Chapter 9

# THE RUS' LAND IN UKRAINE AND BELARUS (FOURTEENTH TO SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES)*

WHILE THE "CONTEST for the legacy of Kievan Rus'" has been the subject of considerable historical investigation,[1] one feature of Kievan–Ukrainian intellectual continuity/discontinuity has not received adequate attention. The myth of the Rus' Land did not disappear in the East Slavic lands that came under the control of Poland and Lithuania, but it played only a minor role there. Moreover, the myth was not mobilized at all in defence of the Cossack Rebellion under Bohdan Khmelnytsky (Khmel'nyts'kyi, 1648–1654). The reasons for this discontinuity remain unexplored and unexplained.

Until now the very existence of a myth of the Rus' Land myth in early modern Ukraine as a technical term has not been fully recognized in Ukrainian historiography. The noun Rus' has been extensively studied, but the phrase the Rus' Land has been considered mostly to be synonymous with Rus'.[2] Existing comments on the myth are brief, unsystematic, and lacking in historical context. It is premature to equate the two terms in Ukraine and Belarus until we have studied the myth of the Rus' Land separately. Consequently, this chapter will not discuss recent studies that examine the meaning of Rus' in any period of medieval and early modern East Slavic history. Phrases that do not use Rus' as an adjective (such as, White Rus') will not be considered. This chapter does not pretend to be comprehensive. In the hope of inspiring future research on the topic, its purpose is to raise the question of how the myth of the Rus' Land *stricto sensu* evolved in Ruthenian territory through the period of the Khmelnytsky uprising. The appearance or non-appearance of the phrase Rus' Land in post-Khmelnytsky sources—*Sinopsis* (*Synopsis*); the so-called Cossack Chronicles (*Litopis samovidtsa* or *Eyewitness Chronicle*); and the works of Hryhorii Hrab"ianka and Samiilo [Samuil] Velychko); and the *History of the Rus'* (*Istoriia Rusov*)—falls beyond the chronological limits of this chapter, and must also be left to other historians to explore.

* I wish to thank Frank Sysyn for reading an earlier draft of this chapter and providing invaluable assistance.

**1** For example, Jaroslaw Pelenski, *The Contest for the Legacy of Kievan Rus'* (Boulder: East European Monographs, 1998), but cf. Paul Bushkovitch's review in the *International History Review* 21, no. 4 (1999): 987–88.

**2** Frank E. Sysyn, "Seventeenth-Century Views on the Causes of the Khmel'nyts'kyi Uprising: An Examination of the 'Discourse on the Present Cossack or Peasant War'," *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 5, no. 4 (December 1981): 430–66 at 452–56; Sysyn, "Ukrainian–Polish Relations in the Seventeenth Century: The Role of National Consciousness and National Conflict in the Khmelnytsky Movement," in *Poland and Ukraine: Past and Present*, ed. Peter J. Potichnyi (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1980), 58–82 at 72–73.

The myth of the Rus' Land continued to appear in sources in Ukraine and Belarus after their acquisition by Poland and Lithuania respectively. However, tracing its evolution is complicated by several problems. Many sources for the thirteenth through seventeenth centuries were written in Polish, Latin, or Russian, creating the possibility of linguistic distortion. Furthermore, Polish and later Muscovite influence might have introduced conceptual distortions even in sources written in the Slavonic, Ukrainian, or Belarusian languages, because Poles and Muscovites might have perceived the Rus' Land differently than Ruthenians.

In the thirteenth century, before and after the Mongol conquest, the princes of Galicia in the southwest who ruled Galicia and Volhynia attempted to appropriate the myth of the Rus' Land. In the twelfth century the narrow definition of the Rus' Land excluded Galicia–Volhynia.[3] Although Galician princes continued to try to occupy the throne of the grand prince of all Rus' in Kiev, their chroniclers used the Rus' Land, including in Latin (*terra Russiae*), to denote Galicia alone. The Hypatian Chronicle includes the *Galician–Volhynian Chronicle*, which contains entries describing events through the year 1292. Curiously it essentially does not use the term the Rus' Land except in one suggestive entry. S.a. 1250 the chronicle excoriates Prince Daniil Romanovich of Galicia for paying tribute to the Mongols. It is particularly improper for Daniil to do so, since he "ruled the Rus' Land, Kiev and Vladimir[–Volhynia], and Halich…(and his) father was tsar in the Rus' Land."[4] This passage asserts a *translatio* of the Rus' Land from Kiev to Galicia–Volhynia, in which Kiev remains the core of the Rus' Land but Vladimir in Volhynia replaced Chernigov and Halych replaced Pereiaslav.[5] However, the context is direct criticism of a grand prince. (The title of Daniil's father was exaggerated.) This is the only passage in any source from the tenth to the seventeenth centuries which mobilizes the myth of the Rus' Land in opposition to a Volodimerovich prince.

A second, equally tentative, *translatio* of the Rus' Land directly to Galicia seems to have been attempted in the fourteenth century. When the Galician princely line became extinct Poland acquired Galicia. King Casimir gave his administrator of Galicia the title *capitanus terrae Russiae*.[6] The administrative identification of Galicia as the Rus' Land stuck when Galicia was reconstituted in the fifteenth century as part of the Rus' (Ruthenian) Palatinate. When kings of Poland claimed that their rule included the Rus' Land, they meant the Ruthenian Palatinate. In Muscovy the Rus' Land appeared in the title of King Sigismund Augustus of Poland during the reign of Tsar Ivan IV in two of the four 1567 epistles to Sigismund in the names of Muscovite boyars whom he had invited to defect to Poland–Lithuania (see above).

---

**3** Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 58–59.

**4** *PSRL*, 2, s.a. 1250, cols. 807–8. The Rus' Land is also referred to s.a. 1262, cols. 857–58, but in a neutral context.

**5** Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 60.

**6** See A. V. Soloviev, "Der Begriff 'Russland' im Mittelalter," *Studien zur alteren Geschichte Osteuropas*, ed. G. Stökl, Wiener Archiv für Geschichte des Slaventums und Osteuropas 2, vol. 1: *Festschrift für Heinrich Felix Schmid* (Graz: Böhlau, 1956), 143–68 at 158; *Khrestomatiia po istorii SSSR…do kontsa XV v.* (Moscow: Sotseksgiz 1960), 641, 642.

This limited reference to the Rus' Land continued to be used during the seventeenth century, including the Khmelnytsky period. A 1648 report on Khmelmytsky by Adam Kysil',[7] referred to the Rus' governor of the Rus' Land ("*ruskim zem'em*"), but the editor changed the name of the region to Galicia.

Ukrainian areas other than Galicia, including Volhynia and the original "core" Rus' Land of Kiev and Chernigov, as well as Belarus, fell under the sovereignty of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The myth of the Rus' Land survived there as well, in chronicles and documentary sources. The Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles (*Belorussko-litovskie letopisi*), also called the Lithuanian Chronicles (*Litovskie letopisi*) or the Western Rus' Chronicles (*Zapadnorusskie letopisi*), are a set of intimately interconnected chronicles, redactions, and manuscripts produced from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries. The consensus among scholars is that the earliest version originated in Smolensk under Bishop Gerasim in the fourteenth century and continued to be written in Belarus, perhaps in the region of Navahrudak (Novogorodok, Novogrudok).[8] Generically they are labelled the *Chronicle of the Lithuanian Grand Dukes* (*Letopisets velikikh kniazei litovskikh*) or the *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Samogitia* (*Khronika velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo i Zhomoistka*) because they were commissioned by members of the Lithuanian royal family or because they reflected the political interests of various Lithuanian aristocratic clans. Therefore, they expressed the Lithuanian point of view even though they were composed by Orthodox Rus' authors, probably clerics, and written, at least originally, in Cyrillic in a form of Belarusian. It was only later that copies were sometimes transliterated into Latin script or translated into the Polish language. While associating their treatment of the phrase the Rus' Land with Belarusians should not arouse any objections, attributing their views to Ukrainians is speculative because no separate Ukrainian chronicles survive from the fifteenth-sixteenth centuries and no Ukrainian sources refer to these chronicles.

The *Hustynia Chronicle* (*Hustyns'kyi litopis*), a Ukrainian chronicle compiled in the 1620s but copied in the 1670s, provides more direct information on Ukrainian conceptions of the Rus' Land. References to the Rus' Land in the *Hustynia Chronicle* overlap but also diverge from those in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles, so I will treat the divergences separately.

Because the contents of these chronicles, redactions, and manuscripts coincide so much, I have not identified them individually. The consistency among the chronicles also obviates the need for chronological distinctions. The Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles

---

**7** Frank E. Sysyn, *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil, 1600–1653* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1985), 2.

**8** Nikolai Nikolaevich Ulashchik, *Vvedenie v izuchenie belorussko-litovskogo letopisaniia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1985), 9–81, 150–67, 237–38; Boris Nikolaevich Floria, "O 'Letopistse Bykhovtsa'," in *Istochniki i istoriografiia slavianskogo srednevekov'ia* (Moscow: Nauka, 1967), 135–44; Gudmantas Kiastutis, "Ob osobennostiakh raboty letopistsev s istochnikami (na materiale litovskikh letopisei XVI)," in *Narrativy Rusi kontsa XV–serediny XVIII v.: v poiskakh svoei istorii*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2018), 142–73; V. I. Ul'ianovskii, "Ukrainskie letopisi nachala XVI–pervoi poloviny XVII: nadregional'noe v regional'nykh narrativakh," in *Narrativy Rusi kontsa XV–serediny XVIII v.: v poiskakh svoei istorii*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2018), 229–60.

conveyed multiple meanings of the Rus' Land, simultaneously applying the myth to different, sometimes overlapping and sometimes mutually exclusive, regions. However, in these narrative sources the term is never applied to Galicia, because it was part of the Polish Crown, not the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

In his sub-chapter "Rus' in the chronicles and historical writing of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania of the Fifteenth to the Seventeenth Centuries," O. I. Dziarnovich tries to analyze each chronicle in chronological order. In the process he makes some valid comments on the different geographic parameters of the term Rus' Land.[9] Unfortunately, he simplistically reduces the alternative definitions of the Rus' Land to a narrow meaning and a broad meaning. His opening paragraph, moreover, vitiates any distinction between Rus' and the Rus' Land by identifying the coordinates of Rus' based on references to the "entire Rus' Land." He refers to "Rus' (the Rus' Land)" as if those terms were synonymous. He misinterprets references to the Rus' Land in passages about the battle of Kulikovo Field (see below) in which the Rus' land is the Muscovite grand principality. He argues that "entire Rus' Land" (always?) constituted an organic part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which is suggested by some passages but contradicted by other passages. His conclusion that Rus' and the Rus' Land refer to the same territory cannot withstand criticism. He fails to note that the Kievan Rus' Land included Galicia, a region that is excluded from the Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles. Dziarnovich's overall schema of the meaning of the Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles remains unconvincing. I will propose a different schema of how the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles employ the myth of the Rus' Land.

Plokhy proposes that Lithuania presented itself, albeit only briefly, as successor of the Rus' Land. He cites a 1338 treaty between Gediminas, Grand Duke of Lithuania, and the Master of the Livonian Order as evidence of Gediminas's aspiration to be "gatherer" of the Rus' Land (a term later applied to Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi and Ivan III) in which the Rus' Land presumably denoted the Lithuanian state. However, the treaty ascribes only geographic, not political, dimensions to the Rus' Land, mentioning the Lithuanian (Lettowen in the German original) and Rus' Lands (Ruslande or Ruscelande in the German original, *ruskoi zemle* in Slavonic) to which a German merchant could travel. The Rus' Land refers to Rus' territory under Gediminas's rule. By 1385 the Union of Krewo between Poland and Lithuania, however, the "Rus' lands" denoted the Rus' lands that Jogaila, the Grand Duke of Lithuania who became Wladyslaw, King of Poland upon his conversion to Catholicism, pledged to attach to Poland.[10]

---

**9** O. I. Dziarnovich, "Rus' v leto- i istoriopisanie VKL XVI–XVII vv.," in *Narrativy Rusi kontsa XV–serediny XVIII v.: v poiskakh svoei istorii*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2018), 174–89, especially 175–80.

**10** Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 95–96. Plokhy cites the 1338 treaty from *Polotskie gramoty XIII–nachala XVI veka*, comp. A. L. Khoroshkevich, 4 vols. (Moscow: Nauka,1977–1982), 3:102–7, inaccessible to me, but another anthology compiled by Khoroshkevich also contains the text: *Polotskie gramoty XIII–nachala XVI veka*, ed. A. L. Khoroshkevich et al., 2 vols. (Moscow: Universitet Dmitriia Pozharskogo, 2015), 1:66–69, no. 8, and 2:22–23 (commentary). (The commentary does not address the issue of how the Rus' Land is utilized in the text.)

I have identified five geographic definitions of the Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles and will correlate them to the meaning of the Rus' Land in the *Eulogy to Witold*.

Given the volume of material, my citations might not be comprehensive, particularly in later chronicles, redactions, or manuscripts in Polish.

1. The Rus' Land is Kievan Rus', either in the narrower sense, the Dnieper River valley, or the broader sense of all East Slavic lands under Volodimerovich princes.

In the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles, as in the *Hutsynia Chronicle*, the narratives of Kievan Rus' history were derived from the *Hypatian Chronicle* and/or a mid-fifteenth-century Muscovite compilation; for our purpose the exact filiation of any given passage is secondary.[11] The content of these passages is purely derivative.[12]

2. The Rus' Land comprises all the Ruthenian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Locations in Belarus dominate this material, so some references here might quality as allusions only to Belarusian territories. In many cases the text referred to "the entire (*vsia*) Rus' Land"; the *Eulogy to Witold* might belong to this category. Smolensk, Vitsebsk (Vitebsk), and Navahudrak from Belarus, and Kiev and Chernigov from Ukraine, among many other cities, appear multiple times.[13] One passage stands out: In 1500 Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow invaded the Rus' Land. This is a one-sentence embodiment of the contest between Moscow and Vilnius for the legacy of the myth of the Rus' Land. Quite clearly here the Rus' Land is not Muscovy.

---

**11** Omeljan Pritsak, "The Hypatian Chronicle and Its Role in the Restoration of Ukrainian Historical Consciousness," in *Chomu katedri ukratnoanavstva v Garvardi?* (Cambridge, MA: Ukrainian Studies Chair Fund, 1973), 54–60 at 57–60.

**12** *Zapadnorusskie letopisi* in *PSRL*, 17 (Moscow: Iazyki slavianskikh kul'tur, 2008), 1, 3, 5, 11, 21, 25–26, 27, 111, 115, 123, 230, 243–44, 477; *PSRL*, 35:19, 27, 36, 37, 40, 79, 118, 119, 120, 129, 174, 176; Aleksandr Aref'evich Bevzo, *L'vivskii litopis i Ostrozh'skii litopisets. Dzhereloznavche doslidzheniia* (Kiev: Akademii Nauk USSR, 1970), 133; *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. and with introduction Oleksiy Tolockho (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 2013), 34, 40, 41, 61, 62, 64, 69, 76, 86, 90, 103, 105, 108, 113, 115, 130, 138, 141, 143, 145, 152, 153, 158, 159, 160, 162, 164, 168, 186, 187, 217, 223, 224, 230, 233, 241, 245, 247 253, 254, 261, 264, 265, 266, 268, 270, 277, 278, 283, 287, 296, 297.

**13** *PSRL*, 17:68, 93, 102, 108, 135–36, 136–37, 140, 137, 180, 188, 202, 275, 281–82, 285–86, 299, 325, 336, 339, 342 (discussed in the text), 360, 364, 365, 387, 391, 399, 451, 462, 464, 466, 514, 533; *PSRL*, 35:76, 92, 109, 131, 164, 210, 211; *Khroniki: Litovskaia i Zhmoitskaia, i Bykhovtsa, Letopisi: Barkulabovskaia, Averki, i Pantsyrnogo* in *PSRL*, 32 (Moscow: Nauka, 1975), 19, 20, 155; *Khronika Bykhovtsa* (Moscow: Nauka, 1966), 45, 72; *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 308, 329, 332, 344, 356; Iuate Kiaupene, "Problema samoidentifikatsii rusinov v kontekste zarozhdeniia rannemodernoi natsiogeneticheskoi mifologii velikogo kniazhestva Litovskogo," in *Drevniaia Rus' posle Drevnei Rusi: diskurs vostochnoslavianskogo (ne)edinstva*, ed. A. V. Doronin (Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2017), 93–105 at 102.

3. The Rus' Land comprises the Belarusian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The Rus' Land could also, sometimes ambiguously, designate only the Belarusian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which could also encompass the *Eulogy to Witold*.[14] One passage in the *Khronikia Bykhovtsa* best attests to this connotation of the Rus' Land. Grand Duke Alexander and his wife Elena (incidentally, the daughter of Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow), travelled to the Rus' Land, staying in Smolensk, Vitsebsk, and Polatsk (Polotsk), before returning to Vilnius. Here Vilnius is not part of the Rus' Land.

4. The Rus' Land comprises the Ukrainian territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

References to exclusively Ukrainian cities as constituting the Rus' Land are relatively few, because at the time this region did not play an active role in the political life of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. However, Kiev and Chernigov make their appearance here.[15] The most intriguing passage recounts that in 1497 the Tatars invaded Volhynia, killing the local archbishop, something that had never before happened in the Rus' Land. Ergo Volhynia is in the Rus' Land. This is intriguing because in 1237–1238 the bishop of Vladimir in the northeast, very much part of the Rus' Land as it was then defined, perished when the Tatars took that city.[16] Vasyl Ul'ianovs'kyi (Vasilii Ul'ianovskii) interprets the Rus' Land here to mean the boundaries of the metropolitanate, by which he means the territory under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Kiev, the Ruthenian regions in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Ul'ianovs'kyi is probably correct that in practice the metropolitan in Kiev exercised authority only within the boundaries of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, comparable to references in the *Council of One Hundred Chapters* identifying the bishops of the Rus' Land under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Moscow, but he should have clarified that the metropolitan in Kiev bore the title "metropolitan of Kiev and All Rus'," never "metropolitan of the Rus' Land," just as the metropolitan of Moscow bore the title "metropolitan of Moscow and All Rus'," not "metropolitan of the Rus' Land."

5. The Rus' Land is the Northeast, later Muscovy.

The Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles and the *Hustynia Chronicle* also contain derivative material from the northeastern and later Muscovite chronicles covering events from the Mongol conquest to the end of the fourteenth century. These passages directly contradict any claim that the entire Rus' Land had been incorporated into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or that, according to the chronicles, the Rus' Land and Muscovy were mutually exclusive. The cities of Suzdal', Nizhnii Novgorod, and Moscow did not belong to Lithuania. In addition to recounting the Mongol census of the northeastern Rus' in

**14** *PSRL*, 17:184, 338; *PSRL*, 35:143, 232; *Khronika Bykhovtsa*, 87, 107 (discussed in the text).

**15** *PSRL*, 17:233–34, 248–49, 302, 392, 481, 580; *PSRL*, 35:124 (discussed in the text), 130, 148; *Khronika Bykhovtsa*, 40.

**16** Ul'ianovskii, "Ukrainskie letopisi," 233. A passage in another chronicle located the Volhynian Land within the Rus' Land (Ul'ianovskii, "Ukrainskie letopisi," 237).

the thirteenth century these chronicle passages regurgitate excerpts from Muscovite depictions of events of Rus'-Tatar relations in the last two decades of the fourteenth century that identified Muscovy as the Rus' Land: the defeat of Emir Mamai by Grand Prince Dmitrii Donskoi at the battle of Kulikovo Field in 1380 (including excerpts from the *Narration of the Battle with Mamai*), the sack of Moscow by Khan Tokhtamysh in 1382, and the invasion of the Rus' Land by Timur (Temer-Aksak, commonly Tamerlane) in 1395. In 1399 Vytautus, Grand Duke of Lithuania, expected his ally Tokhtamysh to assign him the Rus' Land after Tokhtamysh had defeated Timur on the Vorskla River. Unfortunately for Vytautus, Timur won the battle. The Rus' Land that Vytautus expected to receive included Tver', Pskov, and Moscow, none of which belonged to the Rus' Land that Vytautus already ruled, even if Tver' and Pskov sometimes fell within the Lithuanian sphere of influence.[17] No northeastern or Muscovite chronicle ever referred to the northeastern grand princes as Lithuanian servitors, so the passage in the *Eulogy to Witold* characterizing them as such cannot derive from them.

The *Hustynia Chronicle* in discussing the pre-history of the Slavs opines that Sarmatia is now the Rus' Land.[18] The vagueness of the term "Sarmatia" precludes any analysis. In entries beginning after the Mongol conquest, the *Hustynia Chronicle* somewhat ambiguously refers to Galicia as the Rus' Land, either on its own or in combination with all the Kievan Rus' Lands. The Tatars returned from their Eastern European campaign of 1242 to the Rus' Land; in 1261 the Tatars harmed the Rus' Land; Khan Nogai in 1269 attacked the Rus' Land; in 1343 Casimir III the Great, King of Poland, divided the Rus' Land.[19]

The *Hustynia Chronicle* notes that s.a. 1469, the Volga Tatars attacked "our Rus' Land," referring at least in part to Podillia; s.a. 1516 it observes that Batu had attacked "our Rus' Land"; and s.a. 1589 the Patriarch of Constantinople Jeremiah visited "our" Rus' Land.[20] I wonder if the qualifier "our," which occurs in other passages concerning the Kievan Rus' period,[21] implicitly acknowledges that there was a Rus' Land other than "ours," unlike the qualification of the Muscovite Land as "ours" cited above.

Finally, the *Hustynia Chronicle* notes s.a. 1589 that the Union of Brest was imposed on the Rus' Land.[22] If the extent of the Rus' Land corresponds to the jurisdiction of the newly-appointed Rus' metropolitan, then we might infer that the Rus' Land in that year encompassed all Ruthenian Orthodox territories, which would be historically true of the Union of Brest. Unfortunately, the vagueness of the passage precludes further analysis.

---

**17** *PSRL*, 17:27, 37, 41–42, 43, 47, 97, 54, 173, 330–31, 456–57, 517; *PSRL*, 35:17, 29–30, 31, 45, 50, 52, 54, 73, 139, 161, 188; *PSRL*, 32:55, 58, 148; *Khronika Bykhovtsa*, 74; *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 303, 315, 316, 327, 330.

**18** *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 27.

**19** *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 299, 304, 306, 322.

**20** *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 340, 363. This passage goes on to mention that Cossacks fought off the Tatars, but it does not categorize the region the Cossacks defended as the Rus' Land.

**21** *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 90, 287.

**22** *The Hustynia Chronicle*, comp. Tolockho, 367.

However, this passage lends some credence to Ul'ianovs'kyi's interpretation of the 1497 passage (cited above) on the death of the metropolitan in Volhynia, that the Rus' Land coincides with the boundaries of the Kievan Metropolitanate.

Another text, outside the chronicle tradition, assigns yet another slightly different location to the Rus' Land. Plokhy discusses the *Eulogy for Vitold* (Vytautus) (*Pokhvala velikomu kniaziu Vitovtu*) originally composed for a native of Moscow, Germasim, Bishop of Smolensk and Metropolitan of Lithuania; the extant manuscript was commissioned in 1428. According to Plokhy, it lauded Vitold as suzerain "simply put" (*reshchi prosta*) all the Rus' Land." A further declaration clarified the meaning of Rus' Land in this text by stating that grand princes of Moscow, Tver', and Riazan', as well as Novgorod the Great (*Velikii Novogord*) and Great Pskov (*Velikii Pskov*),[23] "served" Vytautus. Therefore, according to Plokhy, "all the Rus' Land" meant all Rus' people apart from the Rus' Lands in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. When this text was incorporated into the *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania* the description of the service of the Rus' grand princes was deleted, depriving the reference to "all the Rus' Land" of any definition, but the Moscow and other grand princes were referenced next to the rulers of Moldavia, Bessarabia, and Bulgaria, their Orthodox co-religionists.[24] I would translate "*vsia russkaia zemlia*" as the "entire Rus' Land" and qualify Plokhy's interpretation. "Rus' Land" cannot denote *all* Rus' people apart from the Rus' Lands in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, because Galicia belonged to Poland at this time. Moreover, the list of territories within the Rus' Land treats the Muscovite grand principality (in Ruthenian perception, probably "duchies"), although listed first, as no more than one among several other realms, and does not reflect the Muscovite view that it alone was the Rus' Land. The grand principality of Vladimir (in the northeast) is conspicuously absent. Plokhy does not mention that the text summarizes the list of principalities/duchies and cities as "simply put (*reshchi prosta*) all the Rus' people" (*ves' russkii iazyk*, literally" tongue)," which diminishes its commitment to any concept of the Rus' Land. The particular configuration of territories denoted as the Rus' Land in the *Eulogy to Witold* further illustrates the malleability of the phrase. In any case its author seems to use the term descriptively, even if he avoids allocating too much influence to Muscovy, but also eluded Polish-held Galicia.

The ambiguities revealed by the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles and the *Hustynia Chronicle* attached to the assertion that the Rus' Land was located in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania also surfaced in the sixteenth century in the texts of the Union of Lublin of 1569 that created the Commonwealth and transferred some East Slavic lands under the sovereignty of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the Crown of Poland. Galicia was already part of Poland, so its status was not altered. Sigismund Augustus referred to himself in

---

**23** As we have seen above, Pskovian sources very rarely names Pskov "Great Pskov."

**24** Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 106–7. Plokhy cites the text of the *Eulogy to Witold* from Mykhailo Hrushevs'kyi, *Istoriya Ukrayiny-Rusy: v odynadtsyaty tomakh, dvanadtsyaty knyhakh*, 7 vols. (1905–1913; facsimile repr. Kiev: Lybid, 1992–1996), 5:164–65, which was inaccessible to me. He kindly provided me with a digital copy of an alternative publication which included the text, M. Hrushevs'kyi, "Pokhvala velikomu kniaziu Vitovtu," in Hrushevs'kyi, *Tvori*, 50 vols. (L'viv: Svit, 2003), 5:50–65, parallel "Eulogy" and chronicle texts at 55–58.

Latin and Polish as the ruler of both the "Kievan and Rus' Lands" (*terrarum…Cuiaviae, Russiae*, *ziemie…kijowskiej, ruskiej*), but then called Kiev in Latin the "capital of the Rus', Podillian and Volhynian Land" (*Kiioviae, tanquam caput terrarum Russiae, Podoliae et Voliniae*), which since ancient times had belonged to the Crown of Poland, but in Polish "the capital and main city of the Rus' Land" (*Kijow byl i jest glowa i glovnem miastem, a ruska ziemia wszytka z dawnich czasow od przodkow naszych krolow polskich miedzy inemi przedniejszemi czlonki do Korony Polskiej jest prazlacona*).[25] The title of the Polish King discriminated between the Rus' (Galician) and Kievan Lands. Volhynia or Podillia were not listed among his possessions, unless they and Podillia were subsumed under the Kievan Land. (The Kievan Land also occurred in a very late version of the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicle.)[26] However, if Kiev was accorded the dignity of capital of the Rus' Land in Latin, that impugned the distinction between the Rus' Land and the Kievan Land by subordinating Galicia, administratively the Rus' Land, to Kiev. The Polish version interpolated "and main city" after "capital," but more significantly eliminated the references to the Podillian and Volhynian Lands. In the Polish version of the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicle, Kiev is straightforwardly capital of the Rus' Land, despite the distinction between the Rus' and Kievan Lands under the royal title. If Galicia belonged to the Rus' Land and Kiev was always the capital of the Rus' Land, then implicitly but anomalously when Kiev belonged to Lithuania, it was nevertheless the capital of Galicia, which belonged to Poland. Of course, the language used obfuscated the differences between the pre-Lublin past and the post-Lublin present.

It is difficult to say whose point of view about Kiev was expressed in the Union of Lublin agreement. The Poles dominated the proceedings and dictated the resulting territorial adjustments. The Ukrainian nobility supported the adjustments because they promised greater security from the Tatars and Ottomans. Whether the Ukrainian elite shared the Polish definition of Kiev as the capital and main city of the Rus' Land at the time cannot be documented.

Other sources from Poland and Lithuania in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries also refer to the Rus' Land. The Rus Land appears as an identifying qualifier to individuals in documents registered in the Lithuanian Metrica (*Litovskaia metrika*), by definition residents of the Grand Duchy, a boyar "of the Rus' Land," a monk (*chernits*) "of the Rus' Land."[27] A comprehensive search of all published and unpublished volumes of the Lithua-

---

**25** Stanislaw Kutrzeba and Wladsyslaw Semkowicz, eds., *Akta unji Polski z Litwa 1385–1791* (Kraków: Gebethner & Wolff, 1932), 309, 310, 312

**26** *PSRL*, 32:17 (the same sentence refers to the Rus' *monarkhiia*).

**27** Vasilii Irinarkhovich Ul'ianovskii, Andrei Markovich Bovrigia, Nataliia Aleksandrovna Sinkevich, and Vitalii Anatal'evich Tkachuk, "K istokam ukrainskoi natsii," 15, a document prepared for a conference in Vilnius, September 25–27, 2019, as part of the continuing project "The Eastern Slavs in Search of New Supra-Regional Identities (End of the 15th–Middle of the 18th Centuries)" under the direction of Andrei Vladimirovich Doronin of the German Historical Institute, Moscow. For another reference, see *Lietuvos metrika / Knyga 7 (1506–1539): Uzrašymų knyga 7* (Vilnius: Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 2011), 195–97 (as cited in personal communication, Andrei Doronin, October 7, 2019). I wish to express my appreciation to Frank Sysyn for providing me with a copy of the conference document and Andrei Doronin and Vasilii Ul'ianovskii for consultation.

nian Metrica from the fourteenth century through the middle of the seventeenth century is needed to determine the frequency of such allusions, the geographic locations that were denoted as the Rus' Land, and the context in which the reference arose. In addition, the fifteen volumes of *Akty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii iuzhnoi i zapadnoi Rossii*, published between 1862 and 1892, might also contain documentary references to the Rus' Land.[28] These research desiderata are best left to specialists with the necessary access.

In *Palinodia*, his 1621–1622 defence of Rus' Orthodox Christianity against advocates of the Union of Brest, Zakhariia Kopysten'skij twice referenced the Rus' Land historically: Saint Vladimir baptized the Rus' Land, and the Apostle Andrew visited and blessed the Rus' Land. In the same work he also called the Rus' Land his "fatherland" (*otchizna*).[29]

The Jagiellonian kings of Poland (like the Piast rulers before them) and the grand dukes of Lithuania were not descendants of St. Vladimir. Therefore, from a Rus' perspective they were not entitled to rule the Rus' Land or any other "Land" within the Rus' dynastic system. Nevertheless, they were legitimate princes and kings. By right of conquest, they could succeed the Volodimerovichi as rulers of the Rus' Land, even if they and their Ruthenian subjects could not agree on which territories constituted the Rus' Land. Before the Grand Duke of Lithuania automatically succeeded to the elective throne of Poland and before the Union of Lublin, Lithuanian grand dukes and kings of Poland could simultaneously rule different Rus' Lands, because Galicia was the Rus' Land to Poland, whereas Belarus and the rest of Ukraine were the Rus' Land to Lithuania. It is also plausible that from the thirteenth century on in all Ruthenian territory under Polish or Lithuanian rule the myth of the Rus' Land was separated from its dynastic roots because the indigenous Rus' princely line was extinct.

Mid-seventeenth-century Ukrainians could have been familiar with the myth of the Rus' Land from its continued administrative use to refer to Galicia, historical references to Kievan Rus', the multiple narrative applications of Rus' Land in the Belarusian–Lithuanian Chronicles, and occasional documents such as the Union of Lublin or contemporary texts of political discourse, such as Kopystens'kyi's *Palinodia.* Such access, however, has never been documented, in part because the Rus' Land was not considered a technical term deserving of separate investigation. Nor has anyone realized that when Kmelnytsky and the Ukrainian Cossacks came to power after 1648 their spokesmen and diplomats never invoked the Rus' Land.

---

**28** All documents in that series relevant to the Khmelnytsky period were incorporated into the documentary collections cited below, so the search need address only the pre-Khmelnytsky documents.

**29** *Lev Krezva's* A Defense of Church Unity *and Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj's* Palinodia*. Part I: Texts*, trans. with foreword Bohdan Strumiński, ed. Roman Koropeckyj and Dana R. Miller with William R. Veder (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute, 1995), 720, 721. (The translation reads "the Land of Rus'," which I have revised. Other passages in this work which repeat the references to Vladimir and Andrew replaced "the Rus' Land" with "Rus'."); *Pamiatniki polemicheskoi literatury v Zapadnoi Rusi*, ed. Peter A. Gil'tebrandt, 3 vols. in 4, Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka 4, 7, and 19 (St. Petersburg: n.publ., 1878), 1:col. 1055 (citation courtesy of Vasilii Ul'ianovskii, 7 October 2019, personal communication). In this text Rus' and the Rus' Land appear to be synonymous, but note that references to the Rus' Land are rare and never refer to contemporary events.

As far as I can tell, documents from Khmelnitsky never mentioned the Rus' Land and documents about Khmelnitsky never attributed use of the myth of the Rus' Land to him. These documents attest that the Ukrainian Cossacks were Rus' (as a noun), even if "Rus' people" (multiple individuals; in Ukrainian "*liudy*") could mean inhabitants of Galicia or any non-Cossack Ruthenians,[30] individuals belonging to the "Rus' people" ("*narod*", the collective noun), the "Rus' gentry,"[31] individuals that practised the "Rus' faith" under the guidance of "Rus' priests" in "Rus' churches,"[32] individuals who performed "Rus' liturgical services" using "Rus' books"[33] which they learned to read in Rus' schools,[34] or individuals who venerated Rus' saints[35] and entered "Rus' monasteries."[36] The documents also identified various countries, near and far, as "Lands."[37] However, Khmelnytsky and his scribes never brought Rus' as an adjective together with the noun "Land" as a myth.

No document has expressed Khmelnytsky's[38] reasons for not trying to take advantage of the myth of the Rus' Land; I can imagine three theories:

1. Khmelnytsky could simply have been ignorant of the myth.

Given his ubiquitous invocations of the noun Rus' and his application of the adjective Rus' to a plethora of other nouns, I find it unlikely that Khmelnytsky had never heard of the Rus' Land.

2. Khmelnytsky could have been more or less familiar with the myth of the Rus' Land, but found it archaic, obsolete, and useless.

Certainly, the myth of the Rus' Land was superfluous to Khmelnytsky. His loyalty was to the Cossack Zaporozhian Host. He did not need the myth of the Rus' Land. This second theory is more persuasive than the first. On the other hand, unless Khmelnytsky had some aversion to the myth, we would expect it to surface, however randomly.

The myth of the Zaporozhian Host was sufficient for Cossack purposes but need not have been exclusive. Cossacks and non-Cossack Ukrainians and Ukrainian clergy honoured the Kievan inheritance, for example, by comparing Khmelnytsky to St. Vladimir.[39]

---

**30** *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:117–20, 260–6l, 2:40–42; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo 1648–1657*, ed. L. Krip'iakevich and I. Butich (Kiev: Akademii Nauk USSR, 1961), 628–29.

**31** *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 181–82.

**32** *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:113–14, 117–20, 173–74, 197–99; 3:24. 256–57, 361; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 225–26, 285–87, 292–94, 369–71.

**33** *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 1:220, 229.

**34** *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 46–47, 105–7.

**35** *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 105–7.

**36** *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*. 292–94.

**37** *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 2:432, 3:361; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 225–26, 292–94, 369–71.

**38** I use "Khmelnytsky" as shorthand not just for Khmelnytsky personally, but also in general to indicate his officials and publicists, and the authors of all relevant sources from the period of his leadership.

**39** Serhii Plokhy, *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine* (Oxford: Oxford University

This did not extend to the inclusion of the Kievan myth of the Rus' Land in their ideological expressions or as part of their identity. Khmelnytsky, in Serhii Plokhy's words, "did not fully identify himself with the Kyivan political tradition."[40] He made Chyhyrin, not Kiev, his capital. The kings of Poland still valued the Rus' Land enough to include it in their titles. As the myth of the Rus' Land was not in vogue in Ukraine, it is possible that Khmelnytsky found it to be totally without merit or utility. Although this is certainly possible, I find it odd.

3. Khmelnytsky's seemingly consistent reticence toward the myth of the Rus' Lands suggests that to him the myth of the Rus' Land was different from other "Rus' X" formulations (with Rus' as an adjective) that were not similarly absent from Cossack sources, because the myth of the Rus' Land belonged to the Volodimerovich princely dynasty.

My third theory is that despite the separation of the Rus' Land from the old Volodimerovich dynasty, the myth of the Rus' Land retained a vestigial resonance of the dynastic privilege associated with the original Rus' dynasty to which a non-prince such as Khmelnytsky had no claim. Corroboration of this theory might be found in Khmelnytsky's attitude toward the concept of a Rus' principality. A deposition by Kysil' in Polish to a courier from Khmelnytsky concerned the Rus' principality ("*ksiestwie Ruskim*"; "*ksiestwie*" meant "principality" or "duchy").[41] The abortive 1658 Treaty of Hadiach would have created a Rus' Grand Duchy / Principality headed not by a Grand Duke or a Grand Prince but by a Cossack Hetman. According to Tat'iana Tairova-Iakovleva, Khmelnytsky supposedly called himself "Kievan and Rus' Prince" and in 1658 his successor Ivan Vyhovsky aspired to become "Grand Prince / Duke of Ukraine." Nevertheless, Tairova-Iakovleva opines that Khmelnytsky rejected the concept of a "Rus' duchy / principality."[42] If Khmelnytsky declined to enhance his legitimacy by claiming an inheritance from or a right to succeed the Rus' grand princes, he might have been reluctant to invoke the major myth of the Kievan Rus' that was tied to the Volodimerovich dynasty, the Rus' Land.

Why Khmelnytsky and the Zaporozhian Cossacks did not refer to the myth of the Rus' Land requires further study. Regardless of how we explain Khmelnytsky's (in) action, we may conclude that he broke the continuity of the myth of the Rus' Land in Ukraine that dated from Kievan times.

---

Press, 2001), 154–56, 165–66. 228, 267, 270, 272–73, 386–89; Plokhy, *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*, 277–81, 294–99, 232, 237–39, 247–48; V. I. Ul'ianovskii, *Drevniaia Rus' posle Drevnei Rusi*, 133–69; *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 646.

**40** Plokhy, *The Cossacks and Religion*, 272–73.

**41** *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 2:203–4.

**42** *Dokumenty Bohdana Khmelnits'kogo*, 44, quoted in Tat'iana Tairova-Iakovleva, "'Otechestvo' v predstavleniiakh ukrainskoi starshiny kontsa XVII–nachala XVIII vekov," *Journal of Ukrainian Studies* 33–34 (2008): 453–58 at 455. See also *Vossoedinenie Ukrainy s Rossiei*, 2:117.