Chapter 7

THE RUS' LAND AND IVAN IV

HOW THE MYTH of the Rus' Land was adapted to the new political circumstances created by Ivan IV's coronation as tsar in 1547 is of great interest for understanding Muscovite political consciousness. Did the term survive, and if so, did its meaning change? Was it displaced by terms generated by Ivan's new title such as Rus' tsardom (*tsarstvo*, *tsarstvie*) or the more imperial variant, the Ros (*rossiiskaia*) Land? Of course, sixteenth-century book-men continued to refer to the Rus' Land when discussing earlier history. They were after all quoting earlier sources, even if sometimes they could indulge in anachronism. This chapter looks at applications of the term only to events during Ivan's reign, beginning with descriptions of his accession upon the death of his father, Grand Prince Vasilii III.

Vladimir Bovykin's monograph *The Rus' Land and the State in the Epoch of Ivan the Terrible*,[1] although an excellent monograph on local self-government in sixteenth-century Muscovy, unfortunately serves as an example of how not to address this theme. Bovykin's goal is to dispute the assertion of the nineteenth-century Russian conservative journalist Mikhail Katkov that the Rus' Land and the state were synonymous. In so doing Bovykin equates the Rus' Land with the "Russian people" (*narod*) and "society" (*obshchestvo*). He interprets any reference to the "land" as an invocation of the Rus' Land, although (or because?) "land" also meant the commune (*obshchina*, *mir*). He also refers to the "entire territory of the Rus' Land," by which he seems to mean the territory of the state. He dates the transformation of the Rus' Land into a "single centralized national state" (*edinoe tsentralizovannoe natsional'noe gosudarstvo*) to this period.[2] The word "land" could have several meanings in Ivan IV's Muscovy, including "society," but treating "land" and the "Rus' Land" as synonyms without further analysis is unjustified.

In contrast to Bovykin, Mikhail Krom, in his recent stimulating analysis of the birth of the Muscovite state, observed that before the sixteenth century the only term available to express loyalty beyond the local level of city or principality was the Rus' Land which "designated the country (*strana*), a religious–cultural community (*religiozno-kul'turnaia obshchnost'*), but by no means a state (*gosudarstvo*)." Even in the middle of the fifteenth century the phrase was not fixed territorially or politically. It continued to be used after Ivan IV's coronation. It was not definitively replaced by "the Russian (Ros) tsardom" (*Rossiisskoe tsarstvo*) until the beginning of the seventeenth century during the Time of Troubles.[3]

---

1 Vladimir Valentinovich Bovykin, *Russkaia zemlia i gosudarstvo v epokhu Ivana Groznogo: Ocherki po istorii mestnogo samoupravleniia v XVI v.* (St. Petersburg: Bulanin, 2014).

2 Bovykin, *Russkaia zemlia* 5, 6, 79, 149, 377, 382.

3 Mikhail Krom, *Rozhdenie gosudarstva. Moskovskaia Rus' XV–XVI vekov* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2018), 222 (quotation), 223, 231

Previously Krom had defined the Rus' Land as referring to a country, not a state, because it lacked political unity.[4] He had not, it appears, glossed the term as denoting a religious-cultural community.[5] Tracing in detail the appearances of the phrase in sources from Ivan's reign of course fell outside the scope of Krom's synthesis of evidence on Muscovite state-formation.

Krom's conception of the meaning of the Rus' Land before Ivan IV's reign should be qualified. The phrase did connote a country rather than a state, or even a government, and its territorial referents did vary. However, I have argued that the term was actually dynastic. It denoted the territory ruled by princely members of the clan of Saint Vladimir. The potency of the myth made it, in effect, a political football. Whichever prince could speak for the Rus' Land gained legitimacy. Therefore the concept "migrated" territorially as part of princely ideology, from the Kievan Dnieper River basin, to all of East Slavdom, to, in the thirteenth century, the Galician–Volhynian principality (now Ukraine) to the southwest both in contemporary Slavonic sources, the local chronicle, and in Latin as the *terra Russiae* (discussed below) and probably in the second half of the fourteenth century, although reliably dated documentation and evidence does not survive until the middle of the fifteenth century, to the Muscovite principality in the northeast. Thus, rulers who ruled Kiev, Galich, or Moscow each in turn claimed to rule the Rus' Land. By the middle of the fifteenth century Moscow's ascendancy was sufficient that it exercised a monopoly over the term. The *translatio* of the Rus' Land to Muscovy long preceded Ivan IV's coronation as tsar. At no time did the Rus' Land express "national consciousness," which would have been difficult since, as Krom observed elsewhere, agreeing with Kliuchevskii, no concept of the "Russian people" (*russkii narod*) existed before the end of the fifteenth century.[6]

Following its heritage of dynastic affiliations, we would expect the concept of the Rus' Land during Ivan IV's reign to refer to the territory that he ruled. Whether it also carried, as Krom suggests, religious, cultural, and social dimensions as well must be demonstrated from specific passages.[7] It is not only the appearance of the phrase that matters but the specifics of its usage. The "Rus' Land" appears in documentary and narrative sources of state and church provenance, in official and unofficial sources.[8]

---

4 Note the contrast to Cherniavsky's opinion that the Rus' Land did not connote a country.

5 M. M. Krom, "K voprosu o vremeni zarozhdeniia idei patriotizma v Rossii," in *Mirovospriiatie i samosoznanie russkogo obshchestva (XI–XX vv.). Sbornik statei*, ed. L. N. Pushkarev (Moscow: Institut rossiyskoy istorii, Rossiyskaya akademiya nauk, 1994), 16–30 at 19, 24, and its English-language publication, M. M. Krom, "Christian Tradition and the Birth of the Concept of Patriotism in Russia," trans. Ruth Coates, in *The Emancipation of Russian Christianity*, ed. Natalia A. Pecherskaya, with the assistance of Ruth Coates (Lewiston: Mellen, 1995), 17–37 at 21–22, 28.

6 Krom, "K voprosu o vremeni zarozhdeniia idei patriotizma v Rossii," 19; Krom, "Christian Tradition and the Birth of the Concept of Patriotism in Russia," 22.

7 Halperin, "*Rus'* versus *Ros* in Ivan IV's Muscovy," 370 only posed this question.

8 Charles J. Halperin, "What is an 'Official' Muscovite Source from the Reign of Ivan IV?" in *The Book of Royal Degrees and the Genesis of Russian Historical Consciousness / "Stepennaia kniga tsarskogo rodosloviia" i genezis russkogo istoricheskogo soznaniia*, ed. Ann M. Kleimola and Gail Lenhoff (Bloomington: Slavica, 2011), 81–93.

According to the diplomatic papers (*posol'skie knigi*) of Muscovite relations with the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (*litovskie dela*, both before and after the Union of Lublin further fused Lithuania with Poland in 1569), in 1550 Metropolitan Makarii, according to Ivan's communique to King Sigismund Augustus of Poland, had crowned Ivan in 1547 as ruler of the Rus' Land.[9] In 1562 Ivan, again addressing Lithuania, claimed that he ruled the Rus' Land as his patrimony.[10] Clearly here the Rus' Land means the country that Ivan inherited from his father in 1533 and now ruled. In 1559 and 1569–1570, Ivan, addressing Sweden, asserted that the Swedish and Rus' Lands were now at peace, or should be, and also referred to his own country as the Rus' Land.[11]

In a domestic context in 1571 Prince Ivan Fedorovich Mstislavskii falsely confessed to having betrayed the Rus' Land by inviting Crimean Khan Devlet Girei to burn Moscow.[12] (Mstislavskii, more or less voluntarily, let himself play the scapegoat for the Crimean burning of Moscow. If Ivan had actually believed Mstislavskii guilty, he would have had him executed. Instead, he suffered no punishment at all.) It is noteworthy that in this highly emotional situation, fraught with implications of treason, Mstislavskii's confession did not refer to the Russian tsardom, but the Rus' Land.

The 1551 *Council of One Hundred Chapters* (*Stoglav*) is the text of the decisions of an ecclesiastical council on how to improve the faith in Muscovy. It refers to the bishops of the Rus' Land and the bishops of the "entire (*vsia*) Rus' Land."[13] Here the Rus' Land denotes the territory included in the metropolitanate of Muscovy and All Rus' headed by Metropolitan Makarii. Its meaning was ecclesiastical and organizational, but not religious. It should be kept in mind that the territorial boundaries of the Moscow metropolitanate depended upon the boundaries of the territory controlled by the government in Moscow. When Muscovy conquered Kazan' in 1552, the archbishopric subsequently established there was subject to the authority of the metropolitan of Moscow. It "joined" the Rus' Land. The same applied to Polotsk, then in Lithuania but now in Belarus, when Muscovy annexed it in 1563. Polotsk ceased to be part of the eparchy of Moscow, the Rus' Land, when Poland–Lithuania recovered it in 1579. In short, the Rus' Land here was ecclesiastical only derivatively. Ultimately it was political, and still dynastic. Orthodox bishops in lands governed by the tsar in Moscow were under the ecclesiastical supervision of the metropolitan in Moscow.

Confirming the conception of Metropolitan Makarii's eparchy in the *Council of One Hundred Chapters* is a 1563 epistle to him, ascribed to various authors including the

---

9 *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* 59 (1887): 345.

10 *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* 71 (1892): 108.

11 *Sbornik russkogo istoricheskogo obshchestva* 129 (1910): 57, 59, 181.

12 *Sobranie gosudarstvennykh gramot i dogovorov, khraniashchikhsia v Gosudarstvennoi Kollegii inostrannykh del*, ed. A. Malinovsky, 4 vols. (Moscow: Vsevolozhskago, 1813–1826), 1:561–65.

13 *Stoglav*, ed. D. E. Kozhanchikov (St. Petersburg: Imperatorskaia akademia nauk, 1863; repr. Letchworth: Bradda, 1971), 23, 160. Halperin, "*Rus'* versus *Ros* in Ivan IV's Muscovy," 370, erroneously included *Stoglav*, 196 among references to events during Ivan IV's reign. It alludes to the Rus' Land in connection with Constantinople Patriarch Photius and St. Vladimir.

monk Gerasim of the Iosifov Monastery, which also describes him as metropolitan over "the entire (*vsia*) Rus' Land."[14]

Chronicles provide rich information on the semantics of the Rus' Land during Ivan IV's reign, although due allowance must be made for the repetition resulting from their incestuous interrelationship. New chronicles cribbed material from older chronicles. The Nikon Chronicle is the generic name for a series of chronicle compilations that followed the compilation of the "core" *Nikon Chronicle* in 1530. S.a. 1533 the dying Vasilii III asserted that he had held (ruled) his realm (*derzhava*) the Rus' Land with his boyars, an echo of the so-called *vita* of Dmitrii Donskoi. Vasilii III gave his son his realm (*gosudarstvo*), which the boyars should defend against Latins and Muslims abroad and "strong people" (*sil'nye luidi*) at home.[15] In 1541 the Crimean khan attacked the Rus' Land. In response to the Crimean threat the eleven-year-old Ivan IV prayed for God to defend the Rus' Land. Ivan IV placed his trust in the sainted Moscow metropolitans Petr and Aleksei to defend the Rus' Land from the Crimeans. In the last analysis Ivan's prayers were answered: God defended the Rus' Land.[16]

These chronicle passages are fully consistent with the documentary evidence of the diplomatic papers. Vasilii III's realm is the Rus' Land, which he bequeathed to his heir and eldest son, Ivan IV. *Gosudarstvo* clearly derives from *gosudar'* meaning "sovereign," and does not mean "state" (its modern Russian definition). *Gosudarstvo* and *derzhava* function as synonyms, signifying the entity, the country, the realm which Vasilii III ruled and which Ivan will rule. The Rus' Land threatened by the Crimeans manifests itself territorially. The protection of God and Russian saints accorded the Rus' Land does not make the term religious. In this instance Ivan IV prays for the Rus' Land, as a ruler should pray for the security of his realm and people, but below we shall see a more metaphorical and rhetorical ascription of prayer to the reified Rus' Land itself.

The *Resurrection Chronicle* (*Voskresenskaia letopis'*) contains the same passages as the *Nikon Chronicle* concerning Vasilii III's death-bed invocation of the Rus' Land; it served as the source for the *Nikon Chronicle* passages.[17]

Even the *Book of Degrees* (*Stepennaia kniga*), written probably during the 1560s, which is totally committed to the concept of the Muscovites tsardom, still recorded that

---

14 Archimandrite Makarii (Veretennikov), *Zhizn' i trudy sviatitelia Makariia mitropolita Moskovskogo i vsea Rusi* (Moscow: Izdatel'skii sovet Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Tserkvy, 2002), 15.67, 451–52.

15 "Strong people" is a cliché term for those who abuse their economic, social, and political power to oppress commoners. In Muscovite sources it can denote boyars, monasteries, or government officials.

16 *PSRL*, 13 (Moscow: Nauka, 1965), 76 (twice), 99, 103, 105, 106. Halperin, "*Rus'* versus *Ros* in Ivan IV's Muscovy," 370, erred in listing *PSRL*, 13:112, an historical allusion to the invasion of Rus' by Temir-Aksak (Tamerlane) in 1395, which is not about events during Ivan IV's reign.

17 *Voskresenskaia letopis'. Opis' russkikh gorodov*, ed. A. I. Tsepkov, Russkie letopisi 3 (Riazan': Uzoroch'e, 1998), 375, 395. The alternate version of the death of Vasilii III in the *Chronicle of the Beginning of the Tsardom* (*Letopisets nachala tsarstva*) does not refer to the Rus' Land: *PSRL*, 29 (Moscow, Nauka, 1965), 9–11, also in *PSRL*, 13:75–77, left column.

there were bad omens in "all regions (*oblasti*) of the Rus' Land" in 1533, portending Vasilii III's ill-health.[18]

The *Alexander-Nevskii Chronicle* (*Aleksandro-Nevskaia letopis'*), a part of the *Illustrated Chronicle Compilation* (*Litsevoi letopisnyi svod*), compiled later than the *Book of Degrees*, which was one of its sources, retained the assertion that in 1541 Crimean Khan Safa-Girei attacked the Rus' Land.[19]

Ivan IV referred to the Rus' Land both in an epistle in his own name and in epistles he putatively ghostwrote for boyars responding to an invitation from the King of Poland to betray Ivan. Ivan IV's *First Epistle to Prince Andrei Kurbskii* made only an historical reference to the Rus' Land in connection with Dmitrii Donskoi, but in his *Second Epistle to Kurbskii* Ivan wrote that Kurbskii, the priest Sylvester, and the associate boyar (*okol'nichii*) Alexei Adashev[20] "wanted to place the entire Rus' Land (*vsia russkaia zemlia*) under their feet" (control).[21]

The most intriguing references to the Rus' Land during Ivan's reign are found in two epistles to King of Poland Sigismund Augustus in the names of Muscovite boyars. The similarities among these epistles from boyars to Polish–Lithuanian figures, all dated 1567, suggest a common ghost-authorship by Ivan IV[22] or use of a template of his or someone else's design. In any event Prince I. D. Bel'skii offered to partition Poland–Lithuania, allowing Sigismund Augustus to take Poland, while Bel'skii would take the Lithuanian Grand Duchy (*Velikoe kniazhestvo litovskoe*) and the Rus' Land minus whatever lands were claimed by Prince M. I. Vorotynskii. An epistle from Prince I. F. Mstislavskii to Sigismund Augustus suggested the same partition between Bel'skii and Sigismund

18 *Stepennaia kniga tsarstogo rodosloviia po drevneishim spiskam. Teksty i kommentarii*, ed. N. N. Pokrovskii and G. D. Lenkhoff, 3 vols., vol. 2: *Stepeni XI–XVII, Prilozheniia. Ukazateli* (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2007–2012), 323. Another historical reference to Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi as ruling the "Rus' Land" ambiguously implies that Ivan IV now also does so (ibid., 322).

19 *PSRL*, 29:135.

20 Traditional historiography associated these three men as members of the "Chosen Council" (*Izbrannaia rada*) that dominated the Muscovite government during the 1550s. This paradigm has been contested.

21 J. L. I. Fennell, ed., *The Correspondence of Prince A. M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia 1564–1579* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 12–13 (Ivan's *First Epistle*), 188–89 (Ivan's *Second Epistle*, modified from Fennell's translation "all the Russian land"). Whether Kurbskii referred to the Rus' Land depends upon treating the word "holy" in the expression "Holy Rus' Land" as an interpolation in the seventeenth-century manuscripts of Kurbskii's *History* (as proposed by Cherniavsky, *Tsar and People*, 107–11) and then working backwards to the Rus' Land as the original phrase. It also depends upon accepting the authenticity of the text and its attribution to Kurbskii. Brian J. Boeck, "Eyewitness or False Witness? Two Lives of Metropolitan Filipp of Moscow," *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* 55, no. 2 (2007): 161–77 does not accept Kurbskii's authorship or the *History*'s authenticity.

22 For a different view, see Edward L. Keenan, *The Kurbskii-Groznyi Apocrypha. The Seventeenth-Century Origin of the "Correspondence" Attributed to Prince A.M. Kurbskii and Tsar Ivan IV*. With an appendix by Daniel C. Waugh (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971), 67–68.

Augustus, with some lands in Lithuania to himself (he did not proffer any consideration to be given Vorotynskii).[23]

The credibility of the partition offer is not at issue here. Indeed, some historians doubt that these replies to Sigismund's missives were ever sent.[24] Lur'e in his commentary to Bel'skii's epistle glossed the Rus Land as all the Belarusian and Ukrainian lands under the authority of the Grand Dukes of Lithuania.[25] It is more likely that the phrase here denoted Galicia. In the thirteenth century Galicia–Volhynia was called the Rus' Land" by the local chronicle. Although administratively in the middle of the sixteenth century Galicia was part of the Rus' Palatine in Poland, in Slavonic narratives it was still called the "Rus' Land." Regardless of whether Rus' Land referred only to Galicia or a larger group of territories formerly part of Kievan Rus' but now incorporated into Poland or Lithuania, the more important context is what Rus' Land meant in Ivan IV's Muscovy. At the time of writing Ivan ruled the Rus' Land and Makarii presided over the bishops of the Rus' Orthodox Church in the Rus' Land, and neither Ivan's realm nor Makarii's eparchy included the regions denoted as the Rus' Land in Bel'skii's and Mstislavskii's epistles. The "Rus' Land" was a term of great political legitimacy, and belonged to the heir of the Volodimerovichi, Ivan IV. To apply the term to lands belonging to the Lithuanian Grand Duchy and the Crown of Poland in this way took considerable liberties with the concept. It was extraordinarily sloppy politically, intellectually, and ideologically.[26]

The *Tale of Batory's Assault on Pskov* (*Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov*), as previously discussed, is a gripping narrative of Batory's unsuccessful siege of the city in 1581. As expected, the text offers much fuel for Pskovian pride, but the text does not criticize Ivan IV, so one would not be surprised to see at least decorous allusions to the *rossiiskoe tsarstvo*. In fact, there is only one unmodified reference to the tsardom, and only one reference to the "Ros tsardom."[27] There are thirteen references to the Rus' Land, detailed above. There can be no doubt that the author of the *Tale* conceived of Pskov as an integral part of the Rus' Land, as a country and a territory, to which he was obviously devoted. This is quite curious in what is, after all, a regional text in which Ivan IV is barely present and the dynastic context of the Rus' Land is absent. To put it differently, it is as if Pskov appropriated a dynastic myth for regional self-defensive purposes.

More traditional but equally intriguing for a different reason are the appearances of the Rus' Land in the *Kazan' History* (*Kazanskaia istoriia*), a narrative, almost a romance, about the history of Rus'-Kazan' relations crowned by Muscovy's 1552 conquest of the khanate. In addition to historical invocations of the Rus' Land, the term appears seven-

23 D. S. Likhachev and Ia. S. Lur'e, eds., *Poslaniia Ivana Groznogo* (Moscow: Nauka, 1951), 245, 253.

24 Ruslan Grigor'evich. Skrynnikov, *Tsarstvo terrora* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, Sankt-Peterburgskoe otdelenie, 1992), 312–14.

25 *Poslannia Ivana Groznogo*, 674n5. Lur'e utilized the Great-Russian nationalist term, "West-Russian (*Zapadnorusskie*) lands."

26 Contradictorily, ten years later, in a 1577 epistle to Prince Aleksandr Polubenskii in Lithuania, Ivan IV referred to his grandfather, Ivan III the Great, as the "gatherer of the Rus' Land." Ivan the Great did not "gather" Galicia into the Muscovite state.

27 Malyshev, ed., *Povest' o prikhozhdenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov*, 35 (both).

teen times in passages discussing current events. There was great mourning in the Rus' Land at the death of Vasilii III. The Crimean and Kazan' Khanates attacked the Rus' Land during Ivan's minority. Kazan' had ruled part of the Rus' Land for 300 years, and looted and raided the border (*ukraina*) of "our" Rus' Land.[28] While Batu, grandson of Chingis Khan and the commander of the Mongol army that conquered Rus' in the thirteenth century, went through the entire Rus' Land, the Kazanis did not penetrate as deeply, but never left the Rus' Land alone. When the Muscovites captured Sumbek (Suiunbek), *khansha* (wife of the khan) of Kazan', she moaned that she would be ridiculed and cursed when held captive in the Rus' Land. Captured servants (*otroki*, literally "orphans") of Muscovite officers who refused to convert to Islam were tortured to death and lay down their lives for the Rus' Land. Metropolitan Makarii prayed for the "entire Rus' Land." Ivan described the Rus' Land as his "realm." The "entire Rus' Land" prayed for a Muscovite victory at Kazan'. Conquered and now Christian Kazan' had been and now resumed being part of the Rus' Land. News of the victory spread to the Rus' Land, which was Ivan's patrimony. God protects the Rus' Land. The Rus' Land had been suffering, but was now at peace. The author lauds the entire Rus' Land.[29]

In the *Kazan' History,* the Rus' Land has obvious dynastic and territorial referents. The author's assertion that Kazan' had been part of the Rus' Land before the advent of the Kazan' Tatars derives from his invention of autochthonous Rus' primary inhabitants of the region. Kazan' was once and will once again be part of the Rus' Land, but when it was not part of the Rus' Land it could attack the Rus' Land and the Rus' Land could pray for the ability to conquer Kazan'. Of course, the chronology is not that neat; defeated Kazan' immediately becomes (resumes being) part of the Rus' Land, yet news of its conquest spreads "to" the Rus' Land. There is a strong religious element too. It is not just that God protects the Rus' Land, but that Muscovites give up their lives for it (and are implicitly martyred for it). However, the concept of the Rus' Land is hardly religious. Metaphorically the "entire Rus' Land" engages in prayer, which is as close as any source from Ivan's reign comes to conceiving the Rus' Land as a social unit (which was not uncommon in the Kievan and Mongol periods). I cannot see any cultural connotations to the term in the *Kazan' History*.

The oddity is that although some scholars date the first redaction of the *Kazan' History* to the 1560s, all surviving manuscripts derive from a second redaction written no earlier than 1589 and perhaps after 1598. Only seventeenth-century manuscripts survive, and some historians date the text to the seventeenth century.[30] In the absence of any manuscripts of the first redaction it is very problematic to isolate passages in the second redaction that belonged to the first redaction, but the relatively great attention paid to the myth of the Rus' Land makes much more sense in a sixteenth-century context than in a seventeenth-century context when the term had already been superseded by

28 "Our Rus' Land" also appeared in the *Lithuanian-Belarusian Chronicles*; see chapter 9

29 G. N. Moiseeva, ed, *Kazanskaia istoriia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1954), 72, 74, 75, 110, 119, 137, 147, 163–64, 172, 173, 175–76.

30 Such as Edward L. Keenan, Jr., "Coming to Grips with the *Kazanskaya istoriya*," *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences in the United States* 31–32 (1967): 143–83.

the concept of the *rossiisskoe* tsardom. Ivan IV conquered Kazan' after his coronation as tsar, yet more imperial terms, the "Ros Land" (*rossiiskaia zemilia*), let alone the "Ros tsardom" (*rossiiskoe tsarstvo*), did not overwhelm the traditional historical term Rus' Land in the text.

As far as I can tell the Rus' Land appears once in the writings of Ivan Peresvetov, an immigrant who lived in Muscovy in the late 1540s and early 1550s. In the *First Prophesy of the Philosophers and Doctors* (*Pervoe predskazanie filosofov i doktorov*) these scholars predicted that with God's help the Rus' Land would conquer the Kazan' Khanate by force and convert it to Orthodox Christianity.[31] The Rus' Land is a country.

Despite the ubiquity of references to the Rus' Land in these sources from Ivan IV's reign, it should not be forgotten that quite a few sources from that period did not invoke the Rus' Land. In some cases, the nature of the source is such that we would not expect the phrase to appear. In others, we know that the phrase could have appeared, because comparable alternatives did show up, but the Rus' Land did not.

The Rus' Land is not found, nor would we expect to find it, in domestic official administrative sources, such as the Law Code of 1550 (*Sudebnik*); the *Book of the Thousand* (*Tysiachnaia kniga*), codifying the new land allocations of conditional landed estates (*pomest'e*) to selected servitors who lacked lands close enough to Moscow to be mobilized rapidly in time of need; the *Court Quire* (*Dvorovaia tetrad'*), a personnel register of the Royal Court or Household (*Dvor*), curiously not listing all its members, but including a larger number of potential members in a recruitment pool; or the *Registers* (*Razriady* or *Razriadnye knigi*), lists of primarily military commissions in field armies but also political appointments, largely governors (*namestniki*) of cities and county administrators (*volosteli*). For different reasons, mention of the Rus' Land was not required in Ivan IV's 1547 coronation ordo as tsar, focused entirely upon his tsardom. The unofficial *Book of Household Management* (*Domostroi*) did not need to mention the Rus' Land because it is oriented to the household level. There could have been an allusion to the Rus' Land in the introduction to the private political reform proposal of the cleric Ermolai-Erazm (the priest Ermolai took monastic vows as Erazm) to reform land measurement, ownership, and taxation, *On Administration and Land Measurement* (*Pravitel'nitsa. Ashche voskhotiat tsar'em pravitel'nitsa i zemlemerie*) in order to identify the country in need of reform, but there was not.[32] The phrase could have appeared with the same function as the location of the Valaam Monastery, where supposedly two elders debated objections to monastic landowning and the participation of monks in affairs of state, the *Valaam Discourse* (*Valaamskaia beseda*), but there it was not. The first redaction refers to Rus' (*russkie*) grand princes, the second redaction to Ros (*rossiiskie*) princes, but otherwise alludes

31 *Sochineniia I. Peresvetova* (Moscow: Nauka, 1956), 161. Some historians consider "Peresvetov" to be a pseudonym, even of Ivan IV himself, while others date the texts attributed to Peresvetov to the seventeenth century. For a discussion of these issues with bibliography, see A. V. Karavashkin, *Russkaia srednevekovaia publitsistika: Ivan Peresvetov, Ivan Groznyi, Andrei Kurbskii* (Moscow: Prometei, 2000), 27–126.

32 Text: L. A. Dmitriev and D. S. Likhachev, eds., *Pamiatniki literatury drevnei Rusi. Konets XV–pervaia polovina XVI veka* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1984), 652–53.

only once to the tsardom, and once in an ancillary work, the *Prophesy of Kiril of Novoezero* (*Prerechenie Kirilla Novoezera*) to the Ros Land (*Rossiiskaia zemlia*).[33] The narrative of Ivan's sack of the city of Novgorod in 1569–1570, the *Tale of Ivan IV's Campaign against Novgorod* (*Povest' o prikhode Ioanna IV na Novgorod v 1570 godu* or *Povest' o prikhode tsaria Ioanna IV v Novgorod*), discussed above, sadly observes that nothing like this had ever happened in the "Ros Land" (*rossiisskaia zemlia*), rather than the Rus' Land.[34]

The myth of the Rus' Land was utilized in a wide variety of sources of different genres and different provenances referring to events between 1533 and 1584, almost always denoting the territory over which Ivan IV reigned. Writers of all sorts—government, church, private—continued to employ the myth of the Rus' Land in its traditional meanings. Its meaning as a reference to Ukrainian and Belarusian lands in the boyar letters to the king of Poland definitely requires further study. In addition, the significant quantity of occurrences of the phrase in the *Kazan' History* and the *Tale of Batory's Assault on Pskov* deserves greater analysis. Hints of any social, cultural, or religious connotations attached to the Rus' Land seem minimal at best and always problematic. Even the promotion of the ruler from "grand prince" to "tsar" could not erase the bond between ruler and the Rus' Land. Nor could the elevation of Muscovy from a grand principality to a tsardom persuade Muscovite book-men to cease using what might have been considered an obsolete slogan. The concept of the Rus' tsardom carried an imperial colouration; whether from Byzantium or the Mongols is a separate question. The myth of the Rus' Land had no such ties to Ivan IV's new title or the new status of the realm he ruled, but it survived nonetheless. Only the termination of the dynasty itself during the Time of Troubles sounded the death knell of the Rus' Land as a current-event term for Muscovy.

Two aspects of the intellectual history of the myth of the Rus' Land should also be mentioned. First, Krom does not posit any connection between the Rus' Land and Muscovites/Russians as an ethnic entity. Krom acknowledges that the term had no such referent before the sixteenth century because no Russian "people" (*narod*) existed yet. However, in his articles but not in his monograph, he evaluates the sixteenth century as an important stage in the development of "political and national commonality (*obshchnost'*)," the formation of the Great Russian nationality (*narodnost'*), the formation of a Great Russian ethnicity via ethnic consolidation.[35] However, no passage in the sources suggests that the phrase signified a nationality.

Second, the word "land" (*zemlia*) had multiple meanings in sixteenth-century Muscovy, including, at times, the state and/or society, as in references to the "sovereign's and the land's affairs" in which it designates the state, apart from the sovereign,[36] and

---

33 Dmitriev and Likhachev, eds., *Pamiatniki literatury drevnei Rusi*, 162, 163, 178, 195.

34 *Izbornik: Sbornik proizvedenii literatury drevnei Rusi* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1969), 477; *Novgorodskie letopisi. Kniga vtoraia*, ed. A. I. Tsepkov, 2 vols. (Riazan': Aleksandriia, 2002), 2:394.

35 Krom, "K voprosu o vremeni zarozhdeniia idei patriotizma v Rossii," 24; Krom, "Christian Tradition and the Birth of the Concept of Patriotism in Russia," 22, 28. I have modified the English translation rendering of the "Greater Russian ethnicity."

36 M. M. Krom, "'Delo gosudarevo i zemskoe': Poniatie obshchego blaga v politicheskoi diskurse

in expressions such as Ivan IV distributed gifts and rewards to "the entire land" upon his return from the conquest of Kazan'"[37] in which it encompasses Muscovite society as a whole (and cannot refer to the state). But when preceded by the adjective "Rus'," the Rus' Land rose to the level of myth, a myth that carried extensive ideological baggage by the time Ivan assumed the throne. In this form the myth of the Rus' Land had its own separate history quite apart from that of a "Land" in general.

The heterogeneity of purposes and shades of meaning conveyed by the myth of the Rus' Land in sources from Ivan IV's reign reflects the lack of uniformity we would expect in a manuscript culture, where imposing consistency is more difficult. The resilience of the myth of the Rus' Land stands out, attesting to the continued relevance of its historical legacy.

The title of the Kievan *Tale of Bygone Years* promised to tell the story of "where the Rus' Land came from…and from whence the Rus' Land came into being" (*otkudu est' poshla russkaia zemlia…i otkudu russkaia zemlia stala est'*).[38] The history of the myth of the Rus' Land during Ivan IV's reign contributes to the exploration of the final phase of this story, how the Rus' Land disappeared.

Rossii XVI v.," in *Sosloviia, instituty i gosudarstvennaia vlast' v Rossii. Srednie veka i rannee Novoe vremia. Sbornik statei pamiati akademika L. V. Cherepnina* (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2010), 581–85.

37 *PSRL*, 13:228.

38 Adapted from Mykhailo Hrushevsky, *History of Ukraine–Rus'*, vol. 1: *From Prehistory to the Eleventh Century*, trans. Marta Skorupsky, ed. Andrzej Poppe and Frank E. Sysyn with the assistance of Uliana M. Pasiczynk (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1997), 289 (I have changed "Land of Rus'" to "Rus' Land").