goes against Sviatopolk in Kiev with 1000 Varangians and 3000 Novgorodians (175).

Older version

6515 (1017): Iaroslav goes to Berestia (15).

6576–77 (1068–69): Iziaslav Iaroslavich flees to the Poles and then returns with reinforcements (17).

6581 (1073): Iziaslav is driven out to the Poles again (18).

6627 (1119): The church (*tserky*) of Anton [Antonii the Roman, mentioned also s.a. 6633, 6635, 6639, 6655] is completed (21).

6630 (1122): Mstislav's Swedish wife Kristina (Ingesdotter) dies (21).

6633 (1125): Antonii the Roman's chapel (*bozhnitsa*) is painted (21).

6638 (1130): Seven Gotlander boats are sunk at sea, but Danish boats arrive safely (22).

6650 (1142): A Swedish prince and bishop commanding 60 boats attack a group of merchants coming from overseas in three boats (26).

6660 (1152): A Varangian church burns down (29).

6664 (1156): 'People from overseas' erect the Church of the Holy Friday (30).

6672 (1164): Swedes attempt to take Ladoga, but are defeated (31).

6689 (1181): A Varangian church is damaged by fire (37).

6696 (1188): Varangians plunder the Novgorodians in Gotland; *nemtsi* plunder them in Khoruzhek and Novotorzhets. The next spring, no envoys are sent to the Varangians, and they are dismissed without reaching an agreement (39).

6709 (1201): Varangians are sent back over the sea without peace, but they return by land later that year and receive peace on the Novgorodians' terms (45).

6711 (1203): Rurik Rostislavich, the Olgovichi and Cumans attack Kiev. Foreign merchants lock themselves up in the churches and are granted their lives, but lose half of their merchandise (45).

6712 (1204): The sack of Constantinople. 'Isakovich' [the son of Isaakios II Angelos] escapes from Constantinople and requests aid from 'tsar Philip [of Swabia]' and the Pope. These two send Franks to Constantinople, ordering them to do no damage to the Greek land. But the Franks lust after gold and silver, and they destroy many sites in Constantinople. Isakovich expels both Oleksa [Alexios Angelos], the current emperor, and his own father. He wants to bring his Franks into the town, but the boyars are afraid and give 'Murchuf' [Alexis V Doukas, 'Mourtzouphlos'] the crown. The new ruler and his boyars kill Isakovich and tell the Franks to come and see him. The Franks are ashamed because they have disobeyed the Tsar and Pope and have harmed Constantinople. They try to redeem themselves by attacking the town. Eventually, the Franks take it, after fighting against the Greeks and Varangians. They strip many churches, rob and murder Constantinopolitans, and drive out the remaining Greeks and Varangians. Baldwin 'Kondoflandr' [=Count of Flanders], a 'Latin', is appointed Tsar by the Franks 'with their own bishops' (46–49).

6715 (1207): 'People from overseas' complete the Church of the Holy Friday (50).

6723 (1215): Some Prussians kill Ovstrat and his son Lugota, and Iaroslav Vsevolodovich complains to the Novgorodians about this (54).

6725 (1217): When the Novgorodians halt before Medvezhia Golova, the Chud send for the *nemtsi*. In battle, the *nemtsi* flee; some are killed or captured (57).

Fire destroys 'all the countless Varangian wares' in the 'Varangian church (*bozhnitsa*)' (57).

6726 (1218): Tverdislav, suspected of betraying Matei to the prince, goes to the Liudin end and the Prussians; a Prussian man is killed (58–59).

6727 (1219): Mstislav Mstislavich and Volodimir Riurikovich go to Galich to fight against the son of the king of Hungary; the Galicians, Czechs, Poles, Moravians and Hungarians oppose them (59).

Novgorodians under Vsevolod Mstislavich attack outposts of *nemtsi*, Lithuanians and Livonians (59).

6728 (1220): Tverdislav is protected by the Prussians and the 'Liudin end' (60).

6732 (1224): *Nemtsi* kill Viachko Borisovich and take Iuriev [Dorpat] (61).

6736 (1228): Iaroslav Vsevolodich is insulted in Pskov and decides to attack Riga with troops from Pereiaslavl. The Pskovians are afraid and ask the Rigans for help if Novgorod attacks Pskov. Pskov

refuses to support Iaroslav, and so Novgorod also refuses to fight. Pskov had summoned *nemtsi* and others, but dismisses them against once the danger is over (66).

6738 (1230): A common grave is established in 'Prussian Street' (70).

6739 (1231): God is merciful, sending *nemtsi* 'from over the sea' with corn and flour in a famine (71).

6741 (1233): Izborsk drive out Iaroslav Volodimirich, the children of Boris and the *nemtsi*. The Pskovians surround Izborsk and kill one of the *nemtsi*, Danila (72).

Nemtsi drive out Kiuril Sinkinich and take him to Medvezhia Golova, where he is imprisoned until rescued by Iaroslav Vsevolodich (72).

6742 (1234): Novgorodians under Iaroslav attack the *nemtsi*, laying waste to the land around Iurev-Dorpat. *Nemtsi* defend Iurev and Medvezhia Golova, but are eventually defeated. Iaroslav concludes a peace with them on his own terms (72–73).

6743 (1235): After a series of conflicts between Rusian princes, the princes take money from the *nemtsi* to ransom Volodimir Riurikovich and his wife, whom the Cumans have captured (74).

6745 (1237): *Nemtsi* come in a great force from overseas to Riga. These *nemtsi*, the Rigans, the Chud and a Pskovian force all attack the Lithuanians, but are defeated by the 'godless pagans' (74).

6748 (1240): Swedes arrive in many ships with their prince and bishops, intending to take Ladoga. God protects Novgorod 'from the foreigners': they are roundly defeated by Aleksandr Nevskii and the men of Novgorod and Ladoga (77).

Nemtsi, along with men of Medvezhia Golova, Iurev and Veliad, take Izborsk and then defeat the Pskovians too. They do not take Pskov, but do take Pskovian hostages; Pskov had been in talks with the *nemtsi*, and Tverdilo Ivankovich had begun to rule Pskov in tandem with them (77–78).

Nemtsi also attack the Vod and exact tribute from them, and make a fort in Koporia. They come within 30 versts of Novgorod, attacking merchants. While the Novgorodians are attempting to get Aleksandr back to lead them, the *nemtsi* and Chud invade the Novgorodian district (78).

6749 (1241): Aleksandr attacks Koporia. He takes the town, and captures some *nemtsi* (78).

6750 (1242): Aleksandr attacks the *nemtsi* and Chud, who have already taken Pskov. He liberates Pskov, and draws up his forces at 'the Chud lake'. Many *nemtsi* and Chud fall there or are captured. The *nemtsi* later send to Aleksandr, informing him that they are withdrawing from the Vod land, Luga, Pskov and Lotygola, and hostages are exchanged (78–79).

6761 (1253): *Nemtsi* attack Pskov, but flee when Novgorodian reinforcements arrive. These Novgorodians decide they will pillage the *nemtsi* district beyond the Narova. The 'accursed

transgressors of right' are defeated again by the combined forces of Novgorod and Pskov later in the year (80).

6764 (1256): Swedes, along with the Em and Sum and 'Didman and his district', start to erect a town on the Narova, but flee when they hear the Novgorodians are coming (81).

6770 (1262): Dmitri Aleksandrovich and the Novgorodians attack well-fortified Iurev alongside various other princes and troops (83).

6771 (1263): Mindovg is murdered. His murderers take Polotsk (84).

6773 (1265): Voishelg converts to Christianity. He leaves his monastery to defeat the 'pagan Lithuanians' and take Lithuania. Some Lithuanians escape to Pskov and are baptised there (84–85).

6776 (1268): Certain Novgorodians wish to attack Lithuania, but they eventually go to Rakovor instead. *Nemtsi* send deceitful envoys from Riga, Veliad and Iurev, who assure the Novgorodians that they will not offer any resistance to the Rus at Rakovor. Novgorodians and many Rusian princes defeat the Chud, but discover a great force of treacherous *nemtsi* at the river Kegola, near Rakovor. There is a terrible battle with 'the whole land of the *nemtsi*', 'accursed transgressors of the Cross' (86–87).

6777 (1269): *Nemtsi* attack Pskov in a great force, fleeing when they learn that the Novgorodians are coming (87).

Iaroslav Iaroslavich complains about the Novgorodians' bloody conflicts with the *nemtsi* (87–88).

In the winter, many princes come together to attack Kolyvan from Novgorod, but the *nemtsi* submit to their terms and withdraw from all the Narova region (87–88).

6778 (1270): One of the Novgorodians' grievances against Iaroslav is: 'Why are you expelling the men from other lands who live among us?' (88).

Younger version

6783 (1275): A fire that broke out near the court of the *nemtsi* damages a church of the *nemtsi* (323).

6791 (1283): *Nemtsi* arrive at Ladoga with troops, killing Novgorodian merchants; the men of Ladoga resist them (325).

6792 (1284): A force of *nemtsi* attempt to subdue the Korel, but the Novgorodians defeat them (325).

6793 (1285): Lithuanians attack the Novgorodian region (326).

6800 (1292): Swedes attack the Korel and Izhera, but are killed or captured (327).

6801 (1293): Swedes establish a town on Korel land; Roman Glebovich and a Novgorodian force attack the town later in the year (327–28).

6802 (1294): ‘Titmanovich’ [=son of Dietmann] secretly erects a fort on the Novgorodian side of the Narova. Novgorodians burn it and his ‘large village’ down (328).

6803 (1295): Swedes under Sig erect a town [Priozersk/Keksholm] in Korel land, but the Novgorodians plunder it and kill Sig (328).

6806 (1298): *Nemtsi* do ‘much evil’ in Pskov, killing monks and burning the town, but Dovmont and the men of Pskov drive them away (329).

Older version

6807 (1299): Fire in the ‘Varangian Street’ damages the ‘court of the *nemtsi*’ (90).

6808 (1300): Swedes establish a strong town on the Neva; they bring ‘a special master from great Rome, from the Pope’ (91).

6809 (1301): Grand Prince Andrei Aleksandrovich and the Novgorodians attack the Swedish town and sack it (91).

6810 (1302): Envoys are sent over the sea to Denmark to conclude a peace (91).

6819 (1311): Novgorodians go overseas to the land of the *nemtsi* to fight the Em. *Nemtsi* retreat inside the *detinets* at Vanai while the Novgorodians plunder the surrounding land, refusing to agree to peace and eventually returning to Novgorod (93).

A Varangian church burns down (93).

6821 (1313): *Nemtsi* attack the people of Ladoga and burn the area (94).

6822 (1314): The Korel kill off the Rusian inhabitants of Priozersk and bring in *nemtsi* instead. The Novgorodians retaliate, killing the *nemtsi* and the Korelian traitors (94).

6825 (1317): *Nemtsi* come to Ladoga and kill many merchants (95).

6826 (1318): Novgorodians take Liuderev, the town of the prince and bishop of the Sum (95).

6830 (1322): *Nemtsi* try to take Priozersk, but fail (96).

Iurii Danilovich accompanies the Novgorodians to ‘Vybor’, a ‘town of the *nemtsi*’, but fails to take the town despite besieging it for a month (96).

6831 (1323): Novgorodians establish a town at the mouth of the Neva on the island of Orekhov, and conclude an eternal peace with the ambassadors of the king of the Swedes (97).

Lithuanians ravage the area around the Lovot, but are expelled by the Novgorodians (97).

6834 (1326): Envoys from Lithuania and various Rusian princes conclude a peace with Novgorod and with the *nemtsi* (98).

6836 (1328): Iurev burns down, and its churches (*bozhnitsi*) are destroyed. Thousands of *nemtsi* and four Rus die (98).

PVL (Povest vremennykh let, Primary Chronicle), Laurentian Codex²

Introduction: A description of the route from the Varangians to the Greeks, taking in Rome. St. Andrew is said to have travelled to Rome along the Dnieper (7–9).

6367 (859): Varangians impose tribute on Slavonic tribes from beyond the sea (19).

6370 (862): Varangians are driven out by their tributaries, who later ask the ‘Rusian Varangians’ (as opposed to the Gotlanders, Angles, etc.) back. Rurik, Sineus and Truvor arrive, and the Rusian land receives its name (19–20).

6390 (882): Oleg takes Varangians and others to capture Smolensk, Liubech and Kiev; those who accompany him are called ‘Rus’. He obliges Novgorod to pay tribute to the Varangians (22–23).

6406 (898): The newly Christianised Slavs of Moravia ask for a teacher, understanding neither Greek nor Latin (26). Some decry the translation of Scripture into a language other than Hebrew, Greek or Latin, but the ‘Roman Pope’ condemns them (27).

6415 (907): Oleg attacks Constantinople with an army including Varangians, Croats and many more (29).

6449 (941): Igor sends for Varangians (45).

6450 (942): The Croats are defeated by Simeon (45).

6452 (944): Igor’s allies against Constantinople include Varangians (45–47); many of the Varangian witnesses to Igor’s treaty are Christians (54).

² PSRL 1.

- 6485 (977): Vladimir attacks first Novgorod and then Polotsk with Varangian aid (75–76).
Varangians want a share in ‘their’ town which they won (78–79).
- 6488 (980): One of the wives of the pagan Vladimir is a Czech woman (80).
- 6489 (981): Vladimir takes Polish towns, ‘which even now are under Russian [control]’ (81).
- 6491 (983): The tale of the Varangian martyrs (82–83).
- 6492 (984): Vladimir conquers the Radimichians, who are ‘of the race of the Poles’ (84).
- 6494 (986): Vladimir is visited by representatives of various faiths, including *nemtsi* sent by the Pope (85). A Greek philosopher warns Vladimir against the Latins, who use azymes (86–87).
- 6495 (987): The Testing of the Faiths: Vladimir’s envoys experience the worship of various faiths, including a visit to a church of the *nemtsi* (107), which leaves them unimpressed (108).
- 6496 (988): Vladimir converts and is taught the Creed. There follow accounts of the ecumenical councils and a denunciation of Latins (112–16).
- 6500 (992): Vladimir attacks the Croats (122).
- 6504 (996): After his conversion, Vladimir ‘lived in peace with the princes around him: Boleslav the Pole, Stefan the Hungarian and Andrikh the Czech’ (126).
- 6523 (1015): Iaroslav, ruling in Novgorod, hires Varangians to defend him from his father Vladimir (130).
- Georgii, Boris’s loyal Hungarian servant, is murdered along with his master, who is killed by two Varangians in the pay of Sviatopolk (134).
- Sviatopolk murders Sviatoslav, who has fled to Hungary (139).
- Iaroslav’s Varangians do violence to the Novgorodians, who kill them in retaliation (140).
- Iaroslav attacks Sviatopolk with a thousand Varangians and other troops (141).
- 6524 (1016): Sviatopolk flees to the Poles (142).
- 6526 (1018): Sviatopolk and Boleslav with his Poles attack Iaroslav, Rus, Varangians and Slovenes (142). A *voevoda* taunts Boleslav (143). Boleslav enters Kiev with Sviatopolk and sends his *druzhdina* out to the surrounding towns (143).
- Novgorodians insist that Iaroslav continue to fight against Boleslav and Sviatopolk, and more Varangians are hired (143). Sviatopolk murders Poles in Kiev, and Boleslav flees, taking with him many men, property and the Cherven towns (144).

Sviatopolk, driven through Poland by divine wrath, dies in the wilderness 'between Poland and the Czech land' (145).

6532 (1024): Iaroslav fights alongside Iakun the Blind and his Varangians against Mstislav Vladimirovich (148–49).

6538 (1030): Boleslav of Poland dies and the Poles rebel (149–50).

6539 (1031): Iaroslav and Mstislav [of Chernigov] go against the Poles, recapture the Cherven towns, capture many Poles and take them to Rus (150).

6544 (1036): Iaroslav defends Kiev with Varangians (151).

6549 (1041): Iaroslav attacks the Mazovians (153).

6551 (1043): Iaroslav marries his sister to Kazimir (154–55).

6555 (1047): Iaroslav subdues the Mazovians on Kazimir's behalf (155).

6576 (1068): Iziaslav Iaroslavich flees to the Poles (171).

6577 (1069): Iziaslav and Boleslav attack Vseslav Briacheslavich in Kiev. Other princes discourage Iziaslav from attacking Kiev with Poles. The Kievans welcome him. Iziaslav then dismisses the Poles to find food and has them murdered (173–74).

6581 (1073): Iziaslav attempts to buy help from Poles, but he is robbed and turned out of Poland (183).

6582 (1074): A demon in the guise of a Pole appears during a service at the Caves (190).

Iziaslav returns from Poland (193).

6583 (1075): *Nemtsi* envoys are unimpressed by Sviatoslav Iaroslavich's riches (198–99).

6584 (1076): Vladimir Vsevolodich and Oleg Sviatoslavich aid the Poles against the Czechs (199).

6585 (1077): Iziaslav marches on Kiev, with Polish support (199).

6593 (1085): Iaropolk Iziaslavich escapes to the Poles (205).

6594 (1086): Iaropolk returns from the Poles (206).

6600 (1092): Vasilko Rostislavich and the Cumans attack the Poles (215).

6604 (1096): Testament of Vladimir Monomakh: Vladimir makes peace with the Poles at Suteisk, and spends time in Poland and the 'Czech forest' (247).

6605 (1097): Vasilko Rostislavich was intending to invade Poland, and believes (after the Liubech conference) that he will now be given up to the Poles (266). Both Sviatopolk Iziaslavich and David Igorevich seek aid from the Poles, with the former going to Brest and the latter to Volodislav (269). David's Poles are bought off by Sviatopolk. David flees to Poland (269).

Sviatopolk sends Iaroslav his son to incite the Hungarians against Volodar; he returns with Hungarians and besieges Peremyshl (270).

David has returned from Poland and attacks the Hungarians with Cuman troops (270–71).

Iaroslav flees to the Poles (271).

6607 (1099): Sviatopolk drives David into Poland, and the Hungarians are defeated near Peremyshl (273).

6610 (1102): Sviatopolk's daughter Sbylava is sent to the Poles to marry Boleslav (276).

6612 (1104): Peredslava, Sviatopolk's daughter, marries a Hungarian prince (280).

6614 (1106): Sviatopolk takes in Izbygniev [Zbygniew], brother of Boleslav (281).

Vladimir-Suzdal chronicle³

6627 (1119): Iaroslavets Sviatopolchich flees from Volodimer-in-Volynia to the Poles (292).

6630 (1122): The Poles capture Volodar Rostislavich of Peremyshl, brother of Vasilko (292).

6646 (1138): Iaropolk Vladimirovich of Kiev collects troops from many areas of Rus and Hungary (305).

6650 (1142): Vsevolod Olgovich of Kiev sends his son Sviatoslav, Iziaslav Davydovich and Volodimer of Galich to help Volodislav against the Boleslavichi; they meet and fight at Chrnsk [modern-day Czernsk] (310).

6652 (1144): Volodimerko of Galich allies with Hungarians against Vsevolod Olgovich (311).

6653 (1145): Igor Olgovich and his brothers attack the Poles in support of other princes (312).

6657 (1149): Iziaslav Mstislavich is supported by Hungarians and Poles, including Boleslav and his brother Endrikh. Poles and Hungarians take fright and abandon Iziaslav because not all of their

³ PSRL 1.

number are present yet (323). During a battle in Lutsk, a *nemchich* [one of the *nemtsi*] tries to kill Andrei Iurevich Bogoliubskii (325).

6658 (1150): Iziaslav, frustrated by his troops' cowardice, says he will reach Kiev with Hungarians and Poles (327). Later, he says, 'I have no patrimony among the Hungarians or the Poles, but only in the land of Rus' (329). He sends for Hungarians and Poles to help him take Kiev (329).

6659 (1151): Iziaslav has sent his son Mstislav to the Hungarians, to garner support (332, 335). When Mstislav and the Hungarians are camped near Sapogyn, they learn that Volodimerko is coming after them (335). Drunk, they boast of their strength, but are roundly defeated by Volodimerko (336).

6660 (1152): Iziaslav again sends Mstislav to the Poles and Hungarians asking for help against Volodimerko. The Poles refuse but the Hungarians agree (336–37). The Hungarian king does not fight on Sundays, 'according to his custom' (336–37). The next day, a battle takes place. Overcome by the forces of the Hungarians and Iziaslav, Volodimerko sues for peace; Iziaslav does not wish to be reconciled, but the Hungarian king persuades him (337).

6662 (1154): Cumans destroy a Polish church (*bozhnitsa*) (344).

6663 (1155): Mstislav Iziaslavich goes to the Poles when ousted from Luchesk [Lutsk] (345).

6668 (1160): Andrei Bogoliubskii brings 'masters from every land' (perhaps including *nemtsi*, although this is not specified) to beautify the Cathedral of the Dormition (351).

6683 (1175): Iaroslav Iziaslavich taxes all of Kiev, including Latins (367).

6702 (1194): The reconstruction of the Church of the Dormition in Vladimir is completed 'without searching for masters from the *nemtsi*; rather, he [Vsevolod Iurevich] found masters from the Servants of the Mother of God and from our own people' (411).

6714 (1206): Roman Mstislavich of Galich takes two Polish towns, but he and his small druzhina are murdered by Poles (425).

Many Russian princes descend on Galich. The inhabitants send to the king of Hungary for protection. The Hungarians eventually leave again after reconciling the Poles (426–27).

6729 (1221): Mstislav Mstislavich fights the Hungarians and captures their prince (445).

6747 (1239): The princes of Chernigov escape to the Hungarians when attacked by the Tatars (469).

6749 (1241): The Tatars defeat the Hungarians (470).

6750 (1242): Iaroslav Vsevolodovich sends his son Andrei to Novgorod to help Aleksandr Nevskii against the *nemtsi*. They are defeated 'on a lake beyond Pskov' (470).

6771 (1263): Part of the *Tale of the Life of Aleksandr Nevskii*, including his battle against the ‘Roman’ Swedes (477–81).

6793 (1285): Lithuanians attack Tver, but are repulsed (483).

6810 (1302): Grand Prince Andrei Aleksandrovich attacks *nemtsi* from Novgorod; he takes a *nemtsi* fortress and kills and captures many *nemtsi* (486).

Kiev chronicle⁴

6619 (1111): Rusian princes return from their campaign against the Cumans ‘with great glory, [with news travelling] to their people and all the far countries, to the Greeks and the Hungarians and the Poles and the Czechs. It reached as far as Rome, to the glory of God’ (273).

6620 (1112): Evfimiia Volodimerna, daughter of Vladimir Monomakh, is sent to Hungary to marry the prince [Kalman I] (273).

6626 (1118): Iaroslav Sviatopolchich flees from Volodimer-in-Volynia to the Hungarians when attacked by Vladimir Monomakh (285).

6628 (1120): Vladimir Monomakh sends his son Andrei against the Poles (286).

6629 (1121): Iaroslav Sviatopolchich returns with Poles to Cherven, but achieves nothing (286).

6630 (1122): The Poles capture Volodar Rostislavich [prince of Zvenigorod and Peremyshl] by cunning (286).

6631 (1123): Iaroslav Sviatopolchich and the Poles and Czechs and Hungarians surround Volodimer-in-Volynia, where Vladimir Monomakh’s son Andrei is. Two Poles kill sinful Iaroslav ‘for his great pride’. The Hungarians and Poles return home (287).

6645 (1137): Vsevolod Mstislavich marries his daughter Verkhuslava to a Pole (300).

6647 (1139): The Hungarian king sends support to Iaropolk Vladimirovich against Vsevolod Olgovich, prince of Chernigov (301).

6648 (1140): Poles return home after a Galician-Volynian conflict (306).

6649 (1141): Vsevolod Olgovich’s daughter is sent to the Poles to be married (308).

6650 (1142): Vsevolod sends his daughter Zvenislava away to the Poles, to marry Boleslav (313).

⁴ PSRL 2.

6651 (1143): ‘All the brothers gathered, and the godless Poles, and they drank with Vsevolod [Olgovich], and then went home’ (313). Presumably a celebration of Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich’s marriage to Vasilkovna of Polotsk.

6652 (1144): Many Rusian princes, along with Volodislav of Poland, attack Volodimirko of Galich and his Hungarian allies and make him submit to Vsevolod (315).

6653 (1145): The Polish king Volodislav attempts to stir up trouble between Vsevolod and Igor Olgovich (318). Igor and other princes go ‘into the heart of the Polish land’, where two brothers of Volodislav, Boleslav and Mzheka [Mieszko], swear allegiance to Igor and give him Wizna (318).

Volodislav of Poland mutilates his man Petruk and exiles him to Rus; Petruk is the man who tortured and robbed Volodar Rostislavich in 1122 (319).

6654 (1146): Rusian princes under Vsevolod go to Galich along with Boleslav of Poland, the son-in-law of Vsevolod, to fight Volodimirko (319).

6655 (1147): Cumans attack part of Hungary (342).

6656 (1148): Iziaslav Davydovich uses Hungarian troops against Chernigov; some of his Hungarians drown (362).

Iziaslav Mstislavich and his brother Rostislav give each other gifts, Iziaslav ‘from the Rusian lands and all the imperial lands’, and Rostislav ‘from the upper lands and from the Varangians’ (369).

6657 (1149): Iziaslav Mstislavich sends to his relatives among the Hungarians, Poles and Czechs for aid against Iurii Dolgorukii and Viacheslav Vladimirovich. They willingly send support, and the Polish prince Boleslav knights many boyars’ sons (386). However, various obstacles arise, including a Prussian invasion of Poland. Iziaslav and his Polish and Hungarian allies therefore attempt a reconciliation between Iziaslav and Iurii, telling Iurii, ‘We are all Christians in God and one brotherhood’ (387). Iurii and Viacheslav reply that if the Poles and Hungarians wish for a reconciliation, they should return to their own lands. When the Poles and Hungarians have returned home, enmity breaks out again (388).

6658 (1150): Iziaslav Mstislavich is abandoned by his troops when he is about to fight Volodimer of Galich, and says he will finish his journey ‘with Hungarians and Poles’ (401). Iziaslav says: ‘I have no patrimony in Hungary or Poland [lit. ‘with the Hungarians or the Poles’], but only in the land of Rus’ (405). Iziaslav then sends his brother to the Hungarians (405) and the king of Hungary agrees to fight alongside him. Volodimer of Galich’s Hungarian acquaintances eventually convince the king to turn back (406).

Iziaslav’s brother marries a Hungarian princess (407) and they are both at peace with Hungary.

Iziaslav, his brother Volodimer and their Hungarian allies all march on Kiev. Inhabitants of Dorogobuzh, part of Iziaslav's former patrimony, complain that Iziaslav brings 'foreigner Hungarians' with him (410). Iziaslav consults with the Hungarians, who profess their loyalty to him and willingness to ride to Kiev (413–14). Iziaslav enters Kiev as Grand Prince, ousting Iurii Dolgorukii, and feasts with the Hungarians (416). The Kievans are amazed at all the Hungarians congregating in Iaroslav's court (416).

6659 (1151): Iziaslav and Viacheslav (his uncle and co-ruler) do the Hungarians great honour, then dismiss them (419–20). Mstislav, Iziaslav's son, is sent to the Hungarians (420, 425–26). The Hungarian king sends help to Iziaslav and Viacheslav with Mstislav (434). Mstislav sets up camp near Sapogyn, where he discovers that Volodimer of Galich is coming after him (441–42). The drunken Hungarians boast of their strength, but are defeated; Mstislav flees to Lutsk with his druzhina (442).

6660 (1152): Mstislav is sent to the Hungarians again to ask for help against Volodimer of Galich (446); a battle takes place (448–49). Hungarians do not fight on Sundays, according to their custom (448). The wounded Volodimer begs the Hungarian king and Iziaslav to forgive him, promising his loyalty; Iziaslav does not wish to pardon him, despite the encouragement of the Hungarian king, who has been persuaded by his archbishop and voevody. The Hungarian king narrates the acquisition of a piece of the Cross by Stefan of Hungary (repeated by Petr Borislavich, col. 462) (451–52).

6662 (1154): the Polish church (*bozhnitsa*) in Pereiaslavl is burned down by the Cumans (476).

6663 (1155): Volodimer Mstislavich sends his mother to the Hungarian king (482).

6664 (1156): Volodimer flees to the Hungarian king, having been robbed by Mstislav Iziaslavich (485).

6665 (1157): Volodimer Mstislavich returns from the Hungarians to fight with other princes against Mstislav Iziaslavich (486).

6667 (1159): Iaroslav of Galich talks the princes of Rus, the king of Hungary and the Polish princes into helping him against Ivan Rostislavich; all agree to send troops (497).

6669 (1161): Andrei Bogoliubskii brings 'masters from every land' (perhaps including *nemtsi*, although this is not specified) to beautify the Cathedral of the Dormition (512).

6671 (1163): Poles make war around Cherven (522).

6675 (1167): Volodislav the Pole is sent against the Cumans with troops (526).

6677 (1169): Mstislav Iziaslavich sends to Galich and the Poles for help when he is about to take the Kievan throne (533).

6680 (1172): Mstislav sends Volodislav the Pole (again) with the Cumans (549).

6681 (1173): A princess [the wife of Iaroslav Vladimirovich] flees from Galich to the Poles with many boyars (564).

6682 (1174): Princes flee, 'some to Galich, some to the Hungarians, some to Riazan', etc. (567). Volodislav the Pole is captured by the Rostislavichi, one of whom is about to take Kiev (570).

Iaroslav of Galich calls on the Poles for support (571).

Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich, who is angry that Iaroslav Iziaslavich has just taken the Kievan throne for himself after promising it to him, reminds him, '[I am] neither a Hungarian nor a Pole; rather, we are grandchildren of the same grandfather' (578).

Iaroslav taxes all of Kiev, including Latins (579).

6683 (1175): The Tale of the Murder of Andrei Bogoliubskii: 'If a merchant came from Tsargrad or other countries, from the Russian land, or a Latin, or from all Christendom', he would wonder at the splendour of Vladimir, seeing 'true Christianity' (591).

6687 (1179): Sviatoslav marries his son Vsevolod to Kazimerna of the Poles (612).

6696 (1188): Volodimer Iaroslavich of Galicia, the victim of a plot, asks for aid from the Hungarian king. When Roman Mstislavich, who has taken Galich, hears that the king is coming, he flees to the Poles. The Hungarian king places his son Andrei in Galich, but takes Volodimer back to Hungary, committing a grave sin by going back on his promise; his enemy Roman goes to Kazimir in Poland (660–62).

6697 (1189): The Hungarian king sends to Sviatoslav Vsevolodovich of Kiev for his son (662).

Referring to Galich and its current Hungarian prince, the metropolitan says to Sviatoslav and Riurik Rostislavich, co-ruler with Sviatoslav, 'Look, foreigners have taken away your patrimony!' (663).

The Galicians send for Rostislav Berladnichich from Smolensk to rule them, but the Hungarian king sends troops to support his son (663). Rostislav says, 'I will not trespass into an alien land, but will lay down my head in my patrimony' (665), but Hungarians and Galician traitors kill him. Hungarians punish the Galicians for wanting a Russian prince, raping, pillaging, and stabling horses in their churches (*bozhnitsi*) (665).

6698 (1190): Volodimer Iaroslavich escapes from Hungary and goes to the Tsar of the *nemtsi*, who receives him with love when he realises that Volodimer is a relative of Vsevolod Iurevich of Suzdal (666). He entrusts him to Kazimir and the Poles, permitting him to rule in Galich (666). Volodimer undertakes to pay him tribute. The Galicians meet him joyfully and send away the Hungarian king's son (666). Vsevolod of Suzdal sends to all the princes and the Hungarian king and the Poles and makes them swear not to oust Volodimer (667).

The chronicler reports on the Third Crusade: the ‘Tsar of the *nemtsi* with all his land’ are ‘like the Holy Martyrs’, spilling their blood for Christ (667).

6703 (1195): Roman of Galich goes once more to the Poles for help. The Poles offer their support in return for Roman’s participation in an ultimately disastrous conflict with Mezhka [Mieszko] (686–87).

In a dispute, Iaroslav Vsevolodich and all the Olgovichs agree not to take Kiev while Rurik is alive, but refuse to abandon their ancestral claim to Kiev, telling Rurik that they are neither Hungarians nor Poles, but ‘grandchildren of the same grandfather’ (689).

6705 (1197): Description of a church in Smolensk: ‘There is nothing like it in the northern land [Scandinavia? Or northern Rus?], and all those who come to it are amazed’ (703).

Galician-Volynian chronicle⁵

Galician section

6710 (1202): The Hungarian king has left a garrison in Sanok after Roman Mstislavich’s death at the hands of Poles. The presence of many Hungarians in Galich means that the Galicians do not dare to act when Riurik Rostislavich attacks Galich (717).

Roman’s wife flees to Poland and is received ‘with great honour’ by Lestko, despite the fact that Roman had been killed in Poland (718–19).

6711 (1203): Lestko of Poland and the Hungarian king plan to return Roman’s land to his kin. Roman’s son, Danilo, is sent to Hungary, while Roman’s wife and his other son Vasilko remain in Poland (719).

When a conflict arises between two Igorevich brothers, Roman and Volodimer, Roman defeats Volodimer with Hungarian aid and takes Galich (719–20).

6712 (1204): Oleksandr Vsevolodovich of Belz takes Volodimer-in-Volynia with Lestko of Krakow and Kondrat of Mazowie. Poles attack the town and attempt to destroy the Church of the Mother of God, but are restrained by their leaders. Poles capture Sviatoslav Igorevich and Oleksandr rules in Vladimir (720).

⁵ PSRL 2.

At the same time, the Poles also imprison Volodimer Sviatopolchich (720). Lestko takes Ingvar Iaroslavich of Lutsk's daughter in marriage (720). Citizens of Berestia ask Lestko for Roman's wife and child to rule over them (720–21).

Anna, Roman's wife, complains to Lestko that while Oleksandr holds Volodimer-in-Volynia, her son Vasilko has only Berestia. Vasilko receives Belz from Oleksandr, who had taken it back from Ingvar (721).

Andrei of Hungary learns that Galich is in disarray and sends Benedikt to capture Roman Igorevich and send him to Hungary (721–22).

6714 (1206): The Galicians summon Mstislav Iaroslavich to fight the Hungarian Benedikt, but he is unsuccessful (722).

Roman Igorevich escapes from Hungary, and he and his brother Volodimer advance on Galich. Benedikt flees to Hungary. Volodimer takes Galich, and sends his son with gifts to Hungary (722–23).

King Andrei of Hungary and his boyars plan to marry Andrei's daughter to Danilo (723).

6715 (1207): 'The great Roman tsar Filip' is murdered; his niece Kineka married the powerful Ludovic Lonokrabovich, and is now known as St. Alzhibit because she was a servant of God (723).

6716 (1208): The Igorevichi attempt to dispose of some of the boyars of Galich. Other Galician boyars flee to Hungary, then return with Hungarian forces, hoping to put Danilo on the Galician throne. Having won round the people of Peremyshl, this combined force lays siege to Zvenigorod, where they are joined by reinforcements from Poland and elsewhere. The Hungarians are forced to flee until they are rescued by the Rus, who fight off the Cuman allies of Roman Igorevich. Roman Igorevich is captured. The forces then turn Volodimer Igorevich out of Galich; Galician and Volynian boyars as well as Hungarian voevodas put Danilo on the throne, as was King Andrei's wish. The Hungarians want to take the Igorevichi to Hungary, but instead the Igorevichi are hanged in Galich (723–27).

6717 (1209): The Hungarian king comes to Galich, bringing his sister-in-law, Roman Mstislavich's wife, to discuss events. He says that Roman's wife had been expelled from Galich, and punishes those responsible. There is trouble in Galicia, and Roman's wife and Danilo flee to Hungary (727–28).

6718 (1210): Lestko takes Belz from Roman's relatives and gives it back to Oleksandr (728).

The Hungarian king marches against Galich, but many of his supporters and relatives (including the Patriarch of Aquileia and many *nemtsi*) are attacked by treacherous boyars. The king has to return to

Hungary to suppress a revolt there. The pro-Hungarian Galician boyar Volodislav Kormilichich begins to reign in Galich. Danilo and his mother go back to Poland, and are received by Lestko (729).

6719 (1211): Lestko tries to take Galich with Polish and Rusian troops, but is countered by Volodislav Kormilichich, Hungarians and Czechs. The Poles and Rus prevail, but Lestko cannot take Galich. Instead, he takes many prisoners and returns. Lestko informs the Hungarian king that Galich should not be ruled by a boyar, and suggests that his daughter marry the king's son. Volodislav Kormilichich is captured and dies in exile. The Hungarian king gives Galich to his son, and Peremyshl to Lestko. Lestko acquires Volodimer-in-Volynia for Roman's two sons, Danilo and Vasilko (729–31).

6720 (1212): The king of Hungary takes Peremyshl away from Lestko again. Lestko sends for his 'brother' Mstislav Mstislavich ['the Bold'] in Novgorod, and Mstislav begins to reign in Galich, having met little resistance: the head of the Hungarian garrison in Galich is away in Hungary (731–32).

6721 (1213): Danilo takes Mstislav's daughter in marriage, but Mstislav refuses to turn on Lestko on Danilo's behalf. Danilo takes many towns (Berestia, Ugrovesk, Stolp, etc.) and 'all of the borderland'. Lestko is angry at Danilo, and sends men to attack the land on either side of the River Bug. Danilo sends men against Lestko's troops, and many Poles die. Lestko and the Hungarian king advance upon Peremyshl, thinking that Mstislav had encouraged Danilo to take Berestia. Eventually, this Polish-Hungarian army reaches Galich and drives out Mstislav (732–34).

6723 (1215): Danilo sends for the Lithuanians to attack the Poles who are ravaging the land (735–36).

6725 (1217): Filia and the Hungarians march on Galich, but he retreats with his Hungarian and Polish troops when Mstislav Mstislavich arrives with Cumans (736).

6727 (1219): Lestko marches against Danilo to stop him aiding Mstislav. Kondrat plans to reconcile Lestko and Danilo, but then realises Lestko's treachery and reconsiders. Filia is preparing for war, leaving Koloman in Galich. Mstislav and the Cumans fight the Hungarians and Poles. Filia is captured, and Mstislav takes Galich from the Hungarians. There is great rejoicing that Danilo and Mstislav have been delivered 'from the foreigners [Hungarians and Poles]' (737–38).

6729 (1221): Oleksandr had made peace with Lestko, Koloman and Filia, and Lestko makes peace with Danilo and Vasilko, so Lestko betrays Oleksandr (who is consistently hostile to Danilo and Vasilko). Danilo and Vasilko sack Belz (Oleksandr's town) and Cherven (738–39).

6733 (1225): Oleksandr incites Mstislav Mstislavich to attack Danilo. Danilo and Lestko oppose Mstislav, driving him into Belz. Mstislav returns to Galich, while Danilo and the Poles ravage Galicia. Vasilko takes so many prisoners and horses that the Poles are jealous of his success (745–46).

6734 (1226): Mstislav Mstislavich marries his younger daughter to Andrei, the son of the Hungarian king, to whom he gives Peremyshl. Deceived by an adviser, Andrei flees to Hungary and gathers an army. They march to Peremyshl. The Hungarian king stops in Zvenigorod, because he has been told by a sorcerer that he will die if he sees Galich. Mstislav meets the king with his troops, but they are prevented from fighting. The king takes a number of Rusian towns, but the Hungarians are defeated outside Galich by Mstislav. Lestko and the Poles try to help the Hungarian king, who is now retreating, but Danilo and Vasilko do not let them (748–50).

Mstislav wants to give Galich to Danilo, but is persuaded to give it to Andrei, the son of the Hungarian king, instead (750).

6735 (1227): Mstislav tells Danilo that he has sinned in giving Galich to a ‘foreigner’ Hungarian, and suggests that they both march on Galich and take it back (752).

6736 (1228): Danilo sends to Poland for help against Kiev and Chernigov, but a peace is eventually made, and the Poles return home (753–54).

6737 (1229): The ‘great Polish prince’ Lestko is murdered (754). Kondrat of Mazowie requests aid from Danilo and Vasilko, with whom he is on good terms.

Danilo and Vasilko move into Poland and besiege Kalish, even though Kondrat’s Poles do not wish to fight. The elders of Kalish plead with Kondrat, and he concludes a peace with them. The Rus and the Poles promise mutual aid in the future. Danilo and Vasilko return to Rus in glory; no other prince had gone so far into Poland (754–58).

Danilo and his army lay siege to Galich. Having won the town, Danilo permits the Hungarian king’s son to leave unharmed. Bela IV of Hungary arrogantly attacks Galich, but Danilo summons Poles and Cumans as allies. Bela eventually flees, and his troops suffer divine retribution. Danilo is left in possession of Galich (760–61).

6738 (1230): Godless Galician boyars and Hungarians plot to murder Danilo and give his land to the Hungarians (762).

6739 (1231): The boyar Sudislav persuades Andrei, the Hungarian king, to fight Danilo, who has ousted Oleksandr Vsevolodich. The Hungarian king and his two sons besiege Iaroslavl, which is eventually given up to the Hungarians. The king then moves on to Volodimer-in-Volynia. Impressed, he says, ‘I have not found such a town even in the lands of the *nemtsi*’ (765). Volodimer is surrendered to the king, and the king places his son in Galich. Danilo fights Andrei, son of the Hungarian king (763–68).

6740 (1232): The campaign against the Hungarians continues (768–70).

6741 (1233): Danilo and his Rusian allies attack the Hungarians again; the Hungarians still have possession of Galich (770–71).

6742 (1234): Danilo besieges Galich. The king's son dies in Galich and Danilo takes the town back (771).

On his return from a campaign in Rus, Danilo goes to Galich, but then flees to Hungary to avoid a revolt. In the winter, Vasilko, Danilo and some Poles attempt to retake Galich, but they are unsuccessful (774).

6743 (1235): Mikhail Vsevolodovich and Iziaslav Mstislavich, the princes of Chernigov and Smolensk, attack Danilo with Rus, Poles (under Kondrat) and Cumans. By the summer, Mikhail and his son have taken Galich and shut themselves in the town with many Hungarians (775–76).

When Danilo and Vasilko arrive at Berestia in an attack on the Iatvingians, they say, 'It is not right for the Knights Templar, who are called Solomon's [knights], to have possession of our fatherland' (776).

Danilo sends Lithuanians and Novgorodians against Kondrat while he is in Hungary (776).

Friedrich the tsar [Holy Roman Emperor] attacks the 'Gertsik [=Hertzog=archduke]', whom Danilo and Vasilko wish to help until Bela forbids them (776–77).

Danilo rides to Galich and asks its inhabitants, 'How long will you suffer the rule of foreign princes?' (777). He enters the city and hangs his standard on the '*nemtsi* gates'. Rostislav Mikhailovich, who had taken Galich, flees to Hungary (777–78).

6746 (1238): Mikhail Vsevolodovich flees from the Tatars to Hungary (782).

The Hungarian king refuses to marry his daughter to Rostislav Mikhailovich, and sends him away (783).

Mikhail and his son flee to Kondrat in Poland when they learn that Kiev has been taken; he then moves on to the 'Vorotislavskaia' land [=Wrocław] and then to a '*nemtsi* place' called Sereda. There, he is robbed and many of his people are murdered, and he returns to Kondrat in Poland (783–84).

6748 (1240): Danilo is in Hungary when the Tatars attack Kiev. Batyi hears that Danilo is in Hungary and advances on Volodimer-in-Volynia; he takes Volodimer, and then moves on to Hungary. Danilo is stranded in Hungary, because he has only his smaller *druzhina* with him. He then leaves for Barduev in Poland, and is reunited with his family on the way. Boleslav, son of Kondrat, gives him Vyshegorod, and he stays there until it is safe to return to Rus. Danilo's son later leaves Hungary and rejoins him (785–88).

6749 (1241): Kuril the *pechatnik* reminds Rostislav Mikhailovich of the kindness Danilo and Vasilko showed to him when the Hungarian king had banished him and his father from Hungary (791, referring to 783).

Danilo attacks the Bolokhovians; they had forgotten how Vasilko interceded for them before Boleslav of Mazowie when the Bolokhovian princes had entered Mazowie without permission (792).

6751 (1243): Rostislav Mikhailovich flees to Hungary and marries Bela's daughter (794).

6753 (1245): Mikhail Vsevolodovich of Chernigov, father of Rostislav, flees to Hungary but is not received with honour. He is subsequently martyred at the Horde (795).

Danilo and Vasilko attack Boleslav in Poland, attacking and eventually sparing Liublin (795–96).

Rostislav Mikhailovich and his many Hungarian allies march against Peremyshl. Danilo and Vasilko send men against Rostislav, but they are defeated. Danilo attacks Rostislav again. Rostislav flees to Hungary (797).

6757 (1249): Rostislav, supported by Hungarian and Polish troops from the Hungarian king and Lestko of Poland, attacks Danilo. Danilo and Vasilko fight him, soliciting aid from Kondrat and the Lithuanians; the enemy Poles sing 'Kyrie eleison'. Danilo fights Filia the Hungarian and kills him. Rostislav and the Hungarians flee. The Poles call the Rus 'longbeards'. Danilo and Vasilko pursue the Hungarians, Rostislav's Rusian supporters and the Poles. Rostislav flees to Poland, collects his wife and heads to Hungary (800–05).

6758 (1250): Kondrat of Mazowie invites Vasilko to join him against the Iatvingians (808).

Bela offers to marry his daughter to Danilo's son Lev; Danilo does not trust him, but Vasilko and the Metropolitan encourage him, telling him that the king is a Christian (809).

6759 (1251): 'The great Polish prince Kondrat died; he was an illustrious and very good [prince]' (809–10). Boleslav of Mazowie also dies, having left his land to Somovit on Danilo's advice (810).

Danilo and Vasilko ask the new prince of Mazowie, Somovit, for aid against the Iatvingians. Rus and Poles together fight the Iatvingians as 'Christians' against pagans (810–13).

6760 (1252): Danilo helps the Hungarian king against the *nemtsi*. The tsar [Holy Roman Emperor] has already taken a great deal of land and killed the archduke (Friedrich). The *nemtsi* are amazed by the Tatar weaponry and splendour of Danilo and his troops; the Hungarian king greatly values his show of support (813–14).

Persecuted by Mindovg, the Lithuanians Tevtevil and Edivid flee to Danilo and Vasilko. Danilo and Vasilko send envoys to Poland saying, 'Now is the time for Christians [to fight] against the pagans' (815), i.e. the Lithuanians and other pagan tribes. Danilo sends Vykont (the uncle of Tevtevil and

Edivid) to the Iatvingians and Zhemoitans and to Riga, to the *nemtsi* there. Most of them are won over, but the *nemtsi* are reluctant to make peace, agreeing only for Danilo's sake. The *nemtsi* then come to the aid of Tektivil of Lithuania against Mindovg. Tektivil fights with Rusian and Cuman support, and wins plunder for Danilo. He is then baptised in Riga. Mindovg sends many gifts to the Grand Master of the Teutonic Knights (*bozhii dvoriane*, 816), hoping for aid, but the Grand Master insists he must be baptised first. Mindovg sends to the Pope and is baptised, but falsely. The conflict between Mindovg and Tektivil continues, with Danilo's men supporting Tektivil (815–18).

6761 (1253): Danilo, Vasilko, and others attack Novgorodok and other Lithuanian towns on Tektivil's instructions. Mindovg sends to Danilo asking for peace and a potential marriage between their families (818–20).

6762 (1254): A succession conflict erupts between the Hungarian and Czech kings over who should take Archduke Friedrich's lands after his death. The Hungarian king needs aid to conquer the 'land of the *nemtsi*', and so marries Danilo's son Roman to the Archduke's niece, giving Roman *nemtsi* land. The king then asks Danilo for help against the Czechs. Danilo agrees, and makes war on the Czechs alongside Boleslav of Poland, as no Rusian prince had ever done before. When they are fighting the Czechs, he tells the Poles he is fighting with not to be afraid, but they still refuse to attack Opava. The next day, Danilo and some of his forces do attack the town, and there is a conflict between Danilo and the Czech and *nemtsi* inhabitants, which Danilo loses. Danilo continues his campaign (820–25).

Danilo returns home through Krakow, where the Pope's envoys are staying, wishing to give him a blessing, crown and title from the Pope. Danilo feels he should not meet them in a foreign land (*chiuzhei zemli*), and returns to Kholm (826).

6763 (1255): The same papal envoys arrive in Rus to crown Danilo. Previously, the Pope had sent the Bishop of Bern and Kamenets to Danilo, but Danilo had refused a crown then because of the Tatar threat and the fact that the Pope had not promised him aid (826). Danilo still does not want to accept a crown when the envoys arrive in Dorogychin, but he is persuaded by his mother, Boleslav, and the Polish boyars, who offer him support against the pagans if he accepts the crown. 'King Danilo' accepts a crown from the papal envoys. Innocent IV denounces those who slander the Greek faith and wishes to hold a council on orthodoxy and the unification of the churches (827).

Danilo attacks the Iatvingians, whom the cunning Poles begin to aid (827–28).

Danilo is on a campaign against the Lithuanians when Tatars approach Bakota (828–29).

Danilo asks for Hungarian support in his conflict with Iziaslav Mstislavich of Smolensk (830).

Danilo's son Shvarno is married to the daughter of Mindovg of Lithuania (830).

6764 (1256): Danilo and Somovit's and Boleslav's Poles attack the Iatvingians; Danilo is 'king [and] head of all the troops' (831).

6765 (1257): Danilo receives tribute from the Iatvingians, and gives some of it to the Poles as proof that he received it (835–36).

Bela IV abandons Danilo's son Roman in Austria, with his wife Gertruda [of Austria], where Archduke Peremysl repeatedly attacks and besieges him before promising him 'half of the land of the *nemtsi*' if Roman will renounce Bela IV. Roman refuses, and eventually manages to leave the town [Ineperets/Himberg] (836–37).

Danilo begins a campaign against the Tatars. Mindovg offers his help (838).

6766 (1258): Danilo attacks the Lithuanians (838–40).

6767 (1259): The tale of the building of Kholm. Danilo invites '*nemtsi* and Rus, foreigners (*inoiazychniki*) and Poles' to live in Kholm. Danilo builds the Church of St. John, with 'Roman' stained glass, statues, carvings, icons and a ceiling with gold stars on azure (842–45).

6768 (1260): Another Kholm church, St. Mary the Ever-Virgin, is built, with icons and a Hungarian chalice (845–46).

Vasilko defeats the Lithuanians on behalf of Burandai, a Tatar (846–47).

Volynian section

6769 (1261): Danilo flees to Poland and Hungary before the Tatars (850). Burandai attacks Poland. The chronicler relates the tale of a brave Pole who attacks a Tatar (853).

6770 (1262): Mindovg and his Lithuanians attack the Poles and kill the Polish prince Somovit. They then turn on Vasilko (855).

Danilo is in Hungary (857).

Princes of Rus and Boleslav of Poland meet and conclude a treaty about the lands of Rus and Poland (857–58).

Mindovg, ruler of Lithuania, dies. The chronicler relates the tale of Voishelk's conversion (858–59).

6771 (1263): The murder of Mindovg and its consequences (860–61).

6772 (1264): Voishelk is now sole ruler of Lithuania (861).

Roman of Briansk marries his daughter to Volodimer Vasilkovich. During the celebrations, he is attacked by Lithuanians (862).

Shvarno, Danilo's son, and Vasilko aid Voishelk (862–63).

6776 (1268): The Lithuanians begin a campaign against Boleslav and the Poles. Boleslav blames Shvarno for this campaign, and from then on Shvarno and Boleslav are at odds. The Poles ravage the land around Kholm, but the 'border Poles' had already tipped off the Kholmians that Polish boyars were coming to attack them. Poles loot a great deal and defeat the Rus, but eventually a peace is concluded (864–67).

Vasilko, Lev Danilovich and Voishelk meet at the house of 'Markolt the *nemchin* [one of the *nemtsi*]' for talks, but Lev murders Voishelk out of envy (868).

6778 (1270): Troiden, ruler of Lithuania, is a pagan, but his brothers are good orthodox Christians (869).

6781 (1273): There is peace with Boleslav and the Poles. Lev and Mstislav Danilovich fight in the conflicts between Boleslav and the prince of Wrocław (870).

6782 (1274): Troiden is no longer on good terms with Lev after attempting to take Dorogychin. Lev raises an army against him (871–73).

6784 (1276): Volodimer Vasilkovich and Lev Danilovich remove the Prussians who have settled on their land (874).

6785 (1277): Rusian princes attempt to take Goroden, but the Prussians there offer resistance (876–78).

6786 (1278): Troiden sends a great army against the Poles (878).

6787 (1279): Famine affects the Rus, Poles, Lithuanians and Iatvingians. When Volodimer sends the Iatvingians grain, Kondrat kills his men and steals the grain, but denies this; Boleslav informs Volodimer that this has happened. Volodimer and Kondrat fight, and then make peace (879–80).

Boleslav of Krakow, a 'good, restrained, meek, humble and kind' prince, dies and is interred in the church of St. Francis (880).

6788 (1280): Succession problems ensue after Boleslav's death. Lev wants part of Poland (the towns on the borderland), but the Poles win and Lev is dishonoured (881–82).

6789 (1281): Lestko, the new ruler of Poland, attacks Lev in retribution (882).

Kondrat is at peace with Volodimer, but not Boleslav; Volodimer offers to help Kondrat against Boleslav. The Poles have a custom of robbing their opponents' servants in battle (883). All but two of Volodimer's men, Rakh Mikhalovich and 'a Prussian', return safely (883–87).

6790 (1282): Nogai orders the Rusian princes to aid the Tatars against the Hungarians. While Lev is away, Boleslav sacks his villages. Lev and Volodimer set out for Berestia, hoping to join up with the Lithuanians there. The army goes against Boleslav; when the Lithuanians finally arrive, they pillage the area around Liublin (888–90).

The chronicler recounts a time when the Poles ravaged Berestia, but were routed by the Berestians (890).

The Tatars starve in the mountains of Hungary (890–91).

Volodimer and his allies attack Boleslav again (891).

6791 (1283): Telebuga orders the Rusian princes to attack Poland with him. Nogai has beaten him to Krakow, so Telebuga retreats to Lviv (891–94).

There is a great plague in Poland (895).

6792 (1284): There is plague in Rus, Poland and among the Tatars (895).

6793 (1285): There are great floods in the land of the *nemtsi*; the sea burst its banks because of God's anger. More than 60,000 people drown and 111 stone churches are flooded (896).

Lestko son of Kazimir attacks Kondrat; Kondrat is victorious and returns home praising God (896).

6794 (1286): The *nemtsi* in Riga are attacked by Lithuanians and Zhemoitans, and retreat into their towns. The attackers reach Medvezhia Golova, but have no success. The *nemtsi* of Torun take revenge on the Zhemoitans (896–97).

Lestko of Krakow dies. His people mourn his death (897).

6795 (1287): Tatars repeatedly attack the Poles, aided by Rus (897).

Volodimer draws up a testament. Mstislav, Volodimer's brother, summons the Volodimirian boyars and 'the Rus and *nemtsi* townspeople', and reads the testament aloud (905).

Volodimer asks Mstislav to protect Kondrat (906–07).

Kondrat learns he is to reign in Krakow, but is disgraced by Iurii Lvovich, who pillages Liublin (909–11).

6797 (1289): Volodimer dies and is mourned by all of Volodimer-in-Volynia, '*nemtsi* and Surozhians, people of Novgorodok, and Jews' (920).

Mstislav ascends the throne, living 'in peace with the lands around him: the Poles, *nemtsi* and Lithuanians', and ruling over land 'from the Tatars to the Poles and the Lithuanians' (933). He aids Kondrat against Sodomir (933).

6798 (1290): There are succession conflicts in Poland. Boleslav reigns in Krakow, but Indrikh of Wrocław, with his *nemtsi* garrison, challenges him (934–35).

6799 (1291): Mstislav's brother Lev aids Boleslav in Krakow and pillages Indrikh's lands in Wrocław. He then concludes a treaty with the Czech king Viacheslav, but does not manage to take Krakow (935–37).

Bibliography

PSRL = Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei

TODRL = Trudy otdela drevnerusskoi literatury

Abramovich, D.I. [=Abramovich, Dmitro], ‘O redaktsiiah i spiskakh Pecherskogo paterika’, in *Issledovaniia o Kievo-pecherskom paterike kak istoriko-literaturnom pamiatnike* (Saint Petersburg: Otdelenie russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1902)

———, ed., *Zhitiia sviatykh muchenikov Borisa i Gleba i sluzhby im*, Pamiatniki drevnerusskoi literatury, 2 (Petrograd: Otdelenie russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1916)

Abramovich, Dmitro [=Abramovich, D.I.], ed., *Kyievo-pechers'kyi paterik* (Kiev: Chas, 1991)

Abulafia, David, ‘Introduction: Seven Types of Ambiguity, c. 1100–1500’, in David Abulafia and Nora Berend, eds, *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 1–34

Abulafia, David, and Nora Berend, eds, *Medieval Frontiers: Concepts and Practices* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)

Akbari, Suzanne Conklin, *Idols in the East: European Representations of Islam and the Orient, 1100–1450* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2009)

Aleksandrov, Viktor, ‘To zhe i s latiny: Zapret brakov s katolikami u pravoslavnykh slavian v srednie veka’, *Studia Slavica Hungarica*, 47 (2002), 101–13

Angelov, Petür, *Chuzhdite narodi v predstavite na srednovekovniia Bülgarin* (Sofia: TANGRA TanNakRa, 2013)

Avanesov, R.I., ed., *Smolenskie gramoty XIII–XIV vekov* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1963)

Avvakumov, Georgij [=Avvakumov, Yury], ‘Die Fragen des Ritus als Streit- und Kontroversgegenstand: Zur Typologie der Kulturkonflikte zwischen dem lateinischen Westen und dem byzantinisch-slawischen Osten im Mittelalter und in der Neuzeit’, in Rainer Bendel, ed., *Religions- und Kulturgeschichte in Ostmittel- und Südosteuropa, vol. 2: Kirchen- und*

Kulturgeschichte in Nordost- und Ostmitteleuropa: Initiativen, Methoden, Theorien (Berlin: Lit, 2006), pp. 191–233

Avvakumov, Yury [=Avvakumov, Georgij], ‘Western “Confessions” and Eastern Christianity’, in Kenneth Appold and Nelson Minnich, eds, *Cambridge History of Reformation Theology, c.1500–c.1675* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming)

Balzaretti, Ross, and Elizabeth M. Tyler, eds, *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West, Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 16 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2006)

Barankova, G.S., ‘Tekstologicheskie i iazykovye osobennosti antilatinskogo apokrificheskogo pamiatnika «Skazanie o dvenadsati apostolakh, o latine i o opresnotsekh»’, *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo sviato-tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta, I: Bogoslovie. Filosofija*, 27 (2009), 67–92

Barmin, A.V., *Polemika i skhizma: Istoriia greko–latinskikh sporov IX–XII vekov* (Moscow: Institut filosofii, teologii i istorii sv. Fomy, 2006)

Bartlett, Robert, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change 950–1350* (London: Penguin, 1994)

———, ‘Medieval and Modern Concepts of Race and Ethnicity’, *Journal of Modern and Early Medieval Studies*, 31.1 (2001), 39–56

Begunov, Iu.K., ‘Kogda Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo voshlo v sostav Lavrent’evskoi letopisi?’, *Die Welt der Slaven*, 16 (1971), 111–20

———, *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII veka: «Slovo o pogibeli russkoi zemli»* (Moscow: Nauka, 1965)

———, ed., ‘Zhitie Aleksandra Nevskogo (pervaia redaktsiia)’, in *Pamiatnik russkoi literatury XIII veka: «Slovo o pogibeli russkoi zemli»* (Moscow, Leningrad: Nauka, 1965)

Belobrova, O.A., M. Gardzaniti, G.M. Prokhorov, and I.V. Fedorova, eds, *«Khozhenie» igumena Daniila v Sviatuiu Zemliu v nachale XII v.* (Saint Petersburg: Izdatel’stvo Olega Abyshko, 2007)

Beneshevich, V.N., *Drevne-slavianskaia kormchaia XIV titulov bez tolkovanii* (Saint Petersburg: Otdelenie russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1906)

- Berend, Nora, *At the Gate of Christendom: Jews, Muslims and 'Pagans' in Medieval Hungary, c. 1000–c. 1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001)
- Berkhofer, Robert F., *Beyond the Great Story: History as Text and Discourse* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1995)
- Biliarsky, Ivan, *The Tale of the Prophet Isaiah: The Destiny and Meanings of an Apocryphal Text* (Leiden: Brill, 2013)
- Birnbaum, Henrik, *Novgorod in Focus: Selected Essays* (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers Inc., 1996)
- , 'When and How was Novgorod Converted to Christianity?', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12–13 (1988–89), 505–30
- Boyarin, Daniel, and Virginia Burrus, 'Hybridity as Subversion of Orthodoxy? Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity', in *Social Compass*, 52 (2005), 431–44
- Bubner, Friedrich, *Das Kiever Paterikon: Eine Untersuchung zu seiner Struktur und den literarischen Quellen* ([Heidelberg]: Dissertationsdruck- und Verlagsanstalt Werner Blasaditsch, 1969)
- Burke, Peter, and R. Po-Chia Hsia, eds, *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)
- Cameron, Averil, 'How to Read Heresiology', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 33 (2003), 471–92
- , 'The Violence of Orthodoxy', in Eduard Iricinschi and Holger M. Zellentin, eds, *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 102–14
- Cheyne, Jean-Claude, 'Le schisme de 1054: un non-événement?', in Claude Carozzi and Huguette Taviani-Carozzi, eds, *Faire l'événement au Moyen Âge* (Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence, 2007), pp. 299–312
- Chibisov, B.I., 'Termin «latiniane» v vizantiiskikh i drevnerusskikh pis'mennykh istochnikakh (do nachala XIII v.)', *Drevniaia Rus': Vo vremeni, v lichnostiakh, v ideiakh*, 1 (2014), 73–98
- Chibnall, Marjorie, ed. and trans., *The Ecclesiastical History of Orderic Vitalis, Volume VI: Books XI, XII, and XIII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002)
- Chichurov, I.S. [=Čičurov, Igor], 'Skhizma 1054 g. i antilatinskaia polemika v Kieve (ser. XI – nach. XII v.)', *Russia Mediaevalis*, 9 (1997), 43–53

- Christiansen, Eric, *The Northern Crusades: The Baltic and the Catholic Frontier 1100–1525* (London: Macmillan, 1980)
- Čičurov, Igor [=Chichurov, I.S.], ‘Ein antilateinischer Traktat des Kiever Metropoliten Ephraim’, *Fontes Minores*, 10 (1998), 319–56
- Colucci, Michele, ‘The Image of Western Christianity in the Culture of Kievan Rus’’, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12–13 (1988–89), 576–86
- Curta, Florin, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages 500–1250* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Danilevskii, I.N., *Drevniaia Rus’ glazami sovremennikov i potomkov (IX–XII vv.): Kurs lektsii* (Moscow: Aspent Press, 1998)
- Danilov, V.V., ‘O zhanrovykh osobennostiakh drevnerusskikh «khozhdenii»’, *TODRL*, 18 (1962), 21–37
- Demin, A.S., *Poetika drevnerusskoi literatury (XI–XIII vv.)* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 2009)
- Dvornik, Francis, *The Slavs in European History and Civilization* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1962)
- Eremin, I.P., ‘Iz istorii drevne-russkoi publitsistiki XI veka: Poslanie Feodosiia Pecherskogo k kniaziu Iziaslavu Iaroslavichu o latinianakh’, *TODRL*, 2 (1935), 21–38
- , ‘K istorii drevne-russkoi perevodnoi povesti’, *TODRL*, 3 (1936), 37–57
- , *Literatura Drevnei Rusi: Etiudy i kharakteristiki* (Moscow, Leningrad: Nauka, 1966)
- Fedotov, G.P., *The Russian Religious Mind* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1946)
- Feldbrugge, Ferdinand, *Law in Medieval Russia, Law in Eastern Europe*, 59 (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2009)
- Fennell, John, *A History of the Russian Church to 1488* (London: Routledge, 1995)
- , *The Crisis of Medieval Russia, 1200–1304* (London: Longman, 1983)
- Floria, B.N., *U istokov religioznogo raskola slavianskogo mira (XIII vek)* (Saint Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2004)

- Foot, Sarah, 'Finding the Meaning of Form: Narrative in Annals and Chronicles', in Nancy Partner, ed., *Writing Medieval History* (London: Hodder Arnold, 2005), pp. 88–103
- Franklin, Simon, *Byzantium – Rus – Russia: Studies in the Translation of Christian Culture*, Variorum Collected Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002)
- , *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991)
- , 'Some Apocryphal Sources of Kievan Russian Historiography', in *Byzantium – Rus – Russia: Studies in the Translation of Christian Culture*, Variorum Collected Studies (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002), pp. 1–27
- , *Writing, Society and Culture in Early Rus, c. 950–1300* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- Franklin, Simon, and Jonathan Shepard, *The Emergence of Rus 750–1200* (London, New York: Longman, 1996)
- Franklin-Brown, Mary, *Reading the World: Encyclopedic Writing in the Scholastic Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012)
- Garipzanov, Ildar H., ed., *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe (c. 1070–1200)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011)
- , 'Novgorod and the Veneration of Saints in Eleventh-Century Rus': A Comparative View', in Haki Antonsson and Ildar H. Garipzanov, eds, *Saints and their Lives on the Periphery: Veneration of Saints in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe (c. 1000–1200)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), pp. 115–45
- , 'Wandering Clerics and Mixed Rituals in the Early Christian North, c. 1000–1150', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 63 (2012), 1–17
- Gimon, T.V. [=Guimon, Timofey V.], *Istoriopisanie rannesrednevekovoi Anglii i Drevnei Rusi: Sravnitel'noe issledovanie* (Moscow: Universitet Dmitriia Pozharskogo, 2012)
- , 'Otrazhenie v novgorodskom letopisanii XII–XIII vv. nenovgorodskikh sobytii', in E.A. Mel'nikova, ed., *Vostochnaia Evropa v drevnosti i srednekov'e: Kontakty, zony kontaktov i kontaktnye zony: XI chteniia pamiati chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR Vladimira Terent'evicha Pashuto, Moskva, 14–16 apreliia 1999 g.: Materialy k konferentsii* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1999), pp. 139–44

- , ‘Pripiski na dopolnitel’nykh listakh v Sinodal’nom spiske Novgorodskoi I letopisi’, in T.N. Dzhakson [=Tatjana N. Jackson], V.Ia. Petrukhin and others, eds, *Norna u istochnika sud’by: Sbornik statei v chest’ Eleny Aleksandrovny Mel’nikovoi* (Moscow: Indrik, 2001), pp. 53–60
- , ‘Redaktirovanie letopisei v XII–XV vv.: Raznochteniia mezhdru spiskami Novgorodskoi I letopisi’, *TODRL*, 57 (2006), 112–25
- Gimon, T.V. [=Guimon, Timofey V.], and A.A. Gippius [=Gippius, Alexey], ‘Novye dannye po istorii teksta Novgorodskoi pervoi letopisi’, *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik*, 7 (17) (1999), 18–47
- Gippius, A.A. [=Gippius, Alexey], ‘Do i posle Nachal’nogo svoda: raniiaia letopisnaia istoriia Rusi kak ob’ekt tekstologicheskoi rekonstruktsii’, in N.A. Makarov, ed., *Rus’ v IX–X vekakh: Arkheologicheskaiia panorama* (Moscow, Vologda: Drevnosti severa, 2012), pp. 37–63
- , ‘K istorii slozheniia teksta Novgorodskoi pervoi letopisi’, *Novgorodskii istoricheskii sbornik*, 6 (16) (1997), 3–72
- , ‘K kharakteristike novgorodskogo vladychnogo letopisaniia XII–XIV vv.’, in A.A. Gippius, E.N. Nosov, and A.S. Khoroshev, eds, *Velikii Novgorod v istorii srednevekovoi Evropy: k 70-letiiu Valentina Lavrent’evicha Ianina* (Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1999), pp. 345–64
- , ‘K probleme redaktsii Povesti vremennykh let. I’, *Slavianovedenie*, 2007, no. 5, 20–44
- , ‘K probleme redaktsii Povesti vremennykh let. II’, *Slavianovedenie*, 2008, no. 2, 3–24
- Gippius, Alexey A. [=Gippius, A.A.], ‘Reconstructing the Original of the *Povest’ vremennykh let*: A Contribution to the Debate’, *Russian Linguistics*, 38 (2014), 341–66
- Goldfrank, David M., ‘Orthodoxy and Catholicism in the Lithuanian-Belorussian Chronicles’, in S.W. Swierkosz-Lenart, ed., *Le origini e lo sviluppo della cristianità slavo-bizantina*, Nuovi studi storici, 17 (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo, 1992), pp. 343–53
- Golyshenko, V.S., and V.F. Dubrovina, eds, *Sinaiiskii paterik* (Moscow: Nauka, 1967)
- Gorskii, A.A., ‘Dva «neudobnykh» fakta iz biografii Aleksandra Nevskogo’, in V.A. Kuchkin, A.N. Kirpichnikov, and V.L. Egorov, eds, *Aleksandr Nevskii i istoriia Rossii: Materialy nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii 26–28 sentiabria 1995 goda* (Novgorod: Novgorodskii gosudarstvennyi ob’edinennyi muzei-zapovednik, 1996), pp. 64–75

- Guimon, Timofey V. [=Gimon, T.V.], 'Christian Identity in the Early Novgorodian Annalistic Writing', in Ildar H. Garipzanov, ed., *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe (c. 1070–1200)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), pp. 255–75
- Haight, Roger, *Christian Community in History: Volume One: Historical Ecclesiology* (New York: Continuum, 2004)
- Halperin, Charles J., 'The Ideology of Silence: Prejudice and Pragmatism on the Medieval Religious Frontier', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 26 (1984), 442–66
- Hamilton, George Heard, *The Art and Architecture of Russia*, 3rd edn (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1983)
- Heng, Geraldine, *Empire of Magic: Medieval Romance and the Politics of Cultural Fantasy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003)
- Heppell, Muriel, 'Slavonic Translations of Early Byzantine Ascetical Literature', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 5 (1954), 86–100
- , *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989)
- Hinterberger, Martin, 'A Neglected Tool of Orthodox Propaganda? The Image of the Latins in Byzantine Hagiography', in Martin Hinterberger and Chris Schabel, eds, *Greeks, Latins and Intellectual History 1204–1500* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), pp. 129–49
- Howard, Donald R., *Writers and Pilgrims: Medieval Pilgrimage Narratives and Their Posterity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980)
- Hristova, Daniela S., 'Major Textual Boundary of Linguistic Usage in the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle', *Russian History*, 33 (2006), 313–31
- Iakovlev, Vladimir, *Drevne-kievskie religioznye skazaniia* (Warsaw: Sovet Imperatorskogo Varshavskogo universiteta, 1875)
- Iatsimirskii, A.I., 'Novye dannye o Khozhdenii arkhiepiskopa Antoniiia v Tsar'grad', *Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti*, 4 (1899), 223–64
- Ingham, Norman W., 'Czech Hagiography in Kiev: The Prisoner Miracles of Boris and Gleb', *Die Welt der Slaven*, 10 (1965), 166–82

- , ‘Genre Characteristics of the Kievan Lives of Princes in Slavic and European Perspective’, in Paul Debreczeny, ed., *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists, Volume 2: Literature, Poetics, History* (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers Inc., 1983), pp. 223–37
- Ioannisian, O.M., ‘Osnovnye etapy razvitiia Galitskogo zodchestva’, in A.I. Komech and O.I. Podobedova, eds, *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo: Khudozhestvennaia kul'tura X–pervoi poloviny XIII v.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1988), pp. 41–58
- , ‘Vladimiro-suzdal'skoe zodchestvo i lombardskaia romanika: K probleme proiskhozhdeniia masterov Andreiia Bogoliubskogo’, in L.I. Lifshits, M.A. Orlova, and E.S. Smirnova, eds, *Vizantiiskii mir: Iskusstvo Konstantinopolia i natsional'nie traditsii: Tezisy dokladov Mezhdunarodnoi konferentsii: Moskva, 17–19 oktiabria 2000 g.* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2000), pp. 19–24
- Iricinski, Eduard, and Holger M. Zellentin, ‘Making Selves and Marking Others: Identity and Late Antique Heresiologies’, in Eduard Iricinski and Holger M. Zellentin, eds, *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 1–27
- Isoaho, Mari, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy in Medieval Russia: Warrior and Saint* (Leiden: Brill, 2006)
- Jamroziak, Emilia, and Karen Stöber, eds, *Monasteries on the Borders of Medieval Europe: Conflict and Cultural Interaction*, *Medieval Church Studies*, 28 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013)
- Jackson, Tatjana N., ‘The Cult of St Olaf and Early Novgorod’, in Haki Antonsson and Ildar H. Garipzanov, eds, *Saints and their Lives on the Periphery: Veneration of Saints in Scandinavia and Eastern Europe (c. 1000–1200)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), pp. 147–67
- Jauss, Hans Robert, ‘Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature’, in David Duff, ed., *Modern Genre Theory* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), pp. 127–47
- Jorgensen, Alice, ed., *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010)
- Kaljundi, Linda, ‘Waiting for the Barbarians: Reconstruction of *Otherness* in the Saxon Missionary and Crusading Chronicles, 11th–13th Centuries’, in Erik Kooper, ed., *The Medieval Chronicle, V* (Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 2008), pp. 113–27

- Kappeler, Andreas, 'Ethnische Abgrenzung: Bemerkungen zur Ostslavischen Terminologie des Mittelalters', in Uwe Halbach, Hans Hecker, and Andreas Kappeler, eds, *Geschichte Altrusslands in der Begriffswelt ihrer Quellen: Festschrift zum 70. Geburtstag von Günther Stökl* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1986), pp. 124–38
- Karskii, E.F., ed., *Lavrent'evskaia letopis' i suzdal'skaia letopis' po akademicheskomu spisku*, PSRL, 1 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoi literatury, 1962)
- Kazhdan, Alexander [=Kazhdan, Alexander P.], 'Latins and Franks in Byzantium: Perception and Reality from the Eleventh to the Twelfth Century', in Angeliki E. Laiou and Roy Parviz Mottahedeh, eds, *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2001), pp. 83–100
- Kazhdan, Alexander P. [=Kazhdan, Alexander], ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991)
- Keenan, Edward L., 'The Trouble with Muscovy: Some Observations Upon Problems of the Comparative Study of Form and Genre in Historical Writing', *Medievalia et Humanistica*, 5 (1974), 103–26
- Khodarkovsky, Michael, 'Four Degrees of Separation: Constructing Non-Christian Identities in Muscovy', in A.M. Kleimola and G.D. Lenhoff, eds, *Culture and Identity in Muscovy, 1359–1584* (Moscow: ITZ-Garant, 1997), pp. 248–66
- Khrustalev, D.G., *Razyskaniia o Efreime Pereiaslavskom* (Saint Petersburg: Evraziia, 2002)
- Kinoshita, Sharon, *Medieval Boundaries: Rethinking Difference in Old French Literature* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)
- Kirillin, V.M., 'K chitateliam', in V.M. Kirillin, ed., *Drevniaia Rus' i Zapad: Nauchnaia konferentsiia: Kniga reziume* (Moscow: Nasledie, 1996), pp. 6–8
- Koder, Johannes, 'Latinoi: The Image of the Other According to Greek Sources', in Chryssa Maltezos and Peter Schreiner, eds, *Bisanzio, Venezia e il mondo franco-greco (XIII–XV secolo): Atti del Colloquio Internazionale organizzato nel centenario della nascita di Raymond-Joseph Loenertz o.p., Venezia, 1–2 dicembre 2000* (Venice: Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini di Venezia; Centro Tedesco di Studi Veneziani, 2002), pp. 25–39
- Kolbaba, Tia M., *Inventing Latin Heretics: Byzantines and the Filioque in the Ninth Century* (Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 2008)

- , *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2000)
- Konidaris, Ioannis M., ‘The Ubiquity of Canon Law’, in Angeliki E. Laiou and Dieter Simon, eds, *Law and Society in Byzantium: Ninth–Twelfth Centuries* (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1994), pp. 131–50
- Korogodina, Maria Vladimirovna [=Korogodina, M.V.], ‘Kormchie knigi XIV – pervoi poloviny XVII vv. kak istoricheskii istochnik’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, Saint Petersburg State University, 2015)
- Korogodina, M.V. [=Korogodina, Maria Vladimirovna], ‘O vremeni poiavleniia Chudovskoi redaktsii kormchei knigi’, in A.A. Gorskii, ed., *Srednevekovaia Rus’* (Moscow: Indrik, 2011), IX, 197–206
- Korpela, Jukka, *Prince, Saint and Apostle: Prince Vladimir Svjatoslavič of Kiev, His Posthumous Life, and the Religious Legitimization of the Russian Great Power* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2001)
- Kostromin, Konstantin, ‘Problema atributsii «Slova Feodosiia, igumena Pecherskogo, o vere krest’ianskoi i o latyn’skoi»’, *Khristianskoe chtenie*, 36.1 (2011), 6–97
- Kriza, Agnes, ‘Petr Gugnivyi i Papessa: Antilatinskaia tserkovnoslavianskaia polemicheskaia literatura v Tsentral’noi Evrope’, *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, 53 (2008), 397–405
- Le Boulluec, Alain, *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque, IIe–IIIe siècles*, 2 vols (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1985), I
- Lenhoff, Gail, ‘Towards a Theory of Protogenres in Medieval Russian Letters’, *Russian Review*, 43 (1984), 31–54
- Levin, Eve, ‘Lay Religious Identity in Medieval Russia: The Evidence of Novgorod Birchbark Documents’, *General Linguistics*, 35 (1995), 131–55
- Lidov, A.M., ‘Obrazy Khrista v khramovoi dekoratsii i vizantiiskaia khristologiiia posle skhizmy 1054 g.’, in E.S. Smirnova, ed., *Drevnerusskoe iskusstvo: Vizantiia i Drevniaia Rus’. K 100-letiiu Andreia Nikolaevicha Grabara (1896–1990)* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1999), pp. 155–77

- Lieu, Judith M., *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)
- Likhachev, D.S., 'Galitskaia literaturnaia traditsiia v zhitii Aleksandra Nevskogo', *TODRL*, 5 (1947), 36–56
- , *Poetika drevnerusskoi literatury* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1967)
- , *Russkie letopisi i ikh kul'turno-istoricheskoe znachenie* (Moscow, Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR, 1947)
- , ed., *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi: XI – pervaiia polovina XIV v.* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1987)
- Lind, D.G. [=Lind, John H.], 'Nekotorye soobrazheniia o Nevskoi bitve i ee znachenii', in Iu.K. Begunov and A.N. Kirpichnikov, eds, *Kniaz' Aleksandr Nevskii i ego epokha: Issledovaniia i materialy* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1995), pp. 44–54
- Lind, John H. [=Lind, D.G.], 'Christianity on the Move: The Role of the Varangians in Rus and Scandinavia', in Fedir Androshchuk, Jonathan Shepard and Monica White, eds, *Byzantium and the Viking World* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2016), pp. 409–40
- , 'The Concept of "Europeanisation" on the Baltic Rim as Seen from the East', in Jörn Staecker, ed., *The European Frontier: Clashes and Compromises in the Middle Ages: International Symposium of the Culture Clash or Compromise (CCC) Project and the Department of Archaeology, Lund University, Held in Lund, October 13–15 2000* (Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2004), pp. 41–44
- , 'The Martyria of Odense and a Twelfth-Century Russian Prayer: The Question of Bohemian Influence on Russian Religious Literature', *The Slavonic and East European Review*, 68 (1990), 1–21
- Liustrov, M.Iu., 'Evropa i evropeitsy v Galitsko-Volynskoi letopisi', in O.V. Gladkova, ed., *Drevnerusskaia literatura: Tema Zapada v XIII–XV vv. i povestvovatel'noe tvorcestvo* (Moscow: Azbukovnik, 2002), pp. 9–25
- Loseva, O.V., 'Prazdniki zapadnogo proiskhozhdeniia v russkikh i iuzhnoslavianskikh mesiatseslovakh XI–XIV vv.', in B.N. Floria, ed., *Slavianskii mir mezhdurimom i Konstantinopolem: Khristianstvo v stranakh Tsentral'noi, Vostochnoi i Iugo-Vostochnoi*

Evropy v epokhu rannego srednevekov'ia (Moscow: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 2000), pp. 73–79

Louth, Andrew, *Greek East and Latin West: The Church AD 681–1071* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2007)

Lur'e, Ia.S., 'K izucheniiu letopisnoi traditsii ob Aleksandre Nevskom', *TODRL*, 50 (1997), 387–99

———, 'K izucheniiu letopisnogo zhanra', *TODRL*, 27 (1972), 76–93

———, 'Lavrent'evskaia letopis' – svod nachala XIV v.', *TODRL*, 29 (1974), 50–67

Majeska, George P., *Russian Travellers to Constantinople in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 19 (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collections, 1984)

Maletov, E.I., ed., 'Khozhenie na Florentiiskii sobor Neizvestnogo Suzdal'tsa', in *Antologiiia khozhenii russkikh puteshestvennikov XII–XV veka: Issledovanie, teksty, kommentarii* (Moscow: Nauka, 2005), pp. 315–27

———, ed., 'Khozhenie v Tsar'grad Dobryni Iadreibovicha', in *Antologiiia khozhenii russkikh puteshestvennikov XII–XV veka: Issledovanie, teksty, kommentarii* (Moscow: Nauka, 2005), pp. 221–35

Marinides, Nicholas, 'Religious Toleration in the *Apophthegmata Patrum*', *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 20 (2012), 235–68

Martin, Janet, *Medieval Russia 980–1584*, 2nd edn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007)

McKitterick, Rosamond, 'Constructing the Past in the Early Middle Ages: The Case of the Royal Frankish Annals', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Sixth Series*, 7 (1997), 101–29

Mel'nikova, E.A., *Drevniaia Rus' v svete zarubezhnykh istochnikov* (Moscow: Logos, 1999)

Meyendorff, John, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia: A Study of Byzantino–Russian Relations in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981)

Migne, J.P., ed., 'Historia Lausiaca', in *Patrologia Graeca*, 161 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1857), xxxiv, 991–1262

- , ‘Vita et conversatio S.P.N. Antonii’, in *Patrologia Graeca*, 161 vols (Paris: Imprimerie Catholique, 1857), xxvi, 835–976
- Mil’kov, V.V., and R.A. Simonov, *Kirik Novgorodets: Uchenyi i myslitel’* (Moscow: Krug, 2011)
- Morse, Ruth, *Truth and Convention in the Middle Ages: Rhetoric, Representation and Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991)
- Mortensen, Lars Boje, ed., *The Making of Christian Myths in the Periphery of Latin Christendom (c. 1000–1300)* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 2006)
- Müller, L., ‘Eine westliche liturgische Formel in Ilarions Lobpreis auf Vladimir den Heiligen’, *Annuaire de l’institut de philologie et d’histoire orientales et slaves*, 18 (1966), 299–305
- Mur’ianov, M.F. [=Mur’ianov, Mikhail], ‘Zametki k Kievo-Pecherskomu pateriku’, *Byzantinoslavica*, 31 (1970), 42–49
- Mur’ianov, Mikhail [=Mur’ianov, M.F.], ‘O novgorodskoi kul’ture XII veka’, *Sacris Erudiri*, 19 (1969–70), 413–36
- Murray, Alan V., ed., *The Clash of Cultures on the Medieval Baltic Frontier* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009)
- Musin, Alexandr, ‘Two Churches or Two Traditions: Common Traits and Peculiarities in Northern and Russian Christianity Before and After 1054 through the Archaeological Evidence: A View from the East’, in Michael Müller-Wille, ed., *Rom und Byzanz im Norden: Mission und Glaubenswechsel im Ostseeraum während des 8.–14. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997), II, 275–95
- Nasonov, A.N., ed., *Novgorodskaja pervaja letopis’ starshego i mladshhego izvodov*, PSRL, 3 (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1950)
- , ed., *Pskovskie letopisi*, PSRL, 5, 2 vols (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul’tury, 2000)
- Nazarenko, A.V., *Drevniaia Rus’ na mezhdunarodnykh putiakh: Mezhdistsiplinarnye ocherki kul’turnykh, torgovykh, politicheskikh sviazei IX–XII vekov* (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul’tury, 2001)
- Neborskii, M.Iu., ‘Traditsii vizantiiskoi antilatinskoi polemiki na Rusi: Vtoraia polovina XIII–nachalo XV veka’, in V.V. Mil’kov, ed., *Drevniaia Rus’: Peresechenie traditsii* (Moscow: Skriptorii, 1997), pp. 371–94

- Nikolov, Angel, “‘A Useful Tale About the Latins’: An Old Bulgarian Translation of a Lost Byzantine Anti-Latin Text of the End of 11th – Early 12th Century”, *Scripta & E-Scripta*, 1 (2003), 99–119
- , *Mezhdurim i Konstantinopol: Iz antikatolicheskata literatura v Bŭlgariia i slavianskiiia pravoslaven sviat (XI–XVII v.)* (Sofia: Fondatsiia «Bŭlgarsko istoricheskoto nasledstvo», 2016)
- Noonan, Thomas S., ‘Medieval Russia, the Mongols, and the West: Novgorod’s Relations with the Baltic, 1100–1350’, *Mediaeval Studies*, 37 (1975), 316–39
- Okhotnikova, V.I., ‘Povest’ o Dovmonte i kniazheskie zhizneopisaniia XI–XIV vv.’, in D.S. Likhachev, ed., *Istochnikovovedenie literatury Drevnei Rusi* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1980), pp. 115–28
- , *Povest’ o Dovmonte: Issledovanie i teksty* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1985)
- Ol’shevskaiia, L.A., and S.N. Travnikov, eds, *Drevnerusskie pateriki* (Moscow: Nauka, 1999)
- Orlov, A.S., ‘K voprosu ob Ipat’evskoi letopisi’, *Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti*, 31 (1926), 93–126
- Ostrowski, Donald, ‘The Galician-Volynian Chronicle, the *Life of Alexander Nevskii* and the Thirteenth-Century Military Tale’, *Palaeoslavica*, 15 (2007), 307–24
- , *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-Cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier, 1304–1589* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- , ‘Pagan Past and Christian Identity in the *Primary Chronicle*’, in Ildar H. Garipzanov, ed., *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East Central, and Eastern Europe (c. 1070–1200)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 229–53
- Ostrowski, Donald, David Birnbaum, and Horace G. Lunt, eds, *The Povest’ vremennykh let: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004)
- Paszkievich, Henryk, *The Origin of Russia* (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1954)
- Pavlov, A. [=Pavlov, A.S.], *Kriticheskie opyty po istorii drevneishei greko-russkoi polemiki protiv latinian* (Saint Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademiia nauk, 1878)

- Pavlov, A.S. [=Pavlov, A.], ed., 'Kanonicheskie otvety mitropolita Ioanna II', in *Pamiatniki drevnerusskogo kanonicheskogo prava*, Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, 6 (Saint Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia komissii, 1880), cols 1–20
- , ed., 'Pravilo Kiurila, mitropolita rus'kago', in *Pamiatniki drevnerusskogo kanonicheskogo prava*, Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka, 6 (Saint Petersburg: Arkheograficheskaia komissii, 1880), cols 83–102
- Pereswetoff-Morath, Alexander, *A Grin Without a Cat, 1: 'Adversus Iudaeos' Texts in the Literature of Medieval Russia (988–1504)*, Lund Slavonic Monographs, 4 (Lund: Lund University Press, 2002)
- Perfecky, George A., *The Hypatian Codex II: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle: An Annotated Translation*, Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, 16, II (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1973)
- Picchio, Riccardo, 'Models and Patterns in the Literary Tradition of Medieval Orthodox Slavdom', Victor Terras, ed., *American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists, Volume II: Literature and Folklore* (The Hague: Mouton, 1973), pp. 439–67
- Plokhy, Serhii, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)
- Podlipchuk, Iu.V., «*Slovo o polku Igoreve*»: *Nauchnyi perevod i kommentarii* (Moscow: Nauka, 2004)
- Podskalsky, Gerhard, *Khristianstvo i bogoslovskaia literatura v Kievskoi Rusi (988–1237 gg.)*, trans. by A.V. Nazarenko (Saint Petersburg: Vizantinorossika, 1996)
- , 'Principal Aspects and Problems of Theology in Kievan Rus', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 11 (1987), 270–86
- Pohl, Walter, and Gerda Heydemann, eds, *Strategies of Identification: Ethnicity and Religion in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013)
- Polianskii, S.M., ed., 'Poslanie Iaroslavu kniaziiu Muromskomu o vere latinskoi', in *Tvoreniia mitropolita Nikifora* (Moscow: Nauka, 2006), pp. 152–70
- , ed., 'Poslanie Vladimiru Monomakhu o vere latinskoi', in *Tvoreniia mitropolita Nikifora* (Moscow: Nauka, 2006), pp. 124–51
- , ed., *Tvoreniia mitropolita Nikifora* (Moscow: Nauka, 2006)

Polyvyannyi, Dmitry I., 'Bulgarian Polemical Literature in the Confessional Strife between Rome and Constantinople', *Slověne*, 2 (2016), 370–76

Ponyrko, N.V., ed., *Epistoliarnoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: XI–XIII: Issledovaniia, teksty, perevody* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 1992)

———, ed., 'Poslanie mitropolita Ioanna k rimskomu pape Klimentu III', in *Epistoliarnoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: XI–XIII: Issledovaniia, teksty, perevody* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 1992), pp. 30–37

———, ed., 'Poslanie o vere latinskoj', in *Epistoliarnoe nasledie Drevnei Rusi: XI–XIII: Issledovaniia, teksty, perevody* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 1992), pp. 16–20

Pope, Richard, 'O kharaktere i stepeni vliianiia vizantiiskoi literatury na original'nuu literaturu iuzhnykh i vostochnykh slavian: Diskussiia i metodologiiia', in Victor Terras, ed., *American Contributions to the Seventh International Congress of Slavists, Volume II: Literature and Folklore* (The Hague: Mouton, 1973), pp. 469–93

Popov, Andrej, *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor drevne-russkich polemičeskich sočinenij protiv latinjan: XI–XV v.* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1972)

Poppe, André [=Poppe, Andrzej], 'Le traité des azymes Λεοντος μητροπολιτου της εν Ρωσσαι Πρεσθλαβας: Quand, où et par qui a-t-il été écrit?', *Byzantion*, 35 (1965), 504–27

Poppe, Andrzej [=Poppe, André], 'Two Concepts of the Conversion of Rus' in Kievan Writings', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12–13 (1988–89), 488–504

Power, Daniel, and Naomi Standen, eds, *Frontiers in Question: Eurasian Borderlands, 700–1700* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1999)

Prestel, David K., 'A Comparative Analysis of the Kievan Caves Patericon' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, 1983)

———, 'The Kievan Caves Monastery: What Do Monks Have to Do with the World?', *Russian History*, 33 (2006), 199–216

Priselkov, M.D., *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI–XV vv.* (Leningrad: Leningradskii gosudarstvennyi universitet, 1940)

Pritsak, Omeljan, *The Origin of Rus': Volume One: Old Scandinavian Sources other than the Sagas* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981)

- Raffensperger, Christian, *The Kingdom of Rus'* (Kalamazoo, Bradford: ARC Humanities Press, 2017)
- , *Reimagining Europe: Kievan Rus' in the Medieval World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012)
- Ramazanova, N.V., *Sviatye russkie rimliane: Antonii Rimlianin i Merkurii Smolenskii* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2005)
- Ramey, Lynn Tarte, *Christian, Saracen and Genre in Medieval French Literature* (New York, London: Routledge, 2001)
- Rappoport, P.A., 'K voprosu o slozhenii Galitskoi arkhitekturnoi shkoly', in E.I. Krupnov, ed., *Slaviane i Rus'* (Moscow: Nauka, 1968), pp. 459–62
- Rhode, Gotthold, *Die Ostgrenze Polens: Politische Entwicklung, kulturelle Bedeutung und geistige Auswirkung* (Köln-Graz: Böhlau, 1955)
- Rice, James L., 'The Therapeutic Method of Moses the Hungarian: A Semantic Nicety', *Russian History*, 33 (2006), 173–77
- Rock, Stella, *Popular Religion in Russia: 'Double Belief' and the Making of an Academic Myth* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007)
- Rogov, A.I., 'Otrazhenie v ideologicheskoi zhizni slavian razdeleniia tserkvei v 1054 g. (XI–XIII vv.)', in V. Typkov-Zaimova, ed., *Rannefeodal'nye slavianskie gosudarstva i narodnosti (problem ideologii i kul'tury)*, *Studia balcanica*, 20 (Sofia: Bolgarskaia akademiia nauk, 1991)
- Rowell, S.C., *Lithuania Ascending: A Pagan Empire Within East-Central Europe, 1295–1345* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994)
- Rybakov, B.A., ed., *Izbornik Sviatoslava 1073 goda* (Moscow: Kniga, 1983)
- , *Russkie letopistsy i avtor „Slova o polku Igoreve“* (Moscow: Nauka, 1972)
- Seemann, Klaus-Dieter, *Die altrussische Wallfahrtsliteratur: Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Genres* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1976)
- Selart, Anti, 'Confessional Conflict and Political Co-Operation: Livonia and Russia in the Thirteenth Century', in Alan V. Murray, ed., *Crusade and Conversion on the Baltic Frontier 1150–1500* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), pp. 151–76

- , *Livonia, Rus' and the Baltic Crusades in the Thirteenth Century*, trans. by Fiona Robb (Leiden: Brill, 2015)
- Senyk, Sophia, *A History of the Church in Ukraine: Volume I: To the End of the Thirteenth Century*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 243 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 1993)
- Shakhmatov, A.A., ed., *Ipat'evskaia letopis'*, PSRL, 2 (Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 1998)
- , '«Povest' vremennykh let» i ee istochniki', *TODRL*, 4 (1940), 5–150
- Shchapov, Ia.N., *Kniazheskie ustavy i tserkov' v Drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Nauka, 1972)
- , *Vizantiiskoe i iuzhnoslavianskoe pravovoe nasledie na Rusi v XI–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1978)
- Shepard, Jonathan, 'The Coming of Christianity to Rus: Authorized and Unauthorized Versions', in Calvin B. Kendall and others, eds, *Conversion to Christianity from Late Antiquity to the Modern Age: Considering the Process in Europe, Asia, and the Americas* (Minneapolis: Center for Early Modern History, University of Minnesota, 2009), pp. 185–222
- , 'Concluding Remarks', in Ildar H. Garipzanov and Oleksiy P. Tolochko, eds, *Early Christianity on the Way from the Varangians to the Greeks (Ruthenica: Supplementum 4)* (Kiev: Natsional'na akademiia nauk Ukraini, 2011), pp. 133–46
- , 'Some Remarks on the Sources for the Conversion of Rus'', in S.W. Swierkosz-Lenart, ed., *Le origini e lo sviluppo della cristianità slavo-bizantina*, *Nuovi studi storici*, 17 (Rome: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medioevo, 1992), pp. 59–95
- Shliapkin, I., *Russkoe pouchenie XI veka o perenesenii moshchei Nikolaia chudotvortsia i ego otnoshenie k zapadnym istochnikam*, *Pamiatniki drevnei pis'mennosti*, 10 (Saint Petersburg: Obshchestvo liubitelei drevnei pis'mennosti, 1881)
- Spiegel, Gabrielle M., *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997)
- Sreznevskii, I.I., 'Skazanie o Sofiiskom khrame Tsaregrada v XII v. po dvum spiskam', *Sbornik otdeleniia russkogo iazkya i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk*, 12 (1875), 340–52
- Stavrou, Theofanis G., and Peter R. Weisensel, *Russian Travellers to the Christian East from the Twelfth to the Twentieth Century* (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers Inc., 1986)

- Stodnick, Jacqueline, 'Sentence to Story: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as Formulary', in Alice Jorgensen, ed., *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), pp. 91–111
- Stökl, Günther, *Das Bild des Abendlandes in den altrussischen Chroniken* (Köln: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1965)
- Sukhomlinov, M.I., 'O drevnei russkoi letopisi, kak pamiatnike literaturnom', *Sbornik otdeleniia russkogo iazkya i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi akademii nauk*, 85 (1908), 1–238
- Sumnikova, T.A., ed., 'Proizvedeniia Ilariona po spisku ser. XV v. GIM. SIN. No. 591', in A.A. Bazhenova, ed., *Ideino-filosofskoe nasledie Ilariona kievskogo*, 2 vols (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1986), i, 11–41
- Sykes, C.P., 'Holy Bodies, Holy Relics: The Evolution of Late Antique Hagiographical Topoi in the *Patericon* of the Kievan Caves Monastery', in Kirsty Stewart and James Moreton Wakeley, eds, *Cross-Cultural Exchange in the Byzantine World, c. 300–1500 AD: Selected Papers from the XVII International Graduate Conference of the Oxford University Byzantine Society*, Byzantine and Neohellenic Studies, 14 (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2016), pp. 131–42
- Tachaios, Anthony-Emil N., 'The Greek Metropolitans of Kievan Rus': An Evaluation of Their Spiritual and Cultural Activity', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 12–13 (1988–89), 430–45
- Thomson, Francis J., *The Reception of Byzantine Culture in Mediaeval Russia* (Aldershot: Ashgate Variorum, 2004)
- Tikhomirov, M.N., 'Besermeny v russkikh istochnikakh', in N.E. Nosov, ed., *Issledovaniia po otechestvennomu istochnikovedeniiu: Sbornik statei, posviashchennykh 75-letiiu professora S.N. Valka* (Moscow, Leningrad: Nauka, 1964), pp. 50–57
- Timberlake, Alan, 'Older and Younger Recensions of the First Novgorod Chronicle', *Oxford Slavonic Papers, New Series*, 33 (2000), 1–35
- Tolochko, Alexei P. [=Tolochko, Oleksiy P.], 'Pokhvala ili zhitie? (Mezhdu tekstologiei i ideologii kniazheskikh panegirikov v drevnerusskikh letopisiakh)', *Palaeoslavica*, 7 (1999), 26–38
- , 'Proiskhozhdenie khronologii Ipatievskogo spiska Galitsko-Volynskoi letopisi', *Palaeoslavica*, 13 (2005), 81–108

- Tolochko, Oleksiy P. [=Tolochko, Alexei P.], 'The Primary Chronicle's "Ethnography" Revisited: Slavs and Varangians in the Middle Dnieper Region and the Origin of the Rus' State', in Ildar H. Garipzanov, Patrick J. Geary, and Przemysław Urbańczyk, eds, *Franks, Northmen, and Slavs: Identities and State Formation in Early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), pp. 169–88
- , 'Christian Chronology, Universal History, and the Origin of Chronicle Writing in Rus'', in Ildar H. Garipzanov, ed., *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East Central, and Eastern Europe (c. 1070–1200)* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), pp. 205–27
- Torres Prieto, Susanna, "'A Godly Regiment in the Heavens Came to Help Aleksandr...': The Sanctity of Heroic Princes in Kievan Rus'', in Brian J. Boeck, Russell E. Martin, and Daniel Rowland, eds, *Dubitando: Studies in History and Culture in Honor of Donald Ostrowski* (Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers Inc., 2012), pp. 67–83
- Tschižewskij, D., 'Zum Stil der Galizisch-Volynischen Chronik', *Südost-Forschungen*, 12 (1953), 79–109
- Turilov, A.A., *Mezhlavianskie kul'turnye sviazi epokhi srednevekov'ia i istochnikovedenie istorii i kul'tury slavian: Etiudy i kharakteristiki* (Moscow: Znak, 2012)
- , 'Obraz pravitel'ia v letopisnykh «nekrologakh» XI–XIII vv.', in G.G. Litavrin, ed., *Anfologion: Vlast', obshchestvo, kul'tura v slavianskom mire v srednie veka: K 70-letiiu Borisa Nikolaevicha Flori* (Moscow: Indrik, 2008), pp. 195–209
- , 'Otvety Georgiia, mitropolita Kievskogo, na voprosy igumena Germana: drevneishee russkoe «voproshanie»', in B.N. Floria, ed., *Slavianskii mir mezhdurimom i Konstantinopolem* (Moscow: Indrik, 2004), pp. 211–62
- Valk, S.N., *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova* (Moscow, Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1949)
- Veder, William R., 'La tradition slave des *Apophthegmata Patrum*', *Slovo*, 24 (1974), 59–93
- , ed., *The Scete Paterikon [Скитский намерук], Volume 3*, Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies, 14 (Amsterdam: Pegasus, 2012)
- Verkholantsev, Julia, 'St. Jerome, Apostle to the Slavs, and the Roman Slavonic Rite', *Speculum*, 87 (2012), 37–61

- Vilkul, Tat'iana [=Vilkul, T.L.], 'O proiskhozhdenii obshchego teksta Ipat'evskoi i Lavrent'evskoi letopisi za XII v. (predvaritel'nye zametki)', *Palaeoslavica*, 13 (2005), 21–80
- Vilkul, T.L. [=Vilkul, Tat'iana], *Liudi i kniaz' v drevnerusskikh letopisiakh serediny XI–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Kvadruga, 2009)
- Viskovatyi, K., 'K voprosu ob avtore i vremeni napisaniia »Slova k Iziaslavu o Latinekh«', *Slavia*, 16 (1938), 535–67
- Vivian, Tim, and Apostolos N. Athanassakis, trans., *The Life of Antony: The Coptic Life and the Greek Life* (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2003)
- Vodoff, Vladimir [=Vodov, V.], 'Aspects et limites de la notion d'universalité dans l'ecclésiologie de la Russie ancienne', in Sante Graciotti, ed., *Il battesimo delle Terre russe: Bilancio di un millenio* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1991), pp. 143–65
- , *Naissance de la chrétienté russe: La conversion du prince Vladimir de Kiev (988) et ses conséquences (XIe–XIIIe siècles)* (Paris: Fayard, 1988)
- Vodov, V. [=Vodoff, Vladimir], 'Eshche odin sled zapadnogo vlianiia v voprosanii Kirika Novgorodskogo?', in A.N. Sakharov, ed., *Ot Drevnei Rusi k novoi Rossii: Iubileinyi sbornik, posviashchennyi chленu-korrespondentu RAN Ia.N. Shchapovu* (Moscow: Palomnicheskii tsentr Moskovskogo Patriarkhata, 2005), pp. 134–38
- Voronin, N.N., '«Povest' ob ubiistve Andreia Bogoliubskogo» i ee avtor', *Istoriia SSSR*, 1963, no. 3, 80–97
- Ware, Kallistos, 'The Rebaptism of Heretics in the Orthodox Canonical Tradition', in Andrew P. Roach and James R. Simpson, eds, *Heresy and the Making of European Culture: Medieval and Modern Perspectives* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), pp. 31–50
- Webb, Diana, *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c. 700–c. 1500* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002)
- Weickhardt, George G., 'The Canon Law of Rus', 1100–1551', *Russian History*, 28 (2001), 411–46
- White, Hayden, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore, London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992)
- White, Monica, *Military Saints in Byzantium and Rus, 900–1200* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

———, ‘Relics and the Princely Clan in Rus’, in Fedir Androshchuk, Jonathan Shepard and Monica White, eds, *Byzantium and the Viking World* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2016), pp. 391–408

Zubareva, E. Iu., ‘Etnonim “franki” v kul’urologicheskom plane’, *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Serii 19: Lingvistika i mezhkul’turnaia kommunikatsiia*, 3 (2007), 111–23

Žužek, Ivan, *Kormčaja Kniga: Studies on the Chief Code of Russian Canon Law*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 168 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1964)