SUPPLANTING LOVE, ACCEPTING FRIENDSHIP: A HISTORY OF RUSSIAN DIPLOMATIC CONCEPTS

Evgeny Roshchin

Introduction[1]

This article presents a brief history of the concept of friendship in Russian diplomatic language. Using this conceptual history, the article attempts to demonstrate the ways in which the concept was employed to achieve certain political ends and the ways in which concepts frame the processes of diplomatic conduct and international learning. One of the means of building political organization in Kievan Rus' and later in Muscovy, and of socializing this political entity into the European system of international relations, was the concept of friendship that the Russians borrowed from their western neighbors. Russian princes found it expedient to make extensive use of the concept of friendship in the process of expanding their territorial possessions, establishing relations with foreign and other Russian princes of different ranks, and negotiating legal regimes. This suggestion may seem rather counter-intuitive, given conventional understandings of friendship and the often violent power relations among Russian princes as well as with their Tatar and western counterparts. Nonetheless, friendship was constitutive of this complex picture of building the Muscovite state and its subsequent socialization into the European system. Russian diplomatic vocabulary, however, did not evolve from a single source: rather, it was influenced by the first encounters with the Byzantine Empire and then by its dealings with the Polish-Lithuanian common-

wealth, the Hanseatic cities and the Livonian Order. Perhaps partly due to these diverse "international" encounters during the Middle Ages, Russian diplomatic vocabulary possessed several words that could all be rendered into contemporary English as "friendship" (e.g. *liubov'*, *priiazn'*, *priiatstvo*, and *druzhba*).

As a way of inquiring into the formation of the early modern concept of friendship and dealing with terminological multiplicity, this article draws on several methodological precepts guiding the studies of rhetoric and concepts. It follows Quentin Skinner in focusing on the array of terms used to describe and evaluate certain actions and states of affairs (for a description of strategies used to the application of terms and their redescription, see the essays collected in Skinner 2002). It attempts to identify the terms that refer to friendly relations and the range of their application. Thus, it examines the thematic contexts in which the terms appear, and also looks for the adjectives, verbs and other germane words used with these terms. In doing so, it demonstrates the conventions regulating the application of the relevant terms, their transformations and corresponding political processes. Based on the chosen methodological approach, the term "convention" is used not in the legal or normative sense, but rather to denote the prevailing social, political and linguistic processes in a particular historical period (see Palonen 2003, 41; Skinner 1970). This article mainly studies the "treaties" concluded by Muscovite and other Russian princes and republics and their diplomatic correspondence. It is crucial to keep in mind that the Russian medieval treaty or *gramota* (charter) predominantly appeared in the form of a unilateral letter proclaiming the desires of the sender, accepting certain obligations or simply informing the recipient of past or future actions (for a detailed overview of medieval Russian treaties, their structure and principles, see Feldbrugge 2001). Thus, the genre of the *gramota* did not correspond to the rather modest, strict and poor rhetorical language of the modern treaty; instead, it allowed for various modes of accusations, elevated appeals, requests and justifications as part of an agent's argumentative efforts to achieve certain goals. The genre certainly comprised a number of conventional modes to deliver an argument. These modes and conventions of addressing the counterpart and the diplomatic staff involved, as well as the concepts employed to legitimate these actions, will be the subject of the following exposition.

"Love" as a tool for integration

Some of the earliest uses of the concept of friendship are registered in the first Russian chronicles and belong to the accounts of treaties concluded between the Russians and Byzantium in the 10th century.[2] For example, the *Laurentian Chronicle* (*Lavrentievskaia letopis'*) record for the year 912, which reproduces a treaty between Kievan Rus' and Byzantium, the chronicler mentions that Rus' and the Christians proclaim and maintain *liubov'* (which in contemporary Russian language means love) (PSRL 1926, 33). Then, the record for 945 (when another treaty was concluded) notes that *liubov'* between the Greeks and Rus' is to be confirmed (Ibid., 47). These records refer to the so-called first treaties between Kievan Rus' and Byzantium. *Liubov'* in its turn may refer both to a particular type of a treaty and the special relations established between the parties, as the chronicler uses the verbs "to observe" and "to keep" together with *liubov'* and reports about articles of *liubov'* and *mir* (peace) (in the record for 912). The same treaty says that Rus' and the Greeks "will love each other with all their heart", which bears obvious Christian connotations. These relations should be distinguished from a mere peace treaty, since the chronicle on several occasions mentions *mir* independently of *liubov'* (*mir* could be made, established and confirmed; see, for instance, the report on the *mir* made with the Pechenegs in 915).

The appearance of *liubov'* in the reproduction of the first treaties with the Greeks appears to have been an attempt to render the Greek diplomatic term *philia* into Russian (for this hypothesis, see Gedeonov 1876, 266-7; Lavrovskii 1853, 9; Kashtanov 1996, 4-7; Sverdlov 2003, 136-8; Malingoudi 1997, 85). It is worth pointing out that Byzantium often used this term in its relations with barbarian peoples while building and maintaining patron-client relations. For instance, the tenth-century Byzantine emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his *De Administrando Imperio* uses *philia* when describing the relations with barbaric tribes based on unequal terms (see Constantine 1967, 11, 3-6 and 45, 156-158; for a similar observation, see Feldbrugge 2001, 161-162; for the history of the concept of *philia* in Byzantium, see Paradisi 1951). There are good reasons to suppose that the Russians simply borrowed the concept from the Greeks together with its habitual contexts of appearance when they unreflectively reproduced it in the preambles to the first treaties with Byzantium. As early students of

these treaties suggested, the Russians were more concerned about the concrete clauses of the treaties than their rhetorical preambles (Gedeonov 1876, 276). Thus, imperial *philia* was learned by the Russians in the process of socialization into the existing system of Byzantine diplomatic relations. Another dimension of Byzantine *philia* was related to the context of familial relations, which tied peoples to the empire through a system of marriages (Paradisi 1951, 365). The following demonstrates the implications of such conceptual socialization for relations among the Russian princes and for their emerging political organization.

First, however, some remarks concerning the use of *liubov'* need to be made in order to avoid possible confusion. It is worth stressing that although the term *liubov'* in contemporary parlance is used to designate romantic love relationships, it did not perform this function in the accounts of relations among predominantly male Russian rulers and political entities. As Eve Levin argues in her study, "the notion of romantic love was alien to Slavic society before the introduction of Western culture" (Levin 1989, 134). This is not to say that sexual relations and desire were absent, though. However, this sort of activity, particularly outside of marriage, was considered sinful in the view of Orthodox Slavs, hence the choice of condemning terms such as *blud* or *pohot'* (*fornication*, lust) (Ibid., 46-59). The emotional attachment that could exist between a man and a woman and their sexual relations, particularly inside of marriage, were acknowledged, but it was far from love in spiritual sense (Ibid., 162; on the history of the concept of friendship describing the relations between individuals and the corresponding terms see Kalugin 2009). Overall, the root *liubo* could be said to have designated a general positive disposition towards things that have some appeal to the actor.

The concept of *liubov'* appears to have been one of the most popular in the vocabulary describing relations between Russian princes who belonged to the same kin. Not only was the concept used in the first chronicles, it was also omnipresent in the corpus of available treaties concluded between Russian princes in the 14th-16th centuries. Russian princes, who often conducted independent policies towards their western and eastern neighbors, were still united by the myth of common descent. Their political organization was based on the principle of hierarchy, which was intrinsic to the appanage system in the period of feudal fragmentation. Therefore, the central theme of the treaties

between Russian princes, as Ferdinand Feldbrugge maintains, was seniority (Feldbrugge 2001, 162). Thus, this political system allocated two main positions that a prince could occupy: that of a grand prince and that of an appanage prince. Quite surprisingly, *liubov'* was one of the concepts that helped to maintain the integrity of this system, build alliances and negotiate common policies.

This is evident from the conventions that regulated the use of *liubov'* and the contexts in which it appears. Under these conventions, princes with different statuses had different powers in making *liubov'*. Only the Grand Princes could "take in", "grant", "hold in" or "accept into *liubov'*" inferior princes. The following expressions are usually found in the treaties sent by the Grand Princes to their inferior counterparts: "I have accepted into *liubov'* my younger brother and my son" (DDG 1950, № 11, 1389); "And I, the Grand Prince, am granting and holding you in brotherhood and in *liubov'*" (Ibid., № 70, 1473). Reversed or asymmetric language is characteristic of the treaties sent by appanage princes to Grand Princes: "And you, our lord, the Grand Prince, will hold me in brotherhood…" (Ibid., №14, 1390); "[You] will grant us, your younger brothers, your *liubov'* … [You] will accept us into *liubov'*" (Ibid., № 46, 1447).

Similar patterns could be traced in the communications with the Tatar tsars. A curious change in the way to speak about *liubov'* that simultaneously brings its hierarchical dimension to light can be seen when the distribution of powers between the Muscovite and Crimean Tatar tsars changed in favor of the former. In the 1474 treaty between the Muscovite Grand Prince and Crimean tsar, there are still examples of how Grand Prince Ivan III thanked Crimean Tsar Mengli-Girei for calling him "brother and friend", for granting him this status and for agreeing to hold him in *druzhba* (friendship) and *liubov'* (RIO, vol. 41, 1). Later, in a sixteenth-century letter to the German emperor, the Muscovite tsar informed the former that the Crimean tsar *asked for* his *liubov'* and *druzhba*. The Muscovite tsar concluded friendship with Kazy-Girei, but being bound by friendly obligations he awaited Caesar Rudolf's reaction and emphasized that the concluded friendship was *not firm* (PDS, vol. 2, 62).

The verbs "to ask for", "to grant", "to hold" and "to accept" used with the concept of *liubov'* underline the character of relations between these princes, which prescribed unequal roles to the participants in the relationship and subordinate status to the inferior party. In these

relations, inferior princes had only a passive role. *Liubov'* appears to be one of the concepts that defined the limits of the inferior party's power, put that party in the service of the superior one and required the subsequent redistribution of tributes.

Another convention in the use of *liubov'* concerns relations among the Grand Princes themselves. This convention vividly demonstrates the hierarchical component in relations designated by the concept of *liubov'* as it employs drastically different ways of addressing the counterpart and a different set of verbs limiting the range of actions available to the parties. Such verbs as "to accept" and "to grant" would be a part of an unacceptable *liubov'* vocabulary in intercourse between Grand Princes. Instead, princes with comparable statuses "take" *liubov'* with each other. Thus, Grand Prince Basil I wrote to Grand Prince Mikhail Alexandrovich that he would not take *liubov'* with other princes, except for him and his children (DDG, №15, 1396). Another example from the same collection has the Lithuanian Grand Prince Alexander taking *liubov'* with Ivan the tsar of Muscovy (Ibid., № 83, 1494). In a way, *liubov'* also imposes limits on exercising power in relations between equals. A prince could not take or conclude *liubov'* with other princes without receiving agreement from other princes with whom he had concluded *liubov'* before. Thus, a usual formulation with *liubov'* concerning this type of obligation goes as follows: you, my brother, shall not take *liubov'* with other princes without consultations with myself and without receiving my agreement (see examples in DDG, № 34, 1434; № 37, 1439; №79, 1484-5). This is, however, different from subduing one party to another, when power-sharing and the burdens of obligations seem incommensurable.

Liubov' was also used in the context of delineating political space by means of distinguishing between friends and enemies. Concluding *liubov'* often leads to an obligation to treat certain princes as friends and others as enemies. It is registered in many treaties with the formula "a friend of yours will be a friend of mine" accompanying the agreed condition of *liubov'*. When a prince died, his successor confirmed the structure of foreign relations by referring to previous agreements: "my grandfather was a friend to your grandfather, their children were in *liubov'* and brotherhood, hence, we want to be your brother and friend" (see examples from the late 15th century in RIO, vol. 41). *Liubov'* makes princes enter into offensive alliances against other princes and, vice versa, on the basis of concluded *liubov'* a prince could be forced to

maintain peace with a third party. Thus, in the late 15th century the Crimean Tatar tsar Mengli-Girei, according to this rule, promised to show "non-friendship" (*neliubov'*) to Lithuanian lands; after a while it was suggested that he make peace with the Lithuanian Grand Prince Alexander so that he would be a friend to a Muscovite prince's friend (Ibid.: 183, 258). This formula was not a mere political ritual; rather, it represented a part of regulatory apparatus of an existing political order and an effective means of making war and peace. Randall Lesaffer observed similar obligations imposed by *amicitia* in many Renaissance treaties in Western Europe (Lesaffer 2002, 91).

Hence, *liubov'* seems to be not only a power-limiting instrument in hierarchical relations; it also sets limits on the sovereign powers of equal agents via quasi-juridical agreements with concrete stipulations. The concept was used in vertical and horizontal political dimensions, thereby fixing a certain political and spatial order. This order was maintained mainly by the series of speech acts performed in the treaties, and not so much by means of formal institutions that later took the shape of the state bodies or, even later, of the international institutions.[3] The appeals to *liubov'* that often appeared in the preambles to these treaties indicate its justificatory role for subsequent policies. *Liubov'* turned out to be suitable to designate both a type of a contract or a treaty and at the same time a special relationship that would justify the policies agreed on in a particular treaty. Princes could build a special relationship associated with *liubov'* by making references to the ancient custom of their predecessors to hold each other in *liubov'* and by appealing to brotherly love that should guide their conduct. By the 16th century the latter appeal was already bearing strong Christian connotations. For example, Ivan IV (the Terrible) instructed to 'preserve Christian religion … and live in love' and advised his son Ivan to have 'unhypocritical love with his brother … Fiodor' (DDG, № 104, 1572). Emphasis on 'true' and 'unhypocritical' love was made in the letters sent to the western Christian monarchs, whereas as a rule no such mention was made in the letters sent to non-Christian rulers. Thus, the use of *liubov'* in Russian documents was associated with complex social relations, which combined the notions of the contract and political decision with moral and religious significance. Moreover, these social relations preserved some room for questioning the status of the parties.

Taking into account this brief history of early Russian uses of *liubov'*, it is illuminating to look at the attempts of an emerging Muscovite state to maintain diplomatic relations with the German emperor and other western rulers in the 16th century and the ways in which the concept figures in this context. These attempts demonstrate a certain incongruity of conventional Muscovite appeals to *liubov'* and a changing European convention. Firstly, this incongruity became apparent when the Muscovite Tsar Ivan IV described his relations with the German emperor and with the Pope himself in terms of *liubov'*. In his reply the Pope emphasized that he always favored *liubov'* and friendship between Christian princes, and between the German emperor and the Muscovite tsar. However, he did not respond to tsar's proposal to have *liubov'* with him (PDS, vol. 10, 36). Seemingly, the Pope still acted within the logic of hierarchical Europe headed by the German emperor and the Pope himself. In this political organization not all the actors possessed equal symbolic statuses, while friendship relations could imply the symmetrical positions of their subjects. Secondly, the Muscovite tsar made attempts to question the equal status of his counterparts by casting doubts upon their ancestry. As we mentioned above, *liubov'* was conventionally confirmed by references to past treaties. So, Ivan IV, after being insulted by having his name placed after that of the Swedish king in the latter's epistle, questioned the honor of the Swedish lands and suggested establishing the status and descent of the Swedish King John III by listing those tsars with whom his predecessors had "brotherhood and friendship" (see the letter to the Swedish king in PLDR, 122). *Liubov'* rhetoric was also characteristic of correspondence with the English Queen Elizabeth I (see examples in PLDR, 108; RIO, vol. 38, 13-14). However, excessive appeals to true *liubov'* feelings sometimes met with reminders from the Queen about the contractual nature of a relationship. For instance, in one of her replies Elizabeth wrote:

> Because we understand from you (Emperour et great Duke) … that you… earnestlie desire to enter into some contract of strict amitie with us … whereupon we have with good deliberation resolved to accept in most freindlie manner this the offer of the good will of so mightie a Prince, et to contract Amitie with you… (Akty 1842, 373, № IX, year 1570).

These incongruities in conventions of using the concept to achieve certain ends highlight a number of issues related to the emerging conception of state sovereignty, the recognition of the Muscovite prince and changing international norms on the eve of the Westphalian system. They also create a basis for gradual conceptual learning and unification of European conventions. The difference in the conventional uses was also reflected in the appearance of several synonymous terms (*liubov'*, *druzhba*, *priiazn'* and *priiatel'stvo*), which sometimes were enumerated in the same document, creating difficulties for translation into other languages. After the Time of Troubles in the late 16th and early 17th century, when Muscovy renewed its attempts to learn European norms of diplomatic conduct and diplomatic vocabulary, this was also reflected upon by the ambassadors and interpreters. Their reflections will be returned to in the following sections.

Liubov' as a regime-making tool

Let us now leave aside the discursive peculiarities of the emerging and expanding Muscovite tsardom and briefly examine another genealogical line of the concept of friendship. This line benefited from influences from the princedoms and republics lying west and northwest of Muscovy. In contrast to the internal Muscovite picture, in the north-western Russian lands *liubov'* appears to have less prominence, and does not have direct links to the discursive construction and maintenance of sovereign power. In early Novgorodian treaties with the Germans, *liubov'* was coupled with the concept of *mir* (peace). It was important to conclude *mir* with good will and *liubov'* as a prerequisite for further relations (see the treaty between Alexander Nevsky and the German ambassadors (circa 1257-1259) in Gramoty 1857, № Ia). However, these early treaties do not display excessive *liubov'* rhetoric, while some contained only the concept of *mir* (see, for example, the Treaty between Prince Iaroslav and the Novgorodians with the German ambassadors (circa 1195), Ibid., № Ib; or between Velikii Novgorod and the Muscovite Grand Princes Basil II and Ivan III, Lübeck, Livonian Order and Norway in Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova 1949, №19, 1435, №26, 1471, №33, 1301, №37, 1323, №39, 1326 accordingly; see also Feldbrugge 2001, 184).

Liubov' was invoked not in the context of power games, but in the context of establishing peaceful and commercial relations with an equal party. The exchange of embassies between Novgorodian prince Andrei and representatives of the Danish king in the city of Revel (now Tallinn) were accompanied by expressions of *liubov'* and *laska* (the latter could be interpreted as caress, kindness or love) aimed at confirming the 'plenipotentiary powers' of ambassadors (Gramoty, № V, year 1302). Similarly, reference to *liubov'* is made when Velikii Novgorod negotiates with the Hanseatic cities about dispute settlement (Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova, № 62, 1423). Princes of Polotsk and Smolensk also appealed to the desired condition of being in *liubov'* when substantiating their proposals to continue commercial relations, paying indemnities or when merely inviting merchants from Riga. As an additional substantiation, they referred to those instances of *liubov'* that their ancestors held with each other (see two treaties between Polotsk and Riga or the treaty between Prince Alexander of Smolensk and Riga, Gramoty, №IIb, circa 1265, №VI, circa 1300, №VIII, circa 1300, accordingly).

Other examples of using *liubov'* can be found in the context of discussing alliances and the allies' obligations in the treaties of Novgorod and Pskov. For example, in the peace treaty between the Novgorodians and Lithuanian Grand Prince Casimir IV, it is proposed 'to be in *liubov'* and not to start conflicts over serfs and debtors' (Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova, № 70, circa 1440-1447). Nearly at the same time, Casimir informs Pskov that he 'is going to be in *liubov'* with the Grand Prince of Moscow' (Ibid., № 335, 1440). These treaties are mainly aimed at providing or, conversely, not providing help to or against a third party, or simply at informing each other about the moves of that party. It is noteworthy that *liubov'* in these Novgorod and Pskov treaties is not used to define the status and titles of the agents; it simply fixes a certain condition in which the parties undertake to observe a number of rules.

This context also turned out to be the one in which the term *druzhba* (which means friendship in contemporary Russian) and its derivatives appeared. In their treaty sent to Kolyvan, the Novgorodians ask the city not to help Sweden and to inform them about the latter's actions; thereby the city would *izdruzhit* ('make a friendly act') to its neighbors (Ibid., № 50, circa 1410-1411). The above-mentioned "be in *liubov'*" syntagma is quite innovatively substituted for "be in

druzhba" in the treaty sent by Pskov to the Livonian Order. In this treaty Pskov informs the magister that Wytowt from Polotsk asked them 'not to be in *druzhba'* with the magister. Having informed him about this, they let the magister know that Pskov is willing that he [the magister] 'would be in great *druzhba* with Pskov'. What is important in this treaty is that its German copy uses in both cases the word "fruntschop" (Ibid., № 334, 1417; the same collection contains a draft of the treaty between Velikii Novgorod and Lübeck from 1317, in which the similar expression *v druzhbe i v pravde* ["in friendship and in fairness"] is registered, Ibid., № 42). This provides a Western equivalent for the concept with which the Novgorodian use of *liubov'* could be compared. Indeed, when the 1423 treaty between Velikii Novgorod and the Hanseatic cities used the term *neliubov'* (which could be translated into contemporary Russian as 'non-love') in regard to the disputes between Velikii Novgorod and the Germans, it was translated in the German copy as 'unfruntschop' (Ibid., № 62, 1423). Against the background of the widely used *liubov'* it is impossible to conclude whether the use of *druzhba* was an aberration or not (Oleg Kharkhordin, for instance, suggests that *druzhba* was a bookish term that was extended into diplomatic usage, as it was natural for Christian princes to love their neighbors; see Kharkhordin 2005, 121; similarly, it could be supposed that in this case *druzhba* rather represented an unconventional usage, while *liubov'* was more traditional and corresponded to the conventions identified here in the chronicles of an earlier period). What is, however, important is that the use of both terms in these Slavonic lands followed more or less the same convention, and that this convention seemingly regulated the use of friendship in northern Europe too. Deprived of excessive Christian connotations and the logic of 'sovereign games', the concept was used for establishing and maintaining diplomatic relations, as well as for regulating commercial intercourse.

One more source of Russian diplomatic vocabulary sprang from another major player in the regions west of Muscovy: the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. A brief look at the body of documents produced in this princedom reveals yet another word for friendship: *priiazn'*. *Priiazn'* and its derivatives (e.g. *priiatel'stvo* and *priiatel'* which is still in common use in some Eastern European countries) then entered into Muscovite diplomatic vocabulary and remained there in the 15th-17th centuries. This, however, does not mean that these terms replaced

liubov' and *druzhba* completely. Quite paradoxically, they became equally legitimate for use in Muscovite diplomatic documents, and in fact sometimes were used in the same document. This observation, however, applies only to Muscovite treaties and letters. The documents originally produced in the Lithuanian princedom usually contained the term *priiazn'*. Nonetheless, the use of *priiazn'* in Lithuanian documents follows the general conventions already described here in the case of *liubov'*.

First of all, diplomatic relations could be established with the constitutive decision on *liubov'/priiazn'*. Thus, 15th-century diplomatic correspondence between Muscovite and Lithuanian boyars testifies that, in order for princely relations to commence, they need to exchange embassies and reach an agreement on *liubov'* and a treaty (see correspondence in RIO, vol. 35, №17-19). Before that, no normal diplomatic relations could take place. After reaching the necessary agreement, Ivan III and the Lithuanian Prince Alexander exchanged copies of a treaty. As the question of territorial belonging was for a long time a contested issue in the Muscovite-Lithuanian relations, it is also clear that *liubov'* is partly involved in the discursive confirmation of territorial sovereignty. The text of Alexander's copy (dating from 1498) makes it possible to argue that the principle of territorial sovereignty is deduced from relations of *liubov'*:

> Alexander … said … if we had taken *liubov'* and treaty with thou, our brother, and thou conceded to us those regions … and it was written in our treaty, that thou, our brother, cannot enter Smolensk lands…
> (Ibid., 247).

Lithuanian sources from the 16th century are very indicative of the constitutive role of *priiazn'* for diplomatic relations. For instance, the treaties sent from King Sigismund Augustus to the Perekop tsar contain appeals to "brotherly *priiazn'*" and "brotherhood and *priiazn'*" almost before every clause. These treaties highlight several contexts in which the use of *priiazn'* is legitimate and expedient. The list could start with the very establishment of relations between the parties and proceed with the request of the Polish king directed to the tsar to 'keep his brotherly *priiazn'* and word'. This could be roughly compared to the international institution of *pacta sunt servanda.* In this respect, it is illustrative that the Polish ambassadors who are sent to Moscow are

instructed to pronounce in a certain sequence that *'priiazn'* between their Graces could contribute to the good of Christianity' (Kniga 1843, vol. II, № 11, year 1577). Another context has to do with the regulation of common foreign policy. The regulation is associated with the conventional formula "priiateliu nashemu *priiatelem, a nepriiateliu nepriiatelyem byl"* ("be friend to our friend, and enemy to our enemy"). This formula is almost identical to the one used in Muscovy, where the word *priiatel'* is substituted for *drug*. The next context, which turned out to be most significant for Pskov and Velikii Novgorod, includes commercial relations (e.g., the rights of merchants, payments of compensations, etc.) (see, in particular, documents №22, 1545, № 31 and №32, 1547-1548, Ibid., vol. I).

The Polish-Lithuanian uses are still closer to the Muscovite ones in their appeals to Christianity and elevated brotherly love. Sigismund thus proposed to Ivan IV to stand against infidels and 'to be in brotherly *priiazn''* (Ibid., № 96, 1558). Lithuanian sources display an abundance of such rhetorical elevated appeals to *priiazn'* with 'brotherly *priiazn''*, 'good *priiazn'* and faithful and truthful brotherhood' and 'great *priiazn''* being most common expressions (for all these examples see document № 22, Ibid.). It is worth stressing that in the light of the Turkish threat similar elevated rhetoric was inherent in the correspondence between the German emperor and the Muscovite tsar. Thus, in the late 16th century the German emperor and Muscovite tsar called each other "Your Love", beloved friend and brother, while "brotherly love" was a constitutive part of nearly every letter and treaty in this correspondence. What is curious and might even seem inconsistent about this correspondence is that it employs all three terms (*liubov', priiatel'stvo* and *druzhba*). The emperor, for instance sends his *priiatel'stvo* and then expresses his desire to have *"priiatel'noi i susedstvennoi liubvi"* ("friendly and neighborly love/friendship") (PDS, vol. 1, 835-838, circa 1581). Later on, the tsar writes that he will never forget the emperor's *'priiatel'skie bratskie liubvi i druzhby"* ("friendly brotherly love/friendship and friendship") (Ibid., 1326, year 1594). In rare German copies of such letters, *druzhba* and *'liubov'* are translated as *Freundtschaft* and *Liebeschaft* (Ibid., vol. 2, 1282). Thus, in this correspondence, which was exchanged in attempts by all parties to build alliances against Turkish and Polish threats, there is a snapshot of different languages and traditions and their inherent justificatory rhetoric.

Despite all the elevation of brotherly love and appeals to common Christian course, these concepts and syntagmas (apart from those that included the good of Christianity) were used in treaties with the Persian shah and Tatar tsars as well (for examples of "brotherly *liubov'* with the Persian shah see PDTS, 3-5; for examples of "holding firm brotherhood and *druzhba* and *liubov'* with the Tatar tsar in the late 15th century see RIO, vol. 41, №№ 3, 26, 46). This highlights an important aspect in the use of the concept of friendship: in the 15th-16th centuries, it seems to have allowed to merge at least two domains of meanings, meaning that the understanding of *liubov'* as a contracted and political relationship was intertwined with the normative imperatives of Christian brotherly love. Such a peculiar combination allowed the agents to use elevated rhetoric to establish, reinforce or confirm their political relations in cases in which their counterparts possessed a similar religious background. The combination also makes intelligible the attempts of some agents to appeal to moral values and imperatives in cases in which the other party breached or in some way damaged their political or commercial relations. In dealings with non-Christian powers, elevated Christian rhetoric would not have persuaded the audience, hence it was basically missing, although the very terms that had immediate links to Christian discourse were still employed in contracting relations with non-Christian powers. This internal tension and differentiation within the convention erodes as a result of the transformations of the 17th century, examined below.

Unification of the convention

In the course of the 17th century, the Muscovite tsars intensified diplomatic contacts with the western powers. Intensified diplomatic intercourse included both the exchange of correspondence and embassies. Apart from the powers already mentioned, the Muscovite tsars received letters from Amsterdam, France, Florence, Venice and others. The documents translated into Russian language in this period still used *priiatstvo, druzhba* and *liubov'* in combination with highly elevated rhetoric. For example, one of the letters from the Venetian doge mentioned "*'prevelikaia i serdechnaia liubov'* ("the greatest hearty love") (PDS, vol. 10, p. 1266). This elevated rhetoric of love and friendship employed in regard to a relatively new actor on the European stage

was once again activated in the above-mentioned contexts and situations (e.g., launching different diplomatic and commercial regimes, as well as in attempts to recruit a new ally).

However, the increased number of translated documents and experiences of dealing with foreign courts and ambassadors provided Muscovite diplomats with grounds and opportunities to reflect on differences in diplomatic norms, the constitution of international treaties and their vocabularies. To use the terms of International Relations constructivists, this was a situation of active learning and the socialization of an emerging actor into an existing "international society". It is instructive to look at the diplomatic vocabulary at such historical junctures to be able to accept Peter Winch's dictum about the role of concepts that shape our experience of the world (Winch 1990, 15). This was indeed the juncture at which different diplomatic terms clashed, were adjusted and transformed to accommodate new political realities. In this situation, Russian interpreters started noticing that their foreign colleagues had difficulties translating Russian documents into their languages. They also learned how to compose international treaties. Even though their chief interest was the way in which foreign rulers presented their titles in these treaties, some also mentioned the way in which relations with other countries were usually described. According to their account, the Western convention of mentioning friendly relations was more modest in elevated rhetoric and used one term only (see the account given by Ivan Sax to the Muscovite embassy, PDS, vol. 10, 667).

Active diplomatic learning at the end of the 17th century and the copying of all the things European under Peter I gradually synchronized Russian and European treaty formulas. As a result of this synchronization, *druzhba* was left as a master noun for amicable international relations, whereas *liubov'* became nearly an incomprehensible concept in the diplomatic intercourse. However, this change did not take place as a sudden rupture; rather, it was a result of minor conceptual changes and replacements. First, in the late 17th century it was already difficult to render into foreign languages three synonymous terms used in the same formula in the Russian copies. Thus, the Russian phrase in the credentials given to the German ambassadors contains "*bratskie druzhby, priiatstva i liubov'*, whereas the German copy skips one of the nouns leaving only "*bruederliche Freundschaft und Liebe*" in the text (STK, vol. 1, № 1, year 1675). Later, all the Ger-

man letters sent to the Russian monarch consistently used either the Latin *amicitia* or the German *Freundschaft*. For instance, in the correspondence concerning the draft of the peace treaty with the court of Brandenburg, Russian diplomats wrote that His Majesty is willing to maintain "*drevniuiu druzhbu i liubov'*" ("ancient friendship and love/friendship") with the Kurfurst forever, whereas the French copy contains only "*l'ancienne amitie*" (Ibid., vol. 5, 42, year 1697). Starting from the second decade of the 18th century, Russian copies of international treaties predominantly contained the term *druzhba*, whereas *priiatstvo* appeared in texts only occasionally and *liubov'* became virtually nonexistent (for more about this process, see Roshchin 2009).

This was also a time when the form of the international treaty was gradually changing. Russian *gramoty* similar to personal letters with inherent justificatory rhetoric were replaced with the modern treaty, in which two or more parties proclaim their desires in the preamble and concrete articles. Hence, all rhetorical attempts to convince the other party and establish an ancient tradition of friendships had to be voiced elsewhere. Moreover, rhetorical devices associated particularly with the concept of *liubov'* and referring to the context of political hierarchy and contested statuses seemed inadequate on the stage of the concert of Europe. Russian diplomatic conventions were thereby corrected to meet emerging European standards, with the subsequent unification of diplomatic formulas and terms. It is noteworthy that John LeDonne in his "geopolitical" interpretation of the foreign policies of the Russian Empire in the 17th-18th centuries notes the role of Russia's friends in Europe. He uses the term "friendly kingdom" in an attempt to differentiate between client societies, buffer states and great powers that could take a positive stance towards Russian policies. The latter, such as Austria, bore the status of friendly kingdoms (LeDonne 2003, particularly 61-67). His use of the term seems to be more analytical than derived from actual diplomatic vocabulary. Such a choice, made for the sake of the argument of the book, however, discriminates against the variety of political options for using the concept as a tool in centralizing Muscovite authority and in integrating this entity into the European system.

Despite this Europeanization of diplomatic standards, friendship (*druzhba*) was still invoked in the context of international recognition, establishing relations and creating quasi-juridical regimes. This article has traced the convention of appealing to friendship when ne-

gotiating and accepting different commercial obligations in the early Novgorod treaties with Hanseatic cities. This convention remained in force even after the initial socialization into a new European system. For example, the appeal to friendship has clear juridical implications in the Kuchuk-Kainarji peace treaty with the Ottoman Empire (1774). According to this treaty, the subjects of the powers in friendship are promised standard taxation, provided with necessary documents, their vessels are guaranteed safe passage in friendly waters, etc. (Pod Stiagom Rossii 1992, 82-84). However, this convention was actualized only during the initial stages of relations between the two parties, or when the parties decided to resume their relations after some interruption or conflict. Later on, appeals to friendship were replaced with treaties of commerce, navigation and others that built specific regimes of international interactions. Nonetheless, the initial or resumed stage of relations, which is about mutual recognition by the parties and a constitutive decision on the type and intensity of these relations, remains indispensably linked to the appeal to friendship. This is quite clearly demonstrated, for instance, in the peace treaties concluded after the Russo-Persian wars in the early 19th century. Thus, in the Treaty of Gulistan (1813), the Shah as a proof of friendship recognized certain khanates and tsardoms as belonging to the Russian Empire, while the Russian Emperor promised to help any son of the Persian shah who would be chosen as his official heir. Similarly, in the Turkmenchay peace treaty (1828) following the next war with Persia, the Russian Emperor in order to publicly prove his "friendly disposition" to the Persian shah "promises to recognize" Prince Abbas Mirza as a successor and heir to the Persian crown and in case of coronation "will consider him a legitimate ruler of that power" (art. VII) (Ibid., 314-324). Thus, having retained its controlling and binding powers over counterparts, friendship facilitated the forging of common regimes, institutions (e.g., external sovereignty) and practices (e.g., recognition) in the community of equal sovereigns.

Conclusion

This study of Russian international treaties has attempted to show that conceptual analysis should be part of any serious efforts to understand the process of state formation and the emergence of internation-

al law and regimes. Apart from the concept of state, an understanding would also be needed of the ways in which different entities are gathered under the umbrella of one sovereign state and the types of justifications put forward in this gathering. As this article has tried to demonstrate, the emergence of the Muscovite state was mediated by the appeals to *liubov',* which turned out to be the concept that helped maintain a hierarchical appanage system and princes of the same kin to the same symbolic realm. Moreover, *liubov'* as well as *druzhba*, *priiazn'* and *priiatel'stvo* were used in the process of molding the international sphere with its own norms of conduct and specific regimes. We have showed that besides territorial sovereignty, *liubov'* and its synonyms were often used to guarantee the rights of merchants trading in other countries. Having appealed to these concepts, the parties could proceed with advancing concrete stipulations of the ways merchants should be treated, the privileges they could be granted, measures to secure their property rights and ways to settle disputes. Thus, friendship may, at first sight, seem like a purely contractual relationship. However, this contract also appears to acquire some major moral and political significance through a complex structure of justifications and elevated rhetoric. Its illocutionary and performative force is achieved through a series of speech acts that link the concept to the past experiences, familial relations and feeling and to Christian morality.

Quite paradoxically, this concept became the one that the barbaric people inherited from their first encounters with the Christian Byzantine Empire, and the one that the Russian Empire had to get rid of much later while being socialized in the new European international system. While the Muscovite use of *liubov'* and other concepts was compatible with traditions existing in the hierarchical medieval Europe, its conventional association with highly elevated and excessive *liubov'* rhetoric, used in turn in the confirmation of sovereign power and inequality, was hard to accommodate in the system based on the principle of sovereignty and juridical customs. Therefore, the Muscovite rulers had to employ other rhetorical strategies to maintain their status and to integrate into the European concert. These strategies gradually led to the unification of diplomatic vocabularies and the formulation of the modern conventions of using friendship (*druzhba*) in European politics.

NOTES

1. I am very grateful to two anonymous referees of *Redescriptions*, Dan Healey, Tuula Juvonen, Kari Palonen and the participants of a research seminar at the European University at St Petersburg for their comments on the various versions of my manuscript.
2. It is worth emphasizing that this article is not trying to indentify the very first origins of the Russian concept of friendship (whether it is Byzantine by nature or imported via the north-western route). Rather this article is interested in different contexts of its appearance and the political relations it helped to describe and promote.
3. As a methodological reservation, it should be emphasized that here the use of such terms as 'state', sovereignty', 'international', 'regime', 'institution' and others should not be interpreted as an anachronistic attempt to see present day institutions in the past, but rather as a cautious analytical attempt to understand the processes and phenomena that predated modern political institutions.

ABBREVIATIONS

Akty – Akty Istoricheskie, Otnosiashchiesia k Rossii.
DDG – Dukhovnye i dogovornye gramoty velikikh i idel'nykh kniazei, XIV-XVI vv.
Gramoty – Gramoty, Kasaiuschiesia do Snoshenii Severo-Zapadnoi Rossii.
Kniga – Kniga Posol'skaia. Metriki Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo.
PDS – Pamiatniki Diplomaticheskikh Snoshenii Drevnei Rossii s Derzhavami Inostrannymi.
PDTS – Pamiatniki Diplomaticheskikh i Torgovykh Snoshenii Moskovskoi Rusi s Persiei.
PLDR – Pamiatniki Literatury Drevnei Rusi.
PSRL – Polnoie Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei.
RIO – Sbornik Russkogo Istoricheskogo Obshchestva.
STK – Sobranie Traktatov i Konventsii.

DOCUMENTS

Akty Istoricheskie, Otnosiashchiesia k Rossii (Historical Documents Relative to Russia), *Izvlechionnye iz Inostrannykh Arkhivov i Bibliotek A. I. Turgenevym.* vol. 2. St. Petersburg: Tipografiia E. Pratsa, 1842.

Dukhovnye i Dogovornye Gramoty Velikikh i Udel'nykh kniazei, XIV-XVI vv. (Testaments and Treaties of Grand and Appanage Princes, XIV-XVI cc.). Moskva-Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1950.

Gramoty Velikogo Novgoroda i Pskova (Treaties of Great Novgorod and Pskov), ed. S. N. Valka. Moscow and Leningrad: Academy of Sciences USSR, 1949

Gramoty, Kasaiushchiesia do Snoshenii Severo-Zapadnoi Rossii s Rigoiu i Ganzeiskimi Gorodami v XII, XIII i XIV veke (Treaties Concerning the Relations of North-Western Russia with Riga and Hanseatic Cities in the XII, XIII and XIV centuries). St Petersburg, 1857.

Kniga Posol'skaia. Metriki Velikogo Kniazhestva Litovskogo (Legation Book. The Metrics of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania), *Soderzhashchaia v Sebe Diplomaticheskie Snosheniia Litvy v Gosudarstvovanie Korolia Stefana Batoriia.* vol. 2. Moskva: Universitetskaia tipografia, 1843.

Pamiatniki Diplomaticheskikh i Torgovykh Snoshenii Moskovskoi Rusi s Persiei (Monuments of Diplomatic and Commercial Relations of the Muscovite Russia with Persia), ed. N.I.Veselovskii, vol. I. St Petersburg, 1890.

Pamiatniki Diplomaticheskikh Snoshenii Drevnei Rossii s Derzhavami Inostrannymi (Monuments of Diplomatic Relations of the Old Russia with Foreign Powers). vol. 1, vol. 2 (1851), vol. 10 (1871). St. Petersburg.

Pamiatniki Literatury Drevnei Rusi.Vtoraia Polovina XVI veka (Monuments of Old Russian Literature). Sost. L. Dmitriev, D. Likhachiov. Moskva: Khudozhestvennaia Literatura, 1986.

Pod Stiagom Rossii. Sbornik Arkhivnykh Documentov (A Collection of Archival Documents), compiled by A. Sazonov, G. Gerasimova, O. Glushkova, S. Kisterev. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 1992.

Polnoie Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei (The Full Collection of Russian Chronicles). Vol. I. Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1926 edition. (1997 reprint). Available at the Rukopisnye Pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi website: http://www.lrc-lib.ru/rus_letopisi/Laurence/contents.htm (accessed on 26.04.2009).

Sbornik Russkogo Istoricheskogo Obshchestva (A Collection of the Russian Historical Society), vol. 35 (1882), vol. 38 (1883), vol. 41 (1884). St. Petersburg.

Sobranie Traktatov i Konventsii, Zakliuchennyh Rossieiu s Inostrannymi Derzhavami (A Collection of Treaties and Conventions Concluded between Russia and Foreign Powers), compiled by F. Martens, vol. 1 (1874), vol. 5 (1880). St Petersburg.

REFERENCES

Constantine Porphyrogenitus. De Administrando Imperio, In G. Moravcsik (ed.), *Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae*, Vol. I. Eng. transl. by R.J.H. Jenkins. Washington: Trustees for Harvard University, 1967.
Feldbrugge, Ferdinand J.M. 2001. The Treaties of Medieval Russia – A Survey. In R. Clark, F. Feldbrugge, S. Pomorski (eds.), *International And National Law In Russia And Eastern Europe. Essays In Honor Of George Ginsburgs.* The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 157-206.
Gedeonov, Stepan 1876. *Variagi i Rus': Istoricheskoe Izsledovanie.* Part I, St. Petersburg.
Kalugin, Dmitrii 2009. Istoriia Poniatiia "Druzhba" ot Drevnei Rusi do XVIII veka. In Oleg Kharkhordin (ed.), *Druzhba: Ocherki po Teorii Praktik.* St. Petersburg: EUSPB Press, 187-290.
Kashtanov, Sergei 1996. *Iz Istorii Russkogo Srednevekovogo Istochnika (Akty X-XVI vv.).* Moscow: Nauka.
Kharkhordin, Oleg 2005. *Main Concepts of Russian Politics.* Lanham: University Press of America.
Lavrovskii, Nikolai 1853. *O Vizantiiskom Elemente v Iazyke Dogovorov Russkikh s Grekami.* St. Petersburg.
LeDonne, John P. 2003. *Grand Strategy Of The Russian Empire, 1650-1831.* Cary, NC: Oxford University Press, Inc.
Lesaffer, Randall 2002. Amicitia in Renaissance Peace and Alliance Treaties. *Journal Of The History Of International Law,* Vol. 4, 77-99.
Levin, Eve 1989. Sex and Society in the World of the Orthodox Slavs, 900-1700. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
Malingoudi, Jana 1997. Russko-Vizantiiskie Dogovory v X v. v Svete Diplomatiki. *Vizantiiskii Vremennik,* Vol. 57, Is. 82, 58-87.
Palonen, Kari 2003. *Quentin Skinner: History, Politics, Rhetoric.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Paradisi, Bruno 1951. L'amitie internationale: les phases critiques de son ancienne histoire. *Recueil des Cours de l'Academie de Droit International,* 78, 329-377.
Roshchin, Evgeny 2009. Poniatie "Druzhba" v Kontexte Mezhdunarodnykh Otnoshenii. In Oleg Kharkhordin (ed.), *Druzhba: Ocherki po Teorii Praktik.* St. Petersburg: EUSPB Press, 291-423.
Skinner, Quentin 1970. Conventions and the Understanding of Speech Acts. *The Philosophical Quarterly.* Vol. 20. № 79, 118-138.
---------- 2002. *Visions of Politics. Vol. I: Regarding Method.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sverdlov, Mikhail 2003. *Domongolskaia Rus': Kniaz' i Kniazheskaia Vlast' na Rusi VI-Pervoi Treti XIII v.* St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt.
Winch, Peter 1990. *The Idea Of A Social Science: And Its Relation To Philosophy.* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.