Vadym Jurijovyč Aristov

When and How Did Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč Become Monomachos?

Despite its provocative title, this article does not mean to question the genealogy of Prince Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč. Nor does it reject the direct evidence of his maternal name. The present text aims only to define the conditions and circumstances in which that name started to be used in the sources.

In historiography, it became natural to refer to Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč using his Greek 'surname'. Historians tend to essentialize it. They usually write and talk about Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč as if he constantly identified himself and was identified by others as Monomachos from birth to death. The Prince's 'Monomachosness' is, however, not self-evident. To be born from a woman of the Monomachos family and to explicitly identify himself by this name was not the same thing. In this article, the "Monomachos" identification of Volodymyr is problematized and questioned.

In the following sections an analytical survey of the sources is presented. It aims at demonstrating and (where possible) explaining the emergence of the Prince's 'Byzantine name' in different kinds of texts. The key approach is to analyze not only the sources which call Volodymyr "Monomachos" but also those which do not. A special attention is paid to the dating and origin of the texts and artifacts containing the "Monomachos" name. As shown below, Volodymyr's 'Monomachization' was not a one-off event, but a non-linear protracted process. Judging from the available texts, a wide recognition of the Prince under his mother's family name was achieved long after his death. Finally, at the end of the article a proposition is advanced as to the context and conditions under which Volodymyr could first actualize his "Monomachos" identification.

1. *Volodymyr Monomachos' Primary Witnesses*

This section presents a survey of the primary sources created during Volodymyr's lifetime, which refer to him as "Monomachos".

It would be appropriate to begin with the Prince's own text, the so-called *Instruction* to his sons. In the introductory passage, Volodymyr states that he was given three names. At baptism he was named Basil by his grandfather Jaroslav. He received the Ruthenian[1]

---

[1]   The form 'Ruthenian' is used in the article as an adjective from the word 'Rus'. This prevents a still widespread terminological confusion between two different historical notions, 'Rus' and 'Russia'.

Vadym Ju. Aristov (Institute of History of Ukraine) – aristov3000@ukr.net
The author declares that there is no conflict of interest

name Volodymyr from his father Vsevolod. Eventually, he inherited the name "Monoma-
chos" from his mother[2]. This is the only but very eloquent mention of Volodymyr's 'Byzan-
tine name' in the *Instruction*.

The list of the names reveals the Prince's three identifications, namely Christian, Ru-
thenian, and Byzantine (Greek). Undoubtedly, Volodymyr was aware of his half-Byzantine
origin. The 'imperial' identification constituted the Prince's uniqueness among the Ruri-
kids. However, we cannot be sure that Volodymyr thought of and identified himself as
Monomachos throughout his life. This identification was unnecessary within the 'internal'
dynastic context[3]. The political culture of Rus of that time maintained the idea of essential
equality of princes as a 'big family' based on strictly patrilocal principle. The "Monoma-
chos" identification must have been 'activated' in a specific time and circumstances. Thus,
what we can infer from this mention of Volodymyr's maternal name is that the emphasis on
it was important to the Prince at the time of composing his text.

The *Instruction* was written between the late 1090s and the late 1110s. According to
Aleksej Gippius's reconstruction, there were several redactions of the text with the first one
dated to 1099-1101. The scholar suggested that the phrase with the list of the Prince's names
belonged to this earliest textual layer. However, the final version of the *Instruction* was
completed in circa 1117 (Gippius 2003: 91-93; Gippius 2004: 166-167). We have no instru-
ments to prove that the introductory passage took its present shape before the completion
of the now available text[4]. Consequently, the only verified chronology of the inclusion of
the name "Monomachos" to the *Instruction* is around 1117.

The next source is the Primary Chronicle of Rus or *Povĕst' vremĕnnych lĕt* (hereafter
– PVL), composed in 1116-1117. It is known in two main versions, Hypatian and Laurentian.
In the copies of the Hypatian type (namely, the Hypatian and Chlebnikov copies) the PVL
is continued by the Kyivan Chronicle and Galician-Volhynian Chronicle. In the Lauren-
tian-type copies (namely, the Laurentian copy) the PVL lacks the ending, stops at 1110, and
is continued by the Suzdalian Chronicle.

---

[2]   "Азъ худыи дѣдомъ своимъ Ярославомъ . блгⷭвлнъымъ славнъымъ нареⷱнѣмь въ крⷭщ-
нïи . Василии . Русьскъымь именемь Володимиръ . wцⷮмь възлюбленъымь . и мⷮтрью своєю .
Мьномахъı" (Laur.: 240). There is a debate on the reconstruction of the correct meaning of the
phrase's ending, namely the word "Мьномахъı". To whom did the word refer: to him or to his moth-
er? According to one interpretation, 'Мьномахъı' referred to Volodymyr's mother. Instead of her
personal name, the author allegedly used the name of her clan (PVL: 236; Machnovec' 1989: 454;
Gippius 2003: 93). Aleksej Gippius even proposed a conjecture "Мономахы[нею]". According to
another view, it was about Volodymyr's 'surname'. See Samuel Cross' translation: RPC: 206. The
same interpretation: Kazhdan 1988-1989: 416. The second version seems more probable. In this case
we have a symmetric construction. Volodymyr lists three closest relatives each of whom endows him
with a name: grandfather Jaroslav – Basil, father Vsevolod – Volodymyr, mother – Monomachos.

[3]   This is an exclusive example when a Rurikid identified himself and was identified by others
by the mother's family name.

[4]   Introductory as well as final parts of texts are generally most exposed to editorial changes.

In the common text of both versions of the PVL (before 1110), the name "Monomachos" is mentioned only once in 1043. However, the text is referring to the Byzantine Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (Hypat.: 142). In references to Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč, this name is used three times only in the Hypatian version of the chronicle (once before and twice after the boundary of 1110). This alone casts doubt on its initial presence in the PVL.

In the Hypatian text, we come across Volodymyr's maternal name for the first time in 1098 when "заложи Володимеръ **Мономахъ** . городъ на Въстри" (Hypat.: 248) ("Volodymyr Monomachos founded the fortress on the Oster River"; it was known later as Horodok or Horodec on the Oster). Traditionally, this entry is considered one of the so-called Hypatian additions, which were presumably incorporated into a new redaction of the PVL in 1117-1118 (Šachmatov 1916: XXXVIII). Irrespective of the solution to the issue of the additions' origin, this case can be explained in terms of later editorial intrusions into the PVL's text (see below)[5].

In the report of Volodymyr's enthronement in Kyiv in 1113, the Hypatian version of the PVL mentions "Monomachos" for the second time:

> Володимеръ **Мономахъ** . сѣде Киевѣ в недѣлю . оусрѣтоша же и митрополитъ Никифоръ . съ еп͠пы и со всими Кияне . с честью великою . сѣдѣ на столѣ ѿца своего и дѣдъ своихъ . и вси людье ради быша . и мѧтежь влеже (Hypat.: 276).

Two years later the chief Princes of Rus gathered in Vyšhorod to take part in the solemn translation of the relics of saint martyrs Borys and Hlib to a new church. Here we find the third mention of "Monomachos" in the PVL (Hypatian version):

> В лѣ͞ . ҂ѕ҃ х͞ кг Индикта й҃ съвъкупишасѧ . братья Русии кн͠зи Володимеръ . **зовемыи** . **Монамахъ** . сн͠ъ Всеволожь . И Дв͠дъ Ст͠ославлиць и Олегъ братъ его и сдоумаша перенести мощи Бориса и Глѣба" (Hypat.: 280).

The unique combination "Володимеръ зовемыи . Монамахъ" evidently imitates similar (and also unique) wording of Volodymyr's predecessor Svjatopolk's two names, "престависѧ благовѣрныи кнѧзь **Михаилъ зовемыи Ст͠ополкъ**" (Hypat.: 275). The prince was always referred to as Svjatopolk in the previous text. So, the chronicler (appar-

---

[5]   In his recent article, Timofej Gimon put forward a hypothesis about a special 'Pereyaslav chronicle' from which these 'additional' entries might have been borrowed into the PVL (Gimon 2015: 279-294). The suggestion seems superfluous and unnecessary for the explanation of the text. There is no reason to consider the 'additional readings' of the Hypatian version as coherent series. Even if some of them do seem compatible, there is no need to pose some lost chronicles or redactions to account for their introduction into the text. Most of the short additions (for that is exactly what they are) can be much easier explained as glosses in the original codex, probably made by Sylvestr himself after finishing the whole work. In the Hypatian version, most of the glosses might have been incorporated into the body-text, while in the Laurentian tradition, they were mostly ignored.

ently, Sylvestr) decided to point out that the deceased Michael was usually called Svjato-polk[6]. Volodymyr was never called Monomachos in the previous text, except in the gloss of 1098 and the entry of 1113[7]. The remark "зовемъіи . Монамахъ" made sense only for the person who had glossed the Prince's name with "Monomachos".

Chances are that this person was Sylvestr himself[8]. However, the name "Monoma-chos" is absent in Sylvestr's colophon to the PVL (survived in the copies of the Lauren-tian type) where it would be quite appropriate to mention the 'imperial name' of Sylves-tr's patron. Nevertheless, the colophon lacks it, referring to Prince only by his Ruthenian name: "при кнѧзи Володимерѣ . кнѧжащю ѥму Къіевѣ" (Laur.: 286). It is also absent in the only formal panegyric to Volodymyr in the PVL under 1097 (Hypat.: 238; Laur.: 264), which is reflected in both versions of the Primary Chronicle.

Thus, it seems unlikely that Sylvestr himself introduced the name "Monomachos" while revising his own work. A better explanation is that the references to Volodymyr's maternal name found in the Hypatian version are the later editors' amplifications.

Another text from Volodymyr's lifetime is the *Tale About the Miracles of Roman and David*. It was composed, as generally maintained, shortly after 1115. In the oldest copies it is a continuation of the *Tale About the Murder of Borys and Hlib*. From nine mentions of the Prince, Volodymyr's maternal name is used only once. It is the second mention of him: "Володимиръ же **иже и Мономахъ нареченыи** сынъ Всеволожь въ та времена яко же рекохомъ предьржааше убо Переяславьскую оболость" (Abramovič 1916: 63; Buhoslavskij 1928: 167).

The phrase marks the beginning of the description of Volodymyr's activity on vener-ation of the saint brothers. It opens the passage of how Volodymyr decorated the tombs of St. Borys and Hlib ("окова чюдодѣиная и достохвальная святая гроба").

The oldest copy of the *Tale*, which reflects its primary redaction (Buhoslavskij 1928: XI-XII), is the one found in the Uspensk codex, roughly dated to the late twelfth-early thirteenth centuries (USP: 20-21, 24-25). One should not rule out the possibility that the remark about Volodymyr's 'surname' was added later or, if it indeed was in the original, its wording was influenced by the *Instruction* or chronicles.

The *Tale About the Miracles of Roman and David* (as well as the *Tale About the Murder of Borys and Hlib*) has textual relations with the PVL. However, the spot where

---

[6]   The Christian name of Svjatopolk may have had a great symbolic meaning within the structure of the PVL. The year entries and the very history of Rus start with the first year of Byzan-tine Emperor Michael in the ninth century. The narrative ends after the death of another Michael, the Prince of Kyiv.

[7]   The parallel Laurentian text reproduces the phrase "Михаилъ . зовомъіи Стополкъ" but mentions Volodymyr without "Monomachos" in the entries about his enthronement and the trans-lation of St. Borys and Hlib. No reason to believe that the scribe would intentionally have avoided this name; more sensible to view it as an innovation in these passages.

[8]   As O. Toločko recently demonstrated, the PVL depends on the *Instruction* in several frag-ments (Toločko 2020: 441-446).

"Monomachos" is referred to reveals a closer textual similarity to the *Instruction* than the chronicle.

Tale	*Instruction*	PVL
Володимиръ же иже и **Мономахъ нареченыи**	Азъ […] нарe͡ч нѣмь въ кр͡щнїи . Василии . Русьскъімь именемь Володимиръ . wц͡мь възлюбленъімь . и мт͡рью своею . **Мьномахы**	Володимеръ . зовемꙑи . **Монамахъ**

The last text to be listed here is the *Synaxarion* tale "About the Translation of the Finger of St. John the Baptist from Constantinople to Kyiv" (Loseva 2009: 340-341). According to the narrative, the venerable relic came to Kyiv and was placed in the church of St. John "при кнꙗзи Владꙑмери Маномасѣ" (Hypat.: 286). The church was founded in 1121, and the translation of St. John's finger is usually dated to 1121-1122 (Karpov 2014: 143-159; Loseva 2009: 227-228). By this time, the Byzantine-Rus' conflict, which lasted since about 1116, was finally over and a peace was sealed with the marriage of one of Volodymyr's granddaughters to the member of the Komnenoi family. Despite the late dates of the available copies (sixteenth-seventeenth centuries), it is maintained that the tale was composed in the reign of Volodymyr. However, there is no guarantee that the word "Monomachos" was not a later amplification made under the influence of chronicles or some other texts[9].

Besides literary sources, Volodymyr's maternal name is present on two types of his seals.

One type (25a in Valentin Janin's classification) contains a Greek inscription "Lord, help Your servant Basil Volodymyr Monomachos" – "Κ(υρι)ε βο(ήθει) τῷ σῷ δ(ο)υ(λῳ) Βασ(ιλείῳ) Βλαδιμερῳ Μον[ομάχῳ]"[10]. The text is noteworthy since it lists all the prince's names in the same sequence as they are presented at the beginning of the *Instruction*.

Another type (25) is known from the Novgorod find of 1960. It has a Greek inscription "Seal of Basil Monomachos, the noblest archon of Rus" – "Σφραγ[ις] Βασιλ[ε]ιο[υ] του πανευγενεστάτου ἄρχοντος Ρωσιας του Μονομάχ[ου]" (APDR, 1: 16-17, 170). The structure of the text and even the wording is similar to the inscription on the seal of a mysterious archontissa Maria "Monachos" or "Momachos" (type 23), "Seal of Maria Monachos/

---

9   With caution, one more source can be added. This is the *Oration of Grand Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij on God's Grace*. It is traditionally ascribed to Andrij and dated back to the second half of the twelfth century. However, it is known only from the relatively late manuscripts (sixteenth-seventeenth centuries). The text presents Prince Andrij as "сыномъ Георгиевымъ внукомъ Манамаховымъ именем Владимира царя и князя всеа Руси" (Filippovskij 1998: 236). If the quoted fragment of the *Oration* really comes from the twelfth century, it fits well into the proposed hypothesis (see below).

10   It was first published by V. Janin and P. Gajdukov (Janin, Gajdukov 1998: 354, No. 25a). A similar seal is also known in the private collection of the Sheremet'ev Museum, <https://sigillum.com.ua/collections/volodymyr-monomah-knyaz-1076-1093-rr/>.

Momachos, the noblest archontissa" – "Σφραγ[<ις] Μαρίας μοναχης(μομαχης) της ευγενε-
στατης ἀρχοντισ[σ]ης" (APDR, I: 17-18; Janin,Litavrin 1962: 214). Janin suggested omission
of two letters "ομ" and identified her with Volodymyr's mother. This conjecture, however,
was criticized as hypothetic[11].

The formula "the noblest (πανευγενεστάτος) archon", which is unique in Old Ruthe-
nian and, to my knowledge, the Byzantine sigillography, has a parallel in one epigram of
the late eleventh century. The text is dedicated to the imperial couple Nikephoros III Bo-
taneiates (1078-1081) and his second wife Maria, the daughter of the Georgian king Bagrat
IV. Maria is addressed to as "the most noble empress" (βασιλίδι τῇ πανευγενεστάτῃ) (Paul
2012: 95-96). Whatever it meant for the author of the epigram, the word πανευγενεστάτος
on Volodymyr's seal should have conveyed a specific message[12], namely that the Prince pos-
sessed the best pedigree among the Rurikids. Obviously, it was a manifestation of his Byz-
antine origins and right for the family name "Monomachos"[13].

Valentin Janin dated this seal to the 1070s, the earliest stages of Volodymyr's career.
This dating fitted the scholar's scheme of the Rurikids' seals' evolution from the types with
Greek legends to those with the Ruthenian ones (Janin, Litavrin 1962: 210-211). Janin be-
lieved in the concurrent use of Greek seals of Maria "Mon(om)achos" and Volodymyr,
which he called the "twins" (Janin, Litavrin 1962: 214), rejecting the possibility of a late
date for the seals as "anachronistic".

However, the argument against later chronology is not convincing enough. Firstly,
the last quarter of the eleventh century can be considered only as a *terminus post quem* for
the seals which mention the name "Monomachos". Stylistic similarity between the seals
of Volodymyr and Maria does not necessarily indicate an early date of the former. If Ma-
ria had really been the Prince's mother and if her seals had belonged to the third quarter
of the eleventh century, Volodymyr's seal (type 25) could be an imitation of his mother's.
However, the exact name of Volodymyr's mother is not known. To claim that her name was
Maria on the basis of the "archontissa Maria Mon(om)achos" seal means to build a circular
argument. Luckily, from independent sources we know that a woman of this name acted
in the first half of the twelfth century and undoubtedly belonged to Volodymyr's family
circle. She was his daughter Maria (or Marycja) who had been married to pretender Leo

---

[11]   This debate is summarized in Chamajko 2015: 233-234.

[12]   The reference to the noble origin on the seal inscription as such finds the closest parallel
in the seals of Volodymyr's contemporary John II Komnenos (1118-1143). The Emperor is referred
to as "porphyrogennetos". See the items from the Dumbarton Oaks collection: BZS.1958.106.606,
BZS.1958.106.485, BZS.1958.106.606, BZS.1951.31.5.2782, BZS.1951.31.5.1801, BZS.1951.31.5.1694,
BZS.1951.31.5.1693, BZS.1947.2.352, <https://www.doaks.org/resources/seals>.

[13]   Coincidently or not, this word appears to have a semantic equivalent in the Byzantine court
title νωβελίσσιμος (from Latin "Nobilissimus", the noblest). Until the second half of the eleventh cen-
tury, it was reserved for the members of the imperial family. Despite the title's progressive inflation
since the late eleventh century, its basic meaning persisted for some time (ODB: 1489-1490).

Diogenes before (probably, shortly before) 1116 (Kazhdan 1988-1989: 420-422)[14]. So, the 'twin-seals' could have indeed been designed simultaneously for Volodymyr and his female relative, not the mother, but the daughter, though.

Secondly, the idea of the evolution of personal seal types from highly developed and complex to primitive forms is counterintuitive and seems less probable than vice versa. Contrary to Janin, the pretentious formula 'the noblest ($\pi\alpha\nu\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\sigma\varsigma$) archon of Rus' could hardly be used before the death of Volodymyr's father Vsevolod and even before Volodymyr's ascension to the throne of Kyiv in 1113. Vsevolod's seal (type 22a) with the comparable and no less ambitious characteristic "archon of all Rus" ($\alpha\rho\chi\omega\nu\tau\sigma\varsigma$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $P\omega\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$) was undoubtedly designed when the Prince became the ruler of Kyiv (APDR, III: 20-21).

Thirdly, the idea of personal supremacy based on the origin was unique for the Ruthenian political culture. Its manifestation on the official seal could have been provoked by some unusual political situation in which the Prince wanted to emphasize his affiliation to the Monomachos family[15]. Such a situation in Volodymyr's experience took place only once. Shortly after 1113 he provided military support to his new son-in-law, the impostor Leo Diogenes, thereby undertaking his 'Byzantine project' (see the last section of this article). The late chronology of the seal types 25 and 25a would also correlate with the evidence from the literary sources which use Volodymyr's maternal name in relation to the period of his reign in Kyiv.

The scarcity of the primary sources which call Volodymyr "Monomachos" stands in a significant contrast with the abundance of the sources from his lifetime which do not know him under this name.

---

[14]   Maria's identity is debatable in the historiography. Since the nineteenth century the Princess has been mostly considered Volodymyr's daughter and Leo's wife. Vasilij Vasiljevskij put forward a revisionist hypothesis. The scholar argued that Vasyl'ko, son of Leo, was not identical to Vasyl'ko, son of Maria. Accordingly, Maria was Volodymyr's daughter, while Leo's wife was one of the Prince's sisters (Vasiljevskij 1909: 46-48). Vasiljevskij's key argument was textual. The Kyivan Chronicle's entry of 1136 describes the battle between two groups of the Rurikids. In different places, the text reports the death of "Vasyl'ko, son of Leo, son of the emperor" and the death of "Vasyl'ko, son of Marycja, Volodymyr's daughter" (Hypat.: 298). However, there is no need to imagine two Vasyl'kos. The passing away of two princes of the same name in the same battle is unlikely. There is also no contradiction between Vasyl'ko's characteristics as a son of Leo and as a son of Maria. The double mention of Vasyl'ko in the chronicle's entry can be plausibly interpreted as a result of editing. Thus, there are no compelling reasons to duplicate Vasyl'ko and assume an unknown princess, Vsevolod's daughter. The simplest explanation of the source evidence is that Maria (Marycja) was Volodymyr's daughter, Leo's wife and Vasyl'ko's mother. Maria died in 1146 in Kyiv (Laur.: 314-315). The chronicle informs that she was buried 'in her church in which she took the veil' not specifying the name of the church. Quite possibly, it was the church of St. Andrew in the monastery, founded by Vsevolod Jaroslavyč. It could be her death that prompted a reader/editor of the chronicle to make a gloss to the entry of 1136 referring to Vasyl'ko as Marycja's son.

[15]   About this family see ODB: 1398.

2.   *Volodymyr as not Monomachos*

The texts of the late eleventh-early twelfth centuries in which Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč is not called "Monomachos" belong to different types and are independent from each other. We will start with the discussion of the texts addressed to or compiled in the immediate Prince's milieu.

Metropolitan of Kyiv Nikephoros (1104-1121) wrote two epistles to Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč in which the latter is referred to as "Volodymyr, son of Vsevolod, son of Jaroslav" (*Epistle on Fasting and Abstinence from Feelings*) and "Volodymyr, Prince of all Rus, son of Vsevolod, son of Jaroslav" (*Epistle on Latins*) (PMN: 56, 95)[16]. Both are dated to the period of Volodymyr's reign in Kyiv, that is not earlier than 1113. In the *Epistle on Fasting and Abstinence from Feelings* Nikephoros mentions the 'imperial blood' of the Prince ("цр(с̃)кое крови"). Thus, the Metropolitan was fully aware of Volodymyr's half-imperial origin. However, making emphasis on this fact, Nikephoros (a Byzantine himself) failed to use the ruler's 'imperial name' explicitly. Instead, the Metropolitan refers to his patrilineal ancestors.

Soon after 1113, as a new Prince of Kyiv, Volodymyr gathered a council to make some changes to the judicial norms. The event was recorded in a novella of the legal code *Pravda Ruskaja* ("Ruthenian Law"). In such an 'official' text the Prince is mentioned as "Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč" ("Володимиръ Всеволодичь" in the oldest manuscript, the Novgorod *Nomocanon*) (Karskij 1930: 41). It seems that it was unnecessary (or even not an option) for the scribe to include the maternal name of the Prince to the *Pravda Ruskaja*.

The lack of interest in or the awareness of Volodymyr's name "Monomachos" is attested in the paratexts of the *Mstyslav Gospel*. From two possible dates of the book (1106 or 1117) the earlier one is preferable as coinciding with the inauguration of the church of Annunciation in the Prince's residence Gorodishche near Novgorod (Tolochko forthcoming). The colophon by the scribe Aleksa to the *Mstyslav Gospel* mentions Volodymyr, as Mstyslav's father, without his mother's family name, "Мьстиславоу вънооукоу соущю Вьсеволожю а с̃ноу Володимирю" (ME: f. 213). It is also interesting that the inscription on Mstyslav's *enkolpion*[17] emphasizes his relationship with the emperors without any reference to the family name "Monomachos".

An important contemporary mention of Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč is found in the *Pilgrimage of the Abbot Daniel*, preserved, however, in late copies. The text was formed soon after his travel to the Holy Land in about 1106. As Daniel reports, he ordered litanies for the princes of Rus in the monastery of St. Sabbas. He provides their list, on which the second place is occupied by "Basil Volodymyr" ("Василие Володимир") (Norov 1864: 155; Venevitinov 1885: 140). The names of princes vary in the copies, but the reading "Basil

---

[16]   Was he referring to the title of his father "ἄρχοντος πάσης Ρωσίας", known from Vsevolod's seal?

[17]   As O. Toločko convincingly demonstrated, "Theodore the Rhos", the *enkolpion*'s owner, was none other than Mstyslav-Theodore, son of Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč (Tolochko forthcoming).

Volodymyr" is identical in almost all the manuscripts (Janin 1960: 125) and can be considered original. Daniel, who was close to (and evidently sponsored by) the Rurikids, did not specify the 'Byzantine name' of Volodymyr. The Christian and 'Ruthenian' names could be quite enough for church commemoration of the Prince. Moreover, Daniel might have simply been unaware that Volodymyr should have been called Monomachos.

Two (or one and a half) references to Volodymyr in non-literary sources are also important to our discussion.

The Prince is mentioned in a graffito of St. Sophia Cathedral in Kyiv. It reports about the peace treaty concluded on December 4 in the place of Želan' near Kyiv between three princes, Svjatopolk, Volodymyr, and Oleh (Vysockij 1966: 25). The inscription has no definite date. Serhij Vysoc'kyj hypothesized that it refers to the events of 1097 (conflict after the blinding of Vasyl'ko of Terebovl'). In any case, it could not have been made before 1093 when Svjatopolk ascended to the Kyivan throne and after 1113 when he died. Acknowledging the specific genre of the text, which is far from an elaborate narrative, the fact remains that Vsevolod's son is called simply Volodymyr, not Monomachos.

To the range of the surveyed sources one mysterious artifact can be added. This is 'Černihiv torques', a medallion traditionally associated with Volodymyr and dated to around 1100. It has an inscription "Lord, help Your servant Basil, amen" – "Г(оспод)и помози рабоу своюму Василиж амин" –, which resembles the legend on Volodymyr's seal (Rybakov 1964: 19-20; Pucko 2018: 140). If the medallion really belonged to the prince, the absence of the name "Monomachos" would be conspicuous.

The series of the sources evaluated in this section is representative enough to assume that Volodymyr was not known, called and, by and large, recognized as "Monomachos" by his contemporaries. The situation has not changed substantially after his death. For a long time, the Prince remained "Monomachos" only for (and thanks to) a small number of bookmen.

3. *Monomachos after Volodymyr*

Volodymyr's posthumous career in historical memory was more formidable than his worldly success. For centuries, he had been praised as the founder of cities and dynastic traditions. The 'imperial' name "Monomachos" played a key role in his memorialization. However, the things were quite different for his immediate successors.

In the twelfth century (most probably in the 1160s) a short *Synaxarion Life* of Prince Mstyslav, son of Volodymyr, was composed. We might expect from the text the emphasis on noble, Byzantine, roots of Mstyslav. The 'Byzantine name' of his father would be extremely relevant. Nevertheless, the text mentions the Prince's predecessor simply as Volodymyr, "Мьстиславъ бѣ снъ Володимирь" (Loseva 2009: 342).

The legal documents followed the same pattern. The charter of Mstyslav and his son Vsevolod to St. George monastery in Novgorod (about 1130, the text lacks the dating) is the only Rurikids' charter of the twelfth century which is thought to have survived in the original manuscript (Gippius 2008). In the text, Mstyslav is introduced simply as "son of Volodymyr" ("Володимирь сынъ") (GVNP: 140; Gippius 2008: 126).

Volodymyr's descendants were always called "Володимире племя" that is "Volodymyr's kin / progeny"[18], but never "Monomachos' kin / progeny". It would have been more prestigious to label the clan by a rare Byzantine name. The fact that it was totally ignored in this context indicates that the kinsmen remembered him as Volodymyr, not Monomachos. Ruthenian princes had no 'surnames'. The sources did not call princes as individuals by the names of their clan or family founders. Seemingly, such practice already adopted in Byzantium (ODB 1991: 170, 1230-1231, 1435) was not (and could not) have been implemented in Rus. The name "Monomachos" remained a personal designation of Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč not to be inherited by his clan's members.

The distribution of this name in the three chronicle traditions of the twelfth-thirteenth centuries accords with these observations. The Novgorodian First Chronicle does not mention Volodymyr's maternal name at all. The Kyivan and Suzdalian chronicles do. However, they cannot be taken as independent sources because of a considerable volume of common text for the twelfth century. The nature of the relationship between the Kyivan and Suzdalian chronicles has not yet finally been clarified[19]. Controversial scenarios notwithstanding, it seems possible to establish the relations of their fragments marked by Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč's maternal name. Arguably, referring to Volodymyr as "Monomachos" was the result of the Laurentian-type text influence on the Hypatian.

Up to 1175 the name "Monomachos" is absent in the Hypatian-Laurentian common text including the PVL and its Kyivan and Suzdalian continuations. It is used for the first time in the tale of the murder of Andrij, son of Jurij, in 1175. The second and the last time it appears in the common text in the entry about the birth of Vsevolod the Big Nest's son Volodymyr in 1192. In both cases the dependence of the Kyivan Chronicle on the Suzdalian Chronicle can be demonstrated (Vilkul 2005: 32-37; Toločko 2006: 73-87). The Suzdalian interpolations into the Kyivan Chronicle most probably were made after Vsevolod the Big Nest died and his eulogy had been composed, i.e., after 1212 (Toločko 2006)[20].

Within the Laurentian text Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč is referred to as "Monomachos" fourteen times between 1175 and 1222. In this segment the Prince is not mentioned any other way. All the cases are regular genealogical characteristics of Suzdalian princes (Andrij,

---

[18]   This phrase is used thirteen times between 1140 and 1195 (Hypat.: 307-308, 344, 348, 355, 614, 681, 682, 683, 686).

[19]   According to a recent hypothesis, it was the Suzdalian Chronicle (from 1111 to the 1190s) that was edited and amplified to produce the Kyivan Chronicle (Vilkul 2005: 21-80). However, in some cases the Hypatian readings have been proved to be primary.

[20]   An additional argument in favor of the late date of the editorial episode can be added. The Kyivan Chronicle supplemented the borrowed Suzdalian information about the birth of Volodymyr-Dymytrij, son of Vsevolod the Big Nest in 1192 by noting that the boy was named Dymytrij after his father's Christian name, "Всеволодъ же велѣ оучинити сн҃ви своемоу во свое имѧ Дмитрѣи въ ст҃мь кр҃щнии". The only place in the Suzdalian Chronicle which provides Vsevolod's name Dymytrij is the necrology to the prince under 1212.

Mychalko, Vsevolod, Konstantyn, and Jurij)[21]. Such distribution of the name "Monoma-chos" indicates that it first emerged in the Suzdalian Chronicle.

On the contrary, the Hypatian text contains the name "Monomachos" in only eight fragments, all of which have traces of later editing. Those of 1098, 1113, and 1115 formally belong to the first part of the Hypatian codex, the PVL. However, the initial presence of the name "Monomachos" in these fragments is doubtful. The second part, the Ky-ivan Chronicle, which covers almost the whole twelfth century, mentions Volodymyr "Monomachos" five times:

1126   the necrology of Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč (Hypat.: 289);

1140   the panegyric to Volodymyr's son Mstyslav (eight years after Mstyslav's death) (Hypat.: 303);

1149   the phrase announcing the beginning of the reign of Jurij the Long Arm in Kyiv (Hypat.: 383);

1175   the tale about the murder of Andrij (Hypat.: 580);

1192   the report of the birth of Volodymyr, son of Vsevolod the Big Nest (Hypat.: 675).

Eight Hypatian mentions of "Monomachos" reveal a clear pattern. The princes marked by the references to "Monomachos" are Volodymyr – Mstyslav – Jurij – Andrij – Vsevolod. Except for Mstyslav, this sequence represents the Suzdalian dynastic perspective. A survey of the events associated with these references leaves the same impression.

The two last cases are Suzdalian by origin. The report of Jurij's enthronement in Kyiv in 1149 which opens by a unique genealogical remark is Suzdalian in terms of ideology. The remark presents the line of five generations from Volodymyr the Great to Jurij:

> Начало кн҃жения . в Киевѣ кн҃зѧ великаго Дюргѧ сн҃а Володимирѧ . Мономаха . вну-ка Всеволожа . правнука Ярославлѧ . пращюра великаго Володимира . хр҃тившаго всю землю Рускоую.

Such historical depth has no precedents in other analogous remarks in Old Ruthe-nian texts and is the evidence of a special interest to the founder of the Suzdalian dynasty.

---

[21]   In the story of the murder of Andrij under 1175, the Prince is once referred to as the grandson of Volodymyr Monomachos (Laur.: 367). His brother Mychalko is attested in the same way in the report of his death in 1177 (Laur.: 379). The youngest of these brothers, Vsevolod the Big Nest, is mentioned as a grandson of Monomachos ten times in 1187, 1190, 1192, 1194, 1198 (only in the Radziwill copy), 1199, 1200 (only in the Radziwill copy), 1201, 1207, 1212 (Laur.: 405, 408, 409, 411, 414, 415, 429, 436). Vsevolod's son Konstantin is called Monomachos' great-grand-son in his necrology in the entry of 1218 (Laur.: 442). In 1222, Prince Jurij Vsevolodovyč founded a new church of the Dormition of the Mother of God in Suzdal instead of the deconstructed one. The chronicler noticed that the old church was founded by Jurij's grandfather Volodymyr Monomachos (Laur.: 445).

The whole phrase, in fact, is a heading that interrupts the narration[22], and this can be a formal mark of interpolation[23].

Even the first Hypatian mention of "Monomachos" in the note about the foundation of Gorodec on the Oster (1098) finds its explanation in the "Suzdalian tendency" of the editor. During the twelfth century this town was often held or controlled by Jurij and his sons. As the Suzdalian Chronicle reports, in 1195 Vsevolod, son of Jurij, renovated ("обнови") Horodec on the Oster, his patrimony:

> Посла блговѣрнъіи и х͠олюбивъіи кназь Всеволодъ Гюргеви͡ . тивуна своюго Гюрю . с людми в Русь . и созда гра͡ на Городци на Въстри . ѡбнови свою ѡтчину.

When was Vsevolod's patrimony on the Oster River founded? The note of 1098 in all likelihood was invented as an answer to this question by the editor who used the Suzdalian Chronicle. But why this year? The main entry of 1098 reports the convention of princes (including Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč) near Horodec (Hypat.: 248; Laur.: 273). Apparently, the primary chronicler meant Horodec on the Dnieper. But the later editor could mistakenly take it for another town of the same name on the Oster River. This was the earliest and the only mention of any Horodec associated with Volodymyr, which might have prompted the editor to insert the note about the foundation of the "fortress on the Oster" in this particular place.

The necrology of Volodymyr (1126) (Hypat.: 289) contains the readings which do not belong to the Hypatian-Laurentian common text and can be associated with later editorial episodes. Volodymyr's title "Grand Prince of the whole Rus" ("великъіи кн͠зь всея Руси") and the name "Monomachos" are among those readings. The title has a striking parallel in the Suzdalian necrology of Vsevolod the Big Nest (Toločko 2006: 82-83). It is applied here either to Jurij the Long Arm or (more likely, judging by the punctuation of the Laurentian text) to Volodymyr:

> Преставися велїкъіи кна͡ Всеволодъ . именовавъіи в с͠томь кр͠щньи Дмитрии . сн͠ъ Гюргевъ . **бл͠гоч͡тваго кназа всея Руси** внукъ Володимера Мономаха" (Laur.: 437)[24].

---

[22] "Изяславъ же . ѡбратися с женою . и съ дѣтьми поѣха Володи(ми)мирю . а Ростиславъ иде Смоленьску . Изяславъ же и митрополита Клима поя съ собою [...] Гюрги же поѣха оу Киевъ . и множество народа въіде противу ему . с радостью великою . и сѣде на столѣ ѿ͠ца своего".

[23] There are nineteen headings built on the same model "Начало кн͠жения ɴ в Киевѣ" ("the beginning of the reign of ɴ in Kyiv") in the Hypatian text including the PVL and Kyivan Chronicle. But only Jurij the Long Arm deserved two of them. In all other cases, when the princes occupied the Kyivan throne several times, the headings marked only one enthronement. The exception made for Jurij can be explained as a sign of loyalty to the Suzdalian clan. If the second heading announcing Jurij's enthronement corresponds to the common model, the first one deviates from it. Therefore, the unusual heading may be an addition made later than all other similar headings.

[24] In the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle a similar title "самодержьць всея Роуси" was applied to Roman Mstyslavyč (Hypat.: 715).

Given the relationship between the texts, the use of such an extraordinary title in these necrologies is hardly a coincidence. Considering the fact of the influence of the Suzdalian Chronicle on the Kyivan Chronicle, not only the title, but also the name "Monomachos" could be a borrowing in Volodymyr's necrology[25].

The panegyric to Mstyslav (1140), in which the Prince is called son of "Volodymyr Monomachos", is, in fact, a part of a digression from the main narrative. The text informs about the return of two young princes of Polock who were previously banished with their elder relatives to Constantinople by Mstyslav in 1130 (Hypat.: 293). The Prince of Kyiv is praised for his victorious campaigns against Cumans. At the same time, the banishment of the Polock princes is justified by their unpatriotic behaviour and disobedience[26].

The story about Mstyslav and Polock princes occupies a rather odd place in the chronicle narrative, more than ten years after the actual events[27]. On formal criteria, the digression can be qualified as an editorial addition[28]. The described facts about the Cumans' pressure on Rus during the reign of Mstyslav and the Polock princes' obligation to participate in the campaigns to the steppe are historically incorrect (Rukavišnikov 2003: 107). From the list of banished persons (Davyd, Rostyslav, Svjatoslav and two sons of Rohvolod) only Davyd is attested in the events of 1128-1130 in the common text of the Kyivan and Suzdalian Chronicles (Hypat.: 293; Laur.: 299). The identity of others is uncertain[29]. The list was most likely composed *ex post*, which may account for its historical inaccuracy.

---

[25]   The title "Grand Prince of the Whole Rus" resembles the one used by his father Vsevolod on a seal, "αρχοντος πάσης Ρωσίας". This fact, however, should not be taken for an argument that Volodymyr had inherited his father's title later dutifully reproduced in the chronicle eulogy. There seem to be no links between the inscription of seals and the chronicles.

[26]   Interestingly, the Laurentian text has its own digression about the Polock clan under 1128 (Laur.: 299-300).

This is an apocryphal story about Volodymyr the Great, his wife Rohnida and their son Izjaslav, the founder of the clan.

[27]   This inconsistency was detected by the compilers of the Voskresensk Chronicle in the sixteenth century who made an attempt to correct it. They moved the bulk of the story to the entry of 1129, combining it with the short report of the banishment of Polock princes (Voskr.: 28-29). Berežkov believed the Voskresensk Chronicle had preserved the original structure (Berežkov 1963: 134, 139, 327). His suggestion cannot be accepted due to a very late date of the chronicle, whose compilers had a habit of amplifying and amending the texts of their sources.

[28]   The text began with the indefinite modifier of time "В то же времѧ" (in that time) instead of "В се же лѣто" or "В то же лѣто" ("in the same year") which is predominantly used in the surrounding year articles. This may indicate uncertainty and, probably, a significant time distance from the events. The text ends with the phrase "мъ1 же на преднее възъвратимсѧ" ("let us return now to our subject"), which usually indicates a narrative boundary, end of a digression or interpolation. Indeed, it cuts in half the story about how Vsevolod Olʹhovyč established himself as a Prince of Kyiv.

[29]   Svjatoslav is known from the patronymic of Prince Vasylʹko of Polock, mentioned in the Suzdalian Chronicle in the entry of 1132: "[Jaropolk] посла по другаго Мстиславича . [по Изѧслава] в Полтескъ . и приведе и с клѧтвою . wн же wставивъ брата Стополка в Полотьскѣ . и приде

Why did the editor tell the story about Mstyslav's revenge on the Polotsk clan under year 1140? In the entry of 1143, the Kyivan Chronicle reports of two marriages. Svjatoslav, son of Vsevolod Olʹhovyč, Prince of Kyiv, married a daughter of Polock Prince Vasylʹko (Василковна). In the same year Rohvolod Borysovyč, another Prince of Polock, married a daughter of Izjaslav, Mstyslav's son. This meant that by 1143 some Polock princes should have returned from exile. Probably, the editor decided to fill in the narrative gap in order to explain the existence of two Polock princes in 1143 after the whole clan had been banished in 1130. The story about the return of the Polock princes was synchronized with the death of Jaropolk, Mstyslav's brother and successor, and their rival Vsevolod Olʹhovyč's coming to power in Kyiv[30].

Panegyric to Mstyslav undoubtedly represents a later textual layer of the chronicle's text and is not contemporaneous with the events of the first half of the twelfth century[31]. It was most likely conceived not earlier than the second half of the twelfth century. Accordingly, the name "Monomachos" could have been included into the panegyric either while composing its text or even later by subsequent editing.

As demonstrated above, Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč is called "Monomachos" exclusively in either interpolated or edited fragments of the PVL and the Kyivan Chronicle. This can mean that the Prince's maternal name was most likely introduced into these texts not earlier than the late twelfth-early thirteenth centuries, quite possibly, during the same editorial episode. Remarkably, the segments of the Kyivan Chronicle marked by the loyalty to and written/edited in favour of the family of Rostyslav Mstyslavyč and his son Rjuryk make no emphasis on Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč. Instead, they demonstrate interest in Vsevolod Jaroslavyč, the founder of the Vydubyči St. Michael's monastery, where the chronicle was composed. If so, then the interpolation of Suzdalian entries and the name "Monomachos" into the respective fragments of the Kyivan Chronicle (as well as the PVL) should have taken place during the next editorial episode.

The consistent use of the name "Monomachos" first emerged in the segment for 1175-1222 of the Suzdalian Chronicle. From here, it started to spread in Old Ruthenian history-writing. Presumably, this 'revival' of Volodymyr's maternal name was provoked by the 'archeographic' event – the 'discovery' of the Prince's *Instruction* along with the 'proto-Laurentian' codex of the PVL.

в Переяславль на Г҃жинъ дн҃ь . Полочане же рекше лишаетсѧ насъ . и въıгнаша Стѡполка . а Василка посадиша Стѡславича". The passage is absent in the Kyivan Chronicle, but probably goes back to its earlier version (Laur.: 302). Prince Svjatoslav, therefore, could be easily reconstructed by the editor from Vasylʹko's patronymic. We cannot be sure whether Svjatoslav was indeed banished or died earlier. Rostyslav, son of Hlib Vseslavyč (as well as Rohvolod, son of Borys Vseslavyč) is mentioned in the Kyivan Chronicle in the second half of the twelfth century (Hypat.: 493-496, 505, 511). Rohvolod Borysovyč married only in 1143 and was too young in 1130 to have two sons. The other Rohvolods are not known to the texts of the twelfth century.

[30]   Theoretically, the first banished Prince to return could be Vasylʹko Svjatoslavyč, mentioned in 1132 in the Suzdalian Chronicle.

[31]   This unusual text was used by the composers of the Galician-Volhynian Chronicle as a model for panegyrics to Roman Mstyslavyč and his sons Vasylʹko and Danylo (GVLT: 96-97).

4.   *Preliminary Conclusions*

1.   Volodymyr's maternal name is absent in the majority of the sources from the late eleventh-early twelfth centuries. The subsequent gradual spread of "Monomachos" as Volodymyr's 'surname' in the Ruthenian texts was initiated by the editors of the Suzdalian Chronicle in the early thirteenth century.

2.   The sources from the period of Volodymyr's lifetime which call him "Monomachos" are very few and are closely linked to the prince. The key ones are the *Instruction* and the inscriptions on two types of his seals. These texts were made (or commissioned) by Volodymyr himself.

3.   The primary sources containing the name "Monomachos" were most probably created after the beginning of Volodymyr's rule in Kyiv during the short period of 1113-early 1120s.

5.   *The Invention of Volodymyr Monomachos: A Hypothesis*

Despite its triumph in the historical tradition, the name "Monomachos" was hardly legitimate in the sense of 'public recognition' during the Prince's lifetime. Volodymyr was not widely considered as "Monomachos" by his contemporaries and by the next generations of the Rurikids for at least a century. This name was rather a situational self-representation of the Prince. At some point it even became 'official' and appeared on Volodymyr's seals. The ruler was obviously aware of his mother's parentage. But there is no reason to believe that Volodymyr identified himself by the name "Monomachos" from the very beginning of his conscious life. The focused use and promotion of his mother's family name as his own – such extraordinary practice for the Rurikids – must have had a specific boost.

In search of the circumstances which caused the 'activation' of the Prince's identification as "Monomachos" we should pay special attention to the time around 1116. We may venture to suggest that this onomastic and ideological phenomenon was associated with the 'Byzantine project' of Volodymyr.

The ruler of Kyiv provided military support to impostor Leo and helped him to establish a foothold on the lower Danube (Hypat.: 283-284; Laur.: 291). Leo pretended to be a son of Emperor Romanos Diogenes (died in 1071). The impostor was murdered in 1116 by two assassins sent by Emperor Alexios Komnenos. After that Volodymyr continued to send troops on the Danube for the sake of Leo's infant son Basil, who was born from the prince's daughter Maria.

This was a unique for the Rurikids and a large-scale undertaking (Vasiljevskij 1909: 38-49; Pašuto 1968: 186-187; Kazhdan 1988-1989: 420-422; Litavrin 2000: 292; Gorskij 2002: 98-100; Karpov 2015: 155-158; Toločko 2015: 54-55). Although the intimate designs are not quite clear, such an enterprise must have been caused by some serious motifs and cannot be regarded as a mere peripheral conflict. The marriage between Leo and Maria and

Volodymyr's persistence in the war on the Danube reveal the Prince's stake in the affair. At the same time, Leo's physical liquidation (not blinding, imprisonment or deterrence through diplomacy) may imply that Alexios Komnenos regarded him as great menace and did not consider any milder options. By definition, every impostor claims the rights and power of the person he/she pretends to be. In Leo's case his ultimate goal must have been the throne of Constantinople. Regardless of Leo's credibility, Volodymyr evidently recognized him as a true offspring of Romanos Diogenes and a legitimate heir to the throne.

The Prince of Kyiv might have had an elegantly designed plan. It can be imagined as a dynastic union between the Diogenes (whatever Leo's true origins), the Monomachos and the Rurikids (or precisely Volodymyr's family). Among the Ruthenian princes, Volodymyr had indeed the noblest origin, being the only male descendant (although on mother's side) of the Byzantine emperor[32]. He was aware of his pedigree and, perhaps, considered himself superior to the other princes. At the same time, his progeny from Leo and Maria could claim the supreme power in the empire. Volodymyr's family, therefore, could have got primacy over both states, Byzantium and Rus. Should the undertaking succeeded, the Byzantine Empire would have been ruled by Volodymyr's son-in-law and then, eventually, his grandson. The latter was given the name Basil, imitating Volodymyr's Christian name (Litvina, Uspenskij 2006: 140-141). The Prince's grandfather was emperor, and his grandson could become the ruler of Constantinople. The dynasty of the Monomachos could take revenge and revive.

Whether or not Volodymyr indeed had so far-reaching a plan, the circumstances were favorable for the Prince's rediscovery of his imperial lineage and his identification with the family name of his grandfather – Emperor Constantine Monomachos. The ruler of Kyiv needed to enhance or to invent his 'Byzantine identity' and emphasize his mother's origin[33]. This was something bigger than merely declaring kinship with the emperors. This was about demonstrating Volodymyr's belonging to a particular family, the Monomachos, who had ruled the empire before the current dynasty of the Komnenoi.

Meanwhile the military operations on the Danube ended unsuccessfully. The 'Byzantine project' had not come true. Due to the gravity of the situation, the conflict was finally resolved by the equivalent exchange. The daughter of Volodymyr's son Mstyslav married a member of the imperial family of the Komnenoi in 1122 (Hypat.: 286). Basil, son of impostor Leo and Maria, remained in Rus and died ingloriously on the battlefield during one of internecine wars of the Rurikids in 1136 (Hypat.: 298; Laur.: 304).

---

[32]   The PVL mentions Vsevolod's three daughters, Janka, Kateryna (or Iryna) and Evpraksija. The latter was born in his second marriage. Kateryna's (Iryna's) mother (either Byzantine Princess or the second wife of the Prince) cannot be well identified. Only the oldest of Vsevolod's daughters, Janka, was undoubtedly half-Byzantine like Volodymyr.

[33]   This identity was formed by means of both Greek (seals) and Slavonic (the *Instruction* and tale about the finger of St. John) languages, thereby targeting both the Byzantine and the Ruthenian societies.

The name "Monomachos" was topical for the Prince of Kyiv only within the short period from the beginning of his 'Byzantine project' in about 1115 to the reconciliation with the empire in the first half of the 1120s. But it was that very time when the name could have got into the legends of Volodymyr's seals, the *Instruction*, and, possibly, a few other texts[34]. This was enough to start a long tradition. Volodymyr became Monomachos.

Abbreviations

APDR, I: V.L. Janin, *Aktovye pečati Drevnej Rusi x-xv vv.,* I (*Pečati x-načala xiii vv.*), Moskva 1970.

APDR, III: V.L. Janin, P.G. Gajdukov, *Aktovye pečati Drevnej Rusi x-xv vv.,* III, Moskva 1998.

GVLT: O.P. Toločko (red.), *Halyc'ko-Volyns'kyj litopys: tekstolohija*, Kyjiv 2020.

GVNP: *Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova*, Moskva-Leningrad 1949.

Hypat.:   *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, II (*Ipat'evskaja letopis'*), Moskva 1998.

Laur.:   *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, I (*Lavrent'evskaya letopis'*), Leningrad 1926-1928.

ME: *Mstislavovo Evangelie*, <https://catalog.shm.ru/api/spf/2z2zcrd-fNyIa-HjCIju7ntuSFkHcYdzpDt8UaJwrV_2T2Z83U7t81ldDfKF-28KpL.data> (latest access: 20.01.22)

ODB: *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Oxford-New York 1991.

PMN: G.S. Barankova (red.) *Poslanija mitropolita Nikifora*, Moskva 2000.

PVL: D.S. Lichačev, V.P. Adrianova-Peretc (red.) *Povest' vremennych let. Izdanie vtoroe*, Sankt-Peterburg 1996.

RPC: S.H. Cross, O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (eds.) *The Russian Primary Chronicle. Laurentian text*, Cambridge (MA) 1953.

USP: S.I. Kotkova (red.) *Uspenskij sbornik xii-xiii vv.*, Moskva 1971.

Voskr.:   *Polnoe sobranie russkich letopisej*, VII (*Voskresenskaja letopis'*), Sankt-Peterburg 1856.

---

[34]   The political agenda of this period decisively influenced the Primary Chronicle. It could account for the text's focus on the Danube in the stories of Kyi and Sviatoslav as well as the search and discovery of the Byzantine-Rus treaties later incorporated into the Chronicle (Toločko 2015: 54-56).

Literature

Abramovič 1916:   D.I. Abramovič, *Žitija svjatych mučenikov Borisa i Gleba i služby im*, Petrograd 1916.

Berežkov 1963:   N.G. Berežkov, *Chronologija russkogo letopisanija*, Moskva 1963.

Buhoslavskij 1928:   S.O. Buhoslavskij, *Pam'jatky XI-XVIII vv. pro knjaziv Borysa i Hliba*, Kyjiv 1928.

Chamajko 2015:   N.V. Chamajko, *Pečati knjagini Marii*, "Stratum Plus", 2015, 6, pp. 231-244.

Filippovskij 1998:   G.Ju. Filippovskij, *'Slovo' Andreja Bogoljubskogo o prazdnike 1 avgusta po spisku 1597 g.*, in: *Kul'tura slavjan i Rus'. Sbornik statej k 90-letiju akademika B.A. Rybakova*, Moskva 1998, pp. 230-237.

Gimon 2015:   T.V. Gimon, *'Ipat'evskije' dopolnenija k 'Povesti vremennych let'*, in: *Akademik A.A. Šachmatov: žizn', tvorčestvo, naučnoe nasledije (k 150-letiju so dnja roždenija)*, Sankt-Peterburg 2015, pp. 279-294.

Gippius 2003:   A.A. Gippius, *Sočinenija Vladimira Monomacha. Opyt tekstologičeskoj rekonstrukcii. I*, "Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščeniji", 2003, 2 (6), pp. 60-99.

Gippius 2004:   A.A. Gippius, *Sočinenija Vladimira Monomacha. Opyt tekstologičeskoj rekonstrukcii. II*, "Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščeniji", 2004, 2 (8), pp. 146-171.

Gippius 2008:   A.A. Gippius, *Zagadki Mstislavovoj gramoty*, in: *Miscellanea Slavica. Sbornik statej k 70-letiju Borisa Andreeviča Uspenskogo*, Moskva 2008, pp. 109-129.

Gorskij 2002:   A.A. Gorskij, *Zabytaja vojna Monomacha: Russko-vizantijskij konflikt 1116 goda*, "Rodina", 2002, 11-12, pp. 98-100.

Janin 1960:   V.L. Janin, *Mežduknjažeskie otnošenija v épochu Monomachu i 'Choždenie igumena Daniila'*, "Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury", XVI, 1960, pp. 112-131.

Janin, Gajdukov 1998:   V.L. Janin, P.G. Gajdukov, *Drevnerusskie vislye pečati, zaregistrirovannye v 1997 g.*, "Novgorod i novgorodskaja zemlja. Istorija i archeologija", XII, 1998, pp. 338-357.

Janin, Litavrin 1962:   V.L. Janin, G.G. Litavrin, *Novye materialy o proischoždenii Vladimira Monomacha*, in: *Istoriko-archeologičeskij sbornik*, Moskva 1962, pp. 204-221.

Karpov 2014:   A.Ju. Karpov, *Issledovanija po istorii domongol'skoj Rusi*, Moskva 2014.

Karpov 2015:   A.Ju. Karpov, *Velikij knjaz' Vladimir Monomach*, Moskva 2015.

Karskij 1930:   E.F. Karskij, *Russkaja Pravda po drevnejšemu spisku*, Leningrad 1930.

Kazhdan 1988-1989:   A. Kazhdan, *Rus'-Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", XII-XIII, 1988-1989, pp. 414-429.

Litavrin 2000:   G.G. Litavrin, *Vizantija, Bolgarija, Drevnjaja Rus' (IX-načalo XII v.)*, Sankt-Peterburg 2000.

Litvina, Uspenskij 2006: A.F. Litvina, F.B. Uspenskij, *Vybor imeni u russkich knjazej v X-XVI vv. Dinastičeskaja istorija skvoz' prizma antroponimiki*, Moskva 2006.

Loseva 2009:   O.V. Loseva, *Žitija russkich svjatych v sostave drevnerusskich Prologov XII-pervoj treti XV vekov*, Moskva 2009.

Machnovec' 1989:   L.Je. Machnovec' (red.) *Litopys Rus'kyj*, Kyjiv 1989.

Norov 1864:   A.S. Norov (red.) *Putešestvije igumena Daniila po Svjatoj zemle, v načale XII-go veka (1113-1115)*, Sankt-Peterburg 1864.

Pašuto 1968:   V.T. Pašuto, *Vnešnjaja politika Drevnej Rusi*, Moskva 1968.

Paul 2012:   A. Paul, *Historical Figures Appearing in Epigrams on Objects*, in: F. Bernard, K. Demoen (eds.) *Poetry and its Contexts in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, Farnham-Burlington 2012, pp. 89-414.

Priselkov 1913:   M.D. Priselkov, *Očerki po cerkovno-političeskoj istorii Kievskoj Rusi X-XII vv.*, Sankt-Peterburg 1913.

Pucko 2018:   V.G. Pucko, *Kievskaja torevtika vremeni Vladimira Monomacha*, "Drevnjaja Rus': voprosy medievistiki", 2018, 3 (73), pp. 140-150.

Rukavišnikov 2003:   A.V. Rukavišnikov, *Počemu polockie knjaz'ja byli soslany v Vizantiju: svideteľstva istočnikov*, "Drevnjaja Rus': voprosy medievistiki", 2003, 2 (12), pp. 99-111.

Rybakov 1964:   B.A. Rybakov, *Russkie datirovannye nadpisi XI-XIV vekov*, Moskva 1964.

Šachmatov 1916:   A.A. Šachmatov, *Povest' vremennych let*, I, Petrograd 1916.

Toločko 2006:   A.P. Toločko, *O vremeni sozdanija Kievskogo svoda '1200 g.'*, "Ruthenica", 2006, 5, pp. 73-87.

Toločko 2015:   A.P. Toločko, *Očerki načaľnoj rusi*, Kyjiv 2015.

Toločko 2020:   O.P. Toločko, *Volodymyr Monomach i litopys*, in: *Academia. Terra Historiae. Studii na pošanu Valerija Smolija*, II, Kyjiv 2020, pp. 441-446.

Tolochko forthcoming: O.P. Tolochko, *Who Was 'Theodore Rhos from a Family of Emperors' the Owner of the Stone from the Holy Sepulchre?* in: S. Torres Prieto, A. Franklin (eds.), *'Medieval Rus' and Early Modern Russia. Texts and Contexts: Essays in honour of Simon C. Franklin* (forthcoming).

Vasiljevskij 1909:   V.G. Vasiljevskij, *Trudy*, II/1, Sankt-Peterburg 1909.

Venevitinov 1885:   M.A. Venevitinov (red.), *Žit'e i chožen'e Daniila, Rus'skyja zemli igu-
                            mena 1106-1107 gg. 3-j i 9-j vypuski Pravoslavnogo Palestinskogo sborni-
                            ka*, Sankt-Peterburg 1885.

Vilkul 2005:   T.L. Vilkul, *O proischoždenii obščego teksta Ipat'evskoj i Lavrent'evskoj
                            letopisi za XII v. (predvariteľnye zametki)*, "Palaeoslavica", XIII, 2005,
                            1, pp. 21-80.

Vysockij 1966:   S.A. Vysockij, *Drevnerusskie nadpisi Sofii Kievskoj XI-XIV vv.*, I, Kiev
                            1966.

Abstract

Vadym Jurijovič Aristov
When and How Did Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč Become Monomachos?

The article reviews the sources of the late 11th-12th centuries relevant to the use of "Monoma-chos" to refer to Prince Volodymyr Vsevolodovyč. The author questions the idea that the family name of his mother "Monomachos" was the name by which the prince was known during his life-time. The analysis shows that reliable references to the name "Monomachos" dating from the time of Volodymyr's life come from the sources directly connected to him. This is the *Instruction* written by Volodymyr himself and two types of his seals. Their creation can be reasonably dated to around 1116-1117. The mentions of the name "Monomachos" in the text of the *Primary Chronicle* are pre-served only in its 'Hypatian' version. Judging by a number of signs, they were later interpolations. At the same time, in most cases, the chronicles and other sources of the late 11th-early 12th centuries do not apply his mother's family name to Volodymyr. In the chronicles of the 12th century, the name "Monomachos" is rare. In the *Kyivan Chronicle*, it appears in edited or interpolated fragments. In the *Suzdalian Chronicle*, it is mentioned regularly in the year entries of the late 12th-early 13th centu-ries. It was the editors of the *Suzdalian Chronicle* of the early 13th century who initiated the revival and further spread of the name "Monomachos" in the literary tradition. It is proposed that the beginning of the use of Volodymyr's maternal name should be associated with the events of 1116-1117. The prince supported the impostor Leo in the struggle for the Byzantine throne. This 'project' required the actualization of Volodymyr's 'Byzantine' identity.

Keywords

Kyivan Rus; Volodymyr Monomachos; Old Ruthenian Historiography; Byzantine-Rus Rela-tions.