

Andrzej Poppe

THE ORIGINAL STATUS OF THE OLD-RUSSIAN CHURCH

At the turn of 987, the over one-hundred-year old penetration of Christianity in its Byzantine form and Slavonic language variety into the Old-Russian upper social strata, i.e. the prince's court, the knights and merchants, was crowned with an act of the ruler carried out in an exceptionally favourable political situation.¹ Vladimir I gave up his effort to expand the pagan cult and decided to adopt the Christian system of beliefs and ideas of an incomparably stronger impact. It was a mature decision, dictated by the understanding of the growing need to modernise the country and the society through an ideological consolidation of its ruling class, and to acquire the ideological means of influencing the entire population. So Christianisation became law, the state was to watch over it but the Church had its own hierarchy to carry it out. What then was the church organization at its very inception, whose duty it became to consolidate the prestige of the state and the ruling dynasty, and to lay the foundations for the evangelisation of the people of the vast expenses of Kievan Rus'?

¹ A. Poppe, *The Political Background to the Baptism of Rus'. Byzantine-Russian Relations between 986—989*, "Dumbarton Oaks Papers," vol. XXX, 1976, pp. 197—244.

INVESTIGATIONS AND SPECULATIONS

The paucity of source information which, to make it worse, has been hitherto partly neglected or erroneously interpreted, made the reconstruction of the early history of the Rus'sian Church a genuinely difficult task. At the same time, the intricacy and obscurity of the problem have been further compounded by conclusions both biased and *a priori*, often formed under the pressure of a confessional orientation and other prejudices. The 19th-century Russian historiography professed the idea, strongly entrenched for centuries, of the Byzantine origin of Christianity and the Church in Rus'. More importance was attached to the conviction about the pure orthodoxy of the East Slavic Church than to finding answers in source material. On the other hand, Catholic historiography, based on facts both true and invented during the age-long confrontation of the two Churches (particularly in the struggle for the adherence of the Orthodox to the Greek-Catholic uniate Church), proclaimed the contribution of the Roman Church to the evangelisation of the Eastern Slavs.

The first scientific investigations date back to the last quarter of the 19th century and they have to be credited to E. E. Golubinskij, author of the fundamental *History of the Russian Church*. Many are the scholars who had worked in order to pave the way for the answer to the question about the original status of the Rus'sian Church. Today it should be particularly emphasized that the hypotheses and queries which have not stood the test of time and confrontation with the few but credible source data, have played the role of negative catalysts beneficial to the prospects of research. The main credit for supplying documentary evidence for the assertion about the jurisdictional dependence of the Rus'sian Church on the patriarch of Constantinople from the times of Vladimir I, goes, in our opinion, to V. Laurent and E. Honigmann who drew attention to some unappreciated Greek records, and to L. Müller who also examined Old-Russian records and made a thorough and convincing criticism of the various attempts at a solution.² It is their works that laid the foundations

² V. Laurent, *Aux origines de l'Eglise Russe. L'établissement de la hiérarchie byzantine*, "Echos d'Orient," vol. XXXVIII, 1939, pp. 279—295;

for the attempt at the verification of all the known source information and the documentation of the fact that the Rus'sian Church not only came under Constantinople but that it was from the very beginning an ordinary (with suffragans) metropolis i.e. a church province of the Constantinople patriarchate.³ But this assertion, propounded over a period of thirty years (1939—1968), although it gained many supporters among the scholars, is still being questioned, directly and indirectly. To some extent it could be explained by ignorance of those works and a tendency towards the traditional ideas of local schools of history. But this does not explain the main opposition which stems, in the first place, from the conviction about the crucial importance of the year 1037 in the history of the Rus'sian Church, and secondly, from the conviction about the complete silence of Old-Russian sources on the subject of Rus'sian church hierarchy and organisation. But both these statements are difficult to substantiate. The second con-

E. Honigmann, *Studies in Slavic Church History. A. The Foundation of the Rus'sian Metropolitan Church according to Greek Sources*, "Byzantium," vol. XVII (American Series III), 1944/45, pp. 128—162; L. Müller, *Zum Problem des hierarchischen Status und der jurisdictionellen Abhängigkeit der russischen Kirche vor 1039*, Köln—Braunsfeld, 1959, p. 84. Honigmann's opinion was shared by M. V. Levčenko, *Očerki po istorii vizantijsko-russkikh otnošenij*, Moskva 1956, pp. 373—377. The opinion that from the time of Vladimir's conversion the new Rus'sian Church was subordinated to the Patriarchate of Constantinople was consistently supported in all his works by D. Obolensky. Cf. *idem*, *Byzantium, Kiev and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations*, "Dumbarton Oaks Papers," vol. XI, 1957, pp. 23—24; *idem*, *The Byzantine Commonwealth. Eastern Europe 500—1453*, London 1974, pp. 258—259. This scholar also drew attention to the passage in Nicephorus Gregoras (*Historia*, lib. 36, cap. 22—23) that since the baptism of Rus' the Rus'sian Church had formed one single ecclesiastical province, the metropolitanate, whose primate was subordinated to the jurisdiction of Constantinople (*idem*, *Byzantium, Kiev...*, p. 24). But we would rather not treat as source evidence this accurate statement of a Byzantine historian writing around 1355, since his opinion had a current political overtone, though it confirms our own opinion and was probably based on patriarchal archives then in existence.

³ A. Poppe, *Państwo i Kościół na Rusi w XI wieku [State and Church in Rus' in the 11th Century]*, Warszawa 1968, pp. 15—39. A. P. Vlasto has devoted a subchapter of his book (*The Entry of the Slavs in the Christendom*, Cambridge 1970, pp. 268—281) to the original status of the Rus'sian Church. He relates the various opinions on the matter and gives priority to the assertions about the subordination to Constantinople. But his nescience of some vital works (e.g. those quoted in Note 2) and his sometimes insufficiently critical attitude towards sources of doubtful credibility, particularly when of Russian provenance, have weakened the importance of his cogent argument.

viction might be justified if there existed some set of Rus'sian sources from that period i.e. from the years 987—1037. But even if some information has been preserved, it is dispersed in fragments over later works, mostly in the well-known *Primary Chronicle* from the opening years of the 12th century. On the other hand, hypotheses about the existence of earlier chronicles from the first half of the 11th century or even the end of the 10th century are in themselves subjects for discussion and cannot constitute a convincing basis for further hypotheses. Moreover, it is clear, though the inference is indirect, from the extant specimens of ancient Old-Russian literature, beginning with the oldest *Sermon on Law and Grace* by Ilarion and dating back to the mid-11th century, that the status of the Rus'sian Church had remained unchanged. As concerns the crucial meaning of the year 1037, the exposition of the premises and the erroneous interpretation of sources, from which this conviction has grown of fundamental importance for it has also stimulated all those ideas which, without doubting the Byzantine jurisdiction, assumed that up to 1037, Rus' did not have the status of a metropolitanate but some sort of temporary arrangement.⁴

The year 1037 owes its assumed crucial importance to the research carried out by A. A. Šahmatov into the most ancient Rus'sian chronicles. They strongly stimulated investigations and various guesses as to the original organisation of the Rus'sian Church. The hypothesis put forward by that scholar that the most ancient chronicle compilation came into being in 1039, in the metropolitan curia in Kiev, was supported by the statement about

⁴ Not only Fr. Dvornik, A. Stokes and A. Vlasto but even Laurent, *Aux origines...*, p. 295, and Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 74—75, have bowed to this "evidence." Laurent acknowledged the events of 1037 as an act of demotion of an autonomous archbishopric (like Ochrida and Cyprus) to the rank of a simple metropolitanate; Müller saw there the possibility of a promotion of a titular archbishopric to the rank of metropolitanate. Cf. also H. G. Beck, *Kirche u. theologische Literatur im Byzantischen Reich*, München 1959, pp. 68, 187; P. Devos, in: "Analecta Bollandiana," vol. LXXIII, 1955, p. 244; W. T. Pašuto, (*Vnešnjaja politika Drevnej Rusi*, Moskva, 1968, pp. 75, 317) hesitated, admitting the possibility of the metropolitan organisation having been formed only around 1037, but ultimately inclined to the Byzantine thesis. Cf. idem, in: "Sovetskoje Slavjanovedenie", 1969, No. 6, p. 78.

the founding in 1037—39 of a metropolitanate in Kiev.⁵ This assertion was supposedly proved in the chronicle under the year 1037 that “*Yaroslav [...] založi že i cerkov svjatyja Sofija mitropol’ju*” [Yaroslav [...] founded also the church of St Sophia the metropolis], which referred, apparently, to the foundation of a metropolis. Yet, even from the language point of view, this passage should be understood as information about the building of the stone metropolitan cathedral of St Sophia, founded by the prince.⁶ The word “*mitropol’ju*”, (metropolis, metropolitan) whether treated as a noun or an adjective, remains an apposition in relation to the preceding “*cerkov svjatyja Sofija.*” The author simply indicates that it is a metropolitan church, a cathedral, and it is in this sense that it is used in Old-Russian writings. A few lines higher up, under the year 1036, the same chronicler noted that the battle with the Pechenegs was fought “*na mjestje idje že nynje stoit’ svjataja Sofija mitropol’ja rus’skaja*” [on the spot where the Rus’sian metropolitan church of St Sophia now stands].⁷ Thus the record mentions only the construction of the metropolitan cathedral, the first of brick and stone, as we know, but not the first altogether, for there had been previously a wooden St Sophia in Kiev erected in the time of Vladimir and rebuilt, according to Thietmar, after the fire of 1017.⁸ The conviction that the 1037 mention concerned the foundation of a metropolitanate, was expressed earlier but was unreservedly accepted by historians only after it had been propounded by the prominent philologist.

⁵ A. A. Šahmatov, *Razyskanija o drevnejšykh russkikh letopisnykh svodah*, SPb. 1908, pp. 398—420; for a concise exposition of Šahmatov’s hypothesis see M. D. Priselkov, *Istorija Russkogo letopisanija XI—XV vv.*, Leningrad 1940, pp. 26—29.

⁶ *Povest vremennykh let* (hereafter PVL), vol. I, Moskva 1950, p. 102; *The Russian Primary Chronicle*, Laurentian Text, translated and edited by S. H. Cross and O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor. Cambridge, Mss., 1953, p. 137: “[Yaroslav] founded also the metropolitan Church of St. Sophia.” Cf. Müller, *Zum Problem...*, p. 66; J. Fennell and A. Stokes, *Early Russian Literature*, London 1974, p. 56.

⁷ PVL, I, p. 102. see also Laurentian chronicle under the year 1203: “*i mitropol’ju svjatuju Sofiju rozgrabiša i Desjatinnuju svjatuju Bogorodicu rozgrabiša*”, in: *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisej* (hereafter PSRL), vol. I, Leningrad 1928, col. 418.

⁸ See A. Poppe, *Russkije mitropolii konstantinopolskoj patriarii v XI veke*, “*Vizantijskij Vremennik*”, vol. XXVIII, 1968, pp. 86—96; idem, *Zasnuvannja Sofiji Kyivskoj*, “*Ukrajins’kyj Istoričnyi Žurnal*,” 1965, No. 9, pp. 97—104.

The scientific prestige of A. A. Šahmatov was such that the assertions and hypotheses of that outstanding scholar were propagated as certainties and used as starting points for hypotheses by other scholars, M. D. Priselkov in particular.⁹ Once the idea about the metropolitan chronicle of 1039 was accepted, the conclusions were far-reaching because this compilation said absolutely nothing about the Rus'sian ecclesiastical hierarchy and organisation. On this basis Priselkov contended that the Greek metropolitan purposely ignored the earlier history of the Rus'sian Church as not worthy of attention, because only the establishment of Constantinople's authority in 1037—1039 was the beginning of the true Church and of Christianity.¹⁰ This assertion was later frequently repeated in the writings on the subject.

Critics have so effectively undermined the premises of the hypothesis about the chronicle of 1039 that it can now be safely shelved. Also the very idea to link the chronicle-writing with the metropolitan curia is indefensible.¹¹ Let us add that the entire series of records included by Šahmatov in the 1039 text of the chronicle, for instance, those which tell about the conversion of Vladimir to Christianity, about the murder of Boris and Gleb, and particularly the record under the year 1037 containing information about the building activity of Yaroslav, date back to the second half of the 11th century.¹² L. Müller is right when he says

⁹ Even Šahmatov cut himself off from such research process. See A. A. Šahmatov, *Zametki k drevnejšej istorii russskoj cerkovnoj žizni*, "Naučnyj Istoričeskij Žurnal," 1914, No. 4, pp. 30 sq. Cf. also I. U. Budovnic, *Ob istoričeskikh postrojenijah M. D. Priselkova*, "Istoričeskie Zapiski," vol. XXXV, 1950, pp. 199 sqq.

¹⁰ M. D. Priselkov, *Očerki po cerkovno-političkoj istorii Kievskoj Rusi X—XII vv.*, SPb, 1913, pp. 82—87. The opinion about the Byzantine censoring of the Old-Russian chronicle still lingers on. In 1965, it was repeated by M. Čubatý (see Note 32 below).

¹¹ D. S. Lihačev, *Russkie letopisi*, Moskva—Leningrad, 1947, p. 62 sqq. M. N. Tihomirov, *Istočnikovedenie istorii SSSR*, vol. I, Moskva 1962, pp. 61—63. M. K. Karger, *K karakteristike drevnerusskogo letopisca*, "Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury" (hereafter TODRL), vol. XI, 1955, pp. 70—72. N. N. Il'in, *Letopisnaja statja 6523 goda i eë istočnik*, Moskva, 1957, pp. 3—20. U. I. Budovnic, *Obsčestvenno-političeskaja mysl' drevnej Rusi*, Moskva 1960, pp. 28—34. A. Poppe, *Latopisarstvo staroruskie*, in: *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich [Lexicon Antiquitatum Slavicarum]* (Hereafter SSS), vol. III, Poznań 1968, p. 22 sq. H. Łowmiański, *Początki Polski [Poland's Beginnings]*, vol. V, Warszawa 1973, p. 111.

¹² Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 55—60. A. Poppe, *Powieść doroczna*, in: SSS, vol. IV, 1970, pp. 259—265.

that the objection concerning the text of the chronicle up to 1039, can be applied to the whole *Primary Chronicle* which is not at all interested in church hierarchy and, particularly, in matters concerning the metropolitanate. Literally a few only extant texts, except the one about the appointment of metropolitan Ilarion, mention metropolitans casually, in connection with events in which they took part (mainly religious ceremonies). The mentions are later; it is only beginning with the eighties that, though similarly rare, they become almost contemporary with the events they describe.¹³ So the silence of the chronicler about the main centre of ecclesiastic authority does not mean that it did not exist. It simply did not attract the interest of chroniclers who only by the close of the 11th century became sophisticated enough to try and write a comprehensive history of Rus'; this was attempted in the princely monastery of the Caves, independent of the metropolitan jurisdiction, and the monk who wrote it was mainly interested in the state and Christianity in Rus'. He lauded the deeds of the princes, the asceticism of the monks of the Caves, but had nothing or practically nothing to say about the men at the helm of the Church.

Proving the erroneousness of the opinion that the years 1037—1039 were of a crucial nature to the church affairs in Rus' has deprived of fundamental motivation all the substitute theories on the status of the Rus'sian Church in 988—1037. In those years it was exactly the same as after 1037. But since not everybody has been convinced¹⁴ and different ideas on the beginnings of the Rus'sian Church linger on, some mention should be made of the

¹³ Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 52—55. A. Poppe, *Uwagi o najstarszych dziejach kościoła na Rusi* [Remarks about the oldest history of the church in Rus'], "Przegląd Historyczny," vol. LV, 1964, pp. 372—373.

¹⁴ Anyway, some historians remain under the spell of opinions formed on the grounds of A. Šahmatov's hypothesis. Cf. e.g. Budovnic, *Obščestvenno-političeskaja mysl...*, pp. 88, 91. H. Paszkiewicz (The Making of the Russian Nation, London 1963, pp. 95—97) remarks that "Although much has been written on this subject, it still remains insufficiently clear," and thinks that the jurisdictional position of the Russian Church up to 1037 was fluid. Similarly, K. Rose, *Byzanz und die Autonomiebestrebungen der russischer Kirche in der Zeit von X bis XVJh.*, in: *Byzantinistische Beiträge*, Berlin 1964, pp. 304—308, and the authors of the collective work, *Cerkov v istorii Rossji*, Moskva, 1967, pp. 43, 47, who think that the all-Russian church organisation was founded by metropolitan Theopemptos who came only in 1039. Cf. also Note 4 supra, and Notes 15, 29 below.

works that have appeared after the publication of the studies by Laurent, Honigmann and Müller. Then we shall proceed to an analysis of the sources.

The opinion that up to 1037, Perejaslav was the original see of the Rus'sian metropolitanate has lately found advocates in G. Stokes and V. Mošin.¹⁵ This variant of the Byzantine thesis has become indefensible after it had been proved that all the sources about the Perejaslav metropolitanate refer to the second half of the 11th century, when the bishopric in Perejaslav ranked temporarily as a titular metropolitanate.¹⁶

After the critics have had their say from 1913 onwards, after the works of J. Snegarov and L. Müller, there would be no need to return to the baseless opinion of M. D. Priselkov about the jurisdiction of the archbishopric-patriarchate of Ochrida over the Russian Church before 1037, if it had not been for its amazing vitality. This opinion has been uncritically repeated not only before the publication of V. Laurent's and E. Honigmann's studies but also in works written in the past decades.¹⁷ Having read all these outworn expositions one feels inclined to share Šahmatov's opinion:

¹⁵ A. D. Stokes, *The Status of the Rus'sian Church 988—1037*, "The Slavonic and East European Review", vol. XXXVII, 1959, pp. 430—442. V. Mošin, *Poslanie ruskogo mitropolita Lva ob opresnokah v Ohridskoj rukopisi*, "Byzantinoslavica", vol. XXIV, 1963, pp. 87—105. Vlasto (*The Entry...*, pp. 280 sqq) is willing to suppose that the *Primary Chronicle* marked under the years 1037 and 1039 the return of the Metropolitanate to Kiev after a period of "exile" at Perejaslav which temporarily (1026—1037/9) became the acting centre of the Old-Russian Church.

¹⁶ A. Poppe, *Le traité des azymes Leontos metropolitou tēs en Rōsia Presthlabas; Quand, où et par qui a-t-il été écrit?*, "Byzantion," vol. XXXV, 1965, pp. 504—527. Idem, *Zur Geschichte der Kirche der Rus im 11 Jh.: Titularmetropolen*, in: *Das heidnische und christliche Slaventum*, vol. I. Wiesbaden 1970, pp. 64—74.

¹⁷ Cf. e.g. I. Nazarko, *Svjatyj Volodimir Veliky, Volodar i Hrestytel Rusi-Ukrainy*, Roma 1954, pp. 108 sq. P. Koviralevski, *L'Eglise russe en 1054*, in: *L'Eglise et les Eglises*, vol. I, Chevetogne, 1954, p. 475 sqq. A. V. Kartašev, *Očerki po istorii russkoj cerkvi*, vol. I, Paris 1959, pp. 157—181, cf. review by L. Müller in: "Kyrios," vol. III, 1963, No. 4, pp. 243—253. Mošin, *Poslanie...*, pp. 94—96, who modernises the Bulgarian thesis arguing that the jurisdiction of Ochrida over Kiev existed only in 988—991, when the patriarch of Ochrida supposedly sent Metropolitan Michael to Rus'. H. Koch's article, *Byzanz, Ochrid und Kiev 987—1037*, first published in "Kyrios," vol. III, 1938, pp. 253—292, which defended the Bulgarian assertion, was reprinted in: H. Koch, *Kleine Schriften zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte Osteuropas*, Wiesbaden, 1962. L. Müller was right when he pointed to the purely jubilee value of this reprint in: "Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie," vol. XXXI, 1964, p. 434 sqq.

"In the end, it seems that the whole hypothesis propounded by M. D. Priselkov rests on the common name of the hierarchs of Kiev and Ochrida who lived in the twenties of the 11th century."¹⁸ There is no need to go too far in arguing with a notion that has already been abolished¹⁹ but it would be instructive to illustrate the feebleness of M. Priselkov's construction on one example: He says, for instance, that the "*archiepiscopus civitatis illius*" in Thietmar's narrative who welcomed the Russian prince Svjatopolk and the Polish Duke Boleslaw at the gates of Kiev, was the archbishop-patriarch John of Bulgaria, who at the time was supposedly visiting the Rus'sian church province subordinated to him. So, in 1018, when Basil the Bulgar-Slayer was putting an end to the existence of the West-Bulgarian state, the head of the Bulgar Church was to visit Kiev and be the same archbishop *predictae sedis* who in August 1018, went to Novgorod as a mediator in the negotiations between Boleslaw and Svjatopolk, on the one hand, and Yaroslav on the other. John of Ochrida could not have been that archbishop if only for the simple reason that he assumed the see only in the summer of 1018.²⁰ Priselkov's and his epigones' ignorance of Bulgarian events is all the more glaring in that, according to their own opinion, Yaroslav's recognition of Ochrida's church jurisdiction was to be an expression of the anti-Byzantine policy of that prince. So it would be consistent to presume that Yaroslav gained archbishop John of Ochrida for his policies; yet, the archbishop, though canonically not under the authority of the patriarch in Constantinople, was nevertheless entirely dependent on the Emperor, for he acceded to the archbishop's see by the imperial will alone.²¹

¹⁸ Šahmatov, *Zametki...*, p. 56. For a critique of the Bulgarian thesis as treated by Priselkov's other epigones, see E. Mihajlov, *Bylgarsko-russkite vzaimootnošenija ot kraja na X do 30-te godiny na XIII v. v russkite i bylgarskite istoriografija*, "Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet. Istorič. fak.," vol. LIX, 1966, book 3, pp. 171-175.

¹⁹ Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 12—17. Poppe, *Uwagi...*, pp. 375—377.

²⁰ V. Zlatarski, *Istoria na Bylgarskata država prez srednite vekove*, vol. I—II, Sofia 1927, pp. 775 sqq., vol. II, Sofia 1934, p. 17 sqq. F. Granič, *Kirchengeschichtliche Glossen zu den vom Kaiser Basileios II dem autokephalen Erzbisum von Achrida verliehenen Privilegien*, "Byzantion," vol. XII, 1937, p. 395 sqq.

²¹ Granič, *Kirchengeschichtliche Glossen...*, p. 398 sqq. A. Michel, *Die Kaisermacht in der Ostkirche (843—1204)*, Darmstadt, 1959, p. 46.

Let us also remark that supporting the assertion about the church supremacy of Ochrida over Kiev by pointing to the vast cultural and religious contacts, does not explain anything, because long before its conversion to Christianity as well as after the 987/9 events Rus' benefited immensely from the achievements of Southern Slavs. Bulgaria made a considerable contribution to the spreading of Christian culture among Eastern Slavs and to the evangelisation of Rus'.²²

It is from the critical attitude towards M. Priselkov's Bulgarian thesis and from the assertion about the crucial importance of the year 1037, that have sprung the Tmutorokan and Cherson theses. The first, formulated by G. Vernadsky, supposes that Vladimir entrusted the authority over the Rus'sian Church to archbishop Tamatarkha (Matrakha)-Zikhia because of the role that bishopric, situated on the territory of the Rus'sian Tmutorokan kaganate, was supposed to play in spreading Christianity among the Russes in the 9th—10th centuries.²³ But this guess has not even circumstantial evidence to support it, although it is obvious that the contacts of the Russes who arrived in the Taman peninsula with the local Christian population had exerted an impact on the Christianisation of the knights and merchants who formed the

G. G. Litavrin, *Bolgaria i Vizantija v XI—XII vv.*, Moskva, 1960, p. 356 sqq. G. Ostrogorsky, *History of the Byzantine State*, New Brunswick, N. J. 1969, p. 311.

²² Cf. M. Speranskij, *Otkuda idut starejsie pamjatniki russkoj pismennosti i literatury*, "Slavia," vol. VIII 1928; I. Snegarev, *Duhovno-kulturni vrzki meždu Bolgaria i Rusija prez srednite vekove*, Sofia 1950. For an extensive review of the state of research in Bulgarian with French résumé, see E. Mihajlov, *Relations culturelles Bulgaro-russes de la fin du X^{me} siècle jusqu'aux trente années du XIII^{me} siècle dans l'historiographie russe et bulgare*, "Godišnik na Sofijskija Universitet, Istorič. fak.," vol. LX, 1967, book 3, pp. 193—260; idem, *Les Russes et les Bulgares au cours du haut Moyen Age*, *ibidem*, vol. LXVI, 1975, pp. 77—143. In publications on this subject it happens, unfortunately, that unreliable texts have been used like that of the *Joachimian Chronicle* which is an early 18th century compilation of various legends culled from 16th—17th century works. Cf. e.g. B. St. Angelov, *K voprosu o načale russko-bolgarskih literaturnyh svjazej*, TODRL, vol. XIV, 1958, pp. 132—138.

²³ G. Vernadsky, *The Status of the Russian Church during the first Half-Century Following Vladimir's Conversion*, "The Slavonic and East European Review," vol. XX (The Slavonic Yearbook, Amer. ser. I), 1941, pp. 294—314. For concise treatment of this opinion see idem, *Kievan Russia*, New Haven 1948, p. 67 sqq. (where polemics with E. Honigmann announced), repeated unaltered in the last edition during its author's lifetime of Kievan Russia, New Haven and London 1973, pp. 66—69.

majority of the new-comers. But two vital factors speak against the supposed ecclesiastical role of Tmutorokan. First, the extension of Tmutorokan's jurisdiction over the whole of Rus' would require the decision of the patriarch and the emperor, and would also mean the recognition of the right of Rus' to the lands which Byzantium considered its own. Secondly, if it did happen, Tmutorokan would have to advance to the rank of an ordinary metropolitanate; yet, both in the 10th and in the 11th century it remained a titular archbishopric that is a bishopric directly under the authority of the patriarch but without the right of having its own suffragans.²⁴ So the Rus'sian bishops before 1037 could not be the suffragans of the archbishop of Tmutorokan (Zikhia). Neither could the titular archbishop of Cherson have suffragans; F. Dvornik was quite ready to attribute to him the oversight over the Rus'sian church up to 1037, on the grounds that the town, captured by Vladimir, was supposed to have become the place of his baptism; he took the Chersonian priests and Anastasius the Chersonite from there to Kiev. Anastasius was to have been the first Kievan bishop, suffragan of Cherson.²⁵ The share of Cherson in the Christianisation of Rus' is indubitable²⁶ but this does not mean that it had rights to church jurisdiction.

²⁴ G. Parthey (ed.), *Hieroclis synecdemus et notitiae graecae episcopatumum*, Berolini 1866, p. 100. H. Gelzer, *Ungedruckte und ungenügend veröffentlichte Texte der Notitiae episcopatumum*, "Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der königl. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften," vol. XXI, München 1901, p. 575; C. de Boor, *Nachträge zu den Notitiae episcopatumum*, "Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte," vol. XII, 1891, pp. 319, 531. Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 176. Honigmann, *Studies...*, pp. 130—142, where he convincingly demolishes G. Vernadsky's thesis. The critique was rounded up by Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 17—18. Cf. also Poppe, *Państwo...*, pp. 192—196.

²⁵ Fr. Dvornik, *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, London 1949, p. 177 sqq., repeated in: idem, *The Slavs, Their Early History and Civilisation*, Boston 1956, p. 210. For critique of the Chersonian thesis see Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 19—22. In his last work he seems to tone down his earlier statements. In the text he speaks of the establishment of "the archbishop of Cherson as a kind of supervisor of the young Russian Church," while in the notes he emphasizes the Byzantine origins of Christianity in Kiev and refers readers to D. Obolensky's work (see Note 2 *supra*). See Fr. Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs*, New Brunswick, N. J. 1970, pp. 272, 417, Note 32.

²⁶ But more modest than usually thought. About the role of Cherson in the events of 986—989 see Poppe, *The Political Background...*, pp. 198—200, 221—224.

The concept linking the original church organisation in Rus' with the apostolic see has lost its advocates;²⁷ in the face of unquestionable evidence it has been reduced to the thesis about the missionary activity of bishops without determining their outside legal status.²⁸ This assertion is supported by unquestionable but modest influences in ecclesiastical writings and terminology, and in diplomatic and missionary contacts. At the time Rus' was not a backwater and did not isolate itself from the rest of Europe, subtle dogmatic disputes were alien to it, the two Churches, notwithstanding differences, did not fight each other as they were to do beginning with the second half of the 11th century. No wonder then that the influence of the Latin Church reached Rus', although it was not strong enough to vie in Kiev for the place occupied by the representative of Hagia Sophia.

After the critical remarks by L. Müller who effectively undermined the thesis about the missionary bishoprics, A. Amman tried to defend his stand,²⁹ but his main argument: the silence of Bruno of Querfurt on the subject of the status of the church in Rus' in the letter he sent in 1008 to King Henry II, if it does prove anything, it is the wrongness of his conception. Church relations must have been settled in Rus' at the time and been known in the West since they required no commentary. Bruno, who went abroad to convert the Pechenegs, wrote primarily about his own mission. He mentioned the Rus'sian ruler, because he was his host but he did not call him by name nor did he mention Kiev where he stayed twice. Bruno was not interested in Christian, as he sup-

²⁷ Among the best known in the 1920s and 1930s were N. Baumgarten and M. Jugie. For criticism of their theories see Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 26—36.

²⁸ A. M. Ammann, *Die Anfänge der Hierarchie im Kiewer Rus'-Reich*, "Ostkirliche Studien," vol. II, 1953, pp. 59—64; *idem*, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Kultur und des religiöses Lebens bei den Ostslaven*, Würzburg 1955, p. 35 sqq.

²⁹ Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 36—42, and A. Ammann's reply, *Gedanken zu einigen neueren Veröffentlichungen aus der früh russischen Kirchengeschichte*, "Ostkirliche Studien, vol. IX, 1960, No 2/3, p. 104 sq. An opinion akin to Ammann's was voiced by E. Winter, *Russland und das Papstum*, B. I, Berlin 1960, pp. 27—34, who makes even Theophylact of Sebaste a missionary bishop, and describes the period up to 1037 as a time of Byzantine—Roman rivalry and wavering on the part of the Russes.

posed, Rus', but in the conversion of the Pechenegs.³⁰ After all, if we have learned from Thietmar that Kiev had its archbishop, it is only because he took part in the political events of 1018, related by the German chronicler.

The missionary thesis is close to the assertion about the autonomous status of the Rus'sian Church up to 1037, as the result of the interaction of the influences of various church centres (Byzantium, Ochrida, Rome). Its fullest exponent was N. Zernow, who saw an independent bishop of Kiev in Anastasius the Chersomite; but it was refuted convincingly by L. Müller.³¹ A new version of it has been put forward by M. Čubaty. It is really just a conglomerate of all the theses which question the jurisdiction of the Constantinople patriarch over the Rus'sian Church until 1037. Čubaty argues that there was no need in Vladimir's times to found a metropolitanate and bring its head from abroad, because for a long time on the territory of the Rus'sian state there existed two centres of church authority: the Tmutorokan archbishopric and the bishopric in Peremyšl in the Slav rite belonging to the Moravian church province.³² The supposition about the alleged foundation of a bishopric in Peremyšl in early 10th century is pure fantasy, and the reference to post-war archaeological investigations does not help it in the least. It is easy to see through

³⁰ *Monumenta Poloniae Historica*, vol. I, 1864 (re-ed. 1960), pp. 224—228; let us note that when writing about his visit to Poland, Bruno does not mention at all the Polish Church hierarchy; the only clear point is the Roman sovereignty because, when speaking about St Peter as the country's defender, he adds that Duke Boleslaw calls himself his tributary. Cf. also M. Hellmann, *Vladimir der Heilige in der zeitgenössischen abendländischen Überlieferung*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas," vol. VII, 1959, p. 397 sq.

³¹ Cf. N. Zernow, *Vladimir and the Origin of the Russian Church*, "The Slavonic and East European Review," vol. XXVIII, No. 70, 1049, pp. 123—138, No. 71, pp. 425—438. Similar opinion on the independent status of the Russian Church was expressed by N. Lavrov in: *Istoria Kultury Drevnej Rusi*, vol. I, Moskva 1950, p. 90, and smatteringly by O. M. Rapov, *O nekotoryh pričinach kresćenija Rusi*, "Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta," istoria, 1976, No. 4, p. 68 sq. For criticism of this opinion see Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 42—47.

³² M. Čubaty, *Istoria xristianstva na Rusi—Ukraini*, vol. I ("Opera Graeco-Catolicae Academiae Theologicae," vol. XXIV—XXV), Roma—New York, 1965, pp. 101 sqq., 122—134, 257 sqq., 274 sqq., 297 sqq. Very critical reviews by: L. Müller in "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas," vol. XVII, 1969, pp. 271—273, and O. Bachus, H. Stammer in "Slavic Revue," vol. XXX, 1971, pp. 361—365.

the author's intentions, he wants to show the age-long links between Rus'-Ukraine and the apostolic see dating back to the very beginnings of Christianity. M. Čubaty thinks that two hierarchs, of Tmutorokan and Peremyśl, with the help of Anastasius the Chersonite, who was probably the bishop of Kiev, and the Cherson and Bulgarian clergy laid the foundations of the Russian church organisation by founding new bishoprics and ordaining bishops. The head of the Rus'sian Church was supposedly the archbishop of Tmutorokan, freed, seemingly at Vladimir's request, from the jurisdiction of the patriarch. Čubaty has even managed to reconcile his vision with the Perejaslav thesis: the Tmutorokan archbishop was to have his temporary residence in Perejaslav when he visited Rus'. In more than 100 pages devoted to the years 989—1054, M. Čubaty has passed over in silence the evidence illuminating the status of the Russian church prior to 1037. Although his extensive bibliography includes the works by V. Laurent and E. Honigmann, he has not deemed it apposite to quote their arguments. He has ignored L. Müller's thorough study and mentioned only that its author had not been able to explain the silence of all the Rus'sian and other sources on Byzantine Church supremacy.³³ After Čubaty's work had been severely criticised, its author tried to defend his views but he has considered neither the main sources of the disputed subject nor the studies which had pointed to the lameness of the arguments referred to by himself and his predecessors.³⁴ Let us concentrate on Čubaty's main argument in favour of the existence in 989—1037 of an independent archbishopric of Rus' "outside of the boundaries of the traditional patriarchates," because it affords a good opportunity to get to know his way of working. The fundamental sources consist here of the relations about the events of about 1020, in the two hagiographic works on Boris and Gleb. Čubaty is right when he says that their authors, Anonymous and Nestor, give John, then the head of the Rus'sian Church, the title of archbishop. But why does he forget to add that they also call him metropolitan and that they use these titles alternately also with

³³ Čubaty, *Istoria...*, p. 241.

³⁴ N. D. Čubaty, *Kievan Christianity Misinterpreted. Response to Reviewers*, "The Ukrainian Historian," vol. IX, 1972, Nos 3/4, pp. 5—15.

regard to George, metropolitan of Kiev in the seventies of the 11th century? Next, Čubaty suggests that “both authors call the residential archiepiscopal church “Catholicane Ecclesia” which supposedly proves that the Church in Rus’ had the same autocephalous status as the national churches such as the Armenian, Georgian, Bulgarian.³⁵ First, it should be noted that Nestor solely used that term when telling about the dedication of a church to SS Boris and Gleb in Vyšgorod near Kiev; he says that after the ceremony had ended Archbishop John, who officiated, “returned to his *kafo-likani iklisia*.”³⁶ This Greek note (καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία) in Cyrillic transliteration means, as is known also to Old-Russian sources, the main church in the town, in this case, a cathedral one.³⁷ This meaning is clear from its very context, and though the semantics of the term may give ground to some other interpretations in Christian terminology, here a reference to them, considering the context, would be devoid of any grounds.³⁸ Nestor did not use a translation, although he had the Slavonic equivalent (*zbornaja cerky*), not perhaps because of his own literary style, but probably because he repeated the term applied to St Sophia’s cathedral in Kiev by the metropolitan’s entourage. Unfortunately, Čubaty has not even as much as mentioned such a simple interpretation of the text. He has preferred an artificial one, best serving the hypothesis to which Nestor’s text gives no ground at all.

There is no doubt that in this case we have a question exceptionally poor in sources and hence extremely complex, from

³⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 10—11.

³⁶ *Die altrussischen Hagiographischen Erzählungen und liturgischen Dichtungen über die Heiligen Boris und Gleb*. Nach der Ausgabe von D. Abramovič herausgegeben von L. Müller, München 1964, p. 19; for an interpretation of this text identical with Čubaty’s see Kartašev, *Očerki*, vol. I, p. 163, with the difference that according to the latter it was John, archbishop of Ochrida, to the former — the archbishop-katholikos of Tmutokan (Tamatařkha).

³⁷ Du Cange, *Glos. graecitatis*, p. 537; *idem*, *Glos. latinitatis*, vol. III, p. 224; I. I. Sreznevskij, *Materialy dla slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka*, vol. I, col. 1201, vol. III, col. 650—651. The *-an-* inserted into *kafolikani* seems to be a Slavic adjective-formative suffix, which has to “slavonise” the Greek form.

³⁸ Cf. in the dogmatic sense, in Ilarion’s Creed: “K Kafolikii i Apostolstej Cerkvi pritekaju.” *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede auf Vladimir den Heiligen und Glaubensbekenntnis*. Nach der Erstausgabe von 1844 neu herausgegeben, eingeleitet u. erläutert von L. Müller, Wiesbaden 1962, p. 143. Cf. *ibidem* p. 192 the relevant Greek text from the Creed of Michael synkellos.

the source point of view. The proper image of the situation may be created only through the comprehensive checking of all texts which, treated singly, could seem enigmatic. The data which we now have at our disposal thanks to our predecessors makes it possible to defend the thesis that the Rus'sian Church had from its inception been a metropolitan diocese of the Byzantine Church. So it is worthwhile to put them in order again together, and to add new details.

ORDO THRONORUM

In *Notitia episcopatum* of the Constantinople patriarchy, drawn up and promulgated under Alexius Comnenus around 1087, among the eighty listed metropolitan sees, the sixtieth place is occupied by the metropolitanate ἡ Ῥωσία. In a similar official register drawn up under emperor Leo the Wise and the patriarch Nicholas Mystikos in 901—902, among the fifty-one listed metropolitanates and as many autocephalous archbishoprics there is no mention of Rus'.³⁹ In his analysis of the time when twenty-nine metropolitanates were founded, H. Gelzer concluded that their order on the list of around 1087 reflected the order in the time of their creation in the years 902—1084. This meant that the establishment of the dates of foundation of metropolitanates prior to and following that of Rus' would determine the time limits of its emergence. But the eminent scholar made a mistake which casts a doubt on the proposed criterion: lacking information about the time of the foundation of many Greek metropolitanates, he took over from Russian ecclesiastical historiography the mistaken opinion that linked the emergence of the metropolitanate with the year 1037 and made this date (or 1035) the chronological determinant of the *terminus ante quem* and *post quem* of the

³⁹ Parthey..., (*Notitia* II), pp. 96—98; *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. CXIX, cols 819—820; Gelzer, *Ungedruckte [...] Texte...*, pp. 550—559; idem, *Zur Zeitbestimmung der Notitia episcopatum*, "Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie," vol. XII, 1886, pp. 540—541; Cf. Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 143. Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 151 sq.; F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, th. I. München 1924, No. 1140; V. Grumel, *Les Regestes des Actes du Patriarchat de Constantinople*, vol. I, Kadiköy—Paris 1932—1947, Nos 598, 943.

creation of other Greek metropolitan sees.⁴⁰ Later, the discovery of other source texts made it possible to correct some of H. Gezler's statements. So it came out that the metropolitanate of Alania, listed 61st, whose creation that scholar put to the years 1035—1084, existed as early as 997. Also, as pointed out by C. de Boor, the metropolitanate of Keltzene, listed 55th, was founded before the year 1000, not after 1022, as Gelzer thought. On this basis, V. Laurent and E. Honigmann, taking into account also other sources, questioned the date 1035—1037 as that of the creation of the metropolitanate of Rus', and said that it must have been founded before the promotion of the archbishopric of Alania to the rank of a metropolitanate.

The corrections brought by the advances in the knowledge of Byzantine Church geography to H. Gelzer's time-table, have questioned the very usefulness of the date criterion proposed by that scholar. So it is no wonder that G. Konidaris, while emphasizing that the order in drawing up the *Notitiae* or in signing documents at synods was determined by the dignity (τὸ ἀιδεσιμον) of the see, does not say what relation does it bear to the date of the foundation of the given see.⁴¹ It seems that the order on the lists followed that of the foundations. This order determined their ἀιδεσιμον and only later political criteria may have had their impact on certain shifts. In an indirect way, these doubts as to the chronological criterion of order were reflected in H. G. Beck's compendium, published in 1959, which to some metropolitan sees applies the newly established dates, to others those established by Gelzer. For instance, for the metropolitanates of Colonea, Thebes and Serres, listed 56th, 57th and 58th, he adopts Gelzer's dates of 1022—1035 as those of their foundation; for the 59th metropolitanate of Pompeiupolis the first half of the 11th century, for Rus', in the 60th place, the year 1037, for Alania (61st) end of the 10th century; Ainos, listed 63d, is dated by him to the years 1035—1054.⁴²

⁴⁰ Gelzer, *Zur Zeitbestimmung*, pp. 538—540.

⁴¹ Cf. G. I. Konidaris, *Die neue in parallelen Tabellen Ausgabe der Notitia episcopatum und die Echtheit der Notitia D*, Cod. Paris 1555 A, in: *Haristerion eis A. K. Orlandou*, vol. 4, Athinai 1967—1968, pp. 248, 250—252.

⁴² Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 166, 168, 170, 174, 177, 180, 187.

In order to obtain a sure answer to the question whether the order in which a see is listed in *Notitiae* can constitute a date criterion, we have to check the whole list of the metropolitan sees founded in the 10th—11th centuries.

Below is a list of the metropolitanates created in 902—1084 after the *Ordo thronorum* of c. 1087 (Parthey, *Notitia* II) taking into account the known data about the time of their foundation:

52. Amastris	} prior to 940, for the two sees are mentioned in <i>Nea Taktika</i> , written in that year at the latest. ⁴³
53. Khonai	
54. Hydrus/Otranto	in 968, as witnessed by Liutprand of Cremona, <i>Legatio</i> § 62. ⁴⁴
55. Keltzene	969—972, appears in <i>Notitia</i> (<i>Cod. Athen.</i> 1372) dated to the first period of the reign of Tzimiskes. ⁴⁵
56. Koloneia	972—976; mentioned as the last of the metropolitan sees in the original version of <i>Notitia</i> III drawn up in the second period of the reign of Tzimiskes. ⁴⁶
57. Thebai	from a note by Nicethas of Amasea it follows that Thebes was a metropolis as early as the end of the 10th century. ⁴⁷

⁴³ Gelzer, *Ungedruckte [...] Texte...*, pp. 565, 570; Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 144; Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 168, 169. The letter of 945 was addressed to the metropolitan of Chones Procopius. See J. Darrouzès, *Epistoliers byzantins du X^e siècle*, Paris 1960, pp. 63, 82.

⁴⁴ MGH SS vol. III, p. 361; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 792; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 183; V. Laurent, *Le Corpus des Sceaux de L'Empire Byzantin*, vol. V-1-A. Paris 1963, p. 728; V. v. Falkenhausen, *Untersuchungen über die byzantinische Herrschaft in Süd-Italien vom 9 bis ins 11 Jh.*, Wiesbaden 1967, p. 148.

⁴⁵ Gelzer, *Ungedruckte [...] Texte...*, p. 572; C. de Boor, *Nachträge...*, pp. 321—322; Honigmann, *Studies...*, pp. 144—145; R. Janin, in: *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclesiastiques* (hereafter DHGE), vol. XII, col. 130—131; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 168; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 627. G. I. Konidaris narrowed the accepted dating of 969—976, by pointing to the year 972 as terminus ante quem, in his *Zur Frage der Entstehung der Diocese des Erzbistums von Ochrida und der Notitiae No. 3 bei Parthey*, "Theologia," vol. XXX, Athina 1959, p. 10 sq.

⁴⁶ Parthey., p. 128; Konidaris, *Zur Frage...*, pp. 1—19. Before, *Notitia* III was dated to the years 980—985; see Gelzer, *Ungedruckte [...] Texte...*, p. 572; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 630.

⁴⁷ J. Darrouzès, *Documents inédits d'ecclésiologie byzantine*, Paris 1966, pp. 170—171; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 591. The metropolitan of Thebes, present at the synod in December 1079, signed his name in the order in accordance with his rank in *Notitia* II, after Koloneia and before Pompeiupolis. See J. Gouillard, *Un Chrysobulle de Nicephore Botaneiates à subscription synodale*, "Byzantion," vol. XXIX/XXX, 1960, p. 31.

58. Serrhai }
59. Pompeiupolis } 976—997; *Notitia* from Tzimisikes times mentions them both as archbishoprics. The signatures of the two metropolitans are on the synodal document of February 21, 997.⁴⁸
60. Rhōsia ?
61. Alania prior to 997; confirmed in the synodal document of May 1024, referring to a privilege granted to the metropolitan of Alania, Nicholas, in the year 6506 /997/8/.⁴⁹
62. Ainos prior to 1032, as evidenced by the signature on a synodal document of 1032.⁵⁰
63. Tiberiupolis no data, localisation uncertain.
64. Eukhaneia prior to 1054, as witnessed by the signature of metropolitan Nicholas on a synodal document of July 24, 1054. In the note on one of the MSS the metropolitan of Eukhaneia Nicholas was called “the man of Theodora Porphyrogenite.” This note may date to the time before 1042, when Theodora became empress.⁵¹
65. Kerasus 1024—1058; in 1024 it was not yet a metropolitanate; a metropolitan of this see, a contemporary of Michael Cerularius (1043—1058), is known.⁵²
66. Nakoleia prior to 1066; a signature on a synodal document of April 21, 1066.⁵³
67. Germia no precise data; a synodal document of December 1079 was signed by the metropolitan of Germia as the last of those present (after Kerasus). In the synodal minutes of April 11, 1062, Germia is listed among those present between Tiberiupolis (63) and

⁴⁸ Gelzer, *Ungedruckte... Texte...*, p. 571; *Patrologia graeca*, vol. 119, col. 741^a; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 804; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, pp. 595, 598.

⁴⁹ Published by G. Ficker in “Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher,” vol. III, 1922, pp. 93—95. See Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 806, No. 827; Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 146; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 613; Clement, metropolitan of Alania, was listed before Ainos in a document of the year 1032. (Cf. Ficker, Note 50 below).

⁵⁰ G. Ficker, *Erlasse des Patriarchen von Konstantinopel Alexios Studites*, Kiel 1911, p. 26; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 840; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, pp. 614—615. Cf. V. Grumel, *Les Metropolites sinclles*, “*Etudes Byzantines*,” vol. III, 1945, p. 110.

⁵¹ Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 869; R. Janin, in: DHGE, vol. XV, col. 1313 sq.

⁵² N. Skabalanovič, *Vizantijskoje gosudarstvo i cerkov v XI veke*, SPb 1884, p. 416; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 170.

⁵³ *Patrologia graeca*, vol. CXIX, col. 756; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 896; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 172.

- Abydos (74); also mentioned in *Notitia Cod Coislin.* 211, f. 261v, of c. 1082/4.⁵⁴
68. Madyta 1059—1067, promoted to the rank of titular metropolitanate by Constantine Ducas.⁵⁵
69. Apameia date of foundation unknown, mentioned among the present metropolitans between Kerasus (65) and Dristra (71) in the synodal minutes of March 21, 1082, and in *Notitia, Cod. Coislin.* 211.⁵⁶
70. Basileion 1059—1067, promoted by Constantine Ducas.⁵⁷
71. Dristra belonged to the patriarchate of Ochrida, separated from it and subordinated to Constantinople probably after the Bulgarian rising in 1040/1. It obtained the rank of metropolitanate before 1071, as witnessed by the signatures of Dristra metropolitan Leo on the synodal documents of November 6, 1071 and March 14, 1072.⁵⁸
72. Nazianzos 1068—1071, status of metropolitanate obtained from Romanus Diogenes.⁵⁹
73. Kerkyra 1072—1082; nearer to the latter date, because in *Notitia Cod. Coislin.* 211, f. 261v—262, it is both on the list of metropolitanates and that of autocephalous archbishoprics where there is also a note about its promotion.⁶⁰

⁵⁴ F. I. Uspenskij, *Deloproizvodstvo po obvineniju Ioanna Itala v eresi*, "Izvestija ruskogo arheologičeskogo instituta v Konstantinopole," vol. II, Odessa 1897, p. 62; Gouillard, *Un Chrysobulle...*, p. 31. Cf. Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 638. About *Notitia* in *Cod. Coislinianus* see A. Poppe, *Russkije mitropolii Konstantinopolskoj patriarhii v XI stuletii*, "Vizantijskij Vremennik," vol. XXVIII, 1968, pp. 98—101, where also a photograph of the folio with the texts of the taxis.

⁵⁵ Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 938; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 552.
⁵⁶ Uspenskij, *Deloproizvodstvo...*, p. 36. Poppe, *Russkie mitropolii...*, p. 99.

⁵⁷ *Patrologia graeca*, Vol. CXIX, col. 877. Dölger, *Regesten...*, Nos 964, 1011, 1140; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, Nos 904, 934, 943; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 162; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 617.

⁵⁸ N. Oikonomides, *Un decret synodal inédit du Patriarche Jean VIII Xiphilin*, "Revue des Etudes Byzantines," vol. XVIII, 1960, p. 57. Cf. Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 159; G. G. Litavrin, *Bolgaria i Vizantija v XI—XII vv.*, Moskva 1960, pp. 332—354. Judging from its place in *Notitia Cod. Coislin.* 211, it was promoted in the 1060s. Cf. Poppe, *Russkie mitropolii...*, pp. 101—104.

⁵⁹ *Scylitzes-Kedrenos*, vol. II (Bonnae, 1839), p. 705; Dölger, *Regesten...*, No. 974; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 899; Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 162; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 159. On the list of the metropolitans present on March 14, 1072, Gregory, metropolitan of Nazianzos, is the last. See Oikonomides, *Un decret synodal...*, p. 67—68.

⁶⁰ Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 182; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 618; Poppe, *Russkie mitropolii...*, pp. 99—100; Grumel, *Metropolitans sinclles...*, p. 110.

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| 74. Abydos | } | c. 1081/2, all three figure also in <i>Notitia Cod. Coislín.</i> 211 as metropolitan sees; in the synodal edict of March 14, 1072, Methymna is confirmed as an archbishopric. Christianopolis confirmed as a metropolitanate in the synodal minutes (<i>Cod. Athos.</i> 120. f. 711) of March 20 and 21, 1082, Abydos in those of April 11, 1082. ⁶¹ |
| 75. Methymna | | |
| 76. Christianupolis | | |
| 77. Rhusion | | In 1082; after March 24, 1082 (<i>Cod. Athos.</i> 120 f. 711) when it is still an archbishopric. Like Kerkyra, it figures twice in <i>Notitia Cod. Coislín.</i> , 211 /1082/4/ with note about promotion. ⁶² |
| 78. Lakedaimon | | around January 1, 1083, promoted by Alexius Comnenus. ⁶³ |
| 79. Naxia | | in May 1083. ⁶⁴ |
| 80. Attaleia | | between September 1, 1083 and August 31, 1084 (6592); promoted metropolitanate by Alexius Comnenus. ⁶⁵ |

The survey of the dates on which the particular metropolitan sees were created in the 10th and 11th centuries, although it introduced vital corrections into the concrete dates proposed by H. Gelzer, wholly confirmed his assertion that the metropolitanates were listed in the *Notitiae* in order of their foundation. The figures listed above show that the dates of the promotion of this or that see are not known in all cases, but wherever they can be credibly though unfortunately only approximately established, their pattern

⁶¹ Uspenskij, *Deloproizvodstvo...*, pp. 30, 36, 62; Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 162, 175, 179; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, pp. 622—624; Oikonomides, *un decret synodal...*, pp. 57—68. In the inscription 6594 of the year 1085/86, Methymnoi figures as a metropolis.

⁶² Uspenskij, *Deloproizvodstvo...*, pp. 31, 36; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 897; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 174; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 719; Poppe, *Russkie mitropolii...*, pp. 99—100. In the synodal papers of March 14, 1072 and December 1079, it figures as a titular archbishopric. See Oikonomides, *Un decret synodal...*, p. 68.

⁶³ Parthey..., (*Notitia* III, scholion), p. 119, cf. pp. 216, 259; Dölger, *Regesten...*, No. 1086; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 928; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, p. 624; idem, *La date de l'érection des métropoles Patros et de Lacédémon*, "Revue des Etudes Byzantines," vol. XXI, 1963, pp. 136—139.

⁶⁴ Parthey..., (*Notitia* III, scholion), p. 123; Dölger, *Regesten...*, No. 1088; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 929; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 174.

⁶⁵ Parthey..., (*Notitia* III, scholion), p. 116; Dölger, *Regesten...*, No. 1112; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 930; Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 166.

is evidently chronological.⁶⁶ Thus the conclusion that the metropolitan see of Rus' was founded prior to 997 has been confirmed. As follows from the *Notitiae*, it was founded after the promotion of Serres and Pompeiupolis between the years 976 and 997. It is precisely the time of the events which created the conditions for the establishment of the metropolitan see in Rus'. This act could not have been promulgated earlier than in 987/8, but close to that date, if one considers that Alania obtained a metropolitanate after Rus' but prior to 997.

TRANSLATION OF METROPOLITAN THEOPHYLACT

Another evidence of the sovereignty of Constantinople over the Russian church during the reign of Basil Porphyrogenitus, that is before 1025, has been preserved in the *Church History* by Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, completed around 1317, and in some unpublished versions of the treatise *peri metatheseon (de translationibus episcoporum)*. One of them in the *Vatican codex*, No. 1455, of 1299, was referred to by V. Laurent,⁶⁷ another, from the Jerusalem collection in a 1687 copy, has for long been signalled to scholars⁶⁸ without, unfortunately, arousing due interest.

⁶⁶ It is worth noting that the documentation of this fourth successive attempt (1st — Gelzer, 2nd — Honigmann, 3rd — Poppe) has more details also in comparison with the third (cf. Poppe, *Państwo...*, pp. 26—28). In the 11th century, the metropolitans-synkelloi tried to revise the accepted *ordo praesidentiae metropolitanum (taxis prokathedrias)* based, as it is right to assume, on the principle of the seniority of a see. But these attempts failed, when in May 1065, the Emperor backed the old ranking order. See Dölger, *Regesten...*, No. 961; Grumel, *Les métropolitains syncelles...*, p. 92 sq. Beginning with the 12th century the changes in the rank of particular sees basically disturbed and later destroyed its chronological order. Cf. Darrouzès, *Listes synodales et Notitiae*, "Revue des Etudes Byzantines," vol. XXVIII, 1970, pp. 57—94.

⁶⁷ Laurent, *Aux origines...*, p. 293, following him, V. Grumel, *Chronologie patriarcale au X^e siècle*, "Revue des Etudes Byzantines," vol. XXII, 1964, p. 53.

⁶⁸ A. Pavlov, *Zamiečatelnyje rukopisi kanoničeskogo soderžanija v Moskovskoj Sinodalnoj (byvšej patriaršej) biblioteke*, "Zapiski Imp. Novorossijskogo Universiteta," vol. XIII, Odessa, 1874, p. 170; Vladimir arhimandrit, *Sistematičeskoje opisanije rukopisej Moskovskoj sinodalnoj biblioteki*, part 1, *Rukopisi grečeskije*, Moskva 1894, p. 491. The Canonical Codex of Synodal Library (now in the State Historical Museum, Moscow), No. 336, containing part of the treatise *peri metatheseon*, was copied in 1687 in Jerusalem on the instruction of Dositheos, the patriarch of Jerusalem, for the library of the Moscow patriarch where it arrived in 1693.

Xanthopulus in his relation about the promotion of Proklos, metropolitan of Cyzicus, to the patriarchal throne in 434, makes a lengthy digression quoting examples of bishops being moved from one see to another over the centuries. Among such examples which took place during the reign of Basil II Porphyrogenitus, there is the mention that "during his rule, Theophylact was promoted from this see of Sebaste to the see of Rhōsia."⁶⁹ E. Honigmann, who understood the importance of this unexplored text, tried to find out the source of Xanthopulus's information about the translation of Theophylact. In comparing the relation about the transfers of bishops with the anonymous treatise *peri metatheseon* in which there is, unfortunately, no mention of the case of interest to us, he noticed that the two works on that subject have only one point in common: the information about the transfer of Agapetos from Seleucia to Antioch. As the anonymous author quotes Theodore of Sebaste⁷⁰ but at the same time commits errors which Xanthopulus does not, Honigmann decided that the latter drew his information about the translations of Agapetos and Theophylact directly from the chronicle of Theodore of Sebaste. The latter, a metropolitan and author of a lost monograph on the reign of Basil II, upon which later Byzantine chroniclers drew, particularly John Scylitzes, was confirmed in his see in 997.⁷¹ From this the obvious conclusion was that Theodore must have succeeded Theophylact in the see; so the latter must have

⁶⁹ Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopulos, *Ekklesiastike istoria*, 1b, XIV, 39 (*Patrologia graeca*, vol. CXLVI, col. 1196^b). This historian was a member of the clergy of Hagia Sofia and had access to its rich library. See about him Gy. Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. I, Berlin, 1958, pp. 459—560; Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 705—706. Attention was drawn to Kallisto's information by V. G. Vasiljevskij (Trudy, vol. II—1, SPb., 1909, p. 67) who, bearing in mind the mention under the year 1039 in the Primary Chronicle (PVL), remarked that "if one was to read Theopemptos, it would indicate that it referred to the metropolitan of Rus'."

⁷⁰ *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. CXIX, col. 905, 908. Cf. Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 150. I. Sykoutres, *Synodikos tomos tes ekloges tou patriarhou Germanou tou III (1265—1266)*, "Epetēris Hetaireias Byzantinōn Spoudōn," vol. IX, 1932, p. 200, note 5. The author of this anonymous treatise was Balsamon who composed it on the occasion of the transfer in 1189 of the Jerusalem patriarch Dositheos to the throne of Constantinople. See Grumel, *Le Peri metatheseon et le Patriarche de Constantinople Dosithee*, "Études Byzantines," vol. I, 1943, pp. 239—248.

⁷¹ Moravcsik, *Byzantinoturcica*, vol. I, pp. 336, 345, 426; Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 805; Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 156.

been transferred to Rus' before 997. As in 992—996 the throne of the patriarch was vacant, Honigmann concluded that the translation of Theophylact must have occurred under the pontificate of the patriarch Nicholas Chrysoberges, that is before December 16, 991, so that Theophylact of Sebaste was the first metropolitan of Rus'.⁷²

This conclusion was questioned by V. Grumel who argued that Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus did not consult the chronicle of Theodore of Sebaste but one of its numerous versions *peri metatheseon*. The only passage in common, the mention about the transfer of Agapetos which in the published treatise on translations contains a clear reference to Theodore of Sebaste, resembling it also from the stylistic point of view, is so different from the passage in Xanthopulus that the latter compiler's direct knowledge of the chronicle of Theodore of Sebaste must be excluded. Another argument against the information about Theophylact having been drawn from that source was the fact that in the version of *peri metatheseon* in the *Codex Vatican.* of 1299, where both the examples of translations are quoted, they are separated by twenty others. In conclusion Grumel wants to show that the information about Theophylact did not have to come from Theodore of Sebaste but from some other of the lost chronicles (e.g. that of Demetrius of Cyzicus); but then Theophylact might just as well have occupied the Sebaste see after Theodore and the year 997 would then lose its feature of *terminus ante quem*, and there remains only the certainly that the transfer took place in the period up to 1025.⁷³

Grumel's noticing that the passage about translations in Xanthopulus did not contain Theodore of Sebaste among its sources seems convincing, but the argument that since the two entries do not, in one of the versions of *peri metatheseon*, figure next to each other and so do not come from the same source, may turn out to be misleading. Grumel himself remarks that, according to V. Laurent, more than one-hundred unpublished manuscripts of *peri metatheseon* have survived in various versions, prepared

⁷² Honigmann, *Studies...*, pp. 148—158.

⁷³ Grumel, *Chronologie patriarcale...*, pp. 51, 57.

probably as historical motivation in the fairly frequent cases of transfers from one see to another which was contrary to canons.⁷⁴ So records from one source could find their way to two different texts and later meet again in some new compilation. During such peregrinations they underwent stylistic changes, and this is well brought out by the comparison of the passage under discussion as treated by:

Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulos: *Peri metatheseon* in *Cod. Vat.* 1455 of 1299, and in *Cod. Sinod.* 336 of 1687 (copy of *Jerusalem Cod.*)

ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡγεμονίας θεοφύλακτος ἐκ τῆς Σεβαστηῶν ἐξ Ῥωσῶν ἐνάγε-
ται.⁷⁵

ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας (βασιλείου) τοῦ πορφυρογεννήτου Θεοφύλακτος ὁ Σεβαστείας μετέθη εἰς τὴν Ῥωσσίαν (εἰς Ῥωσῶν).⁷⁶

⁷⁴ This contradiction was resolved by forbidding *metabasis* that is transfer at the request of the interested person, but not *metathesis* — transfer for the good and need of the Church, and always an exception. Cf. Grumel, *Chronologie patriarcale...*, p. 53; Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 72 sq., 593. A. P. L'Huillier, *Les translations episcopales*, "Messager de l'Exarchate russe en Europe occidentale," vol. XV/57, Paris, 1967, pp. 24—38. About the filling of vacant sees and translations of bishops in Byzantium in the 4th—14th centuries, see also M. M. Petrovič, *Nomokanonski propisi i popunjanje upražnjenih eparhija i promistaju arhijereja*, "Pravoslavna misao," vol. XXII, Beograd 1975, pp. 13—22.

⁷⁵ *Patrologia graeca*, vol. CXLVI, col. 1196^c, it follows from the preceding sentence that it concerns the times of the reign of Basil Porphyrogenitus. Some light is thrown on the data about the transfers in Xanthopulos's *Church History* by the *Codex Barrochianus*, No. 142, of the Oxford Bodleian — a collection of source extracts drawn up by himself. (Cf. G. Genz, F. Winkelmann, *Die Kirchengeschichte des Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulos und ihre Quellen*, Berlin 1966, pp. 135—136). The text on translations, contained in it and written in 1265 (*Baroc. f.* 266v—268v), was published by Sykutris, *Syndikos tomos...*, pp. 179—183. It contains no information about the transfer of Theophylact to Rus', but the information about the translation of Agapetos to Antioch (*ibidem*, p. 181) differs in form from that in *Church History* where the text is closer to that in the anonymous treatise *peri metatheseon* (cf. their comparison in Honigmann, *Studies*, p. 150). It follows that although Xanthopulos had *Cod. Barrochianus* at hand and used it, he drew the information about the translation of Agapetos from another source (another version of *peri metatheseon*?) which may also have contained the information about Theophylact.

⁷⁶ Vladimir, *Sistematičeskoje opisanie...*, p. 140; Laurent, *Aux origines...*, p. 293, in brackets readings from *Cod. Vatic.*; Fr. Dvornik, *The Making...*, p. 179, Note 131, preferred to see in Theophylact the bishop of Sebaste under the metropolis of Laodicea (Phrygia) transferred to an episcopal see in Rus'. Doubts as to such an interpretation were raised by Obolensky, *Byzantium, Kiev...*, p. 58. In his later works Fr. Dvornik no longer referred to this opinion but it should be noted that although the doubt about which Sebaste was involved might have some justification (although we have presented arguments in this article which definitely

The two passages express exactly the same thing, the syntax also shows that they come from the same original text, but at the same time there are differences which mark the separate lives of the two items.

Although Honigmann's arguments in favour of Theodore of Sebaste have been weakened, his chronicle still seems the most probable original source of the mention about the translation of Theophylact. We do not know how long Theodore occupied the see of Sebaste, which fact is confirmed in 997, while the next mention about the metropolitan of Sebaste dates only to 1030 and 1032, when the see was occupied by Georg.⁷⁷ There is enough time between these two dates for Theophylact to hold the see of Sebaste and then to accede to the metropolitanate of Rus'. But if one considers that Theodore was the chronicler of an emperor who was his contemporary and thus wrote probably in the second half of the long reign (from 976, but in fact from 985 to 1025) of Basil II, and that a translation after 1018 seems unlikely because the Kievan see was then occupied by metropolitan John I, then the period from before 997 suits best the transfer of Theophylact to Rus'.

Let us note that Grumel's critical yet controversial remarks about Theophylact's transfer are not "disinterested." For the case of Theophylact attracted the attention of Byzantologists who wanted to resolve a chronological puzzle in the light of contradicting evidence: when did the four-year long vacancy on the patriarchal see occur, before or after the pontificate of Nicholas Chrysoberges? But these investigations were marred by trust in later Russian texts about the first metropolitans Michael and Leo, which are really only the product of the inquisitiveness of Old-Russian bookmen in the 13th—14th centuries, who tried to fill in the gap in knowledge about the beginnings of church hierarchy

speak in favour of Sebaste in the theme Armenia II), nevertheless it follows from the two items that, in accordance with established ecclesiastical nomenclature, they speak not about an (episcopal) see in Rus' but exclusively about the see of Rus' which, as we know from *Notitiae*, was a metropolitan one. After all, the transfers noted down always concern promotions to a metropolitan or a patriarchal see; in our case, the participation of the Emperor also points to this.

⁷⁷ Ficker, *Erlasse...*, pp. 19, 26; Cf. Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, No. 839, No. 840.

in Rus'.⁷⁸ G. Grégoire and P. Orgels, trusting the data contained in the 16th century *Nikon Chronicle* and *Book of Degrees* about the appointment of Leo to the metropolitan see in 991—992, and accepting Honigmann's assertion that Theophylact preceded Theodore of Sebaste, cast a doubt on the possibility of a vacancy on the patriarchal throne in the years 992—996; they assumed that the appointment of Theophylact to the Rus'sian metropolitanate, which could have occurred some time after 992 and before 997, required the participation of the patriarch.⁷⁹ Though he admits the relation by Yahya of Antioch about the four-year vacancy after the death of Nicholas Chrysoberges, Grumel also uses the Rus'sian data about the ordainment of Leo in 922, as an argument for shifting the date of this patriarch's death from December 16, 991 to 992. He also excludes the possibility of Theophylact's having been translated during the vacancy, that is between December 16, 992 to April 12, 996.⁸⁰

The involvement of Michael and Leo, the supposed metropolitans of Rus', in the study on the chronology of the patriarchate at the close of the 10th century, has confused even more the already sufficiently vague situation. But, Grumel is right that the case of Theophylact cannot constitute an argument in considering the time of the pontificate of Nicholas Chrysoberges. In the light of well-known fact of the intervention of emperors into ecclesiasti-

⁷⁸ Cf. Poppe, *Le traité...*, pp. 524—527; *idem*, in: SSS, vol. III, pp. 43—44 (Leo), pp. 241—243 (Michael). Let us add here an interesting re-adaptation of the legend about Michael and Leo. The *Nikon Chronicle* in the early forties of the 16th century lists them in the following order: the first metropolitan—Michael, the second—Leo, but repeats the older version that both had been sent by patriarch Photius (cf. PSRL, vol. IX, pp. 57, 64). Twenty years later, the author of the *Book of Degrees* (an excellent example of a historian writing on commission; he was concerned with illustrating the unbreakable bonds between the ruling dynasty and the Church in Rus'), took another step: he still makes Photius send Michael, but for Leo, having observed the glaring anachronism, he replaces Photius by Nicholas Chrysoberges (cf. PSRL, vol. XXIII, pp. 102—113).

⁷⁹ G. Grégoire, P. Orgels, *La chronologie de Nicolas II Chrysoberges*, "Byzantion," vol. XXIV, 1954, pp. 161—172.

⁸⁰ Grumel, *Chronologie patriarcale...*, pp. 54—56, 69—70. This opinion was uncritically repeated by Vlasto, *The Entry...*, pp. 227—278, who thought that the transfer of Theophylact during the vacancy was technically impossible because "there was no patriarch to consecrate." The fact that Theophylact had already been bishop and that consecration was unrepeatable has been forgotten.

cal affairs, it is true that among the imperial rights was the right to translate bishops. The share of the patriarch and his standing synod, the so-called *synodos endemousa*, was not necessary in this act which was not quite consistent with the canons. The emperor, on the other hand, as commented by Theodore Balsamon, a 12th-century, Byzantine canonic lawyer, was not bound by canons in undertaking measures serving the common good, he was above them.⁸¹ So the emperor's decisions about translations may have been the result of his wish to by-pass the regular procedure in appointing bishops. Though the emperor could exert his influence on it, yet the patriarchal synod was also involved; the candidate, in order to obtain consecration from the patriarch, had to fulfil certain conditions, and the entire procedure lasted several weeks, sometimes even two to three months.⁸² When choosing a candidate from among consecrated officiating hierarchs, the emperor avoided the formalities in the competence of the patriarchal synod and gained time. It is clear that he used this right primarily during a patriarchal vacancy when the appointment to a see could not be carried out in the regular way, even if there was a suitable candidate on hand but not a consecrated bishop. Thus, the translation of the metropolitan of Sebaste did not have to, but could have taken place precisely at the time of the vacancy in Hagia Sofia. Anyway, the need to create a new church province and the appointment of its head emerged during the civil war and the undoubtedly tense relations between Basil II and at least part of the higher church hierarchy. Only the emperor's intervention into church affairs could have satisfied that need without much delay. Perhaps the time factor was also

⁸¹ Cf. Michel, *Die Kaisermacht...*, p. 27 sqq, particularly pp. 37—39; Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 72—73; J. M. Petritakis, *Interventions dynamiques de l'empereur de Byzance dans les affaires ecclesiastiques*, "Byzantina," vol. III, 1971, pp. 137—146. Many interesting opinions on the Emperor's interventions into ecclesiastical affairs are contained in the works of various authors, recently collected and published by H. Hunger in: *Das Byzantinische Herrscherbild*, Darmstadt 1975. There is no information to indicate that translations had to be put on the agenda of the patriarchal synodos endemousa, cf. J. Hajjar, *Le synode permanent dans l'église byzantine des origines au XI^e siècle*, Roma 1962, pp. 142—143.

⁸² Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 70—71; Hajjar, *Le synode...*, pp. 140—142. E. Herman, *Appunti sul diritto metropolitico nella chiesa bizantina*, "Orientalia Christiana Periodica", vol. XIII, 1947, p. 522 sqq.

of importance should Theophylact have been the metropolitan sent to Rus' together with the emperor's sister Anna Porphyrogenite.

In line with Honigmann's hypothesis, Theophylact was the first metropolitan of Rus', but it should be emphasized that the text about his transfer from Sebaste to Rus' justifies only the assertion that Theophylact was the first credibly confirmed metropolitan of Rus'.

There exists, however, a source which, despite some vagueness it contains, gives better grounds for arguments in favour of Honigmann's opinion. It is the information supplied by the Armenian historian, Stephen of Taron (Asoghik) which, it seems, fits well with the mention about the transfer of the metropolitan of Sebaste Theophylact to the metropolitanate of Rus'. We learn from it that the Sebaste metropolitan persecuted and tortured the clergy of the Armenian rite, and together with "his other numerous colleagues" wrote polemical letters to the katholikos of Armenia, Khatchik; in that same year 435, he was sent by the emperor to the land of the Bulgars with his sister who was to be the bride of the Bulgarian ruler. When the Bulgars learned that they had been deceived, for the princess turned out to be a simple court servant, they tortured the metropolitan and burnt him at the stake as a cheat.⁸³

Considering other misinterpretations about Bulgarian affairs handed down by Asoghik, this relation could be taken as a moralising story about the punishment deservedly meted out to a persecutor of the Armenian Christians in Sebaste; but it contains some elements which are not fiction. The main reason for which Asoghik became interested in the fate of a metropolitan, whose name he did not divulge, was the insertion in his *History* of the extensive reply of katholikos Katchik I (972—992) to his polemical letter.⁸⁴ This argument did really take place and Asoghik's information about one of its participants and addressees of the katholikos's theological expositions, that is the metropolitan of

⁸³ Asoghik, 1b. III, §§ 20, 22, 24; for French translation see F. Macler, *Histoire universelle par Etienne Asolik de Taron*, II partie, Paris 1917, pp. 74—75, 124—125, 127—128.

⁸⁴ Asoghik, 1b. III, § 21; Macler, *Histoire universelle*, pp. 76—123.

Sebaste, was not completely fictitious.⁸⁵ In Chapter 43, book III, there is a pointer about the time the historian obtained this information. In relating Basil II's expedition to Armenia in the summer of 1000, in order to incorporate Upper Tao into the Empire after the death of its ruler curopalates David, Asoghik mentions that on the road near Melitene the Emperor received a delegation of the Armenian clergy of Sebaste which solicited the confirmation of their religious freedoms infringed sometime before by the metropolitan described by him.⁸⁶ So this would constitute *terminus post quem* the story was related to Asoghik (probably by some member of the Sebaste Armenian clergy) who wrote it down before the year 1005.

It is also true that in the year 435 of the Armenian era (March 25, 986 — March 24, 987) the metropolitan of Sebaste had to leave the town occupied in February 987 by the usurper Bardas Sclerus, immensely popular with the Armenian population. He could find shelter only in the capital under the Emperor's protection. While everything speaks against any possible negotiations between Basil II and the Bulgars, we know that such negotiations were undertaken in the summer-autumn of 987 with Rus', and that they were concerned with the marriage of the emperor's sister with the ruler of Rus'.⁸⁷

A church dignitary, as devoted to the emperor as was the Sebaste metropolitan Theophylact, was eminently qualified to lead a mission going to Kiev and then to become the first head of the Rus'sian Church. This reconstruction of the life of the first metropolitan of Kiev is supported by the fact, contained also in Asoghik's relation, that anyway he did not return to his see after Basil's victory, in 990/91, when the Armenian themes were restored to the emperor's authority. It was not in Basil's interest,

⁸⁵ Mathias of Edessa lb. I, XXV in telling about this argument drew from another source; among its Greek participants he mentions the patriarch and the metropolitan of Melitene, a locality neighbouring on Sebaste. Cf. Macler, *Histoire universelle*, p. 75, Note 6. A. Ter-Mikelian, *Die armenische Kirche, in ihren Beziehungen zur byzantinischen*, Leipzig 1892, pp. 77—80. P. Charanis, *The Armenians in the Byzantine Empire*, Lisboa 1963, pp. 20, 23, 27, 33, 52, 200.

⁸⁶ Asoghik, lb. III, § 43; Macler, *Histoire universelle*, p. 163. Cf. H. M. Bartikian, *La conquête de l'Arménie par l'Empire byzantin*, "Revue des Études Arméniennes," n.s, vol. VIII, 1971, pp. 332 sq.

⁸⁷ Poppe, *The Political Background...*, pp. 202—204, 224—225, 228 sqq.

who even during the wars with the usurpers, tried to win over the Armenian population, and in the year 1000 confirmed the religious freedoms of the Armenians of Sebaste, to return the Sebaste see to a prelate who had fallen foul of them.⁸⁸ A new appointment resolved the whole matter, and the Sebaste see soon went to another supporter of the emperor and later his historian, Theodore who, as we know, held it in 997.

Admittedly, the source material with which we are trying to reconstruct the curriculum vitae of the first Rus'sian metropolitan is somewhat shaky. But too many factors speak in favour of the identity of the two metropolitans of Sebaste, Anonymous and Theophylact, Emperor Basil II's contemporaries, for the assertion to be abandoned outright.

RELATION OF YAHYA OF ANTIOCH

That Byzantine high church hierarchs were sent to Rus' immediately upon the decision of Vladimir to be baptised can be concluded from the writings of Yahya ibn Said al-Antaki, i.e. of Antioch, a Christian historian of Egyptian origin, and writing in Arabic (c. 980—1066). He wrote that, when the rebel Bardas Phocas, on September 14, 987, put on the royal purple and proclaimed himself emperor: "*La situation était devenue grave et l'empereur Basile en était préoccupé à cause de la force de ses troupes et de l'avantage qu'il avait sur lui. Les caisses étaient vides. Dans ce besoin pressant [Basile] fut contraint de demander secours au roi des Russes, qui étaient ses ennemis. Le [Russe] y acquiesça; après ils firent une alliance de parenté, et le roi des Russes épousa la soeur de l'empereur Basile à la condition qu'il se ferait baptiser avec tout le peuple de son pays. Le grand peuple des Russes n'avaient à cette époque aucune loi ni aucune foi religieuse. Par après, l'empereur Basile lui envoya des metropolitans et des évêques qui baptisèrent le roi et tout le peuple de son pays; en même temps il lui envoya sa soeur qui fit bâtir plusieurs*

⁸⁸ Cf. Poppe, *The Political Background...*, pp. 235—236. For the ethnic situation in the region of Sebaste see N. Oikonomides, *L'organisation de la frontière orientale de Byzance aux X^e—XI^e siècles et le Taktikon de l'Escorial*, in: *Actes du XIV^e Congrès International des Etudes Byzantines*, Sept. 6—12, 1971, vol. I, Bucaresti 1974, pp. 296—298.

églises dans le pays des Russes."⁸⁹ Then follows a relation about the arrival of the Russian troops and the victorious battles at Chrysopolis and Abydus.

From the last quoted sentence it follows that Yahya's text is not contemporary with the events. We learn from his own preface to his chronicle that even before his moving over to Antioch in 1014—1015, he had time not only to write his work (c. 1006—1007) but also to supplement it with fresh material and revise it as well as the work of his predecessor. Later, after he had settled in Byzantium in Antioch, he wrote "I revised it again, and I found other chronicles from which I took what (I deemed useful) to add to it and supplement it, and I changed part of it and left the whole work in this form."⁹⁰

Yahya devoted much room to the events in the Christian church and world for he was the continuator of the chronicle of Eutychios, patriarch of Alexandria (933—940), and his relative. It would seem that such an event as the accession to the Christian world of "a big people" did not pass unobserved by the Christian community in Egypt. But this supposition lacks confirmation, if we analyse Yahya's text about the baptism of Rus' in the wider context of his relation entirely devoted to the events occurring within the Byzantine empire, and to the revolt of Bardas Sclerus and Bardas Phocas, in particular. The relation about these events required the introduction of Rus'sian troops which were instrumental in the defeat of the usurper. The appearance of the Rus'sian forces in the Empire had to be explained: hence the information about the agreement, the baptism of Rus' and the marriage of the Russian ruler with a Porphyrogenite. It explains the circumstances and the conditions in which the alliance between two hostile states was concluded.⁹¹

⁸⁹ *Histoire de Yahya-Ibn-Sa'id d'Antioche*, éditée et traduite en français par I. Kratchkovsky et A. Vasiliev, vol. II, in: *Patrologia Orientalia* (hereafter PO), vol. XXIII/3, Paris 1932, p. 423. See also Russian translation by V. N. Rozen, *Imperator Vasilij Bolgarobojca. Izvlečenija iz letopisi Jahii Antiubijskogo*, SPb, 1883, pp. 23—24, and commentary p. 194 sqq. (Reprint 1972 by "Variorum")

⁹⁰ *Histoire de Yahya...*, fasc. I in: Po, vol. XVIII, 1924, p. 708. Rozen, *Imperator...*, pp. 013—016.

⁹¹ Speaking of hostility Yahya thought about Svjatoslav's struggles with the Empire, of which he wrote earlier. Cf. *Histoire de Yahya...*, in PO, vol. XVIII, 1924, p. 833; Rozen, *Imperator...*, pp. 177—181, 195.

We think that Yahya began to take particular interest in the internal events in Byzantium when he settled for good within the borders of the Empire and when, as he himself says, he came upon fresh chronicles. The matter of his sources has not been satisfactorily studied so far, but V. Rozen's findings have made it possible to establish that Yahya had Greek chronicles at his disposal (such as the Continuation of Theophanes or Symeon Logothetes) and the local chronicle with good knowledge of events in Antioch in the second half of the 10th century, including the fighting against pretenders in 987—989. Yahya's Antiochian source may also have been reminded of it by the presence of Russian troops taking part in the Syrian campaign, who were several times quartered in Antioch in the years 995—1001.⁹²

So most probably the information about the revolt of Sclerus and Phocas as well as about Rus' was introduced by Yahya into his chronicle after his arrival in Antioch, i.e. after 1014, when he gained access to new material. The revised chronicle was completed before 1027. The detailed information about the internecine struggles in the Empire must have been taken from a chronicle compiled in Antioch. The credibility of Yahya's text about the Byzantine-Russian agreement of 987 and the Byzantine church hierarchs having been sent to Rus' following this accord, the text being an integral part of the relation about the rebellion, is of first-rate quality.

Yet A. Ammann tried to undermine it: Yahya's relation that "Emperor Basil sent metropolitans and bishops (*matārinat wa asaqifat*) who baptised the King (Vladimir) and the whole people of his country" was supposedly of no value to the matter of the status of the Russian Church because the metropolitans are mentioned in the plural.⁹³ There is an inaccuracy here but it does not

⁹² P o p p e, *The Political Background...*, pp. 205—206, where Yahya's data are discussed in detail.

⁹³ A m m a n n, *Untersuchungen...*, pp. 38—39; for criticism of such an attitude see M ü l l e r, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 41—42, cf. also p. 23, Note 9a. Let us add that Ammann's sceptic attitude towards Yahya's information is due to reading Koch (see Note 17 supra) who repeated Priselkov's opinion, while the latter emphasized that "metropolitans and bishops figure exclusively as baptizers, not as members of church hierarchy in Rus'." He described the paragraph about baptism as interpolation and referred to V. Rozen who, however, spoke about digression not insertion. Cf. P r i s e l k o v, *Očerki...*, pp. 30—33. R o z e n, *Imperator...*, p. 197.

discredit Yahya's text. Arabists would be more competent in explaining it but certain suggestions could be advanced. The possibility of an error — the change of the singular into plural — is inherent in the fact that Yahya's chronicle has come to us in later MSS, the oldest of which dates back to the turn of the 14th century.⁹⁴ If the plural (*matārinat* instead of *matran*) was present in the original text — which is more probable — then the inaccuracy may be explained by the specific character of the source upon which the Arabian historian drew in Antioch. The Greek equivalent of the two ecclesiastical titles, turned by Yahya into Arabic, *matārinat wa asaqifat*, could have been one term *archiereis* used in Byzantine church nomenclature as a collective term for bishops of all degrees but not assimilated by the Arabic. If so, the original text would only relate about the sending to Rus' of some number of *archiereis*. It is only when compared with the known principles of the organisation of a church province under the jurisdiction of the patriarch in Constantinople and the source information about the Rus'sian Church, that it becomes obvious that the group of church prelates which went to Kiev must have been capable of founding such a province, i.e. was composed of suffragans bishops with a superior (*proedros*) bishop i.e. metropolitan. Finally, the fact that Yahya or the copyist of his chronicle, mentioned metropolitans in the plural is not surprising in view of the church relations in Asia Minor, particularly in the area under the jurisdiction of the patriarchate of Antioch where there were more metropolitans among the hierarchy than plain bishops.⁹⁵

So we cannot dismiss Yahya's passage about the original church hierarchy in Rus' on the grounds of a small and easily explained inaccuracy, all the more so as his text is fully supported in the Byzantine sources, discussed above, and in Ilarion's text about Vladimir: "You, together with our new fathers, the bishops, often

⁹⁴ *Histoire de Yahya...*, in PO, vol. XVIII, p. 702 (introduction to the edition); Rozen, *Imperator...*, p. 091 sqq.; Honigmann, *Studies...*, p. 152, Note 102.

⁹⁵ For church geography of the patriarchate of Antioch see Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 190—196.

congregated conferring with great humbleness about how to consolidate the divine laws in those newly converted people."⁹⁶

THIETMAR AND ILARION

Much light is thrown on the legal status of the Russian church in 1018 by the eminently credible writings of Thietmar, bishop of Merseburg, from which it follows that Kiev had its own archbishop, residing at the time in the still wooden cathedral of St Sophia.⁹⁷ The early history of the Kievan cathedral church, which has been treated separately,⁹⁸ supplies yet another convincing proof to support the assertion that Kiev had been from the very beginnings the seat of the head of the Rus'sian Church subordinated to the patriarch of Constantinople. Here it is worth adding that the dedication of the Kievan cathedral to the Divine Wisdom points to the model: the Hagia Sofia of Constantinople. The geographical pale of the spread of this dedication, reserved exclusively to cathedrals, determines not only the scope of the Empire's influence but, first and foremost, of the Byzantine ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Thietmar's relation proves that in 1018, Kiev was within its pale.

Many writers on the subject have tried to interpret Thietmar's mention of the Kiev archbishop as information about the different organisation of the Rus'sian Church prior to 1037. Yet, to Thietmar the title of archbishop was the most adequate equivalent, adopted in the Western Church, of the Greek metropolitan — a hierarch at the head of a church province.⁹⁹ In Byzantium, hence also in Rus', the two terms were used alternately, not only in writing, as al-

⁹⁶ *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede auf Vladimir den Heiligen und Glaubensbekenntniss*, nach der Erstausgabe von 1844 neu herausgegeben, eingeleitet und erläutert von Ludolf Müller, Wiesbaden 1962, pp. 117—118. Cf. also the remark of the author of the *Primary Chronicle* about the bishops taking part in the prince's council under Vladimir, PVL, vol. I, p. 86 sq. *The Russian primary Chronicle...*, p. 122.

⁹⁷ Thietmar, lib. VIII, c. 32.

⁹⁸ Cf. Note 8 supra.

⁹⁹ See Du Cange, *Glos. latininitatis*, vol. I, p. 366, vol. V, p. 371. Idem, *Glos. graecitatis*, pp. 129—130, 931. Cf. V. Laurent, *La succession épiscopale de métropole de Thessalonique*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", vol. LVI, 1963, p. 289.

ready mentioned,¹⁰⁰ but also in the official church nomenclature as evidenced in the recently published collection of seals of Byzantine bishops. The title of archbishop was used not only by the metropolitans of the western provinces of the Empire like Thessalonica, Corinth or Dyrrachion which inherited this title from the times of the Roman jurisdiction, but also by heads of the oldest metropolitan sees of Caesarea, Ephesus and Heraclea. It also figures on the seals of the metropolitans of Mitylene, Euchaite and Ancyra.¹⁰¹ It is significant that by the end of the 11th century the title of archbishop disappeared from the seals of the metropolitans under the patriarch of Constantinople; this is due to the putting in order of ecclesiastical matters at the patriarchal synod with the participation of Alexius Comnenus. The title of archbishop was reserved for the patriarch and the heads of the autonomous churches of Bulgaria and Cyprus and to titular archbishops i.e. autocephalous bishops subordinated directly to the patriarch.¹⁰²

Some writers on the subject contended erroneously that Rus' could have originally obtained an archbishopric of the same rank as did Cyprus and Bulgaria, which only in 1037 was demoted to the rank of an ordinary metropolitanate.¹⁰³ This contention contradicts the texts, mentioned above; L. Müller has used some very apposite arguments against it.¹⁰⁴ It is also worth noting that this supposed promotion would have been of a doubtful nature because the Churches of Cyprus and Bulgaria (after 1018), although they did not come under the patriarch, were entirely dependent on the emperor. It is no accident that Nilus Doxopatres in his treatise of 1143, on church geography, says that since the times of Basil II "and up till now Cyprus and Bulgaria have received their bishops from the emperor, and their own bishops consecrate them," and

¹⁰⁰ Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 64—65; Poppe, *Uwagi...*, p. 374 sq. Cf. A. V. Soloviev, *Metropolitensiegel der Kiever Russland*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift," vol. LVI, 1963, p. 320.

¹⁰¹ Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, Nos 246, 247, 254, 262, 301, 338, 447, 449—454, 456, 554—560, 670—672, 735, 751, 764.

¹⁰² Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, pp. XXVIII—XXXI; Cf. Grumel, *Les Regestes...*, Nos 940, 942, 943.

¹⁰³ So still Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 68, 187. V. Laurent who earlier assumed this possibility, in his review of Müller's *Zum Problem...* came out in favour of the precedence of the metropolis ("Byzantinische Zeitschrift," vol. LIII, 1960, p. 401).

¹⁰⁴ Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 68—70.

remarks that "the patriarch of Constantinople sends a metropolitan to great Rhōsia." He does not list Rus' among the Byzantine metropolitanates, and thus emphasizes, in the formal and legal sense, the purely ecclesiastical character of the bonds between Constantinople and Rus'.¹⁰⁵

In the light of the foregoing it is impossible to admit that originally there was in Rus' an autocephalous archbishopric of a lower rank, that is a titular one,¹⁰⁶ for the Rus'sian Church had four or five suffragans as early as during Vladimir's and Yaroslav's reigns before 1037.¹⁰⁷ Such an opinion is also contradicted by the alternate calling of Rus'sian hierarchs metropolitans and archbishops in two old texts: *The Anonymous Tale of the Holy Martyrs Boris and Gleb*, of about 1072, and *Reading Concerning the Life and Murder of the Blessed Martyrs Boris and Gleb*, of c. 1080, by Nestor. It is certainly a manner proper to hagiography but it is also possible that the 11th century Rus'sian metropolitans used the archbishop title in imitation of the chief Byzantine metropolitanates. Although in the *ordo thronorum* Rhōsia was listed 60th, they were aware of their exceptional mission. V. Laurent, trying to explain the archiepiscopal title on the seal (mid-10th century) of the metropolitan of second rank Euchaite, supposes that the metropolitan used that title in connection with his court office of synkellos.¹⁰⁸ Let us note that among the Rus'sian metropolitans called by the alternate title of archbishop, Georg (he held Kiev before and after 1072) also held the honorary office of

¹⁰⁵ Parthey..., pp. 285—286, 297. Considering that Doxopatres wrote his treatise at the court of Roger II in Sicily, whom he wanted to gain for the idea of the church supremacy of New Rome (cf. Beck, *Kirche...*, pp. 152, 619—620), his drawing attention to the ecclesiastical status of politically sovereign Rus' may not have been accidental.

¹⁰⁶ Müller, *Zum Problem...*, pp. 71—75. But he formulated this opinion as an alternative (favouring also the precedence of the metropolis) and later abandoned it. See *idem*, *Staat u. Kirche in der Rus' im XI Jh. Bemerkungen zu einem Buch von Andrzej Poppe*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas," vol. XX, 1972, pp. 241—246. About the origins of the institution of autocephalous titular archbishops and titular metropolitans see E. Chrystos, *Zur Entstehung der Institution der autokephalen Erzbistümer*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift," vol. LXII, 1969, pp. 263—286.

¹⁰⁷ By the end of the 11th century Kiev had nine suffragans. See A. Poppe, *L'organisation diocésaine de la Russie aux XI^e—XII^e siècles*, "Byzantion," vol. XL, 1970, pp. 165—217.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, No. 764, p. 585 sq.

synkellos.¹⁰⁹ But in our case of greater importance are the two old hagiographic texts which say that in the first years after the accession of Yaroslav the Wise to the throne of Kiev (1019) the Rus'sian Church was ruled by archbishop-metropolitan John.¹¹⁰ Although the doubts as to the chronology of the steps taken for the canonisation and the canonisation itself of Boris and Gleb which, according to the two hagiographers, took place soon after 1019, are justified, this does not mean that their works do not mention a real hierarch. The name of the Kiev hierarch of the second and third decade of the 11th century should have been well known in Kiev around the year 1070. The hagiographical evidence has gained fresh support from the seal of John "mētropolitē Rhōsias" which V. Laurent has dated to the turn of the 10th century on the basis of its engraving and epigraphy; he excludes all possibility of ascribing it to John II, of the eighties of the 11th century.¹¹¹ So John I would be the second thoroughly confirmed metropolitan of Rus'.¹¹² He could also be the archbishop who in 1018 welcomed Bolesław and Svjatopolk to Kiev. The third head

¹⁰⁹ *Die altrussischen hagiographischen Erzählungen...*, (see Note 36 supra), pp. 21, 55—56; Soloviev, *Metropolitensiegel...*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift," vol. LV, 1962, p. 294; Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, Nos 784, 785.

¹¹⁰ The two hagiographers, Anonymous and Nestor, use both titles alternately in respect of John. See *Die altrussischen hagiographischen Erzählungen...*, pp. 17—19, 53—59. This may be the result of literary influences but it is more probable that the custom when addressing a metropolitan was then to call him archbishop. Cf. e.g. what Nestor says: "John [...] archbishop, when he learned about it [...] said to Christ-loving [Yaroslav]: it would be a good thing, orthodox Emperor, if we built a church in their [Boris and Gleb] name. Hearing these words from the metropolitan, the Christ-loving prince said to him [...]" (*ibidem*, p. 17). For the two old texts see J. Fennell, A. Stokes, *Early Russian Literature*, London 1974, pp. 11—31. Cf. St. Maczko, *Boris and Gleb: Sainly Princes or Princely Saints?*, "Russian History," vol. II, fasc. 1, Pittsburgh 1975, pp. 68—76.

¹¹¹ Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, No. 781, p. 600. But the scholar unnecessarily refers to information about John I dating to the 15th-16th centuries. The *officium* in worship of SS Boris and Gleb is ascribed to John I, but it could not have originated earlier than in the second half of the 11th century. See A. Poppe, *O vremeni zaroždenia kulta Borisa i Gleba*, "Russia Mediaevalis," vol. I, 1973, pp. 6—29.

¹¹² When speaking about the seal ascribed by Laurent to John I, which is in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, V. Janin emphasized that "the opinion of such a prominent expert in Byzantine sfragistics is of great import" but inclined towards linking it with the metropolitan John IV (1164—1166) solely on the grounds that he considered open the question of the status of the Rus'sian Church prior to 1037. See V. Janin, *Aktovyje pečati drevnej Rusi X—XV vv.*, vol. I, Moskva 1970, No. 50, pp. 51, 175.

of the Rus'sian Church known by his name is metropolitan Theopemptos, well confirmed by three independent sources.¹¹³

Among the texts which support the Byzantine origins of the Rus'sian Church is also the discourse *Sermon on Law and Grace* which Ilarion delivered around 1049. The orator, soon to be the metropolitan of Rus', probably of the same age as Yaroslav i.e. born around the date of the baptism of Rus', in his eulogy of the work of Vladimir, speaks thus about the path of that ruler to the awareness of one God: "The most he heard about was the ever orthodox land of Greece, Christ-loving and strong in faith," then goes on to compare the Rus'sian prince with Constantine the Great: "He, together with his mother Helena, brought the cross from Jerusalem and having spread the faith throughout the world consolidated it: you, with your grandmother Olga, have brought the cross from the new Jerusalem, from the city of Constantine, and placing it on your land have consolidated the faith."¹¹⁴ The cross, as L. Müller has remarked, is used here metaphorically. It expressed not only the triumph of Christianity in Rus' but also disclosed its origins and the institutional bonds. Yaroslav continued his father's work: "he does not infringe on your decisions but consolidates them," while the whole family of the prince "watches over the orthodoxy in accordance with your will."¹¹⁵ Ilarion clearly emphasized the continuity between Vladimir's and Yaroslav's ecclesiastical policies; it is yet another evidence that the status of the Rus'sian Church had been determined under the rule of the baptizer of Rus'.

All these arguments suffice to leave aside indirect evidence. But one thing should be mentioned: the preserved foundations and details of the interior decoration of the first stone church built in

¹¹³ It is mentioned in Primary Chronicle (PVL, vol. I, p. 103; Cross, *The Russian Primary Chronicle...*, p. 138), in September 1039, he was present at the synod in Constantinople (Ficker, *Erlasse...*, p. 42). For his seal see Laurent, *Le Corpus...*, No. 782; Soloviev, *Metropolitensiegel...*, p. 293; Janin, *Aktovyje pečati...*, No. 41.

¹¹⁴ *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede...*, pp. 102, 118—119, 169. For *Sermon* and its dating see A. V. Soloviev, *Zur Lobrede des Metropoliten Ilarion*, in: *Das heidnische und christliche Slaventum*, Wiesbaden 1970, pp. 58—63. L. Müller, *Ilarion Werke* (Forum slavicum 37), München 1971, pp. 7—18; J. Fennell, and A. Stokes, *Early Russian Literature*, London 1974, pp. 41—60.

¹¹⁵ *Des Metropoliten Ilarion Lobrede...*, pp. 121, 125. Cf. Müller, *Zum Problem...*, p. 76 sq.

Rus' at the close of the 10th century, the Church of the Holy Virgin of the Tithe (the *Desyatinnaya*) not only emphatically confirm the text of the *Primary Chronicle* about the masters brought over from Greece but also indicate the direct links with the art and architecture of Constantinople itself.¹¹⁶

So the Rus'sian Church was from its very beginnings a metropolitanate that is a church province of the Constantinople patriarchate. From this followed certain rights of the patriarch in administration, justice and legislation.¹¹⁷ The most important was the right to appoint the holders of metropolitan sees. In the 10th—11th century this right was within the competence of the patriarchal synod which presented to the patriarch three candidates who fulfilled the conditions determined by canons. The bishop elect was consecrated by the patriarch. If the candidate was chosen in advance (often the emperor's will had to be considered), then at least the valid procedure was observed.¹¹⁸ The path to the Kievan see was the same and that is why the Russian metropolitans were members of the standing patriarchal synod: the first known participant of the synodos endemousa was metropolitan Theopemptos in September 1039. The difference in comparison with the metropolitans within the Empire consisted only in that the enthronization was an ecclesiastical act as well as an act of political accreditation. It was held in the Kiev cathedral. The

¹¹⁶ PVL, vol. I, p. 83; Cross, *The Russian Primary Chronicle...*, p. 119; M. K. Karger, *Drevnij Kiev*, vol. II, Moskva—Leningrad 1961, pp. 27—58; N. P. Syčev, *Drevnejšij fragment rusko-vizantijskoj živopisi*, "Seminarium Kondakovianum," vol. II, 1928, pp. 90—104, table XIII; V. Lazarev, *Regard sur l'art de la Russie pré-mongole*, "Cahiers de civilisation médiévale," vol. XIII, 1970, No. 3, pp. 195—200; H. Schäfer, *Architekturhistorische Beziehungen zwischen Byzanz und der Kiever Rus' im X und XI Jh.*, "Istambuler Mitteilungen," vol. XXIII/XXIV, 1974, pp. 199, 202—205, 218.

¹¹⁷ About these rights see E. E. Golubinskij, *Istoria russkoj cerkvi*, vol. I, Part 1, Moskva 1901, p. 269 sqq; P. I. Sokolov, *Russkij arhierej iz Vizantii i pravo jego naznacenija do nacala XV v.*, Kiev 1913, p. 6 sqq; L. K. Götz, *Staat und Kirche in Altrussland, Kiever Periode 988—1240*, Berlin 1908, p. 8 sqq.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Beck, *Kirche...*, p. 63 sqq; Hermann, *Appunti...*, p. 255 sqq; Hajjar, *Le synode...*, p. 140 sqq; Michel, *Kaisermacht...*, p. 36 sqq., 56 sqq; R. Pötz, *Patriarch und Synode in Konstantinopel. Das Verfassungsrecht des Ökumenischen Patriarchates*, Wien 1971, pp. 27—31, 41—46.

reception of the newcomer, the permission to hold the enthronization ceremony and the participation in it of the prince and his court meant the *de facto* confirmation of the proceedings that had taken place in Constantinople.¹¹⁹

(Translated by Krystyna Kęplicz)

¹¹⁹ This custom was confirmed only under the year 1104 in the *Primary Chronicle*, but it was nothing new. Metropolitan Nicephorus arrived in Rus' on December 6, 1104. His enthronization was held on the second Sunday after his arrival, December 18. See PVL, vol. I, p. 185; Cross, *The Russian Primary Chronicle...*, p. 202. On the role of Kievan metropolitans in church and state of Rus' see L. Müller, *Russen in Byzanz und Griechen in Rus'-Reich*, in: *Bulletin d'Information et de Coördination*, Association internationale des Études Byzantines, No. 5, Athinai—Paris 1971, pp. 96—116.