T. V. Guimon

COMMUNITY NAMES IN THE FIRST NOVGORODIAN CHRONICLE AND THE TERRITORIAL STRUCTURE OF THE NOVGORODIAN LAND (1115–1272)

There are only few written sources which present direct information on the territorial structure of early Rus. These are lists of 'tribes' in the Primary Chronicle and very rare official documents which list duties of certain districts or communities[1]. Most of what we know of the territorial structure of Rus, we know from the chronicles (*letopisi*, 'летописи', a better translation would be 'annals' or 'annalistic chronicles').

The chronicles, however, record events, not structures or places. Thus they do not contain any systematic information on political geography: we only can deduce it from descriptions of events. Firstly (and mostly), we can follow the history of the Rurik dynasty and to analyze how Rus was divided between its members, what principalities existed at what time, and which was their hierarchy. Secondly, we can follow the history of the church and the dioceses, which presumably was connected with that of the dynasty. Finally, we can study the mentions of communities, or territorial groups of people (Slavonic or non-Slavonic 'tribes', dwellers of towns, like 'the Kievans' or 'the Novgorodians', etc.). Such community names are used quite frequently by the chroniclers, and it seems that the communities designated were regarded as actors responsible for many events. As community names are used frequently, it seems legitimate to analyze their usage as an evidence for the territorial structure of Old Rus (at least as it was perceived by the annalists).

In the present paper I will analyze from this point of view the text of the First Novgorodian Chronicle for 1115–1272[2]. I will study only the mentions which concern the

---

[1] The most important of these texts are printed: Древнерусские княжеские уставы XI–XV вв. / Изд. подгот. Я. Н. Щапов. М., 1976. С. 140–165.

[2] In 1115 the use of the Kievan source in the First Novgorodian Chronicle stops and the continuous set of contemporary Novgorodian notes starts. 1272 is the last annal before a big lacuna in the oldest Synodal manuscript.

Novgorodian Land[3]. In other words, this paper follows how the authors of the official chronicle of Novgorod perceived the structure of the territories subordinate to this city.

Analyzing this I won't concern neither the question of social make-up of those who could act as 'the Novgorodians', 'the Pskovians', etc. ('democracy' *vs.* 'oligarchy'; urban population with or without the dwellers of the rural vicinity)[4], nor the problem of non-impartiality and special functions of references to 'communities' in the annalistic narratives[5]. My purpose is only to analyze the annalistic usage of community names as a source for the territorial structure of the Novgorodian Land.

The First Novgorodian Chronicle is extant in several manuscripts, of which the oldest is Synodal MS[6] written partly *c.* 1234 (annals up to 1234), partly *c.* 1330 (from the end of the annal for 1234 till 1330)[7]. Both, *c.* 1234 and *c.* 1330 the scribes copied the Archiepiscopal Annals of Novgorod, which are not extant in original manuscript but can be reconstructed when comparing the Synodal MS. (or the Elder Version) with the so-called Younger Version of the First Novgorodian Chronicle (manuscripts of the fifteenth century and later). The Archiepiscopal Annals were kept year by year, rather systematically, so that their notes are always more or less contemporary[8]. A linguistic analysis of the Synodal MS. undertaken by Alexey Gippius showed that in most of the cases changes of Novgorodian (arch)bishops led to changes of scribes who updated the annals[9].

The annals for 1115–1274 use the following community names.

'The Novgorodians' ('новгородцы'), the inhabitants of Novgorod, are mentioned almost in each annal. The uses of this term were analyzed many times when discussing the problems of socio-political structure of Novgorod/the Novgorodian Land (as well as other regions of Old Rus), the functions and make-up of the Novgorodian *veche* (gathering of

---

[3] Of the studies of historical geography of the Novgorodian Land see: *Насонов А. Н.* «Русская земля» и образование территории древнерусского государства: Историко-географическое исследование. Монголы и Русь: История татарской политики на Руси. 2-е изд., стереотип. СПб., 2006. С. 64–114; *Буров В. А.* Очерки истории и археологии средневекового Новгорода. М., 1994. С. 114–137; *Фролов А. А.* Устав князя Ярослава «о мостех» об административном устройстве Новгородской земли середины XIII в. // Староладожский сборник. СПб., 2013. Вып. 10. С. 266–274.

[4] See e. g. much debated conception of 'city-states' of Old Rus: *Фроянов И. Я., Дворниченко А. Ю.* Города-государства Древней Руси. Л., 1988. See also works cited in note 10.

[5] See: *Вилкул Т. Л.* Люди и князь в древнерусских летописях середины XI–XIII вв. М., 2009.

[6] The text is printed: Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего извода / Под ред. и с предисл. А. Н. Насонова. М.; Л., 1950 (reprinrted in: Полное собрание русских летописей (далее — ПСРЛ). Т. 3. М., 2000). С. 15–100 (I will quote this edition and refer only to annal-numbers). A facsimile of the Synodal MS. see: Новгородская харатейная летопись / Под ред. М. Н. Тихомирова. М., 1964.

[7] *Гимон Т. В., Гиппиус А. А.* Новые данные по истории текста Новгородской первой летописи // Новгородский исторический сборник. СПб., 1999. Вып. 7 (17). С. 18–47.

[8] On the text-relationships of the manuscripts and the process of keeping the Archiepiscopal Annals see: *Гимон Т. В.* Новгородское летописание XI – середины XIV в. как социокультурное явление: Дис. … д-ра ист. наук. М., 2014 (URL: http://www.igh.ru/upload/information_system_8/6/3/4/item_634/gimon-dissertazia.pdf (дата посещения — 01.11.2015 г.)); *Guimon T. V.* Christian Identity in the Early Novgorodian Annalistic Writing // Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe (*c.* 1070–1200) / Ed. I. Garipzanov. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011. P. 255–275.

[9] *Гиппиус А. А.* Новгородская владычная летопись XII–XIV вв. и ее авторы (История и структура текста в лингвистическом освещении). I // Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка, 2004–2005. М., 2006. С. 114–251.

people taking decisions)[10]. Here I will not discuss these questions. My purpose is only to outline the roles 'the Novgorodians' play in the annalistic accounts and to find out how often this term is used to designate a community, a collective actor as opposed to the other possible meaning: 'some inhabitants of Novgorod'.

Firstly, the annalist's 'Novgorodians' are an army. The most frequent context is that either a prince undertakes a raid 'with the Novgorodians'[11], or 'the Novgorodians' do the same 'with' a certain prince[12], or a prince is not mentioned at all[13]. 'The Novgorodians' can receive a portion of the tribute as in 1214 when the prince gave two thirds of the Chuds' (Eesti's) tribute to the Novgorodians and one third to his own militants ('дворяномъ'). 'The Novgorodians' and the prince can take a joint decision to go to a raid, and to discuss the advisability of the raid already on the march, as in the same 1214. In 1135 both participants of a conflict in southern Rus invited 'the Novgorodians' to fight on their side but they refused to both. An invitation of the same sort was received by 'the Novgorodians' in 1139 and again was declined.

Secondly, 'the Novgorodians' are a political body which can take political decisions as to expel or invite a prince, or to elect or depose a posadnik (the main city magistrate)[14]. 'The Novgorodians' are a side in negotiations with princes[15] or form a military force if there is a conflict with a prince[16]. They elect archbishops[17] and archimandrites[18]. They can kill or arrest somebody if he is accused in treason, or plunder or confiscate somebody's property[19], or a prince can accuse 'the Novgorodians' in such actions[20]. They refuse in 1257 to take the Tatars' census in their city and do it in 1259.

---

[10] Historiography is enormous, see the most important and recent works: *Фроянов И. Я.* Древняя Русь: Опыт исследования истории социальной и политической борьбы. М.; СПб., 1995; *Янин В. Л.* Новгородские посадники. 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. М., 2003; *Granberg J.* Veche in the Chronicles of Medieval Rus: A Study of Functions and Terminology. Göteborg, 2004 (a revised Russian translation see: *Гранберг Ю.* Вече в древнерусских письменных источниках: Функции и терминология // Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы, 2004 год: Политические институты Древней Руси. М., 2006. С. 3–163); *Вилкул Т. Л.* Люди и князь в древнерусских летописях середины XI–XIII вв. М., 2009; *Севастьянова О. В.* Древний Новгород: Новгородско-княжеские отношения в XII – первой половине XV в. М.; СПб., 2011; *Лукин П. В.* Новгородское вече. М., 2014.

[11] *S. a.* 1116, 1123, 1130, 1133, 1134, 1148, 1164 ('Prince Svyatoslav with the Novgorodians and with posadnik Zakharia'), 1168, 1173, 1179, 1180, 1185, 1191, 1212 (twice), 1214 (twice), 1216, 1219, 1223, 1227, 1231, 1234, 1240–1242, 1245. See also 1256.

[12] *S. a.* 1181, 1209, 1210, 1217, 1222, 1228, 1253, 1262, 1268, 1269.

[13] *S. a.* 1168, 1191, 1200, 1217, 1229, 1253. See also 1169, 1267. See also the raids undertaken not by the whole army from Novgorod but by some smaller groups of Novgorodians (1145, 1149, 1169, 1186, 1193, 1219), the word 'Novgorodians' normally not being used. *S. a.* 1192 it is said: 'a small number of Novgorodians' ('новъгородци въмале').

[14] *S. a.* 1148, 1154 (twice), 1156, 1160, 1170, 1171, 1176–1181, 1184, 1187, 1196, 1210, 1215, 1218, 1219, 1221, 1223–1225, 1228, 1240, 1255, 1264, 1270, 1272.

[15] *S. a.* 1195, 1196, 1209, 1211, 1218, 1224, 1255, 1269, 1270.

[16] *S. a.* 1220, 1255, 1270.

[17] Or, rather, candidates from which the winner is defined by lot (see on this function of 'the Novgorodians': *Печников М. В.* Новгородцы и кафедра Св. Софии в середине XII – XIII в. // Средневековая Русь. М., 2011. Вып. 9. С. 7–46). *S. a.* 1186, 1193, 1199 (Prince Vsevolod consulted the posadnik and the Novgorodians before sending a candidate to Novgorod, then he was enthroned by 'all Novgorod'), 1200, 1211 (the prince and the Novgorodians 'loved' the candidate), 1219.

[18] *S. a.* 1226, 1230 ('all Novgorod').

[19] *S. a.* 1167, 1209, 1218, 1229, 1257.

[20] *S. a.* 1215.

For the first time the Novgorodians are mentioned in such a 'political' context *s. a.* 1125 when 'the Novgorodians put [Prince] Vsevolod on the throne' ('посадиша на столе Всеволода новгородци'). This note is not clear: Vsevolod already was the prince of Novgorod since 1117. Perhaps, the annalist meant that in the year of political changes, 1125, when Vladimir Monomakh died and his son Mstislav succeeded to Kiev, it was a deliberate decision of the Novgorodians to recognize Mstislav's son Vsevolod as their prince[21]. In any case 'the Novgorodians' here act as a political body.

Some other 'political' contexts deserve special attention. *S. a.* 1132 it is mentioned that Prince Vsevolod earlier «had kissed the cross to the Novgorodians as 'I want to die with you'» ('а целовавъ крестъ к новгородцемъ, яко хоцю у васъ умерети'), i. e. had sworn that he would never change Novgorod for another throne. In 1134 'the Novgorodians started to talk of the war against Suzdal and killed their man and threw him down from the bridge' ('Почаша мълъвити о Суждальстеи воине новъгородци и убиша мужь свои и съвъргоша и съ моста'). In 1141 Prince Svyatoslav ran away from Novgorod 'having been afraid of being arrested by ruse by the Novgorodians' ('убоявъся новгородьць: чи прельстивъше мя имуть'). *S. a.* 1184 the annalist reports the position of the Novgorodians who were discontented with Prince Yaroslav, and Vsevolod of Suzdal recalled him.

In some contexts 'the Novgorodians' are both a military force and a political body. In 1167 they, first, swore that they did not want Svyatoslav to be their prince and, second, went to Luki to drive him out. They act in these two capacities later in the same annal as well. In 1209 'the Novgorodians' took part in Prince Vsevolod's campaign into the Land of Ryazan, and then Vsevolod let the Novgorodians go home, gave them presents and «gave them all freedom and the statutes of old princes, what they wanted, and said to them: 'Love those who are good to you, and punish those who are bad'» («вда имъ волю всю и уставы старыхъ князь, егоже хотеху новгородьци, и рече имъ: 'кто вы добръ, того любите, а злыхъ казните'»). When the Novgorodians returned home, they 'gathered *veche*' ('створиша вече') against posandik Dmitr and his brothers, and plundered their property.

'The Novgorodians' are shown building fortifications. In 1211 Prince Mstislav 'sent' posadnik Dmitr Yakunich to Luki 'with the Novgorodians to build towns' ('съ новгородьци города ставитъ'). In 1239 'Prince Alexander with the Novgorodians built [of wood] towns along [river] Shelon' ('князь Александръ с новгородци сруби городци по Шелоне'). In these cases one can guess that 'the Novgorodians' are the same as those who took part in military campaigns: an army of men from Novgorod went to a certain place to build a fortress. However in 1262, when 'the Novgorodians' built new wooden city walls, this term rather refers to those who took the decision.

Some annalistic notes seem to give some idea of the make-up of 'the Novgorodians'. In 1166 Rostislav, the prince of Kiev, came to Luki, in the south of the Novgorodian Land, and 'called Novgorodians to negotiations' ('позва новгородьце на порядь'). Then the annals specify the groups of Novgorodians invited: '*ognishchane*, *grid'*, and the elder merchants' ('огнищане, гридь, купьце вячьшее'). It is not absolutely clear what are the first two categories (nobles? retinue? militants?), but Pavel Lukin presented some case that this formula represented all fully capable population of Novgorod[22]. The same groups of Novgorodians ('огнищане и гридьба и купци') were ready to go with Vsevolod of Suzdal to his raid to the Land of Chernigov in 1193, but Vsevolod let them go back. Another note of this sort is

---

[21] See a more sophisticated hypothesis: *Янин В. Л.* Новгородские посадники. С. 97–99.
[22] *Лукин П. В.* Новгородское вече. С. 170–174.

s. a. 1191: Prince Yaroslav 'took the Novgorodians, the fore retinue' ('поя съ собою новъгородьць передьнюю дружину') to negotiations with the prince of Pololsk, and a peace was concluded and a decision was taken to undertake a joint raid against the Chuds or the Lithuanians. 'The fore retinue' is presumably only a part of 'the Novgorodians' which can represent them.

A very interesting context is *s. a.* 1211 when a fire took place 'in Novgorod in the absence of the prince and the Novgorodians' ('бесъ князя и без новъгородьць Новегороде'). This clearly means that 'the Novgorodians' are not all the population of Novgorod, but those who formed its military force and could be away during a campaign. Almost the same is *s. a.* 1217 when Prince Mstislav came to Novgorod 'in their absence' ('без нихъ'): the Novgorodians were raiding Estonia.

In 1215, after a famine and a conflict with Prince Yaroslav, 'there were few Novgorodians, for there [in Torzhok] the elder men were arrested, and the smaller [men] either dispersed or died of hunger' ('бяше же новгородьцевъ мало: ано тамо измано вячьшие мужи, а мьньшее они розидошася, а иное помьрло голодомь').

The term 'Novgorodians' is used in formula: 'And the Novgorodians were glad (to see what they wanted)' ('и ради быша новгородьци своему хотению', 1168[23]) which is used mostly when reporting arrivals of new princes to Novgorod. In 1214 Prince Yaroslav arrived to Novgorod and was welcomed by the archbishop 'with the Novgorodians'. *S. a.* 1141 it is said that 'the Novgorodians sat without a prince for nine months' ('седеша новгородци бес князя 9 месяць'). Once there is a prayer for 'the Novgorodians' (1233).

The contexts in which the annalists use the word 'Novgorodians' not to designate the collective actor but mean 'some Novgorodians' are relatively rare[24]. On the contrary, there are many contexts where the word 'Novgorodians' is not used, but the annalists probably (or even certainly) mean the Novgorodian community as a collective actor.

Firstly, in some cases the actor is the city, 'Novgorod', or 'all Novgorod', or 'all the city'. For instance, in 1156 'all the city of people' ('всь град людии') gathered to elect a new bishop. *S. a.* 1196 the word 'Novgorod' is clearly used as a community name: 'and gave to Novgorod freedom in [the choice] of all princes: where *they* like, there they recruit a prince' ('а Новгородъ выложиша вси князи вь свободу: кде имъ любо, ту же собе князя поимають'). In 1199 'all Novgorod, having come, enthroned with honour' ('и всь Новъгородъ, шьдъше, съ честью посадиша') a new archbishop. In the same year 'all Novgorod was glad' ('обрадовася вьсь Новъгородъ') when a new prince arrived[25].

Secondly, important decisions or actions often are described it third plural with no actor specified, for the first time *s. a.* 1126: 'In this same year [they] gave the post of posadnik to Miroslav Gyuryatinich' ('Въ то же лето вдаша посадницьство Мирославу Гюрятиницю'). Changes of posadniks and even pricnes are very often reported in this way[26]. The collective actor is presumably 'the Novgorodians'. *S. a.* 1161 the appointment of a new Novgorodian

---

[23] Also *s. a.* 1187, 1200, 1210, 1222, 1223, 1225, 1229, 1241. See also formulas 'according to all the will of Novgorod' ('на всеи воли новгородстеи', 1222, 1229, 1230), 'all the people were glad' ('и ради быша людье вси', 1228), 'all the city was glad to see what they wanted' ('радъ бысть всь град своему хотѣнию', 1205).

[24] *S. a.* 1131, 1134, 1169, 1188, 1215 (twice), 1216, 1229, 1236. See also the word 'Novgorodians' used when persons killed in battles are listed (1216, 1234, 1240).

[25] See also *s. a.* 1193, 1205, 1230.

[26] *S. a.* 1128, 1130, 1132, 1134 (twice), 1135, 1136, etc. (changes of posadniks); 1132, 1136, 1138, 1139, 1161, etc. (changes of princes).

prince seems to be presented as a result of an agreement between two princes, but it is interesting that, while the discharge of the previous prince is described in dual form ('выведоста'), the invitation of the new one is reported in plural ('въведоша'), as if the two princes took away the old prince, and the Novgorodians accepted the new one. The same actor could be had in mind *s. a.* 1130 when speaking of the appointment of the archbishop: 'and [they] appointed archbishop Nifont' ('и поставиша архепископа Нифонта'): we saw that in many cases new archbishops were elected by 'the Novgorodians'[27]. The same third plural with no actor specified is used sometimes for building of churches and the city bridge[28]. Perhaps, in some of these cases again 'the Novgorodians' are the collective actor, especially when speaking of the bridge[29]. In 1229 the bridge was built with the money confiscated by 'the Novgorodians' from those accused of the support of Prince Yaroslav. The third plural is sometimes used when mentioning a murder or plunder of somebody in Novgorod (perhaps with a collective decision, but perhaps not)[30].

Of course, we must not assume that any time when the annalist uses impersonal third plural he means 'the Novgorodians': for example, when a church is consecrated[31] the actor is probably the archbishop (maybe with other participants of the ceremony). But in some cases it is absolutely clear that this 'they' or third plural mean the Novgorodians as a political body. *S. a.* 1134 it is said: «And [they] let the metropolitan go to Kiev… And going to [the raid to] Suzdal they had not let him go, and he had been telling them: 'Do not go, God will hear me'» («И пустиша митрополита Кыеву… а на Суждаль идуче, не пустиша его, а онъ мълвляше имъ: 'не ходите, мене богъ послушаеть'»). Here 'they' are both the army of Novgorod and the political body which decides to detain the metropolitan or to let him go. In 1201 'they' concluded peace with 'the Varangians'. *S. a.* 1219 the third plural certainly refers to the Novgorodians who earlier, as a military force, undertook a raid to Pertuev (Cēsis in present Lativa): 'Having returned from Pertuev, [they] gave the post of posadnik to Tverdislav' ('Пришьдъше же от Пьртуева, вдаша посадничьство Твьрдиславу').

Novgorod consisted of two 'sides' ('halves': 'сторона', 'полъ') and (by the late thirteenth century) of five 'ends' ('концы'); the inhabitants of these, as well as of some smaller localities (the most well-known are *prusi*, 'пруси', the dwellers of the Prussian, 'Прусская', street) are mentioned as actors in inner conflicts in Novgorod. They can be called both by collective plural ('the dwellers of', e. g. *prusi*) or by the geographical term itself (e. g. 'Торговыи полъ', 'the Trade Side').

For the first time such a group is mentioned as an actor *s. a.* 1157, when 'the people' ('людье') revolted against a prince, and 'the Trade Half rose with arms in his support' ('Търгoвыи же полъ сташа въ оружии по немь'). In 1215 *prusi* killed certain Ovstrat and his son, and the prince accused 'the Novgorodians' in that. It is clear here that the annalist opposes *prusi* who are guilty to the Novgorodians as a whole who are not guilty. *S. a.* 1218 the annalist for the first time describes in detail a bloody inner conflict in Novgorod in which the following parties took part: 'the dwellers of That [i. e. Trade] Side' ('ониполовици'), the Nerevsky End/its dwellers ('Неревьскыи коньчь', 'неревляне'), the Lyudin End and *prusi*

---

[27] See note 17. See also 1228 when an archbishop was deposed at *veche*.

[28] *S. a.* 1133, 1144, 1188, etc.

[29] The churches were typically an enterprise of a private donator, and in most of the cases such a donator is named.

[30] *S. a.* 1136, 1137, 1141, 1186, 1227, 1230.

[31] *S. a.* 1136 and many times later.

('съ Людинемь концемь и с пруси'). The dwellers of the Zagorodsky End ('загородьци') 'did not stand neither for these nor for these, but looked [who would be] the winner' ('не въсташа ни по сихъ, ни по сихъ, нъ зряху перезора'). Here we see five communities with their different positions. In 1220 *prusi* and the dwellers of the Lyudin and the Zagorodsky ends supported posadnik Tverdislav in his conflict with the prince and formed five regiments ('и урядивъше на 5 пълковъ').

S. a. 1236 Slavno, a district in Novgorod, is mentioned as a place represented by one of three noble Novgorodians whom Prince Yaroslav took with him to Kiev. It is probable that in this as well as in other cases such envies and/or hostages were representatives of parts of Novgorod that is of communities which formed Novgorod as a whole[32]. Twice *gorodishchane*, i. e. the dwellers of Gorodishche, princely residence near Novgorod, are mentioned. In 1229 'the Novgorodians' confiscated from them much money for their support of Prince Yaroslav. In 1234 one of them was killed in a battle.

It also must be mentioned that smaller groups of Novgorodians are sometimes said to have sponsored building of churches: the dwellers of Lukina street ('лукиници') *s. a.* 1185, *shetitsinichi* ('шетициничи', maybe the dwellers of Shchitnaya street) *s. a.* 1173, as well as overseas merchants ('заморьстии') *s. a.* 1156 and 1207.

Dwellers of towns of the Novgorodian Land mentioned in the annals include the inhabitants of Pskov ('псковичи, 'псковские мужи'), Torzhok, or Novy Torg ('новоторжцы'), Ladoga ('ладожане'), Rusa (now Staraya Rusa, 'рушане'), Luki (now Velikie Luki, 'лучане').

In the majority of cases they act as military forces. In that capacity they take part in campaigns undertaken by the Novgorodians[33] or act independently: the people of Pskov[34], Ladoga[35], Torzhok[36], or Rusa[37] could fight without the Novgorodians, especially when their town was attacked by somebody from outside the Novgorodian Land. The people of Luki are said twice to preserve themselves from a battle and to retreat[38]. In 1216 'all dwellers of Torzhok' ('новотържьци вси') were taken as prisoners by Prince Yaroslav.

---

[32] See: *Гимон Т. В.* В каких случаях имена новгородцев попадали на страницы летописи (XII–XIII вв.)? // Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы, 2004 год: Политические институты Древней Руси. М., 2006. С. 307–313.

[33] *S. a.* 1168, 1191, 1192 (the Pskovians), 1198 (the dwellers of Pskov, Torzhok, Ladoga, and 'all the Novgorodian Land'), 1214, 1217 (the Pskovians), 1225 (the dwellers of Torzhok), 1240, 1241 (the dwellers of Ladoga), 1268 (the people of Pskov and Ladoga).

[34] *S. a.* 1176 (the Chuds attacked Pskov), 1183 (a battle of the Pskovians with the Lithuanians), 1190 (the Pskovians defeated the Chuds in the lake), 1213 (see below), 1237 (the Pskovians joined the Livonian crusaders in their raid to Lithuania and were defeated near Šiauliai), 1240 (the crusaders seized Izborsk and then Pskov), 1266 (Prince Dovmont and the Pskovians two times raided Lithuania).

[35] *S. a.* 1142 (it is said that the Swedish atacked 'the Novgorodian Land', 'область Новгородьскую', and the people of Ladoga defeated them), 1164 (roughly the same situation; this time the dwellers of Ladoga have a leader: Ladoga's posadnik Nezhata), 1228 (roughly the same).

[36] *S. a.* 1167 (Prince Andrey of Vladimir burned Torzhok, and its dwellers retreated to Novgorod), 1181 (the town was beseiged by Vsevolod of Vladimir, then the dwellers surrendered and were taken to Vladimir 'all with wives and with children', 'новотържьце все съ женами и съ детьми'), 1238 (the siege by the Tatars with no help from Novgorod), 1245 (the dwellers tried to repulse an attack by the Lithuanians), 1255 (the dwellers were in an army of Prince Alexander which went against Novgorod), 1258 (Torzhok was attacked by the Lithuanians).

[37] *S. a.* 1224 (the people of Rusa fought with the Lithuanians), 1234 (the Lithuanians raided Rusa and its dwellers fought).

[38] *S. a.* 1167, 1198.

However, sometimes the inhabitants of these towns also act as political bodies. For the first time this is seen in 1132, when Prince Vsevolod returned to Novgorod but was not accepted. 'The Pskovians and the people of Ladoga came to Novgorod' ('и придоша пльсковици и ладожане Новугороду'), and then the prince was turned out, though soon invited back. In 1136 again a political decision was taken jointly by the people of Novgorod, Pskov and Ladoga: 'the Novgorodians invited the Pskovians and the people of Ladoga and decided as to turn out their prince Vsevolod' ('новгородьци призваша пльсковиче и ладожаны и сдумаша, яко изгонити князя своего Всеволода'). In 1137 the Pskovians acted in opposition to Novgorod: they accepted Prince Vsevolod earlier expelled from Novgorod and continued to support him even when the army of 'all the Novgorodian Land' was near Pskov. When, in the same year, Vsevolod died in Pskov, the Pskovians invited his brother Svyatopolk, and 'there was no peace' ('не бе мира') between them and Novgorod. In 1138 there was a false alarm in Novgorod that the Pskovians (as an army) are near the city. In the same year 'peace was made with the Pskovians' ('съ пльсковици съмиришася'). Conflicts between the Pskovians and Novgorod or, rather, Novgorodian princes also are described *s. a.* 1228 and 1232. In 1265 the Pskovians with their prince Svyatoslav baptised 300 Lithuanian refugees (the Novgorodians wanted to slaughter them but Prince Yaroslav did not allow). In 1266 the Pskovians accepted Dovmont of Lithuania as their prince.

The dwellers of Torzhok did in 1196 the same that the Pskovians in 1137: when the Novgorodians drove out Prince Yaroslav, Torzhok accepted him, and he was sitting in Torzhok and collecting tribute from some parts of the Novgorodian Land. Later such political division between Novgorod and Torzhok (situated close to the Suzdal Land) recurred[39]. In 1229 the Novgorodians made Ivanko posadnik of Torzhok, and the dwellers of Torzhok did not accept him. In 1230 they (or rather some of them) escaped with some noble Novgorodians to Chernigov. In 1236 Prince Yaroslav took with him to Kiev three noble Novgorodians and 100 dwellers of Torzhok; he let them go back with gifts in a week[40].

A note on the Pskovians *s. a.* 1213 is of special importance: the Pskovians play here the same roles as the Novgorodians do (military and political bodies), and, as the Novgorodians in 1211, they can be *absent* from the town: 'In the Apostles' Fast the godless Lithuanians[41] raided Pskov and burned it, since the Pskovians in that time had driven out their prince Vladimir, and the Pskovians were on the Lake; and [the Lithuanians] did much harm and went out' ('Въ Петрово говение изъехаша Литва безбожная Пльсковъ и пожгоша: пльсковици бо бяху въ то время изгнали князя Володимира от себе, а пльсковици бяху на озере; и много створиша зла и отъидоша').

So, the dwellers of the towns of the Novgorodian Land, as the Novgorodians themselves, are presented as political bodies (at least the people of Pskov, Ladoga, and Torzhok) and as military forces (all of them). One can add that most of these towns at least sometimes

---

[39] In 1215, 1224.

[40] See also *s. a.* 1148 when Archbishop Nifont, during his visit to Suzdal, 'reinstated all the dwellers of Torzhok' ('новотържьцѣ всѣ выправи') — a note which is not absolutely clear. In 1188 Novgorodians were persecuted in Scandinavia for some guilt of certain Khoruzhko and the dwellers of Torzhok (see: *Янин В. Л., Зализняк А. А.* Новгородские грамоты на бересте (Из раскопок 1977–1983 гг.). М., 1986. С. 172–174).

[41] We know from the *Chronicle* of Henry of Livonia that 'the Lithuanians' were in fact Eesti (*Матузова В. И., Назарова Е. Л.* Крестоносцы и Русь: Конец XII в. – 1270 г.: Тексты, перевод, комментарий. М., 2002. С. 88, 120, 164, 292–293).

became residences of their own princes[42] and almost in all of them at least once we hear of local posadniks[43]. There was also one town in a periphery of the Novgorodian Land, Volok Lamsky (now Volokolamsk), where a prince was set by 'the Novgorodians' in 1177. Volok Lamsky is mentioned *s. a.* 1216 and 1229 as a Novgorodian possession occupied by the prince of Pereyaslavl, but there is no mention of its dwellers. However, since Volok had once its own prince, one can guess that it had something of the same status as Torzhok, Rusa, etc.

Finnic-speaking groups subordinate to Novgorod[44] in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries included the Vods (Votes, Votians 'водь'), the Izhora (Izhorians, 'ижора'), and the Korela (Karelians, 'корела'). They are mentioned in the annals mostly in military contexts.

S. a. 1143 it is reported that the Korela attacked the Yem (Häme). In 1149 the Yem attacked the Vods, and the Novgorodians, having heard of that, attacked and defeated the Yem together with the Vods. In 1191 the Korela joined the Novgorodians in their raid against the Yem. In 1228 the Izhora and the Korela defeated the rests of the Yem, who had earlier attacked Ladoga and had been defeated by its dwellers. In 1241 the German crusaders and the Chuds attacked the Vods, imposed on them tribute and built a town in Koporye. In the next year Prince Alexander re-conquered this area 'with the dwellers of Novgorod and Ladoga, and with the Korela and the Izhora' ('с новгородци, и с ладожаны, и с корелою, и съ ижеряны'). Traytors among the Vods were hung. In 1253 the Korela did much harm to the land of the Germans (that is to Livonia). In 1269 Prince Yaroslav wanted to raid the Korela, but the Novgorodians persuaded him not to do so. In 1270 'all the Novgorodian Land gathered to Novgorod: the dwellers of Pskov and Ladoga, the Korela, the Izhora, the Vods' ('совкупися в Новьгородъ вся волость Новгородьская, пльсковичи, ладожане, корела, ижера, вожане') to offer resistance to a prince.

A unique context is *s. a.* 1215: when describing a famine in Novgorod and the Novgorodian Land, the annalist specifies that 'the Vods died, and the rest dispersed' ('а вожане помроша, а останьке разидеся'). One can guess that the Vods (and no other communities of the Novgorodian Land) are mentioned because they especially suffered from hunger.

'The Novgorodian Land' also seems to be a collective actor in some accounts of military campaigns[45]. It can be mentioned separately or together with some other community names.

In 1134 Prince Vsevolod and 'all the Novgorodian Land' ('вся Новгородьская волость'[46]) undertook a raid against Suzdal. In 1137 Prince Svyatoslav 'gathered all the Novgorodian Land' ('съвъкупи всю землю Новгородьскую') to go against Pskov. In 1147 Prince Svyatopolk went against Suzdal 'with all the Novgorodian Land' ('съ всею областию Новъгородьскою'). In 1191 Prince Yaroslav Vladimirovich went against the Chuds 'with the Novgorodians, and the Pskovians, and his land'. In 1198 the same prince set out

---

[42] The princes of Pskov are known in 1137, 1211, 1213, 1216, 1232, 1243, 1255, 1257, 1265, 1266 etc., of Torzhok in 1177, 1180, 1245, of Luki in 1198 and 1211.

[43] The posadnik of Pskov is mentionned *s. a.* 1132, of Ladoga *s. a.* 1132, 1164, and 1228, of Torzhok *s. a.* 1210, 1215, 1228, 1238, of Rusa *s. a.* 1224.

[44] I do not consider here the Finnic-speaking groups which were not subordinate to Novgorod and which are typically mentioned as military adversaries: the Chuds (Eesti, Estonians, 'чудь'), the Yem (Häme, Tavastians, 'ѣмь'), etc.

[45] Not to mention the uses of 'the Novgorodian Land' as a purely geographical term *s. a.* 1184, 1225, 1240 (twice).

[46] 'Волость' (*volost'*, lit. 'possession'), 'земля' (*zemlya*, 'land'), and 'область' (*oblast'*, 'area') are not equal terms (see: *Горский А. А.* От славянского Расселения до Московского царства. М., 2004. С. 130–146) but it is acceptable here to translate them all as 'land'.

against Polotsk 'with the dwellers of Novgorod, and Pskov, and Torzhok, and Ladoga, and all the Novgorodian Land'. In 1223 Prince Yaroslav Vsevolodich went to Kolyvan (Tallinn) 'with all the land' ('съ всею областию'). In 1224 'the Novgorodians gathered all the land' ('новгородци же скопиша всю волость') against the prince. In 1234 Prince Yaroslav Vsevolodich went to Yuryev (Tartu) 'with the Novgorodians, and with all the land, and with his troops'[47] ('съ новгородци и съ всею областью и с полкы своими'). In 1270 'all the Novgorodian Land gathered: the dwellers of Pskov and Ladoga, the Korela, the Izhora, the Vods' ('совкупися в Новьгородъ вся волость Новгородьская, пльсковичи, ладожане, корела, ижера, вожане').

Obviously, '(all) the Novgorodian Land' means a big army gathered not only in Novgorod but in the other parts of the land as well. It is interesting that sometimes the definition of this army includes community names of two types: those of the dwellers of towns (Pskov, Ladoga, Torzhok) and those of Finnic-speaking 'tribes' (as in the last example). These lists, especially the last one, illustrate exactly what we have seen when cataloguing separate uses of the community names.

The territorial structure of the Novgorodian Land — at least as it was perceived by the 12th- and 13th-century annalists — included 'the Novgorodian Land' as a general term, 'the Novgorodians' as the community of the dominating city, the smaller towns with their dwellers (acting both together with 'the Novgorodians' or separately), and, finally, the Finno-Ugric 'tribes'. On the third level there are local communities inside Novgorod which act in inner conflicts in the city but which are not very frequently mentioned by the annalists.

It can be assumed that the Finnic-speaking groups subordinate to Novgorod (the Vods, the Izhora, and the Korela) had something of the same status in the whole structure as the towns (Pskov, Ladoga, etc.). This is seen from the list *s. a.* 1270, and also from the fact that they are treated similarly by the annalists. Both, the towns and the 'tribes', are frequently mentioned as participants of military campaigns and rarely in other capacities. The towns and their communities are sometimes mentioned in the accounts of political conflicts (in which they — namely Pskov and Torzhok — could oppose 'the Novgorodians') and in some other contexts (mostly building of churches and fortifications)[48]. The only non-military mention of a Finno-Ugric 'tribe' is that of the famine among the Vods in 1215. As for military notes, the similarity between the towns and the 'tribes' is even more obvious. They are mentioned as participants of the campaigns conducted by the Novgorodians themselves and as those who repulsed the attacks of outer forces (such as the Chuds, the Yem, etc.)[49]. Very rare are notes on campaigns undertaken by the communities subordinate to Novgorod (in fact one such note concerns the raid of the Korela against the Yem in 1143 and three notes concern the military enterprises of the Pskovians[50]) though such raids certainly were more numerous. In the case of the Pskovians in the early thirteenth century such selectivity of the annals is very well confirmed by the comparison with the *Chronicle* of Henry of Livonia; there is some evidence on military activity of the Korela not reflected in the Novgorodian annals[51].

---

[47] That is with the army from his own principality of Pereyaslavl.

[48] See: *Гимон Т. В.* Упоминание неновгородских топонимов и описание путей в новгородском летописании XII–XIII вв. // Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы, 2009 год: Трансконтинентальные и локальные пути как социокультурный феномен. М., 2010. С. 422–425.

[49] See notes 33–38.

[50] *S. a.* 1237, 1266 (two raids) — see note 34.

[51] See: *Гимон Т. В.* Военная история Балтийского региона в XII–XIII вв. и новгородская летопись // Висы дружбы: Сб. ст. в честь Т. Н. Джаксон. М., 2011. С. 74–82.

Both, the towns (Pskov, Ladoga, etc.) and the 'tribes' had some forms of self-govern-ment. As for the towns this was seen above: the towns not only were capable to have their own princes and posadniks (though both in part of the cases were appointed from Novgorod) as well as to conduct their own military activity, but could sometimes expel or invite princes and be opposed to Novgorod. As for the Finnic-speaking 'tribes', an important evidence one finds in the *Life of Alexander Nevsky*, a late thirteenth-century text. Describing the events of 1240 the *Life* speaks of Pelgui (Pelgusy), an 'elder man' ('мужъ стареишина') in the Land of Izhora who was entrusted (by Novgorod) to guard the sea-coast. He was Christian but lived among pagans[52]. Thus, the Izhora were not fully integrated into the structure of the Novgorodian Land. They had their own elder men and preserved their traditional beliefs. One can add to this that the Izhora (as well as the Vods and the Korela) participated in wars as a separate entity and, finally, preserved their ethnic names.

Thus, in the Novgorodian Land (according to the annals) there were towns (with Slavonic-speaking population) and Finnic-speaking 'tribes'. This uneven structure has a close analogy in the Land of Chernigov in the twelfth century. This land, as any other in Rus, included towns, but also a supposedly 'tribal' entity: the Vyatichi ('вятичи'). The Vyatichi are one of the East Slavonic 'tribes' listed in the *Primary Chronicle* as having inhabited what became Kievan Rus by the chronicler's time. The Vyatichi lived in the upper basin of Oka. According to the *Primary Chronicle* the Vyatichi were conquered by Kievan princes twice (!): in 966 and 981–982[53]. Nevertheless, *c.* 1100 Vladimir Monomakh mentions in his *Instruction* (Поучение), in the list of his military achievements, that he went 'through the Vyatichi' ('сквозе Вятиче')[54] and later undertook two winter raids to the Vyatichi, against Khodota (Ходота) and his son[55], presumably Vyatichi's chiefs. In the 12th century the Vyatichi are mentionned many times in the Laurentian and the Hypatian chronicles, but mostly as a geographical term (an area in the northern frontier of the Chernigov Land). They certainly were not by this time an independent 'tribe', but it is a question if they preserved some autonomy and self-identity, still forming at that time a community, an entity which could be a subject of some activity as the Finnic 'tribes' of the Novgorodian Land. Some scholars believe that they did, others think that they did not[56]. The first opinion seems more convincing. Firstly, in 1147 some princes 'summoned the Vyatichi' ('созваша Вятиче') to give *them* instructions[57] which certainly means that the Vyatichi still were a unity with some degree of self-governence (though, as Pavel Lukin rightly sais, the Vyatichi here act in pas-sive role[58]). Secondly, *s. a.* 1147 and 1152[59] the word 'Vyatichi' is used as a geographical

---

[52] ПСРЛ. Т. 1. М., 1997. Стб. 479; Т. 3. С. 292.

[53] Там же. Т. 1. Стб. 65, 81–82.

[54] Там же. Стб. 247.

[55] Там же. Стб. 248.

[56] See: *Лукин П. В.* Восточнославянские «племена» в русских летописях: Историческая память и реальность // Образы прошлого и коллективная идентичность в Европе до начала нового вре-мени. М., 2003. С. 275–279 (with references). — Pavel Lukin believes that in the twelfth century the Vyatichi were not a 'tribal' entity (though there could still be a memory of their 'tribal' past). However, some recent scholars share the opposite opinion, see: *Фетисов А. А., Щавелев А. С.* Русь и радимичи: История взаимоотношений в X–XI вв. // История: Электронный научно-образовательный журнал. 2012. № 5 (13) (URL: http://history.jes.su/s207987840000421-2-1 (дата посещения — 01.11.2015 г.)). Абз. 18–20.

[57] ПСРЛ. Т. 2. М., 1998. Стб. 338.

[58] *Лукин П. В.* Восточнославянские «племена»… С. 278.

[59] ПСРЛ. Т. 2. Стб. 342, 455.

term but it is important that the Vyatichi are listed together with towns: this implies that there were districts with central towns and there were, next to them, the Vyatichi, a district with a 'tribal' name. The very fact that the community name 'Vyatichi' designated a region in many annalistic narrations until the late twelfth century[60], which was not typical for that time[61], is also significant.

Maybe such areas inhabited by autonomous 'tribes' existed in other regions as well. A possible candidate are the Golyad, a presumably Baltic-speaking group (Galindians)[62] in the basin of Protva, in the south-eastern periphery of the Smolensk Land, next to the Vyatichi. The Golayd are mentioned in the annals only twice. In 1058 they were conquered by Prince Izyaslav of Kiev[63]. In 1147 'the people Golyad' ('люди голядь')[64] were raided by Prince Svyatoslav of Chernigov as a part of the campaign against Smolensk[65]. Thus the Novgorodian Land with its Finnic 'tribes' was not an exclusion. If the annals of Chernigov or Smolensk had survived, they probably would have had mentions of the Vyatichi and the Golyad as participants of military campaigns.

Another obvious observation is the absence of any mention in the Novgorodian annals of rural communities of the Novgorodian Land. It looks as if there were towns and non-Slavonic 'tribes' but nothing and nobody in the space between them. Obviously this is not true: rural communities are known from other sources. The treaty of 1266 between Novgorod and Prince Yaroslav Yaroslavich mentions 'бежичане' and 'обонижане', the dwellers of Bezhetski Verkh and Onega region, who receive judicial immunity for three years[66]. Birchbark documents of the 12th and the 13th centuries know such community names as 'волочане' (i. e. dwellers of the basin of North Dvina[67]), 'имоволожане', 'жабляне', 'городьчане', 'ясеняне', 'хотыняне', 'которяне'. In most of the cases these names are used in plural to designate collective addressers or addressees of the letters (e. g. petitions or instructions)[68]. One of the interpolations to Prince Yaroslav's *Ustav o mostekh* ('Statute on Paving', 'Устав о мостех') uses several community names from the countryside around Novgorod ('тигожане', 'коломляне', 'нередичане', 'вережане', 'пидьбляне')[69], who probably were responsible for the conveyance of wood for the pavement[70]. No doubt, the absence of such rural community names from the annals of the twelfth and the thirteenth

---

[60] Там же. Стб. 310–311, 336, 343, 368, 371, 374, 459, 468, 502, 509, 637; Т. 1. Стб. 314–315, 341, 348, 350, 413.

[61] Another example are the Dregovichi (again a 'tribal' name) mentioned *s. a.* 1116 and 1149 in geographical sense but again next to towns (see: *Лукин П. В.* Восточнославянские «племена»… С. 279). References to other Slavonic 'tribes' in the twelfth century are more obscure (Там же. С. 280–283).

[62] See on the Golyad: *Седов В. В.* Голядь // Iš baltų kultūros istorijos. Vilnius, 2000. Т. 75–84 (URL: http://www.tarnautojai.lt/memo/modules/sections/index.php?op=viewarticle&artid=9 (дата посещения — 31.10.2015 г.)).

[63] ПСРЛ. Т. 1. Стб. 162; Т. 2. Стб. 151.

[64] This wording, according to Lukin, indicates the Golyad's 'tribal' status — as against the Vyatichi (*Лукин П. В.* Восточнославянские «племена»… С. 279).

[65] ПСРЛ. Т. 2. Стб. 339.

[66] Грамоты Великого Новгорода и Пскова / Под ред. С. Н. Валка. М.; Л., 1949. С. 11. № 2.

[67] *Зализняк А. А.* Древненовгородский диалект. 2-е изд., перераб. с учетом материала находок 1995–2003 гг. М., 2004. С. 291.

[68] Там же. С. 291, 316–317, 383–384, 471, 482 (birchbark documents № 600, 640, 704, 739, 844, 872, 885; see also the texts at: www.gramoty.ru (дата посещения — 01.11.2015 г.).

[69] See the text: Древнерусские княжеские уставы… С. 149–152.

[70] See: *Янин В. Л.* Очерки комплексного источниковедения: Средневековый Новгород. М., 1977. С. 116–120.

centuries means only that these communities were not actors in events important enough to be reported by the annalist.

Some contexts in the annals also suggest that there were areas in the Novgorodian Land which were not embraced by 'the towns and the tribes'. In 1196 Prince Yaroslav, expelled from Novgorod, was sitting in Torzhok and collecting tribute from all [Bezhetski] Verkh, and [river] Msta, and behind the Volok ('и дани поима по всему Вьрху и Мьсте, и за Волокомь възьма дань'). These areas were outside both towns and 'tribal' territories. In 1242, after the Battle on Ice, the defeated Germans promised: 'what we have seized with sword: the Vods, Luga, Pskov, the Lotygola, all this we give up' ('что есмы зашли Водь, Лугу, Пльсковъ, Лотыголу мечемь, того ся всего отступаемъ'). Here four areas are listed. The Vods is a 'tribal' name. Luga is a river. Pskov is a town. The Lotygola is again 'tribal' name meaning Latgalians, the people of eastern Latvia (some parts of the Lotygola seem to have been subordinate to Novgorod[71]). In 1244 the Lithuanians raided near Torzhok and Bezhitsa ('около Торжку и Бежици'), the first being a town and the second being an area. This use of territorial names along with those of towns and 'tribes' implies that the structure of the Novgorodian Land was even more uneven than it can be deduced from the annalistic use of community names[72]. But we must note that in these contexts the geographical terms designate not *actors* (as town-dwellers and 'tribes' usually do) but *objects* of collecting tribute, or ravaging by enemies, or territorial claims.

Thus, the analysis of the use of community names in the Novgorodian annals in the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries leads to conclusions of two sorts.

1) In most of the cases community names are used to designate political or military bodies which can act and make decisions. Much more seldom community names mean not the community as an actor but only some group representatives of the community. And, on the contrary, sometimes geographical terms are used as community names ('All Novgorod', 'All the Novgorodian Land', or 'the Trade Side' can act as political or military bodies). The communities of the Novgorodian Land (the dwellers of Novgorod and its parts, of other towns, Finnic-speaking 'tribes', and the Land as a whole) are regarded by the annalists as actors of the events, their role being worth recording.

2) In the light of this analysis the Novgorodian Land looks as a hierarchy of town communities: the central one ('the Novgorodians' with smaller communities inside) and a few periphery ones ('the dwellers of Pskov, Ladoga, Torzhok, etc.), which are supplemented by three Finnic-speaking 'tribal' communities (the Vods, the Izhora, the Korela). The Slavonic-speaking rural periphery (which certainly existed and housed the majority of population) is completely absent from the annals, though sometimes we meet geographical terms designating some areas outside the towns and the 'tribes' (Bezhetsi, Msta, Luga, etc.), which are not regarded as actors. Does this picture reflect the real political structure of the Novgorodian Land? At what time this structure emerged? What was the role of 'rural' areas in political life

---

[71] *Насонов А. Н.* «Русская земля»… С. 76–77.

[72] And all these lists do not correspond at all with the second interpolation to *Ustav o mostekh* (the 1260s, see note 69), where a list of eight or nine areas of the Novgorodian Land is given. Of these one ('Vochskaya') corresponds with one of the 'tribes' (the Vods), and two correspond with 'geographical' names in contexts quoted above ('Bezhichkaya'/Bezhitsi, 'Luskaya'/river Luga). Other names are unknown to the annals. Frolov argues that the interpolation lists only rural districts subordinate to Novgorod itself but not to any of its subordinate towns (like Ladoga or Rusa) (*Фролов А. А.* Устав князя Ярослава...). However, the list includes at least one of the 'tribes' (the Vods), and thus still contradicts to the picture deduced from the annals.

and the formation of the army? How this picture can be reconciled with the second interpolation of *Ustav o mostekh*[73] and with later administrative division? These questions are not to be discussed here. My task was only to analyze the territorial structure of the Novgorodian Land as it can be deduced from the annalistic usage of community names.

Автор: Гимон, Тимофей Валентинович — Государственный академический университет гуманитарных наук, Москва, Россия, доктор исторических наук, старший научный сотрудник, guimontv@mail.ru
Заголовок: Community names in the First Novgorodian Chronicle and the territorial structure of the Novgorodian Land (1115–1272) [Коллективные обозначения жителей в Новгородской I летописи и территориальная структура Новгородской земли (1115–1272)]

Резюме: В виду почти полного отсутствия источников, впрямую раскрывающих нам территориальную структуру древнерусских княжеств, первостепенную значимость приобретают летописные упоминания. Среди них важное место занимают коллективные обозначения больших групп людей — «племен», горожан («кияне», «новгородцы») и др., которые воспринимаются летописцами как действующие лица многих событий. В статье анализируется употребление коллективных обозначений жителей Новгородской земли («новгородцы», жители отдельных районов Новгорода, жители новгородских «пригородов», финно-угорские племена, «вся Новгородская земля») в тексте Новгородской I летописи за 1115–1272 гг. Анализируется то, в каких функциях выступают в летописи эти группы: как выясняется, в абсолютном большинстве случаев это именно коллективные действующие лица, а не просто «совокупности жителей». Они могут представлять собой войско, принимать политические решения, быть сторонами конфликтов, отсутствовать в своем городе (как «новгородцы» в 1211, 1217 гг. и «псковичи» в 1213 г.) и т. д. Из анализа упоминаний жителей вырисовывается следующая территориальная структура Новгородской земли: она состоит из Новгорода (внутри которого, в свою очередь, есть «стороны», «концы» и «улицы», тоже выступающие в качестве действующих лиц событий), нескольких зависимых от него городов (Псков, Ладога, Торжок, Руса, Луки, Волок Ламский [?]) и трех финно-угорских «племен» (водь, ижора, корела). Статус «пригородов» и «племен» во многих отношениях схож, как схож и характер их упоминаний в Новгородской летописи. Такая несимметричная структура (города и «племена») характерна не только для Новгородской земли: в Черниговской земле в XII в. наряду с городами были «вятичи», а в Смоленской — «голядь». В Новгородской летописи полностью отсутствуют упоминания групп жителей сельской местности (таковые известны по другим источникам), хотя несколько раз встречаются названия некоторых территорий. Вопрос о статусе и административном делении сельской периферии Новгородской земли должен решаться на основании других источников: в летописи ее составными частями выступают только города и «племена».

Ключевые слова: Новгород, Древняя Русь, Средние века, коллективные обозначения жителей, Новгородская земля, финно-угры, племена, Новгородская I летопись, летописание

Литература, использованная в статье

Буров, Владимир Андронович. Очерки истории и археологии средневекового Новгорода. Москва: ИА РАН, 1994. 249 с.

Вилкул, Татьяна Леонидовна. Люди и князь в древнерусских летописях середины XI–XIII вв. Москва: Квадрига, 2009. 407 с.

Гимон, Тимофей Валентинович. В каких случаях имена новгородцев попадали на страницы летописи (XII–XIII вв.)? // Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы, 2004 год: Политические институты Древней Руси. Москва: Восточная литература, 2006. С. 291–333.

Гимон, Тимофей Валентинович. Упоминание неновгородских топонимов и описание путей в новгородском летописании XII–XIII вв. // Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы, 2009 год:

---

[73] Note 72.

Трансконтинентальные и локальные пути как социокультурный феномен. Москва: Индрик, 2010. С. 291–333.

Гимон, Тимофей Валентинович. Военная история Балтийского региона в XII–XIII вв. и новгородская летопись // Висы дружбы: Сб. статей в честь Т. Н. Джаксон. Москва: Изд-во ун-та Дмитрия Пожарского, 2011. С. 74–82.

Гимон, Тимофей Валентинович. Новгородское летописание XI – середины XIV в. как социокультурное явление: Дис. … д-ра ист. наук. Москва: ИВИ РАН, 2014 (URL: http://www.igh.ru/upload/information_system_8/6/3/4/item_634/gimon-dissertazia.pdf (дата посещения — 01.11.2015 г.)).

Гимон, Тимофей Валентинович; Гиппиус, Алексей Алексеевич. Новые данные по истории текста Новгородской первой летописи // Новгородский исторический сборник. Санкт-Петербург: Дмитрий Буланин, 1999. Вып. 7 (17). С. 18–47.

Гиппиус, Алексей Алексеевич. Новгородская владычная летопись XII–XIV вв. и ее авторы (История и структура текста в лингвистическом освещении). I // Лингвистическое источниковедение и история русского языка, 2004–2005. Москва: Древлехранилище, 2006. С. 114–251.

Горский, Антон Анатольевич. От славянского Расселения до Московского царства. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. 390 с.

Гранберг, Юнас. Вече в древнерусских письменных источниках: Функции и терминология // Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы, 2004 год: Политические институты Древней Руси. Москва, 2006. С. 3–163.

Зализняк, Андрей Анатольевич. Древненовгородский диалект. 2-е изд., перераб. с учетом материала находок 1995–2003 гг. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2004. 872 с.

Лукин, Павел Владимирович. Восточнославянские «племена» в русских летописях: Историческая память и реальность // Образы прошлого и коллективная идентичность в Европе до начала нового времени. Москва: Кругъ, 2003. С. 257–285.

Лукин, Павел Владимирович. Новгородское вече. Москва: Индрик, 2014. 607 с.

Матузова, Вера Ивановна; Назарова, Евгения Львовна. Крестоносцы и Русь: Конец XII в. – 1270 г.: Тексты, перевод, комментарий. Москва: Индрик, 2002. 447 с.

Насонов, Арсений Николаевич. «Русская земля» и образование территории древнерусского государства: Историко-географическое исследование. Монголы и Русь: История татарской политики на Руси. 2-е изд., стереотип. Санкт-Петербург: Наука, 2006. 412 с.

Печников, Михаил Викторович. Новгородцы и кафедра Св. Софии в середине XII – XIII в. // Средневековая Русь. Москва: Индрик, 2011. Вып. 9. С. 7–46.

Севастьянова, Ольга Валентиновна. Древний Новгород: Новгородско-княжеские отношения в XII – первой половине XV в. Москва; Санкт-Петербург: Альянс-архео, 2011. 404 с.

Седов, Валентин Васильевич. Голядь // Iš baltų kultūros istorijos. Vilnius: Diemedis, 2000. T. 75–84 (URL: http://www.tarnautojai.lt/memo/modules/sections/index.php?op=viewarticle&artid=9 (дата посещения — 31.10.2015 г.)).

Фетисов, Александр Анатольевич; Щавелев, Алексей Сергеевич. Русь и радимичи: История взаимоотношений в X–XI вв. // История: Электронный научно-образовательный журнал. Москва: ИВИ РАН, 2012. № 5 (13) (URL: http://history.jes.su/s207987840000421-2-1 (дата посещения — 01.11.2015 г.)).

Фролов, Алексей Анатольевич. Устав князя Ярослава «о мостех» об административном устройстве Новгородской земли середины XIII в. // Староладожский сборник. СПб.: Каламос, 2013. Вып. 10. С. 266–274.

Фроянов, Игорь Яковлевич. Древняя Русь: Опыт исследования истории социальной и политической борьбы. Москва; Санкт-Петербург: Златоуст, 1995. 704 с.

Фроянов, Игорь Яковлевич; Дворниченко, Андрей Юрьевич. Города-государства Древней Руси. Ленинград: Изд-во Ленинг. ун-та, 1988. 269 с.

Янин, Валентин Лаврентьевич. Очерки комплексного источниковедения: Средневековый Новгород. Москва: Высшая школа, 1977. 240 с.

Янин, Валентин Лаврентьевич. Новгородские посадники. 2-е изд., перераб. и доп. Москва: Языки славянской культуры, 2003. 511 с.

Янин, Валентин Лаврентьевич; Зализняк, Андрей Анатольевич. Новгородские грамоты на бересте (Из раскопок 1977–1983 гг.). Москва: Наука, 1986. 311 с.

Granberg, Jonas. Veche in the Chronicles of Medieval Rus: A Study of Functions and Terminology. Göteborg: University of Göteborg, 2004. 245 p.

Guimon, Timofey. Christian Identity in the Early Novgorodian Annalistic Writing // Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe (*c.* 1070–1200) / Ed. I. Garipzanov. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011. P. 255–275.

Information about article

Author: Guimon, Timofey Valentinovich — State Academic University for Human Science, Moscow, Russia, Doctor in History, Senior Researcher, guimontv@mail.ru

Title: Community names in the First Novgorodian Chronicle and the territorial structure of the Novgorodian Land (1115–1272)

Summary: There are only few written sources which present direct information on the territorial structure of early Rus, and in this situation the evidence of the Rus chronicles (annals) is of primary importance. In particular, it is interesting to study from this point of view the annalistic usage of community names — those of 'tribal' entities, dwellers of cities and towns ('the Kievans', 'the Novgorodians'), etc., those entities being often presented in the annals as actors. The paper is dedicated to an analysis of the usage of such community names inside the Novgorodian Land ('the Novgorodians', the dwellers of districts or Novgorod, the dwellers of towns subordinate to Novgorod, the Finnic-speaking 'tribes', 'all the Novgorodian Land') in the text of the First Novgorodian Chronicle for 1115–1272. The author follows the functions in which such communities can act: it is shown that in most of the cases the community names designate collective actors, and only rarely the meaning is 'some members of the community'. A community can act as an army, as a political body (which can, for example, invite or depose a prince), as a side in a conflict; it can be away from the city (as 'the Novgorodians' in 1211 and 1217, and 'the Pskovians' in 1213), etc. The following structure of the Novgorodian Land can be deduced from the analysis of the annalistic usage of the community names: the Land consists of Novgorod, the leading city (inside which, in turn there are 'sides', 'ends', and 'streets' which also can act in events), several subordinate towns (Pskov, Ladoga, Torzhok, Rusa, Luki, Volok Lamsky [?]) and three Finno-Ugric 'tribes' (the Vods, the Izhora, and the Korela). The status of the towns and the 'tribes' seems to be similar in many respects, as well as the character of references to them in the annals. Such uneven structure (towns and 'tribes') was characteristic not only for the Novgorodian Land: in the Chernigov Land there were the Vyatichi next to towns; similar is the position of the Golyad in the Smolensk Land. No rural community names are used in the Novgorodian annals, though a few times we meet geographical terms designating large areas. The question of administrative status of rural periphery of the Novgorodian Land must be answered on the base of other data: in the annals the Land is made up only of towns and 'tribes'.

Keywords: Novgorod, Old Rus, the Middle Ages, community names, the Novgorodian Land, Finno-Ugric peoples, tribes, the First Chronicle of Novgorod, annals

References

Burov, Vladimir Andronovich. *Ocherki istorii i arkheologii srednevekovogo Novgoroda* [*Essays in history and archaeology of medieval Novgorod*]. Moscow: Russian Academy of Science Press, 1994. 249 p. (in Russian).

Fetisov, Aleksandr Anatolyevich; Shchavelev, Aleksey Sergeevich. Rus' i radimichi: Istoriya vzaimootnosheniy v X–XI vv. [The Rus and the Radimichi: The history of relations in the 10th–11th centuries], in *Istoriya* [*History*]: Electronic Journal of Research and Education. Moscow: Russian Academy of Science Press, 2012. № 5 (13) (URL: http://history.jes.su/s207987840000421-2-1 (last visit — November, 1, 2015)) (in Russian).

Froyanov, Igor' Yakovlevich; Dvornichenko, Andrey Yur'evich. *Goroda-gosudarstva Drevney Rusi* [*The city-states of Old Rus*]. Leningrad: Leningrad University Press, 1988. 269 p. (in Russian).

Froyanov, Igor' Yakovlevich. *Drevnyaya Rus'*: Opyt issledovaniya istorii sotsial'noy i politicheskoy bor'by [*Old Rus*: An attempt at study of socio-political struggle]. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Zlatoust Publ., 1995. 704 p. (in Russian).

Frolov, Aleksey Anatolyevich. Ustav knyazya Yaroslava "o mostekh" ob administrativnom ustroystve Novgorodskoy zemli serediny XIII v. [Prince Yaroslav's statute 'on pavement' on the administrative division of the Novgorodian Land in the mid-thirteenth century], in *Staroladozhskij sbornik*. Saint-Petesburg: Kalamos, 2013. Vol. 10. P. 266–274. (in Russian).

Gimon [Guimon], Timofey Valentinovich; Gippius, Aleksey Alekseevich. Novye dannye po istorii teksta Novgorodskoy pervoy letopisi [New data on the text-history of the First Novgorodian Chronicle], in *Novgorodskiy istoricheskiy sbornik*. St. Petersburg: Dmitriy Bulanin Publ., 1999. Issue 7 (17). P. 18–47. (in Russian).

Gimon [Guimon], Timofey Valentinovich. *Novgorodskoe letopisanie XI – serediny XIV v. kak sotsiokul'turnoe yavlenie*: Disertatsia [*The Novgorodian annalistic writing of the 11th – the mid-14th centuries as a socio-cultural phenomenon*: Thesis for a Doctor's degree]. Moscow: Russian Academy of Science Press, 2014 (URL: http://www.igh.ru/upload/information_system_8/6/3/4/item_634/gimon-dissertazia.pdf (last visit — November, 1, 2015)) (in Russian).

Gimon [Guimon], Timofey Valentinovich. Upominanie nenovgorodskikh toponimov i opisanie putey v novgorodskom letopisanii XII–XIII vv. [The mentions of toponyms and the references to ways in the Novgorodian annals of the 12th–13th centuries], in *Drevneyshie gosudarstva Vostochnoy Evropy, 2009 god: Transkontinental'nye i lokal'nye puti kak sotsiokul'turnyj fenomen.* Moscow: Indrik Publ., 2010. P. 291–333. (in Russian).

Gimon [Guimon], Timofey Valentinovich. V kakikh sluchayakh imena novgorodtsev popadali na stranitsy letopisi (XII–XIII vv.)? [In which cases the names of the Novgorodians were mentioned by the annals (the 12th–13th ceturies)], in *Drevneyshie gosudarstva Vostochnoy Evropy, 2004 god: Politicheskie instituty Drevney Rusi*. Moscow: Oriental Literture Publ., 2006. P. 291–333. (in Russian).

Gimon [Guimon], Timofey Valentinovich. Voennaya istoriya Baltiyskogo regiona v XII–XIII vekah i novgorodskaya letopis' [The military history of the Baltic region in the 12th–13th centuries and the Novgorodian annals], in *Visy druzhby*. Moscow: Dmitry Pozharsky University Press, 2011. P. 74–82. (in Russian).

Gippius, Aleksey Alekseevich. Novgorodskaya vladychnaya letopis' XII–XIV vekah i ee avtory (Istoriya i struktura teksta v lingvisticheskom osveshchenii). I [The Archiepiscopal Annals of Novgorod of the 12th–13th centuries and their authors: Text-history and structure in the light of linguistics. I], in *Lingvisticheskoe istochnikovedenie i istoriya russkogo yazyka, 2004–2005*. Moscow: Drevlekhranilishche Publ., 2006. P. 114–251. (in Russian).

Gorskiy, Anton Anatolyevich. *Ot slavyanskogo Rasseleniya do Moskovskogo tsarstva* [*From the Slavonic Settling to the Muscovite State*]. Moscow: «Languages of Slavic culture» Publ., 2004. 390 p. (in Russian).

Granberg, Jonas. *Veche in the Chronicles of Medieval Rus: A Study of Functions and Terminology*. Göteborg: University of Göteborg Publ., 2004. 245 p.

Granberg, Yunas. Veche v drevnerusskikh pismennykh istochnikakh: Funktsii i terminologiya [*Veche* in Old Rus written sources: Functions and terminology], in *Drevneyshie gosudarstva Vostochnoy Evropy, 2004 god: Politicheskie instituty Drevney Rusi* [in English]. Moscow, 2006. P. 3–163 (in Russian).

Guimon, Timofey. Christian Identity in the Early Novgorodian Annalistic Writing, in Garipzanov I. (ed.). *Historical Narratives and Christian Identity on a European Periphery: Early History Writing in Northern, East-Central, and Eastern Europe (c. 1070–1200)*. Turnhout: Brepols Publ., 2011. P. 255–275.

Lukin, Pavel Vladimirovich. *Novgorodskoe veche* [*The Novgorodian veche*]. Moscow: Indrik Publ., 2014. 607 p. (in Russian).

Lukin, Pavel Vladimirovich. Vostochnoslavyanskie «plemena» v russkikh letopisyakh: Istoricheskaya pamyat' i realnost' [East Slavonic 'tribes' in Rus chronicles: Historical memory and reality], in *Obrazy proshlogo i kollektivnaya identichnost' v Evrope do nachala novogo vremeni*. Moscow: Krug Publ., 2003. P. 257–285 (in Russian).

Matuzova, Vera Ivanovna; Nazarova, Evgeniya L'vovna. *Krestonostsy i Rus': Konets XII v. – 1270 g.:* Teksty, perevod, kommentariy [*Crusaders and Rus, the late 12th century – 1270:* Texts, translations, commentary]. Moscow: Indrik Publ., 2002. 447 p. (in Russian).

Nasonov, Arseniy Nikolaevich. *«Russkaya zemlya» i obrazovanie territorii drevnerusskogo gosudarstva:* Istoriko-geograficheskoe issledovanie. Mongoly i Rus': Istoriya tatarskoy politiki na Rusi [*'The Rus Land' and the formation of the territory of the Old Rus State*: A historical and geographical study. The Mongols

and Rus: The history the Tatars' policy in Rus]. 2nd edition. St. Petersburg: Nauka Publ., 2006. 412 p. (in Russian).

Pechnikov, Mikhail Viktorovich. Novgorodtsy i kafedra Sv. Sofii v seredine XII – XIII v. [The Novgorodians and the see of St. Sophia in the mid-12th – the 13th centuries], in *Srednevekovaya Rus'*. Moscow: Indrik Publ., 2011. Issue 9. P. 7–46 (in Russian).

Sedov, Valentin Vasilyevich. Golyad' [The Golyad], in *Iš baltų kultūros istorijos*. Vilnius: Diemedis Publ., 2000. P. 75–84 (URL: http://www.tarnautojai.lt/memo/modules/sections/index.php?op=viewarticle&artid=9 (last visit — October, 31, 2015). (in Russian).

Sevastyanova, Ol'ga Valentinovna. *Drevniy Novgorod: Novgorodsko-knyazheskie otnosheniya v XII – pervoy polovine XV v.* [*Old Novgorod: The relations between Novgorod and princes in the 12th – the first half of the 15th century*]. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Alyans-arkheo Publ., 2011. 404 p. (in Russian).

Vilkul, Tat'yana Leonidovna. *Lyudi i knyaz' v drevnerusskikh letopisyakh serediny XI–XIII vv.* [*People and prince in the Rus chronicles of the mid-11th – the 13th centuries*]. Moscow: Kvadriga Publ., 2009. 407 p. (in Russian).

Yanin, Valentin Lavrentyevich; Zaliznyak, Andrey Anatolyevich. *Novgorodskie gramoty na bereste (Iz raskopok 1977–1983 gg.)* [*The Novgorodian documents on birchbark: From the excavations of 1977–1983*]. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1986. 311 p. (in Russian).

Yanin, Valentin Lavrentyevich. *Novgorodskie posadniki* [*The posadniks of Novgorod*]. 2nd edition. Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture Publ., 2003. 511 p. (in Russian).

Yanin, Valentin Lavrentyevich. *Ocherki kompleksnogo istochnikovedeniya: Srednevekovyj Novgorod* [*Essays in complex source studies: Medieval Novgorod*]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola Publ., 1977. 240 p. (in Russian).

Zaliznyak, Andrey Anatolyevich. *Drevnenovgorodskiy dialekt* [*Old Novgorodian dialect*]. 2nd edition. Moscow: Languages of Slavic culture Publ., 2004. 872 p. (in Russian).