The Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine

Byzantine Roots of Ukrainian Christianity

Ihor Ševčenko

Harvard University Ukrainian Studies Fund

The Millennium Series

Byzantine Roots of Ukrainian Christianity

Ihor Ševčenko

Ukrainian Studies Fund
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ISBN 0-9609822-4-8

Printed in the United States of America

The Ukrainian Studies Fund, Inc. was established in 1957. Its purpose is to raise funds for the establishment and support of Ukrainian scholarly centers at American universities. The organization has endowed three chairs in Ukrainian studies (history, literature, and linguistics) at Harvard University, and is in the process of completing the endowment of Harvard's Ukrainian Research Institute.

The Friends of HURI was established by a group of young professionals concerned about the cultural development of Ukraine and committed to the advancement of Ukrainian scholarship. The founding principle of this organization was two-fold: to seek financial support for HURI in the Ukrainian community and to draw the community into the academic and social life of Harvard University.

A generous subsidy toward the publication of this booklet has been provided by Franka Dachniwska, Walter Denys, and Jaroslaw Hura, outstanding contributors to the Ukrainian Studies Fund at Harvard University.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

On the occasion of the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine the Ukrainian Studies Fund in conjunction with the Friends of the Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute has initiated the Millennium Series of seminal studies on historical and religious topics. The purpose of the Millennium Series is two-fold. First, the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches are successors to the Church formed in Kievan Rus' in 988 and the Ukrainian cultural tradition traces its roots to the Kievan Rus' period. Therefore it is vital that the West be informed about the religious history and culture of Kievan Rus' from the Ukrainian perspective. Second, Ukrainians themselves may not be aware of how much scholarly work has recently been done on topics relating to Ukraine's rich cultural and religious legacy. Therefore it is important to make readily available to all the heirs of the Christianization of Kievan Rus' a basis for re-examining their spiritual roots.

As part of the Millennium Series, the Ukrainian Studies Fund is presenting two essays by Professor Ihor Ševčenko. The first is a lecture, "The Christianization of Kievan Rus'," delivered at the Fordham University Conference held in New York in 1960 on the eve of the millennium of the Christianization of Poland. The second is an essay, "Byzantine Elements in Early Ukrainian Culture," that originally appeared in *Ukraine: A Concise Encyclopedia.* Both works explore the historical circumstances and impact of the conversion of Rus', and describe the position of Kievan Rus' among Christian nations in the tenth century. Under the Byzantine Christian influence Kievan Rus' flourished spirtually and culturally. Within a short time it produced important contributions to art, literature, and architecture. It is that vitality of Christian development that the Millennium Series commemorates today.

Harvard Ukrainian Studies Fund
Cambridge, Massachusetts

I

The Christianization of Kievan Rus'

Prince Vladimir's Rus' adopted Christianity twenty odd years after it had been adopted by Mieszko's Poland.* Thus scholars and future organizers of *Russiae sacrum millennium* still have some twenty years' time to agree on the exact date and place of Vladimir's baptism and to tell us with certitude when, where, and by whom the first permanent ecclesiastical hierarchy was introduced among the Eastern Slavs. But we do not have to wait for the results of these special researches if our aim is general as it is today: to trace the progress of Christianity among the Eastern Slavs, to view the final act of this progress against the general background of the tenth century, and to assess the immediate consequences of Vladimir's conversion.

Ever since antiquity and down to the late Middle Ages, the Mediterranean world maintained a bridgehead in Eastern Europe – the Crimean peninsula. Christianity may have spread among Jewish communities there as early as the apostolic times. By the early Middle Ages, Byzantine Crimea served as a place of exile for recalcitrant popes, like Martin I, and as a haven for monks fleeing iconoclastic persecution in the Eastern Empire. By the eighth and ninth century the peninsula was covered by a network of Byzantine bishoprics.

Thus it is plausible to assume that Christianity may have radiated from the Crimea to the north even before the ninth century. The Crimea did serve in 861 as a springboard for the Khazar mission of St. Cyril, the later apostle of the Slavs. It may have performed a similar role at an earlier date. But before the ninth century it must have been difficult for Christian influences coming from the south

* In this article the Church Slavonic forms *Vladimir* and *Ol'ga* are used. *The Primary Chronicle*, the major source to the Kievan period, predominantly uses the East Slavic *Volodimer*. The modern Ukrainian variants are *Volodymyr* and *Ol'ha*.

to reach the Eastern Slavs who lived in the Kiev region, since these Slavs were separated from the Byzantine Crimea by various nomadic peoples who, in the course of their westward movement, spelled each other in the Ukrainian steppe. Closer contacts with Byzantine possessions and the Byzantine capital itself became possible only with the emergence of a force which could control, or at least safely enjoy, the Dnieper waterway linking the hinterland zones with the Black Sea. Such a force was in existence by the middle of the ninth century. I am referring to the Scandinavian Rus' who formed the upper crust in the Varangian-Slavic principalities which they helped create in Eastern Europe. A Varangian expedition, originating in Kiev, attacked Constantinople in 860. Almost immediately, Byzantium struck back with spiritual weapons; in 866 Patriarch Photius proudly announced to his eastern colleagues the progress of Christianity among the fierce Rus' and the dispatch of a bishop for a mission to them. This mission to the barbarians of the north was only one of many which Byzantium was simultaneously and successfully undertaking among the Balkan and Central European Slavs: Bulgarians, Serbs, Moravians, and Pannonians. In Eastern Europe this first attempt failed, probably because a competing Scandinavian group swept away the pro-Christian rulers of Kiev, but from then on, especially from the second quarter of the tenth century, we have convincing evidence that Christianity began to take roots in Kiev. Some Rus' who ratified the Rus'- Byzantine treaties of the mid-tenth century were Christians. A Christian church existed in Kiev at the same time. It was dedicated to St. Eliah who, to judge by one of his attributes, was a competitor to the local pagan god of thunder, Perun. By 957 Ol'ga, a Kievan princess and regent of the realm, had been baptized, probably in Constantinople, which she visited in any case. And the first recorded Christian martyrs of Kiev antedate the Christianization of the land. They are two Varangians killed by the pagan mob; their martyrdom is placed by the Rus' Primary Chronicle in the year 983.

However highly placed the Kievan converts to Christianity may have been at that time, we still must speak of individual conversions, not of the baptism of the land. For Rus' as a whole to have been baptized, the notion of the Rus' land had to crystallize in the minds of the Kievan princes. In that respect Svjatoslav, Ol'ga's son, is somewhat of a reactionary. His Slavic name–the first such name to be borne by a Rus' prince–points to later developments, but his pagan predilections and his Viking restlessness are the remnants of a waning age. Svjatoslav the Viking fought on the Volga

and at the approaches to Constantinople, cared little for Kiev, and dreamed of establishing his capital on the Danube, altogether outside the East Slavic territory. But hard realities stopped the southward drive of the Rus'. The defeat they suffered at the hands of the Byzantines at Silistria in 971 was the Lech Field battle of Rus' history. Thereafter the period of settling down around Kiev begins, and it begins with Vladimir the Organizer. More than any prince before him he must have felt the need for a force which would endow his state with inward coherence and outward respectability. In tenth-century terms, this meant the adoption of an articulate religion. A local solution could be tried, and seemingly it was. In his pagan period Vladimir did set up a group of statues of pagan gods upon a hill near Kiev. This may have been his attempt to establish a pagan pantheon for his realm. But Finnish and Slavic wooden idols could not compete with higher religious beliefs held in centers neighboring upon the Kievan state. Through war, diplomacy, and commerce Kievan leaders of the late tenth century were well aware not only of the impressive religion of Byzantium and of a somewhat more sober version of that religion practiced in the newly re-established Western Empire, but also of Islam, adopted in 922 by the Volga Bulgars, and of Judaism, widespread among the recently defeated Khazars. As for the religious situation in the other Slavic countries, Vladimir could obtain detailed information on it within the family circle, from his Christian wives —two Czechs and one Bulgarian.

A decision had to be made. Which of the many religions to choose? The Primary Chronicle contains a colorful description of the "testing of faiths." According to this account first Bulgar (that is, Islamic), Latin, and Greek missionaries arrived in Kiev, and then Rus' emissaries were sent out to collect information on the relative merits of these three religions. Most probably we are dealing with a literary commonplace here. But the story does reflect a historical truth, namely the existence of simultaneous cultural influences converging in Kiev and Kiev's awareness of these influences.

The envoys reported their findings (so the story goes) and the decision fell in favor of Byzantium. If we adopt the point of view of tenth-century Kiev, we will agree that it was obvious and wise. It was obvious, for Kiev's previous contacts with Byzantium had been frequent and prolonged. It was wise, for in the last quarter of the tenth century Byzantium was, with the possible exception of Baghdad, the most brilliant cultural center of the world as Kiev–and Western Europe–knew it. And Byzantium was at the

height of its political might. Western contemporaries, like Liutprand of Cremona and Thiethmar of Merseburg, might scorn Greek effeminacy and haughtiness. Sour grapes, all this. Byzantium had recently emerged victorious from its struggle with the Arabs in the Mediterranean and in Syria and had made considerable advances in the Balkans. As for culture, its provincial prelates read and commented upon Plato, Euclid, and even the objectionable Lucian; its emperors supervised large encyclopedic enterprises; its sophisticated reading public clamored for, and obtained, re-editions of old simple Lives of Saints, which were now couched in a refined and involved style. All this the pagan Rus' may not as yet have been able to appreciate. But they certainly could appreciate the splendor of Constantinople's art and the pomp of its church services. The Primary Chronicle even intimates that this pomp tipped the scales in favor of the Greek religion.

Thus we need only be aware of things as they stood in the tenth century in order to agree with Vladimir that the Byzantine form of Christianity provided the most appealing choice. This much seems clear. Clarity disappears, however, when we turn to the details of the Christianization. Not that our sources–Slavic, Byzantine, Arabic, and Armenian–are mute. The problem arises when we try to piece their contradictory information together. It has been done dozens of times. For the present, all such tries must remain enlightened guesses. The attempt which follows is one guess more, every separate detail of which can be contradicted or confirmed by solutions proposed by scholars in the past. I shall give the account of Vladimir's conversion as it might have been–but, alas, was not–recorded by a Byzantine chronicler. I shall adopt some of the Byzantine chronicler's vagueness. *September 987*: The Byzantine Emperor's throne is threatened by a rebellion. The Emperor, whose name is Basil II, sends an embassy to the ruler of the barbarian Rus' and asks for military assistance. In exchange, the northern barbarian asks for the hand of the Emperor's sister. This is a highly embarrassing request, for it runs against the concept of the world-embracing Byzantine hierarchy of rulers and states. The Emperor, however, is in distress. The princess is promised, but baptism is demanded of the barbarian as the condition for receiving him and his realm into the family of civilized peoples. Vladimir–this is the barbarian's name–is baptized in his capital, Kiev, in 987 or 988. Troops 6,000 strong (as a matter of fact, Vladimir's own boisterous Varangian mercenaries of whom he wants to rid himself) go to Byzantium and help to suppress the rebellion by a victory won in April of the year 989. The situation

of the Empire having improved, there is no need to send the imperial princess to a sure cultural starvation in the north. The embittered barbarian attacks the Byzantine city of Kherson in the Crimea and takes it between April and June of 989. Now the princess has to be sent to the north after all. The marriage is celebrated in Kherson in 989. Vladimir, the Christ-Loving prince, his bride Anna, her ecclesiastical entourage, and some Kherson ecclesiastics and citizens proceed to Kiev, where the whole people are baptized. The head of the new church arrives very soon, not later than 997. By that time, he has the rank of a metropolitan; he is a Greek prelate and comes from Byzantium.

Under the Byzantine stimulus the young Kievan civilization developed with remarkable rapidity. Within one or two generations after the Conversion, it produced important works of art and literature. The Cathedral of St. Sophia in Kiev, with its mosaics and frescoes of sacred and secular content, is a major monument of Byzantine architecture. Metropolitan Hilarion's Sermon on Law and Grace, delivered about 1050, is as sophisticated as a Byzantine sermon of the best period. Thus, in the short run, Vladimir's decision paid very good dividends, and the immediate results reaped by Kiev from its ties with Byzantium seemed greater than those derived by the Poles from their association with the West. Under these circumstances, we should not be astonished to find in Poland some traces of the westward radiation of Byzantine culture with Kiev acting as an intermediary. A German lady praised Prince Mieszko the Second, the son of Bolesław Chrobry, for his knowledge of Greek. He may have learned this language from someone who arrived in Poland via Kiev, and I can think of a likely candidate for the position of the prince's tutor–Anastasius the Khersonian, the Greek who helped Vladimir take Kherson in 989 (one of the Christianization years), who made a brilliant administrative career in Kiev, but who switched sides in 1018, when Kiev was taken by the Poles, and emigrated to Poland with the retreating Polish forces of Bolesław Chrobry.

Still, we know that Kiev did not become an intermediary transmitting the achievements of Byzantine culture to the West. Before we deplore this, we must recall some peculiarities of the Kievan version of Byzantine culture. In one important aspect, this version was twice removed from its original. Most of the literature read in eleventh-century Kiev was received from Bulgaria, where Christianity had thrived for over a century, and–but to a much lesser degree–from Bohemia, heir to the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition. Byzantine writings predominated among these imported

works, but they were Old Church Slavonic translations from the Greek. Direct knowledge of Greek is attested in Kiev soon after the conversion–both through the Primary Chronicle and through translations of Byzantine texts made on Kievan soil–but the extent of this knowledge should not be exaggerated. Moreover, the list of translated Byzantine works was very selective. Naturally enough, most of them were of ecclesiastical character. The secular ones either were collateral reading to the study of sacred texts or represented the low-middlebrow level in Byzantine literature. There were some advantages to this situation. The availability of a Slavic literary idiom combined with the relative geographical remoteness of Kiev from Constantinople contributed to the impressive growth of the vernacular literature, especially of historiography. This was a genre in which comparable Polish achievements were not forthcoming for centuries. But there also was a disadvantage due to the tenuousness of direct knowledge of the Greek language and literature and to the adoption of a selective procedure in translating–namely, the virtual lack of acquaintance with the works of antiquity. The Kievan bookmen derived their knowledge of antique literature from the translations of Byzantine equivalents to Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations*. In this one important respect, the "barbaric" West was better off with its intolerant predilection for Latin. Thiethmar and later the Polish historian Wincenty Kadłubek quote Virgil and Horace. The Rus' Primary Chronicle does not quote Homer.

Under the year 988, the traditional date of Vladimir's conversion, the Primary Chronicle introduces a "philosopher" who expounds the tenets of the new faith to the prince and admonishes him in the following terms: "Do not accept the teachings of the Latins, whose instruction is vicious." This is an anachronism for the tenth century and therefore a later propagandistic interpolation. Throughout the second half of the tenth century and a great part of the eleventh the upper crust of Kiev did not find the Latin teachings vicious at all. Princess Ol'ga may have been baptized in Constantinople, but in 959–certainly before the final establishment of the Byzantine hierarchy in Rus'–her ambassadors negotiated with Otto I for the sending of a missionary bishop and priests to her land. As such a request fitted perfectly into Otto's grandiose plans of eastern missionary expansion, two bishops were ordained and one of them, Adalbert, was dispatched to the Rus' in 961. Adalbert's mission came to naught under mysterious and tragic circumstances. There is no doubt, however, that it took place. Our evidence on it is unimpeachable, since it stems from the unhappy

head of the mission himself. I shall omit from this discussion the information we have on several papal embassies sent out to Vladimir, as our evidence on this point is somewhat controversial. This omission does not matter much, for there are many other–and sure–indications that a peaceful intercourse existed between the West and Kiev for quite a time after the baptism of the Rus'. The evidence comes from German missionaries who were greatly assisted and judiciously advised by Vladimir when they passed through Kiev on their way to the Pečenegs in 1006. It also comes from the presence in East Slavic manuscripts of Lives of Czech and Western saints and of Western Prayers. This fact, of which Father Dvornik has so rightly reminded us in his writings, points to the traffic in literary texts between the Bohemian centers of Slavic liturgy, active until the very end of the eleventh century, and Kiev. Vladimir's marrying into the Byzantine imperial family should not make us oblivious to the fact that Polish, French, German, and other Western marriages of the Kievan princely house by far outnumber those contracted with the Byzantines. Finally, some see the most dramatic illustration of Kiev's Western contacts in the odyssey of the exiled grand prince of Kiev, Izjaslav, which occurred some twenty years *after* the schism of 1054. In order to further his cause, Izjaslav appeared at the court of Henry IV of Germany; having failed there, he sent his son to the Curia of Gregory VII. In exchange for papal intercession, he promised "due fealty" to the Pope and commended his land to St. Peter. Izjaslav's Polish wife left prayers *pro papa nostro* in her Psalter which can be inspected today in the Italian city of Cividale.

However, we must keep things in their proper perspective. Adalbert's mission ended in failure. The embittered ecclesiastic called the Rus' "frauds." Bohemian texts on East Slavic soil are but a small fraction of texts of Byzantine provenence. Great Prince Izjaslav's peregrinations and promises were but so many moves of a desperate *émigré*. When he recovered his Kievan throne, he promptly forgot all about the vassalage to St. Peter, and he was supported by the abbots of the Kievan Monastery of the Caves. The atmosphere of this monastery must have been pro-Byzantine in the 1070's for–so the Primary Chronicle informs us–when the devil was sighted at that time by one of the monastery's saintly monks, he appeared–I am sorry to report–in the guise of a Pole.

If Kiev remained in the Byzantine fold, this was not only because its Greek metropolitans saw to it, but mostly because it had been closely tied to Byzantium from the very time of Vladimir's conversion. This was apparent to contemporaries, both Western

and Eastern. Thiethmar of Merseburg stressed the proximity of Kiev to Greece, and Adam of Bremen even took Kiev for one of Greece's foremost cities. But the most significant text comes from Kiev itself. It is a Eulogy of St. Vladimir written in the eleventh century. In his final address the author of the Eulogy prays not to Vladimir alone, in the name of the Rus' alone, but to both rulers famous for establishing the conversion of their subjects, Constantine the Great *and* Vladimir, on behalf of the Rus' *and* the Greek peoples:

> O you Holy emperors, Constantine and Vladimir, help those of your kin against their enemies, and rescue the Greek and Rus' peoples from all tribulation, and pray to God on my behalf so I may be saved, for you enjoy special favors with the Saviour.

These passages may be interpreted as an expression of emulation of Byzantium. Vladimir has even been given an imperial title, and in another passage (not quoted here) Kiev has been promoted to the position of the Second Jerusalem, a title usually reserved for Constantinople. But I prefer to see, in the passages quoted, an expression of the concept of unity, of membership in and sharing of the only, and therefore the highest civilization, now embracing Byzantium and Kiev alike. What Svjatoslav could not achieve by force of arms alone, Vladimir did achieve – by Christianizing his realm.

II

Byzantine Elements in Early Ukrainian Culture

The Byzantine heritage is the most important non-Slavic component of early Ukrainian culture. It is not always easy to differentiate between Byzantine influences due to the direct impact of the Eastern empire and its Church on Rus'–Ukraine, and those coming through the mediation of the heavily Byzantinized Balkan countries such as Bulgaria, Serbia, and, perhaps later, Wallachia. From the fifteenth century on, and as long as the direct dependence upon the Constantinopolitan patriarchate existed, Byzantine influences continued to be felt in Ukraine, in spite of its increasingly western orientation, although less strongly than in the Muscovite state.

Contacts before Christianization. Little is known of Byzantine cultural influences on the Ukrainian territories before the tenth century. Byzantine sources of the sixth and seventh centuries refer to military clashes and alliances between the Eastern empire and the Antes. There is evidence also that there were in the sixth century Byzantinized Antes in high commanding posts in the Byzantine army. A number of finds of remarkable Byzantine silverware and coins of the time of Emperor Heraclius (d.641), made in Mala Pereščepyna, point to a lively trade and a refined, although restricted, buying public (possibly Avar). The evidence of such contacts stops in the seventh century when the Bulgarian migration across the Ukrainian steppe separated the northern Ukrainian territories from the Black Sea.

In the ninth and tenth centuries, contacts with Byzantium were renewed both in peaceful and military form. The two often went together, as commercial treaties followed predatory raids by the Ῥῶς (as the people of Rus' are called in Byzantine sources) on the Byzantine empire. However, relations of this type did not contribute decisively to cultural penetration. Only the acceptance by one partner of the other's world view as superior makes an assimilative process fully possible. The Byzantine world view was inseparable from Orthodox Christianity.

Rus': A Member of the Civilized World. The first precise reference to the spread of Byzantine Christianity among the Ῥῶς was made by Patriarch Photius (867). Thus it dates from the greatest

period of Byzantine missionary activity. The decisive step, however, was taken by Prince Volodymyr (Vladimir) only a century later (988 or 989).

By adopting Christianity and marrying Anna, the sister of Emperor Basil II, Prince Volodymyr became a member of the Byzantine imperial family, and his land was included in the ideal Byzantine family of states. At that time, this family of states was tantamount to the civilized world, for the only two recognized centers of civilization in the tenth century were Constantinople and Baghdad. Byzantium was at the peak of its military and cultural might. It is no wonder, then, that the civilization of early Rus' was derived to a great extent from that of the Byzantine empire.

It is noteworthy that later attempts by Kiev to assert independence in church and cultural matters often were but veiled desires to equal the corresponding Byzantine models. Kiev, "Mother of the Cities of Rus'" (cf., μητρόπολις and the feminine gender of πόλις, Kiev is masculine) has, like Constantinople, its Golden Gate, its churches of St. Irene, St. George, and, above all, St. Sophia. Its patroness is the Holy Virgin, protectress of Byzantium. Like Constantinople, Kiev is referred to as the "New Jerusalem." When a western source speaks of Kiev as "*æmula Sceptri Constantinopolitani,*" it may reflect this competition with the capital on the Bosporus. Volodymyr, like many Byzantine emperors, was referred to as a new Constantine. An official formula used to describe the activity of a Byzantine emperor ("to accomplish unaccomplished things") is applied by Hilarion to Volodymyr's son, Yaroslav. One of the arguments brought forward to justify the independent ordination of Metropolitan Clement, a native of Rus' (middle of the twelfth century), was that Kiev's principal relic, the head of Pope Clement, could confer sanctification just as effectively as the hand of John the Baptist, by which metropolitans were consecrated in Constantinople. This fruitful tension between the giving and the receiving cultures was similar to that between the Byzantines and the Bulgarians in the tenth and the eleventh centuries, the Normans in the twelfth century, and the Serbians in the fourteenth century, and had at its roots the acknowledgement by Rus' of Byzantine cultural supremacy.

Church. Civilization meant Christianity. The new religious cult and the Church hierarchy were Byzantine. Kievan metropolitans (attested from 997 on) were, for the most part, of Greek extraction, as were many of the bishops in the earlier period; up to the fifteenth century, at least in theory, they had to be consecrated by the Patriarch of Constantinople. The first churches were built after

Byzantine models, initially by imported architects, later by local masters carrying on the Byzantine tradition. The interior decoration of the early churches not only duplicated Byzantine religious iconography and displayed Greek explanatory inscriptions, but also was inspired by Byzantine imperial imagery (for example, the Hippodrome frescoes in the St. Sophia Cathedral of Kiev). Ecclesiastical terms were borrowed either in the Greek form or as *calques: onoriia* (Gr. *ἐνορία*, diocese), *skhyma, epitymiia, skyt, otshel'nyk (Gr. ἀναχωρητής*, literally, "the one who moves away"). Matters of dogma and ritual observance were referred to Constantinople and were decided there; examples of this date from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. The organization of the monastic life in Rus' followed closely the rules set out in the Byzantine *typika* (foundation charters regulating the life of monasteries). There are no Eastern Slavic contributions to Orthodox liturgy. A few prayers inserted in some manuscripts into the text of the liturgy are translations from Greek.

Language. The Church Slavonic language (imported to Rus' mainly from the Balkans) had acquired much of its specific character in the process of the translation from Greek texts. It teems with direct borrowings from Greek and with Byzantine loan translations (*calques*) in its vocabulary, phraseology, and syntax. With the adoption of the Church Slavonic Koine for original literary production in Rus', innumerable *calques* reflecting Byzantine patterns of thought, found their way into early Rus' literature. Some random examples follow: *ispravleniem—κατορθώμασι* (achievements); *vina—αἰτία* (cause); *beslovesna—ἄλογα* (animals); *o sikh—ἐν τούτοις* (thereupon); *yako i begati—ὥστε φεύγειν* (so that they avoided) [all these instances are from the *Patericon* of the Kievan Cave Monastery] *pakybytiie—παλιγγενεσία* (resurrection) [Hilarion and Cyril of Turiv]; *yakozhe reshti—ὡς εἰπεῖν* (so to say) [Laurentius Chronicle and elsewhere]. A mere mention of the existence of numerous Byzantine lexical borrowings in the learned literature of the early period must suffice here.

Literature. The literature read and copied in Rus'-Ukraine consisted, for the most part, of translations from the Greek. This may be deduced from the catalogs of diocesan and monastic libraries, dating from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries.

The literary taste of the readers in Rus' was formed by the homilies of John Chrysostom (fourth and fifth centuries); they could, and did, have some inkling of Christian neo-Platonism through the works of Basil the Great (fourth century) and John of Damascus (eighth century). They learned world history and the Christian

philosophy of history through the mediocre models of John Malalas (sixth century) and George Hamartolus (ninth century). They discovered far-away lands with Cosmas Indicopleustes (sixth century), who informed them that the earth had the shape of a cylinder. In Johannes Moschus' writings (seventh century) they found stories of the record-breaking ascetic monks of the Egyptian desert. Johannes Climacus, or "of the Ladder," (sixth century) led the monks of Rus' up to paradise, rung by rung. As Byzantine prophecies, ascribed to Methodius of Patara (written in the seventh century) or to the Prophet Daniel, were geared to the Byzantine struggle with Islam, they lent themselves well to adaptation in a land where wars with the pagan (later Islamic) steppe were a problem of survival. The Byzantine epic of Digenis Akritas (ninth to tenth centuries), the frontier hero and rebel of mixed origin, found willing ears in the courts of the princes of Rus', who defied the Kievan Grand Prince, fought with the Cumans but married their daughters.

Many of these translations were imported from Bulgaria. But a number of other translations are the work of eleventh- and twelfth-century translators in Kievan Rus'. Sources tell us expressly of a group of translators from the Greek appointed in Kiev by Yaroslav the Wise (*d.* 1054). It is unfortunate that most of our information on the twelfth-century Greek-speaking princes of Rus', on contemporary schools where Greek was taught, and on Greek books in thirteenth century Rus' should come from the sources quoted by Tatishchev (a not always reliable Russian historian of the eighteenth century). It may safely be surmised, however, that Greek was among the five languages spoken by Prince Vsevolod, the father of Volodymyr Monomakh.

It is not surprising, then, that there are many Byzantine elements in the original works, both sacred and profane, of the Kievan period. Metropolitan Clement (twelfth century, a native of Rus') was said to have quoted Homer and Plato (he may have learned his Platonism from Byzantine *Florilegia* and the Fathers of the Church); Byzantine influences are present in the sermons of Cyril of Turiv (twelfth century), but it is not clear whether he ever consulted Byzantine texts in their original Greek. Prince Volodymyr Monomakh (*d.* 1125) quotes St. Basil in his didactic treatise and Byzantine ecclesiastical hymns in his Prayer. The Byzantine apocalyptic seventh millennium plays an important role in the Tale of Ihor. The Kievan Chronicles owe much of their chronological framework, form, and material to Byzantine historiography, a genre in which Byzantium surpassed anything done in the Latin Middle

Ages. The Primary Chronicle's attitude toward the Byzantines is ambiguous; nevertheless, it draws on the work of the Byzantine chroniclers, Hamartolus and Malalas, and even derives its first historical reference to the *Rhōs* (allegedly 852) from a Byzantine source.

Law. Intimate ties existed between Byzantine law and the law of the old Kievan Realm. Byzantine law collections such as the *Ecloga* (eighth century) and the *Prochiron* (ninth century) found their way into eastern Europe soon after its Christianization. A Slavic compilation of Byzantine laws (*Zakon sudny liudem*), which may go back to the Cyrillo-Methodian period, was known there in the twelfth century. The *Nomocanon* (first that of Johannes Scholasticus, later in the form attributed to the Patriarch Photius) was used to settle questions of ecclesiastical and canon law. The first translation of the *Nomocanon* into the literary language of Rus' belongs to the eleventh and twelfth centuries. About 1270 a Kievan metropolitan rejoiced over receiving a new adaptation of this text. As for the *Syntagma* of Matthew Blastares(1335)—a compilation of secular and ecclesiastical law that decisively influenced the codes of the Balkan countries—its presence in the lands of Rus' is attested only at a later date (sixteenth century).

In view of this impact of Byzantine legal models, it is the more remarkable that the rudimentary political theory of Kievan Rus' should have remained relatively unaffected by the Byzantine idea of the ruler as Christ's image and imitator on earth. The Kievan scribe could read the rudiments of Byzantine political theory in the *Novellae* inserted into the *Nomocanons*, or hear about it from Greek metropolitans. But the ideal ruler, as depicted in the Kievan literature, had only to exhibit the qualities of a good Christian. In the principality of Muscovy theorists followed more closely the Byzantine model.

Art. Up to the sixteenth century, the art of Rus'-Ukraine was under pronounced Byzantine influence. It must be said, to the credit of the Byzantines, that in the domain of art they gave Rus' the best they had to offer. Rus' owes the introduction of stone architecture to Byzantium. In monumental art, a few local, Romanesque, and Caucasian elements were added to structures of a basically Byzantine type. Architects continued to be imported from "Greek lands" well after the initial period.

Thus in the middle of the thirteenth century, the *khytrec* (= τεχνίτης) Audios designed and built the cathedral church in the western outpost of Kholm. The huge double-headed eagle which adorned one of Kholm's towers has been connected with Audios's

activity there (A. V. Solovev).

The art of the icons, painted either according to the indications of the "Painter's Manual," of relatively late date, adapted from Greek, or by copying directly imported Byzantine models, reveals Byzantine characteristics down to modern times. Many techniques of the minor arts—for example, that of enamel, for which Rus' was so known in the Middle Ages—were learned in Byzantium (cf. the term *finipt* for enamel work, borrowed from the Byzantine χυμευτός).

It was natural that the princes and their entourages should import both objects of art and artists from Constantinople and have such objects made in Rus' according to Byzantine fashion. In 1135, for instance, Mstyslav of Kiev ordered from Constantinople a gospel with a luxurious binding; the same prince imported three singers to Kiev from Byzantium.

Ways of cultural penetration. The Church and the princely courts were the principal channels through which Byzantine cultural influences penetrated into the Ukrainian territories (most often directly from Byzantium, although occasionally from the Crimea, where the Byzantines held some cities up to the twelfth century). Not only did the Greek (or the Byzantinized Balkan) church hierarchy bring with it books and religious objects, it also introduced Byzantine manner, taste, and administrative practices. The Fragments of Beneševič provide a glimpse into the workings of the metropolitan chancery under Theognostus (mid-fourteenth century) who often visited Ukraine. The language of the chancery was certainly Greek, and thus some knowledge of Greek by native scribes may have been derived from this center.

We are well provided with data on the courtly contacts between Rus' and Byzantium. Intermarriage between the courts of Rus' and Constantinople is well documented for the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Nuns of high birth visited Byzantium. Undesirable princes of Rus' frequently were banished to Constantinople, although some of them returned to their native lands after having prospered in the empire. The reverse phenomenon was the prolonged sojourn at the court of Yaroslav Osmomysl of Halych of the fugitive Andronicus Comnenus, who later became emperor of Byzantium (*d.* 1185). The twelfth century was a period of animated Byzantine diplomatic activity in Kiev and in Halych as part of Byzantium's policy of encirclement toward Hungary.

The task of maintaining uninterrupted contact with Byzantium was recognized as a matter of importance to all Rus'. Caravans went to Byzantium along the Dnieper-Black Sea trade route in spite

of nomadic harassments. Thus, Rostyslav and other princes by common effort protected the Dnieper waterway from the Cumans in order that merchants trading with Byzantium (*hrechnyky*) could proceed unmolested (1166). Similar measures were taken by other princes later.

Some steps lower on the social ladder were the pilgrims from Kiev, who traveled, often in groups, to Constantinople or to the Holy Land, stopping en route in Constantinople. When they returned home, they spread their knowledge of Byzantine life. Many of them left written accounts of their experiences such as that of the "southerner" Daniel (from the Chernihiv region, beginning of the twelfth century).

Mount Athos, which attracted Kievan pilgrims at an early date (journey of Antonius of the Kievan Cave Monastery before 1033), soon saw the establishment of a permanent home for a number of Rus' monks, and became one of the important centers of translation activity from Greek into the language of Rus' as well as into Bulgarian and Serbian. A signature by an abbot of the Ῥῶς monastery in a document from the year 1016 may not be conclusive, but it is certain that the monastery Xylourgou (earliest of the preserved documents—1030; first clear proof of its Rus' character—1142), and later that of Panteleimon (monks from Rus' took possession of it in 1169) were centers from which Byzantine cultural influences reached old Ukraine. The exporting of Rus' books (most probably liturgical texts and translations from Greek) from these monasteries to Rus' may be inferred from a document of the year 1142.

Byzantium after Byzantium. The later political fate of the Ukrainian lands, which fell first under the domination of Lithuania and later under that of Poland, laid them open to western cultural influences. However, it would be an error to underestimate the survival of "Byzantium after Byzantium" in Ukraine. Texts of Byzantine inspiration preserved in monasteries continued to be read; Greek was taught in the schools of the Stavropegian brotherhoods and in other church schools. The Ukrainian Church continued to depend upon the Patriarchs of Constantinople, who, however degraded they may have become under Turkish rule, were the heirs of the Byzantine emperors as protectors of Christianity. The religious struggle preceding and following the Church Union of Berestia (1595) made Byzantine Christianity and Constantinople necessary points of reference for the Ukrainian Orthodox camp.

It was from the exhortations of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople that Ukrainian princes, bishops, and the faithful gathered additional strength to withstand the Uniate movement (for example, the correspondence of Meletius Pigas with Prince Ostrozhsky, published by the latter in Greek; the letter of Cyril Loucaris to the Stavropegian brotherhood of "Leontopolis," Lviv, 1634). One of the polemicists (Smotrytsky) had to go to Constantinople before finally becoming convinced of the justice of the Uniate cause.

The literary controversy over the Union forced the Orthodox and the pro-Uniates alike to concentrate on certain problems of Byzantine history (the ecumenical councils, the "usurpation" of Charlemagne, and the division of the Christian empire viewed by Orthodox polemicists through Byzantine eyes, and the Photian schism). It is true that this Orthodox polemical literature was permeated with western (often Protestant) elements, that it used the results of Catholic scholarship (Baronius), and that it was often written in Polish; yet the titles of most of the tracts and the pseudonyms used were Byzantine—for example, *Antirrisis, Antigrafi, Teraturgima* (all with itacisms); Θρῆνος, Λίθος (in Greek letters); *Feodul* (the Uniates wrote a *Parēgoria*, indicating the western humanistic pronunciation). The verbal abuse and the puns were ultimately of Byzantine inspiration (*mateolog, katolyk*—from λύκος [wolf], *Apollia Apologii*—effective only in "Byzantine" pronunciation, *apolia apoloiias*—plays on the name Zizania = darnels). Not only Fathers of the Church such as John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nazianzus (whose verses on "Two Romes" were cited in Greek), but also lesser Byzantine polemicists (Barlaam of Calabria, fourteenth century) were quoted. Sometimes Byzantine legends were used and erroneously transplanted from one century to another—for example, I. Vyshensky, an Athonite monk of Western Ukrainian origin, spoke of Catholic atrocities supposedly perpetrated on Athos after the Council of Florence (fifteenth century); however, the Byzantine legend referred to alleged persecutions under the Uniate emperor, Michael VIII (d. 1282).

From an examination of the publishing activity of the Kievan Cave Monastery (where an academy was founded in Peter Mohyla's time), it appears that the majority of the books printed there were either liturgical texts or translations of Byzantine works: such were the *Speculum Principis* of Agapetus (sixth century—this work was popular also with the western Humanists); the novel of Barlaam and Ioasaph (because it was believed to be by John of Damascus); the *Nomocanon*; sermons of Macarius of Egypt; and a Gospel

commentary (in the form of sermons) by Callistus, Patriarch of Constantinople (fourteenth century). In this way Peter Mohyla strove to raise the level of the cultural life of Ukraine. He bought for his library, along with Latin classics, Greek Christian authors—some of them late Byzantine. Contemporaries were aware of Mohyla's complex tastes. In a dedicatory preface, written in 1630 and teeming with polonisms, the Lviv printer, A. Skulsky, recommended to the metropolitan a "Slavonic" version of Χριστὸς πάσχων (The Suffering Christ), a Byzantine *cento* (mainly from Euripides), written in the eleventh or twelfth century but attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus.

The end. In 1685 the metropolitan see of Kiev was made dependent upon the patriarchate of Moscow. This may be regarded as the final date in the history of Byzantine and post-Byzantine cultural influences in Ukraine.

In Nizhyn, on Hetman Mazepa's territory, a churchman left a library containing many Byzantine works (Psellos, Planudes, etc.). In 1690, it was sent to Moscow upon the demand of Peter the Great. The catalog made on that occasion (both in Ukrainian and in Russian), points, albeit by its mistakes, to some knowledge of Greek in Mazepa's chancery (for example, *hotovoslovets'* stands for Etymologicum, as ἕτοιμος, ready and ἔτυμος, true were pronounced alike in Byzantine and later Greek). Ukrainian pilgrims visited the holy places of Greece, and learned the language and customs of the land (Hryhorovych-Barsky, d. 1747); Greek merchants passed through Ukraine. One of the latter, Vatatzes, left a description of his journey (ca. 1710) in "political" verse, referring to the factual differences between Russia and Ukraine. In the Ukrainian literature of the same period the Greeks were reduced to the level of humorous stage figures, appearing in the "intermedia."

The Ukrainian intellectuals of the eighteenth century showed occasional interest in Balkan and Byzantine subjects (*Photius* by G. Shcherbatsky, 1789). The dogmatic works of one of them (T. Prokopovych) were translated into "Byzantine" Greek, but their motivation and their cultural roots were already different.

The cessation of contacts with the post-Byzantine world may be exemplified by the title *Stephanotokos* of a panegyric on the Russian Empress Elisabeth (by I. Mihilevych, 1742). A monstrous misformation after the model of *theotokos* (Mother of God), it shows total lack of feeling for the Byzantine language and culture. A century earlier, the term *porfirogenita* would have been used.

Religious and literary terms (*piit, spudei*) aside, the chief recipient of Greek vocabulary derived directly from Greece was Ukrainian slang: *khvyrka*—χείρ (hand); *zitaty*—ζητῶ (to ask); *kryso*—κρέας (meat); *kimaty*—κοιμῶμαι (to sleep); *siuraty*—ξέρω (to know). The words were introduced probably by the *lirnyky*, wandering minstrels of dubious honesty.

Contemporary situation. On the surface little remains of the Byzantine heritage in present-day Ukraine. But its presence is still felt in many domains. The contemporary Ukrainian alphabet goes back ultimately to the Byzantine ninth century uncial script.

The liturgy in its Church Slavonic form remained for the Ukrainians the permanent, though indirect, tie with Byzantium. The charming mistranslation, daily repeated in Ukrainian churches at the beginning of the Cherubic song (*izhe kheruvymy*—"which Cherubim" instead of simply "Cherubim"), reminds one of how close these links still are. The Ukrainian national banner (gold and blue) displays a typically Byzantine combination of colors.

The Ukrainian birthday song *Mnohaia Lita* (that is, πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη) is only a translation of the formula often repeated in a work by a tenth-century Byzantine emperor (also an expert on the Rus' problem)—a formula which was echoed for centuries through the halls of the imperial palace of Constantinople. The present-day literary language preserves many scholarly terms borrowed directly or indirectly from Byzantium (*okean, leksykon, hramatyka, dohmat, piramida, stykhiia*), although in some cases these terms were later reintroduced from the West in a changed form.

Byzantine and post-Byzantine words are present in contemporary Ukrainian of common usage, although the question as to when and how these borrowings entered the language still needs clarification. They include names of foods (*palianytsia, knysh, kutia*), household objects (*makitra, myska, kadka, krovat'*), fabrics (*oksamyt*), structures (*terem, palata, komora, kolyba*), ships (*korabel', katorha*), places (*levada, lyman*), even an abstract (*khalepa*), and perhaps an adjective (*harnyi*).