

CHURCH AND STATE IN KYIV-RUS' -- 988-1240

BY

OLEH SHAWARSKY

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Department of History
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

July, 1994



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-315-99062-7

Canada

Name Oleh Shawarsky

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

0581 U.M.I.

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administration	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0280
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0313
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0323
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0416
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Palynology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0566
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnology	0428
Operations Research	0796
Plastics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451



CHURCH AND STATE IN KYIV-RUS' -- 988-1240

BY

OLEH SHAWARSKY

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1994

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publications rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

DEDICATION

*This work is dedicated to my parents,
Peter and Nadia (nee Scherbluk) Shawarsky,
whose undying love and support placed me on the road to learning.*

*Appreciation is also extended to the
Consistory of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada
for allowing me to typeset this work on their computer.*

Special thanks to God, Who was always with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface		I
Abbreviations		III
Chapter 1	<i>Introduction</i>	1
Chapter 2	<i>The Sources</i>	7
Chapter 3	<i>Christianity in Rus' Prior to Official Conversion</i>	29
Chapter 4	<i>Volodymyr and Yaroslav</i>	45
Chapter 5	<i>The Bonds of Unity and its Demur</i>	85
Chapter 6	<i>Conclusion</i>	107
Appendices		117
	I: <i>Metropolitans of Kyyiv</i>	118
	II: <i>Velyki Knyazi of Kyyiv</i>	119
	III: <i>Church Statute of Volodymyr the Great</i>	123
	IV: <i>Church Statute of Yaroslav the Wise</i>	125
Bibliography		129

PREFACE

To the best of my knowledge, the following is the first work of its kind, that is, an analysis of Church-state relations in Kyiv-Rus'. Some justification is required for such an undertaking.

As is the case of most historical works it must serve some purpose. There is the antiquarian aspect, knowledge for the sake of knowledge. There is the other aspect of the historian's desire of making some breakthrough, adding to our knowledge on a certain subject. With this the immediate question is why has this subject never been pursued. I must confess that there have been times when I have questioned the validity of such a study. Nonetheless, my prime consideration in undertaking on this task was justified by the new political reality in Eastern Europe. The dynamic changes that have occurred since 1985 have delivered new nations on to the political world stage, nations that heretofore had their self-determination hindered and their respective histories nearly stripped away.

Thus this thesis is written with the intention of providing a new understanding of medieval Eastern Europe. The aftermath of August 1991 has left the peoples of the former Soviet Union searching for their past with a sense of mistrust towards the *history* forced upon them. The Soviet system has damaged many aspects of life, its greatest effect being upon the individual. When a society is formed by lost individuals who are searching for something concrete they

usually start their search with their earliest recorded history. The answers that are commonly asked are "how is it we have come to this point?" and "where do we go from here?". Perhaps this work will be able to provide some answers to such questions.

This study is especially important to the Churches in Eastern Europe. Controlled for years by the tsarist and communist regimes, the Church is also searching for answers since it faces new challenges. Most important is its role in respect to the newly formed states. We can only hope that the search leads to some workable arrangement.

Note on Transliteration

With regards to transliteration of Slavic words I have tried to remain consistent, using the Ukrainian pronunciation of names, places and terms with a few exceptions. For example: Київ (Ukrainian) and Киев (Russian) has been transliterated as Kyiv (Київ). In the past the usual practice has been the application of the Russian pronunciation and transliteration. My reasons for opting for the Ukrainian does not require justification for it is just as valid as the previously held practice. Also the soft sign (Ь) has been transliterated with the use of an apostrophe (example, Ольга - Ol'ha).

ABBREVIATIONS

- AICBS* Acts of the International Congress of Byzantine Studies. (Actes du Congrès international des études byzantines).
- ASEER* The American Slavic and East European Review. Now titled *Slavic Review*. Seattle and New York.
- ByZ* Byzantinische Zeitschrift. Munich.
- Byz* Byzantion. Bruxelles.
- Byzsl* Byzantinoslavica. Prague.
- CSHB* Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae. Bonn.
- DAI* Constantine Porphyrogenitus. *De Administrando Imperio*. Edited by Gy. Moravcsik and translated by R.J.H. Jenkins. Washington, 1967.
- DOP* Dumbarton Oaks Papers. Washington.
- DOS* Dumbarton Oaks Studies. Cambridge and Washington.
- ES* Ezhemesiachnye sochineniia k pol'ze i uveseleniiu slyzhashchie. St. Petersburg.
- HSNPL* Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature. Cambridge.
- HUS* Harvard Ukrainian Studies. Cambridge, Mass.
- IORIAS* Izvestiia otdeleniia russkago iazyka i slvesnosti imperatorskoi adademii nauk. St. Petersburg.
- IZh* Istoricheskie zhurnal. Moscow.
- IzvTOIAE* Izvestiia Tavricheskogo obshchestva istorii, arkheologii i etnografii. Simferopol'.
- JGO* Jahrbucher fur Geschichte Osteuropas. Breslau and Munich.
- MGH* Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Berlin and Leipzig.
- OSP* Oxford Slavic Papers. Oxford.
- PG* Patrologia cursus completus. Series graeca-latinae. Paris.
- Pi* Problemy istochnikovedennia. Moscow.
- PL* Patrologia cursus completus. Series latina. Paris.
- PR* Polish Review.
- PSP* Problemy sotsialisticheskogo prava. Moscow.

- PSRL* Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei. St. Petersburg (Petrograd and Leningrad).
- RIB* Russkaia istoricheskaia biblioteka. St. Petersburg (Petrograd).
- RPC* *The Russian Primary Chronicle -- Laurentian Text.* Translated and edited by Samuel Hazzard Cross and Olgerd Sherbowitz-Wetzor. Cambridge, Mass., The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953.
- RR* Russian Review.
- S* Slavia. Prague.
- SEER* The Slavonic and East European Review. London.
- Sp* Speculum. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- SS* Soviet Studies.
- S-S* Scando-Slavica. Copenhagen.
- SU* Studia Ucrainica. Ottawa.
- TODrl* Trudy Otdela drevnerusskoi literatury. Institute literatury, Akademii Nauk. SSSR. Moscow and Leningrad.
- UZLU* Uchenye zapiski Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Leningrad.
- UQ* Ukrainian Quarterly.
- VDI* Vestnik drevnei istorii. Moscow.
- VV* Vizantiiskii vremennik. St. Petersburg (Leningrad).
- ZI-FFISPU* Zapiski istoriko-filologicheskago fakul'teta Imperatorskago S. Petersburgskago Universiteta. St. Petersburg.
- ZNTSh* Zapysky Naukovogo tovarystva im. Shevchenka. L'viv.

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

The period of history that has come down to us known as Kyyiv-Rus' (988-1240) has been, to a large degree, thoroughly examined. The two events that historians and even the average reader of history usually make reference to are, the Baptism of Rus' (988) and the destruction of Kyyiv by the Mongols (1240). Are we to imply then that in the two hundred and fifty years nothing else happened between these two dates? Or, are we to conclude that these 250 years do not merit examination?

Investigation of the period has been, by-and-large, left to Russian and Ukrainian scholars -- both home and abroad. Their forays are, however, usually replete with general comments and observations, an outcome largely due to fulfilling political needs and sentimental desires. For the most part Russian historians view this period as but a preamble to the rise of Muscovy. Ukrainian scholars by contrast, while glorifying the age of the Kyyivan *knyazi*,¹ tend to skirt this epoch in order to pay more attention to fashionable issues of *Kozachyna* (the Kozak period), the nineteenth century national revival and twentieth century Soviet Ukraine.

¹ I will use the term *knyaz'* to designate the kings of Rus'. The word *knyaz'* is the reference made to these kings in the chronicles. The commonly used translations for *knyaz'* (i.e., prince, duke) are inappropriate. The word *knyaz'* originates from the Scandinavian word *kuning* (*king*). *Knyaz'* is the singular while *knyazi* is the plural. When discussing the civil discord that existed between the *knyazi* the term "inter-princely war" will be used.

In the field of Rus' Church history the best survey thus far is that of E.E. Golubinsky.² This work is vital because it contains much primary source material translated into the Russian vernacular.³ However, noteworthy as this work is, it is more a narrative history as is the Metropolitan Makarii's.⁴ In both one notes an occasional bias towards certain questions. For example, the question of the appointment of the Metropolitan of Kyiv by the Patriarch of Constantinople, or, more precisely, the notion that foreign metropolitans, Byzantine-Greek for the most part, occupied that office.⁵

We are also indebted to M. Hrushevsky⁶ for his careful examination of this period. To date the first two volumes of his history are an exemplary inquiry into the Kyivan period. But, he too tends to overlook the ecclesiastical aspect of Ukrainian history, a defect which arises from his political disposition which was, to a large degree, anti-clerical.

² E.E. Golubinsky, *Istoria russkoy tserkvi*. Volume. I. Edited by C.H. Van Schooneveld. The Hague, Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 1969.

³ *Pamiat' i pokhvala ravnoapostol'nomu kniazuiu Vladimiru (A Eulogy and Praise of the Equal-to-the Apostles, Prince Volodymyr)*, *ibid.*, pp. 238-245.

⁴ Makarii, Metropolitan of Moscow. *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*. I. Second edition. Revised. St. Petersburg, 1868.

⁵ *op. cit.*, pp. 257-332.

⁶ M. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukraïny-Rusy*. Volumes I-II. New York, Published by Knyho-Spilka, 1954.

Although remarkable for their insights into the period, all three tend to ignore the relation between Church and State and largely for the reasons cited.

Historians have in the past tended to focus their attention on such questions as to who was the first metropolitan of Rus', and, where the first metropolitanate was located? On the other hand such questions are not part of the scope of the *Povist' vremennykh lit (PVL)*. The authors/editors of this work state their intention in the preamble, namely: i) from whence did the Rus' polity originate; ii) who first began to rule as *knyaz'* in Kyyiv, and; iii) how did the Rus' polity come into being.⁷ The single-minded pursuit of these over-worked issues has largely displaced any minute examination of the Church-state relationship. Moreover, the scope of their analyses have focused on the questionable Rus' political and ecclesiastical dependency upon the Byzantine Empire. Many nineteenth century writers took on this question because of their particular sense of "nationalism". Consequently it would be culturally distasteful for them to write anything that depicted their ancient forefathers as being politically or ecclesiastically dependent upon the Empire. The irony is that Western scholarship has in the main merely been to reinterpret the same questions posed by Slavic historians.

⁷ *PSRL*, I, col. 1. See *The Russian Primary Chronicle -- Laurentian Text*. Translated and edited by S.H. Cross & O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzer. Cambridge, Mass., The Medieval Academy of America, 1953, p. 51, hereafter to be referred to as the *RPC*.

Twentieth century scholars have preferred to focus on particular problems of this period, specifically upon, the questions of what occurred in 988, the political background to the conversion of Rus', and, political ties with Byzantium among others. All of these are vital avenues of debate. Unfortunately they are examined *ad nauseam*.

With the rise of the newly-independent states of the former Soviet Union, we stand at a historiographical crossroads. The old Soviet historiography will have to undergo drastic reevaluation and reinterpretation. Soviet ideology which dictated the lines and interpretation of historical study will also require to be arduously scrutinized. Caution must needs be exercised when inspecting the Soviet work so as not to label all of it complacent or, to overlook real historical breakthroughs that have been achieved. We in the Western world have also been influenced by the Soviet and, prior to that, pro-Russian historiography. For the most part, we have looked at the Kyiv-Rus' history exclusively as an introduction to Russian history. To a great degree all historical works have been coloured by the contemporary political environment. Now that the "Russian" bias has been somewhat identified and extracted from this period, it will perhaps be approached with a clearer understanding.

The immediate impression that materializes when discussing Church-state relations is that of conflict. As in the case with journalists, many historians' tend to report or analyze only those events where altercations occur. If

there are few or no conflicts, is the period worth attention? In Kyyiv-Rus' the political conflicts have been exceedingly well delineated even while the role of the Church during the inter-princely warfare has been largely neglected.

In short, there has been a want of attention to a period that is vital to East European history. Frequently various groups within these nations argue that their nation has a stronger claim. Such ideas or claims are not part of this work. My task here is not to put forth any new theories or to repudiate past interpretations, but, to portray as clearly as possible a period that has been long neglected although, that portrait may at times appear somewhat nebulous, it will be firmly anchored in the available evidence.

Upon examination of this work the reader may wonder what is meant by the word "Rus'." The word itself has a number of meanings, political, ethnic, geographical and ecclesiastical. It is a term that changes or expands its meaning from decade to decade. The first understanding of the words refers to the Varangian (Norse) invaders who established colonies in Ladoga.⁸ Other references to the word "Rus'" implies nation, an East Slavic nation. The geo-political implies the territory over which the *knyazi* held political preponderance. By the late tenth century Rus' takes on the meaning of the assimilated *nationes* of Slav and

⁸ The *Annales Bertiniani* gives it an ethnic connotation, specifically, Swedish.

Varangian. Finally, the ecclesiastical meaning of Rus' is the Church which encompassed the territory of old imperial Rus' with its primate in Kyyiv.⁹ When reading this thesis, the reader must keep in mind these various comprehensions of Rus', depending upon the time frame and the context in which it is used.¹⁰

⁹ *PSRL* I, cols. 11, 28-29; *RPC*, pp. 55, 63. The chronicler lists the Christian *nationes* that belong to the Slavic rite community of Rus' and which pagan *nationes* were politically subordinate to Rus'.

¹⁰ See G. Knysh, *Rus and Ukraine in Mediaeval Times*. Winnipeg, Published by the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), pp. 7-24.

Chapter Two

THE SOURCES

The problem facing the historian when dealing with any facet of medieval history is the reliability of the sources at his disposal. These may vary in the amount and view of their information because the compilers/editors were faced with the problem of selectivity. With hagiography the choices were simple and straightforward. However, the genre of chronicle writing demanded greater attention. Greatly influenced by hagiography, because the compilers were clerics, chronicle writing assumed a genre all its own.

The same problem emerges with the history of Kyiv-Rus'. There is an added problem, however, that being, what constitutes a source? Historians have pointed to various materials in their works and have identified them as sources. Even sixteenth century chronicles (e.g., *The Nikonian Chronicle*) have been so designated.

The chronicles at our disposal: the *Povist' vremennykh lit'*¹, the *Hypatian*², the *Nikonian*³ and the *Novgorodian*⁴ all contain the same basic information with alterations and

¹ Hereafter to be referred to as the *PVL*. See *PSRL, I. The Russian Primary Chronicle -- Laurentian Text*. Translated and edited by S.H. Cross & O.P. Sherbowitz-Wetzer. Cambridge, Mass., The Medieval Academy of America, 1953. Hereafter to be referred to as the *RPC*.

² *PSRL, II. Litopys Rus'kyi*. The Hypatian Text translated into Ukrainian by Leonid Makhnovetz. Kyiv, Published by "Dnipro", 1989.

³ *The Nikonian Chronicle*. Translated by Serge A. and Betty J. Zenkovsky. 3 volumes. Princeton, New Jersey, The Kingston Press, Inc., 1984. Hereafter to be referred to as *Nikon*.

⁴ *The Chronicle of Novgorod, 1016-1471*. Translated by R. Michell & N. Forbes. New Introduction by W.K. Hanak. Reprint, Hattiesburg, 1970. Hereafter to be referred to as *Novgorod*.

additions. All stem from some original source now lost and they contain accurate information. But for the longest time philologists were sceptical about their reliability. Recent studies have shown much of the information contained in them to be accurate, although transmitted in a poetic style. It is this poetic style that has often confused historians and prompted them to disregard the authenticity of the information gathered in them.

The importance of the chronicles is that they provide us with our basic information on the what, where, when and who of events. The "hows" and "whys" are usually omitted or, given a religious interpretation. But one thing must be kept in mind when reading these chronicles. They were written by monks who were not concerned with *historia per se* but with events they considered to be important and which satisfied the goal of the *PVL* as stated in its preamble. Despite these limitations and, often limited information, we are still able to illustrate a picture of the age they embraced.

The main difficulty with our chronicle sources, with regards to Church-state relations, is that their purpose is not concerned at all with that issue. Their goal is to relate only what is proclaimed in its preamble. Therefore, it follows that most of our primary source material is not relevant to the relationship between the clergy and the ruling dynasty. At times this leaves one grasping at straws for information about the subject being examined.

Doubtless the lack of primary source information regarding Church-state relations is the main reason why historians have tended to skirt this issue. Nonetheless a minute examination of the materials available can lead the student to certain conclusions. We must remain cautious however, so as not to arrive at some fantastic theory or self-indulgent supposition. It is better and safer to attempt to speculate based merely on what our sources provide and not to extrapolate through the application of conjecture. Conjecture is a useful tool that should only be used when all else fails -- and even then, it must be applied moderately.

Any understanding of the Kyyivan period must begin with an analysis of the available primary sources. These include chronicles, political-religious polemics, hagiography, law codes, and church statutes. The obstacle here is that one must struggle through a seemingly endless sea of disinformation, or, more precisely, information written with a religious purpose. Moreover, without being acquainted with the sources the average reader could very well find himself trapped in a labyrinth where fact and fabrication are difficult to distinguish. The major failing of the chroniclers is that they viewed events from a Kyyiv-centered perspective. This places the historian in a difficult position of having to discover what was transpiring in other parts of Rus' since what occurred in Kyyiv was not always reflective of affairs in the rest of Rus'.

Povist' vremennykh lit (PVL)

The chronicles contain a profound admixture of tradition, legend, didactic, moralization and even historical facts. In fact, there is a "snow-ball" method of compilation, each author/editor adding and deleting where his predecessor left off. In most cases authorship is difficult to determine and, conventional titles have been substituted to distinguish them (e.g., *Laurentian Text*, *Hypatian Text*). The greatest tragedy is that none of the component parts have survived in the original. The earliest copy that has survived is the *Lavrents'kyj* (*Laurentian Text*) or "copy", named after the monk Lavrentij who copied it and ascribed his name to it at the end (c. 1377). The second oldest source is the *Ipats'kyj* (*Hypatian Text*) found in a monastery near Kostroma. The *Hypatian* text dates from the end of the fourteenth or beginning of the fifteenth century. The main part of both these chronicles is the *PVL* (*повиcть временных лит*). The date of the *PVL's* composition is supposed to have been between 1113 and 1116. As it appears in the *Laurentian* text it is known as the *Codex of Sylvester*. In this codex the chronicle ends in 1110. At that point a paragraph is inserted with Sylvester's colophon (Hegumen of the Church of St. Michael in Kyyiv, 1116). This insertion is written in the first person singular. It appears that the Abbot Sylvester took the *PVL*, copied and edited it and brought the chronicle up-to-date.

The *PVL* is a work that has been considerably altered. The editors made extensive use of several sources, both Rus' and non-Rus'. The non-Rus' sources include the *Chronicle of George Hamartolos*, the *Life of St. Basil the New* (a tenth century Byzantine work), the *Revelation of St. Methodios of Patras*, the so-called *Pannonian Lives* from which the editors derived knowledge of SS. Cyril and Methodios and the Holy Scriptures. The Rus' sources utilized were the texts of treaties between the Empire and Rus' (tenth century), a series of traditions dealing with the migration of the Slavs, Slavonic customs, a narrative about the Avars (Obry), the legend of St. Andrew, the Kyj tradition, the legend of Knyaz' Oleh (which has its counterpart in Norwegian), Knyahynya Ol'ha's act of vengeance upon the inhabitants of Iskorosten (which also has counterparts in various literatures), the account of the founding of Pereyaslav, and a report of the siege of Bilhorod by the Pechenegs. Lastly, the editor was able to give his own personal description of the events between 1093 and 1113.

The Kyyivan authors were notwithstanding able to add their own versions. In the conversion story, the Slavonic rite in Rus' is ignored. But a later entry in the *PVL* (A.M. 6545 -- A.D. 1037) pictures Yaroslav the Wise as a supporter of the Slavonic rite. The Cyrillo-Methodian origin of the Slavonic rite is described in another context of the *PVL* (A.M. 6406 -- A.D. 898).

The Hypatian Chronicle

This work is divided into three parts: i) *PVL (Povist' vremennykh lit) (Tale of Bygone Years)*; ii) *Kyyivs'kyj litopys (Kyyivan Chronicle)*, and; iii) *Halyts'ko-Volyns'kyj litopys (Galician-Volynian Chronicle)*. There is a problem in attempting to pinpoint its date and compilation. Most have it originated at the beginning of the fourteenth century. An allied issue is the "when" and "how" each part of the chronicle was compiled.

With the advent of Volodymyr Monomakh the chronicles take on a new perspective. Henceforth they were written under royal patronage.

The years encompassing 1117-1199 form the second part of the *Hypatian* text -- *The Kyyivan Chronicle*. This part was compiled and completed in Kyyiv by the hegumen Moses (c. 1199) who used various materials from previous decades including an entire group of princely and monastic-clerical writings. The central part of these writings concerns the account of "Mstyslav's clan" (c. 1146-1168). The likely author was the Kyyivan noble, Petro Boryslavych, who concurrently appears on the pages of the chronicle as a character well informed concerning princely affairs and as an diplomatic officer. The chronicle was continued probably by the archimandrite Polykarp of the Crypt Monastery. In the Kyyivan redaction there was also material from the *Chernihiv* and *Vladimir-Suzdal Chronicles*.

The third part of the chronicle is the *Galician-Volynian Chronicle*. The first part of the *Galician-Volynian Chronicle* (up to 1260) deals with events primarily in Halychyna (Galicia) and *knyazi* of that area. The second part (1261 and on) deals with Volynia and the respective *knyazi* of that province.⁵

The chronicles also provide us with propaganda supplied by the warring Rus' dynasties. The senior members of each princely branch would engage in having "personal" chronicles written concerning their military campaigns and diplomatic missions. When a *knyaz'* conquered Kyiv, he would deliver his "personal" materials to the Pechers'ka Lavra or the Vydubychi St. Michael's Monastery for inclusion into the *Kyivan Chronicle*. Thus the years 1146-1157 are looked upon from three different perspectives, namely, from the perspective of the three warring dynasties.⁶

The Chronicle of Novgorod

The *Chronicle of Novgorod* contains of extensive references to Church affairs. Its *Synodal Version* reports events

⁵ Unfortunately the *Galician-Volynian Chronicle* omits events from 1199-1204 and in its place discusses the death of *Knyaz'* Roman Mstyslavych. The chronicle ends in 1292. This was a totally separate compilation. No less than five authors/editors worked on this section. The first redaction (c. 1255) is the narration up to 1234; the second continuation up to 1265(6) but written c. 1269; the third written up to 1285 and written in 1286; the fourth up to and written in 1289; the fifth in 1292. The first two parts deal with *Knyaz'* Danylo Romanovych and his deeds in Kholm. In the third and fourth redactions Volodymyr Vasyl'kovych is the main character perhaps written in Peremyshyl' or by a native of Pins'k. See *Litopys Rus'kyi*, pp. vii-viii.

⁶ Two examples may illustrate this point: One successful candidate, the Monomakhovych Vsevolod Yuriyovych (who later made a career in the north and received the surname "Great-Nest") was allowed to rule in Kyiv for only five weeks in 1173; a representative of the Ol'hovychi, Svyatoslav Vsevolodovych, lasted only twelve days (1174) in his first tenure as *knyaz'*.

from 1016-1471 and it is almost certain that it was compiled by clerics. Monasticism played a strong role in this area and many references are made to the founding of monasteries by *knyazi*, merchants or hegumens.

Unlike the *PVL* the *Synodal Text* of the *Chronicle of Novgorod* does not begin with the dispersal of Noah's sons or the origin of the Rus'. Absent also is the early East Slavic regional history as also contacts with Scandinavia and Byzantium, the missions of SS. Cyril and Methodius, the Rurikide foundation of the Kyyivan state and, the acceptance of Christianity by Volodymyr the Great. However, a portion of these events were included in the Commissioned Text of the *First Chronicle of Novgorod*. The *Chronicle of Novgorod* is at pains to stress Novgorod's independence from Kyyiv. A number of passages attest to this (e.g., anno 1245, Michael of Chernihiv going to the Mongol Khan Batu), especially those dealing with ecclesiastical matters.

The *Chronicle of Novgorod* also underlines this independence in reference to Novgorodian contacts with Byzantium. For instance, the religious hierarchy of Novgorod eventually became independent of the Kyyivan Metropolitanate and by 1165 elected its own archbishop. The confirmation of this office was usually obtained from the Patriarch of Constantinople or by his successor. To further Novgorod's con-

tact with the Empire references are made to gifts presented to Novgorod from the imperial city (anno 1186).⁷

The fall of Constantinople to the Latin Crusaders (1204) is given substantial attention in the *Chronicle of Novgorod*, much of which is borrowed from a Byzantine work by Nicetas Choniates. Constantinople's fall was important to Novgorod for it meant that the disruption of Novgorod-Byzantine relations might could bring about Novgorod's ecclesiastical submission to Kyiv.

The *Nikonian Chronicle*, composed in the sixteenth century, may have used earlier manuscripts that were, as Zernov states, "equal or of greater authority than the ...[Laurentian Text]... but which have since been lost."⁸ But the compilers of the *Nikonian Chronicle* also incorporated narratives of doubtful origin.

Sermon on Law and Grace

Metropolitan Ilarion's *Sermon on Law and Grace*,⁹ dedicated to Volodymyr, is the oldest form of a Rus' *vita*, being one of the earliest original Rus' compositions. It, too, is a vital historical document for it gives one of the earliest views of a Rus' cleric concerning the nature of Church and State in Rus'.

⁷ *Novgorod*, p. 32.

⁸ N. Zernov, *op. cit.*, p. 124.

⁹ See *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*. Translated with an introduction by Simon Franklin. Cambridge, Mass., Distributed by Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1991, pp. 17-26.

For the purposes of our study Metropolitan Ilarion's (1051-54?) *Sermon on Law and Grace* is a most vital source. It may be considered as a Rus' political ideological treatise. I do not contend that Ilarion proposed some political ideology as to the proper relationship between the secular and ecclesiastical authorities. That was unnecessary because Rus's embracement of Byzantine Christianity also denoted the partial adoption of the Byzantine blueprint for the delineation of Church and state. Granted that the *Ve-lyki knyazi*, Volodymyr Svyatoslavych and Yaroslav Volodymyrovych, applied their own innovations (i.e., tithe system and the *Church Statutes*), but the evidence in the *PVL* and other sources do not disclose anything that would suggest an attempt to create some political innovation and, rejection of the Byzantine model.

What is the main thesis of Ilarion's *Sermon*? It is simply that Rus's free acceptance of Christianity from Byzantium made it a part of the community of Christian nations -- a more western concept -- "in which all nations were equally chosen, regardless of when and from whom they received their Christian faith."¹⁰ Thus, according to Ilarion, Rus' too became an equal with the other Christian nations by its conversion.

¹⁰ A. Baran, "State and Church Ideology in Ilarion's *Sermon*," in O.W. Gerus and A. Baran (eds.), *Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, 988-1988*. Winnipeg, The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1989, p. 75.

The other theme running concurrently through the *Sermon* is the concept of *Isoapostolos* ("Equal to the Apostles") and its association with Volodymyr. In medieval Christian tradition the *Isoapostolos* was the highest attainable position of importance one could achieve of Christ's Grace. The *Isoapostolos* was not converted by a clergyman or missionary but by a personal calling or miracle of Christ Himself. Ilarion was anxious to link Volodymyr with Constantine just as Eusebius linked Constantine with Augustus. This explains why Ilarion calls Volodymyr the "Second Constantine". It also explains Ilarion's reasoning to Volodymyr's right to exercise authority. In the *Encomium* this authority is also extended to Volodymyr's descendants.¹¹ Thus, like the emperor in Constantinople, the Velykyj Knyaz' also claimed the right to rule his subjects as Christ's vicar and earthly administrator and who is responsible only to God.

The *Sermon*¹² is divided into four constituent parts: (i) On Law and Grace; (ii) How Grace spread and reached Rus'; (iii) the *Encomium* to Volodymyr, and; (iv) the prayer.

"The aim of the sermon is to explain and celebrate the status of the newly converted Rus' in sacred and temporal history, and to proclaim the miraculous achievement of Volodymyr. Ilarion takes the argument through three stages, narrowing the focus at each stage: first the theoretical, then the

¹¹ *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*, p. 17.

¹² Its authentic title is *Concerning the Law Given to Moses and the Grace and Truth Which Came by Jesus Christ, and How the Law Departed and Grace and Truth Filled All the Earth and Faith Spread Forth to All Nations Even unto Our Nation of Rus', and an Encomium to Our Kagan Volodymyr by Whom We Became Baptized, and a Prayer to God from All Our Land*. Ilarion's *Sermon* was probably written while Ilarion was still a priest, sometime between 1047 and 1050.

historical, then the personal; from theology, through history (universal>local), to biography."¹³

The *Sermon* has been construed to be anti-Bulgarian and anti-Byzantine in nature. Priselkov holds this interpretation because Bulgaria is not mentioned in the *Sermon*.¹⁴ Because Bulgaria is not mentioned, the "freedom" proclaimed by Ilarion meant its "slavery" or subordination to the See of Ohrid. The argument is difficult to refute, but most probably false.

The anti-Byzantine thesis is the more popular interpretation of the *Sermon*. This thesis unfolds the notion that Ilarion is "promoting the concept of equality for the Rus' among Christian nations -- surely a challenge to Byzantine imperial ideology, according to which the Byzantines regarded themselves as superior to, and the rightful rulers over, everybody else."¹⁵ Those that hold the premise that Ilarion was anti-Byzantine in his *Sermon* have oversimplified Byzantine imperial ideology, Ilarion's *Sermon*, and its relationship to Byzantine tradition. It would be incorrect to believe that the Empire was determined to subject every nation including Rus'. Byzantine imperial ideology was more for those who lived within the Empire and those nations that had settled onto previously held imperial territory (i.e.,

¹³ *op. cit.*, p. xxxi.

¹⁴ M.D. Priselkov, *Ocherki po tserkovno-politicheskoi istorii Kievskoi Rusi X-XII vv.* St. Petersburg, 1913, p. 97-98.

¹⁵ *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*, p. xxxiv.

Bulgarians, Serbians, Croats, Lombards, Franks). No Byzantine source mentions any attempt to subject the Rus' Church in any way. Besides, Constantinople openly aided Yaroslav in his cultural program. The standard was the Constantinopolitan model. Ilarion's exegesis is Byzantine in tradition. Rus', in contrast to Bulgaria, does not demand a separate patriarchate.

The *Sermon* was not written for a Byzantine audience but for the converted of Rus'. Ilarion was writing to the "people of God", to the Kyivan elite who ruled a state that was still largely pagan, exonerating them for having accepted Jesus Christ. The daily problem that faced the *knyaz'* and the priest was not Byzantine ideology, but the paganism that largely dominated the periphery of Rus' society.

Pateryk of the Pechers'ka Lavra (Paterikon)

Another source which is often overlooked is the *Paterikon* of the Kyivan Pechers'ka Lavra.¹⁶ The *Paterikon* (*Pateryk*) is a collection of *vitae*. The *Pateryk* is taken from translated literature, denoted from a Church Slavonic translation of a Greek work described by Patriarch Photius as *Andron hagion biblos* (*The Book of Holy Men*). Unlike its prototype the *Pateryk* deals only with members of the Pechers'ka Lavra.

¹⁶ The monastery of the Dormition of the Theotokos. Antony, a native of Rus', who lived on Mt. Athos (Studite monk), returned to Rus' and began a colony of monks living under the Studite rite.

The authors/editors of the *Pateryk* included Simon, later bishop of Vladimir-Suzdal', and Polikarp (both early thirteenth century compilers). The *Paterikon* (*Pateryk*) does not contain full texts of *Lives*, but only segments that provide examples of Christian devoutness. Its style is based on earlier *Paterikons*,¹⁷ that is, tales of devout saints ending in a strong moral statement. The two authors of the *Kyyivan Paterikon*, Bishop Simon and the monk Polykarp, modelled their work on those prototypes. They also used sources which have since disappeared.¹⁸

The contents of the *Pateryk* deals with the founding of the monastery, miracles, translation of relics, and lives of the individual monks. However, there are also segments which deal with contacts between leading members of the cloister and the *knyazi* of Kyyiv. Whether the discourses are factual is not as important as the ideas presented in the discourses (i.e., the views held by certain members of the cloister in regards to Church-state relations).

The important feature of the *Pateryk* is the number of monks of the Pechers'ka Lavra that later became bishops. But none became metropolitan of Kyyiv. We are not informed how candidates were chosen as bishops. We do know that the metropolitan of Kyyiv was formally appointed by the Patri-

¹⁷ Specifically, the *Paterikon of Sinai* (fourth century), *Paterikon of Skete* (seventh century) and the *Paterikon of Rome* (seventh century).

¹⁸ Specifically, the *Rostov Chronicle*, *Chronicle of the Kyyivan Caves Monastery*, *Life of Antony*, and others).

arch of Constantinople -- the exceptions being Ilarion and Klyment Smolyatych. In the case of those monks of the Lavra who later became bishops, we do not know whether their consecrations were at the instigation of the *knyazi* or by the request of the populace. The logical answer is that when a bishopric was vacant a request was sent to the *Velykyj Knyaz'* and the metropolitan to fill the vacancy. The *Velykyj Knyaz'* would then allocate a candidate or leave it to the discretion of the metropolitan to find a suitable candidate. The best source pool for candidates was the Pechers'ka Lavra. The monks maintained a higher cultural-educational standard than anyone else in Rus' and were members of the indigenous population. Requests coming to Kyiv seem very plausible considering that it was the metropolitan See. This practice of using Kyiv as a source pool for bishops probably continued until the respective bishoprics had candidates worthy of consecration.

Hagiography

Recent scholarship has shown that hagiography possesses different genres. But hagiography is also based on biographical fact. Whether the narratives were absolutely accurate did not enter into question at the time of their composition. Reznowski states:

[The medieval reader accepted the *Life of the Saint* as] an *exemplum* illustrating the heroic imitation of Christ. The Saint's life was in fact a combination of entertainment in the proper sense

of the word, instruction, hope and an ideal of heroic action. The medieval reader was quite undisturbed to see or hear the saint imitating the miracles of Christ or undergoing exactly the same trials as other saints.¹⁹

Other works such as the *Pamiat' i pokhvala ravnoapostol'nomu kniazii Vladimiru* (A Eulogy and Praise of the Equal-to-the-Apostles Prince Volodymyr)²⁰ provides information concerning the early Rus' Church and the nature of Volodymyr's power. This eulogy is attributed to the monk Yakiv (c. 1074), a member of the Pechers'ka cloister in Kyiv.

It is difficult to determine the circumstances that promoted the cult of SS. Borys and Hlib. However, it developed between 1015 and 1072, that is between the date of their martyrdom and the time of the translation of their relics. We are informed that the ruling dynasty played an important role in the development of this cult. In the 1020s Yaroslav Volodymyrovych translated the relics of Hlib from Smolensk to Vyshhorod. In 1072 Izyaslav Yaroslavych along with his four brothers, metropolitan George of Kyiv, the bishops and monastics translated the relics into a wooden church in Vyshhorod. Later, Volodymyr Monomakh

¹⁹ Lorne Reznowski, "The Paterikon of the Kievan Caves Monastery." In *Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, 988-1988*. Edited by Oleh W. Gerus and Alexander Baran. Winnipeg, Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1989, p. 82.

²⁰ *Pamiat i Pokhvala Ravnoapostol' nomu Kniazii Vladimiru*, cited in E. Golubinsky, *Istoria russkoy tserkvi*. Volume I. Edited by C.H. Van Schooneveld. The Hague, Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 1969, pp. 238-245. See *Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*. Translated with an introduction by Paul Hollingsworth. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1992, pp. 165-181.

translated them into a stone church in the same city (1115).²¹

Speculation as to the reason why the *Lives* were composed, and the cult's eleventh century popularity and origin has been interpreted in various fashions. Some argue that Yaroslav was using the cult for a political purpose; either to strengthen his position on the Kyivan throne,²² others claim he wished to legitimize his dynasty,²³ or to maintain Rus' ecclesiastical autonomy vis-a-vis Byzantine cultural hegemony. Still others maintain it was to strengthen Christianity in Rus'.

What is often overlooked by these scholars is that the such cults must be placed in their historical and social context. Their *vitae* were written primarily to serve a religious purpose. Their style is Byzantine hagiographic because the writer knew no other. The *vitae* were not written to serve any political purpose, their composition was to serve a religious goal. Doubtless a political purpose might

²¹ *PSRL*, I, col. 154 and *PSRL*, II, col. 208; *RPC*, p. 154.

²² See J. Fennell & A. Stokes, *Early Russian Literature*. London, 1974, p. 28.

²³ O. Pritsak, *The Origin of Rus'*. Volume One. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1981, p. 37.

be found in this *Encomium* if one searches long and hard enough.²⁴

Rus'ka Pravda

Prior to the codification of Rus' laws, there developed some concept of law and justice. Rules of social behavior based on tribe, community and guild and, especially after c. 988, the Church evolved. There seems to have been a similarity in the evolution of law in medieval Rus' and what had earlier occurred in Germanic lands, in that, once coming into contact with the more civilized Christian-Mediterranean world there arose a need to coordinate old tribal custom and to compile legal manuals.

Under Yaroslav the Wise (1015-1054) a revised compilation in Rus' emerged -- the *Rus'ka Pravda* (RP). Scholars have pointed out the resemblance between the *Rus'ka Pravda* and Western Germanic law codes (i.e., *Lex Salica* and *King Alfred's Wessex Laws*). Some twenty years after Yaroslav's death, his sons issued additional ordinances to reinforce their authority. This version of the RP is known as the

²⁴ If the *Tale and Passion and Encomium of the Holy Martyrs Borys and Hlib* was written with a political purpose then that purpose would be to discourage civil war between the *knyazi*. The idea of divine retribution falls upon *knyaz'* Svyatopolk for the murder of his brothers. However, Borys and Hlib are praised for their peaceful resistance to their brother, Svyatopolk, and that they readily handed themselves over knowing that they would be killed. A twelfth century sermon about the saints reinforces the same idea: "For these saints [Borys and Hlib] ... did not desire power or transient glory, nor to oppose their brother, the accursed Svyatopolk. These two saintly brothers accomplished God's commandment. When their accursed brother Svyatopolk longed to seize their power and end their lives, they did not resist him, [but] imitated the Lord not only in their life of innocence, but also in truth, purity, mildness, humility, and patience." This can hardly be construed as a political treatise. See P. Hollingsworth, *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1992, p. 222-223.

Short Version while the latter is called the *Expanded Version*.²⁵

The *Short Version* consists of two parts: Yaroslav's *Pravda* and the *Pravda* of his sons. The chronicles state that Yaroslav granted the city of Novgorod an important charter (1016 and 1019).²⁶ Whether these charters were similar to the *Pravda* is not known. However, the *Rus'ka Pravda* and the *Novgorod Charter* must be connected in some way for, in Article 1 of the *Pravda*, guarantees are granted for equal consideration to both Kyivites and Novgorodians.²⁷

The three main factors in the development of Rus' legislation were the *knyazi*, the Church and the people (*viche*). Vernadsky states: "The influence of these three factors may be felt -- to a different degree in regard to each -- both in the organization of the courts and in the court procedure."²⁸ In the *Short Version* we find a cooperation between the princely courts and the people's institutions. Within a

²⁵ There are eleven existing manuscript copies of the *Short Version* of the *Rus'ka Pravda*. Most of the known copies date from the eighteenth century, and they all seem to reproduce the text from an identical earlier copy. Thus only two copies from the fifteenth century need to be taken into consideration. These are known as the *Academy Copy* and the *Archaeographic Copy* is the closest to the original. There are over ninety existing manuscripts of the *Expanded Version*. The earliest is the *Synodal Copy* (dated 1282). However, it is the *Trinity Copy* (*Troyits'kyj spisok*) of the fourteenth century which is considered closest to the original by a majority of scholars. The copies differ in content, vocabulary and spelling.

²⁶ Yaroslav's victory over his brother Svyatopolk greatly depended upon the assistance of the Novgorodians. The Novgorodians naturally expected some reward for their services (i.e., political and civil guarantees).

²⁷ G. Vernadsky, *Medieval Russian Laws*. New York, Octagon Books, 1965, p. 26.

²⁸ *ibid.*, p. 9.

generation after Yaroslav (d. 1054) the *Expanded Version* and the princely courts have become the dominant institution.²⁹

The *Pravda* of Yaroslav's sons was a work intended to supplement their father's legislation. The new code was approved at a meeting of the three *knyazi* and their councilors.³⁰ The object of the new legislation was to enforce the authority of the *knyazi*. So, the *Pravda* of Yaroslav's sons is not a general code of law but a series of princely ordinances issued for a specific purpose. The compilation and declaration of these ordinances must have been generated by opposition to princely authority in Kyiv and other districts.³¹

Church Statutes of Volodymyr and Yaroslav

The *Rus'ka Pravda* is not the only legacy of legislation left by the *knyazi* of the Kyivan period. There are various charters, statutes, and ordinances issued by various *knyazi* of various principalities. Unfortunately, the only ones of this latter category are statutes issued for the benefit of

²⁹ There is evidence to suggest that *Pravda* dates to earlier than the first-half of the eleventh century. Although it is true that Yaroslav codified the old customary laws and added a few ordinances of his own. However, the *Rus' Customary Law (Zakon Russkii)* is mentioned in the *PVL* in regards to the Russo-Byzantine treaty of 945. Therefore, the customs themselves date prior to 945. See *PSRL*, I, cols. 50-52; *RPC*, pp. 73-78. Cf. Leonid Biletsky, *Rus'ka pravda j istoriya ii tekstu*. Edited by George Knysh. Winnipeg, The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1993.

³⁰ *PSRL*, I, cols. 181-182; *RPC*, pp. 154-155.

³¹ There were riots in Kyiv in 1068. As a result of this revolt, Izyaslav Yaroslavych, Grand Prince of Kyiv, was forced to briefly relinquish his throne. The issuing of the *Pravda* may have been an attempt on the part of the *knyazi* to ensure that the events of 1068 would not repeat themselves. See *RPC*, pp. 146-149. In the *Pravda* of Yaroslav's sons greater attention is paid to the protection of *knyaz's* servitors and estates. For this reason it has been compared to the *Capitularia* of the Frankish kings.

the Church, bishops and monasteries. The cornerstone of these statutes are the *Church Statutes of Volodymyr and Yaroslav*.³² Under these statutes certain groups of the population were placed under the exclusive authority of the Church courts.

In Rus', all peoples were subject to the Church courts in ecclesiastical affairs. Church people, as defined in the *Church Statute of Saint Volodymyr* and the *Church Statute of Yaroslav*,³³ included not only clergy but every type of attendant, as well as peasants and labourers on Church estates. All of these people were subject to the litigations of the Church courts. Cases involving churchmen and laity were jointly tried by Church and civil authorities.

At first glance of the *Rus'ka Pravda* and the *Church Statutes* one would generally conclude that two sets of laws had been issued for the secular and ecclesiastical members of Rus' society. However, upon closer inspection, one sees that the formulation of these two law codes were made at the instigation of the ruling *Velykyj Knyaz'*. Keeping in mind Ilarion's *Sermon* and the authority designated to Volodymyr and his descendants, the purpose of the Church Statutes becomes apparent. In both cases the *Velykyj Knyaz'* acts as lawgiver. In the *Church Statutes* where it refers to what is

³² S.V. Iushkov (ed.), *Pamiatniki russkogo prava*. Volume I. Moscow, 1952, p. 237-46. See Appendices III and IV.

³³ B. Dmytryshyn (ed.), *Medieval Russia: A Source Book 900-1700*. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1967, p. 51-54.

proper conduct in Church matters and the turning over of certain cases to the Church courts is indicative of the type of position Volodymyr endeavoured to occupy. It is Volodymyr (the *Velykyj Knyaz'*) that determines "what is proper conduct" in Church affairs and that the allocation of certain cases to the Church courts was totally at his discretion. It would be erroneous to assume that the *Velykyj Knyaz'* was the source of law -- the composition of the *RP* contradicts this assertion -- but what is certain is the administrative role of the *Velykyj Knyaz'*. His office as administrator included the right to codify existing laws and to enact new laws (i.e., *Church Statutes*) for the benefit of his subjects. His concern for and right to interfere in secular and ecclesiastical matters is indisputable. In other words, he fulfills the duty of Christ's vicar.

Chapter Three

CHRISTIANITY IN RUS' PRIOR TO OFFICIAL CONVERSION

Before discussing Church-state relations in Rus' a look at the pre-conversion Church is necessary. For this purpose an analysis of the Byzantine sources is vitally important. Most of our knowledge of Christianity in Rus' prior to the official conversion stems from these sources. These sources shed some light on the nature of the pre-conversion Rus' Church.

During the Middle Ages, the Crimea was the Mediterranean world's bridgehead to Eastern Europe. More importantly, it served as the Empire's listening-post on the Eurasian steppe. Christianity may have spread to the Jewish communities there as early as Apostolic times.¹ Furthermore, during the early Middle Ages the Crimea served as a place for exiles fleeing persecution.² Sevchenko postulates the possibility that Christianity may have spread north from the Crimea before the ninth century. The hinterland of Ukraine could only have come into closer contact with Byzantium by the existence of a force that could control the Dnieper waterways. The Rus' could very well have been one of the agents which permitted Christianity to make inroads into north-eastern Europe.

¹ Ihor Sevchenko, "The Christianization of Kievan Rus'." *PR* V, no. 4, (1968), p. 29.

² Exiles such as Pope Martin I and iconodule monks.

At some time prior to 833, the Khazars sent an embassy to the Emperor Theophilos (829-842) requesting the Byzantines to build for them a fortress on the left bank of the Don River.³ Theophilos sent Petronas the *camateros* to build this fortress, which was completed in 833 and was named Sarkel ('white-house'). On Petronas' return to Constantinople he advised Theophilos to convert Kherson (the Byzantine outpost in the Crimea) into a *thema* (military district governed by a *strategos* -- military governor). Indeed the Byzantines and Khazars had good reason to militarize the Crimea and the lower Don regions. The fortification program implied an impending threat. The Magyars could not have been this potential enemy because they were the subordinate allies of the Khazars. Among the peoples who could have possibly posed a danger at this time were the Rus'.⁴

In the *Annales Bertiniani*,⁵ under the year 839, reference is made to Byzantine envoys and Rus' representatives together at the court of Louis the Pious:

There came the Greek envoys sent by Emperor Theophilos...He also sent with them certain men who said that they [their tribe] were called Rhos, and that their king, known as "chacanus" [khagan], had dispatched them to him [the Byzantine Emperor Theophilos], for the sake of friendship, as they

³ Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De Administrando Imperio*. Greek text edited by Gy. Moravcsik. English translation by R.J.H. Jenkins. Washington, D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Center, 1967, Chapter XLII, p. 183. Hereafter to be referred to as *DAI*.

⁴ I use the term Rus' in this sentence to mean Varangians (Vikings, Norsemen, Northmen).

⁵ *Annales Bertiniani*. Edited by G. Waitz (MGH), Hanover, 1883, 20., cited in D.J. Geanakoplos, *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization seen through Contemporary Eyes*. Chicago & London, University of Chicago Press, 1984, p. 349-350.

had asserted. He [Theophilos] asked...that the emperor [the western emperor, Louis the Pious] allow them to return home across his possessions since the roads by which they had come to Constantinople were cut by wild and ferocious tribes and he [Theophilos] did not want them to face danger in case of returning by the same route. The emperor [Louis] investigated diligently the cause of their coming and discovered that they were Swedes by origin.

So, the first contact between Byzantium and the Rus' was probably prior to the raid on Constantinople (860). The ferocious people reported in the *Annales Bertiniani* were in all likelihood the proto-Hungarians, because the Pechenegs only appeared *circa* 896 when they finally drove the Magyars and Onogurs out of the steppe region.

The *PVL* describes the settling of the Varangians in Eastern Europe.⁶ They first established colonies in the north amongst the Finns and Slavs of that area and as a result Ladoga's importance began to take shape in the first half of the ninth century.

As trade with Byzantium increased, the Norsemen (Varangians) found it imperative to establish fortresses further south along the Dnieper (i.e., Kyiv). Kyiv already became an important commercial centre prior to the Varangian arrival.⁷

⁶ *PSRL*, I, cols. 19-21; *RPC*, p. 59-60.

⁷ See N.K. Chadwick, *The Beginnings of Russian History*. Cambridge, 1946, pp. 12 ff. Chadwick rightly points out that the centres where the Norsemen settled must have been prospering prior to their advent; therefore the reason why they were attracted to these areas.

The story related in the *PVL* on the coming of "Askold and Dyr" to Kyiv rests on solid ground, even though it claims that they had first settled in Novgorod.

The earliest conversion of the Rus' is usually attributed to either Patriarch Photius or Ignatius. Photius, in a homily, notes that the Rus' were "an obscure nation, a nation of no account."⁸ This homily was inspired by the Rus' raid on Constantinople in 860.⁹ The *PVL* records this attack and avers that a number of the raiders accepted baptism.¹⁰ This connection between the Empire and the Rus' is also related in Photius' encyclical letter to the eastern patriarchs. In his words:

...the Rus' (in Greek *Rhos*), a nation famous for its inhumanity and warlike spirit, left their pagan ways for Christianity, accepted a bishop and those who were once enemies became friends of the Empire; that is to say they became allies and pledged military aid.¹¹

In the *Vita Basilii*, the biographer, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, claims that it was the Emperor Basil I who persuaded the Rus' into concord.¹² It also adds that Ignatius

⁸ Photius, *The Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople*. English translation by Cyril Mango. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1958, Homily no. IV, p. 98.

⁹ The raid appears to have been an attempt on the part of the Rus' to force the Empire into a trade agreement favourable for the Rus'. The devastation recorded by Photius may have been exaggerated, but from what we know of Viking raids, and that the Empire did enter into a trade agreement, it must have been very persuasive.

¹⁰ *PSRL*, I, col. 21; *RPC*, p. 60.

¹¹ Migne. *Patrologia Graeca*. Volume cii, cols. 736-37, cited in M Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Rusy-Ukrainy*. Volume I. New York, Published by Knyho-Spilka, 1954, p. 405. [trans. O.S.]

¹² "...the nation of the Rus' being barbaric and pagan, gave him [Basil] clothing of gold, silver and silk, and established with them concord and friendship, and instigated a conversion to Christianity."

sent the Rus' an archbishop. This seems to indicate that Ignatius continued the work that Photius had initiated.

The next raid on the Empire is reported to have occurred some time between 907 and 911.¹³ It is reported to have been led by *Knyaz' Oleh* (Helgi). Once again a peace agreement was reached wherein the Rus' appear to have dictated the terms.¹⁴ But another raid led by *Knyaz' Ihor* (Ingvar) in 944-945, was not so successful.¹⁵ A new treaty, dictated by the Byzantines, is noteworthy for the vital new element it introduces. A clause stipulates that a number of Ihor's representatives swear to uphold the treaty by the Christian God:¹⁶

If any inhabitant of the land of Rus' thinks to violate this amity, may such of these transgressors as have adopted the Christian faith incur condign punishment from Almighty God in the shape of damnation and destruction forevermore. If any of these transgressors be not baptized, may they receive help neither from God nor from Perun [the Slavic god of thunder]: may they not be protected by their own shields, but may they rather be slain by their own swords, laid low by their own arrows or by any of their own weapons, and may they be in bondage forever.

Theophanes Continuatus, Book V, chapter 97, pp. 342-43, cited in M. Hrushevsky, *ibid.*, p. 404. [trans. O.S.]

¹³ *PSRL*, I, col. 31; *RPC*, p. 64-65; R.J.H. Jenkins, "The Supposed Russian Attack on Constantinople in 907: Evidence of the Pseudo-Symeon." *Sp* XXIV (1949), 403-406.

¹⁴ *PSRL*, I, cols. 32-37; *RPC*, p. 65-68.

¹⁵ The defeat was largely due to the Byzantine use of the "Greek fire".

¹⁶ *PSRL*, I, cols. 47-48; *RPC*, p. 74

The true founder of the Kyivan imperial state was Oleh. His elimination of earlier dynasts united the north and Kyiv. He also continued the "fusion of the Varyag [Varangian] upper class and the Slavonic elements along friendly lines."¹⁷ The process of conversion was introduced slowly through Rus' commercial ties with Byzantium, the West and Khazaria. The peace treaties of Oleh (911) and Ihor (944) established a peaceful way for *Knyahynya Ol'ha* (Helga), Ihor's widow, to travel to Constantinople to receive baptism.¹⁸

Ol'ha, it is clear intended to spread Christianity throughout Rus' by her personal example and not by royal edict. But her attempt to convince her son Svyatoslav to accept Christianity was unsuccessful. The *PVL* records Svyatoslav's refusal: "How shall I alone accept another faith? My followers will laugh at that."¹⁹ Svyatoslav's rejection of Christianity may be interpreted in two ways: (i) his acceptance of the new faith might have jeopardized his position with his *druzhyina* (retainers, personal retinue) who were, for the most part, made up of pagans, or; (ii) because to their previous contacts with the Byzantine Empire, the

¹⁷ F. Dvornik, "The Kiev State and its Relations with Western Europe." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Fourth Series. Volume XXIX, 1947, p. 33.

¹⁸ Her baptism is attested too by both the *Povist'* and the *Book of Byzantine Ceremonies*. See *PSRL*, I, cols. 60-61; *RPC*, p. 82; *De Caerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*. Book II. Edited by I.I. Reiske, Bonn, 1829-30, p. 571. cited in A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World*. London, Oxford University Press, 1973, p. 499.

¹⁹ *PSRL*, I, col. 64; *RPC*, p. 84. Svyatoslav is reported not to have discouraged anyone from accepting Christianity but mocked those who did.

Rus' understood what the acceptance of baptism implied politically. The *PVL* asserts that Svyatoslav may have realized or knew of the Byzantine "world-view", that is, that they viewed their emperor as Christ's Vicar. If Svyatoslav had completely understood this principle he would certainly not want anything or anyone to minimize his authority, especially when there is evidence in the *PVL* to show that Christians in Rus', prior to Volodymyr's conversion, looked upon the emperor as their protector.

Svyatoslav's unwillingness to compromise his power by accepting Christianity was a futile attempt to turn back the wheels of time. Toynbee points out:

Evidently, in the last quarter of the first millennium of the Christian Era, the inhabitants of the Steppe and of its barbarian hinterlands were feeling that, in order to hold their own among their more highly civilized neighbours, they must adopt one or other of the higher religions that these impressive neighbours of theirs professed. The nomads and the sedentary barbarians felt this whether they were still on the warpath or had suffered a recent military reverse (as the Rus' had in 860 and 971, and the Magyars in 955) or had settled down and gone over to the defensive (as the Khazars had by the 860s and the Volga Bulgars by 922).²⁰

Byzantium was not the only state which established contacts with the fledgling Kyyivan empire. The first fully

²⁰ A. Toynbee, *op. cit.*, p. 437. Toynbee feels that the conversion of the Khazars and the Uigurs to Judaism may have been a shrewd ploy to consolidate their political independence, for both peoples converted to a religion that was not as established religion of any great political power. With the establishment of Judaism in Khazaria and Christianity in Rus' (definitely in the latter half of the ninth century), the Volga Bulgars were left with no other choice but to adopt Islam so as to "maintain their separate identity *vis-a-vis* two adjacent powers which were each more powerful than the Volga Bulgars."

recorded contacts between the Kyyivan state and Western Europe occurred during Ol'ha's regency. Ol'ha appears to have sent an embassy to Otto I of Germany with a request to send a bishop to Kyyiv.²¹

Otto too had designs on extending his power eastward into Slavic territories. We have to recall only the reason for Otto's foundation of Magdeburg to understand his Slavic policy. Ol'ha's embassy must have appeared to Otto as a Godsend, bringing him one step closer to the accomplishment of his ambition.²²

Before Otto's envoy, bishop Adalbert, could reach Kyiv, Ol'ha was forced, according to some historians, to hand over the reins of power to her son Svyatoslav who was not inclined towards either Byzantine or Western Christianity. During his reign a new danger in the shape of Islamic culture and faith began to emerge in the north. Svyatoslav's campaigns against the Volga Bulgars brought him into direct contact with Islamic civilization and he is said to have been so charmed by their culture that he was prompted to

²¹ Dvornik points out that many Russian historians have scoffed at the authenticity of the *Annals* that report this episode. However, the report is genuine. As Dvornik states: "...this move becomes understandable if we remember that the Scandinavian elements in Kiev [Kyyiv] were suspicious of Byzantium's political and religious influence, and that Olga [Ol'ha] tried to allay their apprehensions and intended to neutralize Byzantine interference by closer contact with the Roman Empire as renewed by the king of Germany, Otto I." *ibid.*

²² See F. Dvornik, "The First Wave of Drang nach Osten." *Cambridge Historical Journal*, VII, 1943, pp. 129 ff.

move his capital to Bolgar (located in the middle Volga area).²³ This danger was, however, averted by Byzantium.

Rather than rule from a throne, Svyatoslav attempted to govern from a saddle. Thus began a long series of campaigns against the Silver Bulgars in the Upper Volga region, the Khazars and eventually the Empire. The *PVL* states that he undertook to establish his capital at Preslav on the Danube, but that his efforts were thwarted by the Byzantines and the Pechenegs.²⁴ He then ventured to rule without trying to unite the heterogeneous elements within his control and it too failed. His death at the hands of the Pechenegs brought a formal end to these plans.²⁵ His passing also signified the last of the true "Viking" kings to sit upon the Kyyivan throne.

At the time of Svyatoslav's death in 972 his three sons ruled Rus' as his lieutenants. Yaropolk, the eldest, held Kyyiv, Oleh the Derevlian land, while Volodymyr held Novgorod. The *PVL* records that war broke out between the brothers at the instigation of their uncle Sveineld who enticed Yaropolk to attack his brother Oleh. Oleh perished in the ensuing battle and when Volodymyr heard of his brother's death he fled to Scandinavia and returned the next year with a mercenary force. By treachery Volodymyr had his brother

²³ See A.P. Smirnov, "Ocherki po Istorii drevnikh Bulgar." *Trudy Gosud. Istor. Muzeya*, XI, Moscow, 1940, pp. 55-136.

²⁴ *PSRL*, I, cols. 69-74; *RPC*, pp. 87-90.

²⁵ *PSRL*, I, col. 74; *RPC*, p. 90.

murdered at a peace conference and established himself as sole ruler of Rus' (980).²⁶

After the assassination of Yaropolk, Volodymyr's mercenaries (Varangians) demanded tribute from the city of Kyiv.²⁷ Volodymyr rejected this importunity and instead chose from among them men he could trust who he appointed as governors of cities. The unplaced Varangians left for Constantinople to offer their services to the emperor. Concurrently, Volodymyr sent word to Constantinople warning the emperor of the Varangians and the threat they posed to the Empire.²⁸ Two interpretations may be put upon this communication: (i) he was actually warning the Empire of an impending danger, thereby maintaining good relations with the Empire, or; (ii) he wished to make sure that these Varangians, whom he considered as undesirables, were unable to return to his domain.

Whatever Volodymyr's reasons, his domestic policy *vis-a-vis* Christianity was not, initially, favourable. The *PVL* claims that he erected pagan idols in Kyiv and Novgorod. Indeed his actions seem to indicate that he was intent upon instituting paganism as a state religion. There were movements against Christians -- the martyrdom of the Varangian

²⁶ *PSRL*, I, cols. 74-78; *RPC*, pp. 90-93.

²⁷ *PSRL*, I, col. 78; *RPC*, p. 93.

²⁸ *ibid.* Perhaps this is a confusion of the events of 980 and 988.

Christian and his son,²⁹ being one such manifestation, while Volodymyr's disposition towards Christianity was not initially receptive. Elsewhere in the tenth century paganism was slowly losing out to Christianity. By the 980s Rus' was surrounded by nations that adhered either to Christianity, Islam or Judaism.

Volodymyr's expansionist program may have made him realize the importance that a religion might have in the process of unification. The story in the *PVL* concerning Volodymyr's search for a religion for his people may, it seems, only be legend as most scholars now tend to believe.

His attempt to consolidate his realm by gathering all the gods of Rus' and establishing a pantheon in Kyiv³⁰ was doomed and he then resolved to try monotheism. There is, as Grekov states, "a clear-cut expression of the class attitude towards the old and new religion." This refers to the much later incident in Novgorod [c. 1068] when pagans attempted to kill the bishop. But the bishop confronted the crowd along with the *knyaz'* and his *druzhyna* (retainers) and said: "He who wishes to place his faith in the soothsayer, let him follow him and whosoever believes, let him come to the Cross."³¹ The *knyaz'* and his *druzhyna* sided with the bishop while the people sided with the soothsayer. Even the chro-

²⁹ *PSRL*, I, col. 83; *RPC*, pp. 95-96. There were even reported instances of human sacrifice. However this is more a Norse pagan element than Slavic.

³⁰ *PSRL*, I, col. 79; *RPC*, p. 93.

³¹ *PSRL*, I, col. 179-181; *RPC*, pp. 153-154.

nicler admits that Christianity took 60-70 years after 988 to make deep inroads into Rus' peripheries.³²

The *PVL* presents a very thorough account of Volodymyr's conversion. Under Volodymyr Rus' begins to take shape as a state. What activates this statehood is Volodymyr's conversion.³³

What conclusions can we draw from these events. First, the origin of the imperial Rus' state was a merchant oriented one. The Norsemen were Europe's most renowned plunderers as their expeditions attest (Ireland in 820, Iceland in 874 and Normandy in 911). Their movements into Eastern Europe were also devastating, but they soon learned that more could be gained through trade than by force of arms. The Varangian chieftains, along with their *druzhyna*, imposed public order according to their own as well as local customs and laws. These leaders remained relatively independent of one another and Varangian administration was usually carried

³² For the disintegration of Kyiv see B.D. Grekov, *Kiev-Rus*. Translated by Y. Sdobnikov. Edited by Dennis Ogden. Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, pp. 642-649.

³³ The *PVL* states that Volodymyr accepted baptism in Kherson by a Byzantine bishop. Some argue that the hierarchy of Kyiv was established by Rome rather than Byzantium. The main argument for this theory is derived from the *Annals of Lampert*. The *Annals of Lampert* relate that in 973 a Rus' embassy attended the last diet of Otto I in Quedlinburg. This is perhaps a reopening of negotiations on the part of Yaropolk, Svyatoslav's eldest son and successor. In the *Nikonian Chronicle* mention is made to a embassy from the pope to Volodymyr. The theory that Rome was the baptizer of Rus' is absurd. The Roman embassy to Kyiv at the time of Volodymyr's expedition against Kherson is probably factual. However, the embassy was not sent by the pope but by the Empress Theophano, wife to Otto II of Germany. Otto II was in Rome at this time and had special interest in Volodymyr's conversion since his wife was a Byzantine *knyahynya* and cousin to the *Porphyrogenita*, Anna, Volodymyr's future wife. Since Theophano had experience in marrying a semi-barbarian her sympathies extended to Anna. Hence she sent Anna relics of saints and words of consolation. "If the pope had anything to do with the embassy, it was only to send his blessing to the [Rus'] duchess and her husband and to endorse the message of the Empress Theophano." F. Dvornik, "The Kiev State and its Relations with Western Europe." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Fourth Series. Volume XXIX, 1947, p. 35.

out in a casual fashion. The winter months witnessed the *knyaz'* and his *druzhyna* travelling through the countryside collecting tribute, arranging delivery of tradeable commodities and dispensing justice. Pipes summarizes the situation: "Authority was exercised on the model of a pre-modern commercial enterprise, subject to restraint neither by law nor popular will."³⁴

The Varangian *knyazi* failed however to work out an orderly system of succession. In the ninth and tenth centuries the problem was resolved by force: *knyaz'* fell against *knyaz'* with no regard for kinship. After the death of Yaroslav the Wise in 1054, his heirs, for a brief period, maintained the system left to them³⁵, but were unable to resolve its flaws at the council of Liubech in 1097.³⁶

Whichever lands the Norsemen journeyed to, and in various instances conquered, there was an initial reluctance to fully assimilate with the local population. Nevertheless, within two to three generations they tended to acquiesce in the ways of the indigenous society. By the year of Yaroslav's death the Varangian signatories had become Slavicized.³⁷ A vital factor in this process of assimilation was the Rus' adoption of Byzantine Christianity. With it came

³⁴ Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974, p. 31.

³⁵ Specifically, the words attributed to Yaroslav the Wise to his sons on his deathbed.

³⁶ In Europe at this time, primogeniture was a system that was only in practice in the Byzantine Empire and in some areas of France. See Hans Eberhard Mayer, *The Crusades*. Translated by John Gillingham. Oxford, University Press, 1985, p. 23.

³⁷ The Normans of France at this same time had adopted Frankish customs, speech and religion.

the liturgical use of Church Slavonic which became the literary language of Rus'. The use of Slavonic crept into all documents whether clerical, lay or judicial. The Scandinavian signatories of the treaties between Rus' and the Empire (i.e., 912 and 944) were later Slavicized in the chronicles (c. 1116).³⁸

Very little is known of the pre-conversion Rus' Church. We do not know its organization nor do we know of any bishops by name who served her faithful nor is it known for certain where the episcopal See was located. All we have in terms of information is that Photius sent Rus' a bishop. Moreover, it is not known whether other bishops were sent after the first bishop's death. However, we can come to certain conclusions: i) the process of Christianization was slow and sporadic; ii) the constant contact between Byzantium and Rus' brought on the slow infiltration of Christianity into Rus'; iii) conversion in Rus' remained solely on a personal level not on an official one; iv) Christianity lived side-by-side with Rus' paganism in relative peace prior to the official conversion; v) the political forces in Rus' (i.e., the *druzhyna* and the *viche*) had drastically changed in favour of official Christianity by Volodymyr's time.

The changes in the *druzhyna* played a decisive role in the Christianization of Rus'. The first conversion of the

³⁸ Thus Helgi becomes Oleh, Ingvar become Ihor and so on. Two other factors in the Slavicization of the Varangians was intermarriage with the Slavic population and allowing Slavs into the ranks of the *druzhyna*.

Rus' (860) brought a small Christian element into the *druzhyna*. By Ihor's reign the number of Christians in the *druzhyna* must have been substantial enough to have received mention in the Rus-Byzantine treaty of 944. The regency of Ol'ha continued this process of Christianizing the *druzhyna*. Ol'ha's diplomatic mission to Constantinople³⁹ unquestionably augmented the Christian faction's influence. It is possible that Svyatoslav's accession to the throne altered the official attitude towards Christianity since it appears he recruited his *druzhyna* from the pagan Varangian element.

A power vacuum was created with Svyatoslav's death (972/3). The pagan Varangians were either in Novgorod or killed in Svyatoslav's Bulgarian campaign. Kyiv and the other southern centres already boasted a substantial Christian population. When Volodymyr came to power about 980 he had a considerable problem. His supporters in the civil war were mostly pagan Scandinavian mercenaries who had reached a largely Christian Kyivan region.

By the time of Volodymyr's rise to power, Rus' had been dangerously polarized. Ol'ha championed the Christian cause while her son, Svyatoslav, adopted the opposite course. This polarization manifested itself by a more Christianized southern area to the more rural pagan north. The retainers

³⁹ Her entourage consisted of over 100 people consisting of members of Svyatoslav's *druzhyna*, one cousin of Ol'ha's, eight other of her kinsmen, twenty diplomats (*apokrisiarioi*), forty-three commercial counsellors (*pragmateftai*), the priest Gregory, two interpreters, six servants of the diplomats and Ol'ha's personal interpreter. See *De Caerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*, p. 594-598 cited in A. Toynbee, *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and his World*, p. 504-505, footnote 6.

who had helped Volodymyr placed their hopes in him who would bring back the "good days" and restore their former estate.

Volodymyr's policy was unlike that of his predecessors. An acceptance of the true situation was essential. The traditional relationship of Varangian *versus* Slav needed to be altered. The process of Varangian assimilation, as well as the spread of Christianity was long underway. The expansion of the Rurikide state needed something to unify this largely heterogeneous society. Volodymyr had long decided to unite his state. The question remained by what means? Military conquest was an option that had proven unreliable and unproductive. Initially an attempt at official state paganism was tried but failed. Monotheism was the only other course left.

The political circumstances in Rus' had greatly changed between the early ninth century and Volodymyr's rise to power. Rus' power had been consolidated into a single polity, much to the credit of Svyatoslav's military exploits. The forces of Kyiv's *druzhyna* and *viche* had by this time been infiltrated by a pro-Christian element. Whether or not this faction represented a substantial number we have no way of ascertaining. However, we do know that its influence upon Volodymyr pushed Rus' into the Christian *oikumene* and, more importantly, onto the stage of European politics.

Chapter Four

VOLODYMYR AND YAROSLAV

Scholars have pointed to various reasons why Volodymyr accepted Christianity. Their explanations vary from the politically pragmatic to the religious. The hagiographers of the eleventh century have compared Volodymyr to Constantine the Great. The historian may also compare them, for both remain and shall always remain enigmas.

Some writers have attempted to prove the legendary story of Volodymyr dispatching envoys to the various centres of monotheism. It is not important for our study to determine whether the account in the *PVL* has an historical basis. What is essential is to delineate the reasoning behind Volodymyr's opting for the Byzantine form of Christianity, and his plans to make Rus' a part of Christian Europe. Christianity of course was the vehicle employed to reach that objective. The course of Rus's relationship with the Empire brought the issue to the forefront of his attention. Opting for Judaism or Islam would have brought Rus', economically and culturally, into the Asian sphere of influence. Volodymyr decided long before Rus' official conversion the road he would take. The choice remained -- Byzantium or Rome? But was there a real choice to be made? Rus' had continuous contacts with the Empire from the ninth century and, the sporadic influence of Byzantine refugees in the Crimea had made an impression upon Rus'; an impression that was decisive in its choice of Byzantine Christianity. More-

over, the type of state that he was attempting to create sealed the decision.

In Europe, at this time, three ideologies regarding the temporal and spiritual relationships won varying degrees of support within the eastern Empire, among the Carolingian successor states and by the papacy.

To illustrate Byzantine political ideology it must be remembered that the Byzantines did not refer to themselves by that name, save the citizens of Constantinople, any more than Americans call themselves Washingtonians. They were Romans, and believed firmly that their Empire stood in direct succession to that of ancient Rome.¹

The East Roman Empire was the sole keeper of Christian state ideology until the coronation of Charlemagne which created a "parallel" empire. But Byzantium alone preserved the Augustan notion of "Eternal Rome" later replaced by the Eusebian concept of "the Empire blessed by God". Eusebius expressed his position in a Helio-Platonic system, wherein the Kingdom of Heaven and its earthly reflection were both ruled by God, the Supreme Monarch with the earthly Christian emperor acting as God's temporal vicar.

Byzantine imperial theory was based on the historical fact of the union of the Roman world-state with the Christian belief in the redemption of the world through Jesus Christ. This union of Roman power and Christian belief was

¹ See R.J.H Jenkins, *Byzantium the Imperial Centuries*, pp. 106-107.

actualized by Constantine the Great -- the successor of Augustus and Christ's elect -- the *Isoapostolos* who possessed both supreme earthly power and Heaven's sanction. This grandiose theory included several indisputable axioms. First, there could be only one emperor on earth as there is only one Ruler in heaven. Second, no legitimate earthly power could exist without the emperor's sanction. Third, the emperor's sanction was divine. In other words, any challenge to his authority was not only rebellion but blasphemy. Fourth, the emperor's subjects were the Chosen People of the New Covenant, entrusted by God with the election of His earthly regent, who was to spread His authority to all ends of the earth until the Second Coming. These were not mere theoretical concepts but principles that governed day-to-day imperial policy.

Within the Empire the Church enjoyed the emperor's patronage and was subject to him as its head. Consequently, the Church was within the state and, part of the state organization. In theory there existed a "harmony" between the secular and ecclesiastical authorities which manifested itself by the emperors participation in certain church functions, including the formulation of canon law, the convocation of church councils and, the appointment of bishops. As political head, the emperor used his power to uphold the decisions of the synods and to maintain catholic orthodoxy

within his territory. The idea of the Church existing in the absence a state was inconceivable to the Byzantine.²

In the West struggles ensued between the clerical and secular authorities. Each attempted to control the other. At first the successor kingdoms of the Roman Empire dominated the Church by coercing it into submission, the acme of which control occurs during the reign of Charlemagne. However, even as Western Europe was unified, by Charlemagne's interminable wars, a movement within the Church strove to free itself from its subjection. Eventually the West was split into two ideological camps which collided in what historians have labelled the "Investiture Controversy". The two powers of *imperium* and *sacerdotium* were, however, never able to achieve a final victory and merely exhausted one another.

To establish the real motive behind Volodymyr's conversion is not the sole purpose of this survey, even though the consequences of his conversion are fundamental to this work. What is clear and striking in all the sources is Volodymyr's free acceptance of Christianity. No external pressure

² The patriarchs of Constantinople were by-and-large relegated to the position of chief priest or "minister of religious affairs". There were instances when, and rarely at that, the patriarch did achieve the upper hand on certain issues over the imperial authority (e.g., Nicholas Mysticus, Polyeuctos, Michael Kerularios). However, these instances were sporadic and they left the general situation unaltered.

influenced his decision.³ In the case of Volodymyr and Yaroslav special attention is required. Both rulers established the framework for the Rus' Church within the confines of a state. Scholarly debate rages still over the scope of their powers *vis-a-vis* the Church and, the Byzantine "hierarchy of nations".

The Rurikides of Rus' readily used coercion. The Varangian state they had built and the economic ties they had arranged with Byzantium were established largely by force. In effect they created a merchant oriented state largely wanting any real cohesion. The inhabitants were separated geographically, linguistically and ethnically. What developed then was a primitive state which encompassed some complex elements of structure.

If Volodymyr was to be accepted into the European family of nations, or as Obolensky was pleased to call it, into the "Byzantine Commonwealth", then an adoption of the Christian state-structure was obligatory. During the Middle Ages there existed two types of Christian state: (i) the Western, so-called "Dominial State", and; (ii) the Eastern, so-called "Patrimonial State". These types have been defined in the following manner:

³ See Ilarion's "Sermon of Law and Grace," in *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*, p. 21: "But you, O blessed one, with any of this, you came running to Christ: you understood, through good sense and discernment alone... And you pondered these things; and so entered the holy font of baptism." In the *Tale and Passion and Encomium of the Holy Martyrs Borys and Hlib* it states that Volodymyr, "also enlightened this whole land of Rus' through holy baptism." See P. Hollingsworth, *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1992, p. 97.

The ruler of the Dominal State was responsible for his realm and his subjects in accordance with the law. His rule, depended upon his observance of the law. The ruler of the Patrimonial State, according to the Eastern mentality, considered himself a Vicar of Christ, who held his realm with all its lands and the people as his personal possession, and could dispose of them at his own will. On the other hand, he was responsible before God for the spiritual well-being and salvation of all his subjects. Therefore, the ruler of the Byzantine type of state (patrimonial) had to be a convinced Christian, with a highly developed sense of moral responsibility for the spiritual welfare of his subjects.⁴

Volodymyr attempted to create a state that had both patrimonial and dominal components, not in the sense that he was creating a "parallel" Empire, but a state where his sovereignty over his subjects and the Church was undisputed.

Once Volodymyr had obtained for himself and his realm a Christian status, the next question was where did this new Rus' Church fit into the Byzantine "world hierarchy"? To answer this question an examination of Volodymyr's ecclesiastical policy is required.

The *First Chronicle of Novgorod* provides us with the most information about Volodymyr's ecclesiastical policy. Where the *PVL* is filled page after page with events dealing with Volodymyr's conversion, scarcely any mention is made of his ecclesiastical policy. The last reference to an ecclesiastical matter is in 996, almost a score years before Volodymyr's rule ended. It is for this reason that the

⁴ Alexander Baran, "The Motivations for Volodymyr's Acceptance of Christianity," *Analecta O.S.B.M.* Rome, 1988, p. 376. Also see Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Old Regime*. New York, Scribner's Sons, 1975, pp. 27-58.

Chronicle of Novgorod is of such paramount importance. In one place it relates:

Volodymyr and the whole land of Rus' were baptized and the Metropolitan was appointed in Kyyiv, and an Archbishop in Novgorod, and priests and deacons, and there was joy everywhere. And Archbishop Joachim Khersonin came to Novgorod and destroyed the heathen temples.⁵

This is a vital statement for a number of reasons. In the first place no bishop is mentioned by name in the *PVL* until Theopemptos, who is said to have been the first metropolitan of Kyyiv. Secondly it refers to the first bishop of Novgorod by name and asserts that he was a Khersonite (a native of the Crimea). Finally it asserts that Kyyiv had a metropolitan bishop prior to Theopemptos.⁶

Throughout the earliest record of the Rus' Church, the name of Anastasios of Kherson is mentioned time and time

⁵ *Novgorodskaiia Letopis*, St. Petersburg, 1888, p. 68, cited in N. Zernov, *op. cit.*, p. 132; M. Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, Volume I, p. 517; N.D. Chubaty, *op. cit.*, p. 239.

⁶ There is great debate over who was the first bishop of Kyyiv. The *Nikonian Chronicle* names Michael as the first metropolitan of Kyyiv (until 992), Leo as the second and Ivan (John) as the third (before 1008). A Byzantine polemic states that Leo was metropolitan of Pereiaslav. Vernadsky concluded that the first Rus' eparchy was Tmutorokhan. See G. Vernadsky, "The Status of the Russian Church During the First Half-Century Following Vladimir's Conversion." *SEER XX* (1941), pp. 297-302. The Russian historian Priselkov has conjectured that the Rus' Church was under the authority of the Archbishop of Ochrida, in Bulgaria. See M.D. Priselkov, *Ocherki po tserkovno-politicheskoi istorii Kyyivskoi Rusi*, St. Petersburg, 1913, p. 72.

again.⁷ He, along with Joachim, are the only ones mentioned by name, as having any involvement in ecclesiastical organization. Zernov describes him as "the mystery man of Volodymyr's Empire."⁸ Anastasios is first mentioned in the *PVL* in the account of Volodymyr's siege of Kherson. He appears for the last time in the *PVL* under the year 1018 when he was identified as one of the train which retreated with the Polish king Boleslav.⁹ Anastasios' next mention in the *PVL*, after the Kherson incident, is his role as a dignitary at Volodymyr's court. Further references describe Anastasios as head of the Kyivan clergy, responsible for the maintenance and finances of the *Desyatynna* church.¹⁰ In 992

⁷ Volodymyr's capture of Kherson was aided by Anastasios. This Anastasios informed Volodymyr of the underground water system that ran into Kherson and how Volodymyr could stop the flow. Kherson surrendered soon after Volodymyr cut the water lines. Volodymyr twisted the lion's tail and offered to return Kherson to Basil in exchange for the *Porphyrogenita's* hand in marriage. The conquest of Kherson had ecclesiastical implications. The control of the Crimea meant the control of a number of episcopal Sees: Kherson (Korsun), Doras (the metropolitan city), Phullae, Sugdaea (Surozh), the Bosporus (Kerch) and probably Tmutorokhan. However, when the *Porphyrogenita* Anna arrived in Kherson, Volodymyr restored Kherson and all the Crimea to the emperor as part of the wedding dowry. In the *Nikonian Chronicle* (989), during Volodymyr's stay in Kherson, Volodymyr is said to have been visited in Kherson by papal envoys. It is possible that Volodymyr did request an embassy from Rome so as to ascertain which See would grant him greater autonomy for the newly established Rus' Church. Since nothing came about from this embassy, we can assume that either the papal envoys did not possess the authority to make concessions or what they offered was not pleasing to Volodymyr. But, since the *Nikonian Chronicle* dates from the sixteenth century, it may be a later addition that reinforces anti-Latin sentiment. See *Nikon*, Volume I, p. 107. See Carl de Boor, *Machtrage zu Notitiae Episcopatum*, "Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte," XII, 1891, p. 520, cited in N.D. Chubaty, *op. cit.*, p. 98-99. On Volodymyr's return to Kyiv from Kherson, he ordered the destruction of the shrines and idols, and that churches be built where these pagan shrines once stood. The story related in the *PVL* tells of Volodymyr's mandate where the people of Kyiv were to assemble by the banks of the Dnieper to receive baptism. This may be a story created by the chronicler to moderate Volodymyr's use of coercion. This same style is used later by the chronicler when he states that Volodymyr "invited" people from other towns to accept the new faith. *PSRL*, I, col. 117; *RPC*, p. 117.

⁸ N. Zernov, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

⁹ *PSRL*, I, col. 109, 144; *RPC*, p. 112 & p. 132.

¹⁰ *Desyatynna* -- The Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of the Tithe. See S.H. Cross, "The Earliest Churches in Kiev," *Sp* XI (1936). This church was damaged by fire in 1017 and was rebuilt and rededicated in 1039. It was destroyed during the Mongol capture of Kyiv in 1240. It was never rebuilt after the Mongol takeover.

Anastasios received the *Desyatynna* church and in 996 he was made recipient of the tithe. Strangely Anastasios' hierarchical position is never disclosed in the *PVL*. He is referred to as a tithesman but there was no such position known in the Rus' Church.¹¹ Whatever his real capacity, the vital factor is the appointment of Khersonites to important Church positions in Volodymyr's realm. In other words, Volodymyr may have offered high ecclesiastical posts to those who would serve him faithfully. Zernov suggests that:

Volodymyr appears...as a ruler who was determined to keep the Church under his unchallenged control, who wanted to remain an autocrat not only in the sphere of politics and military matters, but also in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs.¹²

Certain writers have attempted to establish the view that if Rus' was religiously dependent upon the Empire, then a virtual political dependence must have existed. Dvornik, for one, observes that:

The relationship that existed was based on [Rus'] free acceptance of Byzantine political philosophy. Like the Byzantines, they looked upon the *basileus* as the representative of God on earth, and therefore as the supreme head of all Christians and sole legislator in matters concerning Christians.¹³

¹¹ Three different theories have been proposed regarding Anastasios' position: (i) he may have been a layman placed in charge of the church's finances; (ii) he could have been the presiding priest of the *Desyatynna* church, or; (iii) he could have been the leading bishop of the Rus' Church. See N. Zernov, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

¹² *ibid.*, p. 135.

¹³ *ibid.*

The Byzantine Church was closely associated with the government administration of the Empire. The emperor (*basileus*) was considered to be Christ's viceroy who received his power directly from God. The power the emperor wielded, depicted in some polemical literature, assumed his right to interfere in Church affairs because he was "Christ's own anointed", the "New David", and "Christ's Viceroy".

The Empire from the time of Constantine the Great attempted to centralize, by law, the two powers of *imperium* and *sacerdotium*. The acceptance of Byzantine Christianity would also have to encompass some acknowledgement of Byzantine canon law. The recognition of the Byzantine *Nomocanon* is attested to in Volodymyr's *Church Statute* where Volodymyr states that he received baptism "from the Greek Emperor [Michael III] and from the Patriarch Photius of Constantinople."¹⁴ The preamble here makes reference to the so-called first conversion of the Rus' and the establishment of a Rus' eparchy in 867. The location of this first eparchy is not recorded and scholarly views vary as to its site.¹⁵

It is imperative for us here to illustrate the type of semi-patrimonial authority Volodymyr and Yaroslav strove to

¹⁴ *The Church Statute of Saint Vladimir*, cited in G. Vernadsky (ed.), *A Sourcebook for Russian History from Early Times to 1917*, Volume I. New Haven & London, Yale University Press, 1972, p. 39. See Appendix III.

¹⁵ See E. Golubinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 133; G. Vernadsky, *Kievan Russia*, p. 67; N.D. Chubaty, *op. cit.*, p. 97-100; E. Honigmann, "Studies in Slavic History; The Foundation of the Russian Metropolitan Church According to Greek Sources," *Byz XVII* (1945), pp. 128-162.

orchestrate. The following remarks are intended to depict this patrimonial authority and its implications.

In Ilarion's *Sermon on Law and Grace* the *Church Statute of Volodymyr* and *Yaroslav* are remarked upon:

Your devotion is well witnessed and faithfully proved by Georgij [Georgij was the baptismal name of Yaroslav the Wise], your son, whom God made heir to your rule after you; who does not demolish what you established, but rather strengthens it; who does not diminish your deeds of devotion, but rather embellishes them; who does not impair [казяща] but repairs; for he finished your unfinished works, as Solomon David's: for he built the great temple of God's Holy Wisdom, to sanctify and consecrate your city; and he adorned it with every adornment: with gold and silver and precious stones, and holy vessels.¹⁶

Byzantine canon law was set down in the *Church Statute of Volodymyr*, the *Church Statute of Yaroslav*, and the *Kormcha Knyha* (*The Pilot's Book*). The *PVL* does not expatiate upon Volodymyr's relationship to the Byzantine "world hierarchy" of nations. Nor does it address the nature of Volodymyr's own power. There exists, however, other information that may illustrate the type of power Volodymyr was attempting to wield. In the *PVL*, his grandmother, *Knyahynya Ol'ha*, urged her son, *Svyatoslav*, to accept baptism. He refused saying, "How shall I alone wish to accept another

¹⁶ Ilarion, "Sermon of Law and Grace" in *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*. Translated with an introduction by Simon Franklin. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1991, pp. 23-24. The sermon makes reference to the confirmation of Volodymyr's *Church Statute* and Yaroslav's own *Church Statute* (or expansion of Volodymyr's statute). The comparison to Solomon and David is in reference to Yaroslav's building of the St. Sophia Cathedral.

faith, when my retinue will begin to ridicule this."¹⁷ The Old Slavonic word used for "faith" is *zakon*. The word itself can have a double meaning, it can mean faith (*logos*) or law (*nomos*). Hanak observed:

Zakon thus implies that should Svyatoslav consent to accept baptism from the Byzantines, in effect he could negate his nation's laws by acknowledging Byzantine civil law and religious laws as paramount within his own realm.¹⁸

Rus' suspicions were no doubt aroused by the existence of the *Nomocanon* in Bulgaria in the 860s, and that similar religious and political policies might manifest themselves in Rus'. Svyatoslav and his *druzhyna* understood the ramifications of accepting Byzantine Christianity and so their attempts were directed to safeguarding their political and religious principles and practices. Svyatoslav's mother Ol'ha attempted to convert her son by example, the influences of which were only to be truly realized in the succeeding generations. The *Kniga Stepennaia tsarskogo rodosloviia*, a sixteenth century source, articulates the religious legal tradition of Basil II's time, but both the *Stepennaia* and the *PVL* specify that Volodymyr accepted baptism for his nation without however diminishing its integrity or independence, and, preserving his own sovereignty.¹⁹ This is not

¹⁷ *PSRL*, I, col. 63; *RPC*, p. 83-84.

¹⁸ W.K. Hanak, *The Nature and Image of Grand Princely Power in Kievan Russia (988-1054)*, Indiana University, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973, p. 73-74. See above p. 8-10.

¹⁹ *PSRL*, I, col. 124; *RPC*, p. 120-121.

to say that Byzantine canon law did not have any influence upon Volodymyr. The *knyaz'* admits, in the fourth article of his *Church Statute*, that he referred to the *Nomocanon*:

Then, having opened the Greek *Nomocanon*, we found in it that it is not proper for either the prince, or his *boyars* (nobles), or his judges to conduct these [church] courts and lawsuits. And I, having consulted the princess Anna and my sons, granted [the administration of] these courts to the metropolitan and to all bishoprics [in some variants, "bishops"] throughout the [Rus'] land.²⁰

In this passage, Volodymyr affirms what should be the proper relationship between the secular and spiritual authorities. Hanak observes: "...by merely consulting the *Nomocanon* Volodymyr minimized its overall impact upon the Rus' and refused to recognize its paramountcy within his principate."²¹ He was willing to concede the immunity of the Church courts. Still his introduction of the tithe system²² was a deliberate attempt to counter Byzantine ecclesiastical influence.²³ In other words Volodymyr claimed for himself the same right

²⁰ See Appendix III.

²¹ W.K. Hanak, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

²² F. Dvornik feels that the use of the tithe in the Rus' Church was not adopted from Rome nor brought in by the Scandinavian clergy. Dvornik's alternative explanation runs as follows: Volodymyr's influence spread westward with the occupation of cities such as Peremyshl (Przemysl). Here he came into contact with the Poles who only in 966 accepted Christianity under Duke Mieszko I. This area had been disputed over between Czechs, Poles and Rus'. Thus three Slavic kingdoms met at the Carpathians and Volodymyr met that western Roman influence which he incorporated into his Church. See F. Dvornik, "The Kiev State and its Relations with Western Europe." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, Fourth Series. Volume XXIX, 1947, p. 35

²³ Volodymyr established the tithe with the *Desyatynna* church. Volodymyr donated one-tenth of his yearly revenues to this church. See *RPC*, p. 120-121.

the Byzantine emperor claimed over his Church.²⁴ In other words he had the right to employ constraint to enforce secular and ecclesiastical laws.

To fully understand this form of rule one must return again turn to the *PVL*. In the very year that Volodymyr began his sole rule (c. 980), he chose from amongst his Varangian mercenaries men who were "good, wise, and brave"²⁵ and appointed them to govern cities. These belonged to Volodymyr's *druzhyna*. The *druzhyna* was the source of the *knyaz's* personal power. They protected the *knyaz'* from his enemies, put down insurrections and performed administrative and judicial functions in outlying areas. The *druzhyna* was also influential in Volodymyr's acceptance of Christianity and he consulted with them to obtain their approval and support.²⁶

Similarities are drawn between the Biblical king Solomon and Volodymyr in the *PVL*, a parallel drawn up to the

²⁴ G. Vernadsky, "Status of the Russian Church during the First half-century Following Vladimir's Conversion," *SEER XXVIII* (1949-50), p. 308-309; E. Golubinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 616-627; N. Zernov, *op. cit.*, p. 433.

²⁵ *PSRL*, I, col. 79; *RPC*, p. 93.

²⁶ *ibid.* After Volodymyr's conversion he began to replace the *druzhyna* governors and chief *boyary* (nobles) with his sons. The appointment of his sons to various cities was to emphasize the importance of certain designated cities; Kyiv being the most important and Novgorod the second. Not too much should be read into this move. Svyatoslav also placed his sons as governors over the most important Rus' centres. The precedent had already been set generation prior to Volodymyr; he was merely continuing his father's policy of "keeping it in the family". We are not informed by our sources whether insurrections were led by the governors (*boyary*). Therefore, the replacement of the *boyary* with Volodymyr's sons may have been a peaceful transition. The move was an assurance that no noble (*boyar*) could firmly establish himself as a Count Palatine, thus disrupting the already loose Rus' confederation and the claims of the legitimate heirs. *PSRL*, I, col. 121; *RPC*, p. 119. The following are the sons and the respective cities they were appointed to: Vyacheslav (Novgorod); Izyaslav (Polotsk); Svyatopolk (Turov); Yaroslav (Rostov). Upon Vyacheslav's death Yaroslav was sent to Novgorod, Boris to Rostov, Gleb or Hlib or Murom, Svyatoslav to Dereva, Vsevolod to Vladimir and Mstyslav to Tmutorokhan.

time of Volodymyr's conversion. In the post conversion years of his reign (989-1015) he is compared to Constantine the Great:

He [Volodymyr] is the new Constantine of mighty Rome, who baptized himself and his subjects; for the Prince of Rus' initiated the acts of Constantine himself.²⁷

The *Encomium for Prince Volodymyr* concludes in the following words:

O holy emperors (tsars) Constantine and Volodymyr, help your kinsmen against their enemies and deliver your people, both Greek and Rus', from every misfortune! Because you have license to speak to the Savior, pray to God also for me, a sinner, so that I may be saved through your prayers.²⁸

Volodymyr is depicted as equal to Constantine in religious matters, and both are referred to as *tsar* (Caesar, emperor), although, no priestly powers are attributed to either one.

The *PVL* relates that during the time Volodymyr is presumed to have lived in the "fear of God", the number of bandits in his realm increased. The bishops enquired why Volodymyr had not taken any measures to punish these criminals and he replied that he feared divine retribution for the killing of robbers. The bishops pointed out to him that he was the

²⁷ *PSRL*, I, cols. 130-131; *RPC*, p. 124.

²⁸ Cited in *The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*, translated by Paul Hollingsworth. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1992, p. 181.

appointed of God for the chastisement of malefaction and for the practice of mercy toward the righteous, so that it was entirely fitting for him to punish a robber condignly, but only after due process of law.²⁹

The rest of the episode includes Volodymyr's abolition of *wergild* (*vera*) so that the punishment of the robbers could be considered. Notwithstanding, the bishops brought to Volodymyr's attention the beneficial use of *wergild* for the purchase of military arms. Hanak suggests that,

This admonition is an assertion that Volodymyr's princely sovereignty was exclusive, since he was the elect of God and therefore his powers could not be divided. Further, once Volodymyr had come to power, the ecclesiastics recognized that there was no constitutional means to dispose of him for lack of fitness as a ruler, because his sovereignty descended directly from God. The churchmen sought then to introduce rhythm and order in his princely rule, hoping through harmonious cooperation with the grand prince to find a firm civilizing bond to hold the Kyyivan state together and to admit that the unified rule of his predecessors upon the Kyyivan seat was sufficient precedent and testament of his power...³⁰

Another concrete expression of Volodymyr's rule was his association with the Emperor Basil II through his marriage to the *Porphyrogenita* Anna. In the *PVL* Anna is always referred to as *tsaritsa* (empress) in contrast to the Rus' born wives of *knyazi* who were called *knyahini* (queen). The terminology used in reference to Anna indicates that the Rus' were aware of the honour bestowed upon Volodymyr by his

²⁹ *PSRL*, I, cols. 126-127; *RPC*, p. 122.

³⁰ W.K. Hanak, *op. cit.*, p. 36-37.

marriage. The marriage to a Byzantine *Porphyrogenita* was unique in kind, and as an honour, permanent. One contemporary underscores the approbation: "Even in death, Volodymyr and the *tsaritsa* lay side by side in the Church of the Mother of God at Kyyiv, a permanent expression of love and honour."³¹

One may posit the question here about the relationship between the Kyyivan title of *Velykyj Knyaz'* and the Byzantine *basileus* and *autocrator*. The Byzantine title *basileus* meant that the ruler was the "embodiment of law incarnate and his supreme political authority as the terrestrial mirror of divine wisdom and power",³² which later was given a Christian interpolation wherein the *basileus* assumed the likeness of God's Vicar on earth.

The status of Rus' *vis-a-vis* the Empire sheds some light on the *Velykyj Knyaz's* place in the Byzantine world hierarchy and, simultaneously, on Volodymyr's and Yaroslav's authority. Historians have argued whether Rus' was in any way politically dependent upon the Empire. By all accounts relations between the Empire and Rus' changed almost from decade to decade. This is explained by the fact that whoever held the upper hand at the close of a military confrontation between the two powers determined the course of affairs so long as it remained in the ascendant. From its

³¹ Thietmar of Merseburg, *Chronicon*. Edited by R. Holtzmann, in *MGH*, 1935, p. 488, cited in J. Shepard, "Some Problems of Russo-Byzantine Relations c. 860-1050," *SEER* LII (1974), p. 29.

³² W.K. Hanak, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

foundation in the ninth century to Volodymyr's conversion, Rus' was certainly independent of the Empire: The treaties between the two powers, preserved in the *PVL*, clearly demonstrate Rus's status as an independent state. At the time of these treaties Rus' was not officially Christian, and yet both Rus' and the Empire were on a relatively equal standing with one another; each pledging to uphold the articles of the treaties by their respective faiths. In the Byzantine *Book of Ceremonies*, *Knyahynya Ol'ha* is referred to as *archontissa Rhosias*, and her reception was arranged on the exact same pattern as that of an Arab envoy. Thus the reception given to Ol'ha and her retinue indicates no apparent political dependence.³³

The Byzantines used two different formulae of addressing independent and dependent rulers. Before Volodymyr's conversion, the *knyazi* of Rus' were addressed as *archon* and the emperor as *basileus*. Such was the formula used in the Empire to indicate independent rulers. The Byzantine address to vassal or dependent rulers ran as follows: "Order [or command] of the Christ-loving despots (not *basileis*) to such and such."³⁴ The rulers of Rus' were always referred to as *archon* even after the conversion, thus implying that the Empire viewed them as an independent realm. Such a statement may be misleading: the notion that the emperor

³³ A.A. Vasiliev, "Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium?" *Sp* VII (1932), p. 351.

³⁴ *De Ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae*, pp. 690-691, cited in A.A. Vasiliev, *ibid.*

was an *autocrator* meant that the Byzantine rulers considered themselves Roman emperors, men who were conscious of their historical source of power and what that power entailed.³⁵ Other Christian *knyazi* were seen by the Empire as mere deputies of the emperor. Hanak states:

Thus, while the Byzantines were conscious of the historical antecedents of their imperial powers, their application of these theoretical speculations in imperial relations with the Rus' grand princes from Volodymyr to Yaroslav met with resistance.³⁶

Nowhere in the *PVL* does it allude to Volodymyr's dependency upon the Empire nor any willingness to subordinate himself or his people to the temporal and ecclesiastical sovereignty of the Empire. Volodymyr needed a unifying factor that would work simultaneously on a political and religious level. There already existed such a system, what D. Obolensky has termed the "Byzantine Commonwealth".³⁷ However, there are a number of inconsistencies and contradictions found in the *De Ceremoniis* formulae of addresses to foreign rulers.³⁸ Besides which, this vagueness made it possible for the Rus' *knyaz'* and the emperor, who possibly

³⁵ F. Dvornik, *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*, Volume II. Cambridge & Washington, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, p. 839. The emperor was seen as an universal ruler who wielded absolute and unlimited power in the regulation of human affairs. He was simultaneously the regulator of divine matters and the universal ruler of all Christendom.

³⁶ W.K. Hanak, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

³⁷ D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe 500-1453*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971, pp. 223 ff.

³⁸ J. Shepard, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

had different views concerning their relationship, to be on friendly terms. In the writings of Metropolitan Ilarion, Nestor, Yakiv the monk and the *PVL*, allusions are drawn to illustrate the freedom granted to Rus' from devils by their acceptance of Christianity. No doubt these allusions were borrowed from Byzantine literary models as is found in Patriarch Photius' encyclical letter wherein mention is made regarding the Rus' and how they were once bound to their pagan beliefs and were now free of them.³⁹ As Shepard asserts: "It seems that the educated Rus' in the eleventh century regarded Byzantium as a means of liberation from old superstitions and ignorance and of catching up with other Christian nations."⁴⁰ Rus' was to be an exception to the idea of "Byzantine Commonwealth". In the encyclical letter of Photius (867), it is asserted that the Rus', by their acceptance of Byzantine Christianity, had become subjects (*hypokooi*) and friends (*proxenoi*) of the Empire. However, this is not indicative of the Rus' attitude.

Dvornik points out that attempts to make the connection between Rus' religious dependence upon the Empire and virtual political dependence would be an over-exaggeration.

The relationship that existed was based on [Rus'] free acceptance of Byzantine political philosophy. Like the Byzantines, they looked upon the *basileus* as the representative of God on earth, and there-

³⁹ Migne. *Patrologia Graeca*, Volume cii, cols. 736-37, cited in M Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Rusy-Ukrainy*, Volume I. New York, Published by Knyho-Spilka, 1954, p. 405.

⁴⁰ J. Shepard, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

fore as the supreme head of all Christians and sole legislator in matters concerning Christianity.⁴¹

From what we have noted it might be surmised that Volodymyr's primary motive for accepting Christianity was to improve the status of his realm in relation to other European states. Contacts between Rus' and the Empire had a long preamble up to the time of Volodymyr's conversion. It is reasonable to assume that Volodymyr was aware of the relationship that had existed between the Empire and his domain before his advent to power. It is possible moreover that he had some understanding of the Byzantine view of themselves and their emperor, and where the Rus' stood amongst the other nations in the Byzantine order of nations. Hanak claims that the,

[*De Administrando Imperio* and *De Ceremoniis aulae Byzantinae*] established a system of grading all rulers in a hierarchy and of determining their places in this organization by the degree of affinity to the autocrator and by his award of Byzantine court titles to them. This system of imperial organization created the fiction of a world government in which kings and princes were subordinated to the supremacy of the Byzantine emperor. If [Volodymyr] was aware that [Rus'] occupied an inferior rank in the Byzantine grading of states, his conversion and marriage to Anna without doubt could improve his nation's standing. But in seeking to elevate the relative place of his principate, did [Volodymyr] also alter the nature of his grand princely powers and further accept a title, implying a subordinate rank in the autocrator's hierarchy of dependent rulers?⁴²

⁴¹ F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

⁴² W.K. Hanak, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

The answer is no. In political matters there is no evidence that the *knyazi* of Rus' acted as subjects of the emperor. On this point Obolensky points out: "...nor is it likely that they [the Rus'] would ever had tolerated, except in ecclesiastical matters, his [the emperor's] intervention in the internal affairs of their principalities."⁴³

It is certain that the emperor lacked the military and political resources to impose dominion over Rus'. Nor was it possible for the Metropolitans of Kyyiv, who were Byzantines and agents of the emperor, to impose direct sovereignty on behalf of the emperor. The geographical distance, the growing weakness of the Empire, and the power of the Rus' *knyazi* precluded the possibility of political dependency on the Empire. The Byzantines may indeed have considered the Rus' as dependents, for, theory and reality are frequently at variance. We only need to observe other Slavic peoples who accepted Christianity from Constantinople to understand the relationship between the Empire and foreign peoples. The Bulgarian acceptance of Christianity is a case in point. When Boris of Bulgaria accepted baptism in 865 and became godson to Emperor Michael III, the acceptance of the concept of a universal Empire was palpable. The wars of Boris' son, Symeon, against the Empire as also those of Samuel, were not intended to destroy it, but to claim it for

⁴³ D. Obolensky, "The Relations between Byzantium and Russia (XIth - XVth c.)," *XIIIth International Congress of Historical Sciences*, Moscow, 1970, p. 6, cited in D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe*, London, Variorum Reprints, 1982.

themselves. The military and political realities would not allow either the Byzantines or Bulgarians to dominate and so the two people were forced, on several occasions, into negotiations.

Rus' was in a category all its own. Geographically it was out of Byzantine military reach, and historically was never part of the Empire. It accepted Christianity by its own volition and, together with that acceptance, the notion of the Byzantine "world-view" and Constantinople's cultural leadership. Byzantium's "conquest" of Rus' was accomplished without the use of military intervention and without notions of political dependence. It was carried out almost exclusively by the Church. In point of fact the only Byzantine official in Rus' with any form of power was the metropolitan of Kyiv. Meyendorff affirms that: "...He [the metropolitan of Kyiv] controlled the only administrative structure, dependent upon Byzantium, which encompassed the whole of Russia [Rus'] in the period between 989 and 1448. Clearly, the cultural, religious and political consequences of that fact were considerable."⁴⁴ Rus's sovereignty was, notwithstanding, never undermined.

Rus' religious dependency upon the Empire manifested itself in the form of its metropolitan and suffragans being, for the most part, of Byzantine stock and sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople. This should not be considered

⁴⁴ John Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia*, Cambridge, University Press, p. 14.

unusual, either politically or ecclesiastically. Rus' was in no position to take on the task of transforming itself into a Christian state. No preparations had been made for the transformation from a polytheistic to a monotheistic society. This too meant a definition of Rus' as a Christian state. The definition had to be *vis-a-vis* the Empire and clarified, at first, by representatives of the Empire. The shift was drastic in its implementation and consequences.⁴⁵ When the process of Christianization took root, bishops began to be chosen from the indigenous population. This practice this did not, however, include the appointment of the metropolitan of Kyiv. Although Rus' was a sovereign state, and the Byzantines accepted the fact, a metropolitan of native origin was not in the Empire's interests. A metropolitan of Byzantine stock was the only sure contact between the Empire and Rus' and a staunch reminder of the Empire's interests.

Due to its geography, Rus' occupied a pivotal role in Byzantine politics. Rus' became the Empire's listening-post for any nomadic movement across the Eurasian steppe. Having a Byzantine as metropolitan at Kyiv assured the Empire of solid, regular information and a friendly ally against any potential threats.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ Volodymyr's forcible baptism of the Kyiv populace is but one example.

⁴⁶ This point can be illustrated with the appointment of Klyment Smolyatych. At the time of Klyment's appointment, Hungary was making incursions into Serbia -- a territory traditionally under Byzantine influence. Moreover, Izyaslav of Kyiv was the Hungarian king's son-in-law. Byzantine political hegemony in the Balkans was threatened by Hungary and Kyiv was dynastically tied to the Empire's competitor. With Klyment as metropolitan the Empire was left without a spokesman in

As when other rulers accepted Christianity, political ramifications more often than not, outweigh religious ones. Volodymyr's conversion is not unlike that of other major political figures in the middle ages. Borys Michael of Bulgaria, Clovis of Francia, Stephen of Hungary and Constantine the Great accepted Christianity largely because of the political conditions each faced. It is not important that these men adopted Christianity out of purely religious reasons. Rather, what is vital is the influence of Christianity upon the social, economic and political life of these principalities. How does the Church alter, or does it alter, the life led prior to conversion? Does the Church dominate the society? If so, when and why? These are the questions that need to be answered. Whether a definitive answer can be given is uncertain. Due to the nature of our sources one is largely forced into conjecture.

The Patrimonial system was accepted in part by those nations that adopted Christianity from Byzantium, namely, Bulgaria, Serbia and Rus'. This order assumed that the Church was a part of the state administration and that the sovereign was protector and head of the local Church just as the emperor was in Byzantium. In the Bulgarian case the hierarchs were mostly Byzantines who acted as agents for the emperor. The Empire still viewed Bulgaria as one of its provinces and, Byzantine policy in the tenth and eleventh

Rus'. It becomes obvious why the Empire considered Klyment's appointment uncanonical, even though canon law sided with Izyaslav and Klyment.

centuries attest to this conviction.⁴⁷ The Byzantine hierarchy in Rus' faced a totally different situation. No imperial tradition existed in Rus' and, thus, the Empire could make no claim concerning its sovereignty. Likewise, the Rus' Church had to be conformable to the state structure since the existence of the Church in Rus' depended solely on the consent of the *Velykyj Knyaz'*. This reality must be placed in its proper perspective.

The conversion of many of the Slavic nations was a point of conflict between the sees of Rome and Constantinople. The Balkan peoples, Bulgars, Serbs, Croats often shifted allegiances between Eastern and Western Christendom when they found the ecclesiastical situation intolerable to their sovereignty. Borys Michael of Bulgaria oscillated at various times between Rome and Constantinople until Byzantine diplomacy and military force finally sealed Bulgaria's fate.

Volodymyr's conversion was a conscious effort to make his state a part of Christian Europe. His actions suggest that he intended to unify Rus' through an organized state religion. His first attempt, -- through organized paganism -- did not succeed because no clear definition of his power and status could be achieved within it. His only other option was Christianity, specifically Byzantine Christianity. This did not mean that Volodymyr could not do some shopping

⁴⁷ See R.J.H. Jenkins, *Byzantium: The Imperial Centuries*, London, 1966, pp. 241-315.

around for an arrangement that suited his needs. In a word, Volodymyr had already made a conscience decision to convert to Christianity; it only remained to wait for the best opportunity to do so.

The Rus' definition of itself *vis-a-vis* the Empire is posited in the *PVL*:

The Most High appoints emperor (*tsesarya*) and prince (*knyazya*), and gives authority to whomsoever He wishes... Thus did Isaiah say: 'They have sinned from head to foot', that is from the emperor to the common people.⁴⁸

The emperor's universal sovereignty is, be it noted, not put into question. In fact it was further enunciated in the Byzantine canon law which survived in its Slavonic version and was well known in eleventh century Rus'. Written by the deacon Agapetos for Justinian I in the sixth century, it is basically a didactic treatise. It describes the emperor as "lord of all men". It also postulates that: "the emperor is equal to all men in the nature of his body, but in the authority of his rank he is similar to God, who rules all. For there is no one on earth higher than he."⁴⁹ Acknowledgement of this imperial supremacy was never explicitly made by the *knyazi*.

⁴⁸ *PSRL*, I, col. 95; *RPC*, p. 130.

⁴⁹ Agapetos, *Expositio capitum admonitoriorum*, xxi, *MPG* [Migne Patrologie Graeca] vol. 86 (1), cols. 1164-74, cited in Deno John Geanakoplos, *Byzantium: Church, Society, and Civilization Seen through Contemporary Eyes*, Chicago, University Press, 1984, pp. 19-20.

The type of power that Volodymyr wanted to wield is described in Metropolitan Ilarion's *Sermon on Law and Grace*. An examination of this work has shown it to be more than a sermon, that it is in fact an ideological homily of Christian Rus'. It is, moreover, a treatise on the whole Christian world perception. In it the type of patrimonial power that Volodymyr already exercised is articulated. The author was not writing a theoretical treatise but merely placing the already existing situation in religious-political terms. Significantly too, that power was now being exercised by Volodymyr's successor, Yaroslav, and was hereditary and immutable.

The reign of Yaroslav the Wise is a period that has received much attention. Certain historians have interpreted his reign as an attempt to free Rus' from the political and ecclesiastical hegemony of the Empire. But is this the case? We have noted that Volodymyr was neither politically nor ecclesiastically subservient to the Empire. The opponents of that view assert that Yaroslav was in a less favourable position than his father. The basis for their contention is fixed on four factors: i) the appointment of Ilarion as metropolitan; ii) Ilarion's composition of the *Sermon on Law and Grace*; iii) Yaroslav's cultural program, and; iv) Yaroslav's attempt to take the notion of "empire" to himself. Each claim requires comment so as to illustrate the type of power Yaroslav wished to wield.

Before becoming metropolitan, Ilarion served as priest in Berestove, a town on the southern outskirts of Kyyiv. There he served as priest at the Church of the Holy Apostles. The Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople was built by Constantine the Great and was the traditional burial place for emperors. Berestove was Volodymyr the Great's place of residence and Yaroslav is said to have been a great patron of the Berestove church. It seems certain that the Berestove church was part of Yaroslav's architectural program, and one which ventured to replicate the features of Constantinople. Prior to his elevation to the metropolitanate, Ilarion was probably a member of Yaroslav's cultural program.⁵⁰

Insofar as Ilarion's appointment is considered, we know only its date, precisely 1051. No notice of the length of his episcopate has been uncovered. There is a school of thought that insists that Ilarion's appointment was controversial. This view is based on the idea that it did not conform to the accepted practice, that is, the metropolitans of Kyyiv were to be appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople.⁵¹

It is noteworthy however that Ilarion himself is not condemned by any Byzantine writer. It is also significant

⁵⁰ In the *Pateryk* Bishop Simon of Vladimir writes that Ilarion was tonsured by the blessed Antony.

⁵¹ The main arguments put forward to support this view are: Ilarion's "nationality"; his method of appointment; the historical context of the appointment; Ilarion remained unacceptable to Constantinople; Yaroslav's cultural program and Ilarion's role in the execution of that program, and; that Ilarion's *Sermon* is anti-Byzantine in nature.

that at the time of his appointment, Michael Kerularios was the patriarch of Constantinople. Kerularios was probably one of the most powerful clerics to occupy that office.⁵² Byzantine sources inform us about his character and objectives. We know, for instance, that near the time of Ilarion's consecration, Kerularios was attempting to subject all the "national" churches that lay within the boundaries of the Empire to his authority. If the Ilarion appointment was not agreeable to Kerularios, then surely Rus' would have been so informed. But the event is passed over in silence.

The entry in the *PVL* simply reports that Yaroslav summoned the bishops of Rus' and appointed Ilarion as metropolitan.⁵³ It is true that Ilarion is mentioned in the Byzantine diptychs, a fact which suggests that at some point, if not from the beginning, Ilarion's term as metropolitan was considered canonical.⁵⁴

⁵² Kerularios' confrontation with Cardinal Humbert and his support for Isaac Komnenos, which secured his elevation as emperor, attest to his power.

⁵³ *PSRL*, I, col. 155; *RPC*, p. 139.

⁵⁴ Historians have questioned the canonicity of Ilarion's appointment because of the title of Michael Psellos gave to a chapter in his *Chronographia* entitled "On the Revolt or Rising of the Rus'" (*peri teis ton Roson epanastaseos*). See Michael Psellos, *The Chronographia of Michael Psellos*. Translated by E.R.A. Sewter. New Haven, 1953, pp. 147-150. However, from what we know of this affair, a number of Rus' merchants were harassed and killed in Constantinople which provoked Yaroslav's retaliation. Yaroslav sent his son Volodymyr along with an army of 6,000 to avenge the outrage. Volodymyr met with defeat but a peace treaty was soon accomplished by the marriage of Yaroslav's son, Vsevolod, to a princess. Speculation has mounted over the identity of this Byzantine princess. Some have theorized that she was the daughter of the emperor, Constantine IX Monomachos. However, there is no evidence to point to this although Vsevolod's son retained his mother's maiden name -- Monomakh. This Byzantine bride was more likely a member of the Monomakhoi clan; perhaps even from the female side. See Alexander Kazhdan, "Rus'-Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries," *HUS* XII/XIII, 1988/1989, pp. 414-429.

A question that offers itself here is whether the Rus' attack of 1043 and Ilarion's appointment as metropolitan are somehow connected. If Yaroslav did attempt to establish greater autonomy for his Church it was short-lived because the next metropolitan of Kyiv mentioned in the *PVL* (anno 1055) was Ephraim, who was appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople. In sum, there appears to have been no irregularities in Ilarion's appointment. We possess other fragmentary pieces concerning Ilarion. A fifteenth century source preserves his colophon, at the end of a set of works attributed to him. In his confession of faith (*Ispovedanie Very*), he deposes:

I, Ilarion, through the mercy of God who loveth man, a monk and priest, was through His good pleasure consecrated by the God-loving bishops and enthroned (*svyashcen bykh i nastolovan*) in the great and divinely protected city of Kiev, there to serve as metropolitan, pastor, and teacher. These things came to pass in the year 6559 [1051], during the reign of the pious khagan Yaroslav, the son of Volodymyr, Amen.⁵⁵

It has been argued that Yaroslav attempted to usurp the role of emperor. However, the evidence for this is superficial. Some have pointed to Yaroslav's building projects (i.e., the *Zoloti Vorota* -- Golden Gates of Kyiv and the

⁵⁵ Moscow, GIM, Syn. Sobr. no 591, fol. 203a. See T.A. Sumnikova, ed. "Proizvedeniya Ilariona po spisku ser. XV v. GIM SIN. No. 591," in *Idejnofilosofskoe nasledie*, 1:41 (text), 64 (Russian trans.), 171 (photocopy of MS) cited in *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*, p. xvii. *Pamyatniki drevnerusskogo kanonicheskogo prava*, II, 1, ed. V.N. Beneshevich: *Russkaya Istoricheskaya Biblioteka*, XXXVI (1920), p. 103, cited in D. Obolensky, "Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations," *DOP* XI, 1957, p. 60-61.

building of St. Sophia Cathedral in Kyiv) as an attempt to copy the Empire. The fact is that the building of St. Sophia Cathedral cannot be considered to be any different than the practice of other Slavic peoples who accepted Christianity from the Empire. The Bulgars and Serbs too built cathedrals dedicated to St. Sophia. This was natural since the architects and artists who planned, erected and beautified the cathedrals were undoubtedly Byzantines. The converted people had only the Byzantine model to follow. Since the greatest church in Christendom at that time was Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, what would be more natural than to copy and dedicate cathedrals after the Constantinopolitan prototype. In this way the newly converted peoples attempted, not to surpass the Byzantines in splendour -- which would have been impossible --but to create a facsimile of the original and in some way associate themselves with and partake of the greatness of the Empire.

In the Bulgarian case there was an attempt not to destroy but to usurp the Empire. They wanted to become part of the Empire by installing a Bulgarian on its throne. In the fourteenth century the Serb, Stephan Dushan also attempted to achieve that goal. In Yaroslav's case we have no evidence of an attempt to take on the title of emperor (*tsar*). Such a coup would have been most favourable during the period from 1043 to 1054, that is between the time of the Byzantine war, Ilarion's appointment to the metropolitanate and, Yaroslav's death. Some have argued that

Yaroslav ventured to usurp the notion of "empire" during the war of 1043. Equally it may also be conjectured that Yaroslav was subject to the will of the Empire. For example, according to some, the interior of St. Sophia in Kyiv embodies a fresco featuring Yaroslav and his family standing before the enthroned emperor Constantine IX Monomakhos. Moreover, the political system usually associated with empire is a strong, unified monarchy. Yaroslav, by contrast, promoted an "appanage system".⁵⁶

⁵⁶ The *knyazi* appear to have considered Rus' to be personal patrimony to be passed on to their next of kin. After Yaroslav the Wise two principles, seemingly at odds with one another, regulated succession: genealogical seniority and popular election. The latter remained dormant as long as the former ran smoothly. The former ran until the middle of the twelfth century. There appears to have been an order of importance in regards to cities (e.g., Kyiv being the most important). There was a formality of approval by the Kyivan notables and the *viche* for each succeeding Kyivan *knyaz'*. However, there were instances when the *knyaz'* would be ousted by the populace for some disaster or offence against the people. For example, Izyaslav Yaroslavych was deposed in 1068 for being unable to defend the Kyivan territory from the Kumans. In his place Vseslav of Polots'k was elected as *Velykyj Knyaz'*. However, when Vseslav was unable to live up to the people's expectations they were forced to admit Izyaslav back on the throne.

From the 1140s on the *viche* played a greater role of "king-maker". The Kyivans had a greater loyalty to the Monomakhovychi but when it suited them they would readily accept a member of the Ol'hovychi. Unfortunately, we have no surviving written agreements between the *knyazi* and the *viche*, neither do the chronicles provide any assistance. All we know is that when an agreement was reached between the two parties, both sealed their pledge by "kissing the cross".

The principle of genealogical seniority was established in Yaroslav's will. The will itself firmly established the notion of dynastic interests. The right to rule Rus' was not the prerogative of any single *knyaz'*, however powerful, but to the entire house of Ruryk. Each *knyaz'* was allotted a patrimony according to the place where they fell on the genealogical tree. Thus, Izyaslav, being the eldest, was given Kyiv and morally the other brothers were to abide by his decisions and live in amity. The patrimonies were rated in this order: Kyiv, Chernihiv, Pereyaslav, Smolensk, Volodymyr-Volyn'sk. Adjustments were later made in the rating system since certain cities such as Pereyaslav lost much of their importance and were replaced.

The passing of any *knyaz'* automatically affected all the other *knyazi* since a redistribution of thrones was in order. With the passing of a *knyaz'* the remaining *knyazi* would climb further up the ladder to a more important patrimony. But with each generation the situation grew more complicated and it became difficult to establish or determine genealogical seniority. For example, in many instances nephews were much older than their uncles.

Despite all of these complications there is evidence to indicate that the *knyazi* still believed that they belonged to one family. However, by the mid-twelfth century, loyalties were drawn along clan lines and local loyalties became prevalent. What occurred is the loss of the genealogical succession as each *knyaz'* became more interested in securing his patrimony and passing it on to his descendant. Such a system was conducive to civil war which drained the strength of Rus'. As a whole Rus' became unable to defend itself from foreign invaders (i.e., Kumans and later the Mongols).

Suggestions that Yaroslav attempted to usurp the notion of "empire" are farfetched. His building project and statecraft were in reality an attempt to copy the Byzantine models, thus associating the meagerness of Rus' with the grandeur of Byzantium. References to Yaroslav's arduous "book-learning" -- that he read and studied "day and night" -- was surely an attempt to compare Yaroslav to Justinian the Great who was distinguished by the name of "the emperor who never slept". Justinian was renowned for his "book-learning" and for his building projects. The references and similarities to Yaroslav have a political purpose, namely, to exemplify the idea of the "good ruler". Who better to copy than Justinian? As Justinian codified Roman law, so Yaroslav digested the law of Rus'. The similarities are no more than analogies. A nation (i.e., the Rus') that had only recently officially accepted baptism must take on the models of her baptizer in expressions of faith, culture, architecture and learning. The emerging Rus' state needed something or someone to give it direction and form. Volodymyr brought Christianity to Rus' thereby giving it direction, Yaroslav's codification gave it its form. Once the Christianizing process was underway, Yaroslav could implement those features which defined a Christian state, precisely the codification of law, church building and schools. Yaroslav's law code, the *Rus'ka Pravda*, was not issued by a *basileus* deemed to be the source of law, but by a ruler who gathered together and tabulated the existing customary laws.

If Yaroslav aimed at usurping the title of emperor for himself there must have existed a larger danger to cause him to take such a drastic course. But what danger and from whom? A nation reacts when confronted by a force threatening its security and sovereignty. Certainly no threat existed to Rus' from the Empire, Rus' never having been a part of the Empire. Byzantine foreign policy towards Rus' was never expansionist. For which reason her dealings with Rus' remained, by-and-large, friendly.

Here three associated questions might be put forward. First, what would Yaroslav have gained by usurping the Empire's position? Second, could he have achieved such a goal? Third, did he truly understand the concept of "Empire" and the Christian *oikumene*?

The response to all three questions would be an emphatic "no". If he had tried his hand as a *basileus* the anti-absolute monarchist forces within Rus', that is the Varangians, *druzhyna*, the *viche* and the native Slavic population would have interpreted such a move as contrary to and repressive of their respective traditions and privileges.

His position as *Velykyj Knyaz'* would have been put in jeopardy. Beyond which his knowledge of the notion of "Empire" and the Christian *oikumene* was superficial if non-existent. Yaroslav, if we are to believe the chronicler, was literate. And, the materials he read, in all certainty, would have been Byzantine works translated into Slavonic. These doubtless included the Scriptures, the Lives of the

Saints, a few chronicles and, excerpts from law codes. From such a meagre source Yaroslav could hardly comprehend the all-encompassing dynamics of "Empire". Furthermore, Yaroslav lacked the all important constituent in discerning the notion of "Empire", that is, direct personal contact and experience with the Empire. Symeon of Bulgaria had such experience because he was educated at the famous Academy in Constantinople. Symeon's plans to usurp the Empire came to nought but he, at least, understood fully the complexities of the situation.⁵⁷ Yaroslav could not have undertaken such an experiment; external and internal factors would have thwarted such a plan.

Alternatively, was there danger to Yaroslav's sovereignty from within Rus'? The *druzhyna* was, in large degree, dependent upon Yaroslav for its status and protection. It had no legal means of ousting the ruling *Velykyj Knyaz'*. The Rurikides were firmly entrenched as the only ruling dynasty. It is significant here that during the reigns of Volodymyr and Yaroslav, there existed a very strong loyalty to the *Velykyj Knyaz'*. This loyalty was founded on tradition and implied in the text of the *Rus'ka Pravda*. Yaroslav's sons confronted the first local

⁵⁷ Symeon was known as the "Half-Greek" because of his vast Byzantine education. Symeon understood what "Empire" truly entailed and attempted to usurp the Empire by making Bulgaria part of the Empire. This goal was to be accomplished by the military conquest of Constantinople and placing himself, a Bulgarian, at its head. Centuries later Stephan Dushan of Serbia attempted the same, however, both never saw the realization of their objective. Byzantine diplomacy stymied Symeon's plans by granting him an imperial title ("Emperor of the Bulgars") and the offer of a dynastic marriage. However, the Empire refused to accept the Byzantine-educated barbarian even though he was probably more Byzantine than Bulgar. The *DAI* also attests to placating the claims of barbarians with anything save the imperial title, insignia or a dynastic marriage.

disturbances and the state was soon torn by patrimonial wars. By that time too the traditional loyalty to the *knyazi* was offset by a counter-force, the aspirations of the *viche*. Until well into the fourteenth century the chronicles report several instances in which *knyazi* were deposed by the *viche*. Many of the former moved to other principalities and while others subsequently were invited to return to their original patrimony.⁵⁸ Yaroslav's sons realized the danger to their authority by these developments and expanded the ordinances of the *Rus'ka Pravda* to augment their authority. Notwithstanding, the laws were not sufficient to counter the authority and power of the *viche*. It is clear that the longevity of a *knyaz's* reign depended, for the most part, upon his personal ability to control the *viche*.

The Rus' Church was not only a vast land holder but also organized many works of charity, such as pastoral and medical care for the ill, and shelter for travellers among other activities. The *Church Statutes* of both Volodymyr and Yaroslav not only extended exclusive authority to members of the ecclesia, but, especially to the people at large on issues of morality and religious observance. The Church's overall impact on Kyyivan society and life is difficult to determine. Our sources make few references to the religiosity of society. Christianity is described in the *PVL* as a joyous liberation from the powers of darkness, but we cannot

⁵⁸ In the case of Ruryk Rostyslavych, he reigned as *Velykyj Knyaz'* of Kyyiv on nine different occasions between 1173 and 1210.

underestimate the affect Christian principles had on Kyyivan life. The last words attributed Yaroslav to his sons, include an order to love one another so that God will bless them. At the same time, in the *Testament of Volodymyr Monomakh*, the concept of the good *knyaz'* is emphasized in tandem with the virtues of alms-giving and various other signs of Christian behavior.

In the Kyyivan period there were three main bodies of law: *The Church Statute of Volodymyr*, *The Church Statute of Yaroslav the Wise*, and, the *Rus'ka Pravda*. The former two had a distinct influence on the content of the latter. In the *Church Statutes*⁵⁹ certain cases are delegated to the jurisdiction of the bishop's court and others to the *knyaz's* court. In both instances they were to be based on the rules set forth in the Greek *Nomocanon* and, local customs.

The intention of the *Church Statutes* was to minimize the possibility of future contentions between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities over the question of jurisdiction. Offences of a moral and religious nature were left to the jurisdiction of the bishop unless the particular offence had been customarily under the *knyaz's* jurisdiction. In the *Rus'ka Pravda* none of the articles of law dealt with cases that involved 'church people' since the *Church Statutes* reserved them to the jurisdiction of the bishop. Within seventy years of official conversion, boundaries had been

⁵⁹ See Appendices III & IV.

established for the civil and ecclesiastic authorities. The foresight of both Volodymyr and Yaroslav, for the most part, assured the peaceful relationship between the two spheres of authority. For this reason Rus' did not see a situation arise as in England between a Thomas Becket and Henry II concerning the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts and offences committed by members of the clergy.

In conclusion then there existed in Rus' no system or institution comparable to the "proprietary church" that existed in the West. The bishops of Rus' appear to have been elected canonically, -- the one exception being the metropolitan of Kyiv who was appointed by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Additionally, the power of the *Velykyj Knyaz'* was not restrained in any way by the ecclesiastical authorities, the Church had neither the means nor, it appears, the desire to limit that power. Indeed it can be argued that the presence of the clerics enhanced the *knyaz's* power and prestige. Some understanding had been reached between Volodymyr and the Church during or soon after his conversion permitting the Church to evangelize Rus'. For the Church to have any impact on Rus' society it first required a faithful following. It seems clear that an arrangement was formulated during the reigns of Volodymyr and Yaroslav; wherein the traditional authority of the *knyaz'* and the moral authority of the Church were preserved.

Chapter Five

THE BONDS OF UNITY AND ITS DEMUR

Until the death of Yaroslav the Wise (d. 1054) Rus' stood, more-or-less, as a unified state and the *Velykyj Knyaz'* of Kyiv controlled it. Yaroslav's policy or lack of policy, however, brought on the political demise of Kyiv and of the Rus' state. Dividing his realm amongst his five surviving sons, Yaroslav ensured that sovereign authority would remain vested in the three main *knyazi* of Rus' proper. His only command expression in this regard was that they were to love one another and listen to the authority of the *Velykyj Knyaz'*.¹ Such vagueness was a recipe for trouble. Yaroslav had not learned from his father's experience or indeed from his own knowledge, both having had to fight for the throne against their siblings. He obviously expected greater wisdom from his descendants than he or his father had shown.

As elsewhere the Appanage "system" was detrimental to the unity of Rus'. Each of Yaroslav's sons and their descendants would divide their patrimonies amongst their

¹ *PSRL*, I, col. 161; *RPC*, p. 142. The *Testament* of Yaroslav the Wise reveals that the only special power allocated to the *Velykyj Knyaz'* was to assist the younger brothers should they come into conflict with their older siblings. Between 1054 and 1113, Rus' appears to have been ruled by a triumvirate consisting of the *knyazi* of Kyiv, Chernihiv and Pereyaslav. The rotating system of succession appears to have worked for the first nineteen years and reached its apogee in 1072 with the translation of the relics of Borys and Hlib. The event was a manifestation of filial love and unity. The events that followed are lamented upon by the chronicler and culminated in the precarious rule of Vsevolod Yaroslavych, the sole survivor of the first triumvirate. The second triumvirate was composed of Svyatopolk Izyaslavych of Kyiv, Volodymyr Monomakh of Chernihiv and his younger brother Rostyslav Vsevolodych of Pereyaslav. Problems with the succession culminated again in fratricidal civil war. Attempts at solving this question were made at the council of Luibeck (1097). In other words the continued existence of the triumvirate was seen as essential to the stability and existence of Rus' as a polity.

survivors. Within decades the number of principalities increased rapidly. The consequence was that a more pronounced sense of localism soon manifested itself. *Knyazi* developed a greater sense of loyalty to the neighbouring principality, ruled by either father, brother or cousin, than to the *Velykyj Knyaz'*, also a relation, but more distant in kinship. Concurrently, there also existed a confused mobility amongst the princely class.²

After the death of Yaroslav in 1054 the sources pay little attention to Church affairs and concentrate mainly on the inter-princely feuds between his sons and grandsons. Attempts at reconciliation were initiated by *knyaz'* Volodymyr Monomakh and his son, Mstyslav Monomakhovych, the first of which took place at an all-princely conference at Liubech in 1097. There the participants assayed to resolve the problem of patrimonial claims and to establish solidarity amongst the *knyazi* against the Polovtsi (Kumans), the latest Turkic people to invade Rus'. In the long run the council proved a failure for it did not abrogate the principle of seniority in its decision. It did call for an end to inter-princely feuds. But, Rus' remained plagued by civil discord.³

² Prime example of this confused mobility is Oleh Svyatoslavych, prince of Volodymyr-Volyns'k (1073-76), son of *Velykyj Knyaz'* Svyatoslav Yaroslavych (1073-76). After his father's death he was driven from his principality and took over Tmutorakhan in the Caucasus. In 1079 the Byzantines instigated his capture by the Khazars, handed him over to the Byzantines and interned him on the island of Rhodes. He returned to Rus' in 1094 and captured the city of Chernihiv where he ruled for two years. He ended his days in Novgorod-Severs'k.

³ *PSRL*, I, cols. 239-277; *RPC*, pp. 187-200.

One cannot consider Rus' a fully cohesive single polity after the death of Yaropolk Volodymyrovych in 1139 and most political ties were drawn on kinship. If that be so the question then is did this political rupture also include an ecclesiastical rupture? The short answer to that is an emphatic no. Yet, some ecclesiastical fragmentation did occur. A number of incidents in the twelfth century point to this development. These include: the attempt to appoint Klyment Smolyatych to the metropolitanate of Kyyiv; *knyaz'* Andrei Boholjubs'kyj's attempt to create a separate metropolitanate in Vladimir-Suzdal', and; the Leo-Nestor controversy in Vladimir-Suzdal'.

During the decades of political fragmentation, the one centralizing factor was the principle of an indivisible Rus' metropolitanate, subordinate to the patriarchate of Constantinople, the church of the *basileus* and autocrator of the Romans -- that is, of "all Christians". Concurrently, the Eastern Church's estrangement from the West also had repercussions in the Slavic world.

The most significant consequence of this development was the termination of Kyyiv's political authority over the more northern principalities. The political structure within these northern principalities also differed and, the power of the *knyaz'* varied from principality to principality even though they were from the same dynasty.⁴ In some areas

⁴ In the territory of Vyatich there was apparently a princely family not connected with Yaroslav's descendants.

there developed a strong landed aristocracy or merchant oligarchy which inhibited the *knyaz's* power as at Kyyiv and Novgorod. Kyyiv's political importance shortly became a glory of the past. Still the power of Vladimir-Suzdal' needed to be consolidated even after the successes of Andrei Boholjubs'kyj and Vsevolod "Great-Nest".

The *Pateryk* relates the story of Svyatoslav Yaroslavych's visit to the elder Feodosij of the Pechers'ka Lavra. The visit supposedly took place soon after Svyatoslav's usurpation of the Kyyivan throne from his brother Izyaslav.⁵ The *Pateryk* records that Svyatoslav sent an invitation to Feodosij to be his guest at a banquet. Feodosij emphatically refused and wrote a letter reproaching Svyatoslav comparing him to the Biblical Cain.⁶ Angered by the criticism Svyatoslav threatened to imprison the pious elder. Members of the Pechers'ka Lavra pleaded with Feodosij to cease his criticism. But he continued to upbraid Svyatoslav's actions, having, it is said, no fear of imprisonment. Svyatoslav took no measures against him, realizing no doubt the delicacy of his own situation as a usurper. In addition to which, Feodosij's popularity among the Kyyivites was, presumably, a powerful incentive, allowing him to remain free. Eventually Feodosij ended his public chiding "but thought to

⁵ Svyatoslav Yaroslavych (of Chernihiv) and Vsevolod Yaroslavych (of Pereyaslav) joined forces to depose their brother Izyaslav (1073). The *PVL* states that Svyatoslav was the instigator of the usurpation while Vsevolod is represented as being more reluctant. See *PSRL* 1:182, 2:172.

⁶ *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*. Translated by Muriel Heppell. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1989. Discourse no. 8, p. 74-75.

himself that it would be better to beseech him by prayer to restore his brother to his territory."⁷ Finally Svyatoslav requested a meeting with Feodosij, the report of which is carried in the *Pateryk*:

The great Feodosij came out of church with the brethren, and when he saw the prince [Svyatoslav] he prostrated himself in the customary way, as is fitting before a prince; the prince for his part kissed the blessed one. Then the pious prince said to him, "I dared not come to you, father, since I thought that you would be angry with me and not admit me to the monastery." The blessed one said, "Good lord, what has my anger availed against our power? Yet it is right for us to accuse you and to speak to you about the salvation of your soul, and it is right for you to obey."⁸

The entry also describes Feodosij's visit to Svyatoslav's court:

He [Svyatoslav] would say to the blessed one [Feodosij], since he was feeling glad, "I tell you truly, father, even if I were told that my father had risen from the dead, I should not rejoice so much at your arrival, and I should not feel so much fear or misgiving before him as I do in the presence of your venerable soul." The blessed one said, "If you fear me, then do my bidding and restore your brother [Izyaslav] to the throne which your pious father [Yaroslav] entrusted to him" But the prince [Svyatoslav] fell silent at this, since he did not know what to answer, for the enemy [Satan] had so inflamed him with anger against his brother that he did not even want to hear his name mentioned. Our father Feodosij prayed to God daily and nightly for the Christ-loving prince Izyaslav, and also ordered his name to be remembered in the litany, as he was the chief prince and the most senior of them all, whereas he said that the one who was sitting illegally on the

⁷ *ibid.*, p. 76.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 77.

throne was not to be remembered in his monastery. It was only when the brethren begged him to do so that he told them to remember the latter together with the former -- however the Christ-loving one [Izyaslav] first, then the pious one [Svyatoslav].⁹

Relations between Svyatoslav and Feodosij appear to have been very cordial, and reverence was demonstrated for their respective offices. Svyatoslav feared that his rule would be undermined by Feodosij's moral influence. For his part, however, Feodosij admitted that his influence had not hindered Svyatoslav's power in any way. And, while he adds that he had the right to speak on religious matters that pertain to Svyatoslav's salvation, he makes no mention of his influence in the political arena. However, Feodosij did address the reinstatement of Izyaslav to the Kyivan throne as a Christian, moral issue noting, specifically, that the command of Yaroslav the Wise had not been executed. Feodosij's order that Izyaslav's name be mentioned in the litany¹⁰ exclusively may have been an attempt to intimidate Svyatoslav into restoring his brother, Izyaslav. Members of the Pechers'ka cloister encouraged Feodosij to mention both Izyaslav and Svyatoslav in the litany, doing so out of fear of denunciation and possible banishment.

The discourse itself may very well be a total fabrication on the part of the monks of the Pechers'ka Lavra. Even

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 77-78.

¹⁰ The *ektenia* (ектєнїя) was a litany recited by a deacon during the liturgy while the celebrant prayed secretly; it consisted of nine petitions, each of them answered by the choir with a threefold *kyrie* ("Lord have mercy").

so, there are two points of interest. The one is the order of Yaroslav the Wise which entrusted Izyaslav with the rule of Kyiv; the other, that the person of the *knyaz'*, although morally criticized, is not politically subject or obligated to the will of the Church, or its most influential representatives.

Episcopal and monastic influence in political matters was often considerable. Bishops frequently interceded with warring *knyazi* with an eye to preserving the unity of the realm. Each *knyaz'* was acknowledged to possess the right of protection and supervision over the church within his patrimony. Unlike Byzantine emperors, the *knyaz'* never attempted to devise doctrine. But more, the clergy's authority over matters relative to doctrine and private and public morality was undisputed and absolute. On several occasions clerics and monks admonished *knyazi* for their moral frailties.

Later royal statutes, principally from the twelfth century, also touch upon the jurisdiction of church courts. The preamble to these begin with the *knyaz'* identifying himself and tracing his lineage back to Volodymyr the Great.¹¹ The preamble is important in the sense that the *knyaz'* associates himself with the dynasty of the Rurikides and, consequently, has the right to issue church statutes as did his ancestors. In most instances such statutes are in the tradition of those issued by Volodymyr and Yaroslav and are

¹¹ Example: "I, Volodymyr, son of Vsevolod, grandson of Yaroslav, great-grandson of Volodymyr, baptizer of Rus'...".

intended to define the relationship between the ecclesiastical and royal courts. Certain matters are handed over to the church courts and other responsibilities such as living conditions for the poor and the collection of tithes, etc.

In the *Expanded Version of Rus'ka Pravda* and in the *Statute of Volodymyr Monomakh*, no article of law is directed to offences against or perpetrated by "Church People". Clearly the *Church Statutes* of Volodymyr and Yaroslav were recognized as a different code for the "Church People". It is identified as such in the aforementioned statutes and, remained the law for all the different principalities of Rus'.

The controversy over the appointment of Klyment Smolyatych as metropolitan of Kyyiv stands out in history. He is the only medieval metropolitan of Kyyiv whose appointment was systematically questioned.

Klyment Smolyatych was elected metropolitan of Kyyiv in 1147. The legalities of his election remain in question. Only one fragment of his work has come down to us, a letter to a priest named Thomas. Klyment was, the chronicles state, "such a philosopher there has not yet been in the Rus' land."¹²

¹² "Some students of Russian literature have imagined to have found in it proof that Klyment had read Homer, Plato, and Aristotle -- of course in Greek, for no Slavonic translations of these authors ever existed. Upon closer examination, however, one sees that this supposed acquaintance with Greek classics is only attributed to Klyment by his adversaries, obviously an indication of his profane secularism." G.P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity, the Tenth to Thirteenth Centuries*. Volume I. Cambridge, 1946, p. 64.

In the *Epistle to the Presbyter Foma (Thomas)*, Klyment attempts to put to rest the accusations about his irreligiousness:

You [Foma] say to me: "You write so as to glorify yourself, making yourself out to be a philosopher." Yet the fault is primarily your own! As if I ever wrote any such thing to you! But neither did I write or would I write thus! And yet you say: "You write philosophically," while in fact you yourself wrote most falsely, as though I had abandoned the revered Scriptures and had instead written using Homer and Aristotle and Plato, who were renowned in the colonnades [or "among the rhetoricians"] of the Hellenes. But if I did so write, then it was not to you but to the prince, and even thus not readily.¹³

Under the year 1147 [A.M. 6655] it is recorded that *Velykyj Knyaz' Izyaslav* of Kyiv summoned six bishops and appointed the monk, Klyment Smolyatych, to be metropolitan. The reason for this extraordinary appointment is asserted in the *Nikonian Chronicle*, to have been "...owing to the feuds and many difficulties, it was impossible to go to Constantinople to the patriarch in order to have a metropolitan of [Rus'] consecrated there."¹⁴

What actually took place at this meeting will never be known. We do know that there were both supporters and, opponents to Klyment's appointment. The bishops assembled were: Onufrij of Chernihiv, Feodor of Bilhorod, Evfymij of

¹³ Klyment Smolyatych, "Epistle to Foma", in *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kievan Rus'*. Translated with an introduction by Simon Franklin. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press for the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University, 1991, p. 31.

¹⁴ *Nikon*, p. 28.

Pereyaslav, Demyan of Jur'ev, Feodor of Volodymyr-Volyns'k, Nyfont of Novgorod and Manuel of Smolensk. The chronicler epitomizes bishop Onufrij's inclination in the following fashion:

I consider it proper for the bishops to meet and appoint the metropolitan.¹⁵

Apprehensions about the appointment were entertained and the *Hypatian* text further relates:

[The bishops said] that it is not in our laws, for a bishop to appoint a metropolitan without a patriarch, but a patriarch must appoint a metropolitan. And we [the bishops] will not pay homage to you [Klyment] or hold church services with you, since you have not received a blessing from St. Sophia nor from the patriarch. If you correct this, we will pay homage to you. We received a notice from Metropolitan Michael that it is not proper for us to hold services in St. Sophia without a metropolitan. He is heavy at heart against us because of this.¹⁶

The circumstances of the mid-twelfth century stand in sharp contrast to the situation which existed at the time of Ilarion's appointment (1051). In the mid-twelfth century, the old imperial Rus' was no longer a united realm.

¹⁵ *PSRL*, II, col. 340-341.

¹⁶ *PSRL*, II, col. 341. Those who opposed Klyment's appointment were the Greek bishop of Smolensk, Manuel and archbishop Nyfont of Novgorod (perhaps a Greek). It isn't clear how many bishops attended the Kyiv conference. If Nyfont and Manuel were present, it would make five or seven. The *Laurentian* text reports that six bishops were present, the sixth being bishop Ioakym of Turiv, whom Grand Prince Izyaslav Mstyslavych brought to Kyiv in 1146. Onufrij's argument that the bishops had the right to choose their own metropolitan was based on solid canonical grounds; but it was not the practice in the Rus' Church. Moreover, Metropolitan Michael left for Constantinople in 1145, where he died in 1147. He placed a ban on anyone serving in St. Sophia in his absence. This ban remained in effect and no new metropolitan from Constantinople was despatched.

Instead, it consisted of several independent jurisdictions, some of which still recognized Kyiv's political supremacy. That this was case is to be seen in the diverse foreign policies that a number of them undertook. All the while the emperor Manuel Komnenos attempted to draw Rus' into his diplomatic network against Hungary and Norman Sicily.¹⁷

¹⁷ The situation in Rus' takes on a more international nature. The chronicle states that Izyaslav was hostile to the Empire because of his alliance with Hungary. An alliance existed between the Byzantine emperor, Manuel Komnenos, and the German king, Conrad Hohenstaufen, which was directed against Hungary for control over Serbian affairs, as also against the Normans in Sicily who threatened Byzantine commercial and strategic interests in the Mediterranean. The Normans supported Welf interests in Italy. King Vladislav of Bohemia along with princes Vladymyrko of Halychyna (Galicia) and Yuriy of Suzdal' sided with the Byzantines. The other alliance consisted of Louis VII of France, Roger of Sicily, King Geza of Hungary and Izyaslav of Kyiv. See M. Hrushevsky, *op. cit.*, Volume II, pp. 152-154, and G. Vernadsky, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

The Klyment episode provoked schisms within the Rus' and Constantinopolitan Churches.¹⁸ By that time the Rus' Church possessed ten bishops, four of whom were Byzantines. Tensions arose between Klyment, Manuel of Smolensk and Nyfont of Novgorod, these reach their apex with the arrest and imprisonment of archbishop Nyfont in 1149. During his imprisonment in the Pechers'ka monastery, Nyfont is reputed to have suffered physical mistreatment. A letter of Patriarch

¹⁸ The appointment of Klyment needs to be placed in its historical context. The Byzantine Empire was experiencing a brief period of resurgence under the Komneni -- specifically, during the reign of Manuel Komnenos. Manuel's diplomatic intrigues touched most areas of Europe. His diplomacy was aimed primarily at Hungary and Norman Sicily. *Velykyj Knyaz'* Izyaslav was the son-in-law of Geza II of Hungary. Thus the realm of Kyiv was hostile to Manuel. By this time, Rus' was divided into several virtually independent patrimonies, each adhering to its own foreign policy. Izyaslav's appointment of Klyment was judged to be uncanonical and invalid by a minority of bishops, most of whom were Byzantine citizens. The same view was held by those *knyazi* who were allies of the Empire or those generally opposed to Izyaslav. Tensions between Kyiv and Empire proliferated during the reign of *Velykyj Knyaz'* Rostyslav Mstyslavych. Rostyslav refused to accept the new metropolitan, Ioann IV, who was sent by Manuel Komnenos. At a meeting with the Byzantine embassy Rostyslav demanded the reinstatement of Klyment Smolyatych, stating that it was the duty and right of the bishops to choose their own primate. This insertion in the *Hypatian Chronicle* is indicative of the attitude of a section of Rus' society; specifically, that the appointment of foreign primates was an infringement on the sovereignty of the *Velykyj Knyaz'*. Moreover, the diplomatic intrigues of Manuel Komnenos only augmented Rus' suspicions. The incident caused a temporary rift between Rus' and the Empire. Ioann was eventually installed as metropolitan, however, its long-term affect caused feelings of resentment. Manuel Komnenos' plots divided Rus' into pro and anti-Byzantine camps. In the 1140s three *knyazi* competed for political hegemony over Rus': Izyaslav of Kyiv, his uncle Yurij Dolhorukyj of Suzdal' and his cousin Vladimirkko of Halychyna; the latter two being allied with Manuel. The contemporary Byzantine historian described Yurij as the emperor's "ally" (*symakhos*) while Vladimirkko is denoted as his "vassal" (*hypospondos*). Vladimirkko's successor, Yaroslav, moved towards an alliance with Geza II of Hungary, while Kyiv moved into the Byzantine orbit with Yurij's capture of Kyiv in 1154. However, Rostyslav's outburst threatened Manuel's ambitions. Further events complicated matters when Manuel's rebellious cousin, Andronikos Komnenos, sought refuge in Halychyna. Manuel feared a political alliance between Hungary and Halychyna that could possibly support his outlaw cousin. The situation forced Manuel to pardon Andronikos and in the same year (1165) he sent an embassy to Rostyslav. Rostyslav signed a peace treaty wherein he was to supply auxiliary troops to Manuel and accept Ioann as metropolitan; in return he received unspecified gifts and possibly a promise that he or his successor would be consulted regarding the appointment of the next primate. The Byzantine embassy then travelled to Yaroslav of Halychyna. Yaroslav was persuaded to renounce his Hungarian alliance and pledge loyalty to the Empire. Manuel's political intrigues were the last in which the Empire was to influence Rus' foreign and internal policy. The military disasters that befell the Empire in the latter stages of Manuel's reign and the Crusader capture of Constantinople in 1204, effectively ended any future Byzantine collusions. After these events our sources are silent. We may assume that relations remained cordial.

Nicholas Mouzalon of Constantinople to Nyfont, adverts to Nyfont's plight:¹⁹

In the Name of the Holy Spirit [we address] the son and the fellow worker of our humility, the virtuous shepherd of Christ's flock of rational sheep, Nyfont, lord bishop of Great Novgorod. Rejoice in the Lord!

We have heard, my lord, about your righteous suffering, which you are enduring for God's sake because of your opposition to Metropolitan Klym, who by his own arbitrary will has assumed the office of metropolitan of Kyiv without our blessing. But you, honoured father, refuse to allow him such extreme boldness in respect of the priestly office and will not concelebrate with him or mention his name in the divine service. You have endured many evil insults and suffered many reproaches from him, O holy man of God. For the sake of God's righteousness, O sufferer, continue to persevere and do not succumb to this evil serpent Klym and his wicked counsellors. And you, brother, will be numbered by God among the saints of old who suffered steadfastly for the Orthodox faith, and so that you will show yourself as an example of perseverance to those who later became ecclesiastics in the land of Rus'.

In the same year Izyaslav was defeated by his uncle Yurij of Suzdal' and fled to Volodymyr-Volyns'k taking metropolitan Klyment with him. This schism within the Rus' Church was not healed until the death of Izyaslav and the removal of metropolitan Klyment. What happened to Klyment after he was deposed is not known. In all likelihood he ended his days as a monk. Although the schism was healed

¹⁹ Text in Makarij, *Istorija russkoj tserkvi*. Third edition, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1888), Appendix 1, 297, cited in *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*. Translated by Muriel Heppell. Preface by Sir Dimitri Obolensky. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1989, Appendix II, p. 223. Patriarch Nicholas IV Mouzalon (ca. 1070-1152) occupied the see of Constantinople from 1147 to 1151. This letter is attested to by the *Hypatian Chronicle*, see *PSRL*, II, col. 483-485.

temporarily it left, in Obolensky's words, "an aftermath of bitterness."²⁰

The *Chronicle of Novgorod* reports that in the year prior to Nyfont's arrest, he had travelled to Suzdal' and was reconciled with knyaz' Yuriij, Izyaslav's enemy. Apparently Izyaslav's arrest of Nyfont was motivated not only by the desire to achieve recognition of Klyment's appointment but also directed at removing a very dangerous individual, who jeopardized Izyaslav's northern prospects. The arrest and transport of Nyfont from Novgorod to Kyiv was intended to remove one of the leading members of the northern coalition (i.e., Novgorod-Suzdal').

Unquestionably Klyment owed his appointment to the influence of Izyaslav. Notwithstanding, he was not a "king's man" and did fulfill his episcopal duties. Thus he intervened vigorously, but in vain, to stop a mob in Kyiv from murdering the former *Velykyj Knyaz'* Ihor Ol'hovych who had taken monastic vows. Klyment was aware, moreover, of the serious repercussions should Ihor Ol'hovych be murdered.²¹ His prediction, that Ihor's kinsmen, the Ol'hovychi, would exact vengeance, came true. Even after Klyment's deposition, the *Hypatian* text praises his character; a sentiment

²⁰ D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth*, Washington & New York, Praeger Publishers, 1971, p. 228.

²¹ The murder of Ihor Ol'hovych (1147) immediately raised suspicions regarding the complicity of Izyaslav Mstyslavych. The account in the *Hypatian Chronicle* appears to be reliable; that is, Izyaslav had nothing to do with the murder. Ihor Ol'hovych was at the time a monk in the Pechers'ka monastery and, therefore, posed no threat to Izyaslav's government. The account in the *Hypatian* text states that the mob in Kyiv murdered Ihor out of frenzy and hatred towards the Ol'hovychi. See *PSRL*, II, col. 351-360.

which even his enemies shared. Still, the Klyment episode severely threatened the unity of the Church of Rus' and carried political repercussions as well.

The greatest threat to Kyyivan ecclesiastical unity was mounted by *knyaz'* Andrei Boholjubs'kyj of Vladimir-Suzdal'. This *knyaz'* inherited from his father, Yurij Dolhorukyj, the same ambition and drive but different goals. Yurij shared, in large degree, the same aims as all the previous *knyazi* of Rus', that is the control of Kyyiv and control of the Rus' political scene. His son Andrei, on the other hand, seems to have been the first to realize that Kyyiv had lost its political significance for the north. His policy, from all appearances, was to minimize Kyyiv status and, all the while, enhance the prestige of Vladimir-Suzdal'.

The first act in the undermining of Kyyiv was the removal of the icon of the *Theotokos* from Vyshorod to Vladimir in 1155. Two accounts of this incident are reported, the one in the *Kyyivan (Hypatian)* and the other in the *Vladimir-Suzdal' (Laurentian)* text.²²

The two accounts are identical except for the addition in the *Hypatian (Kyyivan)* text which adds that Andrei's

²² *Kyyivan Chronicle*: The same year [1155] Prince Andrej went from his father from Vyshorod to Suzdal' *without his father's permission* [ital. J. Pelenski], and he took from Vyshorod the Icon of the Blessed Mother which was brought from Cesarjagrad on the same ship with the [*Pirogoshcha*] [Icon]. And he had it framed in thirty-grivny-weight-of gold, besides silver, and precious stones, and large pearls and having thus adorned [the Icon], he placed it in his own church of the Mother of God in Vladimir. *PSRL*, vol. II, col. 482. *Vladimir-Suzdal' Chronicle*: The same year [1155] Prince Andrej went from his father from Vyshorod to Suzdal', and he brought with him the Icon of the Blessed Mother which was brought from Cesarjagrad on the same ship with the [*Pirogoshcha*] [Icon]. And he had it framed in thirty-grivny-weight-of gold, besides silver, and precious stones, and large pearls and having thus adorned [the Icon], he placed it in his own church of the Mother of God in Vladimir. *PSRL*, vol. I, col. 346.

action was committed *without his father's permission*. Clearly the compiler of the *Hypatian* text regarded the removal of the icon as an illegal act. To justify his actions, Andrei required another account of the event which placed his actions in a more favourable light. The *Skazanie o chudesakh Vladimirskoj Ikony Bozhiej Materi* (*Account of the Miracles of the Vladimir Icon of the Mother of God*), composed in Andrei's lifetime or shortly after his death (1164-1185), reads as follows:

Prince Andrei wanted to be prince (*knyazhiti*) in the Rostov land. He began to inquire about icons. He was told of the Icon of the Most Holy Mother of God in the Nunnery of Vyshorod - how it departed from its resting place three times. It happened the first time when they [the witnesses] entered the Church and beheld it standing by itself in the middle of the Church; they replaced it. The second time they saw it with its face turned toward the altar. They said, "It wishes to stand in the altar place." And they placed it behind the altar table. The third time they saw it standing by itself on the side of the altar table, and then they saw a multitude of miracles. When we heard of these tidings the Prince [Andrei] was gladdened and went into the Church. He began to look over the icons. Now the aforesaid Icon excelled over all the others. When he saw it, he fell upon his knees and prayed, saying, "O Most Holy Virgin and Mother of Christ Our Lord, Thou shalt be my defender (*zastupnitsa*) in the Rostov land. Come and visit the *newly enlightened people* so that all this may happen according to Thy will." And he took the Icon and went to the Rostov land. He took some clergy with him.²³

²³ Translation in E.S. Hurwitz, *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij: The Man and the Myth*. Florence, 1980, p. 56. The term *newly enlightened people* is most probably taken from Ilarion's *Sermon of Law and Grace* and may also be indicative of the time it took Christianity to make inroads into the Rostov region.

The tale of the transfer then takes on a completely different tone. The icon is represented as having a "desire" to move to the northern principality thereby leaving the impression that Kyyiv had lost its sacral position. The story is anti-Kyyiv in nature, rather than anti-Byzantine, and offers us some insight into Andrei Boholjubs'kyj's ecclesiastical-political policy.

Accompanying the transfer of the icon was the enormous building project undertaken by Andrei immediately after his seizure of the Rostov-Suzdal' lands. The centre piece of this work was the erection of the Mother of God Church in Vladimir and the Golden Gates into that town in 1164. These last were modelled after Kyyivan and Byzantine prototypes. During the early 1160s Andrei built a new town -- named symbolically Boholjubovo -- which became his second residence. The erection of such edifices was a slow but sure attempt to replace Kyyiv's grandeur, in the eyes of northerners, with a new religious-political centre, Vladimir.

Boholjubs'kyj's boldest endeavour, however, involved the creation of a separate metropolitanate in Vladimir, independent of Kyyiv but subordinate to Constantinople. We know of this plan from the *Nikonian Chronicle*. Caution is recommended when analyzing this source, however, since it represents, to a large degree, sixteenth-century Muscovite political-ecclesiastical ideology. Evidence of Andrei's

objective in this respect appears in a letter of Patriarch Lukas Chrysoberges to Boholjubs'kyj.²⁴

Andrei seems to have made his request after the completion of his building program. Both petition and response are to be dated between 1166 and 1168, because the negative response it elicited, to all appearances, influenced his campaign against Kyyiv in March of 1169.

Andrei's appeal appears to have been both to establish a new metropolitanate in Vladimir and the approval of his candidate, Feodor. Patriarch Lukas categorically rejected the request on the grounds that Vladimir could not be removed from the jurisdiction of Rostov and Suzdal'.²⁵

However, the real reason for the rejection of Boholjubs'kyj's request was most probably the patriarch's strict adherence to the traditional Byzantine doctrine of the unitary and indivisible character of the Metropolitanate and the polity of Rus'.²⁶

It was only after the fall of Kyyiv to the Mongols in 1240 that Boholjubs'kyj's scheme aided Vladimir, and later Moscow, acquire its own metropolitanate.²⁷ The patriarch's one concession was his consent to moving the bishop of Rostov-Suzdal' to Vladimir to be in the same city as Andrei.

²⁴ For the text see Makarii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*. Volume III. St. Petersburg, 1868, pp. 298-300 and *Nikon*. Volume II, pp. 116-127.

²⁵ Patriarch Lukas' rejection is most probably based on canon law; specifically the indivisibility of a bishopric or metropolitanate. The canon may be in reference to Canon 12 of Chalcedon. See E.S. Hurwitz, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

²⁶ J. Pelenski, *op. cit.*, p. 771.

²⁷ See J. Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia*. Cambridge, University Press, 1981, pp. 73-96.

This really amounted to very little and proved to be a stumbling block to all of Boholjubs'kyj's plans.

Andrei's second request has to do with the controversy over Leon, bishop of Rostov. Here the patriarch proposed a compromise. The patriarch believed that such internal matters should be left to the metropolitan of Kyiv, the final authority on theological and disciplinary matters in Rus' just as the Kyivan *knyaz'* was the highest secular authority before whom other important conflicts should be adjudicated.²⁸ At every turn Boholjubs'kyj's plans were stymied by the patriarch's response.

Andrei's activities subsequently take on a more violent character. Manifestly, the capture of Kyiv in 1169 was intended as an attempt to destroy any sort of prestige and sacral identity which remained to the city, in Suzdalian eyes, and included the spoliation of churches and monasteries. The *Laurentian* text (*Vladimir-Suzdal'* text) speaks of this sack in religious-ecclesiastical terms being regarded as just punishment for metropolitan Constantine's unlawful interdiction of Polikarp, hegumen of the Pechers'ka monastery.²⁹

Finally, Andrei took action against his one-time protégé, Feodor. Feodor was accused of certain heresies³⁰ and

²⁸ *Nikon, op. cit.*

²⁹ This was a controversy over fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays whenever those days coincided with major holy days of the Lord. It is alleged to have begun in Suzdal' in 1164.

³⁰ See previous footnote.

anti-monastic policies which culminated in the confiscation of monastic properties. He was handed over to metropolitan Constantine for judgment. This surely was meant to appease the metropolitan for the events of 1169. Feodor's condemnation and death as a heretic is the first recorded execution ordered by the metropolitan.³¹

Boholjubs'kyj did not claim the Kyyivan throne after his pillage of the city. Rather he permitted the installation of his brother, Hlib, as *Velykyj Knyaz'*. The arguments usually put forward, especially by Russian historians, regarding the consequences of the sack of Kyyiv is that it inaugurated the transfer of the capitals from Kyyiv to Vladimir.³² This view assumes that Rus' was a homogeneous principality before 1169. This also assumes that the Rus'ians understood the notion of capital, where the central government is fixed and where is formulated matters pertaining to foreign policy, the economy and laws for all. While it is true that all of Rus' had the same laws and religion, there is no evidence to support the assumption that Kyyiv acted in such capacity after 1139 for all the lands of the old Rus' empire or that Vladimir took on the role after 1169. It is to be noted too that the *knyazi* were more anxious to enhance the prestige of their respective patrimonies

³¹ *PSRL*, II, cols. 551-554.

³² See N.M. Karamzin, *Istoriia Gosudarstva Rosiiskogo*. Volume II, p. 208; M.F. Florinsky, *Russia, A History and an Interpretation*. New York, 1953, p. 40; V.O. Kliuchevsky, *Kurs russkoi istorii*. Volume I. Moscow, 1956, pp. 288-291; M. Hrushevsky, *Istoriia Ukraïny Rusy*. Volume III. pp. 222-223.

than bent on conquering their traditional capital, Kyyiv. In the many instances when Kyyiv changed hands (12th c.) the conquerors were more interested in placing a member of their own clan on the throne, thereby insuring control over the Kyyiv region. The title *Velykyj Knyaz'* did not include any special powers in respect to the other *knyazi* because no constitutional executive power was specified either by Yaroslav the Wise or the Council of Liubech. Had that been the case the main military objective of every inter-princely war would have been Kyyiv. So too Boholjubs'kyj's desire to establish a metropolitanate did not imply the transfer of the metropolitanate from Kyyiv to Vladimir, but to create an independent one in his own patrimony. This conclusion is supported by Serbyn who states that:

This policy shows that his [Boholjubs'kyj's] ambition, which after all was in line with the political realities of the day, was to set up a new and independent state and not to remodel the old, as a policy of transfer of centres would imply.³³

Although Boholjubs'kyj's plans met with failure at every point, his actions and life, in the chronicles, are glorified at the expense of Kyyiv. The full impact of Boholjubs'kyj's actions were not, at all events, to be felt until after 1240 with the emergence of Moscow. Andrei Boholjubs'kyj created a type of northern spirit or pride. He

³³ Roman Serbyn, "Some Theories on the Question of the Rus' Unity (1140-1200) Re-examined." In *Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine, 988-1988*. Edited by Oleh W. Gerus and Alexander Baran. Winnipeg, Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1989, p. 121.

realized that Kyyiv had lost its "primacy" in the north. Later, rivalry would erupt among the northern principalities in their aspirations to succeed Kyyiv's past greatness. These struggles, needless to say, greatly damaged the already tenuous bonds of unity.

What should be kept in mind is that during the incessant civil wars the authority of the *knyaz'* in regards to the domination of church affairs was not drastically transformed. As patrimonial rulers, they still retained the power to formulate laws regarding church order, so long as they conformed to the basic principles of the *Church Statutes of Volodymyr and Yaroslav*. Their authority and power was not jeopardized even by the most influential members of the Church. While the moral authority of prelates was indisputable and public opinion could be swayed by them in the Church's favour, it did not affect the *knyaz's* sovereignty.

Chapter Six

CONCLUSION

After the death of Boholjubs'kyj one encounters a blank page in Church-state relations in Rus'. The chronicles deal, for the most part, with the inter-princely feuds that continued to plague Rus' until the Mongol conquest in 1240. A few observations can be made, however. First, that the *knyazi* continued the process of consolidating power in their respective principalities. The northern principalities in particular, to wit, Suzdal, Vladimir, Rostov exhibited a measure of healthy political stability especially under Vsevolod III "Great-Nest" of Vladimir (1176-1212) who dominated the northern Rus' political scene.

In the south, a three-cornered struggle for power developed between the descendents of Rostyslav Mstyslavych of Smolensk (the Rostyslavychi), the descendents of Oleh Svyatoslavych of Chernihiv (the Ol'hovychi) and Roman Mstyslavych of Volyn'.

Can we truly say then that during this period of political fragmentation, Church-state relations remained unaffected? The silence of our sources leads us tentatively to hold to the affirmative. It appears that the normal day-to-day functions of the Church, the Church courts and the civil courts proceeded without serious conflict. The absence of issues between civil and Church authorities, does not necessarily mean they did not exist. Nevertheless, it would be

improper to begin to make such suppositions without any evidence.

With respect to the Church hierarchs one is also wanting information. Our sources, monastic in origin, only peripherally or indirectly comment on prelatical activity. Such views they do carry is only general information. Dates of installation, appointment, death, ethnic origin, and/or a few specific qualities constitute the sum of it. We are not informed about their defects or their pastoral, administrative or religious values. It is notable that, although the vast majority of the metropolitans of Kyiv were Byzantines and, a number of bishops were of Byzantine stock, the sources do not contain any anti-Byzantine bias. Are we to imply from this that these bishops, although being foreigners who either did not know or spoke Slavic poorly, were not cut off from the concerns of their flock? Surely these Byzantine bishops worked with translators who were Greeks who knew Slavic and/or Slavs who knew Greek. It appears, however, that their work was not hindered by the language barrier. The bishops were familiar figures to the people as is clear from the confrontation between the bishop of Novgorod, the soothsayer and the mob.¹ Bishops, moreover, according to the *Church Statutes* of Volodymyr and Yaroslav, were to preside at and administer just punishment for crimes that fell under their jurisdiction.

¹ *PSRL*, I, cols. 179-181; *RPC*, pp. 153-154.

It has often been asserted that the Greek metropolitans of Kyyiv were agents of the emperor in Constantinople. Of course there was correspondence between Constantinople and Kyyiv; the Rus' colony in Constantinople would certainly confirm that fact. The normal sort of correspondence between a bishop and his patriarch, including letters to the emperor were a part of it. Likewise, the metropolitan of Kyyiv who was a foreigner kept in contact with his homeland. Embedded in these communications one would probably find reports about any new developments in Rus'. During the internecine strife after Yaroslav's death it is a virtual certainty that the metropolitan, given the knowledge that the Byzantines had about Rus', would have kept the Empire well informed of the goings-on.

The fact that many of the bishops were ethnically Byzantine-Greek should not be considered as something unnatural or regressive. The Rus' state largely needed to be evangelized for a long period after 988. The local pool of candidates for the episcopacy was severely limited because of the population's rudimentary comprehension of Christianity. Moreover, potential bishops also needed administrative skills and, an ability to combat the pagan superstitions. Consequently the best possible aspirants for the prelacy were the Byzantine-Greeks. At the Synod of Kyyiv in 1147, the transactions of which are related in the *Kyyivan Chronicle*, nearly half of the bishops in attendance were ethnically Byzantine-Greek. So, even after over 150 years of

official Christianity, Rus' remained largely dependent upon the Empire to provide bishops.

The presence of these foreign prelates on Rus' soil may have been favorably looked upon by the *knyazi*. Since these Byzantine bishops had to work through translators, having little or no knowledge of the local language, their influence would be extremely limited, providing little or no threat to the *knyaz's* sovereignty. The inability to speak the local language also diminished their chances of becoming popular figures among the masses. The silence of our sources concerning the character of many bishops leads one to conclude that many of them were distant figures with little to no contact with the populace.

One of the few character sketches of a bishop of Rus' is that of Metropolitan Ioann II (1076-1089). In the *PVL* he is characterized in the following words:

In this year, [Ioann] the Metropolitan passed away. [Ioann] was a man versed in books and study, generous to the poor and to the widows, affable to both rich and poor, calm-tempered and mild, reticent yet eloquent, and able to console the sorrowful with words of Holy Scripture. There never was his like in Rus' before him, nor will there be in later days.²

While this statement gives us indirectly a brief description of the role bishops played in Rus', it reveals that they, or at least some of them, led lives of learning. We know also that Metropolitan Theopemptos, the "first" metropolitan of

² *PSRL*, I, col. 208; *RPC*, pp. 169-170.

Kyyiv, also endeavoured to bring learning to Kyyiv and that the people of Kyyiv protested against this "study of books" (*na uchenye knizhnoe*) because it was not in their tradition. Nevertheless, it does give us an idea of what the main purpose of the Byzantine bishops was; that is, the transplantation of Byzantine religion and culture to Rus'. The *PVL* also offers the story of the founding of the Pechers'ka Lavra by St. Theodosius. In the story it relates that the book of the rule of the Studite monks was brought to Kyyiv translated into Slavic. It seems then that there was a plan to transplant Studite monasticism into Rus'.

The appointment of Byzantine-Greeks as metropolitans of Kyyiv suited the Rus' situation. Had a native Slav been appointed, he could hardly remain indifferent to the rivalries and intrigues that characterized Rus' politics.³

Compared to Western sources, our sources leave us at a grave disadvantage on the subject of Church-state relations. The historian has a wealth of primary source material to analyze the subject in the West. There they exist because of the controversies that arose between the Church of Rome and

³ On one occasion the metropolitan of Kyyiv was asked to take part in a Western European Church-State encounter. The anti-Pope, Guibert of Ravenna, wrote to Metropolitan John (Ioann) II of Kyyiv requesting recognition and support (c. 1085). Rather than writing directly to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Guibert attempted a backdoor approach by writing to Metropolitan John. John replied listing the errors of the Latin Church (i.e., *filioque*, *azymites*, improper Lenten and baptismal practices). Also in the letter, John expressed his views concerning sharing sacraments with Latins, including marriage. The statement concerning marriage was a criticism of Yaroslav's dynastic ties with Latin potentates. John was probably concerned with the possibility of Latin influence in Rus'. The practice was long continued despite John's sharp criticism. See B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance a la Fin due XI^e siecle*. Paris, 1924, pp. 32-37; A Pavlov, *A Critical Essay on the History of the Ancient Greco-Russian Polemic against the Latins*. (In Russian). St. Petersburg, 1878, pp. 167-186; S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955, p. 70-71.

the kingdoms that lay within its ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The larger the issue the more information the historian has at hand. The situation in medieval Rus' is very different. The sources, which are primarily chronicles, do not inform us of any "great" heresies or conflicts that emerged or anything that might be compared to the investiture controversy that was waged in the West. How to account for this is a difficult and important question.

The Germanic kingdoms had a longer contact with Christianity than the Eastern Slavs, although Christianity required a long time to take root. Why is it then that the Rus', a people who officially accepted Christianity much later than any other European people (c. 988), had less problem in resolving relations between the spiritual and temporal authorities. The answer lies in the fact that Rus' acceptance appeared much later than most other European nations.

When Christianity became the official state religion of the Roman Empire, it was a relatively young religion. Time was needed to iron out the wrinkles in terms of how the new faith was to fit into the imperial Roman system. Likewise, in the West, time was needed to work out a workable apparatus for Christianity to fit into the so-called developing "feudal system". Naturally, both the spiritual and secular powers competed for the upper hand but in the end some sort of an arrangement was attained. In the East the Church became subservient to the will of the East Roman government;

in the West the same situation prevailed until the eleventh century when the "Hildebrandine" reforms began to turn the tide in favour of the Church.

By the time Christianity was officially accepted in Rus' (c. 988), it had been around for nearly a millennia and part of the Byzantine imperial system for nearly six hundred years. All the matters concerning dogma, definition, jurisdiction had been settled prior to 988; so it was only a matter of transferring the principles of Christianity to Rus' and fitting it into the traditional political system of Rus'. Moreover, the type of Christianity that was accepted by Rus' also negated any possibility of certain problems from arising as they had in the West (i.e., simony and investiture). Therefore, there is no Rus' equivalent of a Henry IV going to Canossa nor is there anything that compares to a "Donation of Constantine".

I do not wish to give the impression that the Rus' Church lived in a total *symphonia* with the civil authorities; far from it. Our intention is not to paint a rosy-coloured picture of a Christian utopia, the evidence rejects such a notion. Rather the lack of conflict that prevailed between the representatives of the Church and the reigning *knyazi* is a significant and unique development. The conflicts that one identifies, with regard to Church-state relations, do not readily apply to the Rus' model. Absent is the struggle for superiority as in Western Europe and in early Byzantine history. From the time of the official

acceptance of Christianity in 988 the Church was assigned exclusive handling of the spiritual and moral needs of Rus' society. The *Church Statutes* of Volodymyr and Yaroslav did not make the church subservient to the needs of the state but provided a workable distribution of authority between the spiritual and temporal powers so that the power of the *knyaz'* would not be jeopardized nor the prestige of the Church compromised. This sort of relationship remained intact until the end of the Kyyivan period and even beyond.

The influence the *Church Statutes* had on later society can be observed by a Church ordinance dating from 1521 which deals with physicians.⁴ It provides: "Physician, when you approach the afflicted, prostrate yourself, pray, then practice your art."⁵

The growth of the Church in the two and a half centuries to 1240 was monumental. At the end of the Kyyivan period there existed sixteen dioceses, doubling Volodymyr's original eight -- an indication of the inroads Christianity had made.

When historians examine medieval society, specifically Church-state relations, the tendency is to always focus on the negative aspects. In the Rus' case there are very few negative aspects one can explore. The skeptic could point to the metropolitans of Kyyiv being ethnically Byzantine-

⁴ According to the *Church Statutes* physicians also belonged to category of *church people*.

⁵ Cited in Metropolitan Ilarion's *Tserkovne pravo* (*Церковне право*). Unpublished. From Rev. Dr. S. Jarmus' notes (November 1961), p. 101.

Greek who served a Slavic church. But is this a negative predicament? Certainly the chroniclers, who were undoubtedly native Slavic clerics, did not envision it as something improper. Moreover, these foreign clerics are frequently praised. The problem with this period of study has largely been the historians who have examined it. They have focused their attentions largely on to problems or controversies that did not exist. In other words, historians have created much of the controversy.

Rus' was certainly not a Christian utopia. However, in the study of Church-state relations, it was a phenomenon that cannot be compared with any other Christian state subsequent to its foundation. The relative peace that remained between the representatives of the Church and State has not been thoroughly explored. Why is it that this period is distinguished by peaceful cooperation and continues so in southern Rus' (i.e., Ukraine) while the north (i.e., Muscovy and later Russia) was harassed by competition between the hierarchy and the princes of Moscow? This phenomenon needs to be explained historically, culturally, psychologically, anthropologically and sociologically.

The states that have emerged from the ashes of the Soviet empire (i.e., Ukraine, Russia, Belorus) have inherited a portentous legacy. The Church suffered greatly during the seventy years of official atheism. It will be most interesting to examine what course they take in attempting to

establish Church-state relations and what they shall use as a blueprint.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I
METROPOLITANS OF KYIV

Leo (Michael)	992 (?) - 1008 (?)
Ioann	1008 (?) - 1036 (?)
Theopemptos	1037 (?) - 1039 - 1051
Ilarion	1051 - 1052 (1053?)
Ephrem	? - 1055 - ?
Georgios	? - 1072 - 1073 - ?
Ioann II	1077 - 1089
Ioann III	spring (?) 1090 - spring (?) 1091
Nicholas	? - 1096 - 1101 - ?
Nikifor	18.XII.1104 - April 1121
Mykyta	1122 - 9.III.1126
Michael	1130 - 1145
Klyment Smolyatych	27.VIII.1147 - 1155(?), with interruptions
Constantine	January 1156 - 22.XII.1158
Theodore	August 1160 - June 1162
Ioann IV	1164 - 12.V.1166
Constantine II	1167 - 1171 - ?
Nikifor II	? - 1183 - 1198 - ?
Gabriel	? - ?
Dionysios	? - ?
Matthew	? - 1210 - 26 (19?).VIII.1220
Cyril I	6.I.1225 - 27.XI.1233
Joseph	1236(1237) - 6.XII.1240
Cyril II	fall/winter 1246/7 - 6.XII.1281 (1280), from fall of 1250 resided in Suzdal intermittently

APPENDIX II
VELYKI KNYAZI OF KYIV

Oleh Vishchyj	882(?) - 912
Ihor Rurykovich	912 - 945
Ol'ha, wife of Ihor Rurykovich (regent)	945 - 957
Svyatoslav Ihorovich	957 - July 969 (March 972)
Yaropolk Svyatoslavych	July 969 - 11.VI.978; from July 969 - March 972 his father's lieutenant
Volodymyr Svyatoslavych (the Great)	11.VI.978 - 15.VII.1015
Svyatopolk Yaropolkovich Okayanyj	15.VII.1015 - 26.XI.1015
Yaroslav Volodymyrovych (the Wise)	26(27).XI.1015 - 14.VIII.1018
Svyatopolk Yaropolkovich (second time)	14.VIII.1018 - winter 1018/19
Yaroslav Volodymyrovych (second time)	winter/1018/19 - 20.II.1054
Izyaslav Yaroslavych	1054 - 15.IX.1068
Vseslav Briachyslavych	15.IX.1068 - mid April 1069
Izyaslav Yaroslavych (second time)	2.V.1069 - 22.III.1073
Svyatoslav Yaroslavych	22.III.1073 - 27.XII. 1076;
Vsevolod Yaroslavych	1.I.1077 - 15.VII.1077
Izyaslav Yaroslavych (third time)	15.VII.1077 - 3.X.1078
Vsevolod Yaroslavych (second time)	3.X.1078 - 13.IV.1093
Svyatopolk Izyaslavych	24.IV.1093 - 16.IV.1113
Volodymyr Vsevolodovich Monomakh	20.IV.1113 - 19.V.1125
Mstyslav Volodymyrovych (the Great)	20.V.1125 - 15.IV.1132
Yaropolk Volodymyrovych	17.IV.1132 - 18.II.1139
Vyacheslav Volodymyrovych	22.II.1139 - 4.III.1139
Vsevolod Ol'hovich	4.III.1139 - 1.VIII.1146
Ihor Ol'hovich	1.VIII.1146 - 13.VIII.1146
Izyaslav Mstyslavych	13.VIII.1146 - <1.IX> 1149

Yurij Volodymyrovych Dovhorukyj	<2.IX> 1149 - 20.VIII.1150
Vyacheslav Volodymyrovych (second time)	20.VIII.1150 (a few hours)
Izyaslav Mstyslavych (second time)	20.VIII.1150 - 27.VIII.1150
Yurij Volodymyrovych (second time)	<28.VIII> 1150 - <6.IV> 1151
Izyaslav Mstyslavych (third time)	<6.IV> 1151 - 13.XI.1154; together with Vyacheslav Volodymyrovych (third time)
Vyacheslav Volodymyrovych (third time)	13.XI.1154 - <8.XII> 1154; continuation of his third reign along with Svyatoslav Vsevolodovych from 15(16).XI.1154
Rostyslav Mstyslavych	<8.XII> 1154 - 15.XII.1154; from <8.XII> to 10.XII.1154 along with Vyacheslav Volo- dymyrovych (end of his third reign)
Izyaslav Davydovych	16(17?).XII.1154 - 20.III.1155 (approx.)
Yurij Volodymyrovych (third time)	20.III.1155 - 15.V.1157
Izyaslav Davydovych (second time)	19.V.1157 - 21.XII.1158
Mstyslav Izyaslavych	22.XII.1158 - 12.IV.1159
Rostyslav Mstyslavych (second time)	12.IV.1159 - 12.II.1161
Izyaslav Davydovych (third time)	12.II.1161 - 6.III.1161
Rostyslav Mstyslavych (third time)	6.III.1161 - 14.III.1167
Volodymyr Mstyslavych	20.III.1167 - 9(10).V.1167 (approx.)
Yaropolk Izyaslavych	9(10).V.1167 - 15(12).V.1167
Mstyslav Izyaslavych (second time)	15(12).V.1167 - 12.III.1169
Hlib Yuriyovych	12.III.1169 - 20.II.1170
Mstyslav Izyaslavych (third time)	22.II.1170 - 13.IV.1170
Hlib Yuriyovych (second time)	13.IV.1170 - 20.I.1171
Volodymyr Mstyslavych (second time)	5.II.1171 - 10.V.1171
Mykhalko Yuriyovych	12(13).V.1171 - <1>.VII.1171

Roman Rostyslavych	<1>.VII.1171 - mid Feb. 1173
Mykhalko Yuriyovych (second time)	18.II.1173 - 23.III.1173; in name only - in reality his brother Vsevolod Yuriyovych
Ruryk Rostyslavych	24.III.1173 - 6.IX.1173
Svyatoslav Vsevolodovych (second time)	6.IX.1173 - 18(19).XII.1173
Yaroslav Izyaslavych	<20.XII> 1173 - second half of February 1174
Svyatoslav Vsevolodovych (third time)	second half of February 1174 - beginning of March 1174 (12 days)
Yaroslav Izyaslavych	continuation of reign beginning of March 1174 - end of 1174
Roman Rostyslavych (second time)	end of 1174 - 19 (?).VII.1176
Svyatoslav Vsevolodovych (fourth time)	20.VII.1176 - end of July 1176
Roman (third time), Mstyslav, Ruryk (second time) Rostyslavychi	end of July 1176 - beginning of August 1176
Svyatoslav Vsevolodovych (fifth time)	August 1176 - fall 1180
Ruryk Rostyslavych (third time)	summer/fall 1180 - summer 1181
Svyatoslav Vsevolodovych (sixth time)	summer 1180 - <27>.VII.1194
Ruryk Rostyslavych (fourth time)	1.VIII.1194 - summer (?) 1201
Ingvar Yaroslavych	summer (?) 1201 - 2(1).I.1203
Ruryk Rostyslavych (fifth time)	2(1).1203 - mid January 1203
Ingvar Yaroslavych (second time)	mid January 1203 - 16.II.1203
Ruryk Rostyslavych (sixth time)	16.II.1203 - beginning of Feb/1204
Roman Mstyslavych	beginning of Feb/1204 - mid Feb/1204
Ingvar Yaroslavych (third time)	second half of Feb/1204 (few days)
Rostyslav Rurykovych	end of Feb/1204 - approx. 25.VI.1205

Ruryk Rostyslavych (seventh time)	approx. 25.VI.1205 - mid August/1206
Vsevolod Svyatoslavych	mid August/1206 - Oct(?) 1206
Ruryk Rostyslavych (eighth time)	Oct(?) 1206 - April/1207
Vsevolod Svyatoslavych (second time)	April/1207 - end of Oct/1207
Ruryk Rostyslavych (ninth time)	end of Oct/1207 - spring/1210
Vsevolod Svyatoslavych (third time)	spring/1210 - 15.VII.1212 (approx.)
Mstyslav Romanovych	15.VII.1212 (few days) (approx.)
Ingvar Yaroslavych (fourth time)	15.VII.1212 (approx.) - end of July/1212
Mstyslav Romanovych	end of July/1212 - 31.V.1223
Volodymyr Rurykovych	beginning of June/1223 - end of May/1235
Izyaslav Mstyslavych	end of May/1235 - spring/1236
Yaroslav Vsevolodovych	spring/1236 - <10.IV> 1236
Izyaslav Mstyslavych (second time)	<10.IV> 1236 - May/1236
Volodymyr Rurykovych (second time)	May/1236 - January (?)/1238
Yaroslav Vsevolodovych (second time)	January (?)/1238 - 10.III.1238 (approx.)
Mykhailo Vsevolodovych	mid March/1238 - fall/1239
Rostyslav Mstyslavych	fall/1239 - winter (?) 1239/40
Danylo Romanovych	winter (?) 1239/40 - 6.XII.1240; installed his <i>tysiats'kyj</i> * Dmytri
Mykhailo Vsevolodovych (second time)	April/1241 - spring/1243
Yaroslav Vsevolodovych (third time)	spring/1243 - 30.IX.1246; installed his boyar Dmytri Yeykovych

* *tysiats'kyj* -- commander of a thousand men.

APPENDIX III

CHURCH STATUTE OF VOLODYMYR THE GREAT¹

Statute of the Saint Prince Volodymyr,
Who Baptized the Rus' Land,
on the Church Courts

1. In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.
2. I, Prince Vasylij,² called Volodymyr, son of Svyatoslav, grandson of Ihor and of the blessed Princess Ol'ha, received the holy baptism from the Greek Emperor and from patriarch Photius of Constantinople, along with the first metropolitan Leon [in some variants Michael] of Kyyiv, who baptized the entire Rus' land.
3. Within [a few] years I erected the Church of the Holy Virgin [in Kyyiv] and granted to that church, all over the Rus' land, the tithe of all princely court fees... of all market sales... and of all cattle and grain [from princely and private estates].
4. Then, having opened the Greek *Nomocanon* [manual of canon and civil law], we found in it that it is not proper for either the prince, or his boyars, or his judges to conduct these [church] courts and lawsuits. And I, having consulted my princess Anna and my sons, granted [the administration of] these courts to the metropolitan and to all bishoprics [in some variants, "bishops"] throughout the Rus' land.
5. And therefore neither my children, nor grandchildren, nor any of my descendants for all time shall interfere with the church people or with their court cases. I have turned over [to the church] all these matters in all the cities and *pogosty* [rural districts] and *slobody* [settlements], wherever there are Christians...
6. The following are church court cases: divorces; *smil'noe* [perhaps meaning adultery on the part of a husband]; adultery on the part of a wife; rape; kidnapping of a girl; disputes over property between husband and wife; marriage between persons closely related by blood or marriage; sorcery; use of magic drugs; preparation of such drugs; witchcraft; soothsaying; calling [a person] by any of the three shameful epithets -- whore, user of magic drugs, and heretic; biting during a fight; a son or daughter beating his father or mother, or a daughter-in-law her mother-in-law; litigations between brothers (sons of a deceased man) over an inheritance; theft of church property; desecration of graves; cutting down a cross; bringing cattle or dogs or fowl [into church] except in an emergency, or doing anything else unseemly in church...
7. All these court cases have been given over to the church; the prince and the boyars and the judges shall not interfere in these court cases. All this I have given in

¹ Taken from George Vernadsky (ed.), *A Sourcebook for Russian History From Early Times to 1917*. Volume I. New Haven & London, Yale University Press, 1972, p. 39.

² Volodymyr's Christian name.

accordance with the enactments of the former [Greek] emperors and of the seven ecumenical councils...

8. Whoever breaks our law cannot be forgiven according to God's law and shall bring misery upon himself.

12. All these are church people: abbots [hegumens], priests, deacons, their children, wives of priests, choir singers, monks, nuns, bakers of communion bread, pilgrims, physicians... slaves freed by their masters and given to the church... the blind, the lame, [the attendants of] monasteries, hospitals, inns, and places of asylum.

13. The above are church people taken care of in the name of God; the metropolitan or bishop shall have jurisdiction over trials between them, or offences, disputes, fights, or legacies. But if a laymen is involved in a lawsuit with one of these men, then a joint court's trial [by the prince's and the bishop's judges] shall be held.

APPENDIX IV

CHURCH STATUTE OF YAROSLAV THE WISE¹

I, Grand Prince Yaroslav, son of Volodymyr, in accordance with the wish of my father, have conferred with Metropolitan Ilarion and have prepared [this] Church Statute [I believe that] there are matters that belong neither to [the exclusive] jurisdiction of the prince nor to that of the boyars. I have granted this jurisdiction, as embodied in the present rules of the Church Statute, to the metropolitan and the bishops. [These rules shall be valid] in all towns and in all territories wherever Christianity prevails.

1. Whoever shall carry away and then violate a maiden, if she is a daughter of an [influential] boyar, shall pay her five *grivnas* of gold for her indignity, and the bishop shall receive five *grivnas* of gold; if she is a daughter of a less [influential] boyar [she shall receive for her indignity] only one *grivna* of gold and the bishop [shall receive] one *grivna* of gold; and if she is a daughter [only] of a distinguished person she shall receive for her indignity five *grivnas* of silver and the bishop shall receive five *grivnas* of silver. The kidnappers shall [in addition] pay one *grivna* of silver to the bishop. The prince shall administer the justice [in these matters in accordance with ancient customs and traditions].

2. Whoever shall violate a daughter of an [influential] boyar's wife shall pay her five *grivnas* of gold for her indignity, and five [grivnas of gold] to the bishop; [violated daughters and/or wives] of less influential boyars [shall receive] one *grivna* of gold [for their indignities] and the bishop shall receive one *grivna* of gold; [violated daughters and/or wives] of distinguished citizens shall receive three rubles [for their indignities] and the bishop shall receive three rubles; [violated daughters and/or wives] of commoners shall receive fifteen *grivnas* [for their indignities] and the bishop shall receive fifteen *grivnas*.² The prince shall administer justice [in these matters in accordance with ancient customs and traditions].

3. If, without any valid reason, a distinguished boyar puts his wife away, she shall receive three gold *grivnas* for her indignity and the bishop shall receive three gold *grivnas*; for the same action [the wife of] a distinguished citizen shall receive three rubles and the bishop shall receive three rubles and the bishop shall receive three rubles; for the same action [the wife] of a commoner shall receive fifteen *grivnas* and the bishop shall receive fifteen *grivnas*. The prince shall administer justice [in these matters in accordance with ancient customs and traditions].

4. If a daughter who has her father and mother [still living] should give birth to an illegitimate child, she should be reprimanded [by the bishop] and then placed in the bishop's court. The family may then ransom her out.

¹ Taken from Basil Dmytryshyn (ed.), *Medieval Russia: A Source Book 900-1700*. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1967, pp. 51-54.

² Note those portions of the "Statute" which must belong to a later edition, since neither rubles nor *grivnas* without precious metals were in use in Kyyivan Rus' [B. Dmytryshyn].

5. If someone should entice a maiden to his dwelling and then force her to have sexual intercourse with others, the bishop shall receive three *grivnas* [for this crime] and the maiden [shall receive three *grivnas*] for her dishonour. All the participants who dishonoured her shall be fined one ruble. The prince shall administer justice [in this matter in accordance with ancient customs and traditions].

6. If a husband should force his wife into prostitution, this is a religious crime. The prince [however] shall administer justice [in this case in accordance with ancient customs and traditions].

7. Should a husband marry another woman without divorcing his wife, the bishop shall have the jurisdiction in this matter. The new wife shall be placed in the bishop's court and the husband shall be made to live with his [first] wife.

8. Should a wife become very ill, or become blind, or be afflicted with a prolonged illness, [her husband] shall not be allowed to divorce her; the same rule shall apply to the husband [in case of illness].

9. If the godfather should have sexual intercourse with the mother [of his god-child], the bishop shall receive one *grivna* of gold and at his discretion he shall also impose [an appropriate] penance.

10. The bishop shall receive 100 *grivnas* as the fine from whomever sets a dwelling, or a barn, or anything else afire. The prince shall have the jurisdiction [in this matter in accordance with ancient customs and traditions].

11. The bishop shall receive 100 *grivnas* as the fine from whomever shall have sexual intercourse with his sister. The bishop shall also impose [an appropriate] penance. The punishment for this crime shall be administered in accordance with [the existing] laws.

12. The bishop shall receive eighty *grivnas* from whomever marries a close blood relative. The bishop shall separate them and impose [an appropriate] penance.

13. The bishop shall receive forty *grivnas* from whomever shall live with two wives. The second wife shall be placed in the bishop's court and the husband shall be made to live with his lawful wife. Should he later abuse her in any way he shall be imprisoned.

14. If a husband and a wife decide to separate voluntarily, the bishop shall receive twelve *grivnas*. If they were not married legally [in the Church] the bishop shall receive only six *grivnas*.

15. The bishop shall receive 100 *grivnas* from whomever shall have sexual intercourse with a nun.

16. The bishop shall receive twelve *grivnas* from whomever shall commit sodomy. He shall also impose [an appropriate] penance.

17. If a father-in-law should have sexual intercourse with his daughter-in-law, the bishop shall receive 100 *grivnas*: in accordance with the [existing] law he shall also impose [an appropriate] penance.

18. The bishop shall receive thirty *grivnas* from whomever shall marry two sisters.

19. If a brother-in-law should have sexual intercourse with his sister-in-law the bishop shall receive thirty *grivnas*.

20. The bishop shall receive forty *grivnas* from whomever shall have sexual intercourse with his stepmother.

21. Should two brothers be married the same woman, the bishop shall receive 100 *grivnas* and the woman shall be sent to the bishop's court.

22. If a maiden does not want to marry and her father and mother force her into it, and if she then does some harm to herself, her father and mother are guilty and must pay the bishop a fine; the same applies to the young lad [she was forced to marry].

23. If someone should refer to the wife of an influential boyar as a prostitute, for her dishonour she shall receive five *grivnas* of gold and the bishop shall receive five *grivnas* of gold. The prince shall have the jurisdiction in this case [in accordance with ancient customs and traditions]. [For the same dishonour the wife] of a less influential boyar shall receive three *grivnas* of gold and the bishop shall receive three *grivnas* of gold. [For the same dishonour the wife] of an [influential] city dweller shall receive three *grivnas* of silver. [For the same dishonour the wife] of a village [commoner] shall receive one *grivna* of silver and the bishop shall receive one *grivna* of silver.

24. If someone should cut another's hair or his beard, the bishop shall receive twelve *grivnas*. The prince shall have the jurisdiction in this case [in accordance with ancient customs and traditions].

25. If a man and/or his wife steal hemp or flax or any other crops, the bishop and the prince shall exercise joint jurisdiction in such cases.

26. If a man and/or his wife steal white garments, or cloth, or clothing, or linens, the bishop and the prince shall exercise joint jurisdiction in such cases.

27. The prince and the bishop shall equally divide fines from marriage or engagement fights or killings.

28. Should two men fight like women, [that is, should they] bite and scratch one another, the bishop shall receive three *grivnas*.

29. If a man should beat a strange woman [without any cause], she shall be compensated for her dishonour in accordance with the prevailing laws, and the bishop shall receive six *grivnas*.

30. If a son beats his father or his mother, the local representative of the prince shall punish him. The bishop, however, shall have the jurisdiction [over the son].

31. If a maiden wants to marry someone and her father and her mother refuse to give her their consent and if she [then] inflicts some harm to herself, the bishop shall have the jurisdiction over her father and over her mother and also over the lad [she intended to marry].

32. If a monk, or a nun, or a priest and his wife, or a woman who bakes the sacramental bread commit any crime, the bishop shall have [exclusive] jurisdiction over them.

33. The bishop shall have [exclusive] jurisdiction over priests and monks who become intoxicated.

34. If a monk or a nun should abandon their vows the bishop shall have [exclusive] jurisdiction over their cases, and he shall also impose on them an [appropriate] penalty.

35. Local officials of the prince shall have no jurisdiction over crimes committed by bishop's servants, the church people, and those living within monasteries. Crimes committed by these people shall be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the bishop's officials as is also their property.

36. Whoever shall violate this decree of mine, be they my sons, or any grandsons, or my great-grandsons, or any member of my family, or any boyar; whosoever shall infringe this order of things or shall interfere with the jurisdiction of the metropolitan, or that of the Church, or that of the bishops in their dioceses, he shall be subject to the rules of the Holy Fathers and shall be punished accordingly. Whoever shall interfere with the jurisdiction of the Church shall be excommunicated and condemned in accordance with the decrees of the Holy Fathers and of the Council of Nicaea.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources and Collection of Sources

- Abramovich, D.I. (ed.) *Kyjevo-Pecers'kyj Pateryk*. Kiev, 1930. Ed. by D. Cyzevs'kyj. Slavische Propylaen, 2. Munich, 1964.
- Abramovich, D.I. *Zhitia sviatykh muchnikov Borisa i Gleba i sluzby im*. Petrograd, 1916.
- Athanasios, St. *Vita S. Antonii*. PG 26:835-976. Trans. R.T. Meyer, *The Life of St. Anthony*. Ancient Christian Writers, 10. New York, 1950.
- Adam of Bremen. *History of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen*. (*Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum*). Translated by F.J. Tschan. Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, no. LIII. New York, 1959.
- Annales Bertiniani. *MGH, Scriptorum rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*. Edited by G.H. Pertz, I. Hanover, 1826.
- Barker, E. *Social and Political Thought in Byzantium: From Justinian I to the last Palaeologus*. Oxford, 1961.
- Basil of Caesarea, St. *Regulae fusius et brevius tractatae*. PG 31:889-1035. Trans. W.K.L. Clarke, *The Ascetic Works of St. Basil*. London, 1925.
- Beneshevich, V.N. *Drevne-slaviaskaia kormchaia XIV titulov bez tolkovanni, I*. St. Petersburg, 1906.
- , *Kanonicheskii sbornik XIV titulov so vtoroi chetverti VII vieka do 883 g*. St. Petersburg, 1905.
- , *Pamiatniki drevne-russkago kanonicheskago prava*. Chast' 2, vypusk 1. RIB, XXXVI. Petrograd, 1920.
- , *Sbornik pamiatnikov po istorii tserkovnago prava, I*. Petrograd, 1914.
- , *Sinagoga v 50 titulov i drugie juridicheskie sborniki Ionna Skolastika*. St. Petersburg, 1914.
- , *Ustav sviatogo velikago kniazia Vladimiru o tserkovnykh sudakh i o desiatinakh*. Petrograd, 1915.
- The Book of Holy Men (Andron hagion Biblos)*. PL 73:852-1022. Trans. W.O. Chadwick, "The Sayings of the Fathers." In *Western Asceticism*. London, 1958, 37-189.
- Bruno of Querfurt. PL. CXLIV. Paris, 1882.
- Bugoslavskii, S.A. *Pam'iatka XI-XII vv. pro kniaziv Borisa i Gliba*. Kiev, 1928.
- Choniates, Niketas. *Historia*. In *O City of Byzantium, Annals of Niketas Choniates*. Translated by Harry J. Magoulias. Detroit, Wayne State University Press, 1984.

- Constantine Porphyrogenitus. *De Administrando Imperio*. Edited by Gy. Moravcsik and translated by R.J.H. Jenkins. Washington, 1967.
- , *De Cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae*. CSHB, I, 1929.
- Diakonos, Leon. *Historica*. Edited by C.B. Hase. CSHB, Bonn, 1828.
- Dmytryshyn, B. (ed.). *Medieval Russia: A Source Book, 900-1700*. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Franklin, Simon. *Sermons and Rhetoric of Kiev-Rus'*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Freshfield, E.H. *A Manual of Roman Law: the Ecloga Published by Emperors Leo III and Constantine V of Isauria at Constantinople A.D. 726*. Cambridge, 1926.
- Gregoras Nikephoros. *Historica Romaikai*. Edited by L. Schopeni. I-II, Bonn, 1829-1830. III, edited by I. Bekker, Bonn, 1855.
- Grekov, B.D. *Pravda Russkaia*. Three volumes. Moscow & Leningrad, 1940-1963.
- The Hagiography of Kievan Rus'*. Translated by Paul Hollingsworth. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Heinrich, L.L. *The Kievan Chronicle: A Translation and Commentary*. Ph.D. Thesis, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, 1977.
- Hudud al-Alam. *The Regions of the World, A Persian Geography 372 A.H.-982 A.D.* Translated by V. Minorsky. London, 1937.
- The Hypatian Codex Part II: The Galician-Volynian Chronicle*. An annotated translation by George Perfecky. Edited by O. Pritsak. Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1973.
- Iushkov, S.V. (ed.). *Pamiatniki Russkogo Prava*. Volume I. Moscow, 1952.
- Kantakuzenos, Ioannes. *Historica*. Edited by J. Schopeni. Three Volumes. Bonn, 1828-1832.
- Kedrenos, Georgios. *Sunofis historion*. Edited by I. Bekker. CSHB, I-II. Bonn, 1838-1839.
- Kinnamos, John. *Historia*. Translated by Charles M. Brand. New York, Columbia University Press, 1976.
- Krueger, P. (ed.). *Codex Justinianus*. Berlin, 1877.
- , *Corpus Iuris Civilis*. II. Ninth edition, Berlin, 1915.
- Lipshits, E.E. (ed.) *Ekloga: Vizantiiskii zakonodatel'nyi svod VIII veka*. Moscow, 1965.
- Litopys Rus'kyi*. The Hypatian Text translated into Ukrainian by Leonid Makhnovetz. Kyiv, Published by "Dnipro", 1989.

- Medieval Slavic Lives.* Translated by Marvin Kantor. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Michigan Slavic Translations no. 5, 1983.
- Michael Attaleiates. *Historia.* Edited by I. Bekker. *CSHB.* Bonn, 1853.
- Michell, R., & N. Forbes. (Trans.) *The Chronicle of Novgorod, 1016-1471.* New Introduction by W.K. Hanak. Reprint, Hattiesburg, 1970.
- Migne, J.P. *Patrologiae cursus completus.* Series latina. CXLIV and CXLVI. Paris, 1882 and 1884.
- , *Patrologiae cursus completus.* Series graeco-latina. CXLVI. Paris, 1859.
- The Nikonian Chronicle.* Volumes I-III. Edited, Introduced and Annotated by Serge A. Zenkovsky. Translated by Serge A. & Betty Jean Zenkovsky. Princeton, New Jersey, The Kingston Press, Inc., 1984.
- The Old Rus' Kievan and Galician-Volynian Chronicles: The Ostroz'kyj (Xlebnikov) and Cetvertyns'kyj (Pogodin) Codices.* With an introduction by Omeljan Pritsak. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature. Volume VIII. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Ukrainian Press, 1989.
- The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery.* Translated by Muriel Heppell. Preface by Sir Dimitri Obolensky. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Photius. *Homilies of Photius Patriarch of Constantinople.* English translation, introduction and commentary by Cyril Mango. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Psellos, Michael. *The Chronographia of Michael Psellos.* Translated by E.R.A. Sewter. New Haven, 1953.
- Regel, W. (ed.). *Analecta Byzantino-Russica.* St. Petersburg, 1891.
- Russia. Arkheograficheskaja Kommissiia. *Novgorodskaja letopis' po Sinodal'nomu Kharateinomu spisku.* St. Petersburg, 1841-1965.
- Russia. *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei.* St. Petersburg, 1841-1965.
- The Russian Primary Chronicle -- Laurentian Text.* Translated and edited by Samuel Hazzard Cross and Olgerd Sherbowitz-Wetzor. Cambridge, Mass., The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953.
- Saxo Grammaticus. *The First Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo Grammaticus.* Translated by E.O. Elton. London, 1894.
- Vernadsky, G. (ed.). *A Sourcebook for Russian History from Early Times to 1917.* Volume I. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1972.
- , *Medieval Russian Laws.* New York, 1965.
- Zonaras, Ioannes. *Epitomay historion.* Edited by L. Dindorf. IV. Leipzig, 1871.

Secondary Sources

- Artamonov, M.I. *Ocherki drevneishi istorii Khazar*. Leningrad, 1936.
- Barsov, T. *Konstantinopol'skii patriarkh i ego vlast' nad russkoiu tserkvoiu*. St. Petersburg, 1878.
- Berezhkov, N.G. *Khronologiia russkogo letopisaniia*. Moscow, 1963.
- Biletsky, L. *Rus'ka pravda j istoriya ii tekstu*. Edited by George Knysh. Winnipeg, The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1993.
- Billington, J.H. *The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture*. New York, Vintage Books, 1970.
- Birnbaum, H. & M.S. Flier. (eds.). *Medieval Russian Culture*. California Slavic Studies XII. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984.
- Blondal, S. *The Varangians of Byzantium*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Boba, I. *Nomads, Northmen and Slavs: Eastern Europe in the Ninth Century*. The Hague & Wiesbaden, 1967.
- Brehier, L. *The Life and Death of Byzantium*. Translated by Margaret Vaughan. New York, North-Holland Publishing, 1977.
- Brondsted, J. *The Vikings*. Baltimore, 1965.
- Budovnits, I.U. *Obshchestvenno-politicheskaia mysl' drevnei rusi (XI-XIV vv.)*. Moscow, 1960.
- Bury, J.B. *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I*. London, MacMillan & Co., 1912.
- *The Constitution of the Later Roman Empire*. Cambridge, 1910.
- Chadwick, Nora K. *The Beginnings of Russian History: An Enquiry into Sources*. Cambridge, 1946.
- Cherepnin, L.V. *Russkaia istoriografiia do XIX veka*. Moscow, 1957.
- Chubatyj, N.D. *Istoriia khrystianstva na Rusy-Ukraiini*. Volume. I. (to 1353). Rome, New York, Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1965.
- Cross, S.H. *Medieval Russian Churches*. Cambridge, Mass., Mediaeval Academy of America, 1949.
- Cyzevs'kyj, D. *A History of Ukrainian Literature -- From the Eleventh to the end of the Nineteenth Century*. Translated by Dolly Ferguson, Doreen Gorsline, and Ulan Petyk. Edited with a forward by George S.N. Luckyj. Littleton, Colorado, Ukrainian Academic Press, 1975.

- D'iakonov, M.A. *Ocherki obshchestvennogo i gosudarstvennogo stroia Drevnei Rusi*. Fourth edition revised and enlarged, Moscow, 1926.
- Dimnik, M. *Mikhail, Prince of Chernigov and Grand Prince of Kiev 1224-1246*. Toronto, 1981.
- Dmitriev, R.P. *Bibliografiia russkogo letopisaniia*. Moscow & Leningrad, 1962.
- Dunlop, D.M. *The History of the Jewish Khazars*. Princeton, 1954.
- Dvornik, F. *Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy: Origins and Background*. DOS, IX. Two volumes, Washington, 1966.
- . *The Slavs: Their Early History and Civilization*. Boston, 1956.
- . *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*. London, 1949.
- . *The Photian Schism: History and Legend*. Cambridge, 1948.
- Every, G. *The Byzantine Patriarchate, 451-1204*. London, S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Federivich, N. *The Great Prince Saint Vladimir*. New York, U.O.C. of U.S.A., 1957.
- Fedetov, G. *Sviatye drevnei Rusi. (X-XVII st.)*. Second edition. Paris, 1959.
- . *The Russian Religious Mind: Kievan Christianity, the Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Volume I. Cambridge, 1946.
- Fennell, John & Anthony Stokes. *Early Russian Literature*. London, 1974.
- Fennell, J. *The Crisis of Medieval Russia 1200-1304*. London & New York, Longman Group Ltd., 1983.
- Filaret, Archbishop of Chernigov. *Istoria russkoi tserkvi*. St. Petersburg, 1894.
- Florinsky, M.T. *Russia: A History and Interpretation*. I. New York, 1953.
- Gedeonov, S. *Variagi i Rus'. Istoricheskoe izsledovanie*. Two parts. St. Petersburg, 1876.
- Gerus, O.W. & A. Baran. (eds.). *Millennium of Christianity in Ukraine 988-1988*. Winnipeg, The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1989.
- Gill, J. *Byzantium and the Papacy, 1198-1400*. New Brunswick, N.J., Rutgers University Press, 1979.
- Gimbutas, Marija. *The Slavs*. New York & Washington, 1971.
- Golb, N & O. Pritsak. *Khazarian Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*. Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1982.
- Golubinsky, E.E. *Istoria russkoy tserkvi*. Volume. I. Edited by C.H. Van Schooneveld. The Hague, Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, 1969.

- Grekov, B.D. *Kiev Rus*. Translated by Y. Sdobnikov. Edited by Dennis Ogden. Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959.
- . *Kievskaiia Rus'*. Moscow, 1949.
- . *The Culture of Kiev-Rus*. Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1947.
- . *Krest'iane na Rusi s drevneishikh vremen dos XVII veka*. Moscow & Leningrad, 1946.
- Gudzy, N.K. *History of Early Russian Literature*. Translated from the second Russian edition by Susan Wilbur Jones. Introduction by Gleb Struve. New York, The MacMillan Co., 1949.
- Hanak, W.K. *The Nature and the Image of Grand Princely Power in Kievan Russia (988-1054)*. Indiana University, Ph.D., 1973, University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1973.
- Hrushevsky, M. *History of Ukraine-Rus'*. Volumes I-II. New York, Published by Knyho-Spilka, 1954.
- Hurwitz, E.S. *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij: The Man and the Myth*. Florence, 1980.
- Hussey, J.M. *The Byzantine World*. London, Hutchinson University Library, 1970.
- Iakovlev, V. *Pamyatniki russkoy literaturij XII-XIII vv*. St. Petersburg, 1872.
- Ianin, V.L. *Aktovyie pechati drevnei Rusi X-XV vv*. I. Moscow, 1970.
- Ikonnikov, V. *Opyt izsledovaniia o kul'turnom znachenii vizantii v russkoi istorii*. Kiev, 1869.
- Iarion, Metropolitan of Winnipeg. *The Ukrainian Church: Outlines of History of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church*. Prefaced and edited by Fr. Stephan Jarmus. Translated by Orysia Ferbey. Winnipeg, Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada, 1986.
- Il'in, N.N. *Letopisanaia stat'ia 6523 goda i ee istochnik*. (Opyt analiza). Moscow, 1957.
- Ilovaiskii, D.I. *Istoriia Rossii*. I. Moscow, 1876.
- Istrin, V.M. *Ocherk po istorii drevney russkoy literaturij*. Leningrad, 1922.
- Iushkov, S.V. *Ocherki po istorii feodalisma v Kievskoy Rusi*. Moscow, 1969.
- . *Russkaia Pravda*. Moscow, 1950.
- . *Obshchestvenno-politicheskii stroi i pravo kievskogo gosudarstva. Kurs istorii gosudarstva i prava SSSR*. I. Moscow, 1949.
- Jenkins, R.J.H. *Byzantium: The Imperial Centuries*. London, 1966.

- Jones, G. *A History of the Vikings*. New York & Toronto, 1968.
- Kaiser, D. *The Growth of the Law in Medieval Russia*. Princeton, 1980.
- Kartashev, A.V. *Ocherky po istoriii russkoi tserkvy*. Volumes I & II. Paris, YMCA Press, 1959.
- . *Vozsozdanie sv. Rusy*. Paris, Osobaho Komiteta, 1956.
- Kendrick, T.D. *A History of the Vikings*. New York, 1930.
- Kern, F. *Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages*. New York, 1956.
- Khrushchov, I.P. *O drevnerusskikh istoricheskikh povestiakh i skazaniikh*. Kiev, 1878.
- Kliuchevskii, V.O. *Kurs russkoi istorii*. I. Moscow, 1937.
- . *Boirskaia дума drevnei Rusi*. Fifth edition. St. Petersburg, 1919.
- Knysh, G. *Rus and Ukraine in Mediaeval Times*. Winnipeg, The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1991.
- . *The Methodian Roots of Mediaeval Ukrainian Christianity*. Winnipeg, The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Canada (UVAN), 1989.
- Kokovtsov, P.K. *Evreisko-khazarskaia perepiska v X veke*. Leningrad, Akademiia Nauk SSSR, 1932.
- Koncevicius, Joseph B.. *Russia's Attitude Towards Union with Rome, 9th-16th Centuries*. Washington, D.C.: Canorman Press, 1927.
- Kovalevsky, M. *Russian Political Institutions: The Growth and Development of these institutions from the Beginnings of Russian History to the Present Time*. Chicago, 1902.
- Lebedev, V., & V. Panov (eds.). *Drevnerusskie letopisei. Perevod i kommentarii*. Moscow & Leningrad, 1936.
- Letiche, J.M. (ed.). *A History of Russian Economic Thought: Ninth through Eighteenth Centuries*. Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1964.
- Levchenko, M.V. *Ocherki po istorii russko-vizantiiskikh otnoshenii*. Moscow, 1956.
- Lewis, Archibald R. *Naval Power and Trade in the Mediterranean A.D. 500-1100*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1951.
- . *The Northern Seas*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1951.
- Likhachev, D.S. *Russkie letopisi i ikh kul'turno-istoricheskoe zhachenie*. Moscow & Leningrad, 1947.
- Linnichenko, I.A. *Veche v kievskoi oblasti*. Kiev, 1881.

- Luciw, J. *Sviatoslav the Conqueror*. State College, PA, 1986.
- Macartney, C.A. *The Magyars in the Ninth Century*. Cambridge, 1930.
- Makarii, Metropolitan of Moscow. *Istoriia Khristianstva v Rossii do ravnoapostol'nago Kniazia Vladimira, kak vvedenie v istoriiu russkoi tserkvi*. Second edition. Revised. St. Petersburg, 1868.
- *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*. I. Second edition. Revised. St. Petersburg, 1868.
- Mango, C. *Byzantium: The Empire of New Rome*. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1980.
- Menges, K.H. *An Outline of the Early History and Migrations of the Slavs*. New York, Columbia University Press, Department of Slavic Languages, 1953.
- Meyendorff, J. *Byzantium and the Rise of Russia*. Cambridge, University Press, 1981.
- Miliukov, P.N. *History of Russia*. Volume I. *From the Beginnings to the Empire of Peter the Great*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann. New York, Funk & Wagnalls, 1968.
- Mistetstvo Kievskoi Rusi (Art of Kyiv-Rus')*. Kyiv, Mistetstvo Publishers, 1989.
- Nikol'skii, N.K. *Materialy dlia povremennago spiska russkikh pisatelei i ikh sochinenii (X-XI vv.)*. St. Petersburg, 1906.
- *Povest' vremennykh let kak istochnik dlia istorii nachal'nogo russkoi pis'mennosti i kul'tury. K voprosu o drevneishem russkom letopisanii*. I. Leningrad, 1930.
- Novosel'tsev, A.P., et. al. *Drevnerusskoe gosudarstvo i ego mezhdunarodnoe znachenie*. Moscow, 1965.
- *U istokov russkoi gosudarstvennosti (VIII-XI vv.)*. Leningrad, 1924.
- Nowak, F. *Medieval Slavdom and the Rise of Russia*. New York, 1930.
- Obolensky, D. *The Byzantine Inheritance of Eastern Europe*. London, Variorum Reprints, 1982.
- *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453*. New York & Washington, 1971.
- *Byzantium and the Slavs*. Collected Studies. London, Variorum Reprints, 1971.
- Ostrogorsky, G. *History of the Byzantine State*. New Brunswick, 1957.
- Pashuto, V.T. *Vneshniaia politika Drevnei Rusi*. Moscow, 1968.
- Paszkievich, H. *The Making of the Russian Nation*. London, 1963.

- . *The Origin of Russia*. London, 1954.
- Pavlov, A. *Critical Essay on the History of Ancient Greco-Russian Polemic against the Latins*. St. Petersburg, 1878.
- Pipes, Richard. *Russia under the Old Regime*. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.
- Polonska-Vasylenko, N. *Two Conceptions of the History of Ukraine and Russia*. London, 1968.
- . *Ukraine-Rus' and Western Europe in the 10th-13th Centuries*. London, 1964.
- Poppe, A. *The Rise of Christian Russia*. London, 1982.
- Presniakov, A.E. *Kniazhoe pravo v drevnei Rusi. Ocherki po istorii X-XII stoletii. ZIFFISPU. Part XC*. St. Petersburg, 1909.
- . *Leksii po russkoi istorii. I*. Moscow, 1938.
- Priselkov, M.D. *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI-XV vv.* Leningrad, 1940.
- . *Nestor-letopisets. Opyt istoriko-literaturnoi kharakteristiki*. Petrograd, 1923.
- . *Ocherki po tserkovno-politicheskoi istorii Kievskoi Rusi X-XII vv.* St. Petersburg, 1913.
- Pritsak, O. *The Origin of Rus'*. Volume One. Old Scandinavian Sources other than the sagas. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Pushkarev, S.G. *Dictionary of Russian Historical Terms from the Eleventh Century to 1917*. Edited by G. Vernadsky and Ralph T. Fischer, Jr. New Haven & London, 1970.
- Romanov, B.A. *Liudi i nrawy drevnei Rusi (Istoriko-bytovye ocherki XI-XIII vv.)*. Second edition. Moscow & Leningrad, 1966.
- Rubinstein, N.L. *Russkaia istoriografiia*. OGIZ, 1941.
- Runciman, S. *The Byzantine Theocracy*. Cambridge, University Press, 1977.
- . *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and the Eastern Churches during the XI and XIII centuries*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955.
- . *A History of the First Bulgarian Empire*. London, G. Bell & Sons, Ltd., 1930.
- . *The Emperor Romanus Lecapenus and his Reign*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1929.
- Rybakov, B. *Early Centuries of Russian History*. Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1965.

- Senkovskii, B. *Sobranie sochinenii Senkovskago (Barona Brambeusa)*. V. St. Petersburg, 1908.
- Sergeevich, V.I. *Leksii i izsledovaniia po drevnei istorii russkago prava*. Fourth edition. St. Petersburg, 1910.
- . *Drevnosti russkago prava*. II: Veche i kniaz'. Third edition. St. Petersburg, 1908.
- Sevcenko, I. *Byzantium and the Slavs*. Cambridge, MA, 1988.
- Shakhmatov, A.A. *Obozrenie russkikh letopisnykh svodov XIV-XVI vv.* Moscow & Leningrad, 1938.
- . *Razyskaniia o drevneishikh russkikh letopisnykh svodakh*. St. Petersburg, 1908.
- Shchapov, Ia. N. *Kniazheskie ustavy i tserkov' v drevnei Rusi XI-XIV vv.* Moscow, 1972.
- Shekera, I.M. *Kyivska Rus' XI st. u mizhnarodnykh vidosynakh*. Kiev, 1967.
- Sherman, I.L. *Russkie istoricheskie istochniki X-XVIII vv.* Kharkov, 1959.
- Shusharin, V.P. *Sovremennaia burzhuaznaia istoriografiia drevnei Rusi*. Moscow, 1964.
- Solov'ev, S.M. *Istoriia otnoshenii mezhdru russkimi kniaz'iami riurikova doma*. Moscow, 1847.
- . *Istoriia Rosii s drevneishikh vremen*. I. Moscow, 1959.
- Stender-Petersen, A. *Russian Studies*. Kobenhavn, Universitets-for-laget i Aarhus, Ejnar Munksgaard, 1956.
- Subtelny, O. *Ukraine: A History*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1989.
- Suvorov, N.S. *K voprosu o zapadnom vliianii na drevnerusskoe pravo*. Iaroslav, 1893.
- . *Sledy zapadno-katolicheskago tserkovnago prava v pamiatnikakh drevniago russkago prava*. Iaroslav, 1888.
- Tatishchev, V.N. *Istoriia rossiiskaia*. I & II. Moscow & Leningrad, 1962-1963.
- Thomsen, W. *The Relations between Ancient Russia and Scandinavia*. New York, Burt Franklin, 1964 (reprint of 1877 edition).
- Tikhomirov, M.N. *The Towns of Ancient Rus*. Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959.
- . *Drevnerusskie goroda*. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Moscow, 1956.

- . *Istoricheskie sviazi Rossii so slavianskimi stranami i Vizantiei*. Moscow, 1941.
- Tolstoj, I.I. *Drevneishie russkie monety velikogo kniazhestva Kievskogo*. St. Petersburg, 1882.
- Toynbee, A. *Constantine Porphyrogenitus and His World*. London, Oxford University Press, 1973.
- Val'denberg, V. *Drevnerusskiiia ucheniia o predelakh tsarskoi vlasti. Ocherki russkoi politicheskoi literatury ot Vladimira Sviatogo do konsta XVII veka*. Petrograd, 1916.
- Vasiliev, A.A. *The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860*. Cambridge, Mass., The Medieval Academy of America, 1946.
- Vasil'evskii, V.G. *Trudy V.G. Vasil'evskago*. I & II. St. Petersburg, 1908-1909.
- Vernadsky, G. *The Origins of Russia*. Oxford, 1959.
- . *Kievan Russia*. New Haven, 1948.
- . *Ancient Russia*. New Haven, 1943.
- Vlasto, A.P. *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom: An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs*. Cambridge, 1970.
- Volkoff, V. *Vladimir: The Russian King*. Woodstock, New York, The Overlook Press, 1985.
- Voyce, A. *The Art and Architecture of Medieval Russia*. Norman, OK, 1967.
- Vysotskii, S.A. *Drevnerusskie nadpisi Sofii Kievskoi XI-XIV vv*. I. Kiev, 1966.
- Wozniak, F.E. *The Nature of Byzantine Foreign Policy Toward Kievan Russia in the first half of the Tenth Century: A Reassessment*. Stanford University, Ph.D., 1973. Ann Arbor, Michigan, University Microfilms International, 1984.
- Zenkovsky, Serge A. (ed.). *Medieval Russia's Epics, Chronicles and Tales*. New York, E.P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1963.

Articles

- Alexander, P.J. "The Papacy, the Bavarian Clergy, and the Slavonic Apostles." *SEER* XX (1941).
- Andrusiak, M. "Kings of Kiev and Galicia." *SEER* XXXIII, no. 81 (June 1955).
- Avenarius, A. "Metropolitan Ilarion on the Origin of Christianity in Rus': The Problem of the Transformation of Byzantine Influence." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Backus, O.P. III. "Legal Analysis and the History of Early Russian Law." *ASEER* XXXI (1972).
- Baran, Alexander. "The Motivations for Volodymyr's Acceptance of Christianity." *Analecta O.S.B.M.* Rome, 1988.
- Basile, G.M. "The Christian Prince through the Mirror of the Rus' Chronicles." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Benedikz, B.S. "The Evolution of the Varangian Regiment in the Byzantine Army." *ByZ* LXII (1969).
- Bercoff, G.B. "The History of Christian Rus' in the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Caesar Baronius." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Birnbaum, H. "When and How was Novgorod Converted to Christianity?" *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Braichevs'ky, Mykhailo. "Christianization Under Prince Askol'd." *UQ* XLIV, no. 1-2, (Spring-Summer, 1988).
- Brutzkus, J. "The Khazar Origin of Ancient Kiev." *SEER* XXII (1944).
- "Trade with Eastern Europe, 800-1200." *The Economic History Journal* XIII (1943).
- Bugoslavskii, S.A. "K voprosy o kharaktere i ob"eme literaturnoi deiatel'nosti pre-podobnogo Nestora." *IORIAS* XIX (1914), Book I; Book 3
- "Povest' vremennykh let (Spiski, redaktsii, pervonachal'nyi tekst." In *Starinnaia russkaia povest'. Stat'i i issledovaniia.* Edited by N.K. Gudzii. Moscow & Leningrad, (1941).
- Bury, J.B. "The Ceremonial Book of Constantine Porphyrogenitus." *English Historical Review* XXII (1907).
- "The Treatise De Administrando Imperio." *ByZ* XV (1906).
- Carile, A. "Byzantine Political Ideology and the Rus' in the Tenth-Twelfth Centuries." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).

- Charanis, P. "Coronation and its Constitutional Significance in the Later Roman Empire." *Byz XV* (1940-41).
- Chirovsky, Nicholas L. "The Christianization of Ukraine." *UQ XLIV*, no. 1-2 (Spring-Summer, 1988).
- Colucci, M. "The Image of Western Christianity in the Culture of Kievan Rus'." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- Cross, S.H. "The Scandinavian Infiltration into Early Russia." *Sp XXI* (1946).
- , "Primitive Civilization of the Eastern Slavs." *ASEER V* (1946).
- , "The Results of the Conversion of the Slavs." *Annales de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves VII* (1939-1944).
- , "The Earliest Churches in Kiev." *Sp XI* (1936).
- , "Medieval Russian Contacts with the West." *Sp X* (1935).
- , "Jaroslav the Wise in Norse Tradition." *Sp IV* (1929).
- De Vincenz, A. "West Slavic Elements in the Literary Language of Kievan Rus'." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- Dewey, Horace W. "Immunities in Old Russia." *ASEER XXIII*, no. 4 (Dec 1964).
- Dolley, R.H. "Oleg's mythical campaigns against Constantinople." *Bulletin de la classe des lettres de l'academie royale de Belgique XXXV* (1949).
- , "Pseudo-Symeon (pp. 705-707) and the Oleg Controversy." *SEER XXX* (June 1952).
- Dombrovsky, Oleksander. "New Horizons and Controversies in the Current Research of the History of Rus'-Ukraine." *UQ XLVI*, no. 2 (Summer, 1990).
- Dvornik, F. "Constantinople and Rome." In *The Cambridge Medieval History*. Volume IV. Cambridge, (1966).
- , "Byzantine Political Ideas in Kievan Russia." *DOP IX & X* (1956).
- , "The Kiev State and its Relations with Western Europe." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*. Fourth Series. XXIX (1947).
- Ericsson, K. "The Earliest Conversion of the Rus' to Christianity." *SEER XLIV* (1965-66).
- Forbes, N. "The Composition of the Earlier Russian Chronicles." *SEER I*, no. 1 (June 1922).
- Franklin, S. "Booklearning and Bookmen in Kievan Rus': A Survey of an Idea." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).

- Frye, R. "Remarks on Some New Islamic Sources of the Rus." *Byz XVIII* (1946-1948).
- Gierson, Ph. & R.J.H. Jenkins. "The Date of Constantine VII's Coronation." *Byz XXXII* (1962).
- Gieysztor, A. "Local Markets and Foreign Exchange in Central and East Europe before 1200." *Kwartalnik Historii Kultury Materialnej XIV* (1966), suppl. "Ergon", V.
- Gimbutas, M. "Ancient Slavic Religion." In *To Honour Roman Jakobson*. I. The Hague, (1967).
- Grekov, B.D. "Na zare russkogo gosudarstva." *IZh VII* (1942).
- . "Neskol'ko zamechanii o drevnerusskom veche." *UZLU*, seriia istoricheskikh nauk IV, 19 (1938).
- . "Povest' Vremennykh Let' o pokhode Vladimiru na Korsun'." *IzvTOIAE III* (60) (1929).
- Hammer, D.P. "The Character of the Russkaia Pravda." *ASEER XXXI* (1972).
- . "Russia and the Roman Law." *ASEER XVI*, no. 1 (Feb/1957).
- Honigmann, E. "Studies in Slavic Church History; The Foundation of the Russian Metropolitan Church According to Greek Sources." *Byz XVII* (1944/1945).
- Hussey, J.M. "The Later Macedonians, the Comneni and the Angeli 1025-1204." In *The Cambridge Medieval History IV*. Cambridge, (1966).
- Istrin, V.. "Zamechaniia o nachale russkogo letopisannia. Po povodu issledovaniia A.A. Shakhmatova v oblasti drevnerusskoi letopisei." *IORIAS XXVI* (1923).
- Iushkov, S.V. "K voprosy o dofeodal'nom ('Varvarskom') gosudarstve." VI, 7 (1946).
- . "Russkaia Pravda kak kodeks russkogo feodal'nogo prava." *PSP IV-V* (1939).
- . "Provosudie Mitropolichie." *Letopis zaniatii Arkheograficheskoi Komissii XXXV* (1929).
- Jenkins, R.J.H. "The Chronological Accuracy of the 'Logothete' for the Years A.D. 867-913." *DOP XIX* (1965).
- . "The Supposed Russian Attack on Constantinople in 907: Evidence of the Pseudo-Symeon." *Sp XXIV* (1949).
- Kaplan, F. "The Decline of the Khazars and the Rise of the Varangians." *ASEER XIII* (1954).
- Karpovich, M. "Church and State in Russian History." *RR III*, no. 2 (Spring, 1944).

- Kazhdan, A.P. "Rus'-Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- "Khronika Simeona Logofeta." *VV XV* (1959).
- Knysh, G. "Eastern Slavs and the Christian Millennium of 1988." *SU III* (1986).
- Kucherov, S. "Indigenous and Foreign Influences on the Early Russian Legal Heritage." *ASEER XXXI* (1972).
- Labunka, M. "Religious Centers and Their Missions to Kievan Rus': From Ol'ga to Volodimer." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- Levchenko, M.V. "Problema russko-vizantiiskikh otnoshenii v russkoi dorevoliutsionnoi zarubezhnoi i sovetskoi istoriografii." *VV VIII* (1956).
- "Vziamootnosheniia Vizantii i Rusi pri Vladimire." *VV VII* (1953).
- Likhachev, D.S. "Kul'tura Kievskoi Rusi pri Iaroslave Mudrom." *IZh VII* (1943).
- Lind, John H. "The Russo-Byzantine Treaties and the Early Urban Structure of Rus'." *SEER LXII*, no. 3 (July 1984).
- Litvarin, G.G. "Psell o prichinakh posle dnego pokhoda russkikh na Konstantinopol' v 1043 g." *VV XXVII* (1967).
- Luciw, Wasyl. "The Baptism of Ukraine: Early Reports." *UQ XLIV*, no. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1988).
- Lunt, H. "The Language of Rus' in the Eleventh Century: Some Observations about Facts and Theories." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- Macartney, C.A. "The Pechenegs." *SEER VIII*(1929-1930).
- Mango, C. "The Tradition of Byzantine Chronography." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- Mason, Richard A.E. "St. Volodymyr and His Reforms." *UQ XLV*, no. 2 (Summer 1989).
- "Some Remarks on the Ancient Religion of Rus'." *UQ XLVI*, no. 3 (Fall 1990).
- "Western Missionaries to Kyivan Rus' and Their Influence on the Development of the Slavonic Rite." *UQ XLIV*, no. 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1988).
- "Western Missionaries to Kyivan Rus' and Their Influence on the Development of the Slavonic Rite." *UQ XLIV*, no. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 1988).
- Meichik, D.M. "Russko-Vizantiiskie dogovory." *Zhurnal Ministerstva Narodnago Prosveshcheniia II* (1916).
- Meyendorff, A. "Trade and Communication in Eastern Europe A.D. 800-1200." *Travels and Travellers of the Middle Ages*. Ed. by A.P. Newton, New York, Alfred A. Knopf, (1926).

- Mezentsev, Volodymyr I. "The Territorial and Demographic Development of Medieval Kiev and Other Major Cities of Rus': A Comparative Analysis Based on Recent Archaeological Research." *RR III*, (1989).
- Miller, G.C. "Byzantine Treaties and Treaty-Making 500-1025 A.D." *Byzsl XXXII*:1 (1971).
- Miller, G.F. "O pervom letopisatele rossiiskokm prepodobnom Nestore, o ego letopisi i o prodlzhateliakh." *ES* (April, 1755).
- Mirsky, D.M. "Russia, 1015-1462." *Cambridge Medieval History*. Volume VII. Cambridge, University Press, (1966).
- Moroni, E. "The Orient and Rome: Pilgrimages and Pious Visits between the Ninth and the Eleventh Century." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- Moroziuk, Russel P. "Theological Characteristics of Kyivan Christianity." *UQ XLVI*, no. 2 (Summer 1990).
- Mutafchiiev, P. "The Byzantine sources on the Scandinavians in Eastern Europe." *S-S, Supplementum I: Varangian Problems*. Copenhagen, (1970).
- Obolensky, D. "Olga's Conversion: The Evidence Reconsidered." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- "The Empire and Its Northern Neighbours, 565-1018." In *The Cambridge Medieval History IV*. Cambridge, (1966).
- "The Principles and Methods of Byzantine Diplomacy." *AICBS (XIIIe Congres) I.* Belgrad, (1963).
- "Byzantium, Kiev, and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations." *DOP XI* (1957).
- "Russia's Byzantine Heritage." *OSP I* (1950).
- Ostrogorsky, G. "The Byzantine Emperor and the Hierarchical World Order." *SEER XXXV*, no. 84 (1956).
- "Vladimir Sviatoi i Vizantiia." In *Vladimirskii Sbornik v pamiat' 950-letii kreshcheniia Rusi, 988-1938*. Belgrad, (1938).
- "Otnoshenie tserkvi i gosudarstvas v Vizantii." *SK IV* (1931).
- "Slavianskii perevod chroniki Simeona Logofeta." *SK V* (1932).
- Parkhomenko, V.A. "Kharacter i zhachenie epokhi Vladimira, priniavshego khris-tianstvo." *UZZLU LXIII*, seriia istoricheskikh nauk, vyp. VIII (1941).
- Pelenski, J. "The Contest for the 'Kievan Succession' (1155-1175): The Religious-Ecclesiastical Dimension." *HUS XII/XIII* (1988/1989).
- Petrov, N.I. "Drevnie izobrazheniia sviatogo Vladimira." In *Trudy Dukhovnoi Akademii* (July-August 1915).

- Picchio, R. "From Boris to Volodimer: Some Remarks on the Emergence of Proto-Orthodox Slavdom." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Pokrovskii, S. "Salicheskaia pravda i ee skhodstvo s russkoi pravdoi." *SG* V (1936).
- Poppe, A. "Two Concepts of the Conversion of Rus' in Kievan Writings." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- . "The Building of the Church of St. Sophia in Kiev." *Journal of Medieval History*, VII, Amsterdam, 1981.
- . "The Original Status of the Old-Russian Church." *Acta Poloniae Historica*, XXXIX. Warsaw, 1979.
- . "The Political Background to the Baptism of Rus'. Byzantine-Russian Relations between 986-989." *DOP*, XXX, 1976.
- . "Russkie mitropolii konstantinopol'skoi patriarkhii v XI stoletii." *VV* XXVIII (1968).
- Presniakov, A.E. "Drevnerusskoe letopisanie." In *Istoriia russkoi literatury do XIX v.* Edited by A.E. Gruzinskii. I. Moscow, (1916).
- Priselkov, M.D. "Lavrent'evskaia letopis' (istoriia teksta)." *UZLU* XXXII, seriia istoricheskikh nauk, 2 (1939).
- . "Russko-Vizantiiskie otnosheniia IX-XII vv." *VDI* III (1939).
- Pritsak, O. "At the Dawn of Christianity in Rus': East Meets West." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- . "When and Where was Ol'ga Baptized?" Reprinted by Ukrainian Studies Fund, Cambridge, Mass., (1987).
- . "On the Writing of History in Kievan Rus'." Reprinted by Ukrainian Studies Fund, Cambridge, Mass., (1983).
- Rapoport, S. (ed.). "Mohammedan Writers on Slavs and Russians." *SEER* VIII (1929-1930).
- . "On the Early Slavs: The Narrative of Ibrahim-ibn-Yakub." *SEER* VIII (1929-1930).
- Riasanovsky, A.V. "The Embassy of 838 Revisited; some comments in connection with a 'Normanist' source on early Russian history." *JGO* Band X (1962).
- Sawyer, B. "Scandinavian Conversion Histories." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Sawyer, P. "The Organization of the Church in Scandinavia after the Missionary Phase." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Sciacca, Franklin A. "In Imitation of Christ: Boris and Gleb and the Ritual Consecration of the Russian Land." *ASEER* II, no. 2 (Summer 1990).

- Sevcenko, I. "The Christianization of Kievan Rus'." *PR* V, no. 4 (1960).
- , "Byzantine Elements in Early Ukrainian Culture." Reprinted by Ukrainian Studies Fund, Cambridge, Mass., 1984.
- Shakhmatov, A.A. "Nestor-letopisets." *ZNTSh* CXVII-CXVIII (1914).
- , "Povest' vremennykh let' i ee istochniki." *TODrL* IV (1940).
- , "Pisma Arefy - novyi istochnik o politicheskikh sobytiakh v Vizantii 931-945 gg." *VV* I n.s. (1947).
- Shepard, J. "Some Problems of Russo-Byzantino Relations c. 860 - c. 1050." *SEER* LII (1974).
- Shestakov, S. "O rukopisiakh Simeona Logotheta." *VV* V (1898).
- Soloviev, A.V. "O pechati i titule Vladimira sviatogo." *Byzsl* X (1948).
- , "Zamiutki o dogovarakh Rusi s Grekami." *S* XV (1937/38).
- Stokes, A.D. "The Background and Chronology of the Balkan Campaigns of Svyatoslav Igorevich." *SEER* XL (1961).
- , "The Status of the Russian Church, 988-1037." *ASEER* XXXVII, no. 89 (June 1959).
- Tachiaos, A-E. N. "The Greek Metropolitans of Kievan Rus': An Evaluation of Their Spiritual and Cultural Activity." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Talis, D.L. "Iz istorii russko-korunskikh politicheskikh otnoshenii v IX-X vv." *VV* n.s., XIV (1958).
- Terras, V. "Leo Diaconus and the Ethnology of Kievan Rus'." *ASEER* XXIV (1965).
- Thomsen, R.W. "Mission, Conversion, and Christianization: The Armenian Example." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Tolochko, P. "Volodimer Sviatoslavyc's Choice of Religion: Fact or Fiction?" *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Treadgold, W.. "Three Byzantine Provinces and the First Byzantine Contacts with the Rus'." *HUS* XII/XIII (1988/1989).
- Trotskii, I.M. Elementy druzhinnoi ideologii v 'Povesti Vremennykh Let'." *Pi* XVII (1936).
- Uspenskii, F.I. "Iz istorii vizantinovedeniia v Rosii, Annaly." *Zhurnal vseobshchei istorii* I (1923).
- Vasiliev, A.A. "Economic relations between Byzantium and Old Russia." *Journal of Economic and Business History* IV (1932).
- , "Was Old Russia a Vassal State of Byzantium." *Sp* VII (1932).

- , "The Second Russian Attack on Constantinople." *DOP* VI (1951).
- Vasilievskii, V.G. "Khronika Logofeta na slavianskom i grecheskom." *VV* II (1895).
- Vernadsky, G. "On Feudalism in Kievan Russia." *ASEER* VII, no. 1 (Feb. 1948).
- , "The Rus' in the Crimea and the Russo-Byzantine Treaty of 945." *Byzantina-Metabyzantina* I:1 (1946).
- , "Notes on the Social History of Kievan Russia." *ASEER* III, no. 4 (Dec. 1944).
- , "Three Notes on the Social History of Kievan Russia." *SEER* XXII (Dec. 1944).
- , "The Status of the Russian Church During the First Half-Century Following Vladimir's Conversion." *SEER* XX (1941).
- , "Byzantium and Southern Russia." *Byz* XV (1940/41).
- , "Byzantino-Russian Relations in the Twelfth Century." *Byz* IV (1927-28).
- , "Vizantiiskiiia ucheniia o vlasti tsaria i patriarkha." In *Sbornik statei, posviashchennykh pamiati N.P Kondakova*. Prague, 1926.
- Wortley, J. "The Date of Photius' Fourth Homily." *Byzsl* XXXI (1970).
- Zdan, M.B. "The Dependence of Halych-Volyn' Rus' on the Golden Horde." *SEER* XXXV, no. 85 (June 1957).
- Zernov, N. "Vladimir and the Origin of the Russian Church." *SEER* XXVIII (1949-50).