

Chapter 6

THE PSKOVIAN LAND

LIKE ITS “ELDER brother” Novgorod, the medieval city-state of Pskov lacked an indigenous branch of the Volodimerovich clan as its dynasty and for that reason did not and probably could not articulate a self-conception in the form of an ideology of a “Land.” The phrase the Pskovian Land (*Pskovskaia zemlia*), like that of the Novgorodian Land, carried no ideological weight when it appeared in the sources. By the reign of Ivan IV, a literary work exhibiting strong local patriotism to Pskov did not deviate from this pattern. Instead, it showed signs of local assimilation of Muscovy’s successful monopolization of the myth of the Rus’ Land. This chapter will conclude with an analysis of that text to illustrate the triumph of the Muscovite myth of the Rus’ Land over an annexed regional “Land” that lacked a mythic dimension.

Popular and scholarly publications alike elevate the phrase the Pskovian Land to a level of significance that far exceeds its much more modest usage in medieval sources. Elena Morozkina’s *The Pskovian Land* is a popular tourist guide to the “beauty of the Pskovian Land” and the “artistic treasures of the Pskovian Land,” a small format book with numerous (albeit black-and-white) illustrations whose second edition alone numbered 85,000 copies.¹ She establishes the geographic boundaries of the Pskovian Land and defines the Trinity Cathedral in Pskov’s *Krov* (Kremlin) as the symbol of the “entire Pskovian Land.” She modestly admits that she could not discuss all the architectural monuments of the Pskovian Land.² At the same time, she alludes to the *Pskovshchina* in both historical and contemporary contexts as in effect a synonym of the Pskovian Land.³ That word appears only rarely in medieval sources from Pskov. Morozkina’s discussion of partisan activity in the region of Pskov during World War II derives from a memorial volume bearing the title *The Unconquered Pskovian Land. Documents and Materials, 1941–1944*.⁴

Morozkina’s volume is intended for a popular audience. Professional historians writing for both professional and popular audiences also refer to the Pskovian Land. Vladimir Arakcheev’s monograph *Medieval Pskov: Authority, Society, Daily Life in the Fifteenth to Seventeenth Centuries*⁵ contains a fold-out map which purports to illustrate the six-

1 Elena Nikolaevna Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1986), quotations 7, 12.

2 Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 12, 22, 164. Modern-day Nevel’ is situated in the Pskovian Land (ibid., 147).

3 Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 80, 83, 146, 147, 153, 164.

4 Morozkina, *Pskovskaia zemlia*, 171 in the bibliography, citing *Nepokorennaiia zemlia Pskovskaia, Dokumenty i materialy. 1941–1944* (Pskov, 1964).

5 Vladimir Anatol’evich Arakcheev, *Srednevekovi Pskov: vlast’, obshchestvo, povsednevnaia*

teen districts (*uezdy*) as well as the boundaries of the *guby* (administrative-territorial districts) in the Pskovian Land.⁶ Arakcheev finesses his own use of the Pskovian Land by referring to the history of “Pskov and its land.” His study, he declares, delineates the geographic boundaries of the “Pskovian Land” from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries.⁷ The publisher’s blurb in Bergirdt Kafengauz’s *Ancient Pskov: Studies of the History of a Feudal Republic* described it as a study of “Pskov and the Pskovian Land,” to which Kafengauz himself also makes reference.⁸ He later equates the Pskovian Land and the “territory of the *Pskovshchina*.”⁹ Other intrusions of the Pskovian Land in commentary on sources which do not contain it will be mentioned below, but these examples should suffice to establish the relevance and currency of the concept of the “Pskovian Land.”¹⁰

I will discuss sources by genre: chronicles, a saint’s life, documents, a law code, seals, and coins, all of which support the conclusion that the Pskovian Land possessed only a pragmatic geographic or territorial meaning which was not even exclusive and altogether lacked ideological nuances. I will then analyze why this pattern occurred and the attribution to Pskov of an identity within the Rus’ Land.

The Pskov chronicle tradition was late but vibrant. Chronicles arose no earlier than the thirteenth century, probably during the fourteenth century, as Pskov gradually freed itself from subordination to Novgorod.¹¹ The usage of the Pskovian Land in the *First, Second, and Third Pskov Chronicles* was substantially consistent, with considerable repetition. We need not concern ourselves with chronology or the relationships among the chronicles and their manuscripts. I will therefore cite instances from all chronicles in chronological order by Byzantine year to illustrate the continuity of usage. It should be noted that the “Index” *sub verbo* “Pskovian Land” references passages which do not contain the phrase the Pskovian Land but use either the Pskovian region (*oblast’*) or the Pskovian district (*vlast’, volost’*), as was also true of the “Index” to the Novgorod chronicles.¹²

zhizn’ v XV-XVII vekakh (Pskov: Pskovskaia oblastnaia tipografiia, 2004).

6 Arakcheev, *Srednevekoviye Pskov*, Map 1. See *ibid.*, 331 for the definition of *guba*. Arakcheev does not warn the reader that these *guby* differ from the anti-banditry *guby* instituted in Muscovy in the 1530s and 1540s during Ivan IV’s minority, to which he alludes elsewhere (*ibid.*, 123). To add to the confusion, both sets of *guba* institutions were headed by elders (*starosty*).

7 Arakcheev, *Srednevekoviye Pskov*, 5, 10.

8 Bergirdt Borisovich Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov: Ocherki po istorii feodal’noi respubliki* (Moscow: Nauka, 1969), 2, 3.

9 Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 7.

10 Of course, allusions to the Pskovian Land could be multiplied considerably. For example, Anti Selart, “Vvedenie,” in Selart, ed., *Pskovo-Pecherskii monastyr’ vo vremia Livonskoi voiny (1558–1582). Zemlevladienie v Estonii* (Hamburg: Kovač, 2016), 17–47, frequently refers to the Pskovian Land and cites numerous additional publications whose titles mention the Pskovian Land. (Selart is Estonian, but publishing in Russian he accommodated Russian-language usage.)

11 Hans-Jürgen Grabmüller, *Die Pskover Chroniken. Untersuchungen zur russischen Regionalchronistik im 13.–15. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1975).

12 *PL*, 2, “Geographic Index,” 355.

This indicates that the editor (or whomever compiled the Index) did not treat the Pskovian Land as a technical term. This semantic nonchalance illustrates the lack of semiotic weight carried by the phrase. I have disregarded possible duplication of events under different years and included annals which extend beyond the end of Pskov's independence in 1510 because the Pskovian chronicle tradition did not terminate in that year.

- In 6849 the Germans (the Livonian Order) attacked the Pskovian Land.¹³ In the same year Algirdas, Grand Duke of Lithuania, raided the Pskovian village / villages (*selo, sela*) or the Pskovian regions (*oblasti*).¹⁴
- In 6851 Algirdas returned to his own land via the Pskovian district (*volost*). In retaliation for a destructive German attack on the “entire Pskovian region” (*vsia pskovskaia oblast*), the Pskovites attacked the German Land (*Nemetskaia zemlia*).¹⁵ The Pskovian chronicles never refer to the Livonian Order as the *Orden*, only as “the German Land.” The Pskovian chronicler was quite familiar with the “land”-system of political nomenclature.
- In 6856 Algirdas attacked the Pskovian villages in Oreshko. After he had raided the Novgorodian district, he returned to his own land via the Pskovian district.¹⁶ In 6857 Algirdas returned from Novgorod via the Novgorodian district.¹⁷ Note that the Pskovian chronicles used the Novgorodian land, region, and district interchangeably.¹⁸
- In 6912 Prince Daniil Aleksandrovich of Pskov and Pskov's mayor (*posadnik*) Larion Doinikovich and “all of (*vse*) Pskov” attacked Polotsk (Polatsk).¹⁹
- In 6914 Vytautas, Grand Duke of Lithuania, made war on the Pskovian district by travelling to the Pskovian Land, or, to phrase it differently, he invaded the Pskovian district by personally travelling to the Pskovian district.²⁰
- In 6915 Vytautas attacked the Pskovian region. The Master (of the Livonian Order) invaded the Pskovian Land. Grand Prince Vasili I of Moscow broke his peace with Vytautas because Vytautas had made war on the Pskovian district.²¹
- In 6916 the Livonian Master attacked the Pskovian district.²²

13 *PL*, 1:18; *PL*, 2:24, 93.

14 *PL*, 2:94–96.

15 *PL*, 1:21; *PL*, 2:97.

16 *PL*, 2:98, 99.

17 *PL*, 2:26.

18 Halperin, “Novgorod and the Novgorod Land,” 354n51; 356, 67.

19 *PL*, 2:32. The Index cites a non-existing entry for 6912 on 31, but omits this reference on 32 s.a. 6914. I infer typographical errors in the Index.

20 *PL*, 1:28; *PL*, 2:111.

21 *PL*, 1:29; *PL*, 2:33, 114. The Index's reference to 6915 on 34 would seem to be a typographical error.

22 *PL*, 1:31; *PL*, 2:34, 116.

- In 6917 Vasiliï I with the “entire Rus’ Land” marched against Vytautus, while the German Master with the “entire German Land” (*vsia nemetskaia zemlia*) and Lithuanians (*Litva*) attacked the Pskovian districts. Various Germans attacked the Pskovian Land or the Pskovian regions or Vasiliï I raised the “entire Rus’ Land” against Vytautus, who, with a German army (literally: strengths, *sila*) and the Lithuanians (*Litva*), had invaded the Pskovian districts.²³ Note that regions and districts again serve as synonyms here.
- In 6933 the Germans attacked all (*vse*) the Pskovian regions.²⁴
- In 6934 Vytautus with Lithuanians and Tatars attacked the Pskovian districts while Novgorod fought the brother of Vytautus en route to Pskovian districts.²⁵
- In 6935 Germans attacked the Pskovian Land.²⁶
- S.a. 6967 the chronicler observed that Pskov is the land of the Holy Trinity (*Sviataia Troitsa*). In that same year Prince Alexander Vasil’evich of Pskov attacked the German Land and Germans attacked the Pskovian Land.²⁷
- In 6974 an epidemic occurred in “all the Pskovian regions” (variant: districts).²⁸
- In 6975 an epidemic struck for two years in Pskov, its subordinate towns, and in “all Pskovian districts.”²⁹ It would be tempting to infer from this passage that “all Pskovian districts” denoted only the countryside, rural zones, and did not include the city of Pskov or its subordinate cities.
- S.a. 6976 the Pskovian chronicler observed critically that widowed priests were performing the liturgy in Pskovian districts,³⁰ which violated the rules of the Russian Orthodox Church.
- In 9977 Germans invaded the Pskovian Land.³¹
- In 6979 the worst fire that had ever occurred in “all the” (*vsia*) Pskovian districts broke out.³²

23 *PL*, 1:32, 35; *PL*, 2:117. The Pskov chronicles use the collective noun *Litva* rather than the plural Lithuanians (*litovtsy*, singular: *litovets*).

24 *PL*, 1:35. The Index contains a typographical error, listing the year 6935.

25 *PL*, 1:36; *PL*, 2:122, 123.

26 *PL*, 1:38; *PL*, 2:124.

27 *PL*, 1:56; *PL*, 2:145.

28 *PL*, 2:162.

29 *PL*, 2:163.

30 *PL*, 2:54.

31 *PL*, 2:167.

32 *PL*, 2:181.

- In 6985 in civil strife all mayors, well-to-do people (*zhitie liudi*), and “all of (*vsei*)” Pskov armed themselves, which the index erroneously lists as a reference to the Pskovian Land although it does not reference the Pskovian Land, districts, or region.³³
- In 6988 Germans burned and looted the Pskovian district.³⁴
- In 6993 Pskov envoys were killed in the Tverian Land and there was a grain shortage in the Pskovian Land.³⁵ Note the utilization of another “Land”-polity phrase, which a Tverian author treated as a political and ideological term.
- In 6994 Archbishop of Novgorod and Pskov Gennadii sent a boyar to survey all the churches and monasteries in the “entire” (*vsia*)” Pskovian Land.³⁶
- In 7009 Germans attacked the Pskovian Land.³⁷
- In 7011 a Muscovite army drove the Germans from the Pskovian Land.³⁸
- In 7012 it was announced that in the future widowed priests would not serve as parish priests in Pskov and the “entire” (*vsia*) Pskovian Land.³⁹
- In 7015 Lithuanians (*Litva*) and Rus’ (here: Ruthenians, East Slavs residing in Lithuania) attacked the “entire” (*vsia*) Pskovian Land.⁴⁰
- In 7018 in the Pskovian Land there were ten subordinate cities and two fortresses (*gorodishche*).⁴¹
- In 7026 Grand Prince of Moscow Vasilii III sent many Muscovite troops to the Pskovian Land en route to Opochno.⁴²
- In 7031 the Pskovites began to build the Caves (*Pechera*) Monastery in the Pskovian Land.⁴³
- In 7066 a Muscovite army en route west to campaign against Lithuania looted Pskovian villages on the border of the Pskovian Land.⁴⁴

33 *PL*, 2:205.

34 *PL*, 1:77; *PL*, 2:220.

35 *PL*, 2:66.

36 *PL*, 2:68.

37 *PL*, 1:86.

38 *PL*, 1:87.

39 *PL*, 1:89.

40 *PL*, 1:138–39.

41 *PL*, 2:258.

42 *PL*, 1:99.

43 *PL*, 2:226.

44 *PL*, 2:235.

- In 7068 requisitions for auxiliary labour caused great losses to the entire Pskovian Land during the failed Muscovite campaign against Livonia.⁴⁵
- In 7071 Lithuanians (*Litva*) attacked “the Pskovian area” (*Pskovshchina*), a rare term which also occurs in seventeenth-century annals.⁴⁶
- In 7096 the Muscovites built Ivangorod to stop Germans from attacking the Pskovian Land.⁴⁷
- In 7126 the extortions of Muscovite governor Prince I. F. Troekurov did great harm to the “entire” (*vsia*) Pskovian Land⁴⁸.

Clearly the Pskovian chronicles referred to the Pskov Land not as an ideological concept, let alone myth, but purely as a territorial and geographic phrase, to denote the area subordinate to Pskov’s authority. The Pskovian Land is never reified. It is never an autonomous actor. It was the object of attack—Pskov was at war with the Livonian Order for over two hundred years⁴⁹—but also fought Lithuania, Sweden, sometimes Novgorod, and later Muscovy, but never the subject. It was the “Land” to which Pskov armies abroad returned. Moreover, the term did not have exclusive rights to this meaning; Pskovian districts and regions carried the same meaning as the Pskovian Land. No one ever fought for the Pskovian Land as Kievans and later Muscovites fought for the Rus’ Land. No one expresses loyalty to the Pskovian Land. Pskov is not identified as the Pskovian Land but as the land of the Holy Trinity, to which its main cathedral was devoted and to which we will return. The Pskovian Land had no social referent. No prince of Pskov consulted the Pskovian Land or led an army of “the entire Pskovian Land” into battle. To denote an action or belief of all the residents of the city of Pskov the chroniclers wrote “all Pskov.” That is why I translate *vsia Pskovskaia zemlia* as “the entire Pskovian Land” rather than “all of the Pskovian Land,” to encompass territory, rather than rhetorically “all of [the people]⁵⁰ of the Pskovian Land.” The Pskovian Land is a pragmatic, not intellectual, term. Such a pattern of usage of the phrase the Pskovian Land was not confined to Pskov chronicles.

Dovmont was a thirteenth-century Lithuanian prince who immigrated to Pskov, converted to Orthodox Christianity with the name Timofei, and served as prince of Pskov. His *vita* was probably composed during the fourteenth century, and is found within the corpus of the Pskovian chronicles. Our focus is on who and what Dovmont fought for, and who and what he did not fight for.⁵¹

⁴⁵ *PL*, 2:240. The Index erroneously reads 7068.

⁴⁶ *PL*, 2:243; see *PL*, 2, “Geographic Index,” 355 (page 282 should read 283).

⁴⁷ *PL*, 1:119. (*PL*, 1:7096, 120 and *PL*, 2: 7115, 269 are bogus Index entries.)

⁴⁸ *PL*, 2:280.

⁴⁹ Arakcheev, *Srednevekoviye Pskov*, 18.

⁵⁰ The understood term in brackets is inserted by me.

⁵¹ Valentina Il’inchina Okhotnikova, *Povest’ o Dovmonte. Issledovanie i teksty* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1985), 1–187 (analysis), 188–230 (texts). Okhotnikova also published a text with facing modern Russian translation and commentary: “Skazanie o Dovmonte,” ed. V. I. Okhotnikova, in *Biblioteka*

Pskov treated Dovmont as a saint, but the genre to which this text belongs is ambiguous. Valentina Okhotnikova refers to the text as a “narrative” (*skazanie*) based upon its heading, *The Narration of the blessed prince Dovmont and his courage* (*Skazanie o blagovornom kniaze Dovmonte i o khrabrosti ego*), but in the title of her monograph she calls it a “tale” (*povest'*), *The Tale of Dovmont* (*Povest' o Dovmonte*). One of the major sources of the text was a redaction of Nevskii's *vita*, which also suffers from genre identity problems. Therefore, my use of the word *vita* is only for convenience, to distinguish it from the chronicle narratives into which it was usually embedded.

The author of the *vita* of Dovmont was familiar with “Land”-polity vocabulary, but used it selectively. He refers to the Lithuanian Land (and the “Lithuanians,” *Litva*),⁵² but never to the Pskovian Land. Dovmont's supporters wish to fight “for the Holy Trinity and all the holy churches.” Dovmont urges the Pskovites to fight “for the Holy Trinity and for the holy churches and for our fatherland.”⁵³ Other passages describe the Germans as raiding Pskovian villages, which might be no more than straightforward description. Dovmont defended “Novgorod and Pskov” without reference to either as a “Land.” The *vita* emotionally records the sorrow of the men, women, and children of Pskov at Dovmont's death.⁵⁴ Nevskii's *vita* poetically depicted Nevskii's death by writing that “the sun has set in the Suzdalian Land,” which was later changed to the “Rus' Land.” The author of the primary redaction of Dovmont's *vita* did not borrow that phrasing. He could easily have written that the Pskovian Land mourned Dovmont's death, personifying or reifying the Pskovian Land with ideological import, but he did not. No subsequent redaction of the *vita* rewrote his description of the reception of Dovmont's death by the people of Pskov to include the Pskovian Land.⁵⁵ The Pskovian Land does not appear in Dovmont's *vita* even once.

Dovmont fights for the Holy Trinity, meaning the Holy Trinity Cathedral, the emblem of Pskov. Okhotnikova rightfully describes the Holy Trinity Cathedral as the “centre of political and religious life” in Pskov; the Holy Trinity functioned as the city's patron saint. Okhotnikova finesses the *vita's* lack of references to the Pskovian Land by commenting that Dovmont “defended Pskov and its land.”⁵⁶

Documents from Pskov adhere to the same pattern of usage of the Pskovian Land. If it appears, it carries only geographic meaning. The documents manifest the usual familiarity with other “Land”-state names, but rarely projected such a linguistic construction on to Pskov. One late document, from 1509, goes beyond that framework in a fascinating way.

literary drevnei Rusi [hereafter *BLDR*], vol. 6: *XIV-seredina XV veka* (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1999), 56–63 (original on even-numbered pages, modern Russian translation on odd-numbered pages), 520–23 (commentary).

52 The *First Pskov Chronicle* redaction referred to the “Riga Land Master” (*rizhskaia zemlia master*), the Master of the Livonian Order, which was simplified in the Expanded Redaction as the “Riga Master” (*master risskii*). *BLDR*, 6:58; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 191, 220.

53 *BLDR*, 6:58; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 189–90.

54 *BLDR*, 6:58, 62; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 190, 192, 193.

55 Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 195, 199.

56 *BLDR*, 6:521.

Unfortunately, no treaty between Pskov and the princes it invited to sit on its throne survives,⁵⁷ which deprives historians of what might have been very valuable evidence of both Pskov self-identity and princely perceptions of Pskov's identity. Extant treaties between Pskov and Muscovite rulers date to a period in which Pskov had little choice in the matter.

The 1417 treaty between Pskov and the Livonian Order, written in Riga, referred only to Pleskove (Pskov) in its German original. In it Grand Prince Vasili I of Moscow refers to Pskov as his patrimony. The text mentions Pskov's mayor and "all (*alle*) of Pskov," matching the Russian circumlocution of "all (*ves'* or *vse*) Pskov" to denote its entire population. It also alludes to the Pskovian districts.⁵⁸

A 1440 treaty between Lithuanian Grand Duke Casimir and Pskov refers only to Pskov. It stipulates free travel for merchants to the Lithuanian Land and Lithuania (*Litva*) from Pskov and all Pskovian subordinate cities.

In 1462–1465 Pskov issued a charter to Riga in response to a complaint by Prince Ivan Aleksandrovich of Pskov and Pskov's lord mayor (*stepennoi posadnik*)⁵⁹ Maksim Larivonovich, all of Pskov's mayors, Pskov's boyars, merchants, and "all of Pskov" (*vsego Pskova*).⁶⁰

In 1477 Grand Prince Ivan III of Moscow made a treaty with Pskov. The treaty was concluded on Pskov's part by its lord mayors, senior mayors (*starye posadniki*),⁶¹ deputy mayors (*synove posadniki*),⁶² merchants, the well-to-do (*zhitie liudi*), and "all of Pskov" (*ves' Pskov*).⁶³

57 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovi Pskov*, 45.

58 *GVNP*, no. 334: 318–21.

59 George G. Pushkarev, comp., *A Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 95 defines *stepennyi posadnik* as "incumbent mayor." I follow Lawrence L. Langer, "The *Posadnichedstvo* of Pskov: Some Aspects of Urban Administration in Medieval Russia," *Slavic Review* 43, no. 1 (Spring 1984): 46–62 at 48 in my translation as "lord mayor." Pskov's political structure evolved. Eventually two "lord mayors" headed the city, while all former mayors belonged to the Council of Lords (*gospoda, sovet gospod*). The *stepen'* was the rostrum or podium on which Pskov's leaders stood when conducting meetings of the town assembly, like Golgotha (*Lobnoe mesto*) in Red Square in Moscow in front of the Kremlin. Sergei Vasil'eivch Beletskii, *Pechati pskovskie* (St. Petersburg: Institut istorii material'noi kul'tury, 1994), 27.

60 *GVNP*, no. 336: 323–24.

61 Pushkarev, *A Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms*, 95 defines "old mayors" as former mayors, now members of the Council of Lords. I follow Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 38, who concluded that "old" mayors were not necessarily former mayors, but "senior" mayors by reason of seniority in age or length of time in office.

62 Literally "sons of mayors." The office of mayor was hereditary, but I doubt that all sons of mayors (including minors?) held that status in Pskov's administration and society. My translation follows Langer, "The *Posadnichedstvo* of Pskov," 63 (although he also translates the term literally, p. 61). Arakcheev, *Srednevekovi Pskov*, 53–58 too takes the phrase "sons of mayors" literally as evidence that the post of mayor was hereditary.

63 *GVNP*, no. 338: 324.

A 1480 charter (*gramota*) in the form of a petition from Prince Vasili Vasil'evich of Pskov to Casimir, Grand Duke of Lithuania (and King of Poland) complaining of a Livonian Order raid mentioned a town meeting of all of Pskov's mayors and "all of Lord Pskov" (*ves' gospodin Pskov*) at a town assembly.⁶⁴ The documents refer to Pskov as the "land of the Holy Trinity," an expression we have seen before. The petition to Casimir came from the Pskov mayors, lord mayors, senior mayors, deputy majors, boyars, merchants, well-to-do, and "all of" (*ves'*) Pskov. The Pskovian petitioners asked Casimir not to permit the Lithuanians to detain Pskovian captives fleeing from the German Land across the Lithuanian Land to return to Pskov.⁶⁵ No Pskovian Land complements the Lithuanian Land and the German Land.

The expression Lord Pskov (*gospodin Pskov*) elevated the status of the city, really the city-state; it was an ideological statement. However, it references Pskov as a city, not the Pskov Land. Arakcheev dates the origins of Pskov's identification as Lord Pskov to no earlier than the 1460s.⁶⁶ Novgorod also declared itself Lord (*Gospodin*) Novgorod. Pskov originated as a subordinate city of Novgorod; historians date its independence from Novgorod to 1348,⁶⁷ when Novgorod acknowledged Pskov's status as "young brother" (*mladshii brat*) of Novgorod,⁶⁸ so it seems to have taken Pskov over a century to aspire to equal the "lord" status of its former master and implicit current older brother.⁶⁹ Ironically, by the time Pskov achieved the status of lord, at least in its own mind, the authority of the governor (*namestnik*) of Pskov, appointed by the government in Moscow, was expanding, in 1467, to include the right to judge cases in all of Pskov's subordinate cities.⁷⁰

A 1483 judgment charter concerning a territorial dispute involving a monastery records that the trial was held "before Lord (*gospodin*) Pskov Prince⁷¹ Iaroslav Vasil'evich and the lord mayors."⁷² "Lord" applies to Pskov, not Prince Iaroslav Vasil'evich.

A 1503 treaty between Pskov and the Livonian Order was concluded on Pskov's side by the lord mayors, senior mayors, and "all Great" (*vsego Velikii*) Pskov," in German, "alle [corrected by the editor from "alte"] grote Plesckaw." It also refers to the mayors and "all

64 The composition and authority of the town assembly remain subjects of great disagreement among specialists. The word does not appear in Pskov chronicles until the 1450s. Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 90.

65 *GVNP*, no. 339: 325–26.

66 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovi Pskov*, 35.

67 Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 3; Okhotnikova, *Povest' o Dovmonte*, 66.

68 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovi Pskov*, 17; Langer, "The *Posadnichedstvo* of Pskov," 51 dates this development to the late fourteenth century.

69 Because Pskov was not independent during the Kievan period, there is no chapter on Pskov in *Drevnerusskie kniazhestva, X–XIII vv.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1975). If there were, it would certainly have been titled the "Pskovian Land."

70 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovi Pskov*, 45.

71 The text omits the word "prince," but the editor's heading for the document identifies him as a prince.

72 *PRP*, 2:325–27.

of Novgorod.” Finally, it stipulates safe passage for Livonian and Pskovian envoys to and from the Pskovian Land (Plesckawer lande).⁷³ This document stands out for presenting the term “Great Pskov,” which is something of an anomaly. Novgorod on the Volkhov River developed the term Great Novgorod to distinguish it from Nizhnii Novgorod (Lower Novgorod) on the lower Volga River, but there was no Lower Pskov to inspire use of the adjective “Great” to Pskov. The treaty also refers to the Pskovian Land in a purely territorial context.

An excerpt of a land survey of the boundaries of a suburb (*sloboda*) of Pskov belonging to the Holy Trinity Cathedral from the beginning of the sixteenth century explains that the survey was ordered by Lord (*Gospodin*) Pskov Prince of Pskov Semen Romanovich and all of Pskov’s mayors and all (*ves’*) [the people of] Lord (*Gospodin*) Pskov in a town assembly. The suburb should be delivered to Lord (*gospodin*) Pskov in the presence of “all [the people of] Pskov” (*vsem Pskovom*). This excerpt virtually equates “Lord Pskov” and the Holy Trinity Cathedral. “Lord” applies to Pskov, not Prince Semen Romanovich.

A 1509 truce treaty between Pskov and the Livonian Order was concluded in large measure by the governor of Novgorod representing Grand Prince Vasiliï III of Muscovy, but Pskovite officials and elite members participated. Pskov’s governor Prince Ivan Mikhailovich, the lord mayors, the senior mayors, all [the people of] Great Pskov, the Pskov mayors, boyars, a merchant elder, an episcopal governor, and urban and commercial secretaries from Vasiliï III’s patrimony the Pskovian Land all approved the treaty. The treaty included permission for merchants from the Pskovian Land to travel freely to the German Land and to return freely to the Pskovian Land, German merchants could travel freely to the Pskovian Land and return. However, German merchants could not sell salt from the German Land in the Pskovian Land. Trade was to be conducted as of old between the German Land and the Pskovian Land. Procedures were established to handle the situation in which a German was executed in the Pskovian Land. Yet again the treaty emphasized that the Pskovian Land was the patrimony of Vasiliï III.⁷⁴ Pskov’s lord mayor and the “best people” (the upper crust) kissed the cross (swore to uphold the truce) “for (*za*) [= on behalf of] Pskov and all the Pskovian cities and the entire (*vsia*) Pskovian Land [and for] the patrimony” of the great sovereign Russian Tsar Vasiliï III and affixed the seal of the Holy Trinity to the truce. (In fact, two Holy Trinity seals were attached to the document.)⁷⁵

While the territorial meaning of the Pskovian Land dominates the text of the treaty, that is not the entire story. Pskov’s representatives act “on behalf of” *inter alia* the Pskovian Land. The Pskovian Land in this expression cannot be territorial, it is social, that is, all the people of the entire Pskovian Land, implicitly including outside the city of Pskov and the subordinate cities. The term also becomes political. This is the only

73 *GVNP*, no. 347: 331–37.

74 The treaty accords Vasiliï III the title “tsar and grand prince” although he had not been crowned “tsar.” Ivan IV became Muscovy’s first crowned tsar in 1547.

75 N. A. Kazakova, ed., “Dogovor Pskova s Livonieï 1509 g.,” *Voprosy istorii* 1 (1983): 90–98, especially 91–95 (text of treaty); Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 26–27.

instance I have found of the concept of the Pskovian Land as a political and social construct. However, although the document is a truce between Pskov and Livonia and bears Pskov's seals, this is not only a very late statement, one year before Muscovy liquidated Pskov's independence, but also may not be of Pskovian provenance. As often as the text identifies the Pskovian Land as a geographic unit it defines that entity as the patrimony of Vasilii III and therefore not independent. Unlike calling Pskov "Great Pskov," this specific assertion reflected Moscow's, not Pskov's, ideology. The treaty, despite its staunch defence of Pskov's commercial rights vis-à-vis the Livonian Order, could still have been composed by Muscovite scribes, most likely employed by the Muscovite governor of Novgorod. While the term "Great Pskov" occurs in the treaty, the phrase Lord (*gospodin*) Pskov does not. The exceptional usage of the Pskovian Land in the 1509 treaty might derive from a non-Pskov origin.

The documentary evidence amplifies the instances in which the Pskovian Land was used geographically but also expands our appreciation of the concepts Pskovite authors used in lieu of assigning the Pskovian Land any ideological dimension. Of course, the identification of Pskov with the Holy Trinity Cathedral remains, but now that very association may have underlain the application of new attributes to the city's and the city-state's name. Great Pskov appears only in two documents; its usage requires further study. However, Lord Pskov can only be construed as projecting an attribute of sovereignty onto Pskov. It is no surprise that this only occurred after Novgorod recognized de jure what had been true de facto for some time, Pskov's independence from Novgorod. Novgorod attempted to soften the blow to its pride by insisting that Pskov was the young brother of Novgorod,⁷⁶ but that tells us more about Novgorod than Pskov. I doubt that Muscovy was enamored of the title, which did not appear in the 1509 treaty. The unique social and political meaning ascribed to the Pskovian Land in that treaty is problematic as an expression of Pskov's ideology.

Pskov never achieved ecclesiastical autonomy. Its efforts to emancipate itself from the eparchy of the Archbishop of Novgorod and Pskov failed, and it never had its own bishop during this period. Therefore, its autonomy, specifically and especially its autonomy from Novgorod, remained incomplete. This limitation on Pskov's independence had no effect on its lack of an ideological construct of the Pskovian Land, because Novgorod, which had its own (arch)bishop, also lacked a comparable concept.

Pskov's Judicial Charter (*Pskovskaia sudnaia gramota* or *pravda*) contains layers from the fourteenth and fifteenth century, but it certainly belongs to the period of Pskov's independence and antedates the Muscovite Law Code (*Sudebnik*) of 1497, of which it was a source. It does not refer to the Pskovian Land. Nevertheless, the translation of the text by Aleksandr Zimin dramatically illustrates the susceptibility of historians to fall back on "Land"-state nomenclature. Article 76 reads: if a dependent peasant (*izornik*)⁷⁷ runs away across the border (*za rubezh*)." Zimin translates "beyond the border" as "beyond the boundaries of the Pskovian Land" (*za predely Pskovskoi zemli*). Arti-

⁷⁶ Langer, "The *Posadnichestvo* of Pskov," 51.

⁷⁷ On *izorniki*, who were certainly peasants, although additional interpretations are all contested, see Kafengauz, *Drevnyi Pskov*, 9–35; Liudmila Mikhailovna Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*

cle 80 speaks of a Pskovite who has a charter to travel “across the border (*za rubezh*),” which Zimin translates as “beyond the boundaries of the Pskovian Land (*za predely (Pskovskoi zemli)*).⁷⁸ To be sure even here the notion of a Pskovian Land is territorial, but boundaries belong to political entities, and the Pskovian Land was not a political entity, as Zimin’s translation implied.

Issuing coinage was a sovereign right in medieval Rus’; only an independent polity could issue its own coins. Pskov began issuing coins in 1425, and continued to do so for eighty-five years, until Moscow formally annexed it in 1510. Pskov’s silver coins contain images of a man with a crown and a sword, perhaps Prince Dovmont, with a four-line inscription “Pskovian coinage” (*denga pskovskaia*), or an image of an animal (a snow leopard?) with an inscription, or a symbol which might represent the trident seal of the Volodimerovich royal clan in Kievan Rus’ or a monogram of Prince Dovmont. A later, rarer, smaller copper coin had similar images, an inscription “Pskovian” (*pskovskaia*), but no monogram.⁷⁹ Because there is no need here to resolve the complex issues involved in interpreting the coins, we can confine ourselves to the obvious: No coin reads Great Pskov, Lord Pskov, or (unlike some mid-fifteenth-century Muscovite coins inscribed with the Rus’ Land) the Pskovian Land. Pskov’s coinage contributed to Pskov’s political image but did not articulate an ideology of the Pskovian Land.

Pskov’s seals are an even more problematic subject than its coins because of their lack of homogeneity. Pskov instituted a new seal in 1425 to coincide with the reorganization of its administration, the completion of a construction project that created the town assembly’s architectural site, and the issuance of coinage. Seals used by Pskovite private citizens contain the religious illustrations that we would expect—the Holy Trinity, the Mother of God (*Bogoroditsa*), the Life-Giving Cross, Saint-Prince Dovmont⁸⁰—but are hardly likely to contain and did not contain an inscription referring to the Pskovian Land. Seals with the name of the Grand Prince of Moscow that declare Pskov to be his patrimony derive from Muscovite ambitions, not Pskovite sensibilities. Seals issued by the Archbishop of Novgorod and Pskov or by his representatives (governors) in Pskov represent archepiscopal pretensions, not Pskov’s. The illustration of the Mother of God of the Sign⁸¹ is certainly ecclesiastical, and might echo the Church of Hagia Sophia, the archbishop’s church in Novgorod. However, when archepiscopal administrators in Pskov acted as representatives of Pskov rather than the archbishop they used a seal with the Holy Trinity, reflecting Pskov’s Trinity Cathedral. Whether “Pskovian seals” (*pechaty*

XIV–XV vekov (Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1966), 126, 151–53. Halperin, *Ivan IV and Muscovy*, 323, 323n80, twice misprints *izorniki* as *izborniki*.

78 *PRP*, 2:296, 297 (original text), 315, 317 (translation).

79 Iuliia Aleksandrovna Sergeeva, “Monety nezavisimogo Pskova (XV–nachalo XVI v.),” *Pskov* 25 (2006): 16–26 (this is a popular but professionally written and annotated article); Beletskii, *Pechaty pskovskie*, 16–17, 21.

80 Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*, documents no. 4–8, 18–20, 22 described the illustrations. According to Ianin, descriptions of a seal with “glaring eyes” (*glazukha, glazuta*), a seventeenth-century neologism, refer to Dovmont (see note 68 above in this chapter).

81 The Virgin with outstretched arms, with Jesus in her womb.

pskovskie) belonged to the prince, the mayors' court, the boyar council, the Pskov state, or some combination thereof remains contested. Seals reading "Pskovian mayors' seals" (*Pskovskie posadnitskie pečati*) contain comparable, in all cases religious, symbols, such as the Cross and the Trinity.⁸² Seals with the Trinity might also represent Pskov's town assembly and were declared legally equal to princely seals.⁸³ Like Pskov's coins, Pskov's seals never display inscriptions reading Lord Pskov, Great Pskov, or the Pskovian Land.

Arakcheev writes: "The term the 'Pskovian Land' was used to denote the territory belonging to Pskov as a city-state," "the territory under Pskov's sovereignty."⁸⁴ The ample evidence of Pskov's chronicles and the scattered evidence from Pskovian documents confirms that definition of the phrase, which does not appear in Dovmont's *vita*, the Pskov Judicial Statute, or on Pskov's seals or coinage. Despite this intellectually neutral interpretation of the term in the Pskovian sources and because of the highly value-laden system of "Land" names in medieval and early modern Rus', typified by the exalted concept of the Rus' Land, historians nevertheless sometimes persist in ascribing ideological content for independent Pskov to the Pskovian Land. Arakcheev did not ask why the Pskovian Land did not rise to the level of self-identity of the Pskovite city-state.

The answer to that question is the same as the explanation for why the Novgorodian Land did not attain ideological importance in independent Novgorod. Novgorod identified itself with the St. Sophia Cathedral, the seat of its archbishop, who stood atop the Novgorod political pyramid. In Pskov the secular and ecclesiastical administrative apparatuses shared the same elite personnel. Mayors served as elders (*starosty*) of the Holy Trinity Cathedral and other churches. These elders controlled the economic life of Pskov's churches and monasteries.⁸⁵ The fusion of political and ecclesiastical structures in Pskov, as in Novgorod, might explain the prominence of religious concepts such as Hagia Sophia and the Holy Trinity. In Pskov political consciousness and identity were framed in religious terms. However, this positive explanation of the ideological insignificance of the Pskovian Land, like that of the Novgorodian Land, does not suffice.

Neither Novgorod's political thought nor Pskov's precluded the parallel development of concepts, even myths, of a Novgorodian Land or a Pskovian Land respectively, any more than Pskov's city-state political institutions inhibited the simultaneous existence of a princely administrative apparatus.⁸⁶ Rather, the negative explanation for the absence of "Land"-concepts comparable to those in other East Slavic polities comes into play, the lack of a princely dynasty. However significant a role the prince played in Pskov, a role that certainly increased,⁸⁷ as in Novgorod there was no princely dynasty in

82 Beletskii, *Pečati pskovskie*; V. L. Ianin, "Sfragisticheskie kommentarii k pskovskim chastnym aktam," in Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*, 163–78 (174 on *glazukha*); Langer, "The *Posadnichestvo* of Pskov," 52–53.

83 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 87; see *PRP*, 2:293.

84 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 9.

85 Marasinova, *Novye pskovskie gramoty*, 148–49.

86 Aracheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 42.

87 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 39–42. Arakcheev cites Iurii Georgievich Alekseev, *Pskovskaia*

Pskov, and therefore Pskov, like Novgorod, could not articulate an ideology of a “Land”-polity. I exaggerated in attributing a “unique” status and absent “Land”-state concept to Novgorod because Pskov shared that status and that intellectual omission. One might even say that Pskov borrowed or inherited those attributes from Novgorod when it managed to terminate its political dependence on Novgorod and to convince Novgorod, however grudgingly, to recognize that independence.

After its annexation by the Grand Principality, later Tsardom, of Muscovy, sixteenth-century authors in Pskov, unlike some modern scholars, did not anachronistically invest the phrases the Pskovian Land with patriotic import, even as local or provincial boosterism. Historians have not investigated whether such authors assimilated Muscovite ideological monopolization of the Rus’ Land. A text from Ivan IV’s reign illustrates this issue and epitomizes Pskov’s political identity after its incorporation into Muscovy.

How the icon-painter Vasilii, the Pskovian author of the *Tale of the Assault of Stefan Batory on Pskov (Povest’ o prikhozhenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov)* in 1582,⁸⁸ dealt with “Land” terminology is quite instructive. Of course, the text articulates Pskov’s pride in its successful resistance to the siege of the city during the Livonian War by Batory, King of Poland. It should be mentioned that Vasilii particularly extols the courage and skill of the Muscovite governor, Prince Ivan Petrovich Shuiskii, the *Tale’s* hero.

The title of the narration describes the Lithuanian king (*korol*) Stefan as attacking Pskov and the Rus’ Land, the Imperial-Russian tsardrom (*Rossiiskoe tsarstvo*), employing the Hellenized adjective found in the *Tale of Ivan IV’s Campaign Against Novgorod* in 1570 quoted above. Ivan IV returned from his campaign (in Livonia) to the Rus’ Land, and then went to Pskov. Batory attacked Polotsk in the Rus’ Land. He had travelled from Polotsk to the Rus’ Land. His invasion marked the beginning of the decline of the Rus’ Land. Prince Vasilii Mikhailovich Rostovskii-Lobanov vowed to defend Pskov for the Orthodox Christian faith, the holy churches, the sovereign Ivan IV, and the sovereign’s children, and all Orthodox Christians, even unto death. The gentry and their captains, and the musketeers and their captains all took the same oath. Batory attacked the Rus’ Land, proclaiming in his pronouncement to all lands that he was invading the Rus’ Land and would instill fear in the Rus’ Land. He advanced in the Rus’ Land (twice) toward the glorious (*slavnyi*) city of Pskov in the Rus’ Land. At the border of the Rus’ Land, he announced his destination as the Pskovian Land. The text invokes the saints of the Rus’ Land three times. Former gentry warriors, now clerics, entered the field of battle on the walls of Pskov, proclaiming: Today let us die for the Christian faith and the Orthodox sovereign Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil’evich of All Rus’. Pskovites vow to die defending their faith, their sovereign (Ivan IV), and Pskov. During the siege Ivan sent troops to raid the Lithuanian Land; they return safely to the “Rus’ Land.”⁸⁹

sudnaia gramota i ee vremia: Razvitia feodal’nykh otnoshenii na Rusi v XIV-XV vv. (Leningrad: Nauka, Leningradskoe otdelenie, 1980), 12–19, as one of the works that demonstrate this conclusion.

88 V. I. Malyshev, ed., *Povest’ o prikhozhenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov* (Moscow: Nauka, 1952).

89 Malyshev, ed., *Povest’ o prikhozhenii Stefana Batoriia na grad Pskov*, 35, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45, 49, 50–51, 59, 71, 74–75, 78, 83, 91, 98.

There is only one allusion in the text to the Pskovian Land, in its territorial sense. Overwhelmingly the narrative is situated in the Rus' Land ruled by Ivan IV. Pskov is praised as a "glorious city" even by Batory, and the city's defenders are willing to die fighting for the Orthodox Christian faith, for Ivan IV, and for Pskov, but not for the Pskovian Land. With some ambiguity Pskov, and incidentally Polotsk, belong to the Rus' Land.⁹⁰ King Stefan Batory rules not the Polish "kingdom" (*korolevstvo*), but the Lithuanian Land, which is juxtaposed to its opponent, the Rus' Land. Muscovite appropriation of the myth of the Rus' Land, for its state and for its ruler, finds full expression in this text. The Pskovian "patriotism" of the icon-painter Vasilii did not preclude his adherence to the Muscovite ideology of the Rus' Land and certainly did not inspire him to reconceptualize the Pskovian Land as an ideological construct. There is no evidence of Pskov separatism or political dissent against Ivan IV in the text, even though Batory's siege post-dated Ivan's sack of the city during the *oprichnina* in 1570.

Therefore, the concept of the Pskovian Land neither expressed Pskov's political ideology during its period of independence nor found new life in Pskov as a medium of local loyalty after its incorporation into Muscovy.

90 Arakcheev, *Srednevekovyi Pskov*, 93 asserts that the Pskovian Land was part of the Novgorodian Land, so that when Muscovy annexed Novgorod in 1478, Pskov had already become part of the Rus' Land and the Russian state. This conclusion overlooks the fact that neither the Pskovian Land nor the Novgorodian Land possessed juridical value. It also disregards the obvious opinion of Pskov's government that by 1478, probably since 1348, Pskov had terminated its subordination to Novgorod.

