THE BYZANTINE REVIEW

ByzRev 08.2026.028
doi: 10.17879/byzrev-2026-9652

MARIA KOROGODINA, Правила Константинопольского синода 1276 года. Moscow: Изд. дом Высшей школы экономики 2025. 344 pp. – ISBN 978-5-7598-4117-3

• MICHAEL C. PAUL (mcpaul1998@yahoo.com)

MARIA KOROGODINA, head of the manuscript department at the Russian Academy of Sciences library in Saint Petersburg, uses the 1276 synod of Constantinople to anchor a history of the issues facing the Kyivan *metropolia* – the Church in Rus' – in the several decades before and after the Mongol-Tatar conquest of 1237–1240, including how it interacted with the mother-church in Constantinople, and then how it responded to these issues in subsequent centuries. She divides the book into four parts and a conclusion made up of appendices providing the publication history of the documents of the synod, beginning with a background chapter on how the Rus' hierarchy even before 1240 sought to address liturgical and disciplinary concerns through, for example, Archbishop Nifont of Novgorod's replies to the *Inquiries of Kirik* (ca. 1140–1150) and Archbishop Il'ia of Novgorod and an unnamed Bishop of of Belgorod's decree addressing two issues during the liturgy (ca. 1164–1168).

KOROGODINA argues that the Mongol-Tatar Invasion wreaked havoc on the church, as it did on the rest of Rus' society, with only three episcopal sees active in its immediate aftermath (Volodymyr-in-Volhynia in the southwest, and Novgorod the Great and Rostov in the northwest and northeast), while all other bishops (there had been thirteen before the invasion) were either killed or went missing. She cites chronicle entries showing four prelates killed and the bishop of Chernihiv taken captive. However, the others may merely be absent from the rather sparse historic record – or the historic record itself may not have survived to piece together their fates and KOROGODINA, in fact, admits that we do not know. That said, that only five bishops were present at the Synod of Vladimir in 1273 – three of them consecrated by Metropolitan Kirill II (r. 1242–1281), one at the synod itself, and all from northeastern Rus' and Novgorod – is suggestive of a church short of bishops more than thirty years after the Mongol conquest. KOROGODINA also argues that several bishops held multiple sees after the metropolitan's creation of bishoprics in Sarai and Tver' before those new eparchies were approved by the patriarch, and that Serapion

was consecrated not only bishop of Vladimir-on-Kliazma in 1273, but was made metropolitan exarch (*vladychnyi namestnik*) over northeastern Rus' and Novgorod, again pointing to a church with too few hierarchs, perhaps requiring an exarch to consecrate new churches and ordain priests and deacons in vacant sees. She notes the problematic nature of this interpretation, and admits that other historians have read the chronicle entry to mean that he was bishop of Vladimir, Rostov and Nizhniy Novgorod, especially since Dalmat was archbishop in Novgorod the Great at the time. In any event, she lays out a picture of a church in crisis.

KOROGODINA then turns to the synod of Vladimir, which issued six articles dealing with liturgical practices and issues of discipline, such as the acceptance of fees for ordinations, which it allowed up to seven *grivnas*, though the canon was apparently ignored throughout the medieval period, since it was condemned again in the Moscow Council of 1503, and the Stoglav Council in 1551, and Archbishop Gennadii of Novgorod was removed from office in 1505 for charging ordination fees over the accepted rate. Other articles condemned festive fights during holidays, holdovers from pagan practices, addressed the role of deacons in the *Proskomedia*, the preparation of the gifts prior to the Great Entrance during the Divine Liturgy, drunkenness, particularly by the priests, during the Easter season, and clergy refusing to perform certain sacraments during the Easter season, as well as the blessing of fruit by anyone other than the priest, and non-clergy reading the epistle, chanting the *prokeimenon*, entering the sanctuary, carrying sacred vessels, or censing the church. For a church brutalized by the Mongols, several of these issues seem rather unimportant, particularly for Westerners whose churches seem more focused on doctrine than ritual, especially as issues for episcopal synods.

The synod at Vladimir, however, apparently left some disciplinary and liturgical issues unresolved, so the Rus' bishops turned to the mother church in Constantinople for clarification, sending Bishop Feognost of Sarai, to represent Metropolitan Kirill of Kyiv and Khan Mengu-Temur at Constantinople. There he met with the *synodos endemousa* (standing synod) that regularly advised the patriarch, which responded with 33 canons, though various old East Slavic translations have different numbers of canons and add canons not in the Greek text.

The second, third, and fourth parts of the book takes a critical look at these canons and the Rus' church's response to them, with the second part discussing what issues in the Kyivan metropolia they addressed, including

how Rus' bishops and metropolitans had tried to address them locally, as well as how the Rus' bookmen translated the documents, avoiding certain issues that the metropolitans or the Rus' church opposed, including waiting until the patriarch, John XI Bekkos (r. 1275–1282) and other Byzantine hierarchs had died or left office before translating the decrees, and possibly intentionally omitting Metropolitan Leo Pinakas of Heraclea (r. 1265–1281) from the list of participants because of their support of the union with Rome, as well as mistranslating or leaving certain canons out of the Old East Slavic texts. Indeed, KOROGODINA points out that, despite the difficulty of Feognost's journey to Constantinople and back, the synod documents were not translated for the rest of the 13th century, and that the Kyivan metropolitans and the wider Rus' Church ignored many of them.

Part Three looks at 'fiction and reality', that is, what the fathers of the synod in Constantinople (and the hierarchs back in Rus') hoped to achieve compared to how the decrees were actually put into practice (or not), going through each of the 33 canons of the Greek version of the 1276 synod, including the issues faced 'on the ground' in Rus', and how later historians have interpreted them. It is much more than a simple review of the canons, but looks at how they fit into the historic milieu, not just in the 13th century but in the later history of the church in Rus'. KOROGODINA cites additions in the Rus' text, such as discussion of the abbot's role in a concelebrated Divine Liturgy, an issue altogether absent from the Byzantine documents.

As at Vladimir, the bishops at Constantinople also seemed focused on seeming minutiae (or they were answering questions from the Rus' bishops): how many lambs to be used at the Divine Liturgy, that is, the square portion of bread cut with the spear (*lonche* in Greek, *kopie* in Church Slavonic) from the *prosphora* in the Liturgy of Preparation (*Proskomedia*) and placed in the center of the *diskos* (paten) to be consecrated; whether an abbot could bless with liturgical fans or not; in what vestments a bishop was to be buried if he had entered the schema; what to do if the lamb was nibbled on by mice – something Archbishop Il'ia of Novgorod and the Bishop of Belgorod had addressed in the later part of the twelfth century; fasting on Wednesdays and Fridays; what to do if the priest forgets to pour water and wine into the chalice; how Nestorians, Tatars, and others were to be received into the church; can a bishop establish residence in a local monastery, can a widow bake the *prosphora* (Communion bread), and so forth. These disorganized series of questions do not seem to be critical to a church still devastated decades after invasion or faced with a union with Rome that many considered heretical. Those key issues are not addressed at all in either the 1273

or 1276 synods. Indeed, KOROGODINA states that the Byzantine and Rus' churches were gradually moving from the Studite *typikon* (liturgical rule) to the Jerusalem *typikon*, so that the synods instead addressed changes in liturgical, and disciplinary practices – internal church matters – rather than the overall state of the Eastern church in the face of the Byzantines reconquest of Constantinople (1261), Union of Lyon (1274), and the impact of the Mongols.

The book's following section examines those passages in the translation of the documents of the synod that were rejected over the years. Where Part Three went through each canon in the Greek text and compared them to various East Slavic translations, Part Four tabulates their Byzantine or Rus' origins, and reviews how the Rus' translators inserted articles into the original Greek text to address issues of particular interest to the the local church. KOROGODINA notes, as she did in the third section, where the Kyivan metropolia deviated, often quite intentionally, from the canons of the synod, as when Archbishop Moisei of Novgorod left office 1330 to enter the Great Schema (the highest and strictest form of Eastern Christian monasticism) but then came back to the archiepiscopate after Archbishop Vasilii Kalika's death in 1352, before retiring again in 1359, even though the 1276 synod had ruled that a bishop taking the Great Schema must forfeit his episcopal office. While reviewing discrepancies, KOROGODINA also notes differences between various redactions of the translated synod documents, including several parts of the 1276 documents that were never translated. She also discusses how the synod of Vladimir was received differently by the Rus' church compared to the 1276 synod, with the former making its way into *kormchie knigi* (compilations of eastern Christian canon law), while the latter was seen as addressing issues at the parish level, and thus not as authoritative as the Vladimir council, allowing later Rus' bookmen to modify and add to the text.

The book's title may give the impression it is a scholarly presentation of the text of the 1276 synod of Constantinople of use to paleographers, but it is much more than that. It is a thoroughly researched and well-presented discussion of the history leading up to and succeeding the 1276 synod, what issues the churches in Rus' and Constantinople faced in the third quarter of the 13th century, and how they sought to address them. It is also a fascinating look at how the Church in Rus' demonstrated agency in adopting, adapting, and at times ignoring, decrees from the mother church more than a century before Moscow attained autocephaly in 1448, how the Kyivan metropolia dealt with the Mongol invasion and an early effort at church

union with Rome not by addressing these problems head-on in these councils, but by silence.

Keywords

Rus' and Byzantium; Metropolitanate of Kyiv; ecclesiastical history