

*Rival and Epigone of Kiev: The Vladimir-Suzdal' Principality**

This essay focuses on a single century in the history of the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality in northeastern Rus', that between roughly the 1130s and the 1230s. It is advisable to examine this principality within the framework of early Ukrainian history for at least three reasons, two of them objective and the third historiographic. The first objective reason is that within the time span we have just indicated, an ambivalent attitude toward Kiev developed among the rulers of that principality and was exemplified in their actions. Kievan traditions were still of importance and were still invoked by Vladimir-Suzdal's bookmen and Kiev was still a coveted prize for all princes of Rus'. But it was no longer the only or the most desirable prize, nor was it considered by the rulers of Vladimir-Suzdal' as preferable to their own seats of power in the northeast. One can interpret some of the chroniclers' passages to mean that the troops of Suzdalians who took Kiev in 1169 behaved there as if in a foreign city, or, at least, in a city where one does not intend to stay for long.

The second objective reason to look at this principality in the framework of early Ukrainian history is that Moscow was founded or fortified toward the middle of the twelfth century, and that it first appears in our sources as part of the territory of the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality. Moreover, it is in part on this territory that the Russian nation was born and began to take shape. This brings us to the point of differentiating Russians and Ukrainians.

The third, historiographical, reason is that since the sixteenth century there has existed a historical conception of a continuity, at first of legitimacy and then of culture and national substance (when historians began to attach importance to such notions) between Kiev, Vladimir, and Moscow, each taking over legitimate rule from the other in an uninterrupted sequence. It is clear that within such a conception, Ukrainians had no independent role to play.

Let us begin with the geographical setting. Vladimir lies on the Kljaz'ma

* Previously unpublished.

river about 450 miles northeast of Kiev as the crow flies, and even today is separated from it by the Brjansk forests. In the past, these forests, together with the Meščera and the Moscow forests, were a much more formidable barrier separating the steppe and the forest-steppe zone from the North. Thus they provided protection from the steppe nomads and greatly reduced the chief source of the harassment that Kiev endured for three centuries.

The three most important centers of the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality were Rostov, mentioned as early as under the year 862 in the Primary Chronicle, the original seat of a bishopric for the region; Suzdal', which gave the principality one of its two names (the date of its foundation is unknown, but it is mentioned under 1024); and Vladimir, the fortress founded by Volodimer Monomax in 1108 and named after that prince. Two other towns must be mentioned. The name of the first, already stated, was Moscow, a fortified place situated on the river of the same name; its first occurrence in our sources dates to 1147. The second is Bogoljubovo, near Vladimir, which was the residence of Prince Andrej, who thereby got his nickname of Bogoljubskij.

The internal history of the principality may be structured around rivalry among the three cities. Rostov lost its importance at an early stage, but remained a seat of boyar opposition to the princes of Vladimir-Suzdal'. Suzdal' was prominent in the first part of the twelfth century, but Vladimir gained the upper hand in the second part of that century. It kept its position until the Tatar invasion and retained superiority, as the coronation place of princes and as a temporary seat of the metropolitan, well into the period of the Tatar yoke. These internal problems will not concern us here. Instead, we shall look at the principality's neighbors, in order better to understand the geographical factors that facilitated its rise to power. Rostov, Suzdal', and Vladimir were situated in the basin of the rivers Volga, Šeksna, Oka, and Kljaz'ma (on which Vladimir lies). In that area these rivers flow in a roughly west-southerly direction and provide waterways for West-East trade. To the west of the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality lay Novgorod with its possessions, and to the east lived the Bulgars of the Kama and Volga rivers. This geographical setting makes understandable the direction of the principality's expansion, without predetermining it, as well as the character of some of its wars, the nature of its trade, and the cultural influences to which it was exposed.

The principality waged wars with the Novgorodians and with the Bulgars on the Kama and the Volga. We hear of German cloth coming to Suzdal' from the West and of Bulgar wax coming to it from the East. Looking at the architecture of Vladimir-Suzdal', we can detect both Romanesque and Caucasian elements in the mural decorations of its churches. The expansion (if we call it that) of Vladimir-Suzdal' toward the South and the principality's cultural relations with Kiev were thus only one aspect of life there.

This one aspect forms the central part of the present essay. Before dwelling

on it, however, we must deal with two more preliminaries. The first has to do with three princes of the area. They are Jurij Dolgorukij, who took up residence in Suzdal' at a date difficult to determine but prior to the death of his father, Volodimer Monomax, in 1125. Jurij established himself as a grand prince of Kiev in 1155 and died there in 1157 (he lies buried in the Church of the Savior at Berestovo). He was followed by his son, Andrej Bogoljubskij, who moved the capital of the principality to Vladimir. As we already know, that prince built a special residence for himself at Bogoljubovo, about six miles from Vladimir, where he was assassinated in 1174. It is with Andrej Bogoljubskij that historians associate a number of ideological changes foreshadowing claims that would be raised by fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Muscovite intellectuals on behalf of their rulers. Andrej Bogoljubskij was followed (in 1176) by Vsevolod, called the "Great Nest," who died in 1212. Vsevolod was Andrej's half-brother. Andrej was the son of Jurij and a Cuman princess—we may surmise that in childhood he knew a Turkic language—while Vsevolod was the son of the same Jurij and a mother who was Greek, possibly even a Byzantine princess. Under Vsevolod, the principality's capital remained in Vladimir, the princely power acquired some new ideological trappings, and the prince fostered impressive architectural enterprises, such as the Cathedral of St. Demetrius.

The second preliminary has to do with the population of the principality. Faced with the dearth of information on the Vladimir-Suzdal' territory prior to its flourishing in the twelfth century, earlier historians assumed that this blooming was the result of an extensive colonization from the south, a migration coming not only from the Kievan lands, but also from Galicia (i.e., western Ukraine). Their argumentation rested in part on data contained in the work of the eighteenth-century Russian historian Tatiščev, who presumably had access to sources now lost and who spoke of such a colonizing movement under Jurij Dolgorukij and Andrej Bogoljubskij. It turned out that these lost sources were but conjectures by Tatiščev himself and therefore had no value for the topic of demography. Information on colonizing activity in the Vladimir-Suzdal' area in the twelfth century is scarce. We know of only three cities founded by Jurij Dolgorukij (Ksnjatin, Jur'ev-Pol'skij, Dmitrov) in addition to a fourth—Moscow.

It must be granted, however, that a number of place-names attested in the Suzdal' territory are identical to those of the Černihiv and Kiev lands and even of Galicia (e.g., Galič, Perejaslav, Zvenigorod, Starodub, Belgorod, and Peremyšl'). This would point to some population movement, just as a place-name like New Amsterdam points to Dutch colonization in North America in the seventeenth century. Some nineteenth-century Russian historians attributed great importance to this identity of nomenclature, because it helped them to link Kiev with the North, in terms not only of ideal "continuity," but also of

identity of population. In simplified form, their theory stated that people moved from the Kiev area to the North, and this hypothesis took care of Ukrainian claims to the Kievan past as well. Today, historians subscribe neither to the picture of the uninhabited forest colonized by the Suzdal' princes with people from Kievan Rus' nor to the theory of mass migration from the South. They do not believe in a sudden flourishing of cities in the twelfth century *ex nihilo*; they point to the priority of the Varangian Volga route over that of the Dnieper; they know that in about the tenth century the territory of the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality was occupied by the Finno-Ugrian tribe of the Merja, and that Finnic place-names survive there to the present day. We need mention only one, the locality of Kidekša, famous for its Church of SS. Boris and Gleb, only three miles from Suzdal'. Historians also know that the same territory was colonized by Novgorodian Slavs coming from the north-west and by the Krivičians (i.e., the Slavs who lived on the territory of present-day Belarus'), coming from the southwest. Thus, Slavic colonization was not predominantly from Kiev, nor was the population of the Suzdal' territory originally or exclusively Slavic. Sources mention people coming from all lands, including Bulgaria on the Volga.

For convenience' sake, some historians date the end of the unity of Kievan Rus' to the death of Mstislav, Volodimer Monomax's son, in 1132¹ or a few years later.² It is worth mentioning in this context that twelfth-century Novgorod and Vladimir-Suzdal' chronicles do not apply the name of "Rus'" to their territories: they reserve it for the lands of the middle Dnieper basin, with Kiev as the center. The Suzdal' princes began to be referred to as Rus' princes only from the 1270s on, that is, after the period covered by the present essay. Judging by the movements of the princes, however—the kind of information that the chronicles offer most readily—by the end of the eleventh century the land of Suzdal' was still considered part of the Kievan whole. Monomax's father, Vsevolod, ruled in the north; Volodimer Monomax himself went to Rostov, and the struggle for this territory that took place in Monomax's time was an extension of struggles over Kiev between Volodimer Monomax himself and Oleg Svjatoslavič of Černihiv. Jurij Vladimirovič Dolgorukij started out simply as a son of the Kievan grand prince Monomax. As a child, he was sent to Rostov as prince, initially under the guardianship of a Varangian. He was to be prince of Rostov for forty years, but would reside more often in Suzdal', a center on the rise. For it is under Dolgorukij that the ascendancy of the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality began.

Jurij's conception was simple. He wanted to keep his patrimony of Rostov-

1. B. Rybakov, *Early Centuries of Russian History* (Moscow, 1965), p. 177.

2. G. V. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia* (New Haven, 1948), p. 98.

Suzdal'—a routine operation—and to establish his preeminence over as many other Rus' lands as possible. This, too, was not new. Jurij wanted this preeminence to be sanctioned by his control of Kiev and the South, to the displeasure of the Kievans, either through the intermediary of his older sons, especially Andrej, or through himself. As for his younger sons, he kept them in the North. He occupied Kiev for a time in 1149, and established himself there from 1155 to his death in 1157. As we already know, he is buried in the Church of the Savior at Berestovo.

The struggle for Kiev was important to Jurij, but it was not the only goal of his policy. One of his other important goals, which would remain constant during the reigns of the two princes who followed him, was that of securing the trade routes connecting Novgorod and the Volga. As a young man he fought the Bulgars on the Volga in 1120, and his sons, Andrej and Vsevolod the "Great Nest," fought them there, too: the first in 1164 and 1172, the latter in 1184, 1186, and 1205. As for Novgorod, both Jurij and Andrej Bogoljubskij succeeded intermittently in installing their "own" princes there, usually their sons, and this practice was continued by Vsevolod as well. Vsevolod's own son, Konstantin, was installed as prince of Novgorod in 1206; moreover, Vsevolod had his candidate ordained as archbishop of Novgorod and had the Novgorodian boyars hostile to Konstantin killed. Thus, he foreshadowed policies that would be followed by Muscovy's Grand Prince Ivan III two and a half centuries later.

To repeat: during Jurij's time the Kievan throne remained important enough to be a permanent target for occupancy, but the more durable base for his power was in Suzdal', and Jurij pursued other commercial and political goals as well. Again, geography helps us to understand this: Kiev is, as we have noted, about 450 air miles from Vladimir, while both Novgorod and the Bulgarian capital, Greater Bulgar on the Volga, were only 300 air miles distant from that city.

Jurij's actions might be called business as usual, if with modifications. Departure from this occurred with Andrej Bogoljubskij. When Jurij established himself in the Kievan principality, he gave Andrej a princely residence, called Vyšhorod, about ten miles north of Kiev. Under the same year, 1155, the Hypatian Chronicle tells us that Andrej "went away from his father <namely> from Vyšhorod, to Suzdal' without his father's permission and from Vyšhorod he took the icon of the Theotokos, which had been brought from Constantinople...aboard...ship <and> set it up in his church of the Holy Theotokos in Vladimir."³ Thus, the patrimonial possessions in the north

3. Cf. *Polnoe sobranie russkix letopisej (PSRL)*, 2 (1843), p. 78; cf. also *Litopys rus'kyj: Za ipats'kym spyskom*, trans. Leonid Maxnovec' (Kiev, 1989), pp. 266–67.

seemed to Andrej more valuable than the residence of the Kievan princes near the 'mother of Rus' cities.' We shall not ask what this northward flight meant about relations between father and son, or inquire into Andrej's possible involvement in the mysterious circumstances surrounding his father's death in Kiev in 1157. For our purpose, it is important to know that at the news of Jurij's death, there was an uprising in Kiev—or, at least, a looting of the princely palaces. In the words of the Hypatian Chronicle,⁴ "they were killing the Suzdalians in the towns and in the villages and looting their possessions." This seems to indicate two things: first, that Jurij brought his people and his entourage from the North and ruled through them; second, that this class of princely favorites was resented and considered alien by the local population. This feeling of estrangement between the Suzdalian North and the Kievan South, and the concomitant decrease of Kiev's importance in the eyes of that North, can be read into the more fateful of Andrej Bogoljubskij's actions concerning that city. In 1169, Andrej intervened in the struggle for Kiev between the Smolensk princes and Mstislav II. His troops took Kiev and sacked it without mercy. Here is what the Hypatian Chronicle tells us:

Kiev was taken on the eighth of March, during the second week of Great Lent, on a Wednesday. They plundered the city for three days, all of it, both the lower and upper town (*Podolje i Horu*) and the monasteries and the churches of St. Sophia and of the Virgin of the Tithes. Nobody was spared, and from nowhere <did assistance come> as the churches were burning, some Christians were being killed, while others were being put in chains. Women were led into captivity and separated by force from their husbands. Infants cried as they looked at their mothers. And they took an enormous booty and they stripped churches both of icons and books, and of vestments; and they took away all the bells. These were the Smolensk, Suzdal', and Černihiv people and Oleg's retinue. And all things sacred were captured. And the pagans [i.e., the Cuman allies of Andrej] set fire to the Holy Theotokos Monastery of the Caves, but through the intercession of the prayers of the Holy Theotokos God protected it from calamity. And all the people of Kiev moaned and wailed out and were given to inconsolable sorrow and shed tears without cessation. All this happened on account of our sins.⁵

When an army sacks a city so thoroughly, the one who commands it has no intention of establishing himself there. Indeed, Andrej Bogoljubskij did not establish himself in Kiev in 1169. What is more, the Suzdalians were led not by him, but by his son, Mstislav, and the man who was put on the Kievan

4. *PSRL*, *ibid.*, p. 81; cf. also *Litopys rus'kyj*, trans. Maxnovec', p. 270.

5. Cf. *PSRL*, *ibid.*, p. 100; cf. also *Litopys rus'kyj*, trans. Maxnovec', p. 295, and J. Pelenski in *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 11 (1987): 305.

throne was Andrej Bogoljubskij's brother, Gleb. Andrej himself remained in Vladimir.

While it is true that one should not exaggerate the extent of the sack of Kiev—chronicles continued to be written there after 1165 and speeches glorifying the Kievan prince and making ideological claims of his primacy were delivered there as late as 1200—it is also true that the last Kievan church to be built during the princely era, that of St. Cyril, erected in 1146, is also the last to compare in dimensions and in quality of its frescoes to Suzdalian monuments of the late twelfth century. After the construction of this church, there is little to report from Kiev in terms of architecture.

Action, then, was in the North, and by action is meant opulence, power, and ideological innovation. The most telling example for illustrating all these is Vladimir-Suzdalian ecclesiastical and lay architecture and decoration. Architecture is a good indicator of economic wealth, social differentiation, rulers' aspirations, and the influences to which a society is exposed. It usually presupposes the existence of towns and of a class of tradesmen, it indicates the level of economic means at the disposal of the central power and, often, it reflects the various cultures that left lasting marks of their influence on its walls. Our first example will be the Cathedral of St. Demetrius, built by Vsevolod in Vladimir at the end of the twelfth century (1193–1197). The church is of vast proportions; in addition, fragments of sculptures on its outside walls display both Romanesque and Caucasian motifs. A second example is the Church of the Nativity in Suzdal', which at present contains no visible elements that would antedate the 1230s. It displays Romanesque features in the frescoes on the upper registers of the southern apse and in a fragment of the doors that depicts the feast of the *Pokrov'*, the Protection by the Theotokos. If one wonders at the presence of Romanesque motifs in Vladimir-Suzdal', the explanation is that these motifs are not isolated, but are present throughout South Slavic and East Slavic Europe in the twelfth century. The structures that come to mind are the church at Studenica in Serbia, St. Cyril's church in Kiev, and the St. Panteleemon church in Halyč. As for the channels by which these motifs were received, we recall that the people of Suzdal' maintained trade contacts with Novgorod, German cloth being one of the objects of this trade. The chronicles state that German craftsmen were called upon to take part in the construction of the Cathedral of St. Demetrius in Vladimir. Finally, we may explain the Romanesque elements in Suzdal''s architecture by family links between its princes and the princes of Halyč, who were open to Western influences. The presence of purely Byzantine frescoes in that cathedral may be traced to its founder, Prince Vsevolod himself, who was half-Greek. We know for certain that for twelve years (between 1162 and 1174), Vsevolod lived with his mother and brothers in exile in Constantinople; he was therefore familiar with the art of Byzantium. More puzzling is the

presence of Caucasian motifs on the façade of St. Demetrius, as well as on the exterior of other churches of the period in this area. Again, the explanation seems to lie in contacts at the princely level. Vsevolod was married to an Ossetian princess, and the Ossetian principality was located in the Caucasus, where it bordered on Georgia. Andrej Bogoljubskij's son was married, for a time, to the famous Georgian queen Tamar, who ruled around 1200. Stylistic influences must have traveled along with these princely matrimonial comings and goings.

The churches of Vladimir-Suzdal' are impressive in quality and, above all, in the vastness of their dimensions. This is the greatest single surprise to be encountered by a traveler to the territory formerly occupied by the Suzdal' principality. These churches not only bear witness to the great power that it once commanded, but also help us to understand the genesis of Russian architecture. It is on this Vladimir-Suzdal' architecture, copied extensively in northeastern Rus', that Russian art bases one of its claims to independence.

Art was not the only expression of the vigor and innovation that was typical of Vladimir-Suzdal' during the twelfth century. Propagandistic literature and political maneuvers attempted to endow Vladimir with the role of an important political and ecclesiastical center, and to elevate it at least to the level of Kiev. The majority of these attempts coincided with the reign of Andrej Bogoljubskij. The tale of Andrej's campaign against the Bulgars in 1164 relates how on the same day that Andrej set out against the foe, the Byzantine emperor Manuel I moved against the infidels (both rulers were victorious, of course). The story of the Byzantine emperor's campaign is spurious, but by comparing Andrej to the supreme ruler of Christianity, the Vladimir writers enhanced the status of their prince.

It was not by accident that the Feast of the Protection by the Theotokos (*Pokrov'*; in Ukrainian, *Pokrova*) was elevated to the status of an important church holiday during Andrej Bogoljubskij's reign. This feast commemorates a miracle witnessed by Andrej's patron saint, Andrew the Fool in Christ, in the church of the Blachernai in Constantinople. Although it was considered a minor celebration in the Byzantine church calendar, Bogoljubskij propagated this holy day as one of special importance throughout the Suzdal' land. He gave the Theotokos special status as protectress of Suzdal', and at his princely residence at Bogoljubovo, alongside the river Nerl', he built a beautiful church dedicated to the Feast of the Protection.

In the *Life* of Leontij, first bishop of Rostov, we read the standard story about the discovery of the relics of a local saint. The point, again, was that the discovery occurred shortly before 1169, under Andrej Bogoljubskij; thus, the Vladimir-Suzdal' land had obtained an important saint of its own—a missionary, rather than a martyr, for Leontij died peacefully as a successful Christianizer of his land.

The first known instance of the use of Byzantium's imperial political ideology (for political rather than moralizing purposes) in Eastern Europe can be traced to the time of Andrej Bogoljubskij. In the moving description of Bogoljubskij's murder in 1174, preserved in both the Laurentian and Hypatian chronicles, the princely victim—like a Byzantine emperor—is compared to King Solomon of the Old Testament. There is more; in the same description, we read the following sentence: "Although the Emperor is in body like any other man, yet in power he is like unto God." It does not matter that the author of the story of Andrej's murder may have been a Kievan by the name of Cosmas (*Kuz'mišče Kyjanin*): to our knowledge such a theory was never applied in the Kievan principality to a Kievan prince, although at least a part of the Old Bulgarian version of Agapetos's *Mirror of Princes*, the Byzantine text from which the sentence is culled, was known in Kiev in the eleventh century.

To end the enumeration of ideological innovations reflected in this literature, we shall note the special chronicle compilations (*izvody*), centered on and made in and for Vladimir, that historians assign to the years 1177, 1193, and 1212.

One striking claim to ideological independence was made by Andrej Bogoljubskij in the field of ecclesiastical organization. Under the guise of rejecting, on canonical grounds, the installation of Bishop Leo, who had been sent to his principality by the metropolitan of Kiev, Andrej tried to set up a prelate of his own by the name of Theodore, and to obtain for him the metropolitanate of Vladimir. Thus, he was defying the claims of Kiev to be the only metropolitan see in the whole of Rus', and he was making his capital an equal of Kiev in the ecclesiastical sphere. We know the affair mostly from the translation of the reply given by Patriarch Lukas Chrysoberges of Constantinople to Andrej's petition, which had been received in Constantinople some time before 1168. Like all administrations, the church administration in Constantinople was unwilling to rock the boat and preferred to deal with one subordinate rather than with many, so it rejected Andrej's request. The patriarch reasserted the right of the metropolitan of Kiev to be the only metropolitan in the land of Rus' (the metropolitan of Kiev at that time was a Greek, Constantine III), and ordered Andrej to reinstall Bishop Leo. Andrej did so, abandoning his protégé Theodore, who was sent to Kiev to be judged, condemned, cruelly mutilated, and then killed by the metropolitan of Kiev. Thus, the first attempt to split the metropolitanate of Rus' ended in failure, but as we shall see in our next essay, it was a harbinger of things to come. In the recent past, some modern scholars saw in the ideological writings of Andrej's time, and, above all, in his bid for a metropolitanate of his own, a gesture of defiance against Constantinople and even a claim of equality with it. In our perspective, however, these writings and actions can

better be explained as competition with Kiev—a closer rival—rather than with Constantinople.

The fact is that both in terms of receiving the know-how (i.e., in objective terms) and in terms of traditions to which the Vladimir bookmen themselves referred, Kiev loomed large on Vladimir's horizon. We can now turn our attention away from the innovative aspects of Vladimir's culture in order to concentrate on traditional elements in it and consider the extent to which the Vladimir-Suzdal' principality was a cultural dependent and epigone of Kiev.

Stone architecture was introduced to Suzdal' from Kiev at the time of Prince Volodimer Monomax. The first Suzdal' cathedral was built in the Kievan (originally Byzantine) technique of layers of brick interspersed with layers of stone. It is only later that white stone was used as a building material in Vladimir-Suzdal', the same white stone that became distinctive of northeastern architecture. This stone was imported from Bulgaria on the Kama River. During Monomax's time, Suzdalian architecture was influenced by Kievan models, notably by the late eleventh-century Cathedral of the Dormition of the Kievan Caves Monastery (destroyed in 1941). This influence would be easier to explain if it were known for certain that Leontij and Isaija, the first bishops of Rostov, were monks of that monastery.⁶ However, the *Life* of Leontij composed under Andrej Bogoljubskij stresses Leontij's Greek antecedents, hence our doubt about his origin.

In the names of buildings, correspondences between Vladimir and Kiev are noteworthy. The Golden Gate of Kiev had its counterpart in Vladimir; the *zlatoverxyj* (i.e., "Golden-Domed") church of St. Michael in Kiev (built in 1100) had its counterpart in the *zlatoverxij* Cathedral of the Dormition in Vladimir (built around 1160). If my interpretation of a passage from the Hypatian Chronicle is correct, Andrej Bogoljubskij wanted consciously to copy the Golden Gate of Kiev and to erect a church dedicated to the Theotokos at his princely residence at Bogoljubovo, similar to the one erected by Jaroslav at his palace in Kiev. The correspondences extend to the names of rivers around Vladimir that reflect Kievan geography, among them the Lybed', Počajna, and Irpen'. And a harkening back to the Kievan tradition can be detected in the local chronicles. One of them, the Perejaslav-Suzdal' Chronicle, dating from the beginning of the thirteenth century, says that Vsevolod of Suzdal', on his deathbed, exhorted the princes not to quarrel, and promised that the prayers of the Theotokos, of their grandfather Dolgorukij, and their great-grandfather Volodimer Monomax of Kiev would be with them. The description of Andrej Bogoljubskij's murder makes reference to a sword

6. *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, trans. M. Heppell, with a preface by D. Obolensky (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), p. 118.

that was removed from his bedchamber by a faithless Ossetian servant of the prince; the sword had belonged to Prince Boris, the son of Volodimer the Great of Kiev.⁷ The chronicle writers of twelfth- and thirteenth-century Vladimir did use "Southern" sources, mainly Kiev's grand princely chronicle. One version of the *Life* of Leontij of Rostov, written just before 1169, imitated in places an eleventh-century sermon by Metropolitan Ilarion of Kiev.

These literary connections are to be related to the movement of writers and clerics from the South to the North. Simeon, one of the co-authors of the Kievan Caves Monastery's *Paterikon*, was the abbot of a monastery in Vladimir and bishop of Vladimir in 1214. But because he had been a monk of Kiev, he began work on the *Paterikon* out of nostalgia. Serapion was bishop of Vladimir from 1274 on, and is known as Serapion of Vladimir in scholarly literature, but the majority of his sermons date from the time when he was archimandrite of the Kievan Caves Monastery. And we recall that the author of the story about the murder of Bogoljubskij was a man from Kiev.

Close contact between Suzdal' and Kiev ended when the Golden Horde conquered Eastern Europe. In this, too, the Tatar invasion caused a break in East European history and accelerated the differentiation of its various parts.

In sum, from the point of view of some princes, the territory of Kievan Rus' was a single whole, even between 1150 and 1220. These rulers moved from Northern to Southern seats of power and many of them had a crack at the Kievan throne. Thus, Mstislav Rostislavič Xrabryj was for a time prince of Novgorod (by the way, he helped Andrej Bogoljubskij to take Kiev in 1169), but he also put his own candidate on the Kievan throne. Prince Roman Mstislavič, son of the prince who fought *against* Bogoljubskij in 1169, was prince not only of Novgorod, but also of Halyč, and he controlled Kiev, as did his son Daniel (Danylo) of Halyč for a short time before Kiev's fall to the Tatars. To quote one final example, Mstislav Udaloj was prince of Novgorod and of Halyč, but placed his own candidates on the Kievan throne at the beginning of the thirteenth century. This struggle for Kiev, however, was a fight from memory. At the same time, new centers of power were being created on the territory of the former Kievan Rus', and Vladimir-Suzdal' was one of them. It was to have an important future, for Vladimir-Suzdal', along with Novgorod and Muròm-Rjazan', comprised the territory on which the Russian nation took shape.

Another such important center was the Halyč-Volhynian principality with its cities of Halyč, Xolm and L'viv and its own chronicle compilation (the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle). For a short time it, too, qualified as a rival and epigone of Kiev and could therefore have been the subject of a parallel

7. Cf. *PSRL*, 2 (1843), p. 113; cf. also *Litopys rus'kyj*, trans. Maxnovec', p. 314.

essay here, but this principality's rise was ephemeral, and by the first half of the fourteenth century it succumbed to its neighbors, Hungary, Poland and Lithuania. Moreover, no new nation came into being on its territory—in spite of some differences, both the present-day inhabitants of the former Halyč-Volhynian principality and the inhabitants of the Kiev land are Ukrainians.

Shifts in centers of power are a fruitful subject of historical research. In Eastern Europe, too, power moved from one center to another. This movement was accompanied by old dynastic and new ideological claims and by the transfer of cultural attitudes and even objects that symbolized these shifts. The fate of one such object, the icon of the Theotokos of Vladimir, exemplified this movement. An early twelfth-century Byzantine icon, it adorned the palace of the Kievan princes at Vyšhorod, ten miles north of Kiev. In 1155, we recall, the icon was taken to Vladimir by Andrej Bogoljubskij, whose bookmen composed a tale of miracles attributed to it. In 1395, the icon was transported to the Cathedral of the Dormition in the Moscow Kremlin, and in Moscow at the Tret'jakov Gallery it remains to this day.

We should distinguish, however, between shifts of princely thrones of power from one territory to another, on the one hand, and cultural and linguistic continuity, on the other. Despite shifts in political power, cultural and linguistic continuity existed, without being forcefully proclaimed, on the territory of present-day Ukraine, including Kiev, between the twelfth and the early seventeenth century, at which time old Kievan cultural traditions and claims came again to the fore (see Essays 8, 9 and 11). A similar link connects ancient Vladimir-Suzdal' with present-day Russia.