

Maksym Yaremenko

Religious Identification Through the Calendar. Kyivan and Moscow Great Feasts in the Late 18th Century

The creation and development of the synodal church in 18th-century Russia required the different religious cultures and traditions that still existed in the various regions of the Empire to be unified. Unifying the church calendars was considered an important step towards integrating the Synodal church. The use of identical Menologies was meant to ensure the respect of Orthodox accuracy and to become a firm basis for the formation of equal religious practices.

This paper aims to examine and compare the lists of the greatest feasts of Kyivan and Moscow Menologies of the late 18th century. I will focus on the end of the 18th century for two main reasons: first, it was almost 80 years since the Synod had begun to exert pressure on the Kyivan elites to unify their editions of church books with the Muscovite editions: it is interesting to analyze how far the Russian authorities succeeded in implementing their orders, thereby unifying the Ukrainian and Russian Churches. Second, by the end of the 18th century, the Cave Monastery, where the printing house operated, had already been placed under the control of the Kyivan Metropolitan. At the same time, being a stavropigial monastery, it was subordinate only to the Synod, and was thus an autonomous 'player' in ecclesiastical policy with respect to the Metropolia. Present scholarship, therefore, faces one relevant question: do the specificities of the Cave Monastery publications reflect the ideas of the monastery or those of the Kyivan Metropolia elites? In actual fact, by the end of the 18th century, these questions were no longer thought to be important. Hence, I will focus here on the church calendars published as a supplement to the book *Akafisty i kanony* (Kyiv 1798) and the last Eighteenth century Moscow edition of the *Služebnik* (1795). By analyzing the Calendars of that decade, we can describe the situation at the very end of the century. At the same time, for a better understanding of how those Calendars evolved and changed, we sometimes need to take their earlier editions into consideration too. More specifically, for such a comparative diachronic approach, I will consider the Kyivan calendar printed in 1681, when the Kyivan Metropolia was not yet under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate.

Both Menologies mentioned above (1798 and 1795) include more than 600 feasts: the Kyivan text has 615 items, the Moscow Calendar has 614 items¹. A comparison between

¹ Here and further, for all general observations on Calendars, I will refer to: АПК: 307-326v and SL95: 180-243v. For other specific cases I will indicate the year of edition and/or the exact page.

the Ukrainian and the Russian church calendars indicates great similarity in the list of holy days, though there is no total identity. For example, the Kyivan church calendar involved a broader selection of Ukrainian saints belonging to the Kyiv Cave Monastery. Some of the differences had been approved by the Synod but others may have appeared in Kyiv without permission. So, still in 1767, on behalf of the Printing House, the Cave Monastery asked for the Synod's permission for the names of the Monastery's saints to be included in the Calendar². On the other hand, for example, while the Kyivan monks did not include the Dormition of the saint prince Fedor Jaroslavič (5 June), which was included in the Muscovite calendar³, they did include 14 September as the day of the Dormition of St. John Chrysostomos, which was ignored by the Russian calendar⁴. An explanation for the specificity of the latter case may be found in the fact that on September 14 another big feast, the Elevation of the Holy Cross, was foreseen. Hence, to avoid the overlapping of two non-ordinary feasts, the Moscow church calendar chose the 13 of November only for remembering the day of Chrysostomos' death. The Kyivan church celebrated the Dormition of Chrysostomos both the 14 September and the 13 November.

There is no doubt that for the Kyivan ecclesiastical elite these differences helped underline their importance and special status within the Synodal church. A simple calculation shows only 15 different feasts, which represent about 2.6% of the total number of positions in the calendar. Much more eloquent is the examination of the degree of solemnity of the same holy days in the Kyivan and resp. Moscow Menologies. Such differences illustrate significant contrasts in the emphasis put on certain important solemnities.

There were various ways of indicating the degree of solemnity of the feasts. In the Kyivan Calendars the most frequently used marks were red crosses (with or without a red circle around them) and black or red print. The ringed red cross and red font indicated the greatest church holiday. The 1790 Moscow Menologies (including the *Služebnik* that we are examining here) used only red, black, or red and black print combined. The key feasts were indicated by red letters for the entire entry. Generally, church holidays can be divided into three groups: ordinary feasts, feasts with a medium level of solemnity and the great feasts.

In 1798 the Kyivan calendar counted 21 most festive holidays while the 1795 Moscow calendar had 18 positions. There was only one feast that enjoyed the greatest solemnity in both Ukrainian and Russian Menologies: the day of St. George the Victorious (see TABLE 1). The degree of solemnity of all other religious holidays was different and sometimes varied radically in the two religious centers.

Before investigating the differences between the two calendars in question and commenting the possible significance of such differences, we should remember that misprints are not infrequent in menologies. Such cases occurred first of all when the color of a certain holiday changed from red to black or black to red. For instance, if one feast had to be

² For more details see: Jaremenko 2017: 44.

³ АiК: 322, and SL95: 228v.

⁴ АiК: 308; SL95: 184v-185v.

Table 1. The most solemn feasts in Kyivan and Moscow calendars
(The gray color indicates the ordinary feasts in the Kyivan calendar. All dates follow the Julian calendar)

	KYIVAN MENOLOGION OF 1798	MOSCOW MENOLOGION OF 1795
	<i>Different Items</i>	
1	Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (September 8)	St. martyrs prince Mychael of Chernihiv and his boyar Theodor Day (September 20)
2	Elevation of the Holy Cross (September 14)	Leavetaking of the Elevation of the Holy Cross (September 21)
3	Death of Apostle and Evangelist John (September 26)	St. Demetrius of Rostov Day (September 21)
4	Protection of the Theotokos (October 1)	St. Apostle Luke the Evangelist (October 18)
5	St. John Chrysostom Day (November 13)	St. great martyr Demetrius Day (October 26)
6	The Entry of the Most Holy Theotokos into the Temple (November 21)	Remembrance of the extensive and terrible earthquake in Constantinople (October 26)
7	St. Sabbas the Sanctified Day (December 5)	St. Philip the Apostle Day (November 15)
8	St. Nikolaos of Myra Day (December 6)	St. Aleksandr Nevskij Day (November 23)
9	The Nativity of Christ (December 25)	St. Nilus of Stolben Island Day (December 7)
10	The Circumcision of Christ (January 1)	The Conception of St. Anne (December 9)
11	Epiphany (January 6)	Veneration of the Precious Chains of Apostle Peter (January 16)
12	Presentation of Our Lord Jesus (February 2)	St. Metropolitan Alexis the Wonderworker "of all Russia" (February 12)
13	Annunciation of the Mother of God (March 25)	Appearance of the Mother of God Icon in Kazan' (July 8)
14	St. John the Evangelist Day (May 8)	St. Anthony of Kyiv Caves Day (July 10)
15	The Nativity of St. John the Baptist (June 24)	Deposition of the Holy Robe of the Lord in Moscow (July 10)
16	St. Apostles Peter and Paul Day (June 29)	Commemoration of the Holy Fathers of the Six Ecumenical Councils (July 16)
17	Transfiguration of the Savior (August 6)	Translation of the Relics of St. Metropolitan of Kyiv and Moscow Peter the Wonderworker (August 24)
18	Assumption (August 15)	
19	Translation of the Image Not-Made-By-Hands of our Lord from Edessa to Constantinople (August 16)	
20	Beheading of St. John the Forerunner (August 29)	
	<i>Common Item</i>	
1	St. George the Victorious Day (April 23)	

printed with red ink while the other was to be black, the printers were not always keen to change the color. It is difficult to evaluate the exact number of such errors, but there is no reason to doubt that their number was considerable. Evidence for this conclusion is given by my comparison of several calendars printed in 10 years in the same printing house. Indeed, if it is not clear whether a calendar contains a red or black ink error, a comparison with other calendars printed in the same printing house in the years just before or after the date of the calendar presenting possible errors should provide a reliable answer. If the use of black or red is similar in various versions of the calendar of earlier or subsequent years, the use of the colors may be considered correct (remember that any new edition of a book had to be accurately examined by specialists). In the Muscovite calendar of 1795 there is an indisputable error in the date of the feast of the Leavetaking of the Elevation of the Holy Cross, which is marked as a 'solemn' festivity. This error is proven by the fact that the 1795 Muscovite calendar evaluates the Elevation of the Holy Cross as a 'medium' feast, and the 1793 and 1794 calendars even consider it simply as an 'ordinary feast'.⁵ Given the lower status of the feast of the Elevation of the Holy Cross itself, the Leavetaking of that feast cannot be considered much higher, up to 'solemn', with respect to the principal holy day itself.

Another example of a possible misprint in the 1795 Moscow calendar concerns the Nativity of Christ. As shown by the table above, in the 1795 Muscovite calendar this key Christian feast day was not included among the most important holidays of the Russian church. In other Moscow menologies of the 1790s the indicator of the solemnity of the day of Christ's birth could vary. To be sure, in many cases we can have no absolute certainty about an error in the ink used. For example, in the Muscovite Calendar included in the Liturgical Menologion of 1754 (which belongs to another type), the Nativity of Christ was marked as a medium feast (the first letter was black, the following letters were red), while St. Aleksandr Nevskij's day was specified as the greatest feast (the whole name of the feast was printed in red).⁶

However, my experience of reading 18th century menologies suggests that the cases of misprints are not so frequent as to prevent the correct investigation of the subject we are considering here. Appropriate interpretations of the differences between the Menologies of 1798 and 1795 may bring interesting and reliable results.

The first, most evident differences between the Kyivan and the Muscovite Menologies may be as follows: the most venerable holidays of the Ukrainian church are the Nativity and Circumcision of Christ, Epiphany, the Presentation of Our Lord Jesus, the Transfiguration of the Savior, the Translation of the Image Not-Made-By-Hands of our Lord Jesus Christ from Edessa to Constantinople, the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin⁷, the Protection of Our Most Holy Lady Theotokos, the Entry into the Temple of the Most

⁵ Cf. SL93: 66v and SL94: 181.

⁶ MMN: 257 and MMD: 285.

⁷ The solemnity level of Nativity of Mary Day modified in the Moscow calendars of 1790s. For example, it was marked as highest in the edition of 1793 (SL93: 64).

Holy Theotokos, the Annunciation, the Assumption, the Elevation of the Holy Cross, the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, the Death of Apostle and Evangelist John, the days of St. John Chrysostom, St. Sabbas the Sanctified, St. Nikolaos of Myra, St. John the Evangelist, St. Apostles Peter and Paul, the Beheading of St. John the Forerunner. All these feasts are specified as medium in the Russian printed presentation. The only exception is the day of St. George the Victorious, rated most solemn in both the Ukrainian and Muscovite Menologies, as mentioned above.

On the other hand, the 18 great feasts of the 1795 Moscow Menologion were not even considered as medium for the Cave Monastery printed Calendar. The days of St. Michael of Černihiv and his boyar Theodor, the Leavetaking of the Elevation of the Holy Cross, the Remembrance of the extensive and terrible earthquake in Constantinople, the days of St. Aleksandr Nevskij and St. Nilus of Stolben Island, the Conception of St. Anne, the Veneration of the Precious Chains of Apostle Peter, the Commemoration of the Holy Fathers of the Six Ecumenical Councils, the Translation of the Relics of St. metropolitan Peter the Wonderworker (which were especially venerated in Russia) were given status of lowest-ranking church holidays in Kyiv. The other most important feasts of the Russian church indicated in the table above were considered only medium according to the Calendar of the Kyivan Cave Monastery.

An interesting case of a 'hierarchical' shift in the Kyivan tradition is offered by the day of the Conception of St. Anne, whose feast was rated medium solemnity at the end of the 17th century while it had become an ordinary feast by the end of the 18th century. As Natalia Jakovenko put it in her recent book on Joanykij Galjatovs'kyj's (Jakovenko 2017: 182-183), veneration of the Conception of St. Anne and the Nativity of Mary were strictly connected with the recognition of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Does this mean that the acceptance of the Immaculate Conception as a specific feature of Kyivan post-Mohylian religious thought was eliminated by the Synodal unification efforts of the 18th century? The answer is not so easy as it may seem because Galjatovs'kyj's acceptance of the Immaculate Conception may not signify a general agreement of other Kyivan church hierarchs and intellectuals. All the more so that even the 1681 Kyivan Menologion differentiated the two feasts of St. Anne and of the Virgin Mary, considering the birth of the Virgin as a great feast, but rating the feast of the Conception of St. Anne only a medium one⁸. A century later the latter was 'reduced' to an ordinary feast, but we should not forget that, even before that, it was not considered a great feast.

What did the different solemnity of the same feasts mean to Ukrainian believers? First of all it is important to emphasize that most Moscow greatest church holidays had a significant ideological component. As Aleksandr Chorošev (1986: 172) put it, already in the 16th century the cult of the martyrs Michael and Theodor of Černihiv "were the expression of Moscow's policy of claiming supremacy over the Southern Rus' lands that had been incorporated into the Grand Duchy of Lithuania" and helped the Moscow Metropolia to

⁸ Cf. the *sobornik* added to Euchologion in EIT [unnumbered pages, here 432v and 436r].

assert its own exceptional mission to protect the Orthodox Ukrainians and Belarusians living in those regions. At the same time, St. Michael became the symbol of the defense of the Christian Muscovite Tsardom (Pljuchanova 1995: 78-79).

St. Aleksandr Nevskij's Day was only considered an ordinary feast in Kyiv. In Moscow, however, where it had clear ideological significance, it was considered one of the greatest feasts. Until the early 18th century Aleksandr Nevskij was regarded as a heavenly protector of the great princes of Moscow (both Rurikids and Romanovs). During Peter's rule the veneration of this Saint received special emphasis. The city of Saint-Petersburg itself and the new monastery dedicated to Aleksandr became the centers of Nevskij's cult. As a result, the Saint was considered the third heavenly protector of the imperial capital after St. Peter and St. Paul. The new monastic residence was founded in 1710 on the supposed place of the battle of the Neva and Aleksandr Menšikov, Nevskij's namesake and Peter's close associate, was a trustee in the monastery's growth. St. Aleksandr's relics were carried from Vladimir to Petersburg on 30 August in 1723, on the anniversary of the treaty of Nystad, which ratified the Russian state's victory over the Swedes. The date of the most solemn annual commemoration of the Saint shifted from November 23 (as it was in the previous church calendar) to August 30. The iconographic representation of Aleksandr was modified as well. Earlier he was depicted as an ascetic monk and his figure as a prince-warrior rarely appeared in the illustrations to Moscow chronicles or on the icons of Kremlin churches⁹. Places where Aleksandr was presented as a member of the ruling dynasty were generally closed, not accessible to the general public. From the beginning of the 18th century this Saint was generally represented as a heavenly warrior and a lay prince, not as a monk. The same image of Nevskij was given in the new version of his *Life* and in liturgical texts connected to his commemoration on 30 August. More specifically, the Saint was considered a fighter for the liberation of Russia from its eternal enemies, the Swedes. So, Aleksandr Nevskij became an important figure in support of the Russian claim to possession of the Baltic regions, a key religious symbol in the imperial ideology of the 18th century, the patron of the imperial household and "a kind of state icon" (Isoaho 2006: 363-374). The new honorific decoration founded in 1725 was also named after Aleksandr Nevskij: it became one of the highest imperial awards. The Aleksandr Nevskij award had several insignias in the late 18th century. One of the mottos adopted and written in golden letters read "for the labors and the fatherland"¹⁰.

Already in the second half of the 1720s efforts were made to correct the above-mentioned innovations of the veneration of Aleksandr. On 18 September 1727 churches were instructed to withdraw the newly printed order of service to St. Aleksandr and to reintroduce the previous order in accordance with the text of the Menology (PSPR VI: 93). The changes were most probably connected with the difficulties experienced by Aleksandr Menšikov after Peter's death. The man who had prepared the new order of Nevskij's cult in Petersburg was

⁹ However, one of the icon-painting instructions of 1667 prescribed to depict Nevskij like St. George, not as a monk (Isoaho 2006: 368).

¹⁰ "За труды и отечество" (Brokgauz, Efron 1890: 383).

arrested. However the new practices of veneration to Saint Aleksandr were reintroduced soon after, with the instruction to celebrate the feast each year on 30 August, throughout the Empire: this instruction was certainly given in connection with the beginning of Anna Ioannovna's rule, in August-September 1730, although by that time the need had arisen to wait until the celebration of the following year in order to receive the special decree for permission to use the service books which had been withdrawn (PSPR VI: 152-153, 179-180).

Another feast which had the status of 'ordinary' for the Kyivan church, but was considered 'great' for the Muscovite calendars and had a more than purely religious meaning was the day of the Translation of the Relics of metropolitan Peter the Wonderworker. Bishop Peter (1308-1326) had already played an important role in the ideology of previous centuries when the arch-see of the Metropolia was moved from Vladimir to Moscow. As is well known, this action sanctioned the leading role of the principality of Moscow among the other Russian principalities (Isoaho 2006: 367). The veneration of Peter, which since the very beginning was planned as 'all-Russian', was intended to spread all over the former Rus' lands, in other words – among the Orthodox believers in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. The widely accepted veneration of St. Peter contributed considerably to making Moscow "the all-Russian center of his cult" (Chorošev 1986: 96-98).

Metropolitan Alexis also fostered the strengthening and rising of Moscow as the main political and religious center in opposition to the other Russian centers and to the holy places of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania as well. St. Alexis morphed into one of the symbols for Moscow state and church and became a protector of the ruling dynasty from the 16th century (Turilov 2006, I: 637-646).

The icon of the Mother of God of Kazan' was a sacred object for the Romanovs (Chorošev 1986: 181): already at the beginning of the 17th century the first tsar of the dynasty attached state significance to the veneration of this icon. The feast days on 8 July and 22 October were celebrated with large processions, just like the rite of the Icon of the Virgin of Vladimir¹¹. The all-Russian worship of the two dates mentioned above had been established since the middle of the 17th century. In the next century copies of the Icon of the Virgin of Kazan' were involved in various important all-imperial events (for example, the picture of the Theotokos in Kaplunovka was used in the Poltava battle); the most significant state occasions were celebrated on the days of these feasts. Thus, the imperial coronation of Peter I in autumn 1721 was celebrated on the day of the Icon of Kazan'. Most solemnities took place in the church devoted to the Kazan' Virgin in Petersburg. The date of October 22 was also included in the list of official state holidays prepared in 1798 (Čugreeva 2013: 145-146).

As you may have gathered from our observations, the ideological messages that Calendars were supposed to spread all over the Russian state and church did not really reach

¹¹ The Virgin of Vladimir' became the symbol of the Russian state, its feast manifested Moscow's claims to be equal to Constantinople and to change Tsargrad (about the Virgin of Vladimir as a palladium of Muscovy see Pljuchanova: 37-44).

Ukrainian Orthodox believers in the 18th century. Special attention should be given not only to the feasts with clear ideological background which did not trespass the status of 'ordinary' in Kyiv, in contrast with the Moscow calendar: as indicated by the table above, a not insignificant part of holy days which were considered 'most solemn' solely in the Russian Menologion, had not been accepted as such in the Kyivan Eparchy even by the end of the 18th century. To this group belongs the Deposition of the Holy Robe of the Lord in Moscow. A special case is represented by St. Nilus of Stolben Island, whose veneration was unknown in the Kyivan Metropolia from the end of the 17th to the mid 18th centuries, as indicated by the Kyivan Menologies of 1681 and 1741¹². This is easy to explain by the fact that the centralized propaganda of the cult of St. Nilus was only initiated around the second half of the 18th century. St. Nilus' relics had been uncovered in 1667 and the honoring of the saint was fixed for 27 May (invention of the relics) and 7 December (death) following the indications of the Tsar and with the blessing of the Metropolitan of Novgorod. However, until 1756 these feasts were celebrated according to liturgical manuscripts only in the Nilus monastery founded by the saint, while his name was excluded both from the printed Menologies and Martyrologies (*Četii-Minei*) and in printed calendars. In 1756 the monks of the Nilus *pustyn'* requested permission to print the manuscript of the services to the saint in the Menologion, his life from the *Prolog* into the Martyrology and his name in the church calendar. On 15 May 1756 the Synod decided to accept all these requests after verification of the texts, and grammatical and orthographical editing of the service (PSPR VI: 208-209).

A comparison of the solemnity levels of church-wide Orthodox holy days in Moscow and Kyivan calendars provides additional arguments for pinpointing certain differences between the Russian and the Ukrainian religious cultures. The feast of the Translation of the Image Not-Made-By-Hands of our Lord Jesus Christ from Edessa to Constantinople, which was considered solemn for the Kyivan Menologion, needed to be promoted among Russian believers. The State authorities tried to enforce the importance of this date. The emperor's decree of July 1742 (PSPR I: 157) made it illegal to have people working for state-owned bodies on that day (this indicates that people worked on this feast day). However by the end of the 18th century, the Moscow church calendar suggests that the day of the Translation of the Image Not-Made-By-Hands of our Lord Jesus Christ from Edessa to Constantinople had not become one of the biggest feasts.

A good marker showing the special features of Ukrainian religious culture is the calendar remembering of the Day of the Apostle and Evangelist John on September 26. This feast was indicated as 'medium' in Kyiv in 1680, but was granted the status of 'greatest solemnity' a century later. It is interesting that the Day of John the Evangelist on 26 September, as we may see in the Table above, was not considered a major feast day in Russia during the Eighteenth century. Nor was this feast always included in calendars printed for every year (this kind of calendar gave information not only about fixed but also moveable church holidays). So, in November 1744, the Synod issued a special decree for including the 26

¹² ASK: 325V.

September feast of St John (by the way, the 8 November feast of St. Michael the Taxiarch as well) into the 1745 calendar, which was to be printed under the control of the Synodal Bureau¹³. As far as Kyiv is concerned, both feasts of John the Evangelist were celebrated in September and May with equal importance and the rank of the May feast even increased from 'medium' to 'highest' from the end of the 17th to the end of the 18th centuries. What was behind this increasing importance of St. John's feast days? Did it have anything to do with the hetmanate of Ivan (John) Mazepa? There is evidence that the preachers of that time used St. John's Days as an opportunity to praise and glorify the hetman. While the solemnity level of St. John the Theologian's feast rose in Kyiv, the Nativity of St. John the Baptist Day constantly remained on the top register. On the other hand, it is true that since the beginning of its function, the Holy Synod obliged believers in all the Russian eparchies to attend the liturgies when that feast took place¹⁴.

Our analysis of the Calendars taken into consideration leads us to conclude that by the end of the 18th century special Russian feasts had been integrated into the Kyivan printed Menologies. It also appears that in general the positions of feasts in the lists given by Moscow and Kyivan Menologies were quite similar. However, our comparison of the solemnity levels shows that specific Russian and part of the all-Orthodox church days did not have the same significance or status in Moscow and Kyiv.

One interesting question remains unanswered: who or which institution took the initiative in Kyiv to decide that some feasts were to be considered 'solemn', while others would remain 'medium' or 'ordinary'?¹⁵ We may take for granted that the editing and printing practice of that time foresaw the cooperation of several people. Some monks dealt with the composition of the book, others examined the text and the whole Spiritual Council of the Cave Monastery finally granted authorization for publication. Since 1786 the monastery had been under the control of the Metropolitan. This authorizes us to state that calendars were an intellectual product of the whole of the Kyivan ecclesiastic elite. Be it as it may, it remains quite clear that the Ukrainian and the Russian religious cultures were not identical even after decades of Synodal unification attempts.

It is possible that other standardized liturgical books or some special decree obliged the Kyivan churchmen to commemorate one or another Russian feast with high-level solemnity. For example, there is ample proof of the ceremonial celebration of the Day of Poltava victory which also was included in church calendars. We also know that the failure to celebrate liturgical services for feasts foreseen by all-Russian orders and rules implied the risk of paying fines and sometimes even to be blamed for political unreliability. However, the short church calendars that we analyzed made us realize which the actual attitude of the Kyivan church elites towards a specific holiday was: we never found evidence of

¹³ PSPR II: 246.

¹⁴ PSPR II: 443.

¹⁵ We know, for example, that the Metropolitan or a person appointed by him checked the Services and Lives of saints of the Cave Monastery before printing in 1762(PSPR I: 408).

any punishments or even accusation for incorrect marking of the level of calendar feasts solemnity in calendars published in the Kyivan typography. Kyivan high ranking churchmen probably agreed (or were obliged) to participate in specific ceremonial services, but they did not accept that feast as really great. What about the laic believers? We don't know much about so called 'popular religion'. However, also in these layers of society we have examples from the 19th century showing the distance between prescribed norms and everyday practices. The (anonymous) author of a short statement about a ceremony held on 8 July in Kyiv in the 19th century (the year is not indicated) specified which group of people engaged in the celebrations of this date which was considered as really great: "the 8 July, Day of the Appearance of the icon of the Mother of God in Kazan' in 1579, is celebrated predominantly among simple people, mainly Great Russians" (SK: 13). Moreover, the author of the statement underlined that this feast was intended for the members of workmen's cooperative associations consisting of Russian participants, that it was known rather as 'sredolet' (mid-summer) and that the participants in the ceremony had even forgotten its religious sense. "The holiday has become a kind of worker's party – the author comments – and "many workers practiced it not as a one-day celebration, but as a three- or four-day feast with uncontrollable drunkenness, [because they wasted] the money they had earned in the previous six months or had received on account for the next six months" (SK: 13). It is important to emphasize that this was a time when (according to historians) the icon of the Kazan' Mother of God became the sacral national symbol¹⁶.

Abbreviations

ASK:	<i>Akafisty s kanony</i> , Kyjiv 1741.
AiK:	<i>Akafisty i kanony</i> , Kyjiv 1798.
EiT:	<i>Evchologion ili Trebnik</i> , Kyjiv 1681.
MMN:	<i>Minča, mesjac noemvrii</i> , Moskva 1754.
MMD:	<i>Minča, mesjac dekemvrii</i> , Moskva 1754.
PSPR I:	S.P. Grigorovskij (red.), <i>Polnoe sobranie postanovlenij i rasporjaženij po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedanija Rossiiskoj imperii</i> , I, Sankt-Peterburg 1910.
PSPR II:	A.A. Zav'jalov (red.), <i>Polnoe sobranie postanovlenij i rasporjaženij po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedanija Rossiiskoj imperii</i> , II, Sankt-Peterburg 1907.

¹⁶ About the Kazan' Mother of God and the invocation of her protection in various kinds of liturgical texts and sermons of the 19th and early 20th centuries, and about the significance of the icon as an all-Russian national symbol cfr. Shevtsov 2007: 66-84.

- PSPR VI: M.I. Gorčakov, N.I. Grigorovič (red.), *Polnoe sobranie postanovlenij i rasporjaženij po vedomstvu pravoslavnogo ispovedanija Rossijskoj imperii*, VI, Sankt-Peterburg 1889.
- SL93: *Služebnik*, Moskva 1793.
- SL94: *Služebnik*, Moskva 1794.
- SL95: *Služebnik*, Moskva 1795.
- SK: *Sredolet*, "Kievskie eparchialnye vedomosti", XXIX, 1880, p. 13.

Literature

- Brokgauz, Efron 1890: F.A. Brokgauz, I.A. Efron, *Ėnciklopedičeskij slovar'*, Sankt-Peterburg 1890.
- Chorošev 1986: A. Chorošev, *Političeskaja istorija ruskoj kanonizacii (XI-XVI vv.)*, Moskva 1986.
- Čugreeva 2013: N. Čugreeva, *Kazanskaja ikona Bogomateri i dinastija Romanovyč*, "Voprosy istorii", 2013, 9, pp. 144-148.
- Isoaho 2006: M. Isoaho, *The Image of Aleksandr Nevskiy in Medieval Russia. Warrior and Saint*, Leiden-Boston 2006.
- Jakovenko 2017: N. Jakovenko, *U pošukach Novoho neba: Žyttja i teksty Joanykija Galjatorvs'koho*, Kyjiv 2017.
- Jaremenko 2017: M. Jaremenko, *Pered vyklykamy unifikaciji ta dyscyplinuvannja: Kyjiv'ska pravoslavna mytropolija u XVIII stolitti*, L'viv 2017.
- Pljuchanova 1995: M. Pljuchanova, *Sjužety i simvolj Moskovskogo carstva*, Sankt-Peterburg 1995.
- Shevtsov 2007: V. Shevtsov, *Scripting the Gaze: Liturgy, Homilies, and the Kazan Icon of the Mother of God in Late Imperial Russia* in: M.D. Steinberg, H.J. Coleman (eds.), *Sacred Stories: Religion and Spirituality in Modern Russia*, Bloomington (IN) 2007.
- Turilov 2000: A. Turilov, *Aleksij*, in: *Pravoslavnaja Ėncyklopedija*, I, Moskva 2000, pp. 637-646.

Abstract

Maksym Yaremenko

Religious Identification Through the Calendar: Kyivan and Moscow Great Feasts in the Late 18th Century

The author analyzes various liturgical short calendars printed in Moscow and Kyiv in the 18th century. Generally, by the end of the century, the efforts of the Holy Synod succeeded in unifying Orthodox doctrine and celebrations in all the regions of the Russian Empire. In this article the author specifically focuses on the level of solemnity of some non-mobile feasts. The analysis of two Calendars printed respectively in Moscow in 1795 and in Kyiv in 1798 shows that the level of solemnity of the feasts of some saints or icons in several cases diverged in Kyiv and Moscow. This indicates that there were still differences between the ecclesiastical practice of the Russian Church and the Kyivan Metropolia. The paper suggests the historical, political and cultural roots of such differences.

Keywords

Religious Identity and Culture; Russian Empire; Kyivan Metropolitanate.