

# HARVARD UKRAINIAN STUDIES

Volume XII/XIII 1988/1989

Proceedings of  
the International Congress  
Commemorating  
the Millennium of Christianity in  
Rus'-Ukraine

General Editors  
OMELJAN PRITSAK and IHOR ŠEVČENKO  
with the assistance of  
MIROSLAV LABUNKA



Ukrainian Research Institute  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Publication of this volume has been made possible by grants from the late Josyf Cardinal Slipyj and the Millennium of Rus'-Ukraine Christianity Committee, Harvard Project—under the auspices of the WCFU, 63 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10003.

*The editors assume no responsibility for statements of fact or opinion made by contributors.*

Copyright 1990, by the President and Fellows of Harvard College

*All rights reserved*

ISSN 0363-5570

Published by the Ukrainian Research Institute of Harvard University,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Typography by the Computer Based Laboratory, Harvard University,  
and Chiron, Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Printed by Cushing-Malloy Lithographers, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in  
*Historical Abstracts and America: History and Life.*

## CONTENTS\*

<i>Preface</i>	ix
<b>OPENING REMARKS</b>	
OMELJAN PRITSAK	1
IHOR ŠEVČENKO	5
<b>INAUGURAL SESSION</b>	
Religious Missions Seen from Byzantium	7
IHOR ŠEVČENKO	
<b>THE MISSIONARY PHASE</b>	
Mission, Conversion, and Christianization: The Armenian Example	28
ROBERT W. THOMSON	
Scandinavian Conversion Histories	46
BIRGIT SAWYER	
La christianisation de la Hongrie	61
GY. GYÖRFFY	
Christianisation de la Pologne	75
JERZY KŁOCZOWSKI	
<b>CHRISTIANITY IN RUS' BEFORE 988</b>	
At the Dawn of Christianity in Rus': East Meets West	87
OMELJAN PRITSAK	
La brama e lo zelo della Fede del popolo chiamato «Rhos»	114
VITTORIO PERI	
Three Byzantine Provinces and the First Byzantine Contacts with the Rus'	132
WARREN TREADGOLD	

\* The articles in this volume are arranged in the order in which they were presented at the congress, with the exception of the session on "Christianity in Rus' Before 988." The papers in that section have been rearranged chronologically, and the article by Miroslav Labunka, originally in the session on "Problems of the Kievan Legacy," has been added to it—*The editors*.

Ol'ga's Conversion: The Evidence Reconsidered DIMITRI OBOLENSKY	145
Religious Centers and Their Missions to Kievan Rus': From Ol'ga to Volodimer MIROSLAV LABUNKA	159
<b>TRANSMISSION OF THE LITERARY LANGUAGE AND CULTURE: I</b>	
Contacts between Christians and Jews in the Field of Bible Translations M. ALTBAUER	194
From Boris to Volodimer: Some Remarks on the Emergence of Proto-Orthodox Slavdom RICCARDO PICCHIO	200
The Bulgarian Contribution to the Reception of Byzantine Culture in Kievan Rus': The Myths and the Enigma FRANCIS J. THOMSON	214
West Slavic Elements in the Literary Language of Kievan Rus' A. DE VINCENZ	262
<b>TRANSMISSION OF THE LITERARY LANGUAGE AND CULTURE: II</b>	
The Language of Rus' in the Eleventh Century: Some Observations about Facts and Theories HORACE G. LUNT	276
Texts of Closed Tradition: The Key to the Manuscript Heritage of Old Rus' WILLIAM R. VEDER	314
Ilarion und die Nestorchronik LUDOLF MÜLLER	324
An Early Twelfth-Century Kievan Fragment of the Беседа трех святителей MOSHE TAUBE	346
The Tradition of Byzantine Chronography CYRIL MANGO	360

## **BYZANTIUM AND OLD RUS'**

- Byzance face au monde musulman à l'époque des conversions slaves: l'exemple du khalifat fatimide 373  
ALAIN DUCELLIER
- La politique culturelle et religieuse de Byzance à l'égard des Slaves balkaniques 387  
GEORGI BAKALOV
- Byzantine Political Ideology and the Rus' in the Tenth–Twelfth Centuries 400  
ANTONIO CARILE
- Rus'-Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries 414  
ALEXANDER KAZHDAN
- The Greek Metropolitans of Kievan Rus': An Evaluation of Their Spiritual and Cultural Activity 430  
ANTHONY-EMIL N. TACHIAOS

## **ST. VOLODIMER**

- Pourquoi le prince Volodimer Svjatoslavič n'a-t-il pas été canonisé? 446  
VLADIMIR VODOFF
- Il Battesimo di S. Vladimiro* di Karel Havlíček Borovský 467  
GIUSEPPE DELL'AGATA

## **ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH**

- The Organization of the Church in Scandinavia after the Missionary Phase 480  
PETER SAWYER
- Two Concepts of the Conversion of Rus' in Kievan Writings 488  
ANDRZEJ POPPE
- When and How was Novgorod Converted to Christianity? 505  
HENRIK BIRNBAUM
- Projets missionnaires cisterciens dans la Rus' du sud-ouest aux XII<sup>e</sup>–XIII<sup>e</sup> siècles 531  
TERESA DUNIN-WAŚOWICZ

## **ECHOES AND AFTERMATH OF THE CONVERSION**

- The History of Christian Rus' in the  
*Annales Ecclesiastici* of Caesar Baronius 551  
GIOVANNA BROGI BERCOFF

- The Image of Western Christianity in the Culture  
of Kievan Rus' 576  
MICHELE COLUCCI

## **LINGUISTIC ASPECTS**

- What Does "Indo-European" Mean in Reference  
to the Slavic Languages? 587  
NULLO MINISSI

- Prosta Čadŕ and Prostaja Mova* 593  
GEORGE Y. SHEVELOV

- Die nahöstliche botanische und zoologische Terminologie  
in den neueren ukrainischen Bibelübersetzungen 625  
OLEXA HORBATSCH

## **IDEOLOGICAL ASPECTS**

- L'intégration du monde slave dans le cadre de la communauté  
orthodoxe (IX<sup>e</sup>–XII<sup>e</sup> siècles): Notes préliminaires 643  
AXINIA DJUROVA

- The Christian Prince through the Mirror of the  
Rus' Chronicles 672  
GIOVANNI MANISCALCO BASILE

- Metropolitan Ilarion on the Origin of Christianity in Rus':  
The Problem of the Transformation of  
Byzantine Influence 689  
ALEXANDER AVENARIUS

## **JURIDICAL ASPECTS**

- La Rus' entre la Bulgarie et l'Empire byzantin:  
de la fin du X<sup>e</sup> au début du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle 702  
JEAN-PIERRE ARRIGNON

- Der hl. Feodosij Pečerskij: historisch und literarisch  
betrachtet 714  
GERHARD PODSKALSKY

The Bulgarian Contribution to  
the Reception of Byzantine Culture in Kievan Rus':  
The Myths and the Enigma

FRANCIS J. THOMSON

Dichtet, erfindet, träumet,  
schreibt Romane; aber nennt  
es auch ROMANE:  
der Name der GESCHICHTE ist  
heilig, entweiht ihn nicht.

August L. von Schlözer, 1768, 52.

На свете иногда довольно, чтобы кто  
нибудь сказал не улыбаясь вопиющую  
несообразность и многие зеломышленные  
люди станут пересказывать ее  
за историческую истинну.

Осип И. Сенковский, 1834, 59.

The conversion of Kievan Rus' did not lead to the introduction of Byzantine Greek culture, but to the transfer *en masse* of the results of over a century of Bulgarian efforts to receive and adapt that culture to Bulgaria's own needs. Despite the considerable study devoted to Rus'-Bulgarian relations,<sup>1</sup> especially cultural ones,<sup>2</sup> some of the most basic questions remain unanswered: how was the transfer effected? Was the Bulgarian contribution to that transfer active, a deliberate policy promoted by Bulgarian missionaries, scholars and scribes in Kievan Rus', or was it passive, a concomitant factor in a historical process whose motivating force should be sought in Rus'-Byzantine relations? It is asserted both that *Byzantine cultural influences penetrated into the Ukrainian territories often directly from Byzantium*<sup>3</sup> and that *direct spiritual contact with Byzantium and the Greek element was secondary to that from Bulgaria*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Deržavin, *Связи*; D. Angelov, *Руси*; Tihomirov, *Связи*; Cankova-Petkova, *Връзки*; for the earlier period see Mixajlov, *Руси*, and *Русия*.

<sup>2</sup> See Snegarov, *Връзки*; Petkanova-Toteva, *Връзки*; V. Angelov, *Вопросу, Историята and Провикване*; Mošip, *Периодизации*; Dinekov, *Распространении, Мисия and Паралели*; Pavlova, *Връзки*; Schmücker, *Bemerkungen*; Tot (=Tóth), *Предпосылки*; Birnbaum, "Component," "Differences"; Kaliganov, *Соображений*; E. Georgiev, *Начало*; Litavrin, *Переворот*; Rogov, *Связи* (1978) and *Связи* (1982). For earlier contributions see Mixajlov, *Взаимоотношения*.

<sup>3</sup> Ševčenko, *Roots*, 22.

<sup>4</sup> Florovsky, *Ways*, vol. 1, 5.

The reason is not far to seek: *There is a strange discrepancy between the enormous cultural influence which Bulgaria had on Rus' . . . and the silence of the Primary Chronicle about Rus'-Bulgarian relations.*<sup>5</sup> This silence has led some historians to ignore all Bulgarian involvement in the transfer<sup>6</sup> and others, oblivious of the old dictum *a posse ad esse non valet consequentia*, to seek to explain it by hypotheses heaped upon speculative conjectures.<sup>7</sup> The very silence of the Primary Chronicle is itself the object of speculation about the Bulgarophobia of its allegedly Graecophile compilers,<sup>8</sup> to which it could be replied not only that by the time it was compiled Bulgaria was merely a province of the Byzantine Empire,<sup>9</sup> but also that down to the late eleventh century it shows little interest in ecclesiastical

<sup>5</sup> Mošin, *Периодизации*, 50. The lack of information about the spread of Bulgarian letters in Kievan Rus' has often been commented upon, e.g. Sobolevskij, *Материалы*, 135; Snegarov, *Връзки*, 50; Tóth, *Предпосылки*, 50; Schmücker, *Bemerkungen*, 93.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. Schick, *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 4, 24–32; Zernov, *Russians*, 7–12; cf. the remark by Kawerau, *Ostkirchengeschichte*, 55: *Bis zum Jahre 1000 A.D. etwa war auch die Christianisierung der russischen Städte von Byzanz aus beendet*. The sole history of the Russian church ever published in the Soviet Union not merely fails to mention Bulgaria but asserts: *Not only all the first bishops, but all the first priests and monks as well in Kievan Rus' were Greeks*, N. Nikol'skij, *История* (1931), 43 (1983), 31; Lunt, "Interpreting," 259, thinks on the basis of the absence of evidence for the use of Slavonic that at least until Vladimir's death in 1015 the clergy were Greek and Greek was the liturgical language. See also *idem*, "Language." His view has recently been supported by Vodoff, "Questions." It is indeed true that just as the manner of the *translatio litterarum slavicarum ad Russos* remains an enigma, so too the exact time at which it began is uncertain. It is possible that initially Greek was used in the liturgy—there were undoubtedly at least some Greek clergy in Kiev, e.g. Anna's chaplains—but in view of the absence of a knowledge of Greek among native East Slavs (see note 172), this Greek period could hardly have lasted very long or put down firm roots. With regard to the absence of East Slav codices of the first half of the 11th century, it must be borne in mind that the first Slavonic manuscripts in Rus' were of Bulgarian origin and would only gradually have been replaced as the need arose. The training of East Slav scribes will also have required some time, and there is no reason to doubt that South Slav clergy recruited for Rus' copied at least some manuscripts there.

<sup>7</sup> The kindest thing that could be said of the sole work devoted specifically to the Bulgarian contribution to the conversion of Kievan Rus', viz. V. Nikolaev, *Фактор*, is that it belongs to Schlözer's category of *Romane*, see epigraph 1. The recent attempt to resurrect this book from the oblivion to which it has so justly been consigned, see Hannick "Faktor," 345 and 355, is all the more incomprehensible in that Hannick largely deals with some of Nikolaev's errors. The idea that the principal influence on the conversion of Kiev came from Moravia, Bulgarian influence being only secondary, e.g. Popruženko, *България*, 27, cannot be examined here.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Priselkov, *Очерки*, 82–7; Nikol'skij, *Повесть*, 29; Koch, *Byzanz*, 287; Pogorelov, *Русите*, 153; Nikolaev, *Фактор*, 29–48, 159. On the Primary Chronicle's information about Bulgaria see Vaillant, "Bulgarie"; Zykov, *Известия*; Rajkov, *Българите*.

<sup>9</sup> Mošin, *Периодизации*, 50; Schmücker, *Bemerkungen*, 93–4.



events<sup>10</sup> or relations with foreign countries.<sup>11</sup>

With regard to the role played in the conversion by Bulgarian clergy, it is usually assumed that the first priests in Kievan Rus' must have come from Bulgaria,<sup>12</sup> and their role as teachers, translators, and scribes is often stressed,<sup>13</sup> although there is no agreement as to whence they came: were they despatched from Macedonia by Tsar Samuel,<sup>14</sup> or from East Bulgaria, since 971 part of the Byzantine Empire, by Emperor Basil II,<sup>15</sup> or were they refugees from the Bulgaro-Byzantine conflict?<sup>16</sup> Or again, did they only

<sup>10</sup> See Müller, *Problem*, 53–5. It is strange, if the chronicle is really so Graecophile, that it does not systematically mention the Greek metropolitans.

<sup>11</sup> See Zástěrová, "Observations," 241. Thus, for instance, Olga's relations with the West are known only from Western sources.

<sup>12</sup> E. g. Šaxmatov, *Заметки*, 52; Istrin, *Очерк*, 1; Speranskij, *Памятники*, 529; Lužnyč'kuj, *Церква*, 48; Tal'berg, *История*, 52; Gudzij, *Литература*, 8; Vlasto, *Entry*, 262–3; L. Müller, *Taufe*, 85; B. Angelov, *Историята*, vol. 1, 26; E. Georgiev, *Начало*, 20; Mixajlov, *Русия*, 70; Pogorelov, *Русите*, 148, 153. Lixačev, *Свят*, 531, compares them to the Irish monks on the European continent. In actual fact the Primary Chronicle sub 988 makes it quite clear that the first priests to go to Kiev after Vladimir's baptism were from Cherson, not Bulgaria, see PSRL 1, 1926, col. 116. That they were Greeks can scarcely be doubted and occasional claims that they were Slavs, e.g. Kočev, "Anfänge," 507, have never been substantiated.

<sup>13</sup> E.g. Makarij (Bulgakov), *История*, vol. 1, 219–20; Golubinskij, *Обращение*, 190, 144–45, 191, 29–30, and *idem*, *История*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 191; Vlasovs'kuj, *Нарис* vol. 1, 68; Seliščev, *Язык*, vol. 1, 82; B. Angelov, *Вопросу*, 135; Pavlova, *Връзки*, 103; Tóth, *Предпосылки*, 172; Nikolaev, *Фактор*, 143, 147; Schmücker, *Bemerkungen*, 91; Il'inskij, *Въпроса*, 243, also stresses their administrative experience. Soхан', *Очерки*, 26, specifically claims that those who at Vladimir's command in 988 gave instruction to the children of leading families, see PSRL 1, 118–19, were Bulgarian monks.

<sup>14</sup> Thus Mošin, *Периодизации*, 55.

<sup>15</sup> Thus Ščepkina, *Вопросу*, 202; Poppe, *Курилоцѣ*, 334, n. 42, and *idem*, *Christianisierung*, 478, who considers that many of those sent had been taken prisoner in Basil's campaigns against Macedonia; Schmücker, *Bemerkungen*, 92, thinks that they were sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople, as does Bishop Partenij of Leucas, *Патриарси*, 71–2.

<sup>16</sup> Thus Koch, "Ochrid," 143–49; Dvornik, *Making*, 173; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 98; Mošin, *Периодизации*, 61; Snegarov, *Връзки*, 41; Pavlova, *Връзки*, 102; Mixajlov, *Руси*, 132; Litavrin, *Переворот*, 402. Schiwaroff, "Rolle," 147, is even more precise: he suggests that the clergy went to Kiev when Svjatoslav returned from his first campaign, viz. in 968. Nikolaev, *Фактор*, 143, claims that there were bishops among them. Poppe, *Christianisierung*, 478, n. 90, rightly questions the idea of Kievan Rus' appearing a haven to Bulgarian refugees since approximately half of the Byzantine army in Bulgaria consisted of Rus' mercenaries. Similar claims that Bulgarian Christians must have fled to Kievan Rus' in 971 when East Bulgaria was incorporated into the Byzantine empire have been made, e.g. Mošin, *Периодизации*, 52; Vlasto, *Entry*, 252; Tóth, *Предпосылки*, 156–57, but again there is no evidence, although some clerics may have been sent thither as slaves, since Jaropolk was married to a Greek nun, whom Svjatoslav had sent back from his Bulgarian campaigns of 967/8 and 969–71, see PSRL 1 (1926), col. 75. The idea that Svjatoslav's campaigns were motivated by a desire to seize the Bulgarian patriarchate, thus Priselkov, *Очерки*, 15–16, is ludicrous; he was interested in the wealth of the country, as the chronicle makes clear, see PSRL 1, 67. For the assumption that these Bulgarian campaigns must be considered as an important part of the background to the official conversion of the Rus' see also Fine, *Balkans*, 187. Claims that the clergy serving the

arrive *en masse* as displaced persons after 1037 when the first Greek, Leo, was appointed to the archsee of Ochrid and began—or so it is alleged—a policy of replacing even the lower Bulgarian clergy by Greeks?<sup>17</sup> In fact the sole apparently authentic case recorded in any source of a Bulgarian cleric active in Kievan Rus' is that of Gregory *the Philosopher* who arrived with Metropolitan George from Constantinople in 1062.<sup>18</sup> The only other case

---

church of the Prophet Elijah in Kiev, mentioned in the Primary Chronicle sub 945, see PSRL 1, 54, were Bulgarian, thus, for example, Vlasto, *Entry*, 247–48; Bishop Nestor of Smoljan, *Крещение*, 6, and that the church was a centre (очар) of Slavonic liturgical and literary activity, thus Rogov, *Связи* 1978, 43, cf. *idem*, *Связи* 1987, 35, are unsupported by any evidence. Indeed the church probably never existed, see Priselkov, *Очерки*, 8.

<sup>17</sup> Thus Kaliganov, *Проблемы*, 61. In his opinion, *ibid.* pp. 58–60, before then only a few carefully screened Bulgarian clergy were despatched from conquered East Bulgaria, while East Slav ordinands were sent to Constantinople and Byzantine monasteries for training. An interesting hypothesis which—it is to be hoped—will not in future be quoted as a historical fact. On Leo see below n. 104; on the alleged replacement see below n. 162.

<sup>18</sup> A cycle of seven homilies for the days of the week is in most codices ascribed to a certain Gregory the Philosopher, to whose name in one fifteenth-century florilegium, viz. codex 14 in the M. Čuванov collection, State History Museum, Moscow, is added the gloss: в лѣто сѣо Григориа Философа пришедшаго изъ Царяграда съ митрополитомъ Георгиемъ при князи Изяславѣ, сѣа (sic) Юрославѣ, Словесъ седмь..., see Рыков, *Эпизод*, 171. This information, while apparently authentic, is only contained in a codex of the third quarter of the fifteenth century (on the watermark of 1460 see *ibid.*, 171, n. 11), and it is exaggerated to claim, *ibid.*, 171, that *the authenticity of the information in the title gives no cause for doubt*—it will only be absolutely certain if further confirmation is forthcoming. Kaliganov, *Проблемы*, 57, still asserts that not a single name of a Bulgarian working in Kievan Rus' is known, but this is probably to be interpreted as his ignorance of the tradition concerning Gregory, rather than his rejection of it.

The year 6570 covers a period from 1 March 1061 to 28 February 1063, depending upon whether the ultra-March, March or September year was used. Рыков, *Эпизод*, 172, would narrow this down since according to the kalendar in the 11th–12th century Mstislav evangeliary, ed. Žukovskaja, *Апракос*, 31–290, cf. 234, George's predecessor Ephraem consecrated St. Sophia's cathedral on 4 November, which they assume must have been on a Sunday, and thus could only have been in 1061, but the assumption is uncertain. They also, *ibidem*, think that the date could refer to either the date of arrival or the date of the composition of the homilies, although Turilov, *Григорий*, 187, refers it solely to Gregory's arrival, which in view of its position in the title is more probable.

The claim that Gregory came from West Bulgaria, viz. the archsee of Ochrid, whose ecclesiastical autonomy guaranteed better conditions for the development of Slav culture, thus Рыков, *Эпизод*, 173, and Turilov, *Григорий*, 188, is, first, factually inaccurate, as the jurisdiction of Ochrid (see also n. 111 below) contained much of East Bulgaria, including sees at Sardica and Dorostolum, and, second, it ignores the fact of Bulgarian cultural continuity, see below nn. 165, 166, 168. Moreover their claim, *ibidem*, that the title Philosopher meant that he had studied at the school in the Magnaura Palace in Constantinople is speculative as it was applied to people who had not studied there, e.g. the Armenian Pantaleon in the tenth century, see Fuchs, *Schulen*, 22.

Six of the seven homilies have been edited from a codex in which they are ascribed to Cyril the Philosopher by Sobolevskij, *Шестоднев*, 179–202.

that has been quoted<sup>19</sup> is that of the monk of St. Menas' Monastery<sup>20</sup> who, according to the *Vita S. Theodosii abbatis Cryptensis* by Nestor, went to Constantinople, where he settled on an island that came to be known as *Bulgarian Island*. Unfortunately the earliest codex with the *vita* calls him not a Bulgarian but a boyar and the island *Boyar Island*,<sup>21</sup> as does a late thirteenth-century Bulgarian abridgment of the *vita*.<sup>22</sup> In the early fifteenth century Nestor's *vita* was incorporated into the *Patericon Cryptense* in the redaction made for Bishop Arsenius of Tver' and here too the monk remains a boyar;<sup>23</sup> only in the second Cassian redaction of 1462 does he become a Bulgarian and his island *Bulgarian Island*.<sup>24</sup>

The historicity of theories concerning Bulgarian hierarchs allegedly associated with the conversion of Kievan Rus' is no better than that concerning the aforementioned monk. The sole source specifically to link Bulgaria with the conversion of Kiev is the Joachim Chronicle, about which all that is known is what its discoverer, V. Tatiščev, relates: on 20 May 1748 his relative Melchizedek Borščov, then archimandrite of the Monastery of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross at Bizjukovo,<sup>25</sup> sent him three quires of an eighteenth-century codex which he had allegedly acquired from a certain monk Benjamin, who had collected material on Russian history.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>19</sup> By Tóth, *Предпосылки*, 187. The Nikon Chronicle, PSRL 9 (1862), 68, reports that in 1004 Metropolitan Leontius incarcerated the monk Adrian for heresy, see also the *Liber graduum*, PSRL, 21, 1 (1908), 124. It has been claimed that he must have been a Bulgarian monk as in 1004 there were no Russian monks, thus Mošin, *Послание*, 100. However, he is traditionally assumed to have been a Bulgarian Bogomil, thus first Rudnev, *Рассуждение*, 29–38, and frequently repeated since, e.g. Obolensky, *Bogomils*, 277; Bulgakov, *История*, vol. 1, 220–21; Golubinskij, *История*, vol. 1, pt. 2, (= *ЧОИДР*, vols. 209–10, 1904), 791–92. Both claims are suppositions and, besides, the information of such a late source is suspect. The claim that the information was taken from the metropolitan ecclesiastical archives which had been transferred to Moscow, thus Zenkovsky, *Chronicle*, XXXVI, is just one more utterly unsubstantiated hypothesis.

<sup>20</sup> Unknown except in this context. Suggestions as to its location include in or near Kiev, thus Hruševs'kyj, *История* vol. 3, p. 420, n. 2; Golubinskij, *История*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 746; Athos, thus Abramovič, *Патерик*, 215, n. 48; Constantinople, thus Fedotov, *Treasury*, 25, n. 11.

<sup>21</sup> The 12th century Dormition florilegium, ed. Kotkov, *Сборник*, 71–135, cf. 85–6.

<sup>22</sup> Ed. B. Angelov, *Литература*, vol. 1, 204–212, cf. 209. Although the only two known codices of this *vita* are Serbian, the language has Bulgarianisms, see Speranskij, *История*, 24–5.

<sup>23</sup> See Abramovič, *Патерик*, 35, n. 44, and 36, nn. 3 and 5. He also remains so in the first Cassian redaction of 1460, see *ibidem*.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 35 and 36. Clearly it is a case of confusion of *воляринъ* with *болгаринъ*.

<sup>25</sup> On his peripatetic career see (in this order) Stroeв, *Списки*, cols. 464, 461, 203, 183, 572, 598. Even this is incomplete as at some time he was at the Retainer's Monastery of the Dormition in Tver', see the excerpt from his letter of 20 May 1748, ed. Tatiščev, *История*, vol. 1, 107.

<sup>26</sup> Benjamin was not a monk at Bizjukovo as he had sent Melchizedek the quires, see Tatiščev, *ibidem*.

Tatiščev's efforts to obtain more of the codex remained fruitless as Melchizedek died that September and it was not amongst his effects, neither did anyone at Bizjukovo know Benjamin. Indeed Melchizedek's steward, also called Benjamin, stated that at times Melchizedek had claimed that he had himself copied the codex in Siberia, at others that it belonged to somebody else, but in any event he had never shown it to anyone.<sup>27</sup>

Tatiščev published with his own commentary those passages containing information not found in other chronicles.<sup>28</sup> The passages begin with the assertion that Nestor had been ill-informed about events at Novgorod, but that *Bishop Joachim, well-informed*, had written about them,<sup>29</sup> a clear reference to Joachim the Chersonian, the first bishop of Novgorod (991–1030).<sup>30</sup> With regard to Bulgaro-East Slav relations the chronicler's basic thesis is that there were two Bulgarian hierarchs called Michael, one of the ninth and one of the tenth century, associated with the conversion of Kiev. In describing Askold's expedition against Constantinople the manuscript

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* 113. The quires have disappeared without trace. The fate of Tatiščev's library is unknown and the story, first reported by Greč in 1821, that it had been consumed in a fire, is apparently without foundation, see Astraxanskij, *Вопросы*, 85–94. Neither has the rest of the codex been found. An inventory of Melchizedek's effects was drawn up by his successor, Archimandrite Abraham Galickij (1748–57) and forwarded to the Synod (дело Архива Синодальной Канцелярии за 1748 г., № 412), but it lists no manuscript, see Stroganov, *Монастырь*, 56, n. 2. A special search of the monastery's archives was undertaken by N. A. Popov (whose master's dissertation on Tatiščev had been published in 1861) in an attempt to learn more about the manuscript, but it was fruitless, see Stroganov, *Монастырь*, 41, 53–4, and A. Golombiovskij's preface to the posthumous edition of the materials which Popov had collected from the archives: Popov, *Материалы*, preface p. 4; the materials ed. *ibid.*, 6–45; on the monastery's library in 1764 see *ibid.*, 23–24.

<sup>28</sup> As chapter 4 of vol.1, *ibid.*, 107–19, the actual quotations being on 108–13. The manuscript tradition of Tatiščev's history proves, however, that he did not hesitate to alter and expand the actual text of the chronicle, so there is no certainty as to what the precise text in the quires originally was: chapter 4 is found in but four of the manuscripts of the history, only two of which are of importance, viz. Academy of Sciences 1.5.66; Voroncov op. 1, 646. (Uvarov 151 and Sudienko VIII 117/70 are copies of Academy and Voroncov respectively.) Academy has the text of the chronicle in Tatiščev's own hand as well as alterations which he has made to it; Voroncov is basically a copy of the emended text of Academy but includes further additions, this expanded text having again been emended by Tatiščev's hand, i.e. there are no less than four versions extant of the alleged chronicle text! On them see V. Morgajlo, *Работа*, 260–64. The account of the Bulgarian connection is not, however, affected by these successive alterations to the text.

<sup>29</sup> Tatiščev, *История*, vol. 1, 108.

<sup>30</sup> Joachim is an enigmatic personage who only appears in later sources from the 15th century on. The problem of his historicity cannot be examined here. Sabev, "Millénaire," 835, claims that the language of the chronicle is Old Bulgarian and that *ergo* Joachim himself was a Bulgarian. It is a pity that Sabev does not give a linguistic analysis to prove his point! In fact, Sabev's article is based on the uncritical acceptance of unhistorical legends; for another example see below n. 119.

broke off after the words: *And returning home, he sent to Constantinople to the emperor* because two folia were missing, to continue: *but Michael gave thanks to God (and) went to Bulgaria*, on which Tatiščev comments that Michael must have been the hierarch sent by Photius who converted Askold by the miracle of an evangeliary thrown into a fire without being consumed.<sup>31</sup> Then in dealing with Vladimir's conversion it states that Tsar Symeon sent him *learned priests and many books*, after which Vladimir turns to Constantinople for a hierarch and is sent Michael, *a man very learned and pious, a Bulgarian; with him four bishops and many priests, deacons and cantors, Slavs by birth*.<sup>32</sup>

Whereas the earlier parts of the chronicle are clearly based on myths recorded in late Czech and Polish sources,<sup>33</sup> the events in Novgorod in the late tenth–early eleventh century are reported in the first person, and the question is whether the chronicle used a now lost early source, which is what Tatiščev believed since he made use of its information elsewhere,<sup>34</sup> or whether it is the chronicler's own imagination based upon logical deduction from what he knew about Russian history, *in casu* about Michael.

The tradition that the hierarch despatched to Kiev on Vladimir's conversion was called Michael can be traced back to the late thirteenth century when his name was added to the preamble to Vladimir's *Constitutio ecclesiastica*,<sup>35</sup> although an earlier tradition called the hierarch Leo(ntius).<sup>36</sup>

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 110. On this miracle see below.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 112.

<sup>33</sup> A fact noted by Tatiščev himself, although his attitude was ambivalent—on the one hand he suggests that the chronicle used the later sources, *ibid.* 108, on the other the reverse, *ibid.*, 111, n. 34. For the influence of Herodotus see Gorlin, "Joachim," 45. For a recent discussion of Tatiščev's use of late sources see G. Brogi Bercoff, "Tatishchev" 373–420.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 2, Leningrad, 1963, 62–5. Its authenticity has been accepted by many, from the first scholar to study it in detail, Lavrovskij, *Исследования*, especially p. 83, down to the present time, e.g. Paszkiewicz, *Origin*, 367.

<sup>35</sup> It was in the text of a nomocanon copied in 1286, now lost but whose colophon is found in later codices, from where it has been published many times, e.g. Smokina, *Фрагмент*, 68. On this see Pavlov, *Догодка*, 25–6; Ščapov, *Уставы*, 57, 74–5, 115–16. Poppe, "Michał," 242, would trace the tradition back to the mid-thirteenth century as the preamble with Michael's name is in the Chronicle of Perejaslavl in Suzdalia, but that part of the chronicle was compiled in Lithuania and the form of the *Constitutio* which it contains does not antedate the mid-fourteenth century, see Ščapov, *Уставы*, 110–15. The dating of the tradition to the twelfth century by Vodoff, *Naissance*, 83, is an unsubstantiated assertion, while the dating to the sixteenth century, thus Lebedincev, *Примечания*, 32, Malyševskij, *Митрополит*, 133, is contradicted by the archaeological evidence.

<sup>36</sup> His name is found in the preamble to the same *Constitutio* in a manuscript tradition going back to the archetype of the Synodal-Volhynian family of the early thirteenth or even late twelfth century, see Ščapov, *Веков*, 15, 16, 19, 21, 37 n. 22, 42, 46, 69, 76; with the name of Leo(ntius) *ibid.* 18, 22, 30, 37, 72.

The reason for the insertion of the name of Leo(ntius) cannot be examined here. The rea-

In either case his despatch is anachronistically ascribed to Patriarch Photius (858–67, 877–86).<sup>37</sup> In the fourteenth century the Byzantine story of a mission to the Rhos after their expedition against Constantinople in 860 and their subsequent conversion after the miracle involving the evangeliary, became known to the Slavs when an abridged translation was made in Bulgaria of John Zonaras's *Annales*.<sup>38</sup> In 1408 Gregory, a monk of Hilandar, made a revised version of the translation, known as the *Paralipomenon*,

---

son for the insertion of the name Michael remains uncertain, the most plausible hypothesis, advanced by Pavlov, *Догадка*, 23–5, being that the interpolator had realized that the *confessio fidei* taught to Vladimir after his baptism in 988, PSRL 1, 112–14, was taken from Michael syncellus of Jerusalem's *Libellus de fide orthodoxa*, of which there are no less than three early translations, including one in the 1073 florilegium and one as the fifth appendix to the *Nomocanon XIV titulorum*. The third, as taught to Vladimir, is highly heretical, on this see Thomson, "Implications," 64. The interpolator therefore assumed Michael taught Vladimir, *ergo* he was the first metropolitan. This explanation has been accepted by many, e.g. Lebedincev, *Примечания*, 30; Poppe, "Michal," 243; Vlasto, *Entry*, 270; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 83. The hypothesis can be strengthened by a further consideration, namely the preamble with Michael's name stresses that he taught Vladimir the tenets of the faith and the history of the oecumenical councils, viz. precisely the contents of the *Libellus*.

Vernadsky, "Status," 306, advanced a less plausible theory: some codices only name Patriarch Photius (see note 37) and not the emperor, e.g. ed. Šćapov, *Веков*, 20, 30, 36, and a scribe made a marginal gloss with the emperor's name, viz. Michael (III, 842–867), which was mistaken for the metropolitan's name.

<sup>37</sup> His name is found in the preamble in all redactions except those which do not mention the metropolitan, ed. *ibid.*, 62, 66, and that going back to the 1286 nomocanon, ed. *ibid.*, 69. No satisfactory explanation of the ascription to Photius has been suggested. Hypotheses include: a. Patriarch Sergius II (1001–19) was related to Photius, see John Zonaras, *Annales*, XVII, 8, ed. PG 139, 40–414; 135, 9–326, cf. 135, 161, and Photius here means his surname, thus Zacharias Kopystensky in 1621/2 in his *Palinodia iii*, 2, 1, ed. Pritsak, *Lev*, 498; so too Tatiščev, *История*, vol. 2, 234–5; b. Photius' name is a symbol for Orthodoxy, as opposed to Catholicism, thus Filaret (Gumilevskij) *История*, vol. 1, 50, n. 129; c. because of his association with the nomocanon, he was *the* patriarch *par excellence*, thus Honigmann, "Studies," 90; d. the memory of the events of the mid-ninth century were still alive in the thirteenth, thus A. Pavlov, in Goetz, *Denkmäler*, 34; Tóth, *Предпосылки*, 153; e. the author of the tradition was acquainted with the Slavonic translation of Photius' encyclical of 867 with its account of the conversion of the Rhos, thus Golubinskij, *История* vol. 1, pt. 1, 279; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 83 (this is incorrect as the encyclical was not translated until the fifteenth-sixteenth century, see below n. 44); f. Greeks wished to ascribe the beginnings of the Rus' church to him to stress its dependence on the patriarchate of Constantinople, thus Kartašev, *Очерки*, vol. 1, 135; g. a coconsecrator of the first Rus' bishops was Photius of Ephesus, who was confused with the patriarch, thus Laurent, "Origines," 286, n. 1; h. the *Constitutio* was drawn up for Askold at the time of Photius and the true interpolation is the name of Vladimir instead of Askold, which was done as part of a campaign by Jaroslav (1019–54) to obtain Vladimir's canonization, thus Brajčevs'kyj, *Письмо*, 34–5 (this is historical fiction at its worst, for another of his absurd theories see below n. 89).

<sup>38</sup> Unedited in full; the final part (324–1028) ed. Jacobs, ΖΩΝΑΡΑΣ, 106–272, cf. 211, 233–4. The old dating of the translation to 1170 proposed by Potarov, *Судьба*, 184–86, is still being repeated, e.g. by Tvorogov, *Хронографы*, 181, although it has been established that it is of either 1332 or 1334, see Weingart, *Kroniky*, pt. 1, 117–20.

which also includes the story,<sup>39</sup> and by the sixteenth century this version was available in Russia.<sup>40</sup> In the same century the story was incorporated into Russian chronographs<sup>41</sup> and chronicles<sup>42</sup> under the reign of Basil I (867–86), while at the same time the tradition that the first metropolitan despatched by Photius was called Leo(ntius) was also incorporated into various chronicles sub 991.<sup>43</sup> In the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century Photius's *Encyclica epistola ad archiepiscopales thronos per Orientem obtinentes* of 867, in which he asserts that the Rhos have been converted and have accepted *a bishop and pastor*, was translated into Slavonic in "Russia."<sup>44</sup>

The compilers of the Nicon Chronicle in the first half of the sixteenth century knowing, on the one hand, that Rus' had been converted during the reign of Emperor Basil and sent a hierarch by Photius and, on the other, that Vladimir had been converted in the reign of Emperor Basil and sent Leontius by Photius in 991, as well as Michael at some unspecified date, simply combined all their data by asserting that Photius sent Michael in 988 on Vladimir's conversion and Leontius on Michael's death in 991.<sup>45</sup> The compiler of the *Liber graduum* in the second half of the century made a half-hearted attempt to eliminate the anachronism by having Photius send Michael but Patriarch Nicholas II Chrysoberges (979–91) send Leontius.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Ed. Vodjanskij, *Паралипомен*, 1–119, cf. 102–3.

<sup>40</sup> The Russian codex Volokolamsk 230/566 dates from the early sixteenth century, see Tvorogov, *Хронографы*, 182, n. 101.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. the 1512 Chronograph, PSRL 22, 1 (1911), 352–3; see also the West Russian Chronograph, PSRL 22, 2 (1914), 153–4. The compilers of the latter were careful to alter the story by stating that the miracle did not convert the Rus'.

<sup>42</sup> E.g. the Nicon Chronicle, PSRL 9, 13; the *Liber graduum*, PSRL 21, 1, 35–6.

<sup>43</sup> E.g. the First Sophia Chronicle, PSRL 5 (1851) 121; the Resurrection Chronicle, PSRL 7 (1856) 313; the 1512 Chronograph, PSRL 22, 1, 367.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Vulanin, *Послание*, 51–2. This passage too entered the *Liber graduum*, PSRL 21, 1, 62–3, although the compilers altered the *bishop and pastor* into *bishops and their pastor, the most holy metropolitan*.

<sup>45</sup> PSRL 9, 57, 64. They probably considered Basil I to be the same person as Basil II (976–1025), see Lebedincev, *Примечания*, 32. They also add that Michael was a Syrian (*Сиринъ*). This has variously been explained a. as a corruption of syncellus (*синкель*), thus Lebedincev, *ibid.*, 33; Poppe, "Michal," 243; Vlasto, *Entry*, 270; b. as a corruption of Serb (*Сербинъ*), thus Golubinskij, *История*, vol.1, pt. 1, 281 n. 1; c. because Jerusalem, of which city he was syncellus, is in the Near East, thus Pavlov, *Догадка*, 24; d. as a deliberate alteration from Bulgarian, thus Nikolaev, *Фактор*, 117.

The Nicon Chronicle was compiled during the incumbency of metropolitan Daniel of Moscow (1522–39), most probably between 1526 and 1530, see Kloss, *Свод*, 43–51.

<sup>46</sup> PSRL 21, 1, 113. The *Liber* was compiled in 1560–63 under the direction of Metropolitan Macarius of Moscow (1542–63), probably by Andrew protopresbyter of the Cathedral of the Annunciation, Moscow, and confessor to Ivan IV. (He became a monk at the Monastery of the Miracle of Archangel Michael, Moscow, in 1562, and for a brief period, 1564–66, was

The anachronism was only fully eliminated in the seventeenth century in the Ukraine in disputes between Orthodox and Uniates when Michael was asserted to have been sent by either Nicholas II or Sergius II (1001–1019).<sup>47</sup>

The account given in the Joachim Chronicle is simply a fresh attempt to reconcile the conflicting anachronistic data by positing the existence of two Michaels, both of whom it links with Bulgaria. This Bulgarian connection has been accepted with varying degrees of conviction ranging from *not devoid of possibility*,<sup>48</sup> via *completely in agreement with the circumstances*,<sup>49</sup> to *the historical basis of the information itself is completely obvious*,<sup>50</sup> but a closer examination reveals that it is both anachronistic and in contradiction to known facts. If the first of the Michaels is the bishop despatched by Photius,<sup>51</sup> then he must have been in Kievan Rus' when Photius wrote his encyclical in 867 before his deposition in September, but he cannot have left for Bulgaria after converting the Rhos since from late 866 till the spring of 870 Bulgaria was under Roman jurisdiction.<sup>52</sup> The account of Vladimir's conversion contains the glaring anachronism that it took place during Tsar Symeon's reign (893–927) and the attempt to resolve the difficulty by arguing that the Symeon in question is Romanus, Tsar Peter's

---

metropolitan of Moscow, before retiring to the Miracle Monastery.) See Vasenko, *Книга*, 168–212.

<sup>47</sup> In 1617 Leo Kreuzer in his defence of the Union, *Obrona iednosci cerkiewney*, iii, 2, 1, stated that he was sent by Nicholas II but added a new anachronism by dating this to c1000, ed. Pritsak, *Lev*, 3–67, cf. 32 (in the original Vilnius 1617 edition p. 56); Zacharias Kopystensky in his refutation of Kreuzer, his *Palinodia* of 1621/2, accepts c1000 and therefore ascribes the despatch to Patriarch Sergius II, ed. *ibid.*, 498. In his preface to the reader of his Polish translation of the *Patericon Cryptense*, *Paterikon abo Zywoty SS. Oycow Pieczarskich*, published in 1635, Sylvester Kossow repeats Kopystensky's information, cf. Lewin, *Writings*, 13 (in the original Kiev 1635 edition p. 9), although in the list of Kievan metropolitans appended to the translation it is cautiously stated that Michael was sent by either Sergius or Nicholas, ed. *ibid.*, 92–99, cf. 93 (p. 169 of the original edition); on later lists see Malyševskij, *Митрополит*, 140–6. I. Martinov in his edition of Kulczynski's *Specimen ecclesiae ruthenicae*, 310, rightly comments on the variations in dates with regard to Michael and Leontius: *tot capita, tot sensus*.

<sup>48</sup> Bestjužev-Rjumin, *История*, vol. 1, 130 (second pagination).

<sup>49</sup> Solov'ev, *История*, vol. 1, 187. A variant of this is that it *accords well with the historical situation*, thus Mixajlov, *Русь*, 131.

<sup>50</sup> Mošin, *Периодизации*, 55, see also *idem*, *Послание*, 95. Recent scholars to accept the information include Levčenko, *Взаимоотношения*, 195; Klimenko, *Ausbreitung*, 50; Partenij, *Патриархи*, 71; Sabev, "Millénaire," 835; B. Angelov, *Вопросу*, 137. *Idem*, *Историята*, vol. 1, 36, claims that the information may be based on earlier sources. Such claims are obviously meaningless.

<sup>51</sup> de Taube, *Rome*, vol. 1, 45, even speculates that he may have been bishop Michael of Corcyra, who attended the Eighth Oecumenical Council at Constantinople in 869–70.

<sup>52</sup> The facts are too well known to require examination here, for a brief account see Sansterre, "Missionaires."



(927–70) second son, of whom John Scylitzes reports that he was also called Symeon after his grandfather,<sup>53</sup> unfortunately conflicts with both of the differing accounts of Romanus's life.

According to Scylitzes, upon the incorporation of East Bulgaria into the empire in 971, Romanus, together with his elder brother Boris II (969/70–71), was taken to Constantinople, where he was castrated.<sup>54</sup> At an unspecified time after John I Tzimisce's death in 976 the brothers fled to Bulgaria, Boris being accidentally killed while crossing the border.<sup>55</sup> Nothing further is reported until as governor of Skopje under Tsar Samuel, Romanus in ca. 1003 surrenders the city to Basil II and is rewarded with the titles of *patricius* and *praepositus* and appointed *strategus* of Abydos.<sup>56</sup> Another version is given by Yahyā of Antioch, who recounts that after the death of Boris, Romanus was proclaimed tsar<sup>57</sup> but captured in 991 and died in Byzantine captivity in 997.<sup>58</sup> If Scylitzes is correct, Romanus was never tsar; if Yahyā is, then Romanus was never called Symeon and Scylitzes has clearly muddled the governor of Skopje with somebody else.<sup>59</sup> Even if the improbable attempt to reconcile the two accounts is accepted, viz. that Peter had three sons, Tsar Boris, Tsar Romanus, and Governor Romanus-Symeon,<sup>60</sup> the difficulty remains that Romanus-Symeon was never tsar.

To the compiler of the Joachim Chronicle it seemed but logical to connect the conversion of Kiev with the home of Slavonic letters, and the most plausible explanation of the anachronism is simply that he placed too much trust in his memory and put Symeon instead of Samuel.<sup>61</sup> What seemed

<sup>53</sup> *Synopsis historiarum*, ed. Thurn, *Ioannis*, 3–500, cf. 346. This attempt to resolve the anachronism was first proposed by Lavrovskij, *Исследование*, 148; his argument has often been accepted, e.g. Mošin, *Периодизации*, 54–55; *idem*, *Послание*, 95; Angelov, *Вопросу*, 137.

<sup>54</sup> Ed. Thurn, *Ioannis*, 328.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 328–29.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 455. He is never mentioned again.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. *Annales*, ed. Kratchkovsky, *Histoire*, 18, 705–833; 23, 345–520, cf. 418.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 431, 446.

<sup>59</sup> The most recent scholar to identify Symeon with Romanus solves all the problems by the simple expedient of rewriting history: on the death of Boris II Romanus fled to Constantinople, where he changed his name to Symeon and began a campaign against Samuel of Macedonia, thus Kočev, *Anfänge*, 508. All good stirring stuff, even if it totally ignores all the historical sources.

<sup>60</sup> Antoljak, *Македонија*, vol. 1, 407–13, in an effort to reconcile the discrepancies between Scylitzes and Yahyā.

<sup>61</sup> This was suggested by Zavitnevič, *Владимир*, 675, and has been accepted by some, e.g. Vlasto, *Entry*, 270 n. 117. Mixajlov, *Руси*, 133, in a far-fetched attempt to explain away the error, suggests that for the early East Slavs Symeon symbolized Bulgaria and the chronicler used his name in that sense.

logical to him would scarcely have seemed logical to a tenth-century Byzantine and the idea that a Bulgarian would have been placed at the head of a newly constituted church is highly improbable.<sup>62</sup> The chronicle's information on ecclesiastical affairs in general is characterized by its logical rationalism and emphasis on learning. Michael and the clergy sent to Kiev are *learned*;<sup>63</sup> Olga's baptism in Constantinople is recorded but not the legend of the emperor's marriage proposal, and she returns to Kiev with *wise priests* who are assiduous in teaching;<sup>64</sup> Vladimir's baptism is reported but not the legend of the embassies representing various faiths;<sup>65</sup> the forced conversion of the Novgorodians is described in a matter-of-fact way with none of the legendary and miraculous detail which in other chronicles accompanies the account of the conversion of the Kievans.<sup>66</sup> The chronicle is clearly no medieval compilation<sup>67</sup> but a typical product of the late seventeenth or first half of the eighteenth century,<sup>68</sup> probably the 1740s.<sup>69</sup> It matters little whether it was compiled at Bizjukovo,<sup>70</sup> possibly by its

<sup>62</sup> On the cultural role of the Greek metropolitans in Kievan Rus' see Tachiaos, "Metropolitans." For a brief survey of their activities see Podskalsky, *Christentum*, 283–301.

<sup>63</sup> Tatiščev, *История*, vol. 1, 112. On Tatiščev's consistent exaggeration with regard to information about learning and education see Golubinskij, *История* vol. 1, pt. 1, 871–80. Uncritical acceptance of Tatiščev's information is typical of the approach to the history of education of some recent Soviet scholars, e.g. Petrov, *Воспитание*, and Babišin, *Тенденции*, (both works are *avtoreferaty*). Brogi Bercoff, "Reworking," 351, aptly comments that Metropolitan Michael's efforts on behalf of education *can be linked only with the eighteenth century Enlightenment views of the Russian historian about the necessity of disseminating culture among the people*.

<sup>64</sup> Tatiščev, *История*, vol. 1, 111.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, 112.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, 112–13, and PSRL 1, 116–18.

<sup>67</sup> Supporters of its authenticity have gone to ludicrous lengths to explain away the manifest difference between its style and that of mediaeval chronicles; thus Rapov, *Церковь*, 259, invents a new genre: *the memoirs (мемуары) of a cleric*, while Janin, *День*, 17, posits the existence of a whole *body of literature which was subject to especial proscription by the church as it did not correspond to the official point of view*. Thus Joachim's account alone escaped the deadening hand of ecclesiastical censorship!

<sup>68</sup> For similar late mythical tales see those edited by Giljarov, *Предания*, 15–31. On such fanciful chronicles see Šambinago, *Летопись*, 259–62, and Azbelev, *Летопись*, 243.

<sup>69</sup> Gorlin, *Chronique*, 46–7, points out the strange coincidence that its information about Russian territories in Karelia is in accordance with the borders between Sweden and Russia fixed by the treaties of Nystad (1721) and Åbo (1743). Those who would date it to the seventeenth century, e.g. Tixomirov, *Летописание*, 81, ignore Gorlin's arguments.

<sup>70</sup> Gorlin, *Chronique*, 50–51, sees its compilation as part of the monastery's struggle to maintain its stauropegial independence against the claims of the see of Smolensk. On its relations with the see, cf. Stroganov, *Монастырь*.

archimandrite Joachim,<sup>71</sup> by Benjamin who owned the codex,<sup>72</sup> by an unknown person at the instigation of Joachim Savelov when archbishop of Novgorod (22 Dec. 1672–26 July 1674),<sup>73</sup> or even by Tatiščev himself,<sup>74</sup> it has no value as a historical source. Recent attempts to rehabilitate its authenticity by appealing to archaeological evidence are totally misguided,<sup>75</sup>

<sup>71</sup> Thus Grigorovič, *Протоколы*, lxiv–lxv. He says Joachim *floruit* 1730, but Stroev, *Списки*, 598, gives *floruit* 1712/3.

<sup>72</sup> Thus Russov, *Сарах*, 100; although already Tatiščev himself, *История*, vol. 1, 107 n. 1, considered Benjamin to be a mythical personage invented by Melchizedek. This was Tatiščev's second opinion, since in the first version of the note he stated baldly that Benjamin was the compiler of the chronicle, see Morgajlo, *Работа*, 265–66.

<sup>73</sup> This was suggested by Šambinago, *Летопись*, 267, although the link with the Third Novgorod Chronicle which he posited, *ibid.*, 263–66, cannot be upheld, see Azbelev, *Летопись*, 243–48.

<sup>74</sup> This was held by Karamzin, *История*, vol. 1, xxvii, n. 3 (see also ed. 1842<sup>5</sup>, xv, n. 3; it is omitted in P. Polevoj's edition of 1892); so too Golubinskij, *Летопись*, 632, although *ibid.*, 633, he allowed that Tatiščev may only have revised it. Nikolaev on one of his many flights of fancy claims, *Фактор*, 86–8, that originally the chronicle only knew one Michael, a disciple of St. Clement, and that Tatiščev deliberately altered its information.

In view of Tatiščev's treatment of sources (see Peštič, *Дополнение*, 215–22) as exemplified by his many alterations to the text of the Joachim Chronicle itself, see above note 28, Tatiščev is the most likely author. Attempts to exonerate him, e.g. Kuz'min, *Основе*, are unconvincing. For a brief account of his information about Bulgaria see Rajkov, *Българите*, 89–102.

<sup>75</sup> According to the Joachim Chronicle, Vladimir's troops, led by the commanders Putjata and Dobrynja, arrived on the left bank of the Volxov, where they remained for two days in a fruitless effort to persuade the Novgorodians to be converted. After the latter had sacked Dobrynja's house and property on the right bank, Putjata at night crossed the river by boat to the north of the town with five hundred troops and entered it unawares. A fight ensued during which some citizens sacked (*грабляху*) Christians' houses and destroyed (*разметаши*) the church of the Transfiguration, whereupon Dobrynja crossed the Volxov and ordered the houses on the river bank to be fired. The citizens, alarmed, broke off the fight to quench the fire and then sued for peace. The Chronicle ends the account with the words: *For this reason people mock the Novgorodians: Putjata baptized (them) by the sword, and Dobrynja by fire*, see Tatiščev, *История*, vol. 1, 112–13.

Excavations have shown that new pavements and houses were built in the area of High, Serf, and Cosmas and Damian Streets in the Nerev District in 989–90 to replace those destroyed in a fire, while for the same reason similar rebuilding took place in 991 on the bank of the Volxov in the Ljudin District. For a brief account of the dendrochronological evidence see Thompson, *Novgorod*, 23–34 (the level concerned is 26, see *ibid.*, 32). Janin, *День*, 17–8, and *idem*, *Новгородцев*, 31, considered that the fire in the Nerev District was caused by the destruction of the church of the Transfiguration and the Christians' houses, while that in the Ljudin District was the result of Dobrynja's firing some houses, and thus the conversion took place in 989. See also *idem*, *Крещение*, 62. On the other hand Rapov, *Церковь*, 262–63, denied that the fire in the Nerev District was connected with the conversion since the Christians' houses were sacked and the church destroyed, not burned down. Hence only the fire in the Ljudin District reflects the conversion, which consequently took place not in 989 but in 990.

This idea that this archeological evidence provides a *completely factual (реальную) basis*, thus Janin, *Новгородцев*, 31, cf. *idem*, *Крещение*, 62, for the account of the conversion in the Joachim Chronicle is already being repeated by some scholars, e.g. Litavrin, *Принятие*, 66;

and historians who have recourse to it paint a false picture of events.<sup>76</sup>

Recently another attempt has been made to link Michael with Bulgaria by claiming that when Basil II reneged on his promise to give Vladimir his sister Anne in marriage, Vladimir—who had already fulfilled the precondition of baptism—concluded an alliance against Byzantium with Samuel of Macedonia, who despatched Michael, but that when in 991 relations with Constantinople were restored and the first Greek metropolitan Leo arrived with Anne, Michael resigned and lived on in Kiev in retirement.<sup>77</sup> It is true that Basil II was prevented by the outbreak of Bardas Phocas's revolt on 15 August 987<sup>78</sup> from avenging the defeat of his army on 17 August 986 while retreating from an abortive siege of Sardica,<sup>79</sup> and also that Samuel took

---

Kuz'min, Крещение, 321. Before it becomes yet another unchallenged apodeictic axiom, let it be said that the passage *and he* (sc. Dobrynja) *ordered some houses on the bank to be fired, as a result of which the people, greatly alarmed, ran to douse the fire* is a marginal gloss added to the original Academy codex of Tatiščev's history (see above, n. 28), see Tatiščev, *История*, vol. 1, 113, n. 17, and there is no certainty that it was in Benjamin's codex (if the latter ever existed). In the second place, *conquest by fire and the sword* is a *topos* found in both Slavonic translated literature, e.g. Isaiah lxvi, 16, cf. Judges i, 8, and original East Slav literature, e.g. the First Novgorod Chronicle *sub* 1328, ed. Nasonov, *Летопись*, 287. Thirdly, the identification of the traces of a particular fire (or particular fires) with the alleged burning of *some* (*некие*) *houses* is utterly arbitrary, and, finally, as already pointed out, the style of the account of the conversion of Novgorod contrasts starkly with that of other mediaeval accounts of conversion in that the religious aspect is completely overshadowed by the political.

<sup>76</sup> Peštič, *Историкография*, 237, points out that historians only have recourse to it when it suits their theories and calls those who rely on it, *ibid.*, 227, *credulous*. Perhaps a better term would be *Boltinian*, cf. the statement by Boltin, *Ответ*, 14: *Joachim's narrative* (*повествование*) *is more probable than Nestor's*. Scholars such as V. Petrov and Babišin (see note 63) are Boltinians.

<sup>77</sup> Mošin, *Послание*, 94–6. This last detail he based on the fact that Michael's relics were preserved in Kiev. It is true that the tablet beside them claimed that they were those of Michael, who had died in 992, had been buried in the Tithe Church of the Deipara and then translated to the Antonine Caves in the Kievan Caves Laura in 1103, see Evgenij (Bolxovitinov), *Лавры*, 115, but even uncritical Kartašev, *Очерки*, vol. 1, 137, has to admit that the claim is unhistorical. Even Michael's *panagia* was supposed to have survived, see N. Petrov, *Панарио*, 114–16. The relics were more probably those of Michael II (1131–45), thus Lebedincev, *Вопросу*, 13–14. It is not necessary here to deal with late legends concerning Michael's alleged activities while metropolitan, one of the most persistent of which being that he founded St. Michael's monastery with the Golden Dome at Kiev, still occasionally asserted even in the 20th century, e.g. Pavlovskij, *Путеводитель*, 280. The monastery was demolished by modern barbarians in 1935.

<sup>78</sup> Scylitzes, ed. Thurn, *Ioannis*, 332. Yaḥyā dates it to 14 September 987, ed. Kratchkovsky, *Histoire*, 421.

<sup>79</sup> Leo diaconus, *Historia*, x, 8, ed. PG 117, 656–926, cf. 901–05. For the date see Yaḥyā, ed. Kratchkovsky, *Histoire*, 419.

advantage of the ensuing civil war to capture Berrhoia at the same time as Vladimir took Cherson, viz. in 988 or 989,<sup>80</sup> but the sources know nothing of any alliance between Samuel and Vladimir. Indeed it has been suggested that Cherson was in rebel hands and that Vladimir's capture of Cherson was part of his agreement with Basil II.<sup>81</sup> The suggestion that the embassy of Moslem Bulgars to Kiev in 986 to persuade Vladimir to accept their faith and his return embassy in 987 to ascertain how they worship<sup>82</sup> in reality reflect Kievan contacts with Macedonia about possible conversion<sup>83</sup> is unacceptable because, if there is any historical truth behind the story of the examination of the faiths, the Moslem Bulgars can only be those of the Volga-Kama region, since the Primary Chronicle has already reported the baptism of the Danubian Bulgarians *sub* 869.<sup>84</sup> The theory that Michael came from Samuel's Macedonia thus belongs to the realm of pure fancy.

The contradictory nature of the data concerning Michael and Leo(ontius) as the first two metropolitans of Russia has long been the subject of comment.<sup>85</sup> One attempt to reconcile the data has been to posit that Michael was the first hierarch sent in 988, but that Leontius was the first metropolitan as

<sup>80</sup> Leo diaconus, *Historia*, x, 10, ed. PG 117, 908–09, talks of fiery columns in the northern sky indicating the fall of Cherson and, *ibid.*, 917–21, a comet foretelling the earthquake on the eve of St. Demetrius, viz. October 25, while Yahyā, ed. Kratchkovsky, *Histoire*, 432–33, reports that in 989 after a storm on April 7 the sky was dark and full of dust and a fiery column was seen, while on July 27 a comet appeared. Rozen (= W. von Rosen), *Император*, 214, identified Leo's columns with Yahyā's column, which has usually been accepted, with the consequential deduction that Cherson and Berrhoia fell between April 7 and July 27, 989. Recently Rapov, *Дате*, 37, has pointed out that an aurora borealis can only be seen in a clear sky, while Yahyā's description fits a volcanic eruption; Bogdanova, *Времени*, 45–6, further argues that the passage in Leo does not mean that the phenomena foretold subsequent events, but indicated prior events. Indeed, the aorist participle can mean either contemporaneous or antecedent action depending on the meaning of the finite verb and that, παραδηλώω, is ambiguous, cf. οἱ τοὶ τὴν τε συμβᾶσαν πρὸς τῶν Ταυροσκυθῶν τῆς Χερσῶνος ἄλωσιν παρεδήλουν, translated by Vasil'evskij, *Отрывки*, 156: *they foretold the subsequent (последовавшее) capture of Cherson by the Tauroscythians*, but by Bogdanova, *Времени*, 46: *they indicated the prior (совершившийся) seizure of Cherson by the Tauroscythians*.

<sup>81</sup> Thus Poppe, "Background," 211–24. This has been accepted by some, e.g. Müller, *Taufe*, 109–113, and *idem*, "Chronik-Erzählung," 436 n. 17; Pančenko, *Аспекты*, 53, and Stökl, "Christianisierung," 157.

<sup>82</sup> PSRL 1, 84–5, 107.

<sup>83</sup> Thus, e.g., Rozen, *Император*, 219, n. 1; Zavitnevič, *Владимир*, 429; Antoljak, *Македонија*, vol. 1, 398.

<sup>84</sup> PSRL 1, 22. Ibn Faḍlān's report of his journey to the Volga Bulgars in 921–22 shows that Islam had already begun to spread among them by then, ed. Togan, *Reisebericht*, app. 1–45, cf. 30 (German trans. 1–104, cf. 67–8).

<sup>85</sup> See Karamzin, *История*, vol. 1 (ed. 1892), 151, n. 474.

only under him were other sees established,<sup>86</sup> although the thesis that Michael was the Photian hierarch has found greater favour.<sup>87</sup> In fact the legend about Michael is the product of some thirteenth century *scholar*<sup>88</sup> and it is time it was laid to rest.<sup>89</sup>

Another legend linking an early Kievan hierarch with Bulgaria is that of Alexius. In 1748 Karol Orłowski, archdeacon of the cathedral of the Roman Catholic diocese of Kiev at Żytomyr, published a defence of the claims of the see in which he asserted that the Russian author Nicanor writing in 1240, as reported by another Russian author Cassian, stated that after defeating Jaroslav of Kiev (1019–54) in 1018, Boleslas I of Poland (966/7–1025) had him erect the cathedral of St. Sophia at Kiev and in 1021 petition Pope Benedict VIII (1012–24) for a bishop. A Bulgarian, Alexius, was sent but he could not resist the machinations of the Greek clergy, adherents of Patriarch Michael I Cerularius (1043–58), and left the country.<sup>90</sup> This information was repeated in embellished form by the evangelical church historian Christian Gottlieb Friese in his history of the see of Kiev published in 1763.<sup>91</sup>

<sup>86</sup> Suggested by Platon (Levšin), *История*, vol. 1, 39; it has been accepted by some historians, e.g. Evgenij, *Собора*, 64; Lebedincev, *Поводу*, 351; Bulgakov, *История*, vol. 1, 31.

<sup>87</sup> E.g. Lebedincev, *Начале*, 269, 272; Шахматов, *Легенда*, 1100; Stokes, "Status," 436; Golubinskij, *История*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 278–81; some of those who are not sure whether he ever existed think that if he did, he was the Photian hierarch, e.g. Polon'ska-Vasylenko, *Підвалини*, 19; Priselkov, *Очерки*, 39–40; Vlasovs'kuj, *Нарис*, vol. 1, 20; Vlasto, *Entry*, 270.

Ščepkina, *Просвещени*, 200, advances a variant of this theory: Michael was indeed the Photian hierarch but was a Greek consecrated to fill a see at Cherson newly created by Photius. This ignores the fact that a see had existed at Cherson since at least the late fourth century: its bishop, Aetherius, signed the *acta* of the Second Oecumenical Council at Constantinople in 381, see Mansi, *Conciliorum*, vol. 3, 572. (The presence of a bishop of Cherson, Philipp, at the first Oecumenical Council at Nicaea in 325 is uncertain since his name is only found in a late Arabic list, ed. Gelzer *et al.*, *Nomina*, 144–180, cf. 160, and in a late Greek list probably translated from the Arabic, ed. Benešević, *Список*, 285–306, cf. 295.

<sup>88</sup> See Poppe, *Michal*, 243.

<sup>89</sup> Even now it is still being claimed that he was the first metropolitan, see Kuev, *Съдбата*, 15; Mixajlov, *Русия*, 70; Bishop Nestor, *Крещение*, 5; D. Angelov, *България*, 52; Schiwaroff, "Rolle," 148, and Bakalov, "Politique," p. 399.

One last theory relating to Tatišev's information about Michael should be mentioned. According to a chronicle from which A. Xruščov supplied excerpts for Tatišev, Photius wrote to Vladimir and Michael in 991 to warn them against Roman errors, recounting *inter alia* the story of Pope Joan, see Tatišev, *История*, vol. 2, 64. Брајчевс'куј, *Письмо*, 35–8, claims the epistle was written by Photius to Askold in 863 and proves that Joan was pope (855–57). This is some more of his historical fiction, see above n. 37.

<sup>90</sup> Orłowski, *Defensa*, 41–8.

<sup>91</sup> Friese, *Episcopatu*, 6–7, 27–8. The book referred to in Friese's title is Szymon Okolski's *Chioviensium et Czernichoviensium episcoporum sanctae et catholicae Ecclesiae Romanae*

Those historians who accept the veracity of this information interpret it in varying ways: it was a papal initiative to diminish Byzantine influence;<sup>92</sup> it was Jaroslav's initiative either for the same reason,<sup>93</sup> or because the Greek metropolitan had compromised himself by welcoming Boleslas to Kiev in 1018;<sup>94</sup> it was Boleslas's initiative to strengthen his position in Kiev;<sup>95</sup> Alexius was a papal legate despatched to the consecration of St. Sophia's built in 1017.<sup>96</sup> However, the Russian authors Nicanor and Cassian are unknown and the information is anachronistic: Michael Cerularius only became patriarch of Constantinople on 25 March 1043, whereas already in 1039 the metropolitan in Kiev was Theopemptus.<sup>97</sup> The tendentious nature of the information to underpin Roman Catholic claims in Kiev is obvious, which is not to say that the story is an entire fabrication by Orłowski since at least one other legend linking the origins of the see of Kiev with an Alexius was current in the seventeenth century. Patriarch Macarius of Antioch (1647–72), who visited Russia and Ukraine in 1653–56 and again in 1666–67, compiled in Arabic not so much a church history as a collection of accounts of various events in ecclesiastical history in fifty-four chapters. Chapter 50, devoted to Emperors Michael III (842–67) and Basil I (867–86), contains a garbled account of early Russian history including the story of the hierarch who converted the Rhos by the miracle of the evangeliary, except that here he is called Alexius.<sup>98</sup> Macarius too claims that he had found his information *in the books of the Rūs*,<sup>99</sup> and there can be no doubt that Orłowski's account, in so far as it has a source, is but a

---

*ordo et numerus descriptus*, Lviv, 1646. Okolski (1580–1653) was Dominican provincial in Russia. Friese (1717–1795) is most famous for his two-volume history of the Polish Church published at Breslau in 1786.

<sup>92</sup> Thus Winter, *Russland*, vol. 1, 29.

<sup>93</sup> Verdière, "Origines," 222; Kumor, "Problem," 47. Koncevičius' statement, *Attitude*, 32, that Jaroslav was an *orthodox Catholic* is ambiguous, besides there was no schism in 1021.

<sup>94</sup> Thus Laurent, *Origines*, 292. This is based on Thietmar of Merseburg's report that in 1018 the archbishop of Kiev greeted Boleslas on his entry into Kiev, *Chronicon*, viii, 32, ed. Trillmich, *Thietmar*, 2–476, cf. 474.

<sup>95</sup> Dobszewicz, *Wiadomość*, 108–11.

<sup>96</sup> Lužnyc'kij, *Церква*, 54. Some historians merely report the story without comment, e.g. Karamzin, *История*, vol. 1, n. 162; Ramm, *Папство*, 50.

<sup>97</sup> PSRL 1, 153.

<sup>98</sup> His collection, which has no title, remains unedited, but this section on early Russian history in chapter 50 has been edited by Rozen, *Император*, 221–2; Russian translation, *ibid.*, 222–4, cf. 224. This information, despite being completely unhistorical, has occasionally been accepted at face value, e.g. Ivanov, *Македония*, 69; E. Georgiev, *Начало*, 18.

<sup>99</sup> Rozen, *Император*, 224.

reflection of some late legend with no historical foundation.<sup>100</sup>

The third and most recent attempt to link the early Kievan hierarchy with Bulgaria is M. Priselkov's theory that originally the see of Kiev depended upon that of Ochrid. After the incorporation of East Bulgaria into the Byzantine Empire and the deposition of the patriarch Damian in 971, the patriarchal see was moved several times,<sup>101</sup> until under Patriarch Philip (ca. 1000–ca. 1015)<sup>102</sup> it was finally located at Ochrid.<sup>103</sup> The last patriarch negotiated the surrender of Maria, widow of Tsar John-Vladislav (1015–18) to Basil II near Strumica in 1018.<sup>104</sup> With the incorporation of

<sup>100</sup> Okolski, Orłow and Friese were all uncritical historians who tended to collate all the material which they found without evaluating the sources and this information has been correctly dismissed as unhistorical by Pelesz, *Geschichte*, vol. 1, 145; Abraham, *Powstanie*, 15, n. 1.

<sup>101</sup> See Vojnov, Преслав, *passim*. On the question of the organization of the church in the eastern part of Bulgaria incorporated into the Empire see P. Georgiev, "Eglise," and "Organization."

<sup>102</sup> On him see Prokić, "Postanak," 225; Snegarov, *История*, vol. 1, 26; Antoljak, Македонија, vol. 1, 680, 683; Vojnov, Преслав, 75; Săbev, Църква, 262.

<sup>103</sup> See the *Notitia archiepiscoporum Achridanorum* drawn up at the time of Archbishop John Comnenus of Ohrid (1142–c1157), ed. FHB 14 (1968), 109–11, cf. 109.

<sup>104</sup> There is some controversy as to who he was. All codices, except one, of John Scylitzes' *Synopsis historiarum* call the hierarch David, ed. Thurn, *Ioannis*, 357, the exception being the 13th-14th century *codex Vindobonensis hist. graec. LXXIV*, copied from a manuscript written in 1118 by bishop Michael of Deabolis, who was especially interested in Bulgarian history and made many additions and alterations, see Prokić, *Zusätze*. This codex calls the hierarch John, ed. Thurn, *Ioannis*, 357, n. 77. Since in the *Notitia* there is no mention of any David, Philip being followed immediately by John, ed. FHB 14, 109–110, and since in his first charter for the newly established autocephalous archsee of Ochrid of 1019 Basil II confirms John as archbishop, ed. FHB 11 (1965) 40–44, cf. 41, it has been concluded that the last patriarch, John, was confirmed in office with the reduced rank of archbishop, thus B. Prokić, *Zusätze*, 48, and *idem*, "Arhiepiscopep," 270–76, 279–85; Priselkov, *Очерки*, 43; Litavrin, *Переворот*, 396. In this case David would either have been a suffragan of John's or else Scylitzes was ill-informed. The idea that there had been two hierarchs, David in the part of Bulgaria already conquered by Byzantium, perhaps at Dorostolum or Preslav, and John at Ochrid in hitherto independent Macedonia, who was confirmed in office, thus Zachariae von Lingenthal, "Beiträge," 10, 17, is contradicted not only by the fact that it was David, not John, who was at Ochrid before the surrender, but also by the fact that it was John, not David, who became the first occupant of the new archsee.

The idea that John was confirmed in office is, however, a misreading of the charter of 1019, which makes it quite clear that John, a monk, was being confirmed to his office, viz. it bestows imperial sanction upon his canonical election: τὸν εὐλαβέστατον μοναχὸν Ἰωάννην ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Βουλγαρίας ἐκροῶσαμεν εἶναι, ed. FHB 11, 41. See Zlatarski, *Архиепископ*, 464–72. That David was the last patriarch (c1015–18) and John the first archbishop (1019–1036/7) is further borne out both by the fact that John Zonaras, *Annales*, xvii, 9, ed. PG 135, 165, also calls the last occupant of the see before the conquest David, and by the fact that the Vienna codex of Scylitzes' *Synopsis* states that among the captive Bulgarians paraded in Basil II's triumphal entry into Constantinople in 1019 was the hierarch of the Bulgarians, ed. Thurn *Ioannis*, 365. Zlatarski, *Архиепископ*, 472, arbitrarily dismisses this latter fact as a later addition by the copyist of the codex (and not by Michael of Deabolis) on the specious grounds



Macedonia into the empire the patriarchal status of the see was reduced to that of an autocephalous archbishopric, the last patriarch<sup>105</sup> deposed, and a new archbishop appointed, John (1019–1036/7).

The evidence concerning the hierarchs at the head of the church in Kievan Rus' prior to 1039 when the Primary Chronicle mentions Metropolitan Theopemptus<sup>106</sup> is very sparse: Thietmar of Merseburg records that in 1018 an archbishop, whom he does not name, greeted Boleslas in Kiev.<sup>107</sup> Both *vitae* of Boris and Gleb mention a hierarch John, who presided at the translation of their relics on 24 July,<sup>108</sup> and according to the Ochrid theory he is to be identified as the homonymous archbishop of Ochrid, to whom Kiev remained subordinated until his death in 1036–37, when a metropolitan see was established and Theopemptus appointed.<sup>109</sup> Not merely does the theory rest solely upon the coincidence of names, about which one reviewer aptly remarked: *It is curious that the simple thought did not occur to the historian that the name John occurs no less seldom in the lists of the ecclesiastical hierarchy than the name Ivan Ivanovich in ordinary Russian onomatology*, and called the theory *an edifice on sand*,<sup>110</sup> it also conflicts

---

that a hierarch could not have been subjected to such an humiliation—history knows many cases of the humiliating treatment of hierarchs, a classical example being that of John Chrysostom, patriarch of Constantinople, at Easter in 404.

The new archbishop, John, came from Deura and had been abbot of the monastery of the Deipara at Agnoandike, see the *Notitia*, FBH 14, 110. He was succeeded in 1037 by Leo, former chartophylax of St. Sophia, the first of many Greeks to occupy the see, *Notitia, ibidem*.

<sup>105</sup> See previous note.

<sup>106</sup> PSRL 1, 153.

<sup>107</sup> See above, n. 94.

<sup>108</sup> The anonymous *Narratio de passione et laudatio SS. martyrum Borisi et Glebi*, ed. Abramovič, *Памятники*, 27–66, cf. 53, 54, and Nestor's *Lectio de vita et interitu SS. martyrum Borisi et Glebi*, ed. *ibid.*, 1–26, cf. 18–19. They both refer to him as *metropolitan* and as *archbishop*. Šaxmatov, *Разыскания*, 58, n. 1, considered that since two subsequent translations took place on a Sunday, viz. 20 May 1072 and 2 May 1115, this one also did and was thus in either 1020 or 1026; Priselkov, *Очерки*, 71–2, favored 1026, as Gleb's body was only found a year after Svjatopolk's death in 1019. However, as Müller, *Problem*, 12, n. 2, has pointed out, 24 July is their feast and thus there is no compulsion to consider that it was also a Sunday.

<sup>109</sup> Advanced by Priselkov, *Очерки*, 38–46, the theory has been accepted by many, e.g. Tschizewskij, *Geschichte*, 99; Nazarko, *Володимир*, 111–114; Kovalevsky, "Eglise," 478–79; Hoffman, "Początki," 72–5; Koch, "Byzanz," *passim*; *idem*, "Ochrid," *passim*; Kartašev, *Очерки*, vol. 1, 160–65; Lužnyc'kij, *Церква*, 54; Ščerpkina, *Просвещени*, 202; Tóth, *Предпосылки*, 161; and most recently Despodova and Slaveva, *Ракописи*, 16.

<sup>110</sup> Zavitnevič, Review of Priselkov, *Очерки*, 646, 650. That the theory is based solely on the onomastic coincidence has often been pointed out, e.g. Levčenko, *Очерки*, 22, 373–74; Šaxmatov, *Заметки*, 56. Other evidence adduced in its favour is mere special pleading, e.g. Priselkov, *Очерки*, 37–8, considers the Christian names of Boris and Gleb, viz. Romanus and David, were given in honour of Tsar Peter's second son and Tsar Samuel's elder brother. Even if true, it is irrelevant to questions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The Primary Chronicle, PSRL

with known historical facts: Basil II's three charters for the archsee of Ochrid of 1019, 1020 and ca. 1025 specify the jurisdiction of the see in great detail but make no mention of Kiev;<sup>111</sup> moreover, John of Kiev's Greek seal has been discovered and it gives his title as *Metropolitan of Russia*.<sup>112</sup> Had Kiev been subordinated to the archsee of Ochrid, it would certainly have had a diocesan bishop and not been dependent upon visits from distant Ochrid;<sup>113</sup> moreover, for Vladimir to subordinate his church to Macedonia, then in conflict with Byzantium, would imply that he had quarrelled with Basil II, for which there is no evidence after his marriage to Basil's sister Anne.

---

1, 80, reports that their mother was Bulgarian; assuming that this means Danubian and not Volgan (which is by no means certain), what would be more natural than for her to give her sons Christian names associated with Bulgarian rulers?

She too has been the object of fanciful theory: Pogorelov, Русите, 151–53, claims that she persuaded Vladimir to be baptized, which ceremony was carried out by her chaplain, one of the Bulgarian clergymen in Kiev, a theory found by Nikolaev, Фактор, 12, *convincing*. Partenij, Патриарси, 71, suggests that Metropolitan Michael of Kiev was none other than this chaplain, who was despatched to Constantinople for consecration. A strange example of historiographic *monoprosopomania* involving two fictional characters! The Primary Chronicle, PSRL 1, 80, also reports that he had two Czech wives, but as Ammann, "Wladimir," 194–95, remarked, nobody claims that they converted him to Latin christianity. It is true that history knows cases of mothers, sisters and wives, *mulieres suadentes*, who have played a role in the conversion of princes, but since nothing is known about the influence of Vladimir's wives the remarks by Dvornik, *Making*, 93; Ćubatyj, *История*, 215; Mošin, *Периодизации*, 43, remain idle speculation, as does Pogorelov's theory, Русите, 151, that Boris and Gleb owed their exceptional piety to their Bulgarian mother's influence. On *mulieres suadentes* see Labunka, "Centers," 189–93.

<sup>111</sup> Ed. *FHB* 11, 40–44, 44–47, 47. In all they list 31 sees subordinated to it and it clearly had a jurisdiction at least as large as the former Bulgarian empire. The metropolitan sees of Naupactus, Dyrrachium, Larissa and Thessalonica all had to cede part of their jurisdiction, see Granić, "Glossen," 399–400; Konidares, "Entstehung," 7–10. The three charters are found in a chrysobull of 1272 of Emperor Michael VIII (1259–1282) and Priselkov, *Очерки*, 75–6, explains the absence of Kiev in them as due to the fact that by 1272 Kiev was no longer under Ochrid, but then neither were some other sees which they do list, see Snegarov, *Връзки*, 25. Because of the fact that they are only found in the chrysobull, their authenticity has been questioned, most recently by Antoljak, *Македонија*, vol. 1, 688–93, 698–708, but their general import is confirmed by other sources, see Krástanov, *Грамоти*, *passim*. The charters have most recently been published by Tachiaos, Πηγές, vol. 1, pp. 68–69, 69–73, 73.

<sup>112</sup> Laurent, *Corpus*, vol. 5, pt. 1, no. 781, pp. 600–01; see also Soloviev, "Sceau," *passim*; Vlasto, *Entry*, 178; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 85.

<sup>113</sup> Koch, *Byzanz*, 274 and *Ochrid*, 151, claims that the *vitae* of Boris and Gleb make it clear that John was not residing in Kiev, and it is true that according to Nestor's *Lectio* Jaroslav summoned John, who came and afterwards departed, Abramovič, *Жития*, 17, 19, but these terms in no way imply a journey from Ochrid to Kiev and the plain sense of the *vitae* is that the metropolitan was residing in Kiev.

Those who reject the Ochrid theory include Tixomirov, *Связи*, 155–56; Dvornik, *Making*, 177; Honigmann, "Studies," 131; Mošin, *Послание*, 93; Vernadsky, "Status," 295; Snegarov, *Връзки*, 24–6; Ćubatyj, *История*, vol. 1, 253–56; Antoljak, *Македонија*, vol. 1, 398, n. 408a.

Perhaps the most bizarre attempts to link the spread of Christianity in Kievan Rus' with Bulgaria are those relating to Princess Olga and the priest Gregory who was present at her two imperial receptions in Constantinople. The Primary Chronicle does not state where Olga was born but simply reports that a wife called Olga was brought for Igor from *Pleskov*,<sup>114</sup> and according to the Russian redaction of her synaxarium *vita* of the second half of the thirteenth century she was a *Pskovian*.<sup>115</sup> However, a fragmentary chronicle of the late fifteenth–early sixteenth century claims that she was a Bulgarian<sup>116</sup> and its discoverer, Leonid Kavelin, concluded that Pleskov should be identified with Pliska in Bulgaria.<sup>117</sup> Although he later abandoned this theory,<sup>118</sup> it has occasionally been resuscitated,<sup>119</sup> despite its glaring contradiction of the fact that for most of her life she was a pagan.<sup>120</sup>

One of those attending Olga's two imperial receptions at Constantinople

<sup>114</sup> PSRL 1, 29. The variants are <штъ> Пльскова, Плескова, Пьскова, see Scheffer, *Apparat*, 83.

<sup>115</sup> Ed. Serebrjanskij, *Жития*, app. 7–8, cf. 7. On the dating, *ibid.*, 24–32. The South Slav redaction, ed. *ibid.*, app. 6–7, which is closer to the lost original Russian version than the surviving Russian redaction and is perhaps, *ibid.*, 14, of the mid–12th century, does not specify her origins. Since later *vitae* record the legend that she predicted the foundation of Pskov, they place her birth elsewhere, viz. in the nearby village of Vybuto, thus the 16th century *vita*, ed. *ibid.*, app. 8–12, cf. 8, 10, or Vybutts(k)aja, thus the *vita* of the *Liber graduum*, PSRL 21, 1, 6–31, cf. 6, 22. For a bibliography of the legends linking Olga to Pskov, see Ikonnikov, *Опыт*, vol. 2, pt. 1, 851, 854.

<sup>116</sup> Ed. Leonid (Kavelin), *Отрывок*, 295–99, cf. 296. The fragmentary chronicle covers the period 862–1174, but begins with a princely genealogy in which the last named prince is Dmitrij Ivanovich (1483–1509), grandson of Ivan III of Muscovy (1440–1505), ed. *ibid.*, 296. It is found in the 16th-century codex Uvarov 206 and has also been edited by Pavlova, *Летописец*, 8–11, cf. 9.

<sup>117</sup> Leonid (Kavelin), *Родом*, 217, 219. Cf. Leo diaconus, *Historia*, vii, 8, PG 117, 857: Πλίσκουβα; Anna Comnena, *Alexias*, vii, 3, ed. PG 131, 80–1212, cf. 541: Πλίσκóβα.

<sup>118</sup> For a yet more fantastic one: on the basis of the assertion in a short chronicle in the 17th century codex Pogodin 1578 that Olga was the daughter of Tmutarakhan, a Cuman prince, see Vyčkov, *Описание*, vol. 1, 153–54; Kavelin, *Замечаний*, vii–viii, considered that she was a Black Bulgar.

<sup>119</sup> E. g. Povajskij, *Заметки*, 4; Nikolaev, *Фактор*, 99–101; Sabev, “Millénaire,” 836. Tichomirov, *Связи*, 139, found it probable, although elsewhere he accepts her Pskovian origins, *idem*, *Русь*, 299.

<sup>120</sup> As pointed by Malyševskij, *Происхождение*, 332. Soхан', *Очерки*, 21–22, seeks to obviate this difficulty by positing that the chronicle account of her conversion is a later distortion by scheming Russian ecclesiastics who wished to suppress the fact that the first saint of the Russian church was a Bulgarian. Malyševskij, *Происхождение*, 23–26, proposed the far-fetched theory that the idea of her Bulgarian origins had been inspired by a gloss in the Slavonic translation of Constantine Manasses' *Breviarium historiae metricum* which mentions the capture of Pliska, ed. Bogdan, *Cronica*, 1–222, cf. 201. For a detailed refutation of her allegedly Bulgarian origin, see Mixajlov, *Русь*, 134–37.

in 946 or 957<sup>121</sup> was the priest Gregory.<sup>122</sup> Speculations have made him variously a Greek,<sup>123</sup> a priest of the Latin rite,<sup>124</sup> a Bulgarian,<sup>125</sup> and more specifically the Bulgarian hieromonk who was considered to have compiled the *Chronographus Judaicus*, a world history based mainly on the Old Testament and John Malalas' *Chronographia*, which contains between the end of Ruth and the beginning of book v of Malalas a gloss to the effect that Gregory, *presbyter and monk of all the Bulgarian churches*, at the command of Symeon of Bulgaria translated книги завета бжїа ветха <Г>сказающе ѡбразы новаго завета истинн ѡсоудѣ<sup>126</sup> Originally it was considered that Gregory had translated the entire chronograph,<sup>127</sup> but since it has been established that it was compiled from existing Slavonic translations in the thirteenth century,<sup>128</sup> the gloss must refer either to Malalas or to the Old Testament. The claim that it refers to the former since no cleric

<sup>121</sup> They are described by Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *De cerimoniis aulae byzantinae*, ii, 15, ed. PG 112, 73–1445, cf. 1108–1112. Since he dates them Wednesday, 9 September, and Sunday, 18 October, and during his reign (944–59) these dates fell on those days only in 946 and 957, Olga's visit has traditionally been dated to 957 because the Primary Chronicle dates it to 6463, viz. 954–955, PSRL 1, 60, e.g. M. Obolenskij, *Слов*, 42–4; Laehr, *Anfänge*, 103; Levčenko, *Очерки*, 222; Vlasto, *Entry*, 250. Recently Litavrin, *Датировке*, *passim*, has argued for 946 for several reasons, the principal one being that the description of the receptions forms the final section of a chapter recounting the reception of three embassies to Constantinople in May, August and September-October, and the first was definitely in May 946. However, Pritsak, "Ol'ga," 13–14, thinks the reception of 9 September was in 946 and that of 18 October in 957. On the receptions see also Litavrin, *Путешествие*, and *idem*, *Связи*. His dating to 946 has been accepted by some, e.g. Tinnefeld, "Olga," but not all, e.g. D. Obolensky, "Baptism," 161; and *idem*, "Ol'ga's." The question of the date must be considered open, see the remarks of Poppe, "Christianisierung," 460, 464, and D. Obolensky, "Rus'," 41.

<sup>122</sup> PG 112, 1112.

<sup>123</sup> Thus Laehr, *Anfänge*, 52; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 51; Arin'on (= Arrignon), *Отношения*, 119, considers him a Byzantine diplomat who had been sent to Kiev for diplomatic negotiations.

<sup>124</sup> Thus Jugie, "Origines," 258, and *idem*, *Schisme*, 174; Stökl, *Geschichte*, 56; Čubatj, *История*, vol. 1, 178.

<sup>125</sup> Nikolaev, *Фактор*, 103; Pavlova, *Връзки*, 103; Mixajlov, *Русия*, 69. Gregory and the assistant interpreters received the same amount at each reception, viz. 8 and 12 miliaresia respectively. That he received less has been taken by Nikolaev and Mixajlov, *ibidem*, to be a typical instance of Byzantine Bulgarophobia.

<sup>126</sup> The chronograph remains unedited, but the gloss has often been edited, e.g. Kalajdovič, *Иоанн*, 99, 178; Evseev, *Григорий*, 356–7; V. Angelov, *Въпроса*, 50; Obolenskij, *Летописец*, xiii. The considerable literature on the chronograph cannot be given here, for a résumé see Tvorogov, *Хронографы*, 16–18, 23–25.

<sup>127</sup> Thus Kalajdovič, *Иоанн*, 15; Obolenskij, *Летописец*, xiv, xxix; Golubinskij, *История*, vol. 1, pt. 1, 900; it has even been repeated recently by E. Georgiev, *Разцветът*, 303.

<sup>128</sup> See Istrin, *Области*, 185–6; Tvorogov, *Хронографы*, 16. An earlier dating to the 10th century, argued by Šaxmatov, *Энциклопедия*, 15–16, 33–34, cannot be maintained, see Weingart, *Kroniky*, pt. 1, 33–35.

would feel obliged to assert that the Bible contains the truth,<sup>129</sup> is unconvincing in view of the fact that the phrase *divine old testament* can hardly refer to Malalas' *Chronographia*; moreover, the gloss follows Ruth, the last book of the Octateuch, which contains the old covenant, the prototype of the new, to which the gloss clearly refers.<sup>130</sup>

The identification of Symeon's Gregory with Olga's was first suggested by M. Obolenskij, who claimed that after Symeon's death in 927 he went to Russia, where he compiled an account of Olga's embassy to Constantinople, as well as of other events, which was later used in the compilation of the Primary Chronicle.<sup>131</sup> This was then further elaborated into the theory that he had gone to Constantinople, whence he was sent to Kiev to prepare Olga for baptism,<sup>132</sup> and finally reached its apotheosis in the idea that he in c960 left Kiev to return to Bulgaria where he became bishop at Ochrid and died in c1012.<sup>133</sup> In fact, of course, all that is known of Symeon's Gregory is what is stated in the gloss and to identify him with Olga's is another instance of arbitrary monoprosopomania. As for Olga's Gregory, ALL that is known about him is that he attended the two receptions, and it is not even

<sup>129</sup> Thus Istrin, *Александрия*, 355; in order to substantiate his theory, he had to posit that a. the information about Gregory was taken from the title of the Slavonic translation of Malalas; b. the phrase *книгы ... соущ* was the title which the 13th century compiler of the chronograph wished to give to his work, but c. he was unable (*не сумел*) to keep his own title from being contaminated by the translation title (!) and anyway d. *old testament* only means events B. C. as opposed to events A. D., *ibid*, 356–58. All of this can scarcely be termed convincing.

<sup>130</sup> Thus Evseev, *Григорий*, 362–4; Weingart, *Kroniky*, pt. 1, 38–9. The view that it refers solely to Ruth, thus Sobolevskij, *Литературы*, 266, is highly improbable since that book alone is hardly the prototype of the entire new covenant.

<sup>131</sup> M. Obolenskij, *Исследования*, 202–7, 220; *idem*, *Слов*, 87–8; this was accepted by Leonid (Kavelin), *Рукопись*, 17–18.

<sup>132</sup> Lebedincev, *Начале*, 282. This was accepted by Baras, *Составителях*, 75–81, who added sundry equally speculative theories of his own, e.g. that he is to be identified with the monk Gregory who compiled the Greek *Vita S. Basilii iunioris ascetae Constantinopolitani!* According to Soхан', *Очерки*, 22, at Olga's court he *in all probability became her main adviser, not only in questions of Christianity but in others concerning internal politics and external state relations.*

<sup>133</sup> Kavelin, *Описание*, vol 1, 669, vol. 3, 9–11, 361–62; *idem*, *Родом*, 219–22. The identification of him as the bishop of Ochrid is based on a partly illegible and totally obscure inscription on the church of St. Sophia, Ochrid, discovered by Grigorovič, *Очерк*, 100: ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΥ ... ΣΚΗΝΗΝ ΕΓΕΙΡΑΣ ... ΤΩΝ ΘΕΟΓΡΑΦΩΝ ΝΟΜΩΝ ΕΘΝΗ ΤΑ ΜΥΣΩΝ ΕΚΔΙΔΑΣΚΕΙ ΠΑΝΘΘΩΣ ... with a date that could be either σφκ (1012) or σωκ (1312). Gregory could equally well be the person to whom the church was dedicated, thus Filaret, *Святые*, 7, rather than the person who built the church and/or taught the Moesians, while the date could be equally that of Gregory's death, thus Filaret, *ibid*, 8, or that of the construction of the church, thus Sobolevskij, *Литературы*, 267, n. 2. The identification of the two Gregories was first tentatively proposed by Biljarskij, *Состав*, 122–3. For Kavelin it was a fact — both omitted to mention that the date of the inscription is dubious.

certain that he ever visited Kiev.<sup>134</sup>

If the sources are silent about the active contribution of Bulgarians of any degree to the conversion of Kievan Rus', they are no more revealing about the material transfer thither of literary works. The sole source to mention the removal of codices to Kiev is the *vita ordinaria* of Vladimir, which states that the booty which he carried off from Cherson included books,<sup>135</sup> but even if the statement of this *vita*, which is not prior to the late thirteenth century,<sup>136</sup> is to be credited, it scarcely refers to Slavonic codices.<sup>137</sup> This absence of evidence has only fueled speculation,<sup>138</sup> the principal suggestions being that Olga took books back after her visit to Constantinople in the mid-tenth century;<sup>139</sup> manuscripts arrived as booty carried off in Svjatoslav's Bulgarian campaigns of 967/8 and 969–971;<sup>140</sup> brought by refugees from Byzantine oppression;<sup>141</sup> booty carried off to Constantinople and there sold on the market or sent as imperial gifts to Kiev;<sup>142</sup> booty given to Rus' troops who aided Basil II in his conquest of

<sup>134</sup> The fact that Gregory and the assistant interpreters received fixed amounts, see above n. 116, whereas the others present received varying amounts at the two receptions, would perhaps indicate that they were Byzantine officials, while the others received gifts, thus Ajnalov, *Очерки*, 299; Пархоменко, *Начало*, 126–7, suggests that he may have been Olga's guide in Constantinople. At all events the usual assertion that he was a member of Olga's suite, e.g. Poppe, "Christianisierung," 463, remains an unproven assumption.

<sup>135</sup> Ed. Serebrjanskij, *Жития*, app. 17–21, cf. 21.

<sup>136</sup> Serebrjanskij, *ibid.*, 59–62, who calls it the *летописно-проложное житие*, dates it to the 14th century; Sobolevskij, *Памятники*, 11, who calls it the *обычное житие*, to the late 13th century; see also Šaxmatov, *Легенда*, 1052–57.

<sup>137</sup> As Angelov, *Вопросу*, 137, would have it, cf. *idem*, *Историята*, vol. 1, 37. So also Хабургаев, *Становление*, 17; Коцев, "Anfänge," 507.

<sup>138</sup> Typical is the reply given by Lunt, "Interpreting," 260, to his own question: *How did they* (sc. the exemplars for East Slavic codices) *come into the hands of the Rus'*? *We can only speculate*. He then suggests three ways, but—unlike many scholars—he specifies that it is speculation, not fact. His conjecture that some may have come directly from Bohemia and Moravia requires more detailed study.

<sup>139</sup> Thus Хабургаев, *Становление*, 16.

<sup>140</sup> E.g. Žukovskaja, *Изборник*, 12; Rybakov, *Изборник*, 12; Angelov, *Вопросу*, 134; Kuev, *Съдбата*, 14; Schmücker, "Bemerkungen," 92; Litavrin, *Переворот*, 402.

<sup>141</sup> E.g. Mošin, *Периодизации*, 52; Kuev, *Съдбата*, 15; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 98; Mixajlov, *Руси*, 132; Rogov, *Связи* (1978) 44.

<sup>142</sup> E.g. Sobolevskij, *Материалы*, 136; Gudzij, *Литература*, 35; Ščerkina, *Вопросу*, 203–4; Pavlova, *Връзки*, 103. It has even been suggested that perhaps *the entire* (Bulgarian) *Imperial library* (die gesamte Zarenbibliothek) was carried off in the sack of Preslav and presented by the Byzantine emperor to Vladimir on the occasion of his baptism, thus Kronsteiner, "Literatursprache," 10–11 (who has forgotten that at the time of Vladimir's baptism there were co-emperors on the Byzantine throne) and Ščerkina, *Изучению*, 233, who estimates its size as being between 200 and 300 books. On what this estimate is based remains a mystery. Schiwaroff, "Rolle," thinks that the Byzantines sent only a part of the Bulgarian imperial library, but fails to say what they did with the rest.

Bulgaria.<sup>143</sup> There has even been speculation about individual codices<sup>144</sup> and exemplars,<sup>145</sup> not to mention conjecture about the arrival of the Greek codex used for an allegedly East Slav translation.<sup>146</sup> In fact the actual

<sup>143</sup> Thus Poppe, *Курялоуѣ*, 334, n. 44; Vodoff, *Naissance*, 105; Lunt, "Interpreting," 260. The participation of Rus' troops in the conquest is reported by Scylitzes, ed. Thurn, *Ioannis*, 355. Schiwaroff, "Rolle," 149, talks vaguely of a transfer of books after Basil II's conquest of Bulgaria, but it is not clear whether he means as booty or as a Byzantine gift.

<sup>144</sup> Mošin, "Listići," 7–64, has suggested that the 11th century Novgorod (or Kuprijanov) folia represent the remains of an evangeliary presented to Vladimir of Kiev by Samuel of Macedonia. Even if the South Slav origin of the two folia, usually considered to be East Slav, was correct, the rest of Mošin's theory would remain an utterly unsubstantiated hypothesis. On the folia see Šmidt (=Schmidt), *Каталог*, no. 12.

<sup>145</sup> Thus the arrival of the exemplar of the 1073 florilegium has been associated with a. booty from Svjatoslav's Bulgarian campaigns, thus Vlasto, *Entry*, 252, note b; b. the dowry of Princess Anne (it had been taken from the Bulgarian imperial library in Preslav and kept in the library of St. Sophia, Constantinople), thus Ščepkina, *Вопросы*, 202–3; c. property taken to Rus' by Bulgarian refugees fleeing Byzantine oppression in the early 11th century, thus Žukovskaja, *Изборник*, 12; d. booty given to troops sent by Vladimir to assist Basil II in his conquest of Bulgaria, thus Vodov, *Naissance*, 105.

These views rest on the assumption that the extant 1073 codex is a faithful reproduction of an equally sumptuous Bulgarian codex, a view that has been forcefully challenged by Whitman, "Izbornik," 252–67, and again by Lunt, "Izbornik," 359–76. They contend that the imported exemplar probably consisted of two modest, unadorned octavo volumes.

<sup>146</sup> Viz. George Hamartolus' *Chronicon breve*, allegedly translated in Jaroslav's day (1019–1054). The argument provides an excellent example of a conjecture based upon a hypothesis deduced from a theory and goes as follows: Weitzmann, "Illustration," *passim*, on the basis of miniatures in a ninth-century manuscript of Gregory of Nazianzus' homilies, viz. Paris, *codex graecus 510*, postulated that illuminated codices of the histories of Sozomenus, Theodoret and Malalas once existed and, *ibid.*, 129–30, dated their origin to Justinian's day, viz. 527–65. He further pointed out, *ibid.*, 130–31, that only three illuminated codices of Byzantine histories exist, one Greek, viz. *codex Matritensis vitr. 16–2*, of about the late 13th century (the date is disputed) containing John Scylitzes' *Synopsis historiarum* with 574 miniatures, and two Slavonic, viz. the 14th-century Bulgarian *codex Vaticanus slavicus 2* containing Constantine Manasses' *Breviarium historiae metricum* with 69 miniatures, and the 13th–14th-century East Slav Moscow Theological Academy codex 100 containing George Hamartolus' *Chronicon breve* with 129 miniatures. Wilson, "Scylitzes," 218–18, proposed the theory that the exemplar of the Madrid Scylitzes belonged to a very small and special class of illuminated codices kept in the imperial library at Constantinople and sent as diplomatic gifts on special occasions, and that the Slavonic translations were made from two such codices.

Franklin, *Временя*, 327–28, has now suggested suitable occasions upon which the Greek illuminated codex of George Hamartolus' *Chronicon breve* might have been despatched to Kiev: Vladimir's conversion; the arrival of Greek *metropolitans* (sic, a metropolitan?); the consecration (sic) of St. Sophia's at Kiev (presumably he means its foundation in 1037 as it was not consecrated until the 1060's); the marriage of Vsevolod Jaroslavič to a Byzantine princess (viz. 1046).

Before some Boltinian historian (see note 76) seizes upon one of these as THE most suitable occasion, it should be pointed out that a. Weitzmann's postulate remains a theory; b. even Wilson, "Scylitzes," 217, admitted that his notion of "diplomatic" illuminated codices based upon Weitzmann's theory was a hypothesis; c. the two Slavonic codices both contain miniatures definitely not copied from any Byzantine codex, for Manasses see Dujčev, *Miniatures*, 127; for George see Попов, *Заметки*, 131–41, and Vzdomov, *Иллюстрации*, 220–22, and

circumstances in which a particular surviving Bulgarian codex arrived in Russia are first known from the time of Arsenius Suxanov's third mission to the East in 1653/4–1655/6.<sup>147</sup>

Until now few early East Slav codices have been examined in sufficient detail to determine whether they were copied from a Bulgarian exemplar,<sup>148</sup> and in even fewer cases is there agreement as to the provenance of the latter: East Bulgaria in the case of the Ostromir evangeliary of 1056–57,<sup>149</sup> the eleventh century Čudov Psalter,<sup>150</sup> and the eleventh-twelfth century Viktorov fragment of Antiochus's *Pandectes*;<sup>151</sup> West Bulgaria in the case

---

thus neither is a simply copy of an alleged Byzantine archetype; d. indeed, no illuminated Byzantine codex of either Manasses or George has been traced; e. disagreement about the dating of the hypothetical Byzantine archetypes means that in neither case is the postulate of a diplomatic codex either necessary or certain.

In the case of Manasses, the archetype is usually considered to have been contemporary to the author, viz. 12th century, see e.g. Dujčev, *Miniatures*, 127; Vožkov, *Миниатюри*, 88, but some scholars, e.g. Grabar, "Illustrations," 194; Džurova, *Catalogo*, 43, consider the miniatures Palaeologan in style, viz. contemporary to the 14th-century Slavonic codex, in which case there is clearly no need to posit the existence of a prior Greek codex.

In the case of George Hamartolus, the Byzantine archetype is also usually considered to have been contemporary to the author, viz. 9th century, see, e.g. Weitzmann, "Illustration," 131; Pobedova, *Отражение*, 380, or a little later, i.e. of the late 9th or 10th century, thus, e.g. Vzdornov, *Иллюстрации*, 212. Others, however, see 11th-century characteristics in the miniatures, e.g. Franklin, *Времени*, 327; Vožkov, *Миниатюри*, 95 (who considers them similar to those in the Scylitzes codex, viz. they could not antedate the late 11th century), while Ajnalov, *Миниатюри*, 22–3, and *Летопись*, 132, sees in the depiction of the armour and weapons Latin influences due to the crusades and the establishment of the Latin empire, i.e. the archetype could not antedate the 12th century. Protasov, *Черткы, passim*, detects Bulgarian influences and considers that the miniatures only go back to the Byzantine archetype via a 13th-century Bulgarian codex. Clearly any dating later than the mid-eleventh century would negate the idea of a "diplomatic" illuminated codex used for the translation.

Finally, last—but by no means least—f. the alleged East Slav origin of the translation of George Hamartolus' *Chronicon breve* is itself an unproven hypothesis, cf. Thomson, "Russia," no. 50.

<sup>147</sup> For the transfer of Bulgarian manuscripts to Russia from then on see Kuev, *Съдбата*, 41–46.

<sup>148</sup> Kuev, *Съдбата*, 15–30, lists 29 instances, but several are dubious and at least one incorrect; he claims, *ibid.*, 28, that the 1144 Halyč tetrevangelium was copied from a Bulgarian protograph as its kalendar includes the feast of St. John of Rila. In fact the kalendar is on ff. 242v–256r and ff. 229–260 are a 14th-century addition to the codex, on which see Šmidt, *Каталог*, no. 53.

<sup>149</sup> Šmidt, *Каталог*, no. 3. The recent claim by Despodova, *Ракописи*, 16, that the exemplar was Macedonian is based not on linguistic evidence but on acceptance, *ibid.*, 62, of the theory that the Ostromir codex was copied from the Novgorod (or Kuprijanov) folia, the sole surviving fragment of a codex which had belonged to Samuel of Macedonia. On this unsubstantiated theory see above n. 144.

<sup>150</sup> Šmidt, *Каталог*, no. 31.

<sup>151</sup> Šmidt, *Каталог*, no. 201.



of the eleventh-century Eugenius fragments of a psalter<sup>152</sup> and the eleventh–twelfth century Tolstoj psalter,<sup>153</sup> while the presence of Glagolitic letters in a few early East Slav codices<sup>154</sup> may indicate links with West Bulgaria, where Glagolitic remained longer in use.<sup>155</sup>

The first instance in which the circumstances of the arrival of a particular exemplar are known postdates the Kievan period: most East Slav codices of the Serbian nomocanon have interpolated between the preface to and text of the canons of Carthage the colophon of a codex copied in Bulgaria at the request of the Despot James Svjatoslav (?–1275) for Metropolitan Cyril of Kiev (1242/3–1280/1), probably in 1262, and an epistle from James to Cyril, which reveals that the latter had requested a copy of the nomocanon, which James had obtained from the patriarch and had had copied for Cyril.<sup>156</sup>

It is sometimes asserted that until the incorporation of East Bulgaria into the Byzantine Empire most codices went to Kievan Rus' from there and that afterwards until the fall of Macedonia in 1018 most went from West Bulgaria, and then the flow ended.<sup>157</sup> This is, however, based upon the premise that the Byzantine authorities in Bulgaria pursued a policy of *piti- less Graecization*<sup>158</sup> and *systematic Hellenization*<sup>159</sup> and that the period until 1185, when the uprising began which led to the establishment of the second Bulgarian Empire, was *an epoch of Romanization*.<sup>160</sup> This premise not only presupposes a nationalistic Hellenic self-consciousness foreign to the multinational Byzantine Empire at the time,<sup>161</sup> but is contradicted by the evidence. Clearly Greek became the official language of administration and

<sup>152</sup> Šmidt, Каталог, nos. 29–30

<sup>153</sup> Šmidt, Каталог, no. 47.

<sup>154</sup> For brief surveys see Karskij, *Палеография*, 212–13, and П'inskij, *Листки*, 101–2. The claim, thus Shevelov, *Elemente*, 74, repeated by Issatschenko, *Geschichte*, vol. 1, 35–6, that the vast majority of these codices come from Novgorod and indicate links with Moravia rather than Macedonia, is unproven with regard to their northwest Russian origin and purely speculative with regard to the theory of their Moravian provenance. See also Birnbaum, "Novgorod," and de Vincenz, "Elements."

<sup>155</sup> Thus Durmovo, *Введение*, 36, n. 6; Speranskij, *Памятники*, 531–32; Tschizewskij, *Geschichte*, 99–100.

<sup>156</sup> Both colophon and epistle have often been edited, e.g. В. Angelov, *Литература*, vol. 2, 142–47. There are various corrupt readings of the date, the main ones being сѣби едних, сѣби е индих, сѣби едних, *ibid.*, 143–45; for other variants see Ščarov, *Наследие*, 148–49. It was thus either 1262 or 1270, but only the former coincides with the 5th indiction.

<sup>157</sup> See, for example, Speranskij, *Памятники*, 528–530; Мошин, *Периодизации*, 58–9; Тóth, *Предпосылки*, 192.

<sup>158</sup> Thus Speranskij, *Памятники*, 533.

<sup>159</sup> Thus Мошин, *Периодизации*, 60.

<sup>160</sup> Thus Zlatarski, *История*, vol. 2, 167.

<sup>161</sup> See Browning, *Byzantium*, 77–8; В. Angelov, *Страницы*, 86–7.

the ecclesiastical hierarchy was Graecized, but claims that there was a *mass replacement of the higher and even lower Bulgarian clergy down to priests and subdeacons by Greeks*,<sup>162</sup> that Greek ousted Slavonic as the liturgical language,<sup>163</sup> and that Slavonic manuscripts were systematically destroyed<sup>164</sup> are belied by the existence of eleventh- and twelfth-century Bulgarian manuscripts,<sup>165</sup> as well as by continuing translation work.<sup>166</sup> It would be exaggerated to claim<sup>167</sup> that the Greek hierarchy patronized Slavonic letters and liturgy, and undoubtedly the period was one of relative stagnation as a natural consequence of the relegation of Slavonic to second-rate status, but of cultural continuity there can be no doubt.<sup>168</sup>

How Byzantine culture in its Slavonic form as received in Bulgaria was transferred to Kievan Rus' remains thus for lack of evidence in the sources an enigma. Their silence is perhaps not surprising as it did not involve great events, but was a continuing unspectacular process which may have been initially more intense but never halted. The centers of transfer undoubtedly included Athos, where there was an East Slav monastery from the mid-twelfth century on,<sup>169</sup> and perhaps to a lesser degree Constan-

<sup>162</sup> Thus, Kaliganov, *Проблемы*, 61. To support this view he refers to Litavrin, *Болгария*, 367–68. However, the latter only talks of a *partial* replacement. In fact, although some of the urban clergy were replaced by Greeks (in part no doubt necessitated by the growth in the Greek-speaking population), there is no evidence either that this was done on a large scale, or that it affected the country clergy.

<sup>163</sup> Thus Mošin, *Периодизация*, 69.

<sup>164</sup> Thus Zlatarskij, *История*, vol. 2, 265.

<sup>165</sup> The list given by Dinekov in Dinekov *et al.*, *История*, vol.1, 246, is unreliable as it includes West Bulgarian manuscripts of the early 11th century which could have been copied before 1018 and late 12th century ones which could postdate 1185.

<sup>166</sup> See Thomson, "Continuity," to appear.

<sup>167</sup> As does Dostál, "Relations," 173–4. Litavrin, *Болгария*, 351–52, with some justification, however, argues that the initial settlement of 1019 with the establishment of an autocephalous archsee headed by the Bulgarian hierarch John did indeed favour the privileges of the Bulgarian clergy. At all events there is no evidence for a process of Graecization before the appointment of his Greek successor, Leo, in 1037.

<sup>168</sup> See D. Angelov, "Länder," 151–166; Dujčev, *Идеята*, 5–19; Andreev, *Идеята*, 17–37; Mečev, *Иван*.

<sup>169</sup> The claim that there was a *Rusian*, viz. East Slav, monastery there as early as 1016, thus Mošin, *Русские* (ix), 63; Dujčev, *Центры*, 123, and *Монт*, 128; Mamalakes, "Ορος," 73, cf. 673; Lemerle, *Actes de Saint-Pantéléemôn*, 5, *et al.*, is based on the arbitrary identification of two separate monasteries as one. An act, dated only February of the 14th indiction, but which must be of 1016 since it was signed by Nicephorus, Protos of Athos (1010–1019) and Theodoreus, Superior of the Laura (1010–before 1018), see the table of indictions in Grumel, *Chronologie*, 254, bears the signature of one Gerasimus of the monastery του Ρῶς (sic), ed. Lemerle, *Actes de Lavra*, vol. 1, no. 19, pp. 154–55, cf. 155. The only other reference to this monastery is in an act of 1081 to which the illiterate monk Cyriacus του Ρῶς (sic) added his sign and which the scribe signed with the words δηα Κυριακοῦ του Ρους (sic), ed. Bompaire, *Actes*, no. 6, pp. 60–64, cf. 63–4.

tinople, Jerusalem, and Sinai, but the process nevertheless remained essentially Bulgarian.<sup>170</sup> The claim that Byzantium used *every means to prevent the development of cultural links between its restless Slav subjects and the independent Slav lands to the north*<sup>171</sup> is unfounded. There is no evidence for a wide-spread knowledge of Greek in Kievan Rus',<sup>172</sup> nor yet for much

---

In the mid-twelfth century we may assume that the monastery of Xylourgou—that is, the Dormition monastery of Our Lady of the Carpenter, ἡ κοίμησις τῆς Θεοτόκου τοῦ Ξυλοργοῦ—was inhabited by East Slav monks since its inventory of 1142 lists a number of βιβλία ρούσικα (sic) ed. Lemerle, *Actes de Saint-Pantéléémôn*, no. 7, pp. 73–76, cf. 74, while the monastery is referred to in an act of 1169 as Xylourgou ἦτοι τῶν Ρουσῶν (sic), ed. *ibid.*, no. 8, pp. 82–86, cf. 83. (In the confirmations of this act of 1188 and 1194 the monastery is referred to as being that τῶν Ρῶς (sic) and τῶν ιερομονάχων τῶν Ρῶς (sic) respectively, ed. *ibid.*, 86.) Xylourgou is first mentioned in an act of 1030, ed. *ibid.*, no. 1, p. 30, and in two other eleventh-century acts, 1048, ed. *ibid.*, no. 4, pp. 48–50, and 1070, ed. *ibid.*, no. 6, pp. 63–64, but nowhere is there any mention of a *Rusian* connection and it clearly only came into East Slav hands in the course of the twelfth century.

To identify the monastery του Ρῶς with Xylourgou, whose *Rusian* connection are attested only some one hundred and twelve years later is completely arbitrary. The monastery του Ρῶς is just another of the many eleventh-century foundations which disappeared, only their names being preserved in contemporary documents. For other instances see, for example, the lists of signatories to an act dated 19 April 1015, ed. Dölger, *Schatzkammern*, vol. 1, no. 103, pp. 273–75, cf. 275, and to the second Athonite typicon of 1045–46, ed. Meyer, *Haupturkunden*, 151–62, cf. 162. The suggestion that the singular form of its name indicates its founder, viz. *of the Rusian*, as opposed to its inhabitants, viz. *of the Rus'*, thus Mošin, Русские, (ix), 61–2, and Lemerle, *Actes de Saint-Pantéléémôn*, 4, is unlikely, but in either case the most obvious interpretation is that it refers to Norsemen, very large numbers of whom served in the armies of Basil II (976–1025), see Blöndal, *Varangians*, 42–53; Davidson, *Road*, 179–80, 239–42.

Very little is known about East Slav–Athonite relations in the early period. The picture painted by Mošin, Русские, was correctly judged by Dölger in his review, 180: *Das Bild, das M. entwirft, ist, wie die häufigen "Vielleicht" schon äusserlich anzeigen, stark subjektiv und bedient sich nicht selten der "Tradition", um Lücken spärlicher Quellenüberlieferung zu überbrücken.* That Athos did play a role in the transfer of Byzantine culture to the East Slavs in the eleventh century is undoubted, but that it was the main source for that, thus, Birnbaum, *Rus'* 4, is an instance of what Dölger in his review of Mošin, Русские, 209, called *unbegründete Vermutungen*. For a bibliography of Rus'-Athonite relations see Prosvirnin, "Афон," *passim*.

<sup>170</sup> Litavrin, *Переворот*, 397, 400, would limit official contacts between the Rus' and Bulgarian churches to the period after the end of Bulgaro-Byzantine hostilities in 1018 and before the appointment of the first Greek, Leo, to the archsee of Ochrid in 1037; otherwise contacts were unofficial. However, this division of contacts into official and unofficial is a pure hypothesis, unsubstantiated by any historical evidence, and his whole article teems with phrases such as: *It is, in my opinion, impossible to exclude the possibility...* (p. 398); *it seems possible at this stage (naturally only hypothetically) to draw two main conclusions...* (p. 399); *I consider thus the supposition very probable that...* (p. 402).

<sup>171</sup> Mošin, *Периодизация*, 49.

<sup>172</sup> See Hösch, "Griechischkenntnisse," 250–60; Thomson, "Quotations," and "Implications," *passim*. Recent claims to the contrary either ignore or are ignorant of these studies of the level of a knowledge of Greek in Rus', e.g.: *It may be assumed (Можно полагать) that at a certain level of education Church Slavonic–Greek bilingualism (двуязычие) was generally presupposed (предполагалось),* thus Uspenskij, *История*, 32. This is not merely unsubstan-

if any translation work being undertaken there,<sup>173</sup> and the reception of the literary aspects of Byzantine culture<sup>174</sup> in Kievan Rus' passed through an essentially Bulgarian prism. Early Bulgarian literature was the intermediary between Constantinople and Kiev,<sup>175</sup> not merely in the sense of being a passive vehicle for the transfer, but as an active agent in revising Byzantine culture to meet Bulgarian requirements and in the process creating that *corpus paradigmatum*,<sup>176</sup> the structural prototypes, which lasted until the dawn of the modern era. That is Bulgaria's lasting contribution to the reception of Byzantine culture in Kievan Rus',<sup>177</sup> and Boltinian histori-

---

tiated — it borders on the ridiculous. Certainly Uspenskij's own grasp of Greek leaves much to be desired: he, *ibid.*, 35, thinks that жьзль is a translation for ἄνθος and claims that the latter word is feminine in gender.

<sup>173</sup> See Thomson, "Implications," *passim*, and *idem*, "Made in Russia," to appear. What Schmücker, "Bemerkungen," 91, means when he asserts that much of the literature available in Bulgaria was not taken to Kiev in Slavonic but was translated in Rus' from Greek by Bulgarians is unclear — this would involve dual translations of the same works, of which he gives no instances. Uspenskij's claim, *История*, 30, that a large corpus of texts very diversified in content and genre was translated in Kievan Rus' is merely the umpteenth repetition of an unproven assertion. Some of this scholar's statements about translated literature give rise to doubts about his understanding of the nature of mediaeval culture; e.g. the idea that the world chronicles of John Malalas and George Hamartolus could not possibly have any practical interest for the Russian reader and were only of interest to Russians as part of Byzantine culture, *ibid.*, 30, ignores the patently obvious fact that for medieval man all history was *Heilgeschichte*, all events either presage or fulfil the divine will. It is precisely in these two Byzantine chronicles that Byzantine history is viewed from this standpoint as the prolongation of Old and New Testament history. No matter how great the stylistic difference, the Primary Chronicle has an absolutely identical view of history, which Uspenskij describes, *ibid.* 65–6, by citing Eremin, *Литература*, 64, 70–71; Uspenskij omits to point out that Eremin, *ibid.* 66, 68, 69, specifically refers to Greek sources, including Hamartolus, in dealing with what he calls, *ibid.* 64, the Chronicle's philosophy of history. On the notion of divine providence in the Chronicle see Sielicki, "Опатрność," *passim*.

<sup>174</sup> The artistic aspects were largely assimilated directly, see Birnbaum, "Component," 12, although what he means, *idem*, "Rus'," 9, by the statement that the Bulgarian impact did not include the very essence of the Orthodox faith, its liturgical manifestation and the carefully selected knowledge that went with it is unclear — the liturgy certainly passed through the Bulgarian prism, where it was enriched by original hymns, see G. Попов, *Произведения*, *passim*.

<sup>175</sup> Lixačev, *Литературы*, 12–21, and *Развитие*, 23–44, greatly overestimates the supranational aspects of Slavonic literature as the intermediary; see the reactions to the former article by Graševa, *Литературы*, 62–71; Dužev, *Проблемы*, 8–23; Dinekov, *Литература*, 51–72.

<sup>176</sup> Píkio (=Picchio), *Мястото*, 114; see also *idem*, "Impact," 262.

<sup>177</sup> Uspenskij is prone to making assertions such as *the South Slavs played an auxiliary, intermediary role, not an independent one: the orientation was Greek, the written language (письменность) Bulgarian, История*, 25, and *Russian literature (written language, education) was at the initial stage nothing more than a copy (сколок) made from Byzantine literature, ibid.*, 30. See also his remarks at a round-table held on 24 February 1988, in Kavko, *Стол*, 30–31. This approach largely ignores Bulgaria's active role in the transmission and hence gives a distorted view of the process.

ans<sup>178</sup> who, abhorring a historical vacuum, seek to fill the silence of the sources by their own unsubstantiated hypothesizing or by recourse to mystifications such as the Joachim Chronicle merely obscure that achievement.

*University of Antwerp*

#### WORKS CITED

- Abraham, W. *Powstanie organizacyi kościoła łacińskiego na Rusi*, vol. 1, Lviv, 1904.
- Abramovič, D., ed. *Жития святых мучеников Бориса и Глеба и службы им* (= *Памятники древне-русской литературы*, 2, 1916).
- . *Киево-Печерський патерик* (= *Пам'ятки мови та письменства давньої України*, 4, 1931).
- Ajnalov, D. "Летопись Георгия Амартола (Криница). Выставка бывшей Троице-Сергиевой Лавры № 100," *Deuxième Congrès International des Études Byzantines, Belgrade, 1927, Compte-rendu*, ed. D. Anastasijević and P. Granić, Belgrade, 1929, 127–35.
- . "Миниатюры древнейших русских рукописей в Музее Троице-Сергиевой Лавры и на ее выставке," *Памятники древней письменности и искусства*, 190 (1925) 11–35.
- . "Очерки и заметки по истории древне-русского искусства, ii," *ИзвОРЯС*, 13, ii (1908) 290–307.
- Ammann, A. "Wladimir dem Apostelgleichen zum Gedächtnis," *Orientalia christiana periodica*, 5 (1939) 186–206.
- Andreev, J. "Идеята за приемствеността в Българската държава през средновековието (XII–XIV в.)," *Трудове на Великотърновския университет "Кирил и Методи"*, 12, iii (1974–75) 17–37.
- Angelov, V. *Из историята на руско-българските литературни връзки*, 2 vols., Sofia, 1972–1980.
- . *Из старата българска, руска и сръбска литература*, 2 vols., Sofia, 1958–1967.
- . "К вопросу о начале русско-болгарских литературных связей," *ТОДРЛ*, 14 (1958) 132–38.
- . "Към въпроса за книжовното дело на Презвитер Григорий Мних," *Старобългарска литература*, 3 (1978) 48–55.
- . "Проникване на старобългарски съчинения в старата руска литература," *Старобългарска литература*, 2 (1977) 20–45.
- . *Страници из историята на старобългарската литература*, Sofia, 1974.

<sup>178</sup> On this term see note 76.

- Angelov, D. "Die bulgarischen Länder und das bulgarische Volk in den Grenzen des byzantinischen Reiches im XI.–XII. Jahrhundert (1018–1185). (Sozial-ökonomische Verhältnisse)," in Hussey, *Proceedings*, 151–166; \_\_\_\_\_ *Руси и българи в историята*, Sofia, 1945.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. *Руско-български връзки през вековете*, Sofia, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Средновековна България и Киевска Русия," in *Българо-украински връзки през вековете*, Sofia, 1983.
- Antoljak, S., and Panov, V. *Средновековна Македонија*, vol. 1, Skorje, 1985.
- Arin'on, Ž. (= J. Arrignon), "Международные отношения Киевской Руси в середине X в. и крещение княгини Ольги," *Византийский временник*, 41 (1980) 113–24.
- Astraxanskij, V. "К вопросу о судьбе библиотеки и архива В. Н. Татищева," in S. Lurrov and N. Paramonova, eds., *Книготорговое и библиотечное дело в России в XVII–первой половине XIX в. Сборник научных трудов*, Leningrad, 1981, 85–94.
- Azbelev, S. "Новгородская третья летопись. (Время и обстоятельства возникновения)," *ТОДРЛ*, 12 (1956) 236–62.
- Babišin, S. *Основные тенденции развития школы и просвещения в Древней Руси (X–первая половина XIII вв.)*, Kiev, 1985 (*avtoreferat*).
- Bakalov, G. "La politique culturelle et religieuse de Byzance à l'égard des Slaves," *HUS*, 12/13 (1988/1989) 387–99.
- Baras, G. "О составителях Повести временных лет и ее источниках преимущественно еврейских," in *idem*, *Собрание трудов по вопросу о еврейском элементе в памятниках древнерусской письменности*, vol. ii, Berlin, 1924, 7–263.
- Benešević, V., "Синайский список отцов Никейского первого вселенского собора," *Известия Имп. Акад. наук, VI серия*, 2 (1908) 281–306.
- Bestjužev-Rjumin, K. *Русская история*, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1872.
- Biljarskij, P. "Состав и месяцеслов Мстиславова списка евангелия" *Изв. по ОРЯС*, 10, iii (1861–63) 110–137.
- Birnbaum, H. "The Balkan Slav Component of Medieval Russian Culture," in Birnbaum, ed., *Culture*, 3–30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Old Rus' and the Orthodox Balkans: Differences in Kind, Extent and Significance of the Earlier and Later Cultural Impact," *Cyrrillomethodianum*, 8–9 (1984–85) 1–15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "When and How was Novgorod Converted to Christianity?" *HUS*, 12/13 (1988/1989) 505–30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. , and Flier M., eds., *Medieval Russian Culture (= California Slavic Studies*, 12, 1984).
- Blöndal, S. *The Varangians of Byzantium. An Aspect of Byzantine Military History. Translated, Revised and Rewritten by Benedikt S. Benedikz*, Cambridge, 1978.
- Bodjanskij, O. "Паралипомен Зонарин," *ЧОИДР*, 14 (1847) i–viii, 1–119.
- Bogdan, J., *Cronica lui Constantin Manasses. Traducere medio-bulgară făcută pe la 1350*, Bucarest, 1922.

- Bogdanova, N. "О времени взятия Херсона князем Владимиром," *Византийский временник*, 47 (1986) 39–46.
- Boltin, I. *Ответ генерал-майора Болтина на письмо князя Щербатова, сочинителя Российской истории*, St. Petersburg, 1789.
- Bompaire, J. *Actes de Xéropotamou* (= *Archives de l'Athos*, 3, 1964).
- Воѣков, А. *Миниатюри от Мадридския ръкопис на Йоан Скилица. Изследване върху миниатюрите от ръкописа на Йоан Скилица от XII–XIII век в Мадридската национална библиотека. Със 170 цветни и черно-бели илюстрации*, Sofia, 1972.
- Brajčevs'kuj, M. "Неизвестное письмо патриарха Фотия киевскому кагану Аскольду и митрополиту Михаилу Сирину," *Византийский временник*, 47 (1986) 31–38.
- Broggi Bercoff, G. "Rhetorical Reworking and Ideological Background in the *Istoriija Rossijskaja* of V. N. Tatiščev," *Europa Orientalis*, 7 (1988) 339–60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "V. N. Tatiščev: l'innovation et la tradition," *Europa Orientalis*, 5 (1986) 373–420.
- Browning, R. *Byzantium and Bulgaria. A Comparative Study across the Early Medieval Frontier*, London, 1975.
- Bulanin, D. "Окружное послание. Константинопольского патриарха Фотия в древнерусских рукописях XVI–XVII вв.," *Palaeobulgarica*, 5, ii (1981) 35–54.
- Вуѣков, А. *Описание церковно-славянских и русских рукописных сборников Императорской Публичной библиотеки*, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1882.
- Cankova-Petkova, G. "Културни и политически връзки и отношения между България, Киевска Русия и Византия през средновековието," in D. Angelov, ed. *Връзки*, 71–81.
- Љбатѣј, М. *История християнства на Руси–Україні*, vol. 1, Rome, 1965 (= *Праці Греко-католицької богословської академії*, 24–25).
- Davidson, H. *The Viking Road to Byzantium*, London, 1976.
- Deržavin, N. *Племенные и культурные связи болгарского и русского народов*, Moscow, 1944.
- Despodova, V., and Slaveva, L. *Македонски средновековни ракописи*, vol. 1, Prilep, 1988.
- Dinekov, P. "Българо-руски литературни паралели в средновековието," in *idem*, *Похвала на старата българска литература*, Sofia, 1979, 353–65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Историческата мисия на старобългарската литература," *Старобългарска литература*, 2 (1977) 5–19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "О распространении древнеболгарской литературы на Руси," in V. Vazanov et al., eds., *Русско-болгарские фольклорные и литературные связи*, vol. 1, Leningrad, 1976, 27–31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Старобългарска литература – наша гордост и наша тревога," *Литературна мисъл*, 14, ii (1970) 51–72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. et al., eds. *История на българската литература*, vol. 1, Sofia, 1962.

- Dobszewicz, T. *Wiadomość historyczna o biskupstwie Kijowskim rzymsko-katolickim ot założenia jego aż do roku 1339*, Gniezno, 1883.
- Dölger, F. *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges. 115 Urkunden und 50 Urkundensiegel aus 10. Jahrhunderten*, vol. 1, Munich, 1948.
- . [Review of Mošin, “Русские”], *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 43 (1950) 180; 45 (1952) 209.
- Dostál, A. “Les relations entre Byzance et les Slaves (en particulier les Bulgares) au XIe et XIIe siècles du point de vue culturel,” in Hussey, *Proceedings*, 167–75.
- Dujčev, I. “Центри византийско-славянскогo общения и сотрудничества,” *ТОДРЛ*, 19 (1963) 107–129.
- . “Идеята за приемствеността в средновековната българска държава,” *Известия на Българското историческо дружество*, 27 (1969) 5–19.
- . *The Miniatures of the Chronicle of Manasse (sic)*, Sofia, 1963.
- . “Le Mont Athos et les Slaves au moyen âge,” in Rousseau, *Millénaire*, vol. 2, 121–143.
- . “Някои проблеми на старославянската и старобългарската литература,” *Литературна мисъл*, 13, v (1969) 8–23.
- Durnovo, N. *Введение в историю русского языка*, 2nd ed., Moscow, 1969.
- Dvornik, F. *The Making of Central and Eastern Europe*, London, 1949.
- Džurova, A., Stančev, K. and Japundžić, M. *Catalogo dei manoscritti slavi della Biblioteca Vaticana*, Sofia, 1985.
- Eremin, I. *Литература древней Руси*, Leningrad, 1966.
- Evgenij (Volxovitinov). *Описание Киево-Печерской Лавры, с присовокуплением разных граммат и выписок, объясняющих оное, также планов Лавры и обеих пещер*, Kiev, 1831 (quoted as Лавры).
- . *Описание Киевософийского собора и Киевской иерархии с присовокуплением разных граммат и выписок, объясняющих оное, также планов и фасадов Константинопольской и Киевской Софийской церкви и Ярославова надгробия*, Kiev, 1825 (quoted as Собора).
- Evseev, I. “Григорий пръвизитер, переводчик времени болгарского царя Симеона,” *Изв ОРЯС*, 7, iii (1902) 356–66.
- FHB = *Fontes historiae bulgaricae*, Sofia.
- Fedotov, G. *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality*, New York, 1948.
- Felmy, K., et al., ed. *Tausend Jahre Christentum in Russland. Zum Millenium der Taufe der Kiever Rus'*, Göttingen, 1988.
- Filaret (Gumilevskij). *История русской церкви в пяти периодах*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1857.
- . *Святые южных славян*, Černihiv, 1865.
- Fine, J. *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor, 1983.
- Florovsky, G. *Ways of Russian Theology*, vol. 1, Belmont (Mass.), 1979.
- Franklin, S. “К вопросу о времени и месте перевода Хроники Георгия Амартола на славянский язык,” *ТОДРЛ*, 41 (1988) 324–30.



- Friese, C. *De episcopatu Kioiensi cuius sedes olim fuit Kioviae, nunc vero Zytomiriae in Ukraina, eisque praesulibus brevis commentatio, quam ex Simonis Ocolscii opere et ex variis antiquioribus monumentis descripsit ad praesensque usque tempus perduxit Christianus Gottlieb Friesius*, Warsaw, 1763.
- Fuchs, F. *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter (= Byzantinisches Archiv, 8, 1926).*
- Gajek, J. and Hryniewicz, W., ed. *Chrystus zwyciężył. Wokół Chrztu Rusi Kijowskiej*, Warsaw, 1989.
- Gelzer, H., Hilgenfeld, H., and Cuntz, O. *Patrum Nicaenorum nomina latine, graece, coptice, syriace, arabice, armenice*, Leipzig, 1898 (= *Scriptores sacri et profani*, vol. 2).
- Georgiev, E. "Начало болгаро-руских культурных и литературных связей," in Angelov, *Връзки*, 12–22.
- . *Разцветът на българската литература в IX–X в.*, Sofia, 1962.
- Georgiev, P. "L'église bulgare à la fin de (sic) Xe siècle et au début de (sic) XIe siècle," *Miscellanea Bulgarica*, 5 (1987) 241–46.
- . "L'organisation religieuse dans les terres bulgares du Nord-Est après l'an 971," in *Dobrudža. Études ethno-culturelles. Recueil d'articles*, ed. D. Angelov and D. Oвčarov, Sofia, 1987, 146–58.
- Giljarov, F. *Предания русской начальной летописи*, Moscow, 1878.
- Goetz, L. *Kirchenrechtliche und kulturgeschichtliche Denkmäler Altrusslands nebst Geschichte des russischen Kirchenrechts (= Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, 18–19, 1905).*
- Golubinskij, E. *История русской церкви*, vol. 1, pt. 1 (= *ЧОИДР*, vol. 198, 1901).
- . "Обращение всей Руси в христианство Владимиром и совершенное утверждение в ней христианской веры при его переимниках," *ЖМНП*, 190 (1877) 100–63; 191 (1877) 26–47.
- . "О так называемой Иоакимовской летописи Татищева," *Прибавления к изданию Творений Святых Отцев в русском переводе*, 28 (1881) 602–40.
- Gorlin, M. "La chronique de Joachim," *Revue des études slaves*, 19 (1939) 40–51.
- Grabar, A. "Les illustrations de la Chronique de Jean Skylitzès à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Madrid," *Cahiers archéologiques. Fin de l'Antiquité et Moyen Age*, (1971) 191–211.
- Granić, J. "Kirchenrechtliche Glossen zu den von Kaiser Basileios II dem autokephalen Erzbisum von Achrida verliehenen Privilegien," *Byzantion*, 12 (1937) 395–415.
- Graševa, L. "Старославянски литератури в ново осветление," *Литературна мисъл*, 13, iii (1969) 62–71.
- Grigorič, V. *Очерк путешествия по европейской Турции. (Скартой окрестностей Охридского и Преспанского озер)*, Moscow, 1877.
- . [as reported in] "Протоколы заседаний Съезда," *Труды третьего Археологического Съезда в России бывшего в Киеве в августе 1874 года*, vol. 1, Kiev, 1878, xvii-lxxxv, cf. lxiv-lxv.

- Grumel, V. *La Chronologie (= Traité d'études byzantines*, 1, 1958).
- Gudzij, N. "Литература Киевской Руси и древнейшие инославянские литературы," in A. Robinson, ed., *Исследования по славянскому литературоведению и фольклористике. Доклады советских ученых на V Международном съезде славистов*, Moscow, 1960, 7–60.
- Hannick, C. "Der slavobulgarische Faktor bei der Christianisierung der Kiever Rus'," in *Slavistische Studien zum X. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Sofia 1988*, ed. R. Olesch and H. Rothe (= *Slavistische Forschungen*, 54, 1988), 345–55.
- Hoffman, J. "Początki hierarchii kościoła wschodniego na Wołyńi," *Rocznik Polskiego towarzystwa naukowego na Obczyźnie*, 6 (1955–56) 72–75.
- Honigmann, E. "Studies in Slavic Church History," *Byzantion*, 17 (1944–45) 128–82.
- Hösch, E. "Griechischkenntnisse im alten Russland," in W. Gesemann *et al.*, eds., *Serta slavica in memoriam Aloisii Schmaus*, Munich, 1971, 250–60.
- Hruševs'kyj, M. *Исторія України Руси*, vol. 3 (= *Збірник історично-філософської секції Наукового Товариства імені Шевченка*, vol. 3, 1901).
- Hussey, J., *et al.*, ed. *Proceedings of the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies. Oxford, 5–10 September 1966*, London, 1967.
- Ikonnikov, V. *Опыт русской историографии*, vol. 2, pt. 1, Kiev, 1908.
- Il'inskij, G. "Към въпроса за българското влияние върху староруското църковно право," *Български преглед*, 1, ii (1929) 243–48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Погодинские кирилло–глаголические листки," *Byzantinoslavica*, 1 (1929) 86–118.
- Povajskij, D. "Историко-критические заметки," *Русский вестник*, 199, xii (1888) 3–18.
- Issatschenko, A. *Geschichte der russischen Sprache*, vol. 1, Heidelberg, 1980.
- Istrin, V. *Александрия русских хронографов. Исследование и текст (= ЧОИДР*, 168–69, 1894).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Из области древне-русской литературы, iii," *ЖМНП*, 350 (1903) 167–86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Очерк истории древнерусской литературы домосковского период (11–13 вв.)*, Petrograd, 1922.
- Ivanov, J. *Северна Македония. Исторически издирвания*, Sofia, 1906.
- Jacobs, A., ed. ΖΩΝΑΡΑΣ – ZONARA. *Die byzantinische Geschichte bei Joannes Zonaras in slavischer Übersetzung (= Slavische Propyläen*, 98, 1970).
- Janin, V. "День десятого века," *Знание–сила*, 3 (1983) 15–18.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Как и когда крестили новгородцев," *Наука и религия*, 11 (1983) 28–31.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Крещение Новгорода и христианизация его населения," in Tolstoj, *Введение*, 61–63.
- Jugie, M. "Les origines romaines de l'Église russe," *Échos d'Orient*, 40 (1937) no. 187, 257–70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Le schisme byzantin. Aperçu historique et doctrinal*, Paris, 1941.

- Kalajdovič, K. *Иоанн Ексарх Болгарский. Исследование, объясняющее историю словенского языка и литературы IX и X столетий*, Moscow, 1824.
- Kaliganov, I. "Историко-литературные проблемы южнославянского влияния на Русь," *Славянские литературы, X Международный съезд славистов, София, сентябрь 1988 г. Доклады Советской делегации*, ed. P. Nikolaev, Moscow, 1988, 51–66.
- . "Несколько соображений о методике изучения болгаро-сербско-русских средневековых литературных связей," *Старобългарска литература*, 18 (1985) 58–73.
- Karamzin, N. *История государства российского*, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1818<sup>2</sup> (1842<sup>5</sup>).
- Karskij, E. *Славянская кирилловская палеография*, Leningrad, 1928.
- Kartašev, A. *Очерки по истории русской церкви*, vol. 1, Paris, 1959.
- Kavko, A., ed., "Круглый стол: 1000-летие христианизации Руси," *Советское славяноведение*, 6 (1988) 10–75.
- Kawerau, P. *Ostkirchengeschichte*, vol. 4 (= *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientantium*, 456, 1984).
- Klimenko, M. *Die Ausbreitung des Christentums in Russland seit Vladimir dem Heiligen bis zum 17. Jahrhundert. Versuch einer Übersicht nach russischen Quellen*, Berlin, 1969.
- Kloss, V. *Никоновский свод и русские летописи XVI-XVII веков*, Moscow, 1980.
- Kočev, N. "Die Anfänge der russisch-bulgarischen literarischen Kontakte," in Felmy, *Jahre*, 503–509.
- Koch, H. "Byzanz, Ochrid und Kiev, 987–1037. Zur 950. Wiederkehr des angeblichen Taufjahres (988–1938)," *Kyrios*, 4 (1938) 253–92.
- . "Ochrid und Byzanz im Kampf um die Christianisierung Alt-Reussens (Kievs)," *Bulgaria. Jahrbuch der Deutsch-bulgarischen Gesellschaft*, Leipzig, 1940–41, 143–49.
- Koncevičius, J. *Russia's Attitude towards Union with Rome (9th-16th Centuries)*, Washington, 1927.
- Konidares, G. "Zur Frage der Entstehung der Diöcese des Erzbistums von Achrida und der Notitiae No. 3 bei Parthey," *Θεολογία*, 30 (1959) 1–19.
- Kotkov, S. ed. *Успенский сборник XII-XIII веков*, Moscow, 1971.
- Kovalevsky, P. "L'église russe en 1054," in O. Rousseau, ed., *1054–1954. L'église et les églises, neuf siècles de douloureuse séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Études et travaux offerts à Dom Lambert Beaudouin*, vol. 1, Chevetogne, 1954, 475–83.
- Krâstanov, T. "Грамоти на византийски императори за Охридската архиепископия," *Известия. Църковноисторически и архивен институт. Централен църковен историкоархеологически музей*, 2 (1984) 62–69.
- Kratchkovsky, I., and Vasiliev, A. "Histoire de Yaḥyā-ibn-Sa'īd d'Antioche, continuateur de Sa'īd-ibn-Bitriq," *Patrologia orientalis*, 18 (1924) 705–833, 23 (1932) 345–520.
- Kronsteiner, O. "Zur Literatursprache der Kiewer Rus'," *Die slawischen Sprachen*, 15 (1988) 7–14.

- Kuev, K. *Съдбата на старо-българските ръкописи през вековете*, 2nd ed., Sofia, 1986.
- Kulczynski, I. *Specimen ecclesiae ruthenicae ab origine susceptae fidei ad nostra usque tempora in suis capitibus seu primatibus Russiae cum S. Sede Apostolica Romana semper unitae*, ed. I. Martinov, Tournai, 1859.
- Kumor, B. "Problem jedności Kościoła na Rusi z Kościołem katolickim do końca XII wieku," in Gajek, *Chrystus*, 45–53.
- Kuz'min, A. "Крещение Руси" в трудах русских и советских историков, Moscow, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Об источниковедческой основе .Истории Российской. В. Н. Татищева," *Вопросы истории* 9 (1963) 214–18.
- Labunka, M. "Religious Centers and their Missions to Kievan Rus': From Ol'ga to Volodimer," *HUS*, 12/13 (1988/1989) 159–93.
- Laehr, G. *Die Anfänge des russischen Reiches. Politische Geschichte im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert (=Historische Studien, 189, 1930).*
- Laurent, V. "Aux origines de l'église russe. L'établissement de la hiérarchie byzantine," *Échos d'Orient*, 38 (1939) 279–95.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Le Corpus des sceaux de l'Empire byzantin*, vol. 5, pt. 1, Paris, 1963.
- Lavrovskij, P. "Исследование о летописи Якимовской," *Ученые записки Второго отделения Императорской Академии наук*, 2, i (1856) 77–160.
- Lebedincev, P. "К вопросу о киевском митрополите XII века Михаиле," *Чтения в Историческом общ. Нестора летописца*, 10 (1896) 3–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "О начале христианства в Киеве до торжественного принятия христианской веры при святом Владимире, *Киевская старина*, 21 (1888) 265–83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "По поводу 900-летия черниговской архиерейской кафедры," *Киевская старина*, 38–9 (1892).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Примечания к 'Догадке' А. С. Павлова," *Чтения в Историч. общ. Нестора летописца*, 11 (1896) 27–33.
- Lemerle, P. et al., ed. *Actes de Lavra*, vol. 1 (= *Archives de l'Athos*, 5, 1970).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Actes de Pantéléémôn (= Archives de l'Athos*, 12, 1982).
- Leonid (Kavelin), "Древняя рукопись," *Русский вестник*, 201, iv (1889) 3–24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Несколько новых замечаний к нашей статье: .Откуда родом была святая великая княгиня Ольга? (Русская старина, июль 1888 г.) – по поводу статьи И. И. Малышевского: .О происхождении великой княгини Ольги святой. (Киевская старина 1889 г., месяц июль и август)," *Киевская старина*, 27 (1889) i–viii.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Откуда родом была святая великая княгиня русская Ольга?" *Русская старина*, 49 (1888) 215–24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Отрывок (начало) старого русского летописца (862–1174 год) конца XV века," *Владимирские епархиальные ведомости*, 10 (1886), unofficial part, 295–99.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Систематическое описание славяно-российских рукописей собрания Графа А. С. Уварова. (Со включением 750 номеров собрания И. Н. Цар-*

- ского, описанных П. М. Строевым в алфавитном порядке), vol. 1, Moscow, 1893; vol. 3, Moscow, 1894.
- Levčenko, M. *Очерки по истории русско-византийских отношений*, Moscow, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Взаимоотношения Византии и Руси при Владимире," *Византийский временник*, 7 (1953) 194–223.
- Lewin, P., ed. *Seventeenth-Century Writings on the Kievan Caves Monastery* (= *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: Texts*, vol. 4, 1987).
- Litavrin, G. *Болгария и Византия в XI–XII вв.*, Moscow, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Культурный переворот в Болгарии и Древняя Русь," *Кирило-Методиевски студии*, 4 (1987) 393–403.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "О датировке посольства княгини Ольги в Константинополь," *История СССР*, 5 (1981) 173–83.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Путешествие русской княгини Ольги в Константинополь. Проблема источников," *Византийский временник*, 42 (1981) 35–48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Русско-византийские связи в середине X века," *Вопросы истории*, 6 (1986) 41–52.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Florja, B. "Принятие христианства народами Центральной и Юго-Восточной Европы и крещение Руси (некоторые сравнительные сопоставления)," *Советское славяноведение*, 4 (1988) 60–67.
- Lixačev, D. "Древнеславянские литературы как система," *Славянские литературы. VI Международный съезд славистов. (Прага, август 1968). Доклады советской делегации*, ed. D. Markov and A. Robinson, Moscow, 1968, 5–48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Големият свят на руската литература. Изследвания и статии*, Sofia, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Развитие русской литературы X–XVII веков. Эпохи и стили*, Leningrad, 1973.
- Lunt, H. G. "On Interpreting the Russian Primary Chronicle: the Year 1037," *SEEJ*, 32 (1988) 251–64.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Language of Rus' in the Eleventh Century: Some Observations about Facts and Theories," *HUS*, 12/13 (1988/1989) 276–313.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Izbormik of 1073," *HUS*, 7 (1983) 359–76.
- Lužnyc'kuj, G. *Українська церква між Сходом і Заходом. Нарис історії Української церкви*, Philadelphia, 1954.
- Makarij (Bulgakov), *История русской церкви*, vol. 1, St. Petersburg, 1889.
- Malyševskij, I. "Кто был первый митрополит Киевский?" *Труды Киевской духовной академии*, 3, x (1883) 123–71.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Происхождение русской великой княгини Ольги святой," *Киевская старина*, 26 (1889) 1–27, 325–53.
- Mamalakes, I. *Τὸ Ἅγιον Ὅρος (Ἄθος) διὰ μέσου τῶν αἰώνων* (= *Μακεδονικὴ βιβλιοθήκη*, 33, 1971).
- Mansi, J. *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 3, Florence, 1759.
- Меџев, К. "Цар Иван Асен Втори и литература. (Въпросът за приемствеността в развоја на българската книжнина от XI до XIII век)," *Търновска*

- книжовна школа*, vol. 3, Sofia, 1984, 19–25.
- Meyer, P. *Die Haupturkunden für die Geschichte der Athosklöster*, Leipzig, 1894.
- Mixajlov, E. “Българо-руските културни взаимоотношения от края на X до 30–те години на XIII в. в руската и българската историография,” *Годишник на Софийския университет, Философско-исторически факултет*, 60 (1967) 193–258.
- . “Киевска Русия и България през X в.,” in V. Angelov, ed., *Връзки*, 62–70.
- . “Руси и българи през ранното средновековие (602–964),” *Годишник на Софийския университет, Исторически факултет*, 66 (1972–73) 77–143.
- Morgajlo, V. “Работа В. Н. Тагицева над текстом Иоакимовской летописи,” *Археографический ежегодник за 1962 год*, (1963), 260–68.
- Mošin, V. “Novgorodski listići i Ostromirovo jevandjelje,” *Arheografski prilozi*, 5 (1983) 7–64.
- . “О периодизации русско-южнославянских литературных связей X–XV веков,” *ТОДРЛ*, 19 (1963) 28–106.
- . “Послание русского митрополита Леона об опресноках в Охридской рукописи,” *Byzantinoslavica* 24 (1963) 87–105.
- . “Русские на Афоне и русско-византийские отношения в XI–XII вв.,” *Byzantinoslavica* 9 (1947–48) 55–85; 11(1950) 32–60.
- Müller, L. “Die Chronik-Erzählung über die Taufe Vladimirs des Heiligen,” in *Slavistische Studien zum X. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Sofia 1988*, ed. R. Olesch and H. Rothe (= *Slavistische Forschungen*, 54, 1988), 429–48.
- . *Die Taufe Russlands. Die Frühgeschichte des russischen Christentums bis zum Jahre 988* (= *Quellen und Studien zur russischen Geistesgeschichte*, 6, 1987).
- . *Zum Problem des hierarchischen Status und der jurisdiktionellen Abhängigkeit der russischen Kirche vor 1039* (= *Osteuropa und der deutsche Osten*, Reihe 3, vol. 6, 1959).
- Nasonov, A. *Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов*, Leningrad, 1950.
- Nazarko, I. *Святий Володимир Великий, Володар і Христитель Руси-України (960–1015)*, Rome, 1954 (= *Analecta ordinis Sancti Basilii Magni. Sectio I, Opera*, 4).
- Bishop Nestor of Smoljan, “Крещение Руси по данным Иоакимовской летописи,” *Palaeobulgarica*, 12, ii (1988) 3–7.
- Nikolaev, N. *Славянобългарският фактор в християнизацията на Киевска Русия*, Sofia, 1949.
- Nikol'skij, N. K. “Повесть временных лет как источник для истории начального периода русской письменности и культуры. К вопросу о древнейшем русском летописании,” vol. 1, *Сборник по русскому языку и словесности Академии наук СССР*, 2, i, (1930) 1–107.
- Nikol'skij, N. M. *История русской церкви*, Rjazan', 1931<sup>1</sup> (Moscow, 1983<sup>3</sup>).

- Obolensky, D. "The Baptism of Princess Olga of Kiev: the Problem of the Sources," in H. Ahrweiler, ed., *Philadelphie et autres études*, (= *Byzantina-Sorbonensia*, 4) Paris, 1984, 159–76.
- . *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism*, Cambridge, 1948.
- . "Ol'ga's Conversion: The Evidence Reconsidered," *HUS*, 12/13 (1988/1989) 145–58.
- . "Rus' i Bizancjum w połowie X stulecia: problem chrztu księżnej Olgi," in Gajek, *Chrystus*, 29–43.
- Obolenskij, M. *Исследования и заметки князя М. А. Оболенского по русским и славянским древностям. (Приложения к сочинению его: «О первоначальной русской летописи», Москва, 1870, и др. статьи)*, St. Petersburg, 1875.
- . "Летописец Переяславля-Суздальского, составленный в начале XIII века (между 1214 и 1219 гг.)," *Временник Имп. Московского общества истории и древностей российских*, 9 (1851) i-c, 1–113.
- . *Несколько слов о первоначальной русской летописи*, Moscow, 1870.
- Okolski, S. *Chioviensium et Czernichoviensium episcoporum sanctae et catholicae Ecclesiae Romanae ordo et numerus descriptus*, Lviv, 1646.
- Orłowski, K. *Defensa Biskupstwa у Dycezyi Kiiowskiej rzetelnym opisaniem z przydatkami niektórymi dla niey potrzebnemi, swiatu remonstrwana*, Lviv, 1748.
- Rančenko, A. "Эстетические аспекты христианизации Руси," *Русская литература*, 1 (1988) 50–59.
- Bishop Partenij of Leucas, "Свети патриарси в България и от български произход," in *Десет години Българска патриаршия, 10 май 1953–10 май 1963*, ed. G. Klisarov, J. Iliev and T. Sâbev, Sofia, 1963, 61–77.
- Parxomenko, V. *Начало христианства Руси*, Poltava, 1913.
- Paszkievicz, H. *The Origin of Russia*, London, 1954.
- Pavlov, A. "Догадка о происхождении древнерусского предания, которое называет первого русского митрополита Михаилом Сирином," *Чтения в Историческом обществе Нестора летописца*, 11 (1896) 22–6.
- Pavlova, R. "Древните българо-руски книжовни и езикови връзки," in B. Kastelov and V. Simeonov, eds., *Българистика и българисти. Статии и изследвания. Българистика в чужбината. Портрети на българисти*, Sofia, 1981, 101–106.
- . "Нов Владимирски летописец," *Език и литература*, 35, v (1980) 1–11.
- Pavlovskij, A. *Всеобщий иллюстрированный путеводитель по монастырям и святым местам Российской Империи и Святой горе Афону*, Nižnyj Novgorod, 1907.
- Pelesz, J. *Geschichte der Union der ruthenischen Kirche mit Rom von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*, vol. 1, Vienna, 1878.
- Pešič, S. "Необходимое дополнение к новому изданию «Истории Российской». В. Н. Татищева (тт. I–VII. Изд. АН СССР, 1962–68)," in A. Šarigo, ed., *Проблемы истории феодальной России, Сборник статей к 60-летию проф. В. В.*

- Мавродина, Leningrad, 1971, 215–22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Русская историография XVIII века,” vol. 1, Leningrad, 1961.
- Petkanova-Toteva, D. “Книжовни връзки между България и Русия през средновековието,” *Език и литература*, 5 (1958) 362–74.
- Petrov, N. “Про різьблену панагію з Звірнецьких печер, що ніби-то належала першому Київському мітрополіту Михаїлу Сирину,” *Записки Історично-філологічного відділу Всеукраїнської академії наук*, 1 (1919) 114–16.
- Petrov, V. *Воспитание и обучение в древнерусском государстве IX–XV веков*, Moscow, 1982 (avtoreferat).
- Picchio, R. “The Impact of Ecclesiastical Culture on Old Russian Literary Techniques,” in Birnbaum, ed., *Culture*, 247–279.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (Pikio). “Мястото на старата българска литература в културата на средновековна Европа,” *Първи международен конгрес по българистика. София 23 май – 3 юни 1981. Доклади. Пленарни доклади*, Sofia, 1982, 110–160.
- Platon (Levšin), *Краткая церковная российская история*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1805.
- Pobedova, O. “Отражение византийских иллюстрированных хроник в Тверском (Троицком) списке Хроники Георгия Амартола,” *Actes du XIVe Congrès International des Études Byzantines. Bucarest, 6–12 septembre, 1971*, vol. 1, Bucharest, 1974, 373–90.
- Podskalsky, G. *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988–1237)*, Munich, 1982.
- Pogorelov, V. “Кой покръсти русите?” *Славянска беседа*, 2, iv (1938) 146–53.
- Polons'ka-Vasylenko, N. *Історичні підвалини Української православної церкви*, Munich, 1964.
- Porov, G. *Триодни произведения на Константин Преславски (= Кирило-Методиевски студии*, vol. 2, 1985).
- Porov, G. V. “Заметки о тверской рукописи Хроники Георгия Амартола (позднейшие доделки и вопросы реконструкции первоначального облика кодекса),” *Византийский временник*, 39 (1978) 124–47.
- Porov, N. A. “Материалы для истории Крестовоздвиженского Бизюкова монастыря,” *ЧОИД,Р* 161 (1891) 1–45.
- Poppe, A. “Christianisierung und Kirchenorganisation der Ostslawen in der Zeit vom 10. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert,” *Österreichische Osthefte*, 30 (1988) 457–506.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Ис курилоцѣ” и “Ис куриловицѣ,” *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics*, 31–32 (1985) 319–50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. [entry Michał] *Słownik starożytności słowiańskich*, vol. 3, Warsaw, 1967, 242–43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Political Background to the Baptism of Rus'. Byzantine-Russian Relations between 986–89.” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 30 (1976) 197–244.
- Poruženko, M. “България и Киевска Русь,” *Родина* 1, iii (1939) 25–31.



- Potapov, P. "Судьба хроники Зонары в славяно-русской литературе," *ИзвОРЯС*, 22, ii (1917) 141–86.
- Priselkov, M. *Очерки по церковно-политической истории Киевской Руси*, (= *Записки Историко-филологического факультета Императорского Санкт-Петербургского университета*, vol. 116, 1913).
- Pritsak, O. "When and Where was Ol'ga Baptized?" *HUS*, 9 (1985) 5–21.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Struminsky, B., eds. *Lev Krevza's Obrona iednosci cerkiewney and Zaharija Kopystenskyj's Palinodija*, (= *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*, 3, 1987)
- Prokić, B. "Postanak Ohridskog patrijarhata," *Glas Srpske Kralj. Akad. nauka*, 90 (1912) 175–267.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Prvi arhiepiskop Jovan" *Glas Srpske Kralj. Akad. nauka*, 88 (1911) 267–303.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Zusätze in der Handschrift des Joannes Scylitzes codex Vin-dobonensis hist. graec. LXXIV. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des sogenannten westbulgarischen Reiches*, Munich, 1906.
- Prosvirnin, A. "Афон и Русская церковь. Библиография," *Богословские труды*, 15 (1976) 185–256.
- Protasov, N. "Черты староболгарской одежды в славянской миниатюре," *Труды Секции археологии и искусствознания*, 3 (1929) 87–95.
- Rajkov, D. *Българите и България в старата руска книжнина. Документален разказ за българското историческо наследство в руската книжнина от XVIII век и първата половина на XIX век*, Sofia, 1983.
- Ramm, V. *Папство и Русь в X-XV веках*, Moscow, 1959.
- Rapov, O. "О дате принятия христианства князем Владимиром и киевлянами," *Вопросы истории*, 6 (1984) 34–47.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Русская церковь в IX–первой трети XII в. Принятие христианства*, Moscow, 1988.
- Rogov, A. "Культурные связи Киевской Руси с Балканскими странами," in N. Todorov *et al.*, eds. *Славянские культуры и Балканы*, vol. 1, Sofia, 1978, 42–49;
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Русско-болгарские культурные связи в конце XII-XIII в.," in E. Demina, ed., *Язык и письменность среднеболгарского периода*, Moscow, 1982, 20–26.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Культурные связи Киевской Руси со славянскими странами в период ее христианизации," in Tolstoj, *Введение*, 34–36.
- Rousseau, O., ed. *Le Millénaire du Mont Athos 963–1963. Études et Mélanges*, 2 vols., Chevetogne, 1963–64.
- Rozen, V. (= W. von Rosen.) *Император Василий Болгаробойца. Извлечения из летописи Яхьи Антиохийского*, (= *Записки Имп. Акад. наук*, 41, 1883, app. 1).
- Rudnev, N. *Рассуждение о ересях и расколах, бывших в русской церкви со времени Владимира Великого до Иоанна Грозного*, Moscow, 1838.
- Russov, S. *О сагах в отношении к русской истории, или вообще о древней Руси*, St. Petersburg, 1834.

- Rybakov, V. "В. Н. Татищев и летописи XII века," *История СССР*, 1 (1971) 91–109.
- , ed., *Изборник Святослава 1073 года. Сборник статей*, Moscow, 1977.
- Rykov, Ju. and Turilov, A. "Неизвестный эпизод болгаро-византийско-русских связей XI в. (Киевский писатель Григорий Философ)," *Древнейшие государства на территории СССР. Материалы и исследования. 1980 год*, Moscow, 1984, 170–76.
- Sabev, T. "Millénaire de coopération ecclésiastique bulgare-russe. Aspects essentiels et principaux éléments," in Felmy, *Jahre*, 831–848.
- Sábev, T. *Самостояна народностна църква в средновековна България. Християнизаторски процес, основаване и възход, автокефалия и междуцърковно положение. Църква и държава, роля и значение*, Sofia, 1987.
- Sansterre, J. "Les Missionnaires latins, grecs et orientaux en Bulgarie dans la seconde moitié du IXe siècle," *Byzantion*, 52 (1982) 375–88.
- Scheffer, L. *Textkritischer Apparat zur Nestorchronik* (= *Handbuch zur Nestorchronik*, vol. 2, ed. L. Müller, *Forum slavicum*, 49, 1977).
- Schick, E. *Kirchengeschichte Russlands in den Grundzügen*, vol. 1, Basel, 1945.
- Schiwaroff, N. "Die Rolle Bulgariens bei der Taufe der Kiewer Rus," *Die slawischen Sprachen*, 16 (1988) 143–53.
- Schlözer, A. L., *Probe Russischer Annalen*, Bremen, 1768.
- Schmücker, A. "Bemerkungen zur Genese der bulgarisch-russischen literarischen Wechselseitigkeit im Mittelalter," in P. Hill, ed., *Bulgarien 1300. Referate der Sektion "Sprache und Literatur" des Symposiums Bulgarien in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Hamburg 9.-17. Mai 1981 (= *Slavistische Beiträge*, vol. 155, 1982), 89–97.
- Seliščev, A. *Старославянский язык*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1951.
- Senkovskij, O. I., *Еймундова сага. Сказание об Еймунде Ринговиче и Рагнаре Агнарвиче, скандинавских витязях, поселившихся в России в начале XI века*, St. Petersburg, 1834.
- Serebrjanskij, I. "Древне-русские княжеские жития. Обзор редакций и тексты," *ЧОИДР*, 254 (1915) i-iv, 1–295, 1–186, i-v.
- Shevelov, G. *Die kirchenslavischen Elemente in der russischen Literatursprache und die Rolle A. Šaxmatovs bei ihrer Erforschung*, in A. Šaxmatov and G. Shevelov, *Die kirchenslavischen Elemente in der modernen russischen Literatursprache*, Wiesbaden, 1960, 43–106.
- Sielicki, T. "Opatrzność Boska w życiu narodu i człowieka na kartach najstarszej kroniki ruskiej," in *Gajek, Chrystus*, 81–93.
- Smokina (= Smochinā), N. P. and N. N. "Вновь найденный фрагмент древнего евангелия," in V. Dubrovina, ed., *Изучение русского языка и источниковедение*, Moscow, 1969, 68–79.
- Snegarov, I. *Духовно-културни връзки между България и Русия през средните векове (X-XV в.)*, Sofia, 1950.
- . *История на Охридската архиепископия (от основаването и до завладяването на Балканския полуостровот турците*, vol. 1, Sofia, 1924.

- Sobolevskij, A. "Из церковно-славянской учительной литературы," *ИзвОРЯС*, 13, iv (1908) 264–89.
- . "Материалы и исследования в области славянской филологии и археологии," *СБОРЯС*, 88, iii (1910) 1–286.
- . "Памятники древне-русской литературы, посвященные Владимиру святому," *Чтения в Историческом обществе Нестора летописца*, 2 (1888).
- . "Шестоднев Кирилла Философа," *ИзвОРЯС*, 6, ii (1901) 177–202.
- Soloviev, A. "Un sceau gréco-russe au XIe siècle," *Byzantion*, 40 (1970) 435–36.
- Solov'ev, S. *История России с древнейших времен*, vol. 1, Moscow, 1959.
- Soxan', P. *Очерки по истории на украинско-български връзки*, Sofia, 1979.
- Speranskij, M. *Из истории русско-славянских литературных связей. Сборник статей*, Moscow, 1960.
- . "Откуда идут старейшие памятники русской письменности и литературы?" *Slavia*, 7 (1928–29) 516–35.
- Stokes, A. "The Status of the Russian Church, 988–1037," *Slavonic and East European Review*, 37 (1958–59) 430–42.
- Stökl, G. *Russische Geschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, (= *Kroners Taschenausgabe*, 244, 1962).
- . "Christianisierung, Nationenbildung und Reichsidee," *Die slawischen Sprachen*, 16 (1988) 155–66.
- Stroev, P. *Списки иерархов и настоятелей монастырей Российской церкви*, St. Petersburg, 1877.
- Stroganov, P. "Ставропигиальный Бизюков монастырь и Смоленские епископы," *ЧИОДР* 212 (1905) 41–67.
- Šambinago, S. "Иоакимовская летопись," *Исторические записки* 21 (1947) 254–70.
- Šaxmatov, A. "Древнеболгарская энциклопедия X века," *Византийский временник*, 7 (1900) 1–35.
- . "Корсунская легенда о крещении Владимира," in *Сборник статей, посвященных почитателями академику и заслуженному профессору В. И. Ламанскому по случаю пятидесятилетия его ученой деятельности*, vol. 2 (= *Записки Историко-филол. фак. Имп. Санкт-Петербургского унив.*, vol. 84, 1908), 1029–1153.
- . "Разыскания о древнейших русских летописных сводах," *Летопись занятий Имп. Археографической ком. за 1907*, 20 (1908) i–xx, 1–686.
- . "Заметки к древнейшей истории русской церковной жизни," *Научный исторический журнал*, 4 (1914) 30–61.
- Ščarov, Ja. *Древнерусские княжеские уставы XI–XV веков*, Moscow, 1976 (quoted as *Веков*).
- . *Княжеские уставы и церковь в древней Руси XI–XIV веков*, Moscow, 1972.
- . *Византийское и южнославянское правовое наследие на Руси в XI–XIII веках*, Moscow, 1978.
- Ščerpkina, M. "К вопросу о просвещении Руси," in *Плиска-Преслав. Прочувания и*

- материали*, ed. H. Vâžarova, vol. 1, Sofia, 1979, 200–205.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “К изучению Изборника 1073 года,” in Rybakov, *Изборник*, 220–34.
- Ševčenko, I. *Byzantine Roots of Ukrainian Christianity*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1984.
- Šmidt (=Schmidt), O., ed. *Сводный каталог славяно-русских книг, хранящихся в СССР. XI–XIII вв.* Moscow, 1984.
- Tachiaos, A. Πηγές ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ἱστορίας τῶν ὀρθοδόξων Σλάβων, vol. 1, Thessalonica, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Greek Metropolitans of Kievan Rus’: An Evaluation of Their Spiritual and Cultural Activity,” *HUS*, 12/13 (1988/1989) 424–39.
- Tal’berg, N. *История русской церкви*, Jordanville [New York], 1959.
- Tatiščev, V. *История Российской в семи томах*, vols. 1–2, Leningrad, 1962–63.
- Taube, M. de. *Rome et Russie avant l’invasion des Tartares*, vol. 1, Paris, 1947.
- Thompson, M. *Novgorod the Great. Excavations at the Medieval City Directed by A. V. Artsikhovskiy and B. A. Kolchin*, London, 1967.
- Thomson, F. “Continuity in the Development of Bulgarian Culture during the Period of Byzantine Hegemony and the Slavonic Translations of Works by the Three Cappadocian Fathers,” to appear in the *acta* of the conference “The Role and Significance of SS. Cyril and Methodius for the Spiritual and Cultural Cooperation between the Balkan Nations – 9th–10th Centuries,” Sofia, 10–16 June, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Implications of the Absence of Quotations of Untranslated Greek Works in Original Early Russian Literature, Together with a Critique of a Distorted Picture of Early Bulgarian Culture,” *Slavica Gandensia*, 15 (1988) 63–91.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Made in Russia’. A Survey of the Translations Allegedly Made in Kievan Russia,” to appear in the *acta* of the conference “Millenium Russiae Christianae. Tausend Jahre Christliches Russland, 988–1988,” Münster, 5–9 July, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Quotations of Patristic and Byzantine Works by Early Russian Authors as an Indication of the Cultural Level of Kievan Russia, *Slavica Gandensia*, 10 (1983) 65–102.
- Thurn, I(oannes=Hans), *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum. Editio princeps.* (= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, vol. 5, 1973).
- Tinnefeld, F. “Die russische Fürstin Olga bei Konstantin VII. und das Problem der ‘purpurborenen Kinder’,” *Russia Mediaevalis*, 6, i (1987) 30–37.
- Tixomirov, M. *Древняя Русь*, Moscow, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Исторические связи русского народа с южными славянами с древнейших времен до половины XVII века,” in V. Pičeta, ed., *Славянский сборник*, Moscow, 1947, 125–201.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Русское летописание*, Moscow, 1979.
- Todorov, N. *et al.*, eds. *Славянские культуры и Балканы*, vol. 1, Sofia, 1978.
- Tolstoj, N., ed. *Введение христианства у народов Центральной и Восточной Европы. Крещение Руси. (Сборник тезисов)*, Moscow, 1987.
- Togan, A. Zeki Validi. *Ibn Faḍlān’s Reisebericht* (= *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. 24, 1939, fasc. 3).

- Tot (=Tóth), I. "Исторические предпосылки возникновения и распространения древнеболгарской письменности на Руси," *Dissertationes slavicae, Sectio linguistica*, 16 (1984) 149–99.
- Trillmich, W. *Thietmar von Merseburg, Chronik*, (= *Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, vol. 9, 1974).
- Tschižewskij (= Čuževs'kyj), D. *Geschichte der altrussischen Literatur im 11., 12., und 13. Jahrhundert. Kiever Epoche*, Frankfurt, 1948.
- Turilov, A. "Григорий Философ—неизвестен книжовник от XI век," in I. Rexli Ivanov, ed., *Българистика и българисти. Статии и изследвания. Българистика в чужбина. Портрети на българисти*. 1981–1986, Sofia, 1986, 186–89.
- Tvorogov, O. *Древнерусские хронографы*, Leningrad, 1975.
- Uspenskij, B. *История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)* (= *Sagers slavistische Sammlung*, 12), Munich, 1987.
- Vaillant, A. "La Bulgarie dans la chronique de Kiev," *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 23 (1957) 207–211.
- Vasenko, P. 'Книга Степенная царского родословия' и ее значение в древнерусской исторической письменности, vol. 1 (= *Записки Историко-филологического факультета Имп. Санкт-Петербургского университета*, vol. 73), 1904.
- Vasil'evskij, V. "Русско-византийские отрывки, ii," *ЖМНП* vol. 184 (1876) 117–78.
- Verdière, C. "Origines catholiques de l'église russe jusqu'au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Études de théologie, de philosophie et d'histoire*, 2 (1857) 131–304.
- Vernadsky, G. "The Status of the Russian Church during the First Half-Century Following Vladimir's Conversion," *Slavonic and Eastern European Review*, 20 (1941) 294–314.
- Vincenz, A. de. "West Slavic Elements in the Literary Language of Kievan Rus'," *HUS*, 12/13 (1988/1989) 262–75.
- Vlasovs'kyj, I. *Нарис історії Української Православної церкви*, vol. 1, New York, 1955.
- Vlasto, A. *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom. An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs*, Cambridge, 1970.
- Vodoff, W. *La naissance de la chrétienté russe. La conversion du prince Vladimir de Kiev (988) et ses conséquences (XIe–XIIIe siècles)*, Paris, 1988.
- . "Quelques questions sur les débuts de la langue liturgique à Kiev (Xe–début du XIe siècle), to appear in the *acta* of the Conference for the Celebration of the Conversion of the Russians to Christianity, Thessalonica, 26–28 November, 1988.
- Vojnov, M. "Преслав, Средец, Охрид—три средновековни престолни града на български царе и патриарси," *Исторически преглед*, 24, iv (1968) 72–76.
- Vzdornov, G. "Иллюстрации к Хронике Георгия Амартола," *Византийский временник*, 30 (1969) 205–25.
- Weingart, M. *Byzantské kroniky v literatuře církevněslovanské. Přehled a rozbor*

- filologický*, part 1 (= *Spisy filosofické fakulty University Komenského v Bratislavě*, číslo 2, 1922).
- Weitzmann, K. "Illustration for the Chronicles of Sozomenos, Theodoret and Malalas," *Byzantion*, 16 (1942–43) 87–134.
- Whitman, R. "The 1073 Izbornik: the Manuscript and its Sources," *Indiana Slavic Studies*, 4 (1967) 252–67.
- Wilson, N. "The Madrid Scylitzes," *Scrittura e civiltà*, 2 (1978) 209–19.
- Winter, E. *Russland und das Papstum*, vol.1 (= *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte Osteuropas*, vol. 6, pt. 1, 1960).
- Xaburgaev, G. A. "Становление древнерусской письменной культуры в связи с крещением Руси в 988 г.," *Вестник Московского университета, Филология*, 1988, v, 10–17.
- Zachariae von Lingenthal, K. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der bulgarischen Kirche," *Mémoires de l'Académie Impériale de St. Pétersbourg*, VIIe série, 8, iii (1864) 1–36.
- Zástěrová, B. "Observations sur le problème de la christianisation en Russie," *Byzantinoslavica*, 11 (1950) 240–54.
- Zavitnevič, V. [Review of Priselkov, *Очерки*], *Труды Киевской Духовной академии*, 1, iv (1914) 628–51.
- . "Владимир святой как политический деятель," *Труды Киевской духовной академии*, 2, vi, 351–441; viii, 635–755 (1888).
- Zenkovsky, S. *The Nikonian Chronicle*, vol. 1, Princeton, 1985.
- Zernov, N. *The Russians and Their Church*, London, 1954.
- Zlatarski, V. *История на българската държава през средните векове*, vol. 2, Sofia, 1934.
- . "Кой е бил български архиепископ в Охрид при покоряването на България от Василий II?" *Християнска мисъл* 2, viii (1909), 464–72.
- Zykov, E. "Известия о Болгарии в Повести временных лет и их источник," *ТОДРЛ*, 24 (1969) 48–53.
- Žukovskaja, L. "Изборник 1073 года. Судьба книги, состояние и задачи изучения," in Рыбаков, *Изборник*, 5–31.
- . *Апракос Мстислава Великого*, Moscow, 1983.