

The Origins of the Muscovite Ecclesiastical Claims to the Kievan Inheritance

(Early Fourteenth Century to 1458/1461)

JAROSLAW PELENSKI

One of the principal concerns of Muscovite Russia's national and imperial ideology was her preoccupation with the Kievan heritage and the resulting formulation of official claims to Kievan Rus', at first ecclesiastical but later secular. This concern was subsequently transmitted to modern Russian national consciousness and historical thought. Although the ideological and historiographic controversies over the Kievan inheritance date back to the nineteenth century, concrete antiquarian and conceptual inquiries into the origins of Muscovy's preoccupation with the Kievan inheritance did not begin until the post-World War II period. At that time D. S. Likhachev attempted to show that Muscovite chronicle-writing and culture were permeated by a new historicism that served as evidence for his hypothesis about the existence of the early Renaissance in Muscovite Russia in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.¹ (As a matter of fact, Likhachev's hypothesis has been questioned in scholarship,² and the topic has been apparently abandoned by the author). Aside from the conceptual differences of opinion, the new literature on the origins of Muscovy's claims to the Kievan inheritance has tended to concentrate on the official secular claims to Kievan Rus'. Likhachev dates these claims to the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century,³ whereas I suggest the second half of the fifteenth.⁴ Still, for a better understanding of the problem, it is necessary to consider the official ecclesiastical claims as well. Therefore, in this article I shall discuss Muscovy's ecclesiastical claims to the Kievan inheritance, concentrating on four major areas in which they were manifested: 1. the transfer of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' to Moscow, and the enhancement of the city of Moscow; 2. the contest for the heritage of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus'; 3. the canonization of three metropolitans; and 4. the Kiev-Suzdal'-Vladimir-Muscovy continuity theory in early Muscovite chronicle-writing.

The Transfer of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and All Rus'

This transfer from Kiev to Moscow was accomplished in two stages. First, a transition from Kiev to Vladimir took place following the establishment of the Mongol-Tatar supremacy over the states of Rus', an accommodation between the Golden Horde (or the Kipchak Horde), Byzantium, and the Grand Principality of Suzdal'-Vladimir in the realm of ecclesiastical policies, and the implementation of the Western-oriented policies of the Galician-Volhynian rulers like Danylo Romanovych (ruled 1238-1264) and Iurii I (1303-1308), both of whom assumed the title of king after the acceptance by Danylo of a royal crown from Pope Innocent IV (1253). Kirill was the first metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus' (1242-1281) to move from the coreland of Kievan Rus' to the northeastern Grand Principality of Vladimir where he performed his duties as the chief ecclesiastical official of Rus' during the greater part of his tenure and until his death in Pereiaslavl'-Zalesskii in 1281. In Vladimir, among other things, he presided over Grand Prince Aleksandr Nevsky's funeral (1263) and held in that city in 1274 an important council of Russian bishops.

The transfer of the Metropolitanate of Kiev to Vladimir was completed by Kirill's successor Metropolitan Maksim (1283-1305), who, according to the Vladimirian Chronicles (while keeping his title Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus') left the Metropolitan see and escaped from Kiev in 1300, because "he could not endure the Tatar oppression."⁵ This explanation of the metropolitan's move by the Vladimirian chroniclers is rather anachronistic and ideologically motivated since the Mongol-Tatars were not oppressing the Church and because Vladimir, to which Maksim moved, was located much more deeply in their sphere of influences than Kiev.

In the second stage of its transition, the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' was moved from Vladimir to Moscow. This transfer was undertaken under the auspices of Metropolitan Petr (1308-1326) who had opted for the Muscovite side in the struggle between Moscow and Tver' for the Grand Principality of Vladimir.⁶

This move had an extraordinary significance for Moscow's rise, growth, and victory in the struggle for supremacy in northeastern Russia, in particular, and for the lands of all Rus', in general. An institution like the metropolitanate would serve in the long run as an ideological, cultural, and, at times, administrative center of the Muscovite state. Among immediate consequences of this transition, the status of Moscow and the Muscovite Grand Principality was greatly enhanced. This is best attested by the selection of

Moscow by Metropolitan Petr in 1322 to be the permanent residence of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus', the attention paid by early Muscovite ideologies to Petr's special concern for the city of Moscow as a chosen city at the time when Moscow was still struggling for recognition as one of the principal centers of northeastern Rus', and, finally, by the cult of Petr as hierarch-saint of Moscow and the Suzdal' land.

Petr's role as a hierarch-saint is best attested in the "Praise for Petr," contained in the second recension of the so-called *Pouchenie Petra Mitropolita* (Admonition of Metropolitan Petr). Paraphrasing other admonitions and to some extent the famous "Praise of Volodimer I" by Metropolitan Ilarion, the Muscovite author, writing probably at the end of 1330s, exclaimed:

O great miracle. Rome prides itself in having the Supreme Apostle Peter, Damascus proudly philosophizes about having the light of the entire universe—Apostle Paul. The city of Thessalonica rejoices in having the Christian martyr Demetrius, Kiev takes pride in having the new Christian martyrs Boris and Gleb, the Rus' Princes—the healers. Rejoice o city of Moscow in having the great hierarch—Petr.⁷

Metropolitan Petr's pivotal role in the enhancement of Moscow was magnified by Kiprian, another metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus', who wrote an expanded *Vita* of Metropolitan Petr in 1381. In it he inserted the famous prophecy about the future greatness of Moscow, allegedly made by Petr in an exchange with Ivan Danilovich Kalita, the ruler of Moscow:⁸

And so, my son, take my advice, and build a church in your city of Moscow, and you shall be glorified above all other princes, and your sons and grandsons for generations to come. And this city will be glorified in all the cities of Rus', and hierarchs will reside in it, and their arms will be raised above the shoulders of their enemies, and God will be glorified in it, and, finally, my bones will laid to rest in it.⁹

The *Vita* of Metropolitan Petr by Kiprian became one of the most popular biographies in old Russian literature, as attested by its inclusion in both the *Great Menology* (*Velikie minei chetii*) and the *Book of Degrees* (*Kniga stepennaia*). Paradoxically, both Petr, the author of the ideological enhancement of Moscow, and Kiprian, the author of Petr's influential *Vita*, were not even Muscovites by origin. Metropolitan Petr was, in fact, a native of Volhynia or Galicia who originally had made his ecclesiastical career under the auspices of King Iurii of Galicia but subsequently abandoned the King for an even higher office, this time under the sponsorship of the Muscovite ruler. Kiprian, the Bulgarian—who by his own interpretation of Petr's life

and deeds, among other things, contributed immensely to the enhancement of Moscow's position and the creation of the myth of Moscow—is perceived in scholarship as a relatively even-handed individual in the execution of his duties vis-à-vis the Orthodox of all Rus'. It deserves mention that the Muscovite tradition, including the writings of Metropolitan Kiprian, attempted to play down Metropolitan Petr's Galician connection by emphasizing his Volhynian origins and by stressing his sponsorship by a Volhynian prince. In reality, it was King Iurii of Galicia who championed Petr's promotion to the position of Metropolitan of Galicia.

The Contest for the Metropolitanate of Kiev and All Rus'

The origins of this contest coincided with the emergence of the Muscovite patrimonial state and the struggle on the part of the Muscovite dynasty for the Vladimir Grand Principality and supremacy over the various lands of Rus'. They also chronologically coincided with the political-ideological revival of the Galician-Volhynian Rus' under the auspices of King Iurii I and with the transformation of the Lithuanian polity into a dual Lithuanian-Ruthenian state. From 1322 to 1458, the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' was based (with some interruptions) in Moscow and contested by various contenders: Galicia-Volhynia, Poland, the Lithuanian-Ruthenian state, and the Polish-Lithuanian union state. In 1458/1461, the Metropolitanate was finally divided into Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus'—under the auspices of Lithuania and later the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth—and the Moscow-based Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus'. For almost 150 years, the Muscovite court in collaboration with the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' had conducted a protracted struggle for the Kievan ecclesiastical inheritance, as represented by the unity and indivisibility of that Metropolitanate. They had also made all possible efforts to prevent its division and the creation of other metropolitanates with a claim to the Kievan succession.¹⁰

One of them was the Metropolitanate of Halych, a separate ecclesiastical entity, independent of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' and established in 1303 at the request of King Iurii I with the Byzantine Patriarch's approval. It was suppressed in 1347 by the Byzantine empire in a display of open power politics and revived in 1371 by the Byzantine patriarchate under political pressures of King Kazimierz of Poland. The Metropolitanate of Halych was not a lasting organizational success. Originally, it had been created to remove Galicia and Volhynia from the jurisdiction of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus', which was under Tatar and Muscovite con-

trol, and to provide the Orthodox faithful of Galicia with the necessary organizational framework, headed by an ecclesiastical leader, independent of any secular authority outside of the Galician-Volhynian state and later the Polish Kingdom. Unlike the Muscovite dynasty and the Moscow-based Metropolitanate, which were engaged in the contest for the heritage of the entire Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus', the Galician-Volhynian rulers and their Polish successors limited their contest to the land under their control (partial inheritance of Kiev and all Rus').

Another competitor in the contest for the heritage of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' was the Grand Principality of Lithuania, eventually the Lithuanian-Ruthenian state. At first, the Lithuanian dynasty was involved, like Galicia-Volhynia, in the contest for a partial inheritance of the Kievan Metropolitanate which resulted in the establishment of the first Metropolitanate "of the Lithuanians" (1300, or rather 1315-1319). However, the continuous expansion of Lithuania into the lands of old Kievan Rus', particularly the attempts by Grand Prince Olgierd (1345-1377) to rule over *omnia Russia*, led to an extension of the Lithuanian aims. Olgierd and his successors, grand princes of Lithuania and joint rulers of the Polish-Lithuanian union state, endeavored and intermittently succeeded in establishing under their own auspices a Metropolitanate of "Kiev and all Rus'," "all Rus'," or "Rus'" (1352?; 1355-1362; 1376-1380s?; 1415-1421; 1432-1435). Their grand design ("Kiev and all Rus'") was in some respects similar to that of the Muscovite dynasty, as they continued to participate in the contest with Muscovy for the lands of Kievan Rus'.¹¹

Muscovy's efforts in the contest for the preservation of a unitary status of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' under the exclusive control of the Muscovite dynasty and government were greatly facilitated by the policies and ideological approach of the Byzantine Empire and Patriarchate in the framework of which the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' functioned. From the creation of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' throughout the period of the contest for the Kievan ecclesiastical inheritance, both the Empire and the Patriarchate consistently adhered to the doctrine of a unitary status of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' (so conveniently explicated by John Meyendorff¹²), which they defended against attempts to create competitive metropolitanates in the realm of old Rus', such as the one by Andrei Bogoliubsky.¹³ Only in exceptional circumstances, as in the case of the titular metropolitanates in the eleventh century,¹⁴ or in situations of strong political pressures, did they consent to the formation of competing and independent Ruthenian metropolitanates, not subject to politi-

cal and ideological control of the Moscow-based Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' and the Muscovite ruler.

Byzantium's insistence on the unitary nature of the Moscow-based Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' reflected primarily her political and ideological interests and not the religious and organizational-ecclesiastical needs of the Orthodox Christians of the various Rus' polities, except for Muscovy proper. From the Byzantine perspective, Moscow potentially had a good chance to be victorious in the contest for the supremacy over the various Rus' polities, and Byzantine emperors and patriarchs acted accordingly. Such an approach seemed to be obvious. Another imperial power, the Golden Horde, had previously drawn exactly the same conclusions from the struggle for hegemony in the Russian realm and after some vacillations had decided to make the Grand Prince of Moscow the Khan's principal native executive vassal in the lands of Rus'.

The Canonization of Three Metropolitans

Muscovy's ecclesiastical claims to the Kievan inheritance were greatly facilitated not only by the institutional *translatio* of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus', but also by the politics of canonization of saints in the framework of that institution. Significantly, three metropolitans of Kiev and all Rus' of the Muscovite period were canonized as saints of the Russian Church, prior to the establishment of the Patriarchate of Moscow in 1589: Petr (in office, 1308–1326), Aleksei (1354–1378), and Iona (1448–1461).

Immediately following his death, Petr was canonized by the Council of Vladimir in 1327. That his canonization was confirmed in Constantinople already by 1339¹⁵ attests to his exceptionally good reputation at the court of the Byzantine patriarch. His *Vita*, as already mentioned, was authored by Kiprian, another prominent metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'.

Aleksei, who served in the capacity of Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' for twenty-four years, who during the period when Grand Prince Dmitrii Ivanovich was a minor acted as a regent and *de facto* head of the Muscovite government, and who was one of the leading Muscovite statesmen, was canonized as a saint of the Russian Church by Iona, the last Moscow-based metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'.¹⁶ Iona arranged for Aleksei's canonization immediately following his own ascension to the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' in 1448. Like Metropolitan Petr, Aleksei came from the Ukrainian Rus'. He was an offspring of a Chernigovian boyar family that had voluntarily migrated to the north where his father, Fedor Biakont, entered the services of the Muscovite ruler. Metropoli-

tan Aleksei's life and activities became the subject of a series of hagiographic and ideological works: a *Vita* by Pitirim, bishop of Perm, written most probably at the time of his canonization; another *Vita* by Pakhomii the Serbian (Logofet), written at the request of Metropolitan Iona in 1459; an expanded version of the latter, written at the request of Metropolitan Makarii and included in the *Book of Degrees*, the most extensive of all the *Vitae* of metropolitans in that work;¹⁷ and another *Vita*, composed at the end of the seventeenth century by monk Evfimii, a disciple of Epifanii Slavnetsky.

Unlike Petr and Aleksei, Iona was from Riazan'. He was a Great Russian and the first metropolitan of Moscow not confirmed by the Byzantine patriarchate.¹⁸ He was also a prominent Muscovite politician during the age of Vasilii II and a staunch supporter of that Muscovite ruler. During their tenures the division of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' was finalized. Metropolitan Iona was canonized in two stages: the first stage took place in the period 1472–1479; the second coincided with the Church Council of 1547, conducted under the auspices of Metropolitan Makarii. Iona's life and accomplishments were also eulogized in various recensions of his *Zhitie*.¹⁹

These three metropolitans had distinguished themselves by a devotion to the Muscovite cause, service to the Muscovite ruler, and a deep involvement in the struggles for the supremacy of Moscow, in which they unhesitatingly and decisively used the weapon of excommunication against the enemies of the Muscovite rulers. As far as the problem of Kievan ecclesiastical inheritance was concerned, they fought with determination for the preservation of the unitary status of the Moscow-based Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' under sponsorship of the Muscovite dynasty and against all efforts on the part of the Ruthenian, Lithuanian, and Polish rulers to create metropolitanates for Kiev and other Rus' lands, independent from the Muscovite state. In other words, they were the coarchitects of the all-Russian version of Muscovite ideology and politics. Their canonizations were based on their political and ideological achievements, rather than religious contributions. The similarity of their careers and contributions was clearly recognized by Iov, another Muscovite master politician, the first patriarch of Muscovite Russia (1589–1605), at whose request Prince Semen Ivanovich Shakhovskoi composed a joint *Vita* and *Praise* of the three metropolitans.²⁰ The integration of their *Vitae* into a single work attests to their being regarded as presenting a unity of purpose and achievement.

The Continuity Theory in Early Muscovite Chronicle-Writing

The fourth major factor in facilitating Muscovy's struggle for the Kievan inheritance in the ecclesiastical realm (as well as the secular) was the formulation under the sponsorship of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' of the Kiev-Suzdal'-Vladimir-Moscow continuity theory. The theory was first construed in the codex known as the *Troitskaia letopis'* (*TL*), apparently compiled in the metropolitan's chancery mainly under the auspices of Metropolitan Kiprian²¹ from the end of the fourteenth to the beginning of the fifteenth century, and concluded in 1406–1408.

The *TL* represented an official or semiofficial codex. Its only existing copy, used by the Russian historian N. M. Karamzin who quoted extensively from it in his *Istoriia gosudarstva rossiiskogo*, was destroyed in the Moscow fire of 1812. However, the discovery of the Simeonov Chronicle by A. A. Shakhmatov greatly facilitated the study of the *TL*, particularly his findings that for the years 1177–1393 the two chronicles were virtually identical. These findings, in turn, immensely helped M. D. Priselkov reconstruct the *TL* text on the basis of Karamzin's quotations, the Simeonov Chronicle, and other materials.²² The *TL* included as its first component the *Povest' vremen'nykh let* (*PVL*) (the *Narration of the Bygone Years*), according to the *Laurent'evskaia letopis'* (the Laurentian Chronicle), or a closely related text, covering the period to the year 1110. From about 1110 to about 1204, it incorporated Suzdalian and Vladimirian chronicle materials, also based on the Laurentian Chronicle or a closely related compilation, like the prototype of the Radziwill Chronicle. From 1203 to 1205, it followed the Suzdal'-Vladimir historical material, although in an edited version. From 1206 to 1263, it again very closely followed the Suzdal'-Vladimir chronicle-writing until the death of Aleksandr Nevsky in 1263. For the period 1263–1305, it used materials of the Laurentian Chronicle, as well as materials of other chronicles from northeastern Rus'. Its entries for the years 1305–1408 represent a valuable historical source material: until its destruction in 1812, the *TL* was the only surviving Muscovite chronicle covering that period. The *TL* included information pertaining to the history of Muscovy, the Rus' lands under the sovereignty of the Lithuanian Grand Principality and of other Russian states, like Tver', Riazan', and Novgorod.

What is significant about the *TL* is the approach taken by its authors and compilers, especially by Metropolitan Kiprian, to the post-1110 history of the Kievan Rus'. They, first of all, did not use the *Kievskaiia letopis'* (the Kievan Chronicle) (1118–1198 [1200]), or a closely related text for inclusion

into the *TL*. On the contrary, they adapted for their purposes the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s), constituting the second major component of the Laurentian Chronicle for the time period 1111-1203/1204 (or parts of the prototype of the Radziwiłł Chronicle), which treat Kiev, the Kievan land, and "Kievan Rus'" from an exclusively Suzdal'-Vladimirian point of view. For example, the *TL* contains accounts (*skazaniia*) of the sacks of Kiev of 1169 and 1203 to be found in the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicle(s).²³ In other words, the *TL* not only verbally accepted the Suzdal'-Vladimirian interpretations of those events, but also treated the entire history of twelfth-century Kievan Rus' from the generally hostile and anti-Kievan point of view of the Suzdal'-Vladimirian Chronicles.²⁴ The *TL*'s treatment of the time period between 1206 and the mid-1260s, as well as some later periods, with regard to certain lands and polities of Rus', was even more biased. For example, the entire history of the Galician and Volhynian Rus' from 1205 to 1340 was virtually eliminated from the *TL*. Its accounts for the period 1206-1263 deal with the history of the northeastern Rus', viewed primarily from the Suzdal'-Vladimirian perspective and interpret it for the benefit of the Grand Principality of Vladimir. For the period from 1269 to the end of the thirteenth century, the *TL* concentrates on selected developments in northeastern Russia, with emphasis on the Vladimir Grand Principality, however without a particular preferential treatment of princely competitors for the Grand Principality of Vladimir. Scholars have argued that from 1305 to 1408 the *TL* reflected the all-Russian view, however not so much of the Muscovite, as of the Moscow-based Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus'. This opinion needs qualification. Whereas the compilers of the *TL* did indeed include in it materials pertaining to other Russian states, such as Tver' and Novgorod, as well as to the Lithuanian-Ruthenian state, the overall orientation of the *TL* was clearly pro-Muscovite.

As far as the interpretation of the ecclesiastical claims to the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' was concerned, the authors and editors of the *TL*'s component pertaining to the period 1300/1305-1408 emphasized that it had to be based first in Vladimir and then in Moscow, and that it must remain indivisible and by implication, under the auspices of the Muscovite ruler. However, they did not advance any secular dynastic claims for Moscow to the Kievan Rus'. They simply referred to Muscovite rulers as rulers of Moscow and stressed the Vladimirian connection of the Muscovite dynasty, particularly as reflected in the annalistic necrologs for the Muscovite rulers, for example.²⁵ The direct dynastic link to Kiev and claims concerning

unification with Kiev were to be developed in Muscovite chronicle-writing much later,²⁶ specifically in connection with the takeover and annexation of Novgorod in 1470s.²⁷

The principal contribution of the authors and editors of the *TL*, as well as its sponsor, Metropolitan Kiprian, is the advancement of the first known Kiev–Suzdal’–Vladimir–Muscovy continuity theory in Russian history. This can be established on the basis of the analysis of the entry under the year 1392 in the *TL* which includes a reference to a certain *Letopisets’ velikii rusškii* (*LVR*) stating that it covered historical events “from [the time of] Iaroslav the Great to this present prince [Muscovite Grand Prince Vasillii I Dmitrievich, who began to rule in 1389].”²⁸

Traditionally, it has been assumed that the reference to “Iaroslav the Great” applied to Iaroslav I Volodimerovich, the Wise (1019–1054). Therefore, D. S. Likhachev has concluded that the lost *LVR* was the first historical work to provide a “full survey of all Russian history” from the Kievan to the Muscovite period.²⁹ On the basis of this lost work, the *TL* and some other inconclusive evidence have dated the origins of the official secular Muscovite claims to Kievan Rus’ into the late fourteenth–early fifteenth century, namely the period of the hypothetical early Renaissance in Muscovite Russia.³⁰ If one were to accept the traditional interpretation of the reference to “Iaroslav the Great” in the *TL*, then the lost *LVR*, compiled probably in the 1380s, would be the first work to have advanced the Kiev–Suzdal’–Vladimir–Muscovy continuity theory.

However, an analysis of the relevant entry in the *TL* by G. M. Prokhorov, and in particular his identification of “Iaroslav the Great” as Iaroslav II Vsevolodovich of Vladimir (1190–1238/1246),³¹ has established that the lost *LVR* had begun with the Vladimirian and not the Kievan period. In fact, the same applies to the annalistic necrologs for the Muscovite rulers, included in the *TL*.³² Therefore, it can be concluded that the *TL* is the first known work to have advanced the Kiev–Suzdal’–Vladimir–Muscovy continuity theory in Russian history. To be sure, at that initial stage of its development this continuity theory was still rudimentary and unsophisticated. Only later, in the sixteenth century such Muscovite works as the *Voskresenskaia letopis’* (*Voskresensk Chronicle*), *Nikonovskaia letopis’* (the *Nikon Chronicle*), the *Book of Degrees*, and the *Great Menology* provided more accomplished interpretative versions of the continuity theory. Nonetheless, the first continuity theory devised at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century proved in the *TL*, regardless of its inconsistencies, crudity, and naive simpli-

city, was to make an extraordinary career not only in Russian historical and political thought, but also in Western historiography until the present time.

This analysis of the origins of Muscovy's claims to the Kievan inheritance has concentrated on the discussion of the ecclesiastical institution of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' and on historical-ideological works composed within its framework and by its members. The development of the secular official claims to the Kievan inheritance, which I have discussed elsewhere, came much later.³³ Its first major phase falls into the period from the mid-fifteenth century to the beginnings of the sixteenth, which means that the beginnings of the formulation of the secular claims to Kiev and all Rus' coincided with the division of the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' in 1458/1461. Thus, the origins of Muscovy's ecclesiastical claims to the Kievan inheritance preceded the origins of her secular claims to Kievan Rus' by about a century and a half. This, indeed, reflects the status of Russian culture and the level of its development in that period.

Notes

1. D. S. Likhachev: *Natsional'noe samosoznanie drevnei Rusi: ocherki iz oblasti russkoi literatury XI-XVII vv.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1945), pp. 68-81. *Kultura Rusi epokhi obrazovaniia russkogo natsional'nogo gosudarstva: Konets XIV-nachalo XVI v.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1946), pp. 40-41, 57-97, 103-104; *Russkie letopisi i ikh kulturno-istoricheskoe znachenie* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1947), pp. 293-305; *Kultura vremeni Andreia Rubleva i Epifaniia Premudrogo: Konets XIV-nachalo XV v.* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1945), pp. 4, 6, 11-12, 17, 19-20, 90-115, 142-146, 161-170; *Die Kultur Rußlands während der osteuropäischen Frührenaissance vom 14. bis zum Beginn des 15. Jahrhunderts* (Dresden, 1962), pp. 6, 8, 13-14, 18-19, 20-21, 90-117, 145-152, 167-175; "Predvozrozhdenie na Rusi v kontse XIV-pervoi polovine XV veka," in *Literatura epokhi vozrozhdeniia i problemy vseмирnoi literatury* (Moscow, 1967), pp. 136-182.

2. J. Pelenski, "The Origins of the Official Muscovite Claims to the 'Kievan Inheritance,'" *HUS* 1, no. 1 (1977): 29-52; Ch. J. Halperin, "Kiev and Moscow: An Aspect of Early Muscovite Thought," *Russian History*, 7, no. 3 (1980): 312-321, especially p. 313, n. 8; J. Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Moscow* (Cambridge, 1981), p. 128.

3. See note 1 above.

4. See J. Pelenski, "The Origins," pp. 29-52; idem, "The Emergence of the Muscovite Claims to the Byzantine-Kievan 'Imperial Inheritance,'" *HUS* 7 (1983): 520-531; idem, "The Sack of Kiev of 1482 in Contemporary Muscovite Chronicle Writing," *HUS* 3-4 (1979-1980): 638-649.

5. *PSRL*, vol. 1, pt. 1 (1926/1962), col. 485. For a convenient discussion of the circumstances pertaining to the transfer of the metropolitan, see Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Moscow*, pp. 29-72.

6. For Metropolitan Petr's life and career, as well as the literature on the subject, see "Petr," in N. Barsukov, *Istochniki russkoi agiografii* (St. Petersburg, 1882), cols. 431-453; E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 2, pt. 1 (1900), pp. 98-144; V. A. Kuchkin, "Skazanie o smerti mitropolita Petra," *TODRL* 18 (1962): 59-79; Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Moscow*, pp. 149-154; G. M. Prokhorov, "Petr," in D. S. Likhachev, ed., *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti drevnei Rusi*, no. 1 (XI-pervaia polovina XIV v.) (Leningrad, 1987), pp. 325-329.

7. Cited in V. A. Kuchkin, "Skazanie o smerti mitropolita Petra," *TODRL* 18 (1962): 64.

8. L. A. Dmitriev, "Rol' i znachenie mitropolita Kipriana v istorii drevnerusskoi literatury (K russko-bolgarskim literaturnym sviaziam XIV-XV vv.)," *TODRL* 19 (1963): 215-254, especially pp. 236-254. For a recent text edition of Kiprian's *Zhitie mitropolita Petra*, see G. M. Prokhorov, *Povest' o Mitiaie* (Leningrad, 1978), pp. 204-215. See also G. M. Prokhorov, "Drevneishaia rukopis' s proizvedeniiami mitropolita Kipriana," in *Pamiatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytiia. Ezhegodnik za 1978* (Leningrad, 1979), pp. 17-30. For the text in the *Kniga stepennaia*, see *PSRL*, vol. 21, pt. 1 (1908), pp. 321-332. Two recent works related to the themes of this article have erroneously characterized Metropolitan Kiprian's attitudes as unfriendly toward Moscow and have failed to appreciate the significance of the *Vita* in question, as well as the insertion of the prophecy about Moscow in it (N. S. Borisov, *Russkaia tserkov' v politicheskoi bor'be XIV-XV vekov* [Moscow, 1986], pp. 106-111, 113-118, 132-139; A. S. Khoroshev, *Politicheskaiia istoriia russkoi kanonizatsii [XI-XVI vv.]* [Moscow, 1986], pp. 101-104).

9. G. M. Prokhorov, *Povest' o Mitiaie*, pp. 211-212; *PSRL*, vol. 21, pt. 1 (1908), p. 328.

10. The titles "Metropolitan of all Rus'," or "Metropolitanate of all Rus'," or "Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'" were used interchangeably (J. Meyendorff, *Byzantium and the Rise of Moscow*, pp. 73-95). The concept "Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'" was applied more consistently since 1347, and especially since the early 1390s, when in the course of the contest for the Metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus' the concepts "Metropolitan of all Rus'" and "Metropolitan of Kiev and all Rus'" acquired more specific meanings (for a discussion of the use of the titles in the sources, see A. Pliguzov, "O titule 'Mitropolit kievskii i vseia Rusi'" [unpublished paper]).

11. For a discussion of the history of various contending metropolitanates and the relevant literature, see A. S. Pavlov, "O nachale Galitskoi i Litovskoi mitropolii i o pervykh tamoshnikh mitropolitakh po vizantiiskim dokumental'nym istochnikam XIV-go veka," *Russkoe Obozrenie* 3 (May 1894): 214-251; N. D. Tikhomirov, *Galitskaia Mitropoliia, Tserkovno-istoricheskoe issledovanie* (St. Petersburg, 1985); K. Chodnicki, *Kosciol prawoslawny a Rzeczpospolita Polska, 1370-1632* (Warsaw, 1934), p. 374; I. Nazarko, "Halychka Mitropoliia," *Analecta Ordinis S. Basilii Magni*, ser. 2, sec. 11, vol. 3 (1-2), 145-225; M. Giedroyć, "The Arrival of Christianity in Lithuania: Between Rome and Byzantium (1281-1341)," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, n.s., 20 (1987): 14-20, idem, "The Influence of Ruthenian-Lithuanian Metropolitanates on the Progress of Christianization (1300-1458)" (unpublished paper).

12. *Byzantium and the Rise of Moscow*, pp. 73-95. See also D. Obolensky, "Byzan-

tium, Kiev, and Moscow: A Study in Ecclesiastical Relations," *DOP* 11 (1957): 21-78.

13. For a discussion of Andrei Bogoliubsky's attempt to create a competitive metropolitanate, and the literature on the subject, see J. Pelenski, "The Contest for the 'Kievan Succession' (1155-1175): The Religious-Ecclesiastical Dimension," *Proceedings of the International Congress Commemorating the Millennium of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine*, *HUS* 12-13 (1988-1989): 761-780.

14. A. Poppe, "Zur Geschichte der Kirche und des Staates der Rus' im 11. Jh.: Titularmetropolen," *Das heidnische und christliche Slaventum* (Wiesbaden, 1970), pp. 64-75.

15. V. A. Kuchkin, "Skazanie," pp. 71-75; G. M. Prokhorov, "Petr," p. 327. Contradictory assessments regarding the relationship of church and state and the interconnected problem of the canonization politics in Muscovite Russia have recently been offered in scholarship. Contrary to the preponderance of the available evidence, N. S. Borisov has questioned the established view about the close cooperation between church and state in Muscovite Russia, particularly in the fourteenth century, but also in the fifteenth. Borisov has advanced the hypothesis that the Orthodox Church's support for state policies was "rather modest" and that especially in the fourteenth century the prevailing attitude of the Metropolitans of Kiev and all Rus' toward Moscow was characterized by a "temporizing neutrality" (*Russkaia tserkov'*, p. 188 and "Moskovskie kniaz'ia i russkie mitropolity XIV veka," *Voprosy istorii*, no. 8 [1986]: 30-43, especially p. 43). A. S. Khoroshev, however, has maintained that the canonization of Russian saints was a "political institution," that the primary criterion for the canonization of Russian saints was political, and that there existed a most intimate relationship between church and state in Old Rus' (*Politicheskaia istoriia russkoi kanonizatsii*, pp. 189-190. See also idem, *Tserkov' v sotsial'no-politicheskoi sisteme Novgorodskoi feodal'noi respubliki* (Moscow, 1980).

16. For Metropolitan Aleksei's life and career, as well as the literature on the subject, see Barsukov, cols. 27-32; E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 2, pt. 1 (1900), pp. 171-225; idem, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh v russkoi tserkvi* (Moscow, 1903), pp. 74-75; A. E. Presniakov, *Obrazovanie velikorusskogo gosudarstva* (Petrograd, 1918), pp. 290-317; G. M. Prokhorov, "Zhitie Alekseia mitropolita," in D. S. Likhachev (ed.), *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti drevnei Rusi*, no. 2 (vtoraia polovina XIV-XVI vv.), pt. 1 (A-K) (Leningrad, 1988), pp. 243-245. N. S. Borisov has treated the close cooperation of church and state and their symbiotic relationship during the tenure of Metropolitan Aleksei as an exception in the history of church-state relations of the Muscovite period (*Russkaia tserkov'*, pp. 79-99).

17. *PSRL*, vol. 21, pt. 2 (1913), pp. 346-386.

18. For Metropolitan Iona's life and career, as well as the literature on the subject, see N. Barsukov, *Istochniki russkoi agiografii*, cols. 266-272; E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 2, pt. 1 (1900), pp. 469-515; Ia. S. Lur'e, "Iona," in *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti drevnei Rusi*, no. 2, pt. 1 (A-K) (1988), pp. 420-426; Ia. S. Lur'e, "Zhitie Iony," *ibid.*, pp. 270-273. N. S. Borisov's and A. S. Khoroshev's treatments of the activities and the canonization of Metropolitan Iona are rather brief and offer no new insights.

19. N. Barsukov, *Istochniki russkoi agiografii*, cols. 266-272; E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia kanonizatsii sviatykh v Russkoi Tserkvi*, pp. 79-80.

20. N. Barsukov, *Istochniki russkoi agiografii*, cols. 31–32, 271, 449.

21. For Metropolitan Kiprian's life and career, and the literature on the subject, see E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 2, pt. 1 (1900), pp. 297–356; L. A. Dmitriev, "Rol' i znachenie mitropolita Kipriana," *TODRL* 19 (1963): 215–254; D. Obolensky, "A *Philorhomaïos anthropos*: Metropolitan Cyprian of Kiev and all Russia," *DOP* 32 (1979): 79–98. G. M. Prokhorov, *Povest' o Mitiaïe*; N. F. Droblenkova, "Bibliografiia," G. M. Prokhorov, "Kiprian," in "Letopistsy i istoriki XI–XVII vv.," *TODRL* 39 (1985): 53–71; also "Kiprian," in *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti drevnei Rusi*, no. 2, pt. 1 (A–K) (1988), pp. 464–475.

22. For the text of the reconstructed *Troitskaia letopis'*, see M. D. Priselkov, *Troitskaia letopis': Rekonstruktsiia teksta* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1950). The most important scholarly contributions to the study of the *Troitskaia letopis'* are the following: M. D. Priselkov, "Letopisanie XIV veka," in *Sbornik statei po russkoi istorii posviashchennykh S. F. Platonovu* (1922), pp. 24–39; "O rekonstruktsii teksta Troitskoi letopisi 1408 g., sgorevshei v Moskve v 1812 g.," *Uchenye zapiski Gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta im. Gertsena* (1939): 542; M. D. Priselkov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia XI–XV vv.* (Leningrad, 1940), pp. 113–142; Priselkov, *Troitskaia letopis'*, Introduction, pp. 7–49; S. I. Kochetov, "Troitskii pergamennyi spisok letopisi 1408 g.," *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1961 god* (1962), pp. 18–27; G. N. Moiseeva, "Otryvok Troitskoi pergamennoi letopisi perepisannyi G. F. Millerom," *TODRL* 26 (1971): 93–99; Ia. S. Lur'e, *Obshcherusskie letopisi XIV–XV vv.* (Leningrad, 1976), pp. 17–66; G. M. Prokhorov, "Letopisets Velikii Rus'skii: Analiz ego upominaniia v Troitskoi letopisi," in *Letopisi i khroniki* (Moscow, 1976), pp. 67–77; C. J. Halperin, "The Russian Land and the Russian Tsar: the Emergence of Muscovite Ideology, 1380–1408," *Forschungen zur osteuropäischen Geschichte* 23 (1976): 5–103, especially pp. 58–68; Ia. S. Lur'e, "Letopis' Troitskaia," in D. S. Likhachev (ed.), *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti drevnei Rusi*, no. 2 (vтораia polovina XIV–XVI v.) (1989), pt. 2 (L–Ia) (Leningrad, 1989), pp. 64–67. Kiprian's role as a sponsor of the *TL* and the latter's significance in the history of Muscovite chronicle writing and ideology has been almost completely overlooked by N. S. Borisov (*Russkaia tserkov'*) and A. S. Khoroshev (*Politicheskaia istoriia*).

23. *PSRL*, vol. 1 (1926), cols. 354–355, 418–419; *TL*, pp. 244–245, 285–286.

24. For a discussion of these interpretations and views, see J. Pelenski, "The Sack of Kiev of 1169: Its Significance for the Succession to Kievan Rus'," *HUS* 9, no. 3–4 (December 1987): 303–316.

25. J. Pelenski, "The Origins," pp. 36–37, 41.

26. Ia. S. Lur'e, *Obshcherusskie letopisi XIV–XV vv.*, pp. 120–121.

27. J. Pelenski, "The Origins," pp. 46–48.

28. *TL*, p. 439.

29. Likhachev, *Russkie letopisi*, p. 295.

30. See note 1 above.

31. Prokhorov, "Letopisets Velikii Rus'skii," pp. 67–77, especially pp. 71–74.

32. See J. Pelenski, "The Origins," pp. 36–7, 41.

33. See J. Pelenski, "The Origins," pp. 29–52; idem, "The Emergence of the Muscovite Claims," pp. 520–531; idem, "The Sack of Kiev," pp. 638–649.