



Russian
liturgical
memory in Slavonic
Byzantine Catholic
Monthly Word (Recensio Vulgata)
of the middle of the 20th century.

Russian Liturgical
Memories in the
Slavic Byzantine
Catholic Menologion
(Recensio Vulgata)
of the Mid-20th
Century

**Ilya Viktorovich Semenenko
Basin**

independent researcher,
Moscow, Russia

Stefano Caprio

Pontifical Oriental Institute,
Rome, Italy

Ilya V. Semenenko-Basin

independent scholar,
Moscow, Russia

Stefano Caprio

Pontifical Oriental Institute,
Rome, Italy

Summary

This article is devoted to the menologion (calendar of saints), compiled in the 20th century. for Russian Byzantine Catholics. The latter represent a church community with its own Byzantine-Slavic worship and piety, at the same time Catholic and Eastern spiritual way. The Monthly Book, like all the liturgical literature of Russian Byzantine Catholics, was created in Rome under the auspices of the Congregation for the Eastern Churches,

Citation: *Semenenko-Basin I. V., Caprio S. Russian Liturgical Memory in Slavonic Byzantine-Catholic Menologion (Recensio Vulgata) of the middle of the 20th century. // Slovene. 2021 Vol. ten, No. 1. C. 368–391.*

Citation: Semenenko-Basin IV, Caprio S. (2021) Russian Liturgical Memories in the Slavic Byzantine Catholic Menologion (Recensio Vulgata) of the Mid-20th Century. *Slovene*, Vol. 10, No. 1, p. 368–391.

DOI: 10.31168/2305-6754.2021.10.1.16

within the framework of the activities of the Russian Catholic apostolate, i.e., the mission of the Catholic Church, directed at Russia and the Russian diaspora in the world. The corpus of liturgical books for Russian, Bulgarian and Serbian Byzantine Catholics was called *Recensio Vulgata*. The studied calendars in the *Recensio Vulgata* books were compiled on the basis of Orthodox calendars before revolutionary Russia. The compilers of the Byzantine-Catholic Menologion not only selected Russian liturgical memories in a certain way; in addition, the names of several martyrs of the Eastern Catholic Churches and some additional commemorations of Western saints have been added. According to the compilers of the Menologion, in North-Eastern Russia the history of Catholic (orthodox) holiness ended at the turn of the thirties and forties of the 15th century, when the Moscow principality and the Novgorod Republic renounced the Union of Florence. The era after the Union of Florence is depicted in the calendar with events that show the unchanging patronage of the Mother of God over the people, over the Russian land. The calendar of months in the *Recensio Vulgata* books contains twelve feasts of Russian origin in honor of the icons of the Mother of God, of which nine celebrate the events of the second half of the 15th-17th centuries. The compilers of the calendar have created a well-thought-out system in which the Eastern Slavic saints, the ancient saints of the Byzantine calendar, the Latin teachers of the Church, the saints of the Byzantine-Catholic churches of different eras are all subject to harmonic logic, and harmony serves to organize the whole.

Keywords

calendars, hagiography, Russian religiosity, Russian Byzantine-Catholics, Russian Catholic apostolate, *collegium Russicum*, liturgical book
ness

Abstract

The article is devoted to the menologion (calendar of saints) compiled in the 20th century for Russian Byzantine Catholics. The latter are a church community with its own Byzantine-Slavic worship and piety, which follow both the Catholic and the Eastern spiritual traditions. Like the entire liturgical literature of the Russian Eastern Catholics, the menologion was created in Rome under the auspices of the Congregation for Eastern Churches, as part of the activities of the Russian Catholic Apostolate, i.e., of the mission of the Catholic Church addressed to Russia and the Russian diaspora in the world. The corpus of service books for Russian, Bulgarian and Serbian Eastern Catholics was called *Recensio Vulgata*. The menologion under study is in the books of *Recensio Vulgata* and was compiled on the basis of the Orthodox menologia of pre-revolutionary Russia. The compilers of the Byzantine-Catholic menologion did not just select Russian liturgical memories in a certain way, they also included the names of several martyrs of the Eastern Catholic Churches and some additional commemorations of Western saints. According to the compilers of the menologion, the history of Catholic (orthodox) holiness in North-Eastern Russia ended at the turn of the 1440s, when the Principality of Moscow and the Novgorod Republic abandoned the Union of Florence. The menologion reflects the era after the Union of Florence in the events that show the invariable patronage of the Mother

of God over the people and the Russian land. The Recensio Vulgata menologion (RVM) contains twelve Russia-specific holidays that honor icons of the Mother of God, nine of which celebrate the events of the period from the late 15th to the 17th centuries. The compilers of the menologion created a well-devised system in which the East Slavic saints, the ancient saints of the Byzantine menologion, the Latin teachers of the Church, the saints of the Byzantine Catholic churches of different eras all are subject to harmonious logic, and harmony serves to organize the whole.

keywords

Calendar of saints, hagiography, Russian religion, Russian Byzantine Catholics, Russian Catholic apostolate, The Collegium Russicum, liturgical books

Monthly books, along with other hagiographic sources, are able to tell a lot about national images of holiness, cultural memory and the formation of a sense of identity in the community. The authors of this article proceed from the hypothesis that in modern times in Russian Orthodoxy, the canonization of saints and their veneration function as a complex, multi-level system of interpretation of the past [Semenenko-Basin 2017:220], and the design of the cathedral of Russian saints is loaded with additional meanings, cultural and political. The above applies not only to the Moscow Patriarchate, but also to the most diverse church organizations representing Russian religiosity. The month, studied by the authors of this article, appeared due to the activities of the Russian Catholic apostolate, the mission of the Catholic Church, directed at Russia and its diaspora in the world [Kozlov-Strutinsky, Parfentiev 2014: 399–418].

Confessional division in the Christian ecumene has never been perceived as the norm; in modern times, the leaders of the Christian churches tried to change the situation. In particular, during the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII, which lasted from 1878 to 1903, the "Eastern question" was considered in a new spirit, in an effort to overcome the mutual ignorance and misunderstanding of Catholics and Orthodox. A kind of provocation in Russia and Europe was the utopian theology about Russia and the Universal Church of the philosopher Vladimir Solovyov (1853–1900), who proposed the idea of spiritual theocracy as a program for reforming Europe in the Christian spirit.

In the XX century. In the Russian religious space, not only representatives of autocephalous Orthodoxy acted, but also Byzantine-Catholics - a church community with its own Byzantine-Slavic worship and piety. In 1917, in Petrograd, the Cathedral of a relatively small Russian Greek Catholic Church

established an Exarchate for Russian Catholics of the Byzantine rite, but soon the revolution of 1917 in Russia demanded urgent opposition to the regime, which declared its intention to wipe out the Christian faith from the face of the earth [Simon 2009: 166–196; Kozlov-Strutinsky, Parfentiev 2014: 405–418]. Counteracting the Bolshevik aggression, the Catholic Church tried to create an underground network of clergy on the territory of the USSR, and in 1929 in Rome, by the bull of Pope Pius XI, the Collegium Russicum was founded to train Catholic priests who could ensure the evangelization of Russian society in the future [Simon 2009: 295–361]. The Russicum missionaries were even ready to replace the right of the glorious priests, who, as it seemed then, were destined to become victims of repression. Young leaders of the Russian Catholic apostolate who chose the Pro Russia mission were taught Russian culture and language, prepared to celebrate the liturgy according to the Eastern rite, with special permission to perform two rituals, serve according to the Latin and Byzantine-Slavic rites, which is not a normal church practice. At the same time, at first they used Russian liturgical books of the synodal press.

The movement for the unity of the Church, marked by the Florentine (1439) and Brest (1596) unions, assumed the preservation of all the traditions of prayer and worship of the Christian East; this also applied to the church calendar of saints. Accordingly, the emerging Russian Byzantine-Catholic community had to adhere to the liturgical charter of the Orthodox Russian Church of the Synodal period¹, while maintaining a unified Russian chronology, Byzantine in origin, with the elimination of everything that contradicted the Catholic Christian faith.

What could offer the missionaries of Russicum already available on that moment the East Slavic Byzantine-Catholic church tradition? In the early modern times, the unified Kyiv Metropolis did not impose a ban on the veneration of any ancient Russian saints. Moreover, an inclusive approach appeared quite early in Catholic ecclesiastical science. Ignatius Kulchinsky (1707 - c. 1747), Procurator General of the Basilian Order and author of historical and archaeological works [Alekseev 1988], published a long essay on the Ruthenian Church, placing the ideal image of the *Ruthenian saints* at the center of his rhetorical system [Kulczynski 1733].

¹ According to the classical formulation of the Roman Curia, the liturgical practice of the Russian Greek Catholic Church was to be “nec plus, nec minus, nec aliter” (“no more, no less, no other way”) compared to the practice of the Russian Orthodox Church [Vasily 1966: 177-178].

The author included the saints of the Ukrainian-Belarusian region and North-Eastern Russia in the structure of this cathedral; Great Russian saints are taken into account until the division of the Kyiv Metropolis by Pope Pius II in 1482. Along with the Kievan saints of the pre-Mongolian era, the book of Kulchinsky presents the Kyiv Metropolitans Peter, Alexy, Cyprian, the Hierarchs of Rostov Leonty, Isaiah, St. Stephen of Perm, the saints of Chernigov, Lithuanian, Polotsk and Smolensk, St. , Macarius Kalyazinsky, the foolish Isidor of Rostovsky, and others. According to a modern researcher, a century and a half after the Union of Brest, Kulchinsky presented the Russian saints as the common heritage of the Kyiv Metropolis, which had already been divided for a long time, therefore, as a factor contributing to its unification, and not as an argument in favor of separation [Petrovich 2011]. In the real liturgical practice of Ukrainian and Belarusian Greek Catholics during the XVIII century, a diametrically opposite approach was established, i.e., the displacement of the Slavic saints from the calendar. The schism of 1054 was increasingly regarded as a fatal feature; East Slavic ascetics of a later time

regarded as schismatics. The

situation began to change only in the second half of the 19th century, on the wave of romantic nationalism, which appealed to the identity of the nation. An indicator can be considered the attitude towards the figures of Cyril and Methodius, the Enlighteners of the Slavs. Their liturgical veneration in the Russian Orthodox Church was established in 1863 by the decision of the Synod [Kravetsky, Pletneva 2013: 16–21]. The names of Cyril and Methodius were introduced into the Greek Catholic calendar by the fathers of the Lvov Cathedral in 1891. Let us turn to the “Typika” prepared after the Lvov Cathedral by Priest Isidore Dolnitsky in order to normalize the liturgical life of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church.

The monthly part of the Tipika [Dolnitsky 1899: 541–548] includes six names of Eastern Slavic saints: Equal-to-the-Apostles Vladimir of Kyiv (July 15), Boris and Gleb (July 24), Anthony of the Caves (July 10), Theodosius of the Caves (May 3), Hieromartyr Josaphat (1580–1623), Polotsk union archbishop, who defended the union at the cost of his life (November 12). In addition, the Tipika contains the feast of the Intercession of the Mother of God (October 1), which is probably of ancient Russian origin and is highly revered not only by autocephalous Orthodox, but also by Greek Catholics, as well as a specific

2 Pius II separated from the unified Kyiv Metropolitanate the region that was not recognized the union, i.e., the Novgorod Republic and the Grand Duchy of Moscow.

for the Eastern Slavs, the memory of the transfer of the relics of St. Nicholas to Bari (May 9); in memory of Cyril and Methodius (July 5) ³, Paraskeva Tyrnovskaya (October 14).

An outstanding church figure, the Greek Catholic Metropolitan of Galicia Andrey Sheptytsky, sought to renew and restore the Byzantine tradition in the worship of his Church. In compiling the new Liturgikon (Service Book), Metropolitan Andrei included in its monthly part the same East Slavic commemorations as in Isidor Dolnitsky's *Typika*, as well as Olga of Kyiv (July 11), the Vilna martyrs Anthony, John and Eustathius (April 14), in memory of the transfer of the relics of Boris and Gleb (May 2) and the transfer of the relics of Theodosius of the Caves (August 14). The universality of the Church was designated by Metropolitan Andrei by the inclusion of Bishop Ipponsky (August 28) in Augustine's *Menologion*; the number of memories of the Slavic enlighteners increased (Cyril on February 14, Methodius on May 11, Cyril and Methodius on July 5) [Liturgikon 1929: 225–247].

As for the saints of North-Eastern Russia, for a long time they remained out of sight for Catholics. In 1680, the Bollandist Daniel Papebroch (1628-1714) published in the collection of lives "*Acta Sanctorum*" a Greek verse synaxarion and a Russian obverse *Menaion*, and in the comments he cited a list of more than fifty Russian ("Ruthenian") saints [Papebrochius 1680]. In 1863, the Jesuit priest Ivan Mikhailovich Martynov (1821-1894) exhaustively presented the Russian saints in the monograph "*Annus ecclesiasticus Graeco-Slavicus*" [Martynov 1863]. These academic works in no way influenced the current liturgical practice of the Catholic Church, and when in St. Petersburg at the beginning of the 20th century. a group of Russian Byzantine-Catholics declared their commitment to the veneration of Russian Orthodox saints, this only brought them reproaches from the Roman Curia [Vasily 1966: 226-228; Petrowycz 2005: 147–150].

The aforementioned council of the Russian Greek Catholic Church (Petrograd, 1917) decreed that Russian Catholics of the Byzantine rite accept all saints, without exception, canonized by the Catholic Church; it was recognized that the joined Orthodox are not forbidden to privately honor the Russian saints of God in accordance with the traditions of Orthodoxy. The members of the council considered

3 In Dolnitsky's *Typika*, the date July 5 according to the Julian calendar reproduces the date of memory of Cyril and Methodius (July 5 according to the Gregorian calendar) in the Roman martyrology, in other words, in the Latin rite. The general church celebration of Cyril and Methodius on July 5 was established by the encyclical "*Grande munus*" (1880) of Pope Leo XIII, moved to February 14 in the modern Roman Martyrology.

their obligation to subsequently submit to the judgment of the Apostolic See a documentary history of the saints of Russian Orthodoxy in order to petition for the introduction of liturgical veneration for them; at the same time, the council refused to render such veneration to Russian saints until the Roman Church made its decision [Vasily 1966: 323–324]. Russian Catholics of the Byzantine rite in the formation of their own calendar of national saints had to be guided by the calendar of the Russian Orthodox Church, and the approval of the Russian Catholic calendar, as well as changing the Ukrainian calendar, became the work of the Apostolic Capital. Note that in the 1930s among Ukrainian Greek Catholics, a discussion began about their own liturgical texts. In 1930, under the auspices of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, Pope Pius XI set up a commission to draw up liturgical editions of all Oriental rites. On December 21, 1934, on the proposal of the papal commission "Pro Russia", Pius XI ordered the preparation of a complete set of Russian liturgical books of the Byzantine-Slavic rite [Pius XI 1935]. Beginning in 1938, experts under the leadership of Cardinal Eugène Tisserand (1884–1972), secretary of the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, formed two versions of the liturgical literature in Church Slavonic: one that reflected the peculiarities of the Kievan-Galician liturgical tradition and was intended for the Greek Catholics of Ukraine, Belarus, Carpathians, is called *Recensio Ruthena*, and the corpus of books for the Byzantine Catholics of Great Russia, Bulgaria, Serbia - *Recensio Vulgata*⁴. In the course of the reform, the calendars of both versions of the liturgical books were significantly enriched by national saints, and the composition of the new liturgical commemorations in the *Recensio Ruthena* and *Recensio Vulgata* differs noticeably. The starting point for the *Menologion* in the *Recensio Ruthena* was the Greek Catholic *Menologion* of the 17th century, and the calendar in the *Liturgikon* of Metropolitan Andrei Sheptytsky, i.e., in this case, the missing names of East Slavic saints were added. The *Recensio Vulgata* was created on the basis of the calendar of the Orthodox Russian Church, so that the names of some saints were excluded, while others were left. As a result, a disproportion arose, which was described in detail by M. Petrovich:

⁴ An outline of the history of the *Recensio Vulgata* and *Recensio Ruthena* is contained in G. Croce's "Introduction" to the third volume [Korolevskij, 3: XVII–LVIII] and in the monograph [Simon 2009: 541–543]. For the history of the creation of the *Recensio Ruthena* liturgical books, see the doctoral dissertation [Petrowycz 2005].

ancient Russian saints, whose life and activity was geographically localized on the present Ukrainian-Belarusian lands; the saints of North-Eastern Russia are hardly represented, with the exception of only Avraamy of Rostov (October 29) and Nikita the Stylite of Pereyaslavsky (May 24) [Liturgikion 1942: 479-606]. On the contrary, the *Recensio Vulgata* includes most of the Old Russian saints who are present in the *Recensio Ruthena*, and, in addition, more than twenty names of saints of North-Eastern Russia, which are not in the *Recensio Ruthena*.

[Petrowycz 2005: 259–260, 321–322, 371–373; Idem 2008: 286, 294–295]. This article considers the calendar of holidays and saints

published in the *Recensio Vulgata* (hereinafter referred to as RVM); The main source for the history of the RVM was the memoirs and documents of the priest Cyril Korolevskiy (Jean François Joseph Charon, Cyrille Korolevskij; 1878–1959), published by Giuseppe Croce [Korolevskij, 1–5]. Cyril Royal, a French Catholic priest of the Byzantine rite, was one of the main advisers to the Congregation for the Eastern Churches, was directly involved in all the events described below. As is known from a letter from Korolevskoy dated July 12, 1947, addressed to the Dominican Christopher

Dumont (1898–1991), another priest of the Russian Catholic apostolate, the *Recensio Vulgata* book preparation commission consisted of seven priests headed by Eugène Tisserand: these were Philippe de Regis (Rector of Russicum), Russicum professors Stanislav Tyszkiewicz and Josef Schweigl, arch-mandrita of the Grottaferrata monastery Isidoro Croce, Alexander Sipyagin, Nikolay Bratko and Kirill Korolevskiy [Korolevskij 4: 2039] (note that the key figures of this group also worked on the corpus of *Recensio* books). *Ruthena*). In preparing the RVM, as the epistolary of Korolevskoy testifies, the liturgical commission turned to the Russian liturgical books of the synodal press, to scientific literature on liturgy, history, and hagiography. The Slavic books prepared by the Congregation for the Oriental Churches were printed by the printing house of the Grottaferrata Monastery. The Liturgy of John Chrysostom was the first to be published in 1940, the main body

Recensio Vulgata and *Recensio Ruthena* saw the light of day during 1940–1950s (some titles came out later). The RVM of interest to us was first made public in the Service Book of 1942 and later (always in the Church Slavonic script) was included in various liturgical books *Recensio Vulgata*, in the Service Gospel, the Service Apostle, and the Priestly Prayer Book [Korolevskij 4: 2063]. The authors of this article reviewed the RVM text *de visu* in Jereus

in the prayer book and in the Missal [Priestly Prayer Book 1950: 833–1151; Missal 1953: 493–622]. In both editions, the monthly part is identical, with the only difference being that in the Priestly Prayer Book the RVM is provided with troparia and kontakia, which, on the contrary, are absent in the Missal. When compiling the RVM, not only Russian liturgical commemorations were selected, but also the names of several martyrs of the Eastern

Catholic Churches and some additional commemorations of Western saints (the so-called Latin commemorations) were added. The material is presented in the form of three tables. In the first table, in addition to the names of saints, all other Russian memories available in the RVM are also indicated, i.e. holidays in honor of icons and historical events (it should be noted that for the first time a summary table of the names of Russian saints and Russian Mother of God icons from the RVM was published by M Petrovich [Petrowycz 2005: 385]). The second and third tables contain additional memories included by the editors in the months (the spelling of the names is given according to the RVM, in some cases the Slavicized spelling of the name of the saint is accompanied by the modern commonly used spelling in square brackets).

In each table, the first column lists the names of the saints, systematized according to the chronology of life. The second column contains the date of the celebration (the community of Russian Byzantine Catholics adopted the Julian calendar style). In the third column is the sign of the service. The tabular material is commented on on the basis of a published letter from Cyril Korolevskiy to the Dominican Christopher Dumont dated October 29, 1947 (original in French; all explanatory notes in square brackets in Korolevskiy's text belong to the authors of the article).

Table 1

Russian Liturgical Memory in RVM

| | | |
|--------------------------------|------------|---|
| Olga, Princess of Kyiv | July 11 | Unsigned (in red font); the service to Olga is connected with the service to the Great Martyr Euphemia, for which the sign is three black dots. Both saints together: the small hexadecimal feast The middle vigil feast The middle polyeleic feast |
| Vladimir Equal-to-the-Apostles | on July 15 | |
| Boris and Gleb, martyrs | on July 24 | |

| | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Anthony Pechersky | July 10 | Average Polyeleo Feast |
| Theodosius Pechersky | May 3 | Average polyeleic celebration Average polyeleic celebration |
| | August 14 (transfer of relics) | |
| Leonty, Bishop of Rostov | May 23 (acquisition of relics) | Small doxology holiday |
| Isaiah, Bishop of Rostov | May 15 | Small doxology holiday |
| Stefan, Bishop of Vladimir Nikita, | April 27 | Unsigned (in red font) |
| Bishop of Novgorod Kirill, Bishop of Turov | January 31 | Unsigned (black font) |
| Euphrosyne of Polotsk May 23 November 6 | April 28 | Unsigned (in red font) |
| Varlaam Khutynsky | | Unsigned (in red font) |
| | | Small doxology holiday |
| Avramy Smolensky | August 21 | Small |
| Nikita, Stylite of Pereyaslavsky Michael, | May 24 | glorifying holiday holiday |
| Grand Duke and Theodore, his Boyar, Chernigov, Martyrs Ignatius, Bishop of Rostov | September 20 | holiday |
| | May 28 | Small doxology holiday |
| Avramius of Rostov | October 29 Unsigned | (in red font) September 19 Small |
| Theodore Prince, his children the princes David and Konstantin, Smolensk and Yaroslavl | doxology | holiday |
| Sergius and Herman of Valaam | 11 September (transfer of relics) | Unsigned (in red font) |
| | June 28 | Unsigned (in red font) |

| | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|
| Sergius of Radonezh | September 25 | Small |
| | July 5 (acquisition of relics) | glorifying holiday holiday |
| Stefan, Bishop Perm Cathedral of | April 26 | Small doxology holiday |
| the Caves Fathers in the Near Caves Cathedral of | September 28 | Unsigned (in red font) |
| the Caves Fathers in the Far Caves Commemoration | August 28 | Unsigned (in red font) |
| of all the saints who shone in the land of Russ | Second Sunday after 5 tithe | Unsigned (in red font) |
| Protection of the Mother | 1 October | Great vigil feast Medium polyeleic |
| of God Miraculous Icon of the Mother of God of Vladimir | 21 May | feast Medium polyeleic feast Medium polyeleic feast |
| | June 23 | |
| | August, 26th | |
| .. Joy to all who mourn | October 24 | |
| .. | | |
| .. Donskaya | August 19 | Unsigned (in red font) |
| .. Sign | November 27 | Average polyeleic holiday October 13 Average polyeleic |
| .. Iverskaya | holiday | |
| .. | | |
| .. Kazanskaya | October 22 | holiday |
| | July 8 | Medium polyeleic holiday Unsigned (in red font) |
| .. | | |
| .. Konevskaya | July 10 | Medium polyeleic holiday Unsigned |
| .. Hodegetria Smolenskaya | July 28th | (in red font) Medium polyeleic holiday |
| .. | | |
| .. Ustyugskaya | July 8 | |
| .. Tikhvinskaya | June 26 | |

| | | |
|---|-------------|------------------------|
| Consecration of the Church of St. George the Great Martyr in Kyiv | November 26 | Unsigned (in red font) |
| Transfer of the relics of Nicholas the Wonderworker | 9th May | Average Polyeleo Feast |

The Liturgical Commission accepted the Russian holidays in honor of the icons of the Most Holy Theotokos without any difficulty. As for the veneration of saints, Korolevskii, in a letter to Dumont, cites the main criterion of the commission, citing its minutes: "It is desirable that [in the months of tseslov] include as many Russian saints as possible, the most revered by the Russian people, or the most significant for the religious and ascetic formation of the Russian people" [Korolevskij 4: 2063]. The Catholic mentality encouraged the liturgical commission to integrate the various elements without suppressing or destroying anything. Nevertheless, the members of the commission had to remove from the Russian Menologion everything that, in their opinion, could bear the imprint of heresy or a church schism. First of all, it was necessary to determine the attitude of the Kyiv Metropolis (the Russian Church) to the schism of 1054, which took place when Patriarch Michael I Cerularius (c. 1000–1059) occupied the throne of Constantinople.

The members of the commission made two fundamental decisions:

The Russian Church remained Catholic for some time after the schism of Cerularius, of this there is no doubt, and it is equally certain that after the solemn rejection of the Council of Florence in Moscow (1439), it [the Russian Church] can no longer be officially recognized as Catholic. [...] The fact that the Kievan metropolitans [after the schism of 1054] remained in communion with the Patriarch of Constantinople does not prove anything, since at that time the concept of unity with the Roman Church was not understood in the same way as it is now: a dispute between the pope and the patriarchs considered the episcopate, lower clergy and, above all, simple monks and the faithful as a personal matter, and our ideas today are not applicable to those distant times [Korolevskij 4: 2065].

Today we can say that the rupture of Novgorod and the Principality of Moscow with the Union of Florence should be dated not to 1439, when the union was proclaimed at the Ferrara-Florentine Council, but to 1441, the time of the departure of Metropolitan Isidore from Moscow. After the members of the liturgical commission elected 1439 as the after the last date, according to the Royal,

[...] the next steps were as follows: temporarily receive all the Russian saints who lived before the Council of Florence and died before 1439; straightaway

keep [in the calendar] all those who were undoubtedly Catholics, such as Vladimir, Olga and others, and consider other cases individually [Korolevskij 4: 2065].

If the published statements of Russian saints confirmed that they supported anti-Catholic theories or somehow approved of the church schism, then these persons should have been excluded from the calendar, no matter how famous they were, no matter how widely their veneration spread. "Being a Catholic body entrusted with the confidence of the Holy See, the commission could not have acted otherwise. It was not a scholarly work on all the saints venerated by the Russian Church, but a liturgical work for Catholics, limited only to the Service Book" [Korolevskij 4: 2066–2067]. These rules, as Korolevskii wrote to Dumont, would one day be applied to locally venerated saints whose names are contained in the classic catalog of Archimandrite Leonid (Kavelin) "Holy Russia" [Leonid 1891], but not included in the RVM. Having eliminated from the calendar all those who died after 1439, the liturgical commission investigated specific cases relating to an earlier era. Sergius of Radonezh (d. 1392) was the saint whom Cyril of Kings especially wanted to include in the RVM. In a letter to Dumont, the Royal dedicated the most detailed passage to Reverend Sergius:

His case was discussed at a meeting on July 22, 1940. Is it possible to come to Russia without excluding one of the most famous and most popular saints? At that time [in the era of Sergius of Radonezh] the question of communion with Rome did not really exist, everything was mediated by Metropolitan Alexy and the Patriarch of Constantinople, and we cannot draw conclusions about a person's faith based on the faith of his leaders, in that question, which man himself has never had the opportunity to study. He believed in what the Church of his day believed; in fact, faith is expressed through liturgy and symbols. The liturgy is clearly Catholic; at that time, neither the symbol nor the conciliar decrees proclaimed separation from Rome. There is absolutely nothing reprehensible in the Life. Some of our contemporaries wanted to make a politician out of St. Sergius: in fact, he was only a holy monk and peacemaker. [...] Saint Sergius was received. How I would like Russicum to be dedicated to him! But in those days it was imprudent to even talk about it [Korol

The members of the commission recognized that regional councils of saints could be accepted, in particular, the common feast of all the Kiev-Pechersk saints and the cathedral of all saints who shone in the Russian land, and others of the same kind. Royal wrote:

Similarly, we include all the commemorations of Russian princes who were killed by the Tatars out of hatred for the Christian faith during the Mongol yoke, since there is nothing political in their death, and, on the contrary, we examine more carefully the cases of other princes, about which it can be assumed that their veneration had more political than religious origin [Korolevskij 4: 2066].

Further, the question inevitably arose: if the name of an Eastern saint, in particular a Russian one, is included in the month of months officially approved by the Church, can this be equated with an equivalent (Latin *aequipollens*) canonization? In the Catholic Church, in addition to the formal canonization (beatification) of a saint, an equivalent (or equivalent) canonization (beatification) is also provided for without the usual judicial procedure, relying only on the fact of prolonged veneration of the ascetic and on universal witness for a long time about his saint. life. As we have seen, the work of perfecting the monastic part of the *Recensio Vulgata* and *Recensio Ruthena* was concentrated in the Congregation for the Oriental Churches, without any involvement of the Congregation for Sacred Rites, which alone was competent at that time in matters of the canonization of saints. According to M. Petrovich, the revision of the calendar of saints in this case was perceived as an exclusively liturgical problem, solved within the powers of the Eastern Catholic Churches [Petrowycz 2005: 364; Idem 2008: 291–292].

According to Korolevskii, the commission considered the issue of equivalent canonization in June 1940, and the answer was negative [Korolevskij 4: 2064]. Decided that the introduction into the RVM of any new name, previously unknown to the Catholic Church, is in no way equivalent to the canonization of this person; all issues of canonization remained under the jurisdiction of the Congregation for Sacred Rites.

In a letter to Dumont, Korolevskiy explained why certain names were not included in the RVM. Metropolitan Michael (10th century), traditionally considered the first Kievan hierarch, was considered a legendary figure who never existed. Kyiv Metropolitans Peter

(XIII-XIV centuries) and Alexy Byakont (XIV century), according to the members of the commission, were glorified in the Russian Church mainly for supporting the political hegemony of Moscow; in addition, the members of the liturgical commission attributed the beginning of the veneration of these saints to the middle of the 17th century. Metropolitan Jonah (15th century) also turned out to be unacceptable, as he opposed the nickname of Metropolitan Isidore and the Union of Florence. Metropolitan Philip II Kolychev of Moscow (1507–1569), according to Korolevskii, “is a wonderful example of a hierarch worthy of appearing in the calendar.

The commission could not include it because it made it a rule not to go beyond 1439." [Korolevskij 4: 2068].

The name of Prince Igor of Chernigov (XII century) was rejected, because in the circumstances of his murder by the people of Kiev in 1147, according to the members of the commission, there was nothing religious. After a discussion about the Grand Duke Alexander Nevsky (1221–1263), the commission considered "that this question is by no means clear, and that it is wiser to abstain for the present. It will be good to review it for a later edition." [Korolevskij 4: 2068]. Finally, Korolevskii communicated to Dumont the text of the statement made by the liturgical commission on October 21, 1941:

Our work should not be considered complete and does not exclude the possibility of adding more names. We believe that Russian saints can and should be included in the calendar, but we are not competent enough in Russian hagiography; on the other hand, the study of Russian hagiography is still almost non-existent in the West. We have followed the safest path, and for this reason we have been severe enough; we excluded all the metropolitans and almost all the princes, many bishops already at the first consideration. In the second consideration (since there were two of them), we were even stricter and seriously took into account the later life of the saints, even if this was the only obstacle, and this obstacle did not in any way signify complicity in the schism. We also took into account the antiquity of veneration, its universal or local character. Those who come after us may, if they see fit, include more names, for it is not difficult to add others to the twenty or so Russian saints. We did not do this only out of caution [Korolevskij 4:

It was no coincidence that Korolevskii remembered the considerations of caution. The Russicum missionaries sought to build their Byzantine-Catholic community as a subsystem of two cultures at once - the Russian religious culture and the Catholic Church. Such a daring task could not be carried out painlessly; the Russian Catholic apostolate faced misunderstanding. Korolevskij told Dumont that the commission's caution was caused by fears of the critical position of both Ukrainian Greek Catholics and some incompetent Latins. Since then, the Russian liturgical memories in the RVM have never been revised or supplemented, with one minor exception. In the Russian Orthodox tradition, there is a celebration of the cathedral of all saints who shone in the Russian land, established by the local council of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1917–1918. [Kravetsky, Pletneva 2013: 33–36; Semenenko-Basin 2017: 64–67, 70]. This rolling holiday was not included in the RVM, but in 1953, when the Missal was republished

Recensio Vulgata 1942, the book was supplied with several appendices. In particular, the appendix to the calendar contains "The memory of all the saints who shone in the land of Russ" on the second Sunday after Pentecost.

For this memorable day, the appendix contains the prokeimenons for matins and liturgy, the alliliary and the sacrament; there is no nominal list of the cathedral of saints [Misal 1953: 47–48 (second pagination)].

Let us note the change in the definition that took place in 1953—not “in the land of the Russians,” as was customary at the Moscow Council of 1917–1918, but “in the land of the Russians.” A. G. Kravetsky and A. A. Pletneva connect the displacement in liturgical texts of words with the root *Russian*- words with the root *Rus*- (Russian / Russian) with the processes that took place in the Church Slavonic language under the influence of Russian. In the 19th century in Russian culture, the opposition of “Holy Russia” and the Russian Empire appeared, from the beginning of the 20th century. the word “Rus” begins to be used sporadically in new liturgical texts, but the expansion of the word “Russian” was hindered by the official name of the church organization “Orthodox Russian Church” (“Russian”, not “Russian”). The name “Russian Orthodox Church” was given to the church organization in 1943, which later led to the widespread use of the word “Russian” in Orthodox hymnography of the 20th–21st centuries. [Kravetsky, Pletneva 2013: 80–88]. Apparently, the publishers of RVM in 1953 felt this linguistic trend and undertook the replacement of “Russians” with “Russians”⁵.

table 2

The memory of the saints of the Eastern Catholic Churches in the RVM

| | | |
|--|--------------|------------------------|
| Nile Cryptoferratsky [Nile Rossansky] Josaphat, | September 27 | Unsigned (in black) |
| Archbishop of Polotsk, sacred martyr | November 12 | Average Polyeleo Feast |
| Cosmas, presbyter of Armenia, martyr [Komitas Kemurjian, Cosma da Carbonano] | June 5 | Unsigned (black font) |
| Gebre Michael, presbyter of Ethiopia, martyr | August 28 | Unsigned (black font) |
| Francis, Mutios and Raphael, Martyrs [brothers Francis, Abdel Moti and Raphael Massabki] | July 10 | Unsigned (black font) |

⁵ It is curious that in the publications of the Moscow Patriarchate, such a replacement took place only after May 2013, when the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church ordered to use the name “The Week of All Saints Who Resplendent in the Russian Land” instead of “The Week of All Saints Resplendent in the Land of Russia” [Kravetsky, Pletneva 2013: 88].

The compilers of the Recensio Vulgata could not ignore Eastern Christian saints. The names of Equal-to-the-Apostles Cyril and Methodius from the Menologion of the Russian Orthodox Church are quite predictably transferred to the RVM (Cyril - February 14, Methodius - April 6, Cyril and Methodius - May 11). The piety of the Bulgarians and Serbs in the RVM is represented by Paraskeva Tyrnovskaya (October 14), John of Rylsky (October 19), whose names have long been present in the Russian Orthodox calendar. From the calendar of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church, the editors of the RVM borrowed the memory (July 27) of Clement of Ohrid (c. 840–916), enlightener of the Bulgarians, the most famous of the disciples of Cyril and Methodius. Clement of Ohrid is revered by Orthodox and Byzantine Catholics in Bulgaria and Macedonia. Note that in the 1920-1930s. Eastern Catholicism among the Bulgarians was strengthened, an Apostolic Exarchate was created in Bulgaria, to which the papal nuncio in Bulgaria Angelo Roncalli (future Pope John XXIII) contributed a lot.

In a letter to Dumont, Cyril the Royal emotionally described his failure with St. Sava I of Serbia, one of the most revered medieval Serbian saints: “[...] The Commission took a step back. In the meantime, I am collecting everything I can find about St. Sava: I hope that one day he will be included [in the calendar]” [Korolevskij 4: 2071]. The RVM added the name of Nil of

Rossan (910–1004), an adherent of the Byzantine tradition in Italy, who founded the Byzantine-Catholic monastery of Grottaferrata near Rome. The Holy Nile is especially important to the Italo-Albanian Catholic Church. Perhaps it was of some significance that all the books of the Recensio Vulgata and Recensio Ruthena referred to here were printed in the printing house of the Grottaferrata monastery.

The name of Archbishop Josaphat of Polotsk is added, about which Korolevsky wrote to Dumont: “We received Saint Josaphat of Polotsk, despite the fact that non-Catholics hate him: he is a glorious martyr of the union, and we should not overly take into account the preferences or antipathies of anti-Catholic fanatics” [Korolevskij 4:2070]. The celebration of the memory of Jehoshaphat became a semantic link that connected the Russian Byzantine Catholics with the Greek Catholics of Belarus and Ukraine.

The names of the martyrs of the Eastern Catholic Churches, beatified by Pope Pius XI, are included in the RVM for a reason. It was important for the compilers of the Recensio Vulgata corpus of books to show that union with Rome does not deprive the Eastern Christian churches of spiritual fertility, the ability to give birth to saints. Komitas Kemurjian, known as Cosma da Carbonano (1656–1707), a married priest of the Armenian Gregorian tradition, who lived

in the Stambul. Having accepted the Christology of the Council of Chalcedon, in 1696, together with his family, he joined the Catholic Church. This was the very beginning of the Catholic mission among the Armenians, which culminated in the historical perspective with the creation of the Armenian Catholic Church. Komitas Kemurjyan served and preached in the Istanbul Armenian Catholic Church of St. George, was executed during the persecution of Western European Christian Catholics in the Ottoman Empire [Martirologio 2004: 856].

The confession of the Christology of the Council of Chalcedon was also a pivotal moment in the case of Gebre Michael, an Ethiopian monk who joined the Catholic Church under the influence of the Italian missionary bishop Justin de Jacobis, whose labors laid the foundation of the Ethiopian Catholic Church. Just like Justin de Yacobis, Gebre Michael entered the Order of the Lazarists; becoming a priest, he zealously participated in the Catholic mission. An Ethiopian ascetic suffered in 1855 from the authorities of his country [Martirologio 2004: 544].

Brothers Francis, Abdel Moti and Raphael Massabki are active laymen of the Maronite Catholic Church who were killed in Damascus during the massacre of Christians committed in 1860 by the Druze with the complicity of the Turkish authorities [Martirologio 2004: 533]. Pope Pius XI canonized Gebre Michael, the brothers Massabka (among the eleven Martyrs of Damascus) in 1926, Komitas Kemurjian (Cosma da Carbonano) in 1929.

Table 3

Latin memories in RVM

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Augustine, Bishop of Hippo | August 28 | Unsigned (black font) |
| Francis of Assisi [Francis of Assisi] | The 4th of October | Unsigned (black font) |

The Russian Orthodox Menologion traditionally included ancient Western saints, in particular the Hieromartyr Irenaeus Lug of Dun [Irenaeus of Lyons], Julian of Kenomanius [Julian Bishop of Le Mans], Ambrose of Mediolan, Martin of Turon [Martin of Tours], Jerome of Stridon, and ancient Roman popes. Keeping these saints in the calendar, the editors of the RVM added the name of the teacher of the Church, Aurelius Augustine. As for Francis of Assisi, who belonged to a different era than Ambrose and Augustine, the King says the following about him in a letter to Dumont:

St. Francis of Assisi was also included, since there is a whole Russian literature about him, because the Franciscan type of holiness and mercy gets along well with the Russian character, because Russians

the Parisians wanted to honor him in some obvious way, and also as an encouragement to the Capuchins, who formed a well-functioning eastern branch [of their order] [Korolevskij 4: 2070].

Let us add that the members of the commission could be directly or indirectly influenced by the living memory of the Russian culture of the Silver Age, especially since the poet Vyacheslav Ivanov (1866–1949), who lived in Rome, was among the closest employees of Russicum. Not a single Western saint became the subject of aesthetic reflection, philosophical contemplation, and poetic inspiration for the people of the Russian Silver Age as often as the Poor Assisi [Avgustin 2002; Samarina 2007; August 2014].

On the contrary, the proposal to include Teresa the Child Jesus (1873–1897) in the RVM was rejected, despite the fact that Russicum had been dedicated to her patronage since its foundation [Simon 2009: 340]. Korolevsky was against the inclusion of Teresa's name in the RVM, he wrote that Saint Teresa Minor "has nothing to do with Russia" [Korolevskij

4: 2070], probably referring to the discrepancy between the unique spirituality of the holy Carmelite and the inner way and style of Russian Orthodoxy.

...

The Roman Liturgical Commission, which prepared the RVM as the only officially permitted chronology for Russian Byzantine Catholics, with a clearly defined boundary of inclusion / exclusion, did not at all consider its work completed and not subject to revision. Since the compilers of the RVM relied on liturgical publications before revolutionary Russia, let us clarify that the memory of the saints in the liturgical books of the Orthodox liturgical books and in the monastic chapter of the Typikon were intended for use in liturgical contexts, on litia, proskomidia, the great dismissal, i.e. in liturgical publications contained the names of only those saints who were supposed to serve on a certain day. The calendars of saints in Russian liturgical books, as well as separately published calendars, were never complete; during the Synodal period they were repeatedly edited and revised [Bulgakov 1913: 718–720; Rudy 2011]. Thus, the state of the sources alone already suggested further refinement of the RVM.

The Russian memories contained in the RVM have been verified by us with the names of saints in the liturgical books of the Russian Orthodox Church. The monthly chapters of the printed Moscow Typicon of 1695 (the edition that completed the process of correcting the church charter in Russia), the Typicon of 1904, the monthly books in the Priestly Prayer Book and in the Missal, printed by the Moscow Synodal

printing house [Tipikon 1695; Typicon 1904; Priestly prayer book 1900; Missal 1901]. We were interested in the signs of the Typicon for Russian liturgical memorabilia, and it turned out that the far from complete coincidence of these signs already in the Synodal editions themselves.

Taking into account the discrepancies in the books of the synodal press, one can nevertheless state the careful attitude of the compilers of the RVM to the signs of the Typicon; the liturgical status of every Russian memory preserved in the RVM almost always exactly corresponds to the same status in synodal liturgical publications. Undoubtedly, the compilers of the *Recensio Vulgata* corpus valued ecclesiastical continuity with the maternal Orthodox tradition. Having finished the review of the *Menologion*, we will try to find out what image of cultural memory, “the face of Holy Russia”, was presented in the RVM text by its compilers.

First of all, we have before us the central figures of the Christianization of Kievan Rus and medieval saints, mostly associated with the region, which is now called Ukrainian-Belarusian. The East Slavic saints of the pre-Mongol era are represented in the RVM quite fully, and when our attention shifts from the Ukrainian-Belarusian lands to the Great Russian ones, in addition to the holy people, miraculous icons of the Mother of God also appear in our field of vision. Based on the frequency of mentioning saints and icons in the RVM, the ancient cities of Novgorod the Great and Rostov are seen as the main spiritual centers of Great Russia. It was there that holiness worthy of veneration flourished. In second place are Smolensk and Moscow, the Volga region (Kazan) and the Russian North are also noted. It is remarkable that the Moscow region is represented by only one saint, although the most important (Sergius of Rado Nezhsky), and all other Moscow realities are the Mother of God, that is, miraculous icons of the Blessed Mary.

The compilers of the RVM, as can be seen from the documents of Cyril Korolevskii, were fully aware of their lack of awareness of the realities of the local religious cultures of Russia with their local mentality traits and reliance on their own shrines. Suffice it to say that in the RVM, it would seem, all the main ranks of holiness are represented, but ... Russian holy fools are completely absent, which is completely surprising, given their popularity among the people. The history of Eastern Slavic Catholic (orthodox) holiness, according to the RVM, ended at the turn of the 1430s and 1440s, only to flare up again during the struggle for the

Union of Brest in the martyrdom of Archbishop Josaphat of Polotsk. However, the era after the refusal of the Muscovite State from the Union of Florence in the RVM does not remain a “blank spot”, but is captured by events that show the invariable patronage of the Mother of God over the people, over the Russian

earth - "the house of the Virgin". The RVM contains thirteen feasts of Russian origin in honor of the Mother of God icons, of which nine celebrate the events of the second half of the 15th–17th centuries. The latest date of the sacred history of Russia in the RVM is a miracle from the Moscow icon of Joy of All Who Sorrow (1688). Undoubtedly, before us is a figurative interpretation of the national past. Shortly after the compilation of the RVM, it was in the Mariological perspective that Pope Pius XII defined Russian piety, addressing the peoples of Russia on July 7, 1952 in the Apostolic Epistle "Sacro vergente anno":

We also know—and on this rests Our hope, and from this We draw great consolation—that you love and venerate with fiery devotion the Most Pure Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, and venerate Her holy icons. [...] We know that there cannot be no hope of salvation where souls with sincere and unquenchable piety venerate the Most Holy Theotokos [Pius XII 1952a: 510; Idem 1952c: 20].

Experts of the Catholic Church accurately recognized the key moment in Russian religiosity: the "presence" of the Mother of God, her patronage throughout the history of the people, moreover, manifested through icons [Tarasov 1995: 53–73; Shevtsova 2010: 352–415]. A similar "presence" of the Blessed Mary, albeit in different cultural forms, is characteristic of Western (Catholic) Christianity. As follows from the liturgical commission's statement of October 21, 1941, quoted above, a kind of tradition design was carried out in the compilation of the RVM. The editors of the RVM have created a well-thought-out system in which the saints are not just harmoniously distributed over the lands and destinies of Russia. Moreover, the Eastern Slavic saints, the ancient saints of the Byzantine calendar, the Latin teachers of the Church, the saints of the Byzantine-Catholic churches of different eras - all are subject to harmonic logic, and harmony serves to organize the whole. We have the right to see in this a reflection of the psychological paradigm of the Russian Catholic apostolate and his message to the future.

Bibliography

Sources

Dolnitsky 1899

Dolnitsky I., *Typik of the Russian Catholic Church*, Lvov, 1899.

Priestly Prayer Book 1900

Priestly prayer book, Moscow, 1900.

——— 1950

Priestly Prayer Book, Rome, 1950.

Liturgikon 1929

LEITOYRGIKON, that is to say, the Missal, contain the Liturgy of the order of the Holy Catholic Eastern Church of the Liturgy of our holy fathers John Chrysostom, Basil the Great and Gregory the Dialogist, Pope of Rome, with all the weekly, daily, festive and common saints services, Lvov, 1929.

——— 1942

Liturgikon this service, Rome, 1942.

Missal 1901

Service book, Moscow, 1901.

——— 1953

Missal, Rome, 1953.

Typicon 1695

The book Typikon, this is the image of the rank of the church, which is also called the Charter, Moscow, 1695.

——— 1904

Typicon, Siest Ustav, Moscow, 1904.

Martirologio 2004

Martirologio Romano: Riformato a norma dei decreti del Concilio Ecumenico Vaticano II e promulgato da Papa Giovanni Paolo II, Roma, 2004.

Literature

Augustine 2002

Augustine (Nikitin), arch., St. Francis of Assisi in Russian culture, *Christianity and Russian Literature*, 4, 2002, 497–534.

Augustine 2014

Augustine (Nikitin), architect, St. Francis of Assisi and Russian Symbolists, *Neva*, 11, 2014, 227–245.

Alekseev 1988

Alekseev L. V., Ignatij Kulchinsky - the first researcher of Belarusian antiquities, B. A. Timoshchuk, ed., *Antiquities of the Slavs and Russia*, Moscow, 1988, 100–105.

Bulgakov 1913

Bulgakov S.V., *Handbook for sacred church ministers. (Collection of information relating mainly to the practical activities of the domestic clergy)*, 3rd ed., Kiev, 1913.

Vasily 1966

Vasily (von Burman), deacon, *Leonid Fedorov: Life and work* (= Publicationes scientificae et litterariae "Studion" monasteriorum studitarum, 3–5), Rome, 1966.

Kozlov-Strutinsky, Parfentiev 2014

Kozlov-Strutinsky S., Parfentiev P., *History of the Catholic Church in Russia*, St. Petersburg, 2014.

Kravetsky, Pletneva 2013

Kravetsky A. G., Pletneva A. A., Formation of the modern appearance of the Service Mines (XVII - early XXI century), E. Potekhina, A. Kravetsky, ed., *Menaia: an example of hymnographic literature and a means of forming the Orthodox worldview*, Olsztyn, 2013, 15–90.

Leonid 1891

Leonid (Kavelin), arch., *Holy Russia, or information about all the saints and ascetics of piety in Russia (until the 18th century), generally or locally revered* (= Monuments of ancient writing and art, 97), St. Petersburg, 1891.

Russian Liturgical Memories in the Slavic Byzantine-Catholic Menologion (Recensio Vulgata) of the Mid-20th Century

Petrovich 2011

Petrovich M., The image of the holiness of the Kiev church in the practice of the first unified historians: on the butt of Specimen Ecclesiae Ruthenicae Ignaty Kulchinsky CSVV, *Naukovi Notes of the National University "Ostrozka Academy". Ser.: Historical Religion*, 5, 2011, 169–181.

Rudy 2011

Rudi T.R., From the history of Russian hagiology at the beginning of the 20th century: edition of the "Faithful Monthly Book of All Russian Saints", *Russian Hagiography: Researches. Materials. Publications*, 2, 2011, 309–318.

Samarina 2007

Samarina M. S., Francis of Assisi in Russian criticism of the 19th–20th centuries, *Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Ser. 9: Philology. Oriental studies. Journalism*, 3/1, 2007, 9–14.

Semenenko-Basin 2017

Semenenko-Basin I. V., *Holiness in Russian Orthodox Culture of the 20th Century: A History of Personification*, Moscow, 2017. Tarasov 1995

Tarasov O. Yu., *Icon and Piety: Essays on Icon Art in Imperial Russia*, Moscow, 1995.

Shevtsova 2010

Shevtsova V., *Orthodoxy in Russia on the eve of 1917*, transl. from English, St. Petersburg, 2010.

Korolevskij, 1–5

Korolevskij C., *Kniga bytija moego (Le livre de ma vie). Mémoires autobiographiques*, 1–5, Texte établi, édité et annoté par GM Croce (= Collectanea Archivi Vaticani, 45), Cité du Vatican, 2007.

Kulczynski 1733

Kulczynski I., *Specimen Ecclesiae Ruthenicae ab origine susceptae fidei ad nostra usque tempora in suis capitibus seu primatibus Russiae cum S. Sede Apostolica Romana*, Romae, 1733.

Martinov 1863

Martinov J., *Annus ecclesiasticus Graeco-Slavicus editus anno millenario sanctorum Cyrilli et Methodii Slavicae gentis apostolorum, seu Commemoratio et breviarium rerum gestarum eorum qui fastis sacris Graecis et Slavicis illati sunt*, Bruxellis, 1863.

Papebrochius 1680

[Papebrochius D.], *Ephemerides Graecorum et Moscorum, horum figuratae, istorum metricae, Latine redditae et observationibus variis illustratae*, Henschenius G., Papebrochius D., eds., *Acta sanctorum Maii, collecta, digesta, illustrata*, 1, Antverpiae, 1680, i–lxxii.

Petrowycz 2005

Petrowycz M., Bringing Back the Saints: The Contribution of the Roman Edition of the Ruthenian Liturgical Books (Recensio Ruthena, 1940–1952) to the Commemoration of Slavic Saints in the Ukrainian Catholic Church, (A dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Theology [and Doctor of Theology] to the Faculty of Theology, Saint Paul University, Ottawa, Canada, 2005).

Petrowycz 2008

Petrowycz M., The Recensio Ruthena Slavic Sanctoral Reform: Principles, Procedures, Results, Perspectives, *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata*, 3/5, 2008, 283–298.

Pius XI 1935

Pius XI, Motu proprio "De Commissione pro Russia deque liturgicis ritus slavici libris edendis", *Acta Apostolicae Sedis: commentarium officiale*, 27, 1935, 65–67.

Pius XII 1952a

Pius XII, Epistula apostolica "Ad universos Russiae populos", *Acta Apostolicae Sedis: commentarium officiale*, 44, 1952, 505-511.

——— 1952b

Our Holiness Father Pius XII by the Divine Providence of the Pope of Rome Apostolic Epistle to all the peoples of Russia, Rome, 1952.

Simon 2009

Simon C., *Pro Russia: The Russicum and the Catholic Work for Russia* (= *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 283), Rome, 2009.

References

Alekseev LV, Ignatii Kul'chinskii - pervyi issledovatel' belorusskikh drevnostei, BA Timo shchuk, ed., *Drevnosti slavian i Rusi*, Moscow, 1988, 100–105.

Avgustin (Nikitin), arch., Sv. Frantsisk Assizskii v russskoi kul'čtury", *Khristianstvo i russkaia literatura*, 4, 2002, 497–534.

Avgustin (Nikitin), arch., Sv. Frantisk Assizskii i russkie simvolisty, *Neva*, 11, 2014, 227–245.

Vasilii (fon Burman), diakon, *Leonid Fedorov: Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' (= Publicationes scientificae et litterariae "Studion" monasteriorum studitarum*, 3–5), Rome, 1966.

Korolevskij C., *Kniga bytija moego (Le livre de ma vie). Mémoires autobiographiques*, 1–5, Texte établi, édité et annoté par GM Croce (= *Collectanea Archivi Vaticani*, 45), Cité du Vatican, 2007.

Kozlov-Strutinskii S., *Parfent'ev P., Istorii Katolicheskoi Tserkvi v Rossii*, St. Petersburg, 2014.

Kravecckij AG, Pletneva AA, Stanovlenie sovre mennogo oblika Sluzhebnykh Minei (XVII—nach.XXI century), E. Potekhina, A. Kravetskii, ed., *Minei: obrazets gimnograficheskoi literatury i sredstvo formirovaniia mi rovozzreniia pravoslavnykh*, Olsztyn, 2013, 15– 90.

Petrowycz M., *Obraz sviatosti Kijv'sykoj tserkvi v pratsiakh pershikh nyjnykh ystorikyv: na prikladj*

Specimen Ecclesiae Ruthenicae ygnatija Kul'ychin s'ykogo ChSVV, Naukovy' zapiski Natsyonal'nogo un'y versitetu "Ostroz'ka akademija". Ser.: ystorichne rely g'yeznavstvo, 5, 2011, 169–181.

Petrowycz M., The Recensio Ruthena Slavic Sanctoral Reform: Principles, Procedures, Results, Perspectives, *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grotta ferrata*, 3/5, 2008, 283–298.

Rudi TR, Iz istorii russkoi agiologii nachala XX v.: izdanie "Vernogo Mesiatseslova vsekhn rus skikh sviatykh", *Russkaia agiografiia: Issledovaniia. material. Publikatsii*, 2, 2011, 309–318.

Samarina MS, Frantsisk Assizskii v russskoi kritike XIX–XX vv., *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Language and Literature*, 3/1, 2007, 9–14.

Simon C., *Pro Russia: The Russicum and the Catholic Work for Russia* (= *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 283), Rome, 2009.

Semenenko-Basin IV, *Sviatost' v russskoi pravo slavnoi kul'čtury XX century: istorii personifikatsii*, Moscow, 2017.

Shevtsova V., *Russian Orthodoxy on the Eve of Revolution*, St. Petersburg, 2010.

Tarasov O. lu., *Ikona i blagochestie: Ocherki ikon nogo dela v imperatorskoi Rossii*, Moscow, 1995.

Ilya Viktorovich Semenenko-Basin, Doctor of Historical Sciences, independent researcher Moscow

Russia / Russia

vivere.est@gmail.com

Stefano Caprio, Prof., Dr. Scienze Ecclesiastiche Orientali
Pontificio Istituto Orientale

00185, Roma, Piazza di S. Maria Maggiore 7

Italy / Italy

scaprio@orientale.it

November 15, 2020