

INTRODUCTION: CHRISTIANITY EAST AND WEST

Nickolas Lupinin and Donald Ostrowski

During the first century A.D., when Christianity began to spread, the Roman Empire was splitting into two administrative units—Greek in the East and Latin in the West. The line dividing these administrative units paralleled already existing cultural divisions and ran east of the boot of Italy from North Africa into the Balkans, specifically what used to be Yugoslavia, along the border of present-day Croatia and Serbia. To the East of that line the administration was Greek, including Greek language and the Greek alphabet. The differences between the present-day Serbs and Croats are indicative of that difference to a degree since the Serbs use a Greek-based Cyrillic alphabet, and the Croats use a Latin alphabet for what was essentially the same language. The Serbs are associated for the most part with the Eastern Church, and the Croats with the Western Church.

When Constantine (306–337) became Roman emperor, he decreed tolerance for Christians, who until then had undergone periodic persecutions by the authorities. He founded his capital, a new city named Constantinople, on the spot where the fishing village of Byzantium was located, and he declared the bishop of Constantinople to be second among prelates only to the bishop

Tapestry of Russian Christianity: Studies in History and Culture. Nickolas Lupinin, Donald Ostrowski and Jennifer B. Spock, eds. Columbus, Ohio: Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Cultures and the Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies, The Ohio State University, 2016, vii–xxvii.

INTRODUCTION

of Rome. In 451, the Council of Chalcedon established the patriarchate of Constantinople. At the time, there were four chief prelates in the Christian Church: in Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Rome. The patriarch of Constantinople took the lead among the other patriarchies in countering any unilateral decisions of the Roman pontiff. The non-Roman patriarchies saw the Roman pontiff as *primus inter pares* for such things as presiding at church councils, but not for making determinations about doctrine. As a result, major points of disagreement arose between the pope (bishop of Rome) and the Eastern patriarchs.

Major Points of Disagreement

Open to question is the time exactly when the Eastern Church and the Western Church split from each other. Some scholars place it at 1204 when the western warriors of the Fourth Crusade captured Constantinople. Other scholars place it at 1054 when the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople excommunicated each other. Yet other scholars see the split as effectively having occurred earlier. In any case the major points of disagreement had crystallized by the 11th century at the latest. What follows is a brief survey of the most significant of these disagreements.

1. *Language of the Liturgy.* This disagreement was not just a question of whether the language of the liturgy should be Greek or Latin but also a question of whether the local churches could use their own language for the church service. The Western Church used Latin and declared it to be the liturgical language throughout the Christian world. The Eastern Church used Greek in Constantinople, but allowed the local churches to use the local sacred language. Arguments subsequently arose in the historiography about ultimately what this difference meant. Some have seen it as an advantage to the people in the Western Church, especially when they were eager to begin acquiring learning. If one knew Latin, one was already connected with the lingua franca that united Western Christendom, whereas if one were in Rus' and knew Russian and Church Slavonic, but not Greek, then one could not tap into the corpus of Greek literature. The argument is that the local liturgical language was a disadvantage. On the other hand, putting the church service and accompanying sacred writings into the local language (although an elevated form of it, to be sure) allowed the message of the liturgy and those writings to be more comprehensible to the congregants.

2. *Ritual*. Two different forms of ritual developed in the Eastern and Western Christian traditions. The differences in ritual reflected issues considered significant by communities that were slowly dividing into two churches, and that one frequently encounters mentioned in the sources. For example, these issues included the questions of how many “hallelujahs” to say at the end of the church service, whether the Host was on the altar or in a chalice on the altar, what components should be included as parts of the wedding ritual, and so forth.

3. *Two Swords Theory vs. Harmony of Church and State*. Gelasius I (492–496) was the first pope to articulate a “two powers” doctrine. Pope Gregory VII (1073–1085) developed the idea of spiritual superiority over the temporal in his *Papal Register* of 1075 in which he posited that the pope may depose the emperor. Pope Boniface VIII (1294–1303) expanded upon the two powers idea as well as the superiority of the Church into “two swords” theory in his Bull *Unam sanctum* of 18 November 1302. The idea was that there existed a secular sword and an ecclesiastical sword, and that the ecclesiastical sword was superior to the secular sword. The implication was that the church was superior to the state. In the Byzantine Empire, one finds, instead, a notion of harmony, or symphony, between the two powers—that the church and state should be working together to guide the body and the soul of each person. Patriarch Photios of Constantinople (858–867, 877–886) wrote in his *Epanagōgē* that “the polity, like man, consists of parts and members (among these the most important and the necessary parts are the Emperor and the Patriarch). Wherefore the peace and happiness of subjects, in body and soul, consist in the full agreement and concord of the kingship and the priesthood.”¹ In the 17th century, however, Patriarch Nikon applied the Western Church’s “two swords” theory to the relationship between tsar and patriarch in Russia.² The Church Council of 1666–67 rejected Nikon’s formulation and restored the principle of harmony between kingship and priesthood.

4. *Clerical Celibacy vs. Married Priests*. In order to become a priest, a man in the Eastern Church is supposed to be married. In the Western Church, a priest is not allowed to be married. We have

¹ *Jus graecoromanum*, 6: 59–60.

² “Vozrazhenie Nikona,” 314. Palmer, *Patriarch and Tsar*, 1: 252–253.

INTRODUCTION

evidence from as early as the third century, that, although bishops, priests, and deacons could be married, they were not to have sexual relations with their wives after ordination. The eventual difference in whether clergy could or should be married represented different interpretations of Canon VI of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Third Council of Constantinople) 680–681: “And if any of those who enter the clergy wishes to be joined to a wife in lawful marriage before he is ordained a subdeacon, deacon, or presbyter, let it be done.”³ The Eastern Church interpreted this canon to say that in order to become a priest, a man had to be married. Beginning with the late 11th-century Gregorian reforms, the Western Church began to frown upon married clergy entirely. The Second Lateran Council of 1139 declared clerical marriage illegal, which took hold fully in the 13th century. According to the Union of Brest in 1596, the so-called Ukrainian Catholics (Uniates or Greek Catholics) were allowed to maintain such Eastern Church practices as a married clergy, the Julian calendar, and exclusion of the *filioque* in the Nicene Creed, while acknowledging the Western Church primacy of the Pope.

5. *Unleavened Bread vs. Leavened Bread.* Unleavened bread is on the altar during the church service and served in communion in the Western Church, whereas leavened bread is served in communion in the Eastern Church. The Eastern Church favors leavened bread in communion because it represents the risen Christ. The Western Church considers leavening to be unholy and claims one is eating a living thing because the leavening is usually yeast (although it can be some other microorganism such as a bacterium called *clostridium perfringens*).

6. *Statues vs. Icons.* Before the eighth century, statues, paintings, and mosaics of holy figures appeared in Christian churches. Iconoclasts in the Eastern Roman Empire, basing their stance on the commandment against graven images, objected to such representational art. Iconodules (those who supported representational depiction of religious persons) argued the biblical prohibition was against worshipping images, not the images themselves. Conflicts, at times with a significant number of fatalities, occurred between iconoclasts and iconodules in the Byzantine Empire for about 100 years from the early eighth to the early ninth centuries.

³ *Select Library*, 14: 364.

Finally, a compromise was reached in the Eastern Church whereby statuary was excluded, but two-dimensional representations were allowed as long as the artists followed strict stylistic guidelines so as to depict the spirituality of the figure rather than its corporality. The final re-establishment of icons came under Empress Irene in 843, an act now commemorated in Eastern Orthodoxy as “the Triumph of Orthodoxy.” The Western Church has maintained statuary and realistic representational art. Since the Reformation, Calvinist groups have looked askance at such representational depictions.

7. *Role of the Pope (i.e., Bishop of Rome).* A crucial difference of views developed on the role of the pope. Western Churchmen argued that the pope decided judicial, administrative, and dogmatic issues because, according to Matt. 16:18, Jesus said, “You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church.” Peter, so the argument goes, was the first pope, the first bishop of Rome. The Eastern Church says that is not the case. Peter just happened to end up in Rome but that did not give the pope any priority in making decisions; it only made him *primus inter pares*. The bishop of Rome could open, close, and preside over councils of all the church prelates. Other than that he had no priority in decision-making. That was the big bone of contention. As early as the papacy of Victor I (189–199), the Roman pontiff unilaterally declared the Roman church’s method for determining the celebration of Easter to be the only correct one. The church leaders in the eastern Mediterranean disagreed. As a result, the Eastern and Western Churches developed different formulae for computing the date of Easter.

8. *Doctrinal Issues.* Perhaps the most fiercely and extensively argued doctrinal difference concerns the Filioque Clause. This clause is an emendation to the Nicene Creed (325), which states that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father. The Western Church at the Third Council of Toledo (589), endorsed by the Bishop of Rome, added “filioque” (and the son) to the Nicene Creed so that the Holy Spirit was said to process from both Father and Son. In the ninth century, Patriarch Photios, who had been declared deposed by Pope Nicholas, condemned the use of *filioque* as heretical. In subsequent years, the Eastern Church proposed other possibilities for the way the procession of the Holy Spirit occurs but the Western Church has rejected all of these proposals.

INTRODUCTION

Other doctrinal differences include the nature of Original Sin, the existence of Purgatory, the Immaculate Conception, the nature of Hell, the nature of Man, and free will. The Western Church accepted the formulation of Augustine (354–430) that original sin is transferred to the soul of each new born baby through the parents' souls (traducianism). The Eastern Church rejects that formulation in favor of the idea that each soul is created anew by God. The Western Church's notion of original sin being transferred to the souls of children led to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception—that when the Virgin Mary's soul was conceived in her mother Ann's womb, it was done immaculately without the imbuing of it with original sin. The Eastern Church rejects the doctrine of Immaculate Conception since, among other reasons, that doctrine does not comport with its notion of how souls are created.

Between 1160 and 1180, the Western Church developed the doctrine of Purgatory—the place where souls go after death to be purified of residual sin through punishment. Eastern Church theologians agree that not all souls go immediately to Heaven or Hell after death, but they see this intermediate condition as being one of growth not punishment. Thus, prayers for the dead and documents of absolution serve a slightly different function in the Eastern Church from what they do in the Western Church.

9. *Calendar.* Disagreements over calendar use were also fiercely argued. The initial difference in calendars between Rome and Byzantium concerned whether to count from the birth of Christ (Rome) or from the creation of the world (Byzantium). The calendar dating years since the birth of Christ (the *Anno Domini* system) was devised by Dionysius Exiguus in 525 but did not become widespread in the West until centuries later. The Roman Church began using it for dating documents only in the 11th century. The Eastern Church continued to count years according to the ruling of the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Third Council of Constantinople) in 680–681 that the world was created in 5509 B.C. Upon the Russian government's adoption of the *Anno Domini* system in 1700, the Russian Church followed suit, but by that time the papacy had jettisoned the Julian Calendar for the Gregorian Calendar. That changeover came in 1582 under the papacy of Pope Gregory XIII (1572–1585). In 1923, a split occurred in the Eastern Church when, at an ecumenical council in Constantinople, the Orthodox churches of Alexandria, Antioch, Bulgaria,

Constantinople, Cyprus, Greece, Romania, and other New Calendarists adopted a Revised Julian Calendar, which is more accurate than the Gregorian Calendar but allows calculating moveable feasts the traditional way.⁴ The Orthodox churches of Georgia, Jerusalem, Macedonia, Poland, Russia, Serbia, and other Old Calendarists continue, however, to use the old Julian Calendar.⁵

10. *Relationship of Reason to Faith.* By the time of Scholasticism, the Western Church accepted that reason, in the form of dialectic (logic), can be used to defend faith. In the Eastern Church the prevailing notion was that dialectic has no significant relationship to faith. Instead of dividing God's creations into categories, Eastern Church theology tends to focus on the wholeness of God's creation.

As Christianity was gaining first legitimacy and then dominance within the Roman Empire during the fourth century, a series of compromises of antithetical philosophical and theological views occurred. The fragmentation of the Western Roman Empire in the fifth century forced the competing theological factions in the West either to compromise or to be declared heretical. Each compromise laid the groundwork for the next compromise in a constantly evolving synthesis. In order to gain legitimacy among the pagan elite, the church fathers adopted and synthesized with early Christianity a respectable form of pagan philosophy—Neoplatonism. The version of Neoplatonism that the Western church fathers adopted was itself a synthesis of features of mysticism with the Aristotelian logic of the Roman Stoics. As a result, the Western Church allowed the teaching of dialectic within the school curriculum before the 12th century as one of the seven liberal arts. The initial function of dialectic in determining knowledge, however, was limited. It took centuries for the role of dialectic to be expanded, and it did so against serious opposition.

By the 11th century, a synthesis of reason and faith had evolved such that dialectic could be used to describe particulars as long as those particulars coincided with those that faith had already determined. In the 13th century, a new synthesis emerged in which, as a result of the acceptance of dialectic as a descriptive tool and the influx of Aristotelian texts (especially the *Topics* and

⁴ Milankovitch, "Das Ende des julianischen Kalenders," 379–384.

⁵ Ware, *Orthodox Church*, 301–303.

INTRODUCTION

Sophistic Refutations), dialectic was allowed a diagnostic role in determining particulars, as long as those particulars did not contradict the particulars that faith had determined. This difference between “coinciding” and “not contradicting” was an important one for it amounted to another step up for dialectic. Dialectic, thus, had to itself the entire realm of this world, which Neoplatonism dismissed as unimportant.

In the Eastern Church, after the initial synthesis of early Christianity with pagan Neoplatonism, further compromises were avoided so as to maintain the purity of faith. In part, this avoidance can be explained by the form of Neoplatonism adopted in the Eastern Church, which rejected dialectic even as a descriptive tool. Any attempts to use dialectic as a diagnostic tool in matters of doctrine were immediately suppressed. Indicative of this suppression is the absence of dialectic in the school curriculum in Byzantium. In this respect, the centralized power of the Eastern Roman Empire helped maintain theological purity. The Western Church allowed a space for dialectic to develop as a discipline in its own right and eventually to grow and to dominate conceptual thinking in the secular culture, while the Eastern Church eliminated that space and thereby precluded a similar phenomenon from occurring.

11. *Form and Function of Monasticism.* Constantinople had remained for centuries the sole focus of high culture throughout the Christian world. Whatever seeped out to the provinces was sharply circumscribed and controlled. These restrictions were due to the fact that the conduits for Byzantine culture were the monasteries, and the form and function of monasticism had developed differently in the Eastern and Western churches. In the Eastern Church, the primary and almost sole ostensible function of monasticism was the salvation of the soul of the individual monk (which is not to say that many of the monasteries did not become significantly profitable corporations in their own right). Eremitic monasticism predominated in the eastern Mediterranean, and, even in those areas where communal monasteries developed, there was no concept of preserving writings other than those that were liturgical and scriptural in nature. Compendia of sanitized pagan writings were copied, preserved, and used for instruction in the secular culture. Byzantium, as the imitation (*mimesis*) of the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, acted to maintain the purity of the written word and artistic form (e.g., strict rules for icon painting).

In the Western Church, the development of monasticism coincided with the fall of the Roman Empire and, more importantly, was influenced by the perception of a Golden Age about to be lost. When Boethius' student Cassiodorus founded his monastery of Vivarium on his lands at Squillace in Calabria in southern Italy around the year 540, he helped establish the idea, along with the salvation of the soul of individual monks, of preserving the "salvation kit of Latinity"⁶ for a future, better time. The orientation of Byzantine monasticism was merely an outward manifestation of a deep structural difference in mentalité between the two churches. And that difference can be traced back to the different ways Neoplatonism was synthesized with church dogma in Eastern and Western Christianity and their subsequently differing epistemologies.

Neoplatonism also differed from Platonism in certain significant ways, including the assertion that it is impossible to say anything about what the One is, beyond that the One is Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. Thus, only apophatic theology can be used to discuss the One—we can say only what it is not. Ultimately, however, we can comprehend through the silence of mystical union. This silence of mystical union with the One can be seen to coincide with the so-called "intellectual silence" of Rus' culture. It derives from the Byzantine blend of Christianity with Neoplatonism and entered Rus' through Eastern Church monasticism. As a result, communion with the divine is to be experienced, not thought or perceived.

The mysticism of the Eastern Church in having part of the liturgy take place in the sanctuary behind the iconostasis, hidden from the parishioners' view, derives from a more explicit implementation of the mystery of God. Not only can we not have any positive knowledge of God, but also any knowledge of the Mind of God that we might obtain through the Divine Soul is only partial and imperfect. Salvation occurs through our own souls for our own souls in synergy (*synergeia*) or cooperation with God.

12. *Biblical Interpretation.* The two views are illustrated in the differing ways of interpreting the Bible. The Western Church came heavily under the influence of Origen's allegorical interpretation of Scripture for unclear, unrealistic, or difficult to understand passages. This approach suggested that the underlying reality of the

⁶ Lehmann, *European Heritage*, 46.

INTRODUCTION

Divine Soul could be understood in a one-to-one relationship with this world—that is, metaphorically. In other words, what happens in this world has a more or less direct relationship to, and is a metaphor for, understanding the next. Although the allegorical interpretation also existed in the Eastern Church, it was subordinate to the prevailing Eastern Church’s approach, which was a grammatical, non-metaphoric interpretation of Scripture, a style of interpretation that was influenced by John Chrysostom (ca. 349–407).

Eastern Church Thought

It may not be too much of a generalization to characterize Eastern Church thought as synthetic, as bringing everything together into one whole, one entirety, one eternity. The political structure of Byzantium reflected that view—one *ruler* over the whole world, the Kingdom of Heaven on earth. This approach characterized the individual as inseparably part of the whole, and the whole encompassed all the individual parts. Western Church thought began as basically synthetic, but due to various divisions—political, religious, intellectual—an analytic trend developed. Ideas and concepts were broken down (analyzed), categorized, then recombined in different ways. The “two swords” theory was one manifestation of a dichotomous approach.

For Eastern Church theologians, it made no sense to argue about the mystery of things for there was nothing to argue about. They rejected what in their view were innovations such as grammar, rhetoric, and logic as “tricks” and “guiles.” They did not condemn the devices that happened to be grammatical, rhetorical, and dialectical in nature as much as the use of grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic to advance one’s views. Even the trivium could be an innovation that distracted one from the true path. The Eastern Church’s apophatic tradition that began with Iamblichos (ca. 245–ca. 325) and Proclus (412–487), continued through the writings of Leontios the Hermit, Maximos the Confessor (580–662), and John of Damascus (676–749), and includes Patriarch Jeremias II (1572–1579, 1580–1584, 1587–1595). The question of whether the Eastern Church ranked its authorities was ably answered by Yale University professor and scholar of the history of Christianity, Jaroslav Pelikan, in his investigation of this question in the writings of Maximos the Confessor:

Such, then, was the structure of authority in the theology of Maximus: the teaching “of a council or of a father or of Scripture,” but in fact of all three in a dynamic interrelation by which no one of the three could be isolated as the sole authority. Scripture was supreme, but only if it was interpreted in a spiritual and orthodox way. The fathers were normative, but only if they were harmonized with one another and related to the Scripture from which they drew. The Councils were decisive, but only as voices of the one apostolic and prophetic and patristic doctrine.⁷

The building blocks, the elements of knowledge, are quotations from the Divine Writings. Indeed, one of the most widespread collections of Patristic sayings in Rus’ was a Byzantine compilation called *Melissa* (the *Bee*). We could think of any such compilation as a bouquet in which the sayings were like flowers that could be arranged in different ways. Practitioners of Christian Neoplatonic epistemology were allowed to rearrange the “flowers” so as to, as we would say, defamiliarize them in order to understand them anew. This practice may be why many works from early Rus’ appear to be merely mosaics of quotations from the Bible and church fathers, and why what the linguist William Veder calls, the “kaleidoscopic randomization” or “chaotization” of the order in which the quotations in a written composition, or the order of compositions in a codex, becomes so important.⁸ If one hears the same things in the same order all the time, the law of diminishing returns sets in. One becomes numbed to their message or function as a catalyst. By rearranging them, the reader or listener sees and hears them anew, in a different light, and they again can function as a catalyst to startle the reader or listener into some new internal revelation. Not only does the randomization/chaotization have aesthetic value, as Veder has suggested, but it also has epistemological value.

⁷ Pelikan, “Council or Father or Scripture,” 287.

⁸ The term “kaleidoscopic randomization” to describe the constant rearrangement of works from codex to codex was coined by the Slavonic philologist William Veder. Veder, “Literature as Kaleidoscope.” Veder later substituted the term *chaotization* for *randomization* because the latter “still reflects a definite structural principle.” Veder, “Old Russia’s ‘Intellectual Silence,’” 26n41. But it is *chaos* that reflects a structure beyond the horizon line of our understanding, while *random* implies no such structure. Veder compared *Melissa* compilations to pre-12th-century florilegia in the Western Church.

The Russian Church

The Russian Church inherited the prevailing tradition of the Byzantine Church that learning was descriptive (“a continuous and sublime recapitulation”⁹) of what was already known, not diagnostic for determining previously unknown truths. In addition, with the exception of the Kirillo-Belozersk Monastery in the mid- to late 15th century,¹⁰ we have no evidence of any school being set up in Russia to teach the trivium and quadrivium. But, even if such a curriculum had existed throughout Russia, it would have subsumed dialectic to a place as insignificant as the Byzantine Church did.

When the Islamic expansion began threatening and conquering the Eastern provinces of the Byzantine Empire, the Byzantine clerics began to look elsewhere, such as Africa, to expand Orthodoxy. They also started looking in Eastern Europe, especially Moravia, in the eighth and ninth centuries and came into conflict with the Western Church in this area. In addition, they also ventured northward along the Dnepr (Dnieper) River and among the Slavic people there. In 989, the prince of Kiev, Vladimir (Volodimir), converted to Christianity.¹¹ The patriarch of Constantinople appointed a metropolitan to head the Rus’ Church in 992. Thereafter until 1299, metropolitans of Kiev and all Rus’ resided in Kiev.

After the Mongol invasion of Rus’ (1237–1240), a bishop was installed in Sarai, the capital of the Ulus of Jochi (the most accurate name for what is popularly and erroneously called the Golden Horde), in order to tend to Christians coming through the city, and to act as a personal envoy from the Rus’ Church. In 1299, probably as the result of a steppe war between two Mongol/Tatar rulers, Nogai and Tokhta, Metropolitan Maksim (1283–1305)

⁹ This is the phrase of the fictional monk Jorge de Bourgos in Eco, *Name of the Rose*, 399.

¹⁰ Romanchuk, *Byzantine Hermeneutics*, 140.

¹¹ The traditional date for Vladimir’s conversion is 988, but that date is based on the appearance in the *Rus’ Primary Chronicle (Povest’ vremennykh let or Tale of Bygone Years) sub anno 6496 (987/8)* of his attack on Kherson, where the conversion is described as having taken place. But insofar as the events referred to therein can be correlated with related contemporaneous events described in other sources, the year 989 is the more likely date. See Poppe, “Political Background,” 208.

officially moved to Vladimir-on-the-Kliazma in the North.¹² Maksim's successor, Peter (1308–1326), unofficially began to reside in Moscow. Grand Duke of Lithuania Olgerd proposed a rival metropolitan in 1354. From then until the 1680s, a metropolitan residing in western Rus' asserted a rival claim to heading the metropolitanate of Kiev and all Rus'.

In 1441, the Rus' bishops and Grand Prince Vasillii II of all Rus' (1425–1462) rejected the metropolitan, Isidor, sent by the patriarch of Constantinople. They did so because he had accepted the union of Eastern and Western Churches decided by the Council of Florence-Ferrara (1438–1439). The Rus' bishops then arranged to have one of their own, Archbishop Iona, appointed metropolitan by Vasillii II. The ousting of Isidor and ascent of Iona introduced a period of relative autocephaly for the Rus' Church, while at the same time maintaining sporadic contact with the patriarch of Constantinople. In 1588, the patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremiah, and his entourage came to Moscow looking for donations. The Muscovite government would not let them leave until they agreed to appoint a patriarch in Moscow, which they did in 1589.¹³ The raising of the status of the metropolitan of Moscow and all Rus' to patriarch also involved the raising of existing archbishops—Novgorod, Rostov, Kazan', and Sarai—to metropolitans. In 1667, a church council elevated the archbishops of Astrakhan', Riazan', Tobol'sk, and Belgorod to metropolitan status.

In the second half of the 17th century, reforms by Patriarch Nikon (1652–1658) led to a split (*raskol*) within the church, which schism, as a result, came to be called “the Raskol.”¹⁴ Those who opposed the reforms were eventually grouped under an umbrella term, “Old Believers,” but the contemporary opposition was more widespread and involved opposition to the state as well.¹⁵

In 1721, Peter I replaced the patriarchate with a Holy Governing Synod. No new metropolitans were appointed until the reign of Elizabeth (1741–1762), when she appointed metropolitans for Kiev (1747) and Moscow (1757). Catherine II (1762–1796) appointed a metropolitan for St. Petersburg (1783). Monasteries

¹² Ostrowski, “Move of the Metropolitan,” revised version.

¹³ Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform*, 171–187. Jeremiah and his entourage then went on to Kiev, where they helped in the revival of Orthodoxy in Ukrainian lands.

¹⁴ Lupinin, *Religious Revolt*.

¹⁵ Michels, *At War with the Church*.

INTRODUCTION

continued to gather land and wealth until 1764 when Catherine II secularized church and monastic lands. The Russian government then gave monks a yearly stipend. During the course of the 19th century, although the church educated more people than the state, and although many of the new intellectuals were priests' sons (*popovich*), a definite anti-clerical attitude developed among the educated elite. Nonetheless, the church remained as important as ever for people's daily lives. In 1917, after the Bolshevik takeover, the patriarchate of Moscow was reestablished and various new metropolitanates created.

Articles Herein

In the essays in this book, we find many insights into the impact that the Russian Orthodox Church had on society and culture.

In chapter one, "Vladimir's Conversion to Christianity: Divine Providence and the Taking of Kherson," David K. Prestel (Michigan State University) discusses how in the account presented in the *Rus' Primary Chronicle* of the conversion of Vladimir to Christianity, a prominent place is occupied by a Greek philosopher, who tells the story of the history of the world. This history represents the revelation of God's plan for salvation, and historical events needed to be explained within that context. Three main points of the account stand out: 1) that God has worked through individuals and desires to use Vladimir for his purposes; 2) conversion of the Gentiles is a mandate that includes the conversion of Rus'; and 3) focusing of the conversion experience on the Incarnation, by which means Vladimir's heart and mind are prepared, but his conversion must be delayed pending the arrival of circumstances that favor the concurrence of divine purpose and human agency.

In chapter two, "Politics and Hierarchy in the Early Rus' Church: Antonii, a 13th-Century Archbishop of Novgorod," George P. Majeska (University of Maryland) tells us about Dobrynia ladreikovich, better known as Archbishop Antonii of Novgorod (1211–1219 and 1225–1228), and how he is best known to the scholarly community as a result of his description of Constantinople in the year 1200 found in his *Pilgrim Book*. Producing such a work as the *Pilgrim Book* presupposes a talented and sophisticated author whose biography bears study. It would seem clear that Archbishop Antonii was from an important family of Novgorod, most likely of merchant-boyar stock. His trip to Constantinople would have required a considerable amount of money, probably his own,

since no evidence exists that he was part of an official delegation. His choice to be archbishop, according to Majeska, reflected the rise of an anti-Suzdal' faction in Novgorod. His later informal canonization in the 15th century can be associated with Novgorodian attempts to remain independent from a new menace, Moscow.

In chapter three, "Another Look at the Solid Iconostasis in the Russian Orthodox Church," Father Robert M. Arida of Boston's Trinity Orthodox Church suggests that conflict within the hesychast movement may have played a role in the emergence of the solid and vertically developed iconostasis. The solid iconostasis helped to create a vision of liturgy and icon that had little to do with the interpenetration of history and eschatology. The emphasis on Christ's coming again as both an inaugurated and anticipated reality slipped into the background of liturgical worship. This concept of an inaugurated eschatology, *Marana Tha*, was displaced by the quest for individual perfection. The world as sacrament and therefore the interpenetration (*perichoresis*) of matter and spirit, divinity and humanity became obscured. The solid iconostasis, in Arida's view, disrupted the balanced hesychasm of Gregory Palamas (1296–1359).

In chapter four, "Round Up the Usuals and a Few Others: Glimpses into the Knowledge, Role and Use of Church Fathers in Rus' and Russian Monasticism, Late 11th to Early 16th Centuries," David M. Goldfrank (Georgetown University) points out that the inherent tension between individuality and community in monasticism and in traditional Christianity was reflected in the dual life of the patristic tradition, since at least some individual fathers retained their individuality, while they were also submerged, like the others, in the mass of "divine writings." How did what might be called a tradition of church fathers develop and evolve in the Russian Orthodox Church? Goldfrank concludes that, in studying the writings of Iosif Volotskii and Nil Sorskii, one already finds a living Middle Muscovite monastic patristic tradition in which there was room for a great deal of diversity and innovation.

In chapter five, "The Moscow Councils of 1447 to 1589 and the Conciliar Period in Russian Orthodox Church History," Donald Ostrowski (Harvard University) reports that, although historians have been inventive in attributing doctrines to the Russian Church that would count as significant innovations during the 15th and 16th centuries, almost all these practices and formulations were well within the already well-accepted doctrines of the Eastern Church. Upon examining such issues as the so-called Judaizer

INTRODUCTION

heresy, church factions, mid-16th-century polemics, the relationship between secular and ecclesiastical authorities, iconography and church decoration, the relationship of the Novgorod archiepiscopal see with the Moscow metropolitanate, and establishment of the patriarchate, instead of ad hoc doctrines and practices manufactured to deal with issues that were unique to Muscovy, one finds, according to Ostrowski, an adoption of pre-existing doctrines and practices.

In chapter six, “Cultural Diversity, Imperial Strategies, and the Issue of Faith: Toleration in Early Modern Russia in Comparative Perspective,” Maria Arel (Marianopolis College, Montreal) points out that Muscovite awareness of Russia’s shortcomings in certain areas of the society and its need to improve itself vis-à-vis Poland and Sweden to the west and the Ottoman Empire to the south supported the “first” wave (i.e., 17th-century) of Western European migration to Russia. Although Muscovites could be hostile and suspicious towards Catholics and Protestants, the Muscovites who governed understood that the West had much to offer Russia to help it survive geopolitically and even dominate Eurasia. This ruling class operated in a milieu that afforded them, unlike most of their European counterparts, the luxury of tolerating more than one religion, and of adopting differential religious policies to suit specific groups at specific junctures.

The study of commemoration for the dead is a new field with a long history. Many new studies have appeared on a broad spectrum of topics in the field, but still no effort has been made to synthesize them. Chapter seven, “Praying for the Dead: Kinship Awareness and Orthodox Belief in the Commemorations of Muscovite Royalty” by Russell E. Martin (Westminster College), is one of these efforts to do so. Although we find commemoration at the center of Orthodox religious practice, it is as yet poorly understood. An almost insurmountable cultural barrier has prevented Western scholars, and an ideological barrier prevented Soviet scholars, from working on the topic. Research requires access to scattered archival repositories. These sources are often liturgical and resistant to interpretation. The historian, as Martin demonstrates, requires experience with these sources and their conventions, as well as some grasp of Orthodox eschatology to “read” them.

Two directions have developed in the historiography for the study of northern monasticism. One approach sees the monasteries as primarily political and economic entities. The other direction, while acknowledging their political and economic roles,

focuses on monasteries as primarily religious and pious entities. It is this latter direction that Jennifer B. Spock (Eastern Kentucky University) undertakes in chapter eight, “Northern Russian Monastic Culture.” At the heart of this new direction is a discussion of their regional context and the role of the leader/teacher. These issues will explore the differences between types of communities, such as cenobia (communal), on the one hand, and sketes (hermitages), on the other, in social makeup, economic function, and pious forms. In addition, Spock shifts from focusing solely on a single type of text to attempting the integration of a variety of sources.

During the 16th and 17th centuries, the Russian Church remained basically a monastic church in terms of its spirituality. But a new monastic spirit, one that was educated, developed. The Russians built a national church in the middle of the 16th century, including the creation of a patriarchate, but that process did not change the underlying spiritual and institutional dependence of the Russian Church on the Greek Church. The Russian Church did not create its own spiritual and (partially) material culture. When it tried to do so, as Nikolaos Chrissidis (Southern Connecticut State University) explains in chapter nine, “Between Forgiveness and Indulgence: Funerary Prayers of Absolution in Russia,” it looked for prototypes elsewhere (Ukraine, Greece, the West). Similarly, Greek Orthodoxy responded materially and spiritually to impulses from the West in the 16th and 17th centuries. Therefore, according to Chrissidis, the influence of Greek Orthodoxy on 17th-century Russian Orthodoxy is fundamentally Western in nature.

The Old Believers, a term that applies to a wide range of anti-Nikonian, anti-state religious dissenters who trace their origins to the mid- to late 17th century, are best understood as Eastern Orthodox Christians. As “unofficial” religious institutions, both priestly and priestless, Old Believer communities, according to Robert O. Crummey (University of California, Davis) in chapter ten, “Old Believer Communities: Ideals and Structures,” governed their own affairs independently of any hierarchical structure or national organization. Old Believer communities combined elements of the cenobitic monastery or convent, the lay parish, and the peasant village. The mix of these elements was different from community to community and changed over the course of time. But, according to Crummey, each of the fundamental forms of Old Believer organization has contributed to the survival of the movement.

INTRODUCTION

The present historical picture of elders in the Russian Church stands in need of correction and augmentation. One can supplement the general pattern by examining sources and studying individuals who have tended to be overlooked. The inner lives of the elders, as Nickolas Lupinin (Franklin Pierce University) demonstrates in chapter 11, “The Tradition of Elders (*Startsy*) in 19th-Century Russia,” tells us, instantiates humility, mysticism, spiritual direction, obedience, asceticism and ascetic labor, hesychasm, prayer, silence, and immersion in a tradition. Lupinin goes on to produce a concomitant list of other aspects of their lives, such as healing the sick, bearing suffering, dramatic personal encounters, the tribulation of judging others, reigning in the passions, and comforting endless visitors.

Getting at the heart of women’s spirituality at all levels of Russian society in the 19th century is extremely difficult, given the paucity of sources that privilege women. What the average woman thought about God, the Mother of God, Christ, the saints, salvation, and the role that the church played in her life is not easy to ascertain. The historian has to tease information out of a limited number of autobiographies and biographies, sensational stories in the press, and numerous formulaic miracle tales. What Christine Worobec (Northern Illinois University) finds, and reports in chapter 12, “Russian Orthodoxy and Women’s Spirituality in Imperial Russia,” is that the sources demonstrate ways in which Russian Orthodoxy was relevant to women’s lives, as well as the ways in which Orthodoxy empowered women. The tenacity with which women clung to Orthodox practices in the early Soviet period, when religion came under attack, can only be understood, according to Worobec, by further exploring avenues of women’s spirituality in the 19th century.

Gregory Freeze (Brandeis University) argues in chapter 13, “Rediscovering the Orthodox Past: The Microhistorical Approach to Religious Practice in Imperial Russia,” that, given the new accessibility of archives outside the capitals, historians should refocus their research and rely more on local and less on central archives. The principal thesis here is that the use of local repositories will not merely enhance but *change* our perception of Russian religious history. The central repositories, while valuable and indispensable, provide an incomplete, even distorted picture; these files are necessarily too aggregated (as statistics), too

abstract (as reports), and too incomplete (as case records) to provide a clear understanding of grassroots reality. In a word, it is not merely desirable, but essential to refocus research on *local history* and, in projects with an empire-wide focus, to include a salient case-study component (or components). To be sure, some historians, according to Freeze, have begun to tap local repositories, but the scale has been relatively limited. While the imperative to “go local” doubtless applies to all fields, his essay focuses on Russian religious history, which is now a principal topic of study in historical scholarship.

INTRODUCTION

Works Cited

- Eco, *Name of the Rose* = Eco, Umberto. *The Name of the Rose*. Translated by William Weaver. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1983.
- Gudziak, *Crisis and Reform* = Gudziak, Borys A. *Crisis and Reform: The Kyivan Metropolitanate, the Patriarchate of Constantinople, and the Genesis of the Union of Brest*. Cambridge MA: Ukrainian Institute, Harvard University, 1998.
- Jus graecoromanum* = *Jus graecoromanum*. Edited by J. Zepos and P. Zepos. 8 vols. Darmstadt: Scientia Aalen, 1962. Reprint of the 1931 edition.
- Lehmann, *European Heritage* = Lehman, A. G. *The European Heritage: An Outline of Western Culture*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1984.
- Lupinin, *Religious Revolt* = Lupinin, Nickolas. *Religious Revolt in the XVIIth Century: The Schism of the Russian Church*. Princeton, NJ: Kingston, 1984.
- Michels, *At War with the Church* = Michels, Georg B. *At War with the Church: Religious Dissent in Seventeenth-Century Russia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.
- Milankovitch, "Das Ende des julianischen Kalenders" = Milankovitch, M[ilutin]. "Das Ende des julianischen Kalenders und der neue Kalender der orientalischen Kirche." *Astronomische Nachrichten* 220 (1924): cols. 379–384
- Ostrowski, "Move of the Metropolitan" = Ostrowski, Donald. "The Move of the Metropolitan from Kiev in 1299." The Move of the Metropolitan From Kiev in 1299. Revised version of "Why Did the Metropolitan Move from Kiev to Vladimir in the Thirteenth Century?" In *Christianity and the Eastern Slavs*, vol. 1, *Slavic Cultures in the Middle Ages*, edited by Boris Gasparov and Olga Raevsky-Hughes, 83–101. California Slavic Studies, 16. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Palmer, *Patriarch and Tsar* = Palmer, William. *The Patriarch and the Tsar*. 6 vols. London: Trübner, 1871–1876.
- Pelikan, "'Council or Father or Scripture'" = Pelikan, Jaroslav. "'Council or Father or Scripture': The Concept of Authority in the Theology of Maximus Confessor." In *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of The Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*, edited by David Neiman and Margaret Schatkin, 277–288. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 195 Rome, 1973.
- Poppe, "Political Background" = Poppe, Andrzej. "The Political Background to the Baptism of Rus': Byzantine-Russian Relations between 986–89." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 30 (1976): 195–244.
- Romanchuk, *Byzantine Hermeneutics* = Romanchuk, Robert. *Byzantine Hermeneutics and Pedagogy in the Russian North: Monks and Masters at the Kirillo-Belozerskii Monastery, 1397–1501*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

- Select Library* = *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christ Church*, edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 14 vols. New York: Christian Literature, 1890–1900. vol. 14: *The Seven Ecumenical Councils*.
- Veder, “Literature as Kaleidoscope” = Veder, William R. “Literature as Kaleidoscope: The Structure of Slavic *Chetii Sborniki*.” In *Semantic Analysis of Literary Text: To Honour Jan van der Eng on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, edited by Eric de Haard, Thomas Langerak, and Willem G. Weststeijn, 599–613. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1990.
- Veder, “Old Russia’s ‘Intellectual Silence’ Reconsidered” = Veder, William R. “Old Russia’s ‘Intellectual Silence’ Reconsidered.” In *Medieval Russian Culture*, vol. 2, edited by Michael S. Flier and Daniel Rowland, 18–28. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- “Vozrazhenie Nikona” = “Vozrazhenie Nikona.” In *Patriarch Nikon on Church and State: Nikon’s “Refutation”*, edited by Valerie A. Tumins and George Vernadsky, 80–673. Berlin: Mouton, 1982.
- Ware, *Orthodox Church* = Ware, Timothy. *The Orthodox Church*. 2nd ed. London: Penguin, 1997.