

SEEMSG Meeting, 13th November 2004

Mikhail Raev

Trinity College, Cambridge

The Russian-Byzantine treaty from 971: 1. Theophilos (Philotheos) and Sveneld

In my report certain textual problems were investigated which existed in the Russian-Byzantine treaty of 971. This document was kept only in the form now available from the medieval Russian chronicle called the *Povest' Vremennikh Let* (hereafter PVL). There were two problems that were investigated. The first one concerns the name of synkellos Theophilos which was mentioned in the Russian-Byzantine treaty of 971. We proposed that there was a metathesis in his name and that in the original Byzantine text he was known as Philotheos. There were two reasons for this assumption. First of all, Theophilos from PVL was considered by the scholars to be the same person known from the Scylitzes' chronicle (finished after 1081) as the ἀρχιερέυς of Euchaita. According to Scylitzes, he was sent as an envoy to the Pechenegs in order to negotiate a peace between the Byzantines and them and to arrange a safe return of the defeated Russian troops from Bulgaria to Kievan Rus'. However, a few scholars suggested that actually Theophilos from Euchaita was the well-known metropolitan and synkellos from the same town, Philotheos, who was firstly mentioned in the events from 963 that ended with the capture of imperial power by the general Nicephorus II Phocas (963-969). The second mission, where Philotheos took part, was in the marriage negotiations between the Byzantine and Bulgarian courts in 969 whose final result was the dispatch of two princesses to the young emperors Basil and Constantine. The historicity of Philotheos was supported by material evidence in the form of four excavated seals (two of them refer to him as synkellos), while Theophilos was not mentioned in the sources any more. Our proposal for the metathesis in his name has its support not only in the short time between the two references in which they both are mentioned (969 and 971), and in the high position he achieved, but also in certain problems of transmission of historical information between different Byzantine and early Russian works. First of all, it is important to emphasize the links between different Byzantine authors from the second half of the tenth up to the end of the eleventh century. As was pointed out by scholars, between Leo the Deacon, the only known historical writer from the second half of tenth century, and John Scylitzes who worked at the last quarter of eleventh century, there were two common sources concerning the events of 961-976. And though up to now they were considered to have been used independently by both writers, now we have proposed a hypothesis according to which there were connections between Scylitzes and PVL in the section concerning the Russian-Byzantine treaty of 971. First of all we should stress the fact that Scylitzes' work was composed on the basis of a few earlier treatises like the Continuator of Theophanes, the aforementioned sources, and Catacalon Cecaumenus' biography. Secondly, it is important to add information from the fourteenth century Slavonic translation of the Chronicle of Symeon Logothetis, which according to Kazhdan was the closest redaction to the original Byzantine text of the same work and which covers the period from 842 to 961. In the Slavonic translation, the period after 961 was treated very closely to the descriptions of Leo the Deacon and John Scylitzes. In fact, with the

latter author there was a connection as the Slavonic translation of Logothetis' chronicle was known to belong to the first redaction of Logothetis' chronicle, while to the second one belonged the aforementioned Continuator of Theophanes and the Continuator of George Amartolos. Actually the last one was used by the compiler of PVL. The connections between these works enable me to propose that in the continuation of the second redaction of Logothetis' chronicle a metathesis of Philotheos' name appeared. Later on, a work from this group was consulted by the Russian chronicler, usually assumed to be the monk Nestor, who created a section describing the end of Sviatoslav's Balkan campaigns. There were mentioned the emperor John Tzimiscis, prince Sviatoslav, and the mistaken name of Philotheos. In addition to these three persons there was added the chieftain Sveneld, whose mythical figure was employed by Russian writers for events which extended for more than fifty years. All these points, as well as the argument developed by Kashtanov that the *intitulatio* of this treaty was very close to those used in twelfth century treaties, give rise to the idea that the Russian-Byzantine treaty from 971 might actually have been invented by Nestor in the beginning of the twelfth century. However, the means and ends of the Russian compiler and what was the role which this document played in the PVL will be a matter of continuing research.

Olga Novikova

Universidad Complutense

Tsardom and Empire: the Coronations of Charles V and Ivan IV

This work is an attempt to compare the coronations of two representatives of the imperial idea in the West and the East of Europe: the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire Charles V (1530) and the Russian tsar Ivan IV (1547). My main purpose here is to show how the different conceptions of "imperial theology" (quoting Walter Ullmann) were expressed in the ceremonies. In this summary let us consider who could become emperor in the East and the West, and where and how it happened.

Who. In order to be a candidate for coronation, the future tsar had to satisfy three conditions, which he enumerated in his speech addressing the metropolitan at the beginning of the ceremony. First of all, be chosen by the "will of God" ("*bozh'im izvoleniem*"). The second condition was the succession by birthright ("*ot praroditelei velikyx kniazei*"). Actually, the two first conditions were connected, because divine election was not individual, but dynastic. In the third place, he claimed right by virtue of the old customs, ("*starina*"), which was one of the most solid foundations of the pre-modern legal system.

In the case of the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, there were two conditions. In the first place, he had to be elected as emperor by the princes-electors.¹ La Coronación imperial de Carlos V, Madrid, Junta Nacional del Centenario, 1957, p.3. ² Ibid., p.7. The pope, before admitting him to the coronation ceremony, had to confirm that the election had been properly conducted.¹ The second condition was to swear to protect and to defend the Pope and the Holy Roman Church.²

The principal actors in these coronations were, in the first case, the pope and the emperor, and the tsar and the metropolitan in the second. But only the tsar and emperor gained in status and prestige as the result of the ceremony. The situation of other participants did not change.

What kind of relations existed between the emperor and the pope, the tsar and the metropolitan? In the case of Charles V and the pope this relation was that of vassalage which was expressed in many different ways: a) by means of verbal *formulae*, such as those that we can find in the oath; b) by gestures, such as the kneeling and giving a kiss (*osculum*), which the vassal gave to the lord; c) through the opposition high-low (for instance, the seat of the pope was situated higher than that of the emperor); or, d) by a special ritual, such as when Charles went on foot holding the reins of the papal horse. During the coronation he became both a deacon and a knight of Saint Peter, thus entering into the Church hierarchy, and recognising, by doing that, his subordination to the pope.

³ Ibid., p.3.

⁴ G. Giordani, "Della venuta e dimora in Bologna del Sommo Pontefice Clemente VII per la Coronazione di Carlos V Imperatore celebrata l'anno MDXXX, published in: V. de Cadenas y Vicent, *Doble coronación de Carlos V en Bolonia, 22-24/II/1530*, Madrid, Instituto Salazar y Castro (CSIC), *19, p. 199. The empire belonged to the pope, and Charles V could only "ask with great humbleness for the anointment, the consecration and the coronation".³ The coronation gave him the *possessio* of the empire, and the right to use the title of the Cesar Augustus (*per eso venne lo eletto Imperatore ad acquistare il vero e real possesso* [my emphasis - O.N.] *del romano imperio de il privilegio di potere giuridicamente usare il titolo di Augusto*),⁴ but the *dominium* of the empire was still of the pope. So it was not strange that the *insignia*, like the crown, which was a symbol of a specific geographic territory, was kept in the cathedrals.

The pope was the *vicarius Christi*, his only legal representative on earth, and as such he was a mediator between men and God. By virtue of the coronation he interceded before the Lord in favour of the emperor. ⁵ La Coronación imperial... p. 10.

⁶ G. Giordani ..., p. 197. (*a las viudas y pupilos clementisísimamente ayudas y defiendas*).⁵ One of the most impressive moments of the ceremony was when Charles removed the crown and bowed before the Pope.⁶ These were the gestures of somebody in the presence of his sovereign. It was worth comparing it with the analogous gesture of Ivan IV, who did the same thing before God (he removed the crown and bowed during the reading of the gospel.).

The relationship between the tsar and the metropolitan was more complicated. Neither of them was subordinate to the other. They were, as put by a Byzantine law, two heads of the bicephalous empire. Throughout the ceremony you can see the effort to maintain the subtle balance between these two forces, and, if at any moment this balance seems to incline in favour of one of them, elsewhere it happens to the contrary. The tsar bowed to the metropolitan, and the metropolitan answered him with the same bow. The tsar addressed himself to the metropolitan, using a polite imperative: "I ty by, otsets nash, na to na velikoe kniazhestvo menia blagoslovil i

*pomazal i postavil i narek by menia velikim kniazem, bogovenchannym tsarem...*⁶⁷

“Chin venchaniia na tsarstvo tsaria i velikogo kniazia moskovskogo Ivana IV Vasil’evicha”, published in: *L’idea di Roma a Mosca. Secoli XV-XVI. Fonti per la storia del pensiero sociale russo*, Roma, Herder, 1989, p.82.

⁸ Ibid, p. 88. But the “imperativeness” of the regal words was diminished by the use of the same verbal form in the metropolitan’s reply: “*I nam by tebia...blagosloviti i postaviti na velikoe kniazhestvo i pomazati i venchatisia bogovenchannym tsarskim ventsom*”.⁷

The only time when this balance seemed about to break was when the metropolitan acted as the mediator between the people and the emperor. In his *Instruction* he uses the full imperative form, describing in great detail the emperor’s obligations before the different groups of the population: “*boiar zhe svoix i velmozh zhalui i bregui po ix otchestvu i ko vsem kniazem i kniazhatam, ... budi pristupen...*.”⁸

The Russian coronation ceremony did not include the monarch’s oath to his people, which existed in some European countries. In Aragon, for instance, in a ceremony related to the coronation the king swore to respect the old customs and rights of his subjects, (“*los fueros*”). But even in Aragon the kings struggled to avoid the oath, since it was considered that it placed the person who swore, in an inferior position. One of the greatest concerns of the monarchy was the defence of its sovereignty, its *superioritas*. This meant that the king was subordinate only to God, and to nobody else. As a consequence, he should swear an oath only to God, but not to his subjects. He has to take care of his subjects, as they were children, but he was not answerable to them, as a father was not answerable to his children (it is worth remembering that in Russia the tsar was usually called “father”).

We know that in Russia the subjects swore allegiance to the monarch, and the princes swore its loyalty to each other (I mean swearing on the cross - *krestotselovanie*). But I don’t know of situations, in which the superior swore to his inferiors. In any case, it did not happen very frequently. I think that we deal with the same type of logic, which equated swearing to subjects as a loss of majesty. But, I suppose that in Russia the *Instruction* functioned as the substitute for an oath to the people. The metropolitan enumerates, as the mediator between God and the tsar, like a notary, the conditions of the contract (the obligations of the monarch), which the tsar established with the King of Heaven, the real Lord of the empire. He reminded the tsar of his responsibility to the King of Kings. In this sense, the coronation has an important constitutional significance. It was not strange that the accusations in the first two epistles of Kurbski, that the tsar violated his obligation (I leave here aside the question whether or not he wrote these letters) in fact reproduced the list of obligations enumerated in the metropolitan’s *Instruction*.

How. What was the part of the ceremony, where the emperor-to-be became the emperor? In Russia, it happened after conferring the three insignia: the holy cross, the holy necklace - *barmy*, and the holy crown. After this, the future tsar was called tsar for the first time during the ceremony. Later, the tsar was given a pastoral sceptre and a “chain of the gold of Arabia”. But it was only the insignia were

considered holy, in other words having a transformative power, only they were the repository of the sacred imperial energy.

⁹ La Coronación imperial... p. 8. In the West, the emperor passed from one state to another after being anointed with holy oils, which gave him “the prosperous effect of imperial majesty” (“*el próspero efecto de la imperial majestad*”)⁹ Nonetheless, his proclamation as emperor took place after conferring the insignia.

Where. The area of the coronation of Charles V included not only the cathedral and the papal palace, but also a square before the cathedral, and a number of streets, where the imperial procession took place. But the location of Russian coronation was always in the very circumscribed area of imperial and sacred Kremlin. The celebration was limited to three main spots: the square between three cathedrals, the imperial palace and the cathedral of the Dormition de St. Virgin.