

Mariusz Bartnicki (UNIWERSYTET MARI CURIE-SKŁODOWSKIEJ W LUBLINIE)

ORCID: 0000-0002-9021-359X

The Founding Myth of the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra in the Light of the Tradition of the *The Paterik* of the Kievan Caves Monastery

DOI: 10.25951/11120

SUMMARY

The article deals with the founding myth of the Pechersk Lavra as it is preserved in the *Kiev-Pechersk Paterik*, one of the most important sources for understanding the history of the monastic movement in the Ruthenian lands. The article focuses on the problem of the creation of the founding myth and its function in the construction of a specific message about the Pechersk Lavra. By studying the texts of the *Paterik* and comparing them with the founding myths known from the European area, I have speculated that an integral part of the original story of the beginnings of the above-mentioned monastery was the legend of the relics it could boast of: the golden belt and the crown of Simon the Varangian. This legend, found in the *Life of Anthony*, became the nucleus of the later myth of the *initium loci*, which linked the origins of the monastery to the “Varangian thread”.

The complex history of the Pechersk Lavra, full of dramatic twists and turns, resulted in a significant transformation of the founding myth. The place of the founder of the monastic community, Anthony, was taken by the second Pechersk Ihumen, Theodosius, with whose work the later authors of the *Paterik* and *The Rus’ chronicles* accounts linked most of the stories about the beginnings of the monastery, which they knew from the *Life of Anthony* and the monastic histories.

KEYWORDS: Pechersk Lavra, The Kiev-Pechersk Paterik, Life of Anthony, founding myth, Kievan Rus’, monasticism.

STRESZCZENIE

Mit założycielski zespołu klasztornego Ławry Peczerskiej w świetle przekazów Pateryku Kijowsko-Pieczerskiego

Artykuł został poświęcony mitowi fundacyjnemu Ławry Peczerskiej, jaki zachował się w Pateryku Kijowsko-Pieczerskim. Rozważania koncentrują się wokół problemu kształtowania się

fabuły mitu założycielskiego oraz funkcji, jaką pełnił on w budowaniu określonego przekazu o Ławrze Peczerskiej. Badając teksty wchodzące w skład Pateryku i porównując je do mitów fundacyjnych znanych z obszaru Europy, wysunąłem przypuszczenie, że integralnym elementem pierwotnej opowieści o początkach wspomnianego klasztoru była legenda o relikwiach, tzw. złotym pasie i koronie Warega Szymona. Wspomniana legenda, znajdująca się w Żywocie Antoniego, stała się załącznikiem późniejszego mitu *iniciium loci*, który wiązał początki zgromadzenia zakonnego z „wątkiem wareskim”.

SŁOWA KLUCZOWE: Ławra Peczerska, Pateryk Kijowsko-Pieczerski, Żywot Antoniego, mit założycielski, Ruś Kijowska, monastycyzm.

The history of the monastic movement in the lands of the Rus' in the time before the Mongols is one of the subjects that remain enigmatic because of the state of preservation of the sources. Although there is evidence in the different documents of Ruthenian literature (chronicle, hagiography) of the establishment of more than 70 monasteries in the first half of the thirteenth century, the scant nature of this information means that little is known about the formation of individual monastic communities and their role in the life of local communities¹. The Pechersk Lavra is one of the few monasteries whose history and the legends have been preserved in the literary heritage of the Kievan Rus' period. The fact that the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra was one of the most important centres of monastic life in the Ruthenian lands gave it this unique “source status”, as it played a major role in the development of writing in the Rurikids reign², although

¹ See: E.E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 1, ch. 2, Moskva 1904, pp. 746–776; G. Podskal'ski, *Khristianstvo i bogoslovskaiia literatura v kievskoi Rusi (988–1237)*, Sankt-Peterburg 1996, pp. 84–93; M. Happel, *Introduction: in The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, ed. M. Happel, Cambridge Mass. 1989 (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, vol. 1), p. VIII; Iu.A. Artamonov, *Monashestvo i monastyri v svete khristianizatsii Drevnei Rusi (XI – nachalo XII v.)*, in: *Vostochnaia Evropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'e: Iazychestvo i monoteizm v protsessakh politogeneza: XXVI Chteniia pamiati chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR Vladimira Terent'evicha Pashuto: Moskva, 16–18 apreliia 2014 g.: Materialy konferentsii*, otv. red. E.A. Mel'nikova, Moskva 2014, pp. 17–20.

² According to the hypothesis of A.A. Shakhmatov, the *Pechersk Chronicle* was written within the monastery walls by Nikon, which later became part of the *Povest' Vremennykh Let (The Tale of Bygone Years)*. Its authorship was attributed by the aforementioned researcher to other Pechersk monk, Nestor, the author of *The Life of St Theodosius*. See: A.A. Shakhmatov, *Povest' vremennykh let*, t. 1: *Vvodnaia chast'. Tekst. Primechaniia*, Petrograd 1916, p. XIX; A.A. Shakhmatov, *Nestor letopisets*, in: *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, t. 1: *Povest' vremennykh let i drevnejshie russkie letopisnye svody*, kn. 2. *Rannee russkoe letopisanie XI–XII vv.*, Moskva 2003, pp. 417–427. However, the problem of the identity of Nestor the Chronicler and the author of *The Life of St. Theodosius* raises serious doubts among researchers. See:

it was neither the oldest of the monastic foundations, nor the only centre of cultural life in Rus³.

The work that undoubtedly contributed to the creation of the belief in the exceptional importance of the Pechersk Lavra in the history of the Rus' lands of the pre-Mongol era is the *Kiev-Pechersk Paterik*. The above-mentioned work has been preserved up to the present day in numerous manuscripts, which originate from three main editions (Bishop Arsenius, Monk Cassian's First Editing, Monk Cassian's Second Editing), the oldest of which dates back to 1406, however the genesis of the said collection dates back to the 1320s⁴. The origin of the first texts that later became a part of the *Paterik* is linked to the exchange of correspondence between St Simon Bishop of Vladimir-Susdal (1214–1226) and the Kiev-Pechersk monk Polycarp (c. 1233). It concerned the dilemmas of Polycarp, who wanted to leave the monastic life and seek episcopal dignity. Simon addressed Polycarp (*Discourse 14*) with a message reminding him of humility and obedience, to which he added stories of the lives of holy monks from the Kiev-Pechersk monastery as an example of life according to the rules of monasticism. Polycarp, humbly accepting the bishop's instructions, added works on the saints, which he sent to Archimandrite Akindin. As early as the thirteenth century, the texts of Polycarp and Simon were accompanied by a *Discourse of the First Monk of the Caves Monastery*, giving the whole work the form of the *Paterik*⁵.

The exceptional importance of the *Paterik* for the study of the history of the Pechersk Lavra, as well as the written culture of the Ruthenian lands, means that this work has long attracted the attention of researchers. Traces of the lost *Life of Anthony* – the founder of the monastery⁶, as well as the protograph of the so-

Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnej Rusi, red. D.S. Lihachev i dr., t. 1, Leningrad 1987, pp. 274–278; G. Podskal'ski, *Khristianstvo*, pp. 330–339.

³ The oldest monasteries in Kievan Rus mentioned in the chronicle were the monastery of St George and St Irena, founded around 1037 by Yaroslav the Wise. The development of monasticism in Rus' at the time of Vladimir Sviatoslavovich was already mentioned by Metropolitan Hilarion. See: R. Casey, *Early Russian Monasticism*, "Orientalia Christiana Periodica" (19) 1953, pp. 372–423; G. Podskal'ski, *Khristianstvo*, p. 86; Iu.A. Artamonov, *Monashestvo i monastyri*, pp. 17–19.

⁴ V.A. Iakovlev, *Drevnekievskie religioznye skazaniia*, Varshava 1875, pp. 42–43 et seq. D.I. Abramovich, *Issledovanie o Kievo-Pecherskom Paterike, kak istoriko-literaturnom pamiatnike*, "Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akademii nauk" 1901, vol 6, kn. 4, pp. 68–71; A.A. Shakhmatov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, pp. 75–102; M. Happel, *Introduction*, pp. XXIX–XXXV, also a compilation of literature.

⁵ See: G. Podskal'ski, *Khristianstvo*, p. 262.

⁶ A.A. Shakhmatov, *Zhitie Antoniiia i Pecherskaia letopis'*, "Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia" 1898, Mart. otd. 2., pp. 105–149; A.A. Shakhmatov, *Istoriia russkogo leto-*

called *Kiev-Pechersk Chronicle*, the contents of which were used in the editing of the oldest Rus' chronicle known to us, have been sought in *Paterik: The Tale of Bygone Years*⁷. The *Paterik's* rich factual material has been used for the research into the monastic movement in Rus' and to learn about the ideas operating within the Rus' clergy. It is also an invaluable source of knowledge about the community of the Rurikids authorities of the 13th century⁸.

In the following discussion the accounts of *the Kiev-Pechersk Paterik* will be addressed from a slightly different perspective than it was done before. The founding myth of the monastery will be the centre of interest, particularly the context in which its narrative was formed and its function in constructing a specific message about the Pechersk Lavra. While analysing a particular type of narrative, such as the founding myth, historical facts will not get separated from what we see as the reality of the narrative text, since both have helped to create the memory of the origins of the Lavra. The elaborate plots of the founding myths explained the circumstances of the founding of monastic organisations, presented the founders, but above all they surrounded the very act of founding a community with an aura of the extraordinary. The reference to supernatural forces, which was very common in such narratives, was an important element in the legitimisation and shaping of the image of the institution, thus giving it a specific place in the interpretation of history. The stories of relics, which a religious community could pride itself on possessing, also played an important part. They defined the status of the religious centre and its role in the life of the local ecumene, constituted the community and built its identity⁹.

pisaniia, pp. 183–202; M.D. Priselkov, *Ocherki po tserkovno-politicheskoi istorii Kievskoi Rusi X–XII vv.*, Sankt-Peterburg 1913, pp. 238–274 (note 70); V. Parkhomenko, *V kakoi mere bylo tendentsiozno nesokhranivsheesia drevneishee zhitie Antoniiia Pecherskogo?*, "Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akademii nauk" 1914, vol. 19, № 1, pp. 237–241; M. Happel, *The "Vita Antonii", a Lost Source of the "Patericon" of the Monastery of Caves*, "Byzantinoslavica" 1952/53, vol. 13, pp. 46–58; Ju.A. Artamonov, *Problema rekonstruktsii drevneishego Zhitiiia Antoniiia Pecherskogo*, in: *Srednevekovaia Rus'*, ch. 3, otv. red. A.A. Gorskii, Moskva 2001, pp. 5–81; A. Poppe, *Rus' i Afon v XI v.*, in: *Sbornik statei k 70-letiiu Borisa Andreevicha Uspenskogo*, sost. F.B. Uspenskii, Moskva 2008, pp. 320–340.

⁷ A.A. Shakhmatov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, pp. 75–102.

⁸ M. Bartnicki, *Swój czy obcy? Obraz etniczny społeczności Rusi Kijowskiej w przekazach "Pateryku kijowsko-pieczerskiego"*, "Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechnie" 2021, t. 13, pp. 11–26.

⁹ See: J. Kastner, *"Historiae foundationum monasteriorum". Frillformen monasticher Institutionengeschichtsschreibung im Mittelalter*, Milnchen 1974; C. Caby, *La memoire des origines dans les institutions médiévales: presentation d'un projet collectif*, "Mélanges de l' Ecole Française de Rome, Moyen age" (115) 2003, n° 1, pp. 133–140; A.G. Remensnyder, *Croyance et communaute: la memoire des origines des abbayes benedictines*, "Mélanges de l'

Let us therefore look at the beginnings of the Pechersk Lavra in the light of the *Paterik*. The foundation of the monastery and the events connected with the construction and consecration of the main temple of the Monastery of the Dormition of the Mother of God are narrated in the first parts of the text (*Discourses 1–7*). It is worth noting that this series of stories is not grouped according to the chronological order of events. The main theme of this part of the work is the construction and consecration of the brick church of the Dormition of the Mother of God, which replaced an earlier wooden church of the same name. It is not until *Discourse 7* that the title appears: “An Account Why the Caves Monastery is so Called”, that the circumstances of the founding of the congregation are explained. According to the above-mentioned account, the whole enterprise was initiated by a resident of Liubech, who, driven by piety, set out for the “Greeks” intending to join one of the monastic communities. He became a novice in one of the monasteries of Mount Athos, where, probably after the usual time of novitiate, he was received into the consecrated life, taking the name of Anthony. Anthony was not meant to remain on the Holy Mountain. He was encouraged by his superior to return to Rus’ to strengthen the faith of others. When the monk arrived in Kiev, he was faced with the dilemma of choosing a place in which to set up his hermitage. In search of a suitable location, Anthony came to the vicinity of the princely village of Berestovo, near Kiev, where he found a cave which was “dug by the Varangians” and he decided to settle down there. According to the *Paterik*, these events took place during the reign of Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavitch.

Anthony left the lands of Ruthenia for his home monastery on Athos during the dramatic events of the rise to power of Svyatopolk the Accursed. His second stay in the Greek monastery lasted until the 1150s. At that time, the superior of the monastic community once again ordered Anthony to return to Ruthenia and continue his mission. The author of the *Paterik*, describing another arrival of the pious monk to Berestov near Kiev, gave a new account of the history of the place where Pechersk Monastery was founded. Anthony settled in the “cave of Hilarion”, the first metropolitan of Kyiv – who was a descendant of the local Ruthenian clergy¹⁰. The cave of Hilarion was built during the frequent stays of the future metropolitan at the court of Yaroslav the Wise. During his visits to the prince, the

Ecole Française de Rome, *Moyen age*” (115) 2003, n° 1, pp. 141–154; M. Derwich, *Łysogórski mit miejsca fundacji. Mnisi i przeszłość*, “Roczniki Historyczne” R. 72, 2006, pp. 53–54.

¹⁰ On Hilarion, see: A.A. Turilov, *Ilarion*, in: *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia, pod redaktsiei Patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseia Rusi Kirilla*, vol. 22, <https://www.pravenc.ru/vol/xxii.html> (accessed: 07.06.2023).

monk used to go from Berestov to the hills by the river to pray in the “great forest.” He was so fond of this place that he dug a small cave two fathoms deep. This cave, which the monk left when he took up his post as the Metropolitan of Kiev, became the new nucleus of the Pechersk monastery¹¹.

Thus there are recorded in the text two versions of the *initium loci*, so important in any founding plot. We may call them: the Varangian and the Metropolitan. The fragment of the *Paterik* mentioned above has already attracted the interest of researchers, who have drawn attention to it both because of the two traditions related to the origin of the monastery and because of their difference from the version recorded in *The Tale of Bygone Years*. In fact, the oldest Ruthenian chronicle that has survived to our times does not speak of the “Varangian Caves” near Berestov, nor does it contain any information about Anthony’s double stay on Athos¹². A.A. Shakhmatov, in an attempt to explain the textological discrepancies between the two sources, suggested that the “Metropolitan version” originally appeared in the *Life of Theodosius*, while the “Varangian” version was used in the lost *Life of Anthony*, which “tendentiously gave the characteristics of antiquity to the Pechersk monastery”¹³. The *Life of Theodosius*, according to the researcher’s conception, was a source of information for the author of the so-called *Pechersk Chronicle*, which in turn became the basis of a new chronicle script edited around 1182¹⁴. The *Paterik’s* editor, monk Cassian, tried to reconcile the two versions of the legends about the monastery’s origins and created a story about Anthony’s two stays in Athos¹⁵.

The major shortcoming of A.A. Shakhmatov’s thesis is the lack of an answer to the question why the author of the manuscript, who came from the Pechersk monastery, did not mention the information included in the *Life of Anthony*, the founder of the monastery. The main reason for this omission, in the opinion of the researchers, was the conviction that the work in question had little value as

¹¹ *Kievo-Pechers’kii Paterik*, red. D. Abramovich, in: *Pamiatki movi ta pis’menstva davnoi Ukraïni*, vol. 4, Kiev 1930, pp. 16–17.

¹² *Povest’ vremennykh let*, ch. 1, tekst i perevod, red. D.S. Likhachev, B.A. Romanov, Leningrad 1950, p. 106.

¹³ A.A. Shakhmatov, *Kievo-Pecherskii paterik i Pecherskaia letopis’*, in: *idem, Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, vol. 1, kn. 2, Sankt-Peterburg 2003, pp. 10–33.

¹⁴ A.A. Poppe pointed out that a mention of Pechersk monastery’s origins in “The Tale of Bygone Years” in 1051 is connected with Hilarion’s proclamation as Metropolitan of Kiev in that year. According to the researcher, this event provided a convenient starting point for the early history of the monastery. See: A. Poppe, *Państwo i Kościół na Rusi w XI wieku*, Warszawa 1968, p. 132.

¹⁵ A.A. Shakhmatov, *Kievopecherskij paterik*, pp. 10–33.

a historical source. The *Life of Theodosius*, which was considered reliable, was confronted with the supposedly uncertain account of the *Life of Anthony*. The authors of the *Chronicle* based their account on the first source. Such an assumption, however, raises doubts, since the author of the *Paterik* considered the two versions of the legends of the *initium loci* to be of equal value¹⁶.

Considering the storylines of the two versions: “the Varganian” and “the Metropolitan”, it should be noted first of all that they were the final result of the formation of a set of stories about the origins of the Kiev-Pechersk monastery, which existed in the Kiev milieu of the 12th century. The founding myth changed over time, undergoing an evolution that often depended on the current needs of the institution. The literature on the subject points out that the founding myths of religious communities followed a certain regularity. The first to appear was the story of the abbey’s origins – its founders, the foundation itself and the circumstances surrounding it. It attempted to emphasise the involvement of supernatural factors in order to highlight the importance of the undertaking. In cases where the abbey possessed relics that were venerated, the founding myth was usually supplemented by the story of how they were brought to the abbey and the miraculous events inspired by them. Usually, the story of the abbey’s founding site was added at the very end¹⁷.

In the narratives presenting the founding of the Kievan-Pechersk monastery recorded in both the *Paterik* (*Discourse 7*)¹⁸ and *The Tale of Bygone Years*¹⁹, one is surprised by the absence of almost any reference to the influence of supernatural forces, which would underline the exceptional nature of the whole enterprise. Such a motif, as we shall see below, appears only in the narratives devoted to the construction of the brick temple of the Dormition of the Mother of God. The only subtle hint that reveals the Creator’s will and places the founding of the monastery in the divine plan is the indication that the idea of sending St Anthony to the Ruthenian lands came to the superior of Mount Athos Monastery under the influence of Providence²⁰. The lack of significant involvement of supernatural forces

¹⁶ We have no basis for the claim that the story of the origin of the Pechersk monastery in the ‘extended version’ (the Varangian version) is the invention of the monk Cassian. In: Ju.A. Artamonov, *Zhitie Feodosiia Pecherskogo: problemy istochnikovedeniia*, in: *Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy 2000 g.: Problemy istochnikovedeniia*, red. L.V. Stolarova, Moskva 2003, p. 165.

¹⁷ M. Derwich, *Łysogórski mit miejsca fundacji*, pp. 53–54.

¹⁸ *Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik*, pp. 16–20.

¹⁹ *Povest’ vremennykh let*, p. 106.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 17.

in the myth of the founding of the Pechersk monastery is what distinguishes it from typical accounts of the beginnings of monastic communities that have been preserved in the written tradition of the medieval monarchies.

It is worth mentioning, for example, the description of the foundation of another monastery in Ruthenia, the Monastery of St Anthony in Novgorod, which is preserved in the *Life of St Anthony the Roman*. Although dated to the 16th century, the text is believed to have been based on a 12th-century version written by Brother Andrew, a member of the local monastic community²¹. This work linked the origins of the monastery to the unusual circumstances in which the founder of the community, Anthony, found himself on the banks of the Volkhov River. He was of “Roman origin, the follower of the Greek faith”. When the Catholics in Rome intensified their persecution of non-believers, Anthony went to the seaside, where, on a rock, he prayed ardently to the Creator. By a miraculous act of the Almighty, the rock broke away from the mainland and Anthony travelled, as if on a boat, across the sea, across the estuary of the Neva and Lake Ladoga, and finally reached the banks of the Volkhov River. In the *Life of St Anthony the Roman*, the time of Anthony’s miraculous arrival in Novgorod is precisely dated to the 5th of September 1105. The local bishop Nikita, hearing of the unusual occurrence, came to the shore and allowed the monastery and the stone church of the Mother of God to be built on the spot where the river had cast the stone²².

Similar tales of miraculous circumstances surrounding the founding of religious communities were widespread in 12th century hagiographies. We find them, for example, in the foundation myth of Herford Abbey, as recorded in the 12th

²¹ See: A.V. Nazarenko, *Antonii Rimlianin*, in: *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia*, t. 3, <https://www.pravenc.ru/text/116106.html> (accessed: 07.06.2023); E.A. Ryzhova, *Motiv “plavanie sviatogo na kamene” v Zhitii Antonii Rimlianina i fol’klore*, in: *Russkaia agiografiia: Issledovaniia. Materialy. Publikatsii*, t. 2, Sankt-Peterburg 2011, pp. 3–7; Iu.A. Iakovenko, *Vostochno-khristianskie agiograficheskie paralleli v zhitii Antonii Rimlianina: k opredeleniu kruga istochnikov*, in: *Antonii Rimlianin i ego vremia. K 900-letiu osnovaniia sobora Rozhdestva Bogoroditsy Antonieva monastyria (1117–1119). Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii 29–31 oktiabria 2019 g.*, Velkii Novgorod 2020, pp. 195–200.

²² *Zhitie Antonii Rimlianina*, in: *Sviatye russkie rimliane. Antonii Rimlianin i Merkurii Smolenskii*, red. N.V. Ramazanovoi, Sankt-Peterburg 2005 (Sviatye i sviatyni Russkoi zemli), pp. 252–266. The literature on the subject points out the similarity of the motif about “floating on a stone”, to hagiographical accounts created in Anglo-Saxon and Irish circles. See: M.F. Mur’ianov, *O novgorodskoi kul’ture XII veka*, „Sacrīs Erudiri” 1969–1970, vol. 19, pp. 424–427. The starting point of the legend of Anthony the Roman may have been the atypical architectural style in which the monastery’s orthodox church was built, which differed significantly from the typical orthodox church architecture of the Ruthenian lands. See: *ibidem*, pp. 425–426.

century *Life of St Waltger*²³. Saint Walther altogether made three attempts to build the monastery (Müdehorst, Altenherford), but it was only after a vision which he experienced after a humble prayer to the Virgin Mary that he chose the right place to erect the building²⁴. The same can be said of the founding of the Brauweiler monastery, whose founders were the Palatine Ezzon and his wife Matilda. According to the *Fundatio Monasterii Brunwilarensis*, Matilda passed by the chapel in Brauweiler and stopped to pray. Tired of the heat, she lay down under a tree and took a nap. In her dream, she saw the heavens open up and a shining ball of light descending on the place so dear to God and illuminating it with a great radiance. The Palatine, to whom his wife told the vision, recognised this as a sign from the Creator and decided to build a convent on the site of the Brauweiler chapel²⁵.

Another motif that was often used to explain how monasteries came to exist was that of the Anecumene. Places untouched by man, economically unused, often imagined as backwoods, inhabited by wild animals, symbolised the forces of evil, or at least forces alien to the sacred. Such areas were characterised by moral and religious disorder, which the congregation's founder put an end to. He tamed this "hostile world" and made it develop²⁶.

Such a take on the foundation myth is presented in the 14th century anonymous poem about the founding of the Cistercian monastery in Lubiąż, the so-called *Versus Lubenses*, which traces the origins of the place itself to the time of Julius Caesar, but moving on to the time of the founding of the congregation, mentions the existence of a pagan temple, destroyed by the Cistercians who, with strenuous labour, developed the surrounding wilderness. In a similar context, a legend was presented about a Benedictine abbey in Łysogóry, which was supposed to have been built on the site of a temple where three pagan gods were worshipped: Lada, Lela, Body²⁷.

²³ E. Forwick, *Waltger von Dörnberg oder der Heilige Walther von Herford*, 72, "Jahresberichte des Historischen Vereins für die Grafschaft Ravensberg", Bietefeld 1980, pp. 12–54.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 22–28. See R. Michałowski, *Święta moc fundatora klasztoru*, „Kwartalnik Historyczny” R. 91, 1984, t. 1, pp. 5 et seq.

²⁵ H. Pabst, *Fundatio monasterii Brunwilarensis*, "Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde" 1872, Bd. 12, p. 159. Examples of foundation myths of German monasteries in which the motif of supernatural forces appears have been collected by J. Kastner, "Historiae foundationum monasteriorum". *Frühformen monastischer Institutionsgeschichtsschreibung*, pp. 93 ff.

²⁶ See R. Michałowski, *Święta moc fundatora klasztoru*, pp. 7–8.

²⁷ M. Derwich, *Łysogórski mit miejsca fundacji*, pp. 53–65.

Taking into account the *Paterik's* description of the founding of the Pechersk monastery, we can assume that the absence of the typical plot explaining to the reader why the hill near the village of Berestovo was chosen by the founder of the monastery is the result of editorial changes in the original version of the story. Still A.A. Shakhmatov believes that the original founding myth was included in the *Life of Anthony*²⁸. The lost work, was not a typical life of a saint, but told the story of the foundation of the monastery, in which the monk Antony played a prominent role²⁹. In the *Kyiv-Pechersk Paterik*, references to the *Life of Anthony*, as a source which, in the eyes of the authors, was supposed to confirm the authenticity of the events cited, can be found in seven texts written by Bishop Simon and the monk Polycarp³⁰. Looking for traces of the aforementioned plot lines about the beginnings of the monastery, our attention is drawn to the series of stories about the foundation of the stone church of the Dormition of the Mother of God³¹. The main protagonist is Simon (Sigmundr), the son of Prince Alfrik (Eiríkra)³². The circumstances under which he appeared in Rus' are not entirely clear, we only learn that he and his brother Friandi got deprived of his fatherland by his uncle Haakon and, fleeing persecution, sought refuge across the sea³³. Simon managed

²⁸ A.A. Shakhmatov, *Kievo-Pecherskii paterik i Pecherskaia letopis'*, pp. 10–33.

²⁹ D. Tschizewskij, *History of Russian Literature: From the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque*, The Hague 1960, p. 47; M. Happel, *Introduction*, pp. XI–XII. The mysterious *Life of St. Anthony*, mentioned in the *Kyiv-Pechersk Paterik*, has long attracted the attention of historians. Some researchers have questioned the existence of such a work (Ia.Ia. Khrushchev, *O drevne-russkikh istoricheskikh povestiakh i skazaniakh XI–XII stoletii*, Kiev 1878, p. 19; V. Vasil'ev, *Istoriia kanonizatsii russkikh sviatykh*, in: *Chteniia v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, kn. 3, Moskva 1893, p. 111; E. Benz, *Russische Heiligenlegenden*, Zürich 1989, p. 170. For further literature on the subject see: Ju.A. Artamonov, *Problema rekonstruktsii*, pp. 5–9.

³⁰ See: M. Heppell, *The "Vita Antonii", a Lost Source of the "Patericon" of the Monastery of Caves*, "Byzantinoslavica" 1952/53, vol. 13, pp. 46–58; Ju.A. Artamonov, *Problema rekonstruktsii*, pp. 15–36, 81.

³¹ *Kievo-Pechers'kii Paterik*, pp. 1–5.

³² O. Pricak, *The Origin of Rus'*, Cambridge 1981, pp. 412–416. The correct sound of Simon's father's name was attempted to be determined by the Russian philologist F.A. Braun, who noted that the name of Simon's brother 'Friand' corresponds to the term friandi = relative. See the same: *idem*, *Friand i Shimon, synov'ia variashskogo kniazia Afrikana*, "Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk" 1902, vol. 7, kn. 1, pp. 360–365. More recently, the voice on the identification of the mentioned names was taken by S.M. Mikheev, *Variashskie kniaz'ia Iakun, Afrikan i Shimon: Literaturnye siuzhety, transformatsiia imen i istoricheskii kontekst*, „Drevniaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki" 2008, № 2 (32), p. 32.

³³ If we consider the hypothesis of O. Pricak, we can link the story of Simon's arrival in Rus' to

to win the favour of Yaroslav the Wise, who sent him to serve his minor son Vsevolod I. After the death of Yaroslav the Wise, Simon bound his fate to the new Kiev ruler Izyaslav. During his reign, dramatic events took place, which the author associates with the “miraculous” circumstances of the foundation of the Church of Dormition of the Mother of God. In 1068, a Cuman expedition led by Khan Sharukan set out for the Ruthenian lands. The Yaroslavovich princes: Izyaslav, Svyatopolk and Vsevolod, decided to fight the approaching nomads. Before setting off from Kiev, the brothers entered the Pechersk monastery to pray for the successful outcome of the battle. While at the monastery, Simon, who was accompanying Izyaslav, heard a prophecy from Brother, Anthony, which foretold the defeat of the Ruthenian army. Simon, terrified by the monk’s vision, asked the clergyman to save him. The monk comforted the Varangian that however many of his companions would die, he himself would escape death. Further events unfolded according to the canons of the foundation legend. The severely wounded Simon, lying among his dead comrades on the battlefield by the River Alta, had an epiphany – he saw a magnificent church in the sky. At this point, the author of the account mentions that Simon had already experienced a similar vision during his journey to Rus’, when he saw a similar temple at sea. Having recovered from his illness, Simon went to the Pechersk monastery, found Anthony and told the monk everything that had happened to him. From Simon’s conversation with Anthony, we learn further details of Varangian’s life. While still in his homeland, he adopted the Christian faith. His father, Alfrik, made a cross by himself, on which he painted the image of Christ and embellished it with a golden crown and a precious belt which weighted fifty gold grivnas. Simon brought these votive offerings with him to Rus’. They played a key role in the foundation of the Dormition of the Mother of God Church. At this point in the story, a new protagonist appears, Brother Theodosius, whom Anthony entrusted with the construction of the temple. It is worth noting that the next story (*Discourse 2*) “On Arrival of the Craftsmen from Constantinople” however, credits the main role in the construction of the temple to Brother Anthony³⁴. The founder of the monastery, facing the dilemma of choosing a site for the temple, prayed fervently for the right decision. God listened to the monk’s prayers and twice indicated the location where the church should stand. On the

events that took place in Norway in 1028, when Olaf II Haraldsson, was defeated by Cnut the Great and sought refuge in Rus’ with his followers. See O. Pricak, *The Origin of Rus’*, pp. 412–416.

³⁴ *Kievo-Pechers’kii Paterik*, pp. 7–8.

third day, Anthony marked out the site of the future temple, using as a measure “Simon’s golden belt”³⁵.

Researchers have variously assessed the influence of the *Life of Anthony* on the editing of the stories of the *Paterik*. A.A. Shakhmatov assures that in the *Discourse about the foundation of the stone church of the Dormition of the Mother of God*, Bishop Simon summarised everything he had read in the *Life of Anthony*³⁶. M.P. Priselko has a different opinion and speculates that the Bishop of Vladimir-Suzdal found a reference to Simon’s “golden belt” in the above-mentioned work and borrowed the story of the arrival of the Greek foremen. The historian believes that this work also underpinned the account of the consecration of the temple which took place in 1089³⁷. Ju Artamanov, on the other hand, supposes that only a fragment of the story about the choice of the site for the construction of the stone church came from the now lost work, while the rest of the account was written down on the basis of legends that circulated in the Pechersk-Kyiv monastery³⁸.

First of all, it should be noted that the story in question was written at a time (the 1330s) when the origins of the Pechersk monastery were seen from a completely different perspective. Saint Anthony was already a semi-legendary figure, while his place in the interpretation of the history of the monastery, as we shall see below, was taken by St Theodosius. Contrary to the claims of some researchers, Bishop Simon did not use the text of the *Life of Anthony* while writing the story of the construction of the Dormition of the Mother of God church, because at that time (around 1226) he was in Vladimir on the Klyazma River³⁹. He probably became acquainted with the text during his stay at the monastery (until 1206)⁴⁰, before he became Bishop of Vladimir. Therefore, we do not know to what extent Bishop Simon’s story, created on the basis of what he remembered from his time in the monastery, reflected the stories contained in the *Life of Anthony*.

When we examine the works whose authorship is attributed to Bishop Simon, we encounter some plots that commonly appeared in legends about the beginnings of religious congregations: the unusual circumstances surrounding

³⁵ *Ibidem*.

³⁶ A.A. Shakhmatov, *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, p. 107. A similar opinion was expressed by Kuzmin, who, however, believes that only a part (a summary) of the story that was in *The Anthony’s Life* was included in the *Paterik*. A.G. Kuz’min, *Nachal’nye etapy drevnerusskogo letopisaniia*, Moskva 1977, p. 169.

³⁷ M.D. Priselkov, *Ocherki*, pp. 249–251.

³⁸ Ju.A. Artamonov, *Problema rekonstruktsii*, pp. 21–22.

³⁹ M. Happel, *Introduction*, pp. XIV–XVI.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*.

the choice of the site for the foundation of the stone church of the Dormition of the Mother of God, and the “miraculous objects” – relics that accompanied its creation. The origin of both fragments from the *Life of Anthony* has already been hinted at in the literature⁴¹, but their connection with the foundation of the temple has not been questioned. In these stories we can see quite significant “corrections” which were supposed to convince the reader that an important, if not decisive role in the “miraculous incidents” was played by Brother Theodosius. It was Brother Theodosius who received the votive offerings Simon the Varangian brought from his homeland⁴². However, in the further parts of the text, he gave them to Antony⁴³. Brother Theodosius, as ordered by Antony, took care of the matters concerning the construction of the stone church of the Dormition of the Mother of God⁴⁴ (but in the following story we read that it was actually Antony who determined the place of the foundation, and measured the foundations of the church)⁴⁵. If we turn to the information about the Pechersk monastery preserved in *The Tale of Bygone Years*, we learn from the first fragment dedicated to this monastic congregation, that the builder of both the wooden temple of the Dormition of the Mother of God and the “Great Orthodox Church” was the first ihumen of the monastery, Varlaam⁴⁶. The next entry states that the foundations of the new church were laid by ihumen Theodosius in the year 1073⁴⁷. If we are to believe the chronology of *The Tale of Bygone Years* the construction of the stone church of the Dormition of the Mother of God is rather puzzling. The foundation of the church was commissioned by ihumen Theodosius in 1073, the construction was continued and completed by his successor, ihumen Stephanus in 1075⁴⁸, and the consecration of the church did not take place until 1089 under the reign of the next ihumen Nikon⁴⁹. The *Life of Theodosius*, on the other hand, consistently linked the construction of the monastery buildings and the temple to the person of Theodosius. In order to highlight the saint’s role in the foundation of the monastery, the author of the *Livs of Theodosius* emphasised that Anthony had already predicted at his first

⁴¹ M.D. Priselkov, *Ocherki*, pp. 249–251; Ju.A. Artamonov, *Problema rekonstruktsii*, pp. 21–22.

⁴² *Kievo-Pechers’kii Paterik*, p. 2.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, p. 3.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, pp. 7–8.

⁴⁶ *Poves’ vremennykh let*, p. 106.

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 122.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 131.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 137.

meeting with Theodosius that the latter would “erect a famous monastery on this site, where many monks would gather”⁵⁰.

We can speculate that the miraculous events linked in Bishop Simon’s story to the foundation of the brick church of the Dormition of the Mother of God, which was the most important centre of the cult of St Theodosius at the beginning of the 13th century, were originally part of an independent work – the myth of the first relics of the Pechersk monastery in the *Life of Anthony*. The relics in question were the golden belt and the crown of Simon the Varangian. Both items have long attracted the attention of historians. The question of their authenticity was most thoroughly considered by M.F. Murianov. The researcher formulated the thesis that the depiction of the crucified Christ described in the *Paterik*, which Simon’s father Alfrik adorned with a crown and golden belt, corresponds to a depiction in the type of the reigning Christ. Looking for an analogy to this type of depiction of the crucified Christ, Murianov pointed to the Volto Santo crucifix, now in St Martin’s Cathedral in Lucca⁵¹. This relic dates to the 12th century, although it was modeled on an older unpreserved work, as testimonies of the Volto Santo cult date back to the 3rd quarter of the 11th century and mention Lucca as a pilgrimage destination from almost all of Europe⁵². The Volto Santo depicts the living Christ (with eyes open), dressed in a tunic with long sleeves (*tunica manicata*), tied at the waist with a long belt with two ends hanging low. The figure of Christ is depicted frontally, with a golden crown on the Saviour’s head. If we were to look for the depictions of Christ as Volto Santo which are geographically closer to the Ruthenian lands, we can find a crucifix (ca. 1050) from an abbey church near Aarhus, now in the collection of the National Museum in Copenhagen. It is made of copper-coated oak and features crowned Christ wearing a perizoma and a belt⁵³.

We do not know whether the Pechersk monastery originally housed a Volto Santo figure of Christ, which significantly differed from the depiction of Christ

⁵⁰ “[...] прозорочными очима прозря, яко тъ хотяше възградити самъ мѣстъ то и манастьрь славынь сътвори на събъране множьству чърньць”; *Zhitie Feodosiia Pecherskogo*, red. O.V. Tvorogov, in: *Biblioteka literatury Drevnei Rusi*, red. D.S. Likhachev, L.A. Dmitriev, A.A. Alekseev, N.V. Ponyrko, vol. 1: *XI–XII v.*, Sankt-Peterburg 1997, <http://lib2.pushkinskijdom.ru/tabid-4872> (accessed: 08.06.2023).

⁵¹ M.F. Mur’ianov, *Zolotoi poias Shimona*, in: *Vizantiia. Iuzhnye slaviane i drevniaia Rus’. Zapadnaia Evropa. Iskusstvo i kul’tura*, Z.V. Udal’tsova, G.A. Ostrogorskii, Moskva 1973, pp. 189–193 et seq.

⁵² R. Hauss herr, *Das Imerwardkreuz und der Volto-Santo-Typ*, “Zeitschrift für Kunstwissenschaft” 1962, 16, pp. 129–170.

⁵³ http://danmarkskirker.natmus.dk/uploads/tx_tchurchsearch/Aarhus_1429-1452_01.pdf (accessed: 16.12.2021).

the Triumphator known in Byzantine art, but the very memory of the miraculous origin of the golden crown and belt (according to the *Paterik*, the golden crown was suspended above the altar)⁵⁴, contributed to their recognition as relics. The confirmation of the thesis that these artefacts were not mere votive objects is found in the story of the arrival of Greek craftsmen at the Church of the Dormition of the Mother of God (*Discourse 4*). It mentions the healing power of one of the objects: “Then Vladimir was ill and with this gold belt he was girded, and here he recovered, thanks to the prayers of our holy fathers Anthony and Theodosius”⁵⁵.

If we are to believe the chronological clues contained in the *Paterik*, Vladimir Monomakh’s miraculous healing took place during the Pereyaslav reign of his father Vsevolod (1053–1073)⁵⁶, thus even before the construction of the stone church of the Dormition of the Mother of God.

Relics of a similar kind were also kept in other monasteries. The Benedictine congregation on the Michealsberg hill near Siegburg was in the possession of a piece of a belt which, according to legend, belonged to Christ and was given to the congregation by the founder of the monastery, Archbishop Anno II of Cologne⁵⁷. The relics of the belts of Christ and Mary are kept in the treasury of the Cathedral of Aachen⁵⁸. It is also worth mentioning the Orthodox tradition, preserved in one of the oldest liturgical books of the Rus’: the *Evangelinary of Ostromir*⁵⁹ about the “belt” that St Thomas received from the Blessed Virgin Mary as a sign of remembrance.

Although it is debatable whether the Church of Dormition of the Mother of God housed Simon’s “golden belt”⁶⁰, we can assume with a high degree of certainty that these relics were venerated in the Pechersk monastery in the late 11th century. Due to their unique origin, which is different from the Ruthenian art, they became the starting point for the “Varangian legend”.

⁵⁴ This way of placing the crowns was characteristic of the Latin rite see: V. Elbern, *Liturgisches Gerat in edlen Materialien zur Zeit Karls des Grohen*, in: *Karolingische Kunst*, hg. von W. Braunfels und H.S. Schnitzler, Dusseldorf 1966, pp. 115–167; see M.F. Mur’ianov, *Zolotoi poias Shimona*, p. 189.

⁵⁵ “Тогда Владимиръ, боленъ сый и тымъ поясомъ златымъ обложенъ бысть, и ту абие здравъ бысть молитвами святую отцю нашу Антоша и Феодосиа”; *Kievo-Pechers’kii Paterik*, p. 11. [M.B. mark].

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁷ M.F. Mur’ianov, *Zolotoi poias Shimona*, pp. 195–196.

⁵⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁹ *Ostromirovo evangelie 1056–57 goda*, ed. A. Vostokov, Sankt-Peterburg 1843, <https://viewer.rusneb.ru/ru/rl01003543020?page=288&rotate=0&theme=black> (accessed: 10.12.2021).

⁶⁰ M.F. Mur’ianov, *Zolotoi poias Shimona*, pp. 195–196 et seq.

It is reflected not only in the story of the origins of the monastery, but also in one work whose authorship is attributed to Polycarp. In the *Paterik* (*Discourse* 33), we read about Brother Theodor, who lived in a cell called the “Varangian Cave”. It concealed countless quantities of silver and gold, as well as precious vessels, which were described as ‘Latin’⁶¹. This ‘Varangian treasure’ became the cause of Theodore’s demise, as well as that of his spiritual mentor – Vasily. Both brothers died as martyrs, refusing to betray to Prince Mstislav Svyatopolkovich the place where the valuables were hidden⁶².

The Varangian theme that appeared in the *Paterik* was most often linked to the early history of the Kiev hills. The “Varangian cave” was seen as a hiding place for the Varangians – robbers⁶³; or it was regarded as a place of refuge for the first Christians, who came to Kiev from the north⁶⁴. There have also been made assumptions about the literary origin of the Varangian motif, which served to emphasise the ‘ancient’ origins of the monastic congregation⁶⁵. However, it cannot be ruled out that the myth of the origin of the first relics may have been at the root of the “Varangian references” in the *Paterik*. The areas within the range of influence of the monastery, often became the source of fictional content, far more interesting than the one produced away from cultural centers⁶⁶. It was the monastic congregations that supplied the tales and legends that “ordered the space” – gave specific meanings to certain objects. As a result, heights gained a new context, turned into “graves of the first Christians”, stones took on a sacred dimension. The connection of the story with a material object, in such a way that the message found its justification in a specific object or in an existing place, provided a guarantee that the legend really took place⁶⁷. Places that existed in real life guaranteed as much credibility as an appeal to the authority of the written word. The term “Varangian cavern” was thus not only an element of spatial ordering (the role of the name as a topographical clue), but at the same time a record of the cultural imagery of the local community. The plots that arose around topographical

⁶¹ The late origin of the mentioned legend, as already noted by I. Malyshevskii, is indicated by the use of the term “Latin” as a synonym for the word “Varangian”. See I.I. Malyshevskii, *Variagi v nachal'noi istorii khristianstva v Kieve*, Kiev 1887, nr 12, p. 25.

⁶² *Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik*, pp. 161–171.

⁶³ E.E. Golubinskii, *Istoriia*, vol. 1, p. 544.

⁶⁴ I.I. Malyshevskii, *Variagi v nachal'noi istorii*, p. 25.

⁶⁵ A.A. Shakhmatov, *Kievopecherskij paterik*, pp. 10–33.

⁶⁶ J. Banaszkiwicz, *Fabularyzacja przestrzeni. Średniowieczny przykład granic*, in: *idem, Takie sobie średniowieczne bajeczki*, Kraków 2012, pp. 128 et seq.

⁶⁷ *Ibidem*.

names stimulated the imagination of the population, becoming firmly rooted in the consciousness of the inhabitants, and over time acquiring the status of almost real events that took place in the past. The story of the “Varangian Cave” seems to have emerged at the end of the process of the formation of the “legend of the origins of the Pechersk monastery”, complementing the originally existing tales about the founder of the congregation, the supernatural phenomena accompanying the whole enterprise and the miraculous relics venerated there.

One of the questions that needs to be considered at the end is why the 13th century authors of the *Paterik* linked most of the myths to the stone church of the Dormition of the Mother of God, while the origins of the monastery itself were only supplemented by an enigmatic and late tradition linking the place of its foundation to the Varangians and Metropolitan Hilarion. As mentioned above, in the narratives about the origins of the aforementioned temple, we can notice numerous ‘editorial corrections’, the purpose of which was to link its construction with the second ihumen of the Paterian monastery – Theodosius. The stories in the *Paterik*⁶⁸, as well as *The Tale of the Bygone Years*⁶⁹ and the *Life of Theodosius*⁷⁰, leave the reader in no doubt that it was actually the reign of the abbot that led to the wonderful development of the Pechersk Lavra. Indeed, Ihumen Theodosius introduced into the monastery the Studite Rule⁷¹, which became obligatory for all Ruthenian monasteries, and during his reign “the monastery filled with monks”⁷². The activities of Theodosius overshadowed, but did not completely erase, the memory of the monastery’s founder. The reasons why the ‘miraculous events’ which generally accompanied the founding of a monastic congregation were linked to Anthony’s successor can be traced back to the complex and dramatic turns in the history of the Pechersk community⁷³. The monastery, founded

⁶⁸ *Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik*, pp. 18–30, 35–47, 51–60, 61–70, 75–98 et seq.

⁶⁹ *Povest' vremennykh let*, pp. 122–131, 138–141.

⁷⁰ *Zhitie Feodosiia*, electronic version: <http://lib2.pushkinskijdom.ru/tabid-4872> (accessed: 08.06.2023).

⁷¹ See A. Poppe, *Studity na Rusi. Istoki i nachal'naia istoriia Kievo-Pecherskogo monastyrnia*, Ruthenica, supp. 3, Kiev 2011, pp. 18–46.

⁷² *Kievo-Pecherskii Paterik*, pp. 19–20; *Zhitie Feodosiia*, electronic version: <http://lib2.pushkinskijdom.ru/tabid-4872> (accessed: 08.06.2023).

⁷³ The early history of the Pechersk monastery is still under discussion. Recently, Ju. Artamanov has put forward the thesis of internal conflict in the community, the source of which was the rivalry between the monastery’s founder Antony and his disciple Theodosius over the nature of the monastic rule. See: Ju.A. Artamonov, *Zhitie Feodosiia Pecherskogo*, pp. 215–235. For polemical comments against Artamanov’s thesis, see: A. Poppe, *Studity na Rusi*, pp. 46–68 et seq.

around 1051, was burned to the ground more than forty years later by the Cumans who, “after they had broken down the gate of the monastery, they went to the cells, breaking down the doors, and if they found anything in the cells they carried it away”⁷⁴. As we can guess, the precious relics kept in the monastery at that time – the golden belt and the crown – fell prey to the invaders. The monastery buildings were soon rebuilt, but the main relics of the “Theodosius Monastery” – as the editor of *The Tale of Bygone Years* described the Pechersk Monastery – now became the remains of Theodosius⁷⁵. The beginnings of Theodosius’ cult predate this invasion. The transfer of the monk’s remains to the consecrated church of the Dormition of the Mother of God took place in 1091, but the dramatic events of 1096 accelerated the process of elevating the cult of St Theodosius to a national status, which took place in 1108⁷⁶. The development of the cult of St Theodosius erased the memory of Brother Anthony and helped to change the story of the history of the congregation itself, culminating not in the founding of the monastery itself, but in the construction of the Church of Dormition of the Mother of God, where the relics of St Theodosius, the “father of Ruthenian monasticism”, were kept.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

Kievo-Pechers’kii Paterik, red. D. Abramovich, in: *Pamiatki movi ta pis’menstva davnoi Ukraïni*, vol. 4, Kiev 1930.

Ostromirovo evangelie 1056–57 goda, ed. A. Vostokov, Sankt-Peterburg 1843, <https://viewer.rusneb.ru/ru/rsl01003543020?page=288&rotate=0&theme=black> (accessed: 10.12.2021)

Pabst H., *Fundatio monasterii Brunwilarensis*, “Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde” 1872, bd. 12.

⁷⁴ *Kievo-Pechers’kii Paterik*, pp. 151–152 [translated by M.B.].

⁷⁵ *Povest’ vremennykh let*, p. 131.

⁷⁶ The question of Theodosius’ canonisation is controversial among historians and it is inextricably linked to the question of when the *Life of Theodosius* was written. Some researchers have stated that as early as 1091, during the transfer of the remains of the monk to the newly consecrated Church of the Dormition of the Mother of God, there was a local cult of St Theodosius, which acquired a widespread character in 1108; see: A. Poppe, *Studity na Rusi*, pp. 57–68. Ju.A. Artamonov on the other hand, believes that in 1091 an unsuccessful attempt was made to have Theodosius canonised, which later succeeded in 1108. See: M. Bartnicki, *U źródeł świętości. Wokół problemu początków kultu św. Teodozego – ihumena Lawry Peczerskiej w Kijowie*, „Saeculum Christianum” 2022, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 31–49.

- Povest' vremennykh let*, ch. 1, tekst i perevod, red. D.S. Likhachev, B.A. Romanov, Lenin-grad 1950.
- Skazanie O chiudesekh prechistyiya Bogoroditsa Volodimir'skoi ikony*, in: *Biblioteka literatury Drevnei Rusi*, vol. 4, red. V.P. Grebeniuk, <http://lib.pushkinskiydom.ru/Default.aspx?tabid=4938> (accessed: 20.12.2021).
- The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, ed. M. Happel, in: *Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature*, vol. 1, Cambridge Mass. 1989.
- Zhitie Antoniiia Rimlianina*, in: *Sviatye russkie rimliane. Antonii Rimlianin i Merkurii Smolenskii*, red. N.V. Ramazanovoi, Sankt-Peterburg 2005 (Sviatye i sviatyni Russkoi zemli).
- Zhitie Feodosiia Pecherskogo*, red. O.V. Tvorogov, in: *Biblioteka literatury Drevnei Rusi*, red. D.S. Likhachev, L.A. Dmitriev, A.A. Alekseev, N.V. Ponyrko, vol. 1: *XI–XII v.*, Sankt-Peterburg 1997, <http://lib2.pushkinskiydom.ru/tabid-4872> (accessed: 08.06.2023).

Secondary sources

- Abramovich D.I., *Issledovanie o Kievo-Pecherskom Paterike, kak istoriko-literaturnom pamiatnike*, "Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akademii nauk" 1901, vol. 6, Kn. 4, pp. 68–71.
- Åby kirke Hasle Herred*, http://danmarkskirker.natmus.dk/uploads/tx_tchurchsearch/Aarhus_1429-1452_01.pdf (accessed: 16.12.2021).
- Artamonov Ju.A., *Problema rekonstruktsii drevneishego Zhitiiia Antoniiia Pecherskogo*, in: *Srednevekovaia Rus'*, ch. 3, otv. red. A.A. Gorskii, Moskva 2001.
- Artamonov Ju.A., *Monashestvo i monastyri v svete khristianizatsii Drevnei Rusi (XI – nachalo XII v.)*, in: *Vostochnaia Evropa v drevnosti i srednevekov'e: Iazychestvo i mono-teizm v protsessakh politogeneza: XXVI Chteniia pamiatii chlena-korrespondenta AN SSSR Vladimira Terent'evicha Pashuto: Moskva, 16–18 apreliia 2014 g.: Materialy konferentsii*, otv. red. E.A. Mel'nikova, Moskva 2014, pp. 17–20.
- Artamonov Ju.A., *Zhitie Feodosiia Pecherskogo: problemy istochnikovedeniia*, in: *Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy 2000 g.: Problemy istochnikovedeniia*, red. L.V. Stoliarova, Moskva 2003, pp. 32–44.
- Banaszkiewicz J., *Fabularyzacja przestrzeni. Średniowieczny przykład granic*, in: Banasz-kiewicz J., *Takie sobie średniowieczne bajeczki*, Kraków 2012.
- Bartnicki M., *Swój czy obcy? Obraz etniczny społeczności Rusi Kijowskiej w przekazach "Pateryku kijowsko-pieczerskiego"*, "Średniowiecze Polskie i Powszechne" 2021, t. 13, pp. 11–26.
- Bartnicki M., *U źródle świętości. Wokół problemu początków kultu św. Teodozego – ihumena Ławry Peczerskiej w Kijowie*, "Saeculum Christianum" 2022, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 31–49.
- Benz E., *Russische Heiligenlegenden*, Zürich 1989.
- Braun F.A., *Friend i Shimon, synov' iavariashskogo kniazia Afrikana*, "Izvestiia otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoi Akademii Nauk" 1902, vol. 7, kn. 1, pp. 360–365.

- Caby C., *La memoire des origincs dans les institutions mediévales: presentation d'un project collectif*, "Mélanges de l' Ecole Française de Rome, Moyen age" 115, 2003, n° 1, pp. 133–140.
- Casey R., *Early Russian Monasticism*, "Orientalia Christiana Periodica" (19), 1953, pp. 372–423.
- Derwich M., *Lysogórski mit miejsca fundacji. Mnisi i przeszłość*, "Roczniki Historyczne" R. 72, 2006, pp. 53–66.
- Elbern V., *Liturgisches Gerat in edlen Materialien zur Zeit Karls des Grohen*, in: *Karolin-gische Kunst*, hg. von W. Braunfels und H. S. Schnitzler, Dusseldorf 1966.
- Forwick E., *Waltger von Dörnberg oder der Heilige Walther von Herford*, 72, "Jahresberich-te des Historischen Vereins für die Grafschaft Ravensberg", Bietefeld 1980, pp. 12–54.
- Goetz L.K., *Das Kiever Hohlenkloster als Kulturzentrum des vormongolischen Russlands*, Passau 1904.
- Golubinskii E.E., *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 1, ch. 2, Moskva 1904.
- Happel M., *Introduction*, in: *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, ed. M. Happel, Cambridge Mass. 1989 (Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, vol. 1).
- Happel M., *The "Vita Antonii", a Lost Source of the "Patericon" of the Monastery of Caves*, „Byzantinoslavica” 1952/53, vol. 13, pp. 46–58.
- Haussherr R., *Das Imerwardkreuz und der Volto-Santo-Typ*, "Zeitschrift für Kunstwissen-schaft" 16, 1962, pp. 129–170.
- Heppell M., *The "Vita Antonii", a Lost Source of the "Patericon" of the Monastery of Caves*, "Byzantinoslavica" 1952/53, vol. 13, pp. 46–58.
- http://danmarkskirker.natmus.dk/uploads/tx_tcchurchsearch/Aarhus_1429-1452_01.pdf (accessed: 16.12.2021).
- Iakovenko Iu. A., *Vostochno-khristianskie agiograficheskie paralleli v zhitii Antoniiia Rim-lianina: k opredeleniu kruga istochnikov*, in: *Antonii Rimlianin i ego vremia. K 900-letiu osnovaniia sobora Rozhdestva Bogoroditsy Antonieva monastyria (1117–1119). Mate-rialy nauchnoi konferentsii 29–31 oktiabria 2019 g.*, Velkii Novgorod 2020.
- Iakovlev V.A., *Drevnekievskie religioznye skazaniia*, Varshava 1875.
- Kastner J., *"Historiae foundationum monasteriorum". Frilhformen monasticher Institution-geschichtsschrcibung im Mittelalter*, Milnchen 1974.
- Khrushchev Ia.Ia., *O drevne-russkikh istoricheskikh povestiakh i skazaniiah XI–XII stoletiia*, Kiev 1878.
- Kuz'min A.G., *Nachal'nye etapy drevnerusskogo letopisaniia*, Moskva 1977.
- Malyshevskii I. I., *Variagi v nachal'noi istorii khristianstva v Kieve*, Kiev 1887.
- Michałowski R., *Święta moc fundatora klasztoru (Niemcy XI–XII w.)*, "Kwartalnik Histo-ryczny" R. 91, 1984, t. 1, pp. 3–24.
- Mikheev S.M., *Variashskie kniaz'ia Iakun, Afrikan i Shimon: Literaturnye siuzhety, trans-formatsiia imen i istoricheskii kontekst*, "Drevniaia Rus': Voprosy medievistiki" 2008, № 2 (32), pp. 27–32.
- Mur'ianov M.F., *O novgorodskoi kul'ture XII veka*, „Sacris Erudiri" 1969–1970, vol. 19, pp. 187–198.

- Mur'ianov M.F., *Zolotoi pois Shimona*, in: *Vizantiia. Iuzhnye slaviane i drevniaia Rus'. Zapadnaia Evropa. Iskusstvo i kul'tura*, Z.V. Udaltsova, G.A. Ostrogorskii, Moskva 1973, pp.?
- Nazarenko A.V., *Antonii Rimlianin*, in: *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia*, vol. 3, <https://www.pravenc.ru/text/116106.html> (accessed: 07.06.2023).
- Parkhomenko V., *V kakoi mere bylo tendentsiozno nesokhranivsheesia drevneishee zhitie Antoniiia Pecherskogo?*, "Izvestiia Otdeleniia russkogo iazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akademii nauk" 1914, vol. 19, № 1, pp. 237–242.
- Podskal'ski G., *Khristianstvo i bogoslovskaiia literatura v kievskoi Rusi (988–1237)*, Sankt-Peterburg 1996.
- Poppe A., *Państwo i kościół na Rusi w XI wieku*, Warszawa 1968.
- Poppe A., *Rus' i Afon v XI v.*, in: *Sbornik statei k 70-letiiu Borisa Andreevicha Uspenskogo*, sost. F.B. Uspenskii, Moskva 2008, pp. 320–340.
- Poppe A., *Study na Rusi. Istoki i nachal'naia istoriia Kievo-Pecherskogo monastyria*, Ruthenica, supp. 3, Kiev 2011.
- Pricak O., *The Origin of Rus'*, Cambridge 1981.
- Priselkov M.D., *Ocherki po tserkovno-politicheskoi istorii Kievskoi Rusi X–XII vv.*, Sankt-Peterburg 1913.
- Remensnyder A.G., *Croyance et communaute: la memoire des ongines des abbayes bédectines*, "Mélanges de l' Ecole Française de Rome, Moyen age" 115, 2003, n° 1, pp. 141–154.
- Ryzhova E.A., *Motiv "plavanie sviatogo na kamene" v Zhitii Antoniiia Rimlianina i fol'klore*, in: *Russkaia agiografiia: Issledovaniia. Materialy. Publikatsii*, t. 2, Sankt-Peterburg 2011, pp. 3–7.
- Shakhmatov A.A., *Kievo-Pecherskii paterik i Pecherskaia letopis'*, in: *idem, Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, vol. 1, kn. 2, Sankt-Peterburg 2003, pp. 10–33.
- Shakhmatov A.A., *Nestor letopisets*, in: *Istoriia russkogo letopisaniia*, t. 1: *Povest' vremennykh let i drevneisheie russkie letopisnye svody*, kn. 2: *Raneeie russkoe letopisanie XI–XII vv.*, Moskva 2003, pp. 413–498.
- Shakhmatov A.A., *Povest' vremennykh let*, t. 1: *Vvodnaia chast'. Tekst. Primechaniia*, Petrograd 1916.
- Shakhmatov A.A., *Zhitie Antoniiia i Pecherskaia letopis'*, "Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia" 1898, Mart. otd. 2, pp. 105–149.
- Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi*, red. D.S. Likhachev i dr., t. 1, Leningrad 1987.
- Tschizewskij D., *History of Russian Literature: From the Eleventh Century to the End of the Baroque*, The Hague 1960.
- Turilov A. A., *Ilarion*, in: *Pravoslavnaia Entsiklopediia, pod redaktsiei Patriarkha Moskovskogo i vseia Rusi Kirilla*, vol. 22, <https://www.pravenc.ru/vol/xxii.html> (accessed: 07.06.2023).
- Vasil'ev B., *Istoriia kanonizatsii russkikh sviatykh*, in: *Chteniia v Imperatorskomobshchestve istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, kn. 3, Moskva 1893, pp. 1–249.

O autorze:

dr hab. Mariusz Bartnicki – mediewista, adiunkt w Katedrze Historii Starożytnej i Średniowiecznej, Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej w Lublinie.

Zainteresowania naukowe: szeroko pojęta problematyka Rusi Kijowskiej i Polski, zagadnienia związane z konfrontacją – spotkaniem kultur, ze sposobami wyrażania, trwałości pewnych form ideologii władzy czy funkcjonowania stereotypów i mitów w historiografii obu krajów.

e-mail: mbartnicki@wp.pl