



2021

Legacies of the First-Called: Saint Andrew and Claims to Apostolic Succession in the Rus'-Byzantine World

Danylo Leshchyshyn

Recommended Citation

Leshchyshyn, Danylo (2021) "Legacies of the First-Called: Saint Andrew and Claims to Apostolic Succession in the Rus'-Byzantine World," *The Macksey Journal*: Vol. 2, Article 125.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Johns Hopkins University Macksey Journal. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Macksey Journal by an authorized editor of The Johns Hopkins University Macksey Journal.

Legacies of the First-Called: Saint Andrew and Claims to Apostolic Succession in the Rus'-Byzantine World

Danylo Leshchyshyn

Abstract

This historical study examined the evolution of claims to apostolic succession involving Saint Andrew the First-Called in the Byzantine Empire and Kyivan Rus', an understudied subject in modern scholarship. After a careful examination of primary sources, the author concluded that the Patriarchate of Constantinople began asserting its claim as the successor to the Apostle Andrew only during the Iconoclasm controversy of the eighth century, and that this narrative fully solidified in Constantinople once the Constantinopolitan Church began seriously feuding with the Papacy in Rome. In regard to Kyivan Rus', a critical reading of primary sources revealed that Kyivan claims to Andrean apostolic succession originated in a twelfth-century political conflict between the Grand Princes of Kyiv and the rulers of the northeastern cities of Novgorod and Vladimir-Suzdal. These findings shed light on the historical origins of Andrean succession narratives maintained by the modern Churches of Constantinople and Ukraine, and consequently reframe the current Moscow-Constantinopolitan Schism.

Keywords: Saint Andrew, apostolic succession, Church, Constantinople, Kyivan Rus'

Introduction

On the thirteenth of December, Eastern Christians across the world celebrate the feast day of Saint Andrew the First-Called.¹ Andrew, brother of Simon Peter, was one of the Apostles who spread Christianity beyond the borders of Judaea. As reported in his hagiography, recorded in the *Golden Legend*, Andrew preached in the lands of Scythia (the northern shores of the Black Sea, modern-day Ukraine and southwest Russia), Anatolia, and Achaëa (peninsular Greece) before a government official in the Greek city of Patras ordered him crucified.² On the basis of this itinerary, the churches of Constantinople and Kyiv both claimed the apostle Andrew as their founder.³ Yet the path described in the *Golden Legend* differs from the earliest Andrean itinerary reported in Eusebius's *Church History*.⁴ The question then arises about why and how the legend of Andrew the First-Called changed. The Churches of Constantinople and Kyiv developed Andrean apostolic succession narratives due to struggles for ecclesiastical power and influence.

The Original Andrean Narrative

Andrew's post-Pentecost itinerary in the original tale differs significantly from the modern version of the path he took. Origen provided the earliest known account of Andrew's travels in his third-century commentaries on Genesis.⁵ As quoted by Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Ecclesiastical History*, Andrew simply went "to Scythia."⁶ In this case, "Scythia" (more properly referred to in modern historiography as *Sarmatia*) referred to the Greek colonies around the Black Sea, including Olbia (near modern Mykolaiv), Tauric Chersonesos (modern Sevastopol), and Panticapaeum (modern Kerch).⁷ These Pontic Greek colonies housed many sizable Jewish diaspora congregations, in which Andrew most certainly preached.⁸ Čubatyj and Dvornik both reason that, in traveling to "Scythia," Andrew most likely followed a popular trade route from Antioch to the port city of Sinope, from which he boarded a ship to Tauric

Chersonesos.⁹ This original narrative would evolve over the centuries, but the early periods of Byzantine apostolic theory did not pick up on the Andrean narrative until later on.

The Andrew Legend in Byzantium

Over the next several centuries, the Andrean narrative expanded to include Achaëa, partially because of a case of mistaken identity. In the first century CE, the geographer Strabo recorded the existence of a Scythian tribe called the Achaei, who lived in the southern Caucasus.¹⁰ Although the Greeks had known of them for a long time, Greek writers began to confuse the Scythian Achaei with the Roman province of Achaëa, starting in the third century.¹¹ This tendency towards error conveniently aligns with Dvornik's theory that the association of Andrew with Patras was the result of popular conflation of the Apostle with a similarly-named local Saint.¹² Pseudo-Epiphanius provided the earliest documentation of this expansion, writing that Andrew preached in Scythia and several locations in modern Georgia, before dying in Achaëa.¹³ Soon after Pseudo-Epiphanius, the *Acta Andrae* elaborated on this expanded itinerary, stating that Andrew traveled through Bithynia and Thrace to get to Scythia, then traveled all along the Black Sea coast until he returned to the Pontic city of Sinope, and from there proceeded across the Hellespont to Illyricum (Thessaly, Hellas, and Achaëa).¹⁴ Both of these sources also presented the first historical records asserting that Andrew ordained Stachys as the first Bishop of Byzantium.¹⁵ The fact that the *Acta Andrae* referred to Illyricum as “δυτικούς μέρεσιν” (roughly translated as *western parts*) would, as Dvornik argues, imply that the author considered them to be part of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the westernmost Patriarch, the Roman Pope.¹⁶ This in turn suggests that the rudimentary elements of the later Byzantine narrative of Andrean apostolic succession developed sometime in the early eighth century, prior to the westward shift of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate's borders under the first iconoclastic emperor, Leo III.¹⁷ The

relatively late development of the Andrean narrative would also explain why prominent churchmen in the fifth and sixth centuries, such as Patriarch John Chrysostom, had put little stock in any connection between the see of Constantinople and Andrew, even though Andrew's relics had resided in the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople since the fourth century.¹⁸ Until around the seventh century, the Constantinopolitan Church simply did not have a sufficiently developed narrative to assert a serious claim to Andrean apostolic succession. As the hurricane of Iconoclasm struck the Byzantine world, however, the iconophiles took advantage of the evolved Andrean legend to provide theological support for their battle against the iconoclasts.

Iconoclasm forced the iconophile Church of Constantinople to find new weapons against a resolutely iconoclastic imperial government, and for this purpose prominent Byzantine churchmen leveraged the concept of apostolicity. The iconoclast emperors perceived themselves to be high priests over the entire Christian ecumene, and they used this idea in their attempts to force Iconoclasm on the largely iconophile Churches.¹⁹ To the iconoclasts, it did not matter whether a see possessed a historical connection with an Apostle; the *basileus* was supreme in all matters within the empire, church affairs included. Against this concept, iconophiles within the Constantinopolitan Church, most notably Theodore of Stoudios, brought forth the idea of apostolicity to bolster the doctrinal authority of the five sees of the Pentarchy. Instituted by Justinian I, the Pentarchy granted the bishops of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem ecclesiastical authority over other bishops in their regions.²⁰ By claiming that each of the Pentarchic sees was founded by an Apostle, iconophiles asserted that clerics had the right to determine Christian doctrine, not the state. It is important to keep in mind that Byzantine perceptions of apostolicity differed from Latin Christian perceptions of the same concept. While Rome always focused heavily on

the hierarchical “succession of order,” as Professor Vlassios Phidas puts it, Constantinople emphasized the continuation of the apostolic faith in the Church of Constantinople early on.²¹ What this meant was tracing not just the faith of a particular see, but the entire Church back to the Apostles. It was in this sense that the five sees of the Pentarchy were perceived as apostolic by the Church of Constantinople, and this concept justified the pentarchy as the proper system for governing Christianity.²² In this context, the Church began using Andrean narratives of apostolic succession, but Andrew was not the only Apostle whom the patriarchs attempted to link to the throne of Constantinople.

In building a theory of apostolic succession for Constantinople, the Church synthesized the narratives of Andrew and several of his fellow Apostles. The Patriarchs of Constantinople particularly liked to assert connections between the eparchies under their jurisdiction and the Evangelists due to their dual nature as Apostles and authors of the Gospels.²³ The Evangelist Luke, for instance, was said to have converted Thrace, according to the *Doctrina Apostolorum*.²⁴ Constantinopolitan clerics found Lukan narratives of apostolicity attractive, particularly since the Church of the Holy Apostles housed the remains of Luke along with Andrew.²⁵ John the Evangelist, meanwhile, was popularly associated with the see of Ephesus, and so the patriarchs transferred that apostolic association to the rest of the Patriarchate after Ephesus and Asia Minor came under the jurisdiction of Constantinople.²⁶ As for Andrew, Constantinopolitan churchmen synthesized Johannine and Andrean narratives, typically mentioning Andrew alongside John.²⁷ This strategy ultimately proved potent; as Dvornik notes, the triumph of the iconophiles solidified this idea of apostolic succession within the Church of Constantinople.²⁸ Despite the fact that Constantinople initially synthesized a poly-Apostolic narrative of apostolic succession, the Lukan and Johannine narratives did not endure as long as the Andrean narrative did.

While it is not definitively known why the Andrean narrative outlived the others, the most likely explanation has to do with the relationships between the Apostles. Lukan narratives were the shakiest, since Luke was not one of the Twelve Apostles.²⁹ As for John, it is worth noting that he and Andrew were highly interconnected. It was in the Gospel of John, after all, that Andrew was singled as the first disciple, and described as the one who brought Simon Peter to Jesus.³⁰ Since Constantinople frequently intertwined Johannine and Andrean apostolic succession narratives, it was only natural that the two stories would merge.³¹ Seeing as the Church of Constantinople would later come into conflict with the Petrine see of Rome, it makes sense that Constantinople would settle for a narrative of apostolic succession primarily linked to the Apostle who became one of Jesus's followers before Peter did.³² Thus, Constantinopolitan clerics chose Andrew as the founder of the see, but the imperial capital would not be the only city to lay claim to Andrean heritage.

The Andrew Legend in Rus'

Just as in Constantinople, Andrean connections were slow to build in the Metropolis of Kyiv. A definitive date for the start of the Andrew cult's development is provided by the arrival of Metropolitan John II Prodromos in Kyiv in the early 1080s.³³ As a Greek cleric, he most certainly would have been familiar with the already well-developed Andrew narrative, and thus it is likely that he would have brought these ideas of Andrean apostolicity with him to Kyiv. Čubatyj notes that it was during John II's reign that the Metropolis opened the women's monastery of Saint Andrew and the first church of Saint Andrew in Kyiv.³⁴ These two buildings, likely built on the suggestion of the Greek Metropolitan, then inspired the construction of churches dedicated to Saint Andrew in other Rus' cities.³⁵ On its own, this sequence of buildings would not prove that John II provided much impetus for the development of Andrean narratives in Kyiv. After all, he certainly was not the first Greek to

serve as Metropolitan of Kyiv, so it would be difficult to assert based on a few newly constructed churches that he was the one who introduced a cult of Andrew to Kyivan Rus'. Yet it should be noted that, before John II arrived in Kyiv, few members of the extended Rurikid family bore the name Andrew, but afterwards, Andrew became a much more popular name among the ruling Rurikids.³⁶ Thus it is reasonable to conclude that, by the late eleventh century, Andrew began gaining enough popularity within the Kyivan Church and government to provide the theological foundations for the development of a narrative of apostolic succession during the political fragmentation of the twelfth century.

From the 1140s to around 1164, the Kyivan Church grew increasingly polarized in a manner not unlike the contemporary political situation in Rus'. After the death of *Velykyi Knyaz* (Grand Prince) Volodymyr Monomakh's two sons, Mstyslav in 1132 and Yaropolk in 1139, the Kyivan state began to break apart into numerous different regional principalities.³⁷ Two northeastern regions, Novgorod and Zalisia (the cities of Suzdal, Rostov, and Vladimir-on-Klyazma), were among the first to break away from the orbit of Kyiv.³⁸ Novgorod in particular emerged as a competitor to Kyiv, as its rulers sought to supplant the old capital in cultural significance.³⁹ It was thus not surprising that Archbishop Nifont of Novgorod and Bishop Manuil of Suzdal loudly voiced their opposition to the 1147 election of Klyment Smoliatych as Metropolitan of Kyiv without a consultation with the Constantinopolitan Patriarch.⁴⁰ Klyment was close to the Mstyslavychi, a branch of the Rurikids which at the time had control over the Kyivan throne.⁴¹ After Iziaslav Mstyslavych died in 1154, however, the *Knyaz* of Suzdal, Yuriy Dolgorukiy, marched on Kyiv in 1156 and replaced Klyment with a Greek cleric named Constantine.⁴² Yuriy died in 1158, after which Iziaslav's brother and son, Rostyslav Mstyslavych and Mstyslav Iziaslavych, retook Kyiv.⁴³ Mstyslav eagerly sought to restore Klyment to the Kyivan see, but the cautious Rostyslav decided to wait for a better

opportunity, and let Constantine remain in office for the last few years of his life.⁴⁴ After Constantine's successor, Theodore, died 10 months into his tenure, Rostyslav jumped at the chance to reappoint Klyment as Metropolitan, but relations with the Byzantine Empire forced Rostyslav to accept another Greek to serve as Metropolitan of Kyiv in 1164.⁴⁵ Thus the "Klyment controversy" came to an end. This proved to be a significant period in the history of the Kyivan Church not only because it exposed divisions within the Church, but also because it was the period when the Kyivan narrative of Andrean apostolic succession took hold.

The party of Iziaslav and Rostyslav Mstyslavych was integral to the incorporation of the Andrean episode in the Kyivan chronicle, the *Pověst' vremennykh lět*. Within the *Pověst'*, Andrew is written to have travelled from Tauric Chersonesos, up the river Dnipro, and visited the future site of Kyiv.⁴⁶ All versions of the *Pověst'* reported Andrew then stating to his followers, "See you these hills? So shall the favor of God shine upon them that on this spot a great city shall arise, and God shall erect many churches therein," before setting up a cross and continuing up the Dnipro.⁴⁷ This is a clear reference to Kyiv's status as the locus of Orthodox Christianity in Rus' after Kyivan *Velykyi Knyaz* Volodymyr the Great initiated the state-sponsored conversion of Rus' to Christianity in 988.⁴⁸ While one might assume, based on its presence in all modern copies, that the monk Sil'vestr himself included the Andrean episode in the original *Pověst'* from the early twelfth century, there are several factors which suggest that the Andrean episode was a later interpolation.⁴⁹ First, the story of Andrew traveling to the future site of Kyiv stands out somewhat from surrounding passages. The *Pověst'* featured this episode right between a geographical exposition of Rus' and the legend of the mythical founding of Kyiv.⁵⁰ The narrative of the *Pověst'* then abruptly jumped from the Andrean legend, describing the Apostle's travels from Rome back to Sinope, straight into an introduction of the Polianian tribe that lived on the site of Kyiv.⁵¹ This suggests that the

original manuscript probably transitioned to the Kyivan foundation story directly from the description of the Dnipro flowing into the Black Sea. In addition, the *Pověst'* included a curious scene in the Andrean episode. When the Apostle reached the city of Novgorod, the *Pověst'* had Andrew describe the inhabitants of Novgorod as *primitives*, because of their strange and dangerous bathing habits.⁵² This impolite denigration of one of the most important cities in Kyivan Rus' is the reason why Čubatyj argues that the narrative was a later interpolation.⁵³ He even singles out a likely candidate for the interpolator: Archimandrite Polikarp of the Kyivo-Pechers'ka Lavra. Polikarp was a trusted advisor to Rostyslav, and thus a firm partisan of the Mstyslavychi.⁵⁴ It is likely that Polikarp, drawing upon Byzantine sources and contemporary popular devotion to Saint Andrew, crafted the Kyivan Andrean narrative in order to increase the prestige of the declining capital, and denigrate Novgorod's archbishop for leading the opposition to the election of Metropolitan Klyment.⁵⁵ The archimandrite probably composed this legend during the tail end of the "Klyment controversy," when grudges were still fresh, because the absence of any pejorative descriptions of Suzdal suggests that Polikarp incorporated the episode before Andrei Bogoliubskiy, Yuriy Dolgorukiy's son, brutally sacked Kyiv in 1169.⁵⁶ Thus, the Kyivan Church obtained its narrative of apostolic succession. Just as in Constantinople, it took a major division within the Church for Rostyslav's faithful monk, Archimandrite Polikarp, to construct a claim to Andrean apostolicity.

Feuding Andrean Churches

As in the 1140s, grand political forces in 2018 dragged the Orthodox world into bitter conflict. The annexation of Crimea and the start of the Russo-Ukrainian War in 2014 prompted a large anti-Kremlin push in Ukraine, particularly in religious matters. Responding to this, the government of President Petro Poroshenko began discussions with Ecumenical Patriarch Bartholomew of Constantinople about uniting the various Orthodox churches in Ukraine

under a single autocephalous Orthodox Church, and Bartholomew assented to the plan. In response, the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC) severed communion with the Ecumenical Patriarchate, striking Bartholomew's name from the diptych (the list of church hierarchs whom priests and congregations pray for during liturgies) and forbidding any ROC parishioners from attending liturgies celebrated in parishes of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Patriarch Kirill of Moscow threatened to do the same with any other church that recognized the new Orthodox Church of Ukraine (OCU). Undaunted, the unification council in Ukraine continued as planned, and Bartholomew issued a *tomos* of autocephaly on January 15, 2019.⁵⁷ Although most of the other autocephalous Churches attempted to remain neutral in this conflict, the matter of Ukrainian autocephaly drew battle lines between autocephalous churches. The Patriarch of Alexandria and the Archbishops of Athens and Cyprus, for example, sided with Bartholomew and recognized the OCU, while the Patriarch of Serbia and the Metropolitans of Warsaw and Prešov sided with Kirill. The Moscow-Constantinopolitan schism even threatened to tear some of the other autocephalous Churches into pro-Moscow and pro-Constantinople camps, as the heated debates in the Cypriot Holy Synod demonstrated.⁵⁸ The outcome of this schism will not only determine the ecclesiastical organization of Ukrainian Orthodoxy, but also the power dynamics within the wider Orthodox communion.

The current Moscow-Constantinopolitan Schism, although prompted by the issue of Ukrainian autocephaly, is really a battle for ecclesiastical and cultural dominance, just like the intra-church conflicts of the seventh and twelfth centuries. The controversy of iconoclasm which shook seventh-century Byzantium was fundamentally a battle between the Emperors and the clerics for control of the Church. Just as the feud over the election of Klym Smoliatych as Metropolitan of Kyiv was a struggle for control of one of twelfth-century Rus's most

important cultural institutions, the outcome of today's Moscow-Constantinopolitan Schism will determine which Church asserts dominance in the Orthodox communion. If the Ecumenical Patriarchate is successful in securing acceptance of Ukrainian autocephaly among the other Churches, it would reinforce the historical preeminence Constantinople enjoys. Furthermore, if Bartholomew is able to preside over the successful reintegration of millions of "schismatic" Orthodox Ukrainians back into the Eastern Orthodox communion, a task which the Moscow Patriarchate failed to accomplish in the decades since the collapse of the USSR, it would prove that the Ecumenical Patriarch is still fit to lead Eastern Orthodoxy. Should the Russian Orthodox Church succeed in quashing Ukrainian autocephaly, on the other hand, it would not only retain control over thousands of Ukrainian parishes, but also demonstrate that it is the true center of power within the Eastern Orthodox communion.⁵⁹ Yet, the similarities between the current Moscow-Constantinopolitan Schism and previous schisms extend beyond the political-ecclesiastical stakes of the conflict. Even today, Saint Andrew appears in the narratives leveraged by the Churches party to the schism.

In the current schism, the OCU leans much more heavily on Andrean narratives of apostolic succession than the ROC does. While both utilize historical arguments to justify their positions, the Moscow Patriarchate's symbiotic relationship with Russian President Vladimir Putin makes references to the Christianization of Kyivan Rus' much more beneficial than references to the travels of Saint Andrew.⁶⁰ Growing increasingly conservative and reactionary after the fall of the Soviet Union, the ROC found a kindred spirit in Putin after his ascendancy to the Russian Presidency in 2000. Both the Moscow Patriarchate and Putin's regime advocate for Russia and the rest of the former Soviet Union to reject the liberal and secular West and instead embrace a distinct civilizational identity, which Putin dubbed «Русский мир» (*Russkiy mir*, "Russian world") in 2006. Harkening to the Imperial Russian

“Official Nationality” (Orthodoxy-Autocracy-Nationality) developed during the reign of Nicholas I, Putin’s *Russkiy mir* seeks to reunite the former Soviet Union into a new Russian nation oriented around Russian language, Russian culture, and Russian Orthodoxy.⁶¹ To advance this national project, the ROC leverages its network of parishes among the Russian diaspora to support illiberal and pro-Russian politicians in post-Soviet states.⁶² The Moscow Patriarchate is so deeply integrated into Putin’s regime that the Church *de facto* functions as a governmental department.⁶³ Pointing to the state-initiated Christianization of Rus’ in 988 as the founding moment for Russian Orthodoxy, therefore, serves the dual purpose of establishing a historic claim on Ukraine and reinforcing the ROC’s current position as a junior partner in Putin’s revisionist regime.⁶⁴ After all, if Kyiv is truly Russia’s Jerusalem, to borrow Kirill’s metaphor, then it becomes the civilizational duty of patriotic Orthodox Russians to support Putin’s grand revisionist quest to unite Ukraine, Belarus, and the Russian Federation into a grand “All-Russian Nation.”⁶⁵

The Orthodox Church of Ukraine, by contrast, relies more heavily on Andrean narratives to bolster its ecclesiastical legitimacy and support Ukrainian territorial integrity. On the Church website, the OCU firmly places Andrew’s missionary work on the northern Black Sea Coast at the beginning of a long history of Ukrainian Orthodoxy. This claim to apostolic foundation grants the OCU additional legitimacy in the struggle for recognition as part of the wider Orthodox Communion. The choice of Andrew over Volodymyr, moreover, allocates responsibility for the birth of Ukrainian Christianity to the will of God, as opposed to the will of an earthly ruler. Dating the beginning of Ukrainian Orthodoxy to Saint Andrew also allocates Crimea an integral role in the history of Ukrainian Christianity.⁶⁶ It was in Crimea, after all, that Andrew conducted most of his missionary work. This integration of Crimea into Ukrainian Orthodox history serves as a strong statement against the illegal Russian

annexation of Crimea. The OCU's wielding of Andrean narratives fits the Church into a long history of politically motivated apostolic hagiography, and reveals that this schism is not as unique as it might appear at first glance.

Conclusion

By the end of the twelfth century, political struggles had prompted both the Patriarchs of Constantinople and the Metropolitans of Kyiv to chart their heritage to Andrew the First-Called. In the Church of Constantinople, Iconoclasm prompted iconophiles to craft popular legends around Andrew and Byzantium into a powerful theory of an apostolic pentarchy to leverage against iconoclast emperors. Meanwhile, in Constantinople's daughter see of Kyiv, the monk Polikarp harnessed existing devotion to the First-Called and wove a legendary account of Andrew traveling to the future site of Kyiv in order to increase the prestige of the Metropolis of Kyiv and denigrate its regional competitor, the Archeparchy of Novgorod. These narratives of Andrean apostolicity continue to feature in the political feuds of modern Orthodoxy, as demonstrated by the Orthodox Church of Ukraine's harnessing of Polikarp's tale to reinforce its ecclesiastical legitimacy and Ukraine's territorial integrity. Today, the descendants of those Churches all carry on the legacy of the First-Called.

Notes

¹ More precisely, his feast day is on 30 November, but because the old-style Julian calendar is 13 days behind the newer Gregorian calendar, Saint Andrew's Day is observed on 13 December by Christians following the Old Calendar.

² Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints.*, trans. William Granger Ryan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012), 13-17. <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=e025xna&AN=440857&site=eds-live&scope=site&ebv=EB>.

³ Both the Orthodox Church of Ukraine and the Byzantine-rite Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church trace their origins to the Apostle Andrew. Nicholas Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine] (Rome-New York: Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1965), 43-65, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatyj-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>; "Apostolic Succession of the Great Church of Christ," The Ecumenical Patriarchate, Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, updated 19 Jul 2014, <https://web.archive.org/web/20140719151021/http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/patriarchs>; "Православна Церква України: шлях крізь віки" [Orthodox Church of Ukraine: path through the years], Church History, Orthodox Church of Ukraine, accessed 9 Dec 2020, <https://www.pomisna.info/uk/tserkva/istoriya/>; "Зародження християнства на теренах України" [Birth of Christianity on the territories of Ukraine], History of the UGCC, Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, accessed 9 Dec 2020, http://ugcc.ua/official/ugcc-history/%D0%86_zarodzhennya_hristiyanstva_na_terenah_ukraini_76266.html.

⁴ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History: Books 1-5*, trans. Kirsopp Lake (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959), 190-191, https://www-loebclassics-com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/view/eusebius-ecclesiastical_history/1926/pb_LCL153.191.xml.

⁵ There is also an account attributed to the third-century Saint Hippolytus of Rome, but the identification with Hippolytus is dubious. Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 50, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatyj-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>; *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, vol. 5, *Hippolytus, Cyprian, Caius, Novatian, Appendix* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1919), 242-255, <https://archive.org/details/antenicenefather05robe/page/255/mode/1up>.

⁶ «Ἀνδρέας δὲ τὴν Σκυθίαν». Evidently, Eusebius could write laconically in Greek. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, trans. Lake, 190-191, https://www-loebclassics-com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/view/eusebius-ecclesiastical_history/1926/pb_LCL153.191.xml.

⁷ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 50, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatyj-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁸ Petro Bilaniuk, *The Apostolic Origin of the Ukrainian Church* (Toronto: Moravia Press Ltd, 1988), 74-78; Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 50, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatyj-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>; Francis Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies* 4 (Cambridge:

Harvard University Press, 1958), 198-199,

<https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n179/mode/2up>.

⁹ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 50-51, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>; Dvornik, *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 200, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n179/mode/2up>.

¹⁰ «Πρὸς δὲ τῇ θαλάττῃ τοῦ Βοσπόρου τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ Σινδική: μετὰ δὲ ταύτην Ἀχαιοί...». Strabo, *Geography*, trans. Horace Leonard Jones, vol. 5, *Books 10-12*, Loeb Classical Library 211 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), 190-191, https://www-loebclassics-com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/view/strabo-geography/1917/pb_LCL211.191.xml.

¹¹ Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 220, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n225/mode/2up>.

¹² Čubatyj also theorizes that the Greek city of Patras might have been conflated with a settlement Strabo named “Patraeus” (Πατραεύς) near Panticapaeum. More research is required into the possible existence of a Christian community here. Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 220, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n227/mode/2up>; Strabo, *Geography*, trans. Jones, 196-197, https://www-loebclassics-com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/view/strabo-geography/1917/pb_LCL211.197.xml; Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 52, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

¹³ Pseudo-Epiphanius wrote of Andrew preaching in “Great Sebastopolis” (Σεβαστοπόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ), which based on context clues is most likely Sebastopolis in Colchis, or modern Sokhumi. For more on Pseudo-Epiphanius, see Dvornik’s monograph. *Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae Indices Apostolorum Discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto Aliisque Vindicata*, ed. Theodor Schermann (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1907), 108-109, <https://archive.org/details/prophetarumvita00schegoog/page/n181/mode/2up>; Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 173-176, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n181/mode/2up>.

¹⁴ *Acta Andreae cum laudatione contexta et Martyrium Andreae graece, Passio Andreae latine*, ed. Max Bonnet (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1895), 48-50, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101055428542&view=1up&seq=70>.

¹⁵ *Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae Indices Apostolorum Discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto Aliisque Vindicata*, 120, <https://archive.org/details/prophetarumvita00schegoog/page/n193/mode/2up>; *Acta Andreae cum laudatione contexta et Martyrium Andreae graece*, ed. Bonnet, 50, <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101055428542&view=1up&seq=72>.

¹⁶ Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 172, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n179/mode/2up>.

¹⁷ Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 173, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n181/mode/2up>.

¹⁸ Vlassios Phidas, “The Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople,” trans. George Dion. Dragas, *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 45, № 1–4 (March 2000): 28, [http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site](http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site;);

Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 146, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n153/mode/2up>.

¹⁹ Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 167-168, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n175/mode/2up>.

²⁰ Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 168, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n175/mode/2up>.

²¹ Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 24, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

²² Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 31-37, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

²³ Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 36-39, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

²⁴ The *Doctrina Apostolorum* only survives in Syriac translation. Dr. Phidas translated the relevant sections in his article. Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 38, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

²⁵ Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 138, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n145/mode/2up>.

²⁶ Even among the anti-Chalcedonian party, this association between John the Evangelist and Constantinople persisted. A notable example is John Philoponos, whose words Michael the Syrian preserved in his twelfth-century *Khronikon*. Michael the Syrian, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, trans. Jean-Baptiste Chabot (Paris: Ernest Laroux, 1901), 2:101, <https://archive.org/details/MichelLeSyrien2/page/n105/mode/2up>.

²⁷ Ignatios, for instance, referred to the Johannine apostolicity of Constantinople at the same time as he cited the Andrean. Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 43, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

²⁸ Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 168, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n175/mode/2up>.

²⁹ Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 42-43, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

³⁰ John 1:35-42 (New Revised Standard Edition); Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 42-43, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

³¹ Phidas, "Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople," 43, <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

³² Dvornik, *Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*, 290, <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/page/n297/mode/2up>.

³³ Due to calendar differences and the reliability of sources, dating the reigns of the early Metropolitans of Kyiv can be tricky. Blazejowskyj writes that the Patriarch appointed John to the Kyivan see around 1077, but Čubatyj emphatically writes that he could not have arrived in Kyivan Rus' earlier than 1081. Dmytro Blazejowskyj, *Hierarchy of the Kyivan Church (861-1990)* (Rome: Saint Clement Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1990), 76, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/3406-blazheyovskiy-d-o-iyerarhiya-kiyivskoyi-tserkvi-988-1990/>; Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 409, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

³⁴ The modern stavropegial Church of Saint Andrew in Kyiv, of course, was built much later. Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 409, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

³⁵ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 410, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

³⁶ Take, for instance, Andriy the Good in Volhynia, or Andrei Bogoliubskiy of Suzdal. Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 410, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

³⁷ А Князь (Князь, plural Князі, *Knyazi*, "Prince") was the ruler of an important Rus' city and its economic hinterlands. As the overlord of all other *Knyazi*, the ruler of Kyiv bore the title of *Velykyi Knyaz* (Великий Князь). Orest Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 3rd ed (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), 37, <http://diasporiana.org.ua/istoriya/subtelny-o-ukraine-a-history/>; Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 63, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

³⁸ Paul Robert Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997), 80; Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 61, <http://diasporiana.org.ua/istoriya/subtelny-o-ukraine-a-history/>.

³⁹ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 64, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁴⁰ *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Лѣтописей* [Full Collection of the Rus'ian Chronicles], vol. 2, *Ипатьевская Лѣтопись* [Nypatian Chronicle], ed. Aleksei Aleksandrovich Shakhmatov (Saint Petersburg: M. A. Aleksandrovich, 1908), year 6655, <http://litopys.org.ua/ipatlet/ipat15.htm#6655>.

⁴¹ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 63, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁴² *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Лѣтописей* [Full Collection of the Rus'ian Chronicles], ed. Shakhmatov, year 6664, <http://litopys.org.ua/ipatlet/ipat21.htm>.

⁴³ *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Лѣтописей* [Full Collection of the Rus'ian Chronicles], ed. Shakhmatov, year 6666, <http://litopys.org.ua/ipatlet/ipat21.htm#l6666>.

⁴⁴ *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Лѣтописей* [Full Collection of the Rus'ian Chronicles], ed. Shakhmatov, year 6667, <http://litopys.org.ua/ipatlet/ipat21.htm#l6667>.

⁴⁵ *Полное Собрание Русских Лѣтописей* [Full Collection of the Rus'ian Chronicles], ed. Shakhmatov, year 6671-6672, <http://litopys.org.ua/ipatlet/ipat22.htm#l6671>.

⁴⁶ The *Pověst'* referred to Chersonesos by some variant of "Korsun" (Корсунь, Корьсоунь, Корсѹнь, Корсѹн, and Кърсунь). *The pověst' vremennykh lět: an interlinear collation and paradosis*, eds. Donald G. Ostrowski et al., Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: Texts 10 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 34-42.

⁴⁷ Translation by Bilaniuk. Bilaniuk, *Apostolic Origin of the Ukrainian Church*, 89; *Pověst' vremennykh lět*, eds. Ostrowski et al., 37-38.

⁴⁸ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 214, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁴⁹ The authorship of the *pověst'* is unclear. Sil'vestr was the hegumen of the St. Michael's Monastery in Vydubychi, a settlement near Kyiv. A colophon in the Laurentian redaction of the *pověst'* lists him as the compiler, although this colophon is not present in other versions of the *pověst'*. Many historians, such as Subtelny, also list a monk named Nestor as the author of the *pověst'*. However, Nestor is first mentioned in the title of the 16th-century Khlebnikov Chronicle, which suggests that Nestor was a fictional character. Ostrowski considers Sil'vestr to have been at least one of the original authors, although I remain skeptical. *Pověst' vremennykh lět*, eds. Ostrowski et al., xvii-xviii; Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 51, <http://diasporiana.org.ua/istoriya/subtelny-o-ukraine-a-history/>.

⁵⁰ *Pověst' vremennykh lět*, eds. Ostrowski et al., 33-45.

⁵¹ *Pověst' vremennykh lět*, eds. Ostrowski et al., 42-43.

⁵² *Pověst' vremennykh lět*, eds. Ostrowski et al., 39-42.

⁵³ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 60-64, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁵⁴ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 506, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁵⁵ Subtelny, *Ukraine: A History*, 38, <http://diasporiana.org.ua/istoriya/subtelny-o-ukraine-a-history/>; Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 63-64, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁵⁶ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 64, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁵⁷ Aliya Shandra, "Tomos ante portas: a short guide to Ukrainian church independence," *Euromaidan Press*, 14 October 2018, <http://euromaidanpress.com/2018/10/14/tomos-guide-ukraine-church-autoccephaly/>; Maksym Kamenyev, "Як Порошенко Константинополь брав: історія томосу для українського православ'я" [How Poroshenko took Constantinople: History of the Tomos for Ukrainian Orthodoxy], *Hromadske*, 14 December 2018, https://web.archive.org/web/20181217231208if_/https://hromadske.ua/posts/yak-poroshenko-konstantinopol-brav-istoriya-tomosu-dlya-ukrayinskogo-pravoslavyya; Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. "Πατριαρχικός και Συνοδικός Τομός Χορηγήσεως Αυτοκεφαλίου Εκκλησιαστικού Καθεστώτος εις την εν Ουκρανίαι Ορθόδοξον Εκκλησίαν" [Patriarchal and Synodal Tomos for the Bestowal of the Ecclesiastical Status of Autocephaly to the Orthodox Church in Ukraine]. Ecumenical Patriarchate. Updated 14

January 2019. https://web.archive.org/web/20190810213901/https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/MF6geT6kmaDE/content/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-autokephalou-ekklesiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-ekklesian?_101_INSTANCE_MF6geT6kmaDE_languageId=el_GR.

⁵⁸ The reverberations of the schism even extended to the parish level. One of my professors, for example, had to find a new priest to officiate his wedding, because the original priest he asked left the American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Diocese because it remained loyal to the Ecumenical Patriarchate. Orthodox Times, "Archbishop of Cyprus commemorates Metropolitan Epifaniy of Kyiv for first time (upd)," *Orthodox Times*, 24 October 2020, <https://orthodoxtimes.com/archbishop-of-cyprus-commemorates-metropolitan-epifaniy-of-kyiv-for-first-time/>; Mladen Aleksic, "Patriarch of Serbia: The actions of Constantinople in Ukraine are not in accordance with the tradition of the Church," *Orthodox Times*, 3 March 2021, <https://orthodoxtimes.com/patriarch-of-serbia-the-actions-of-constantinople-in-ukraine-are-not-in-accordance-with-the-tradition-of-the-church/>; Orthodox Times, "Which Church will follow the Church of Greece and recognise the Ukrainian autocephaly?" *Orthodox Times*, 15 October 2019, <https://orthodoxtimes.com/which-church-will-follow-the-church-of-greece-and-recognise-the-ukrainian-autocephaly/>.

⁵⁹ Jeanne Kormina & Vlad Naumescu, "A New 'Great Schism'? Theopolitics of Communion and Canonical Territory in the Orthodox Church," *Anthropology Today* 36, № 1 (February 2020): 7-8, <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12551>; Aliya Shandra, "Tomos ante portas: a short guide to Ukrainian church independence," *Euromaidan Press*, 14 October 2018, <http://euromaidanpress.com/2018/10/14/tomos-guide-ukraine-church-autocephaly/>.

⁶⁰ Čubatyj, *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine], 214, <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.

⁶¹ Martin Solik & Vladimír Baar, "Religious Component in a State's Foreign Policy. A Case Study of the Russian Orthodox Church," *Political Sciences / Politické Vedy* 23, № 2 (April 2020): 166-169, <https://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2020.23.2.157-199>; Natalia Naydenova, "Holy Rus: (Re)Construction of Russia's Civilizational Identity," *Slavonica* 21, № 1-2 (2016): 42-43, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617427.2017.1319120>.

⁶² Solik & Baar, "Religious Component in a State's Foreign Policy," 179-180, <https://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2020.23.2.157-199>.

⁶³ Solik & Baar, "Religious Component in a State's Foreign Policy," 174-175, <https://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2020.23.2.157-199>.

⁶⁴ Shandra, "Tomos ante portas," *Euromaidan Press*, 14 October 2018, <http://euromaidanpress.com/2018/10/14/tomos-guide-ukraine-church-autocephaly/>.

⁶⁵ See also Putin's revisionist history of the East Slavic peoples. Moscow Patriarchate, "Слово Святейшего Патриарха Кирилла на встрече с делегациями Поместных Православных Церквей 31 января 2019 года" [Words of the Most Holy Patriarch Kirill during the meeting with delegations of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches on 31 January 2019], Отдел Внешних Церковных Связей Московского Патриархата [Department for External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate], accessed 15 June 2021, <https://web.archive.org/web/20210615135905/https://mospat.ru/ru/news/46684/>; Vladimir Putin, "Статья Владимира Путина «Про історичну єдність росіян та українців»" (Article by Vladimir Putin: 'On the historical unity of Russians and Ukrainians'), Office of the President of the Russian Federation, 12 July 2021, https://web.archive.org/web/20210712145656if_/http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/66182.

⁶⁶ “Православна Церква України: шлях крізь віки” [Orthodox Church of Ukraine: path through the years], <https://www.pomisna.info/uk/tserkva/istoriya/>.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta Andreae cum laudatione contexta et Martyrium Andreae graece, Passio Andreae latine.

Edited by Max Bonnet. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1895.

<https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=njp.32101055428542&view=1up&seq=72>.

Aleksic, Mladen. "Patriarch of Serbia: The actions of Constantinople in Ukraine are not in accordance with the tradition of the Church." *Orthodox Times*, 3 March 2021.

<https://orthodoxtimes.com/patriarch-of-serbia-the-actions-of-constantinople-in-ukraine-are-not-in-accordance-with-the-tradition-of-the-church/>.

Eusebius of Caesarea. *Ecclesiastical History*. Vol. 1, *Books 1-5*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake.

Loeb Classical Library 153. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1959. <https://www-loebclassics-com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/view/LCL153/1926/volume.xml>.

Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. "Πατριαρχικός και Συνοδικός Τομος

Χορηγησεως Αυτοκεφαλου Εκκλησιαστικου Καθεστωτος εις την εν Ουκρανιαι

Ορθοδοξον Εκκλησιαν" [Patriarchal and Synodal Tomos for the Bestowal of the

Ecclesiastical Status of Autocephaly to the Orthodox Church in Ukraine]. Ecumenical

Patriarchate. Updated 14 January 2019. [https://web.archive.org/web/](https://web.archive.org/web/20190810213901/https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/MF6geT6kmaDE/content/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-autokephalou-ekkleusiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-ekklesian?_101_INSTANCE_MF6geT6kmaDE_languageId=el_GR)

[20190810213901/https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/](https://web.archive.org/web/20190810213901/https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/MF6geT6kmaDE/content/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-autokephalou-ekkleusiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-ekklesian?_101_INSTANCE_MF6geT6kmaDE_languageId=el_GR)

[MF6geT6kmaDE/content/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-](https://web.archive.org/web/20190810213901/https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/MF6geT6kmaDE/content/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-autokephalou-ekkleusiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-ekklesian?_101_INSTANCE_MF6geT6kmaDE_languageId=el_GR)

[autokephalou-ekkleusiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-](https://web.archive.org/web/20190810213901/https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/MF6geT6kmaDE/content/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-autokephalou-ekkleusiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-ekklesian?_101_INSTANCE_MF6geT6kmaDE_languageId=el_GR)

[ekklesian?_101_INSTANCE_MF6geT6kmaDE_languageId=el_GR](https://web.archive.org/web/20190810213901/https://www.patriarchate.org/announcements/-/asset_publisher/MF6geT6kmaDE/content/patriarchikos-kai-synodikos-tomos-choregeseos-autokephalou-ekkleusiastikou-kathestotos-eis-ten-en-oukrania-orthodoxon-ekklesian?_101_INSTANCE_MF6geT6kmaDE_languageId=el_GR).

Jacobus de Voragine. *The Golden Legend: Readings on the Saints*. Translated by William Granger Ryan. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012. <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=e025xna&AN=440857&site=eds-live&scope=site&ebv=EB>.

Kamenyev, Maksym. "Як Порошенко Константинополь брав: історія томосу для українського православ'я" [How Poroshenko took Constantinople: History of the Tomos for Ukrainian Orthodoxy]. *Hromadske*, 14 December 2018. https://web.archive.org/web/20181217231208if_/https://hromadske.ua/posts/yak-poroshenko-konstantinopol-brav-istoriya-tomosu-dlya-ukrayinskogo-pravoslavya.

Michael the Syrian. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*. Vol. 2. Translated by Jean-Baptiste Chabot. Paris: Ernest Laroux, 1901. <https://archive.org/details/MichelLeSyrien2/>.

Moscow Patriarchate. "Слово Святейшего Патриарха Кирилла на встрече с делегациями Поместных Православных Церквей 31 января 2019 года" [Words of the Most Holy Patriarch Kirill during the meeting with delegations of the Autocephalous Orthodox Churches on 31 January 2019]. Отдел Внешних Церковных Связей Московского Патриархата [Department for External Church Relations of the Moscow Patriarchate], accessed 15 June 2021. <https://web.archive.org/web/20210615135905/https://mospat.ru/ru/news/46684/>.

Orthodox Church of Ukraine. "Православна Церква України: шлях крізь віки" [Orthodox Church of Ukraine: path through the years]. Church History. Accessed 9 Dec 2020. <https://www.pomisna.info/uk/tserkva/istoriya/>.

Orthodox Times. "Archbishop of Cyprus commemorates Metropolitan Epifaniy of Kyiv for first time (upd)." *Orthodox Times*, 24 October 2020. <https://orthodoxtimes.com/archbishop-of-cyprus-commemorates-metropolitan-epifaniy-of-kyiv-for-first-time/>.

Orthodox Times. "Which Church will follow the Church of Greece and recognise the Ukrainian autocephaly?" *Orthodox Times*, 15 October 2019. <https://orthodoxtimes.com/which-church-will-follow-the-church-of-greece-and-recognise-the-ukrainian-autocephaly/>.

Ostrowski, Donald G., Horace G. Lunt, and David J. Birnbaum, eds. *The pověst' vremennykh lět: an interlinear collation and paradosis*. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature: Texts 10. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae Indices Apostolorum Discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto Aliisque Vindicata. Edited by Theodor Schermann. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1907. <https://archive.org/details/prophetarumvita00schegoog/mode/2up>.

Putin, Vladimir. "Стаття Володимира Путіна «Про історичну єдність росіян та українців»" (Article by Vladimir Putin: 'On the historical unity of Russians and Ukrainians'). Office of the President of the Russian Federation. 12 July 2021. https://web.archive.org/web/20210712145656if_/http://kremlin.ru/events/president/news/66182.

Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. Vol. 5, *Hippolytus, Cyprian, Caius, Novatian, Appendix*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1919. <https://archive.org/details/antenicenefather05robe/page/255/mode/1up>.

Shakhmatov, Aleksei Aleksandrovich, ed. *Ипатьевская Лѣтопись* [Hypatian Chronicle].

Volume 2 of *Полное Собрание Русскихъ Лѣтописей* [Full Collection of the Rus'ian Chronicles]. Saint Petersburg: M. A. Aleksandrovich, 1908.

<http://litopys.org.ua/ipatlet/ipat.htm>.

Shandra, Aliya. "Tomos ante portas: a short guide to Ukrainian church independence."

Euromaidan Press, 14 October 2018. <http://euromaidanpress.com/2018/10/14/tomos-guide-ukraine-church-autocephaly/>.

Strabo. *Geography*. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Vol. 5, *Books 10-12*. Loeb Classical Library 211. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928. <https://www-loebclassics-com.proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/view/LCL211/1928/volume.xml>.

Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church. "Зародження християнства на теренах України" [Birth of Christianity on the territories of Ukraine]. History of the UGCC. Accessed 9 Dec 2020. http://ugcc.ua/official/ugcc-history/%D0%86_zarodzhennya_hristiyanstva_na_terenah_ukraini_76266.html.

Secondary Sources

Bilaniuk, Petro. *The Apostolic Origin of the Ukrainian Church*. Toronto: Moravia Press Ltd, 1988.

- Blazejowskyj, Dmytro. *Hierarchy of the Kyivan Church (861-1990)*. Rome: Saint Clement Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1990. <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/3406-blazheyovskiy-d-o-iyerarhiya-kiyivskoyi-tserkvi-988-1990/>.
- Čubatyj, Nicholaus. *Історія Християнства на Русі-Україні* [History of Christianity in Rus'-Ukraine]. Rome-New York: Ukrainian Catholic University Press, 1965. <https://diasporiana.org.ua/religiya/2084-chubatiy-m-istoriya-hristiyanstva-na-rusi-ukrayini-t-1-do-1353-r/>.
- Dvornik, Francis. *The Idea of Apostolicity in Byzantium and the Legend of the Apostle Andrew*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 4. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. <https://archive.org/details/DvornikByzApostolicity/mode/2up>.
- Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople. "Apostolic Succession of the Great Church of Christ." Ecumenical Patriarchate. Updated 19 Jul 2014. <https://web.archive.org/web/20140719151021/http://www.patriarchate.org/patriarchate/patriarchs>.
- Magocsi, Paul Robert. *A History of Ukraine*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1997.
- Naydenova, Natalia. "Holy Rus: (Re)Construction of Russia's Civilizational Identity." *Slavonica* 21, № 1-2 (2016): 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617427.2017.1319120>.
- Kormina, Jeanne, and Vlad Naumescu. "A New 'Great Schism'? Theopolitics of Communion and Canonical Territory in the Orthodox Church." *Anthropology Today* 36, № 1 (February 2020): 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8322.12551>.

Phidas, Vlassios. "The Johannine Apostolicity of the Throne of Constantinople." Translated by George Dion. Dragas. *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 45, № 1–4 (March 2000): 23–55. <http://proxy-bc.researchport.umd.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,url,uid&db=hlh&AN=11553322&site=eds-live&scope=site>.

Solik, Martin, and Vladimír Baar. "Religious Component in a State's Foreign Policy. A Case Study of the Russian Orthodox Church." *Political Sciences / Politické Vedy* 23, № 2 (April 2020): 157–99. <https://doi.org/10.24040/politickevedy.2020.23.2.157-199>.

Subtelny, Orest. *Ukraine: A History*. 3rd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000. <http://diasporiana.org.ua/istoriya/subtelny-o-ukraine-a-history/>.