

Monica WHITE

(Nottingham, Department of Russian and Slavonic Studies,
University of Nottingham)

monica.white@nottingham.ac.uk

THE ‘GRAVE COVERING’ OF ST DEMETRIOS BETWEEN BYZANTIUM AND RUS¹

Key words: Vsevolod Iurevich, Manuel Komnenos, St Demetrios, relics, reliquaries, grave covering/slab, hagiography

Abstract: Much scholarly attention has focused on the role of St Demetrios in the maintenance of the civic identity and cultural independence of Thessalonika, the Byzantine Empire’s second city. Yet Thessalonika did not always win this struggle with Constantinople. In the mid-twelfth century, the emperor Manuel Komnenos launched an aggressive campaign to transplant Demetrios’ cult to the capital by re-positioning an item described as the saint’s ‘grave covering’. This relic, with its miraculous oil-exuding properties, became a new focus for the veneration of Demetrios beyond the control of the Thessalonian church authorities. It also exerted a profound influence on the Rus prince Vsevolod Iurevich, who spent a number of years in exile in Byzantium in the 1160s. After returning to Rus, Vsevolod imported a similar relic to adorn the city of Vladimir, demonstrating both his understanding of contemporary developments in Demetrios’ cult and his desire, like that of Manuel, to transplant its most noteworthy features to his own capital.

Vsevolod Iurevich (1154-1212), commonly known by his epithet ‘Big Nest’, is one of the most remarkable yet under-studied princes of pre-Mongol Rus. As the senior member of the princely clan in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, he presided over a period of economic and cultural expansion in his north-eastern patrimony centred in the city of Vladimir. Yet his achievements, including the initiation of a number of religious innovations, have tended to be overlooked by historians, who have traditionally described the late pre-Mongol era in simplistic terms as one of ‘feudal disintegration’ and cultural stagnation. Although recent studies have re-evaluated this period, showing the general continuity of culture and politics with early Kievan times, the reign of Vsevolod has not received significant scholarly attention.² The present study will attempt to

¹ I am grateful for the generous help of two colleagues, Patricia Boulhosa and Scott Ashley, who assisted with a number of questions about Old Norse authors and texts. I would also like to thank Fjodor Uspenskij for translating the summary into Russian.

² The ‘feudal disintegration’ model is discussed and criticised by Martin 2007: 100-05; Franklin and Shepard 1996: 365-71.

broaden understanding of the prince's reign and policies by assessing one of the acts for which he was best known to contemporaries: the translation of the 'grave slab' (доска гробная) of St Demetrios from Thessalonika to his new cathedral in Vladimir. This act will be placed in the context of pan-Orthodox religious culture in the second half of the twelfth century, and comparative analysis will shed light on both Vsevolod's personal religious concerns and his international outlook and connections, which ensured the central position of north-east Rus in the cultural developments of the day.

As the son of Iurii Dolgorukii (1090s-57) and half-brother of Andrei Bogoliubskii (c. 1111-74), Vsevolod has tended to be overshadowed by his relatives, who ushered in a number of important changes to the political and religious life of Rus. Iurii is well known for strengthening his north-eastern territory by founding numerous defensive outposts, including Moscow, and undertaking ambitious building projects in his capital city of Suzdal. Andrei continued his father's efforts to enhance their patrimony, sponsoring the construction of churches and instituting a number of new religious festivals commemorating local saints and events. Through his efforts, the power and prestige of north-east Rus in general, and his capital city of Vladimir in particular, grew rapidly and began to rival those of the older southern centres, including Kiev.³ Vsevolod, born near the end of his father's life, was given the baptismal name Dmitrii. Iurii's foundation of the city of Dmitrov in honour of his son's birth was only the beginning of Vsevolod's lifelong devotion to his patron saint (Kloss 1921: 77). Significantly younger than Andrei, Vsevolod was able to benefit from his relatives' efforts to enhance their patrimony. Like his older brother, Vsevolod focused most of his energies on strengthening the north-east and ensuring that his choice of candidate held the strategic post of prince of Novgorod. Thanks to these efforts, he was able to consolidate his family's successes, securing the north-east's pre-eminence among the regions of Rus.⁴

Vsevolod did much to distinguish his region in the cultural and religious spheres as well, although these efforts have received even less attention than his political career. He is best known for sponsoring the construction of the magnificent Cathedral of St Demetrios in Vladimir. The facades of this monument represent the zenith of the distinctive style of stone carving practiced in north-east Rus and are well known to art historians, although their usefulness as a source for wider religious and ideological concerns has not been well explored.⁵

³ On the history of north-east Rus during the reigns of Iurii Dolgorukii and Andrei Bogoliubskii see, among others, Limonov 1987; Hurwitz 1980; Martin 2007: 109–12, 117–30; Franklin and Shepard 1996: 344–52.

⁴ Historians' assessments of Vsevolod's reign have generally been positive but brief, e.g. Fennell 1983: 4, 22–25, 27–33; Limonov 1987: 104–06; Martin 2007: 128–34.

⁵ Art historical discussions can be found in e.g. Vagner 1969; Voronin 1961–62; Gladkaia 2009. For a rare attempt to tease out the political significance of the carvings see Wörn 1979.

Another object of religious significance from Vsevolod's reign is a relic referred to as the 'grave slab' of St Demetrios, which the prince imported from Byzantium in 1197. Although it has received little scholarly attention, the prince's acquisition of this relic was a matter of great prestige for himself and his realm. Viewed in its historical and devotional context, it is a valuable source for the religious culture of both Rus and Byzantium, as well as the priorities and interactions of their rulers.

The story of the 'grave slab' is closely connected with Vsevolod's personal history and the unusual circumstances in which he grew up. A few years after Iurii died in 1157, Andrei moved to consolidate his power within the family by sending his step-mother and three of her children, including the eight-year-old Vsevolod, into exile in Byzantium. Political deportations of this sort were not unknown in Rus, and the family benefitted from the friendly relations which Iurii had maintained with the court of Manuel Komnenos (reigned 1143-80). The incident is recounted in the *Hypatian Chronicle*, one of the main sources for the history of Rus during this period, which relates: 'Том же лѣтѣ идоста Гюргевича. Црѣюгороду Мъстиславъ и Василко. съ матерью. и Всеволода молодого пояша. со собою третьего брата. и дасть црѣ Василкови. в Дунаи д горы. а Мъстиславу дасть волость. Отскалана.' ('In the same year [1162] Mstislav and Vasilko Iurevichi went to Constantinople with their mother, and took with them a third brother, the young Vsevolod. And the emperor gave Vasilko four towns on the Danube, and to Mstislav he gave the region of Otskalan.'⁶) (Shakhmatov 1998: 521) The family's arrival was also mentioned by the Byzantine writer John Kinnamos, the author of a history of the reigns of Manuel Komnenos and his father John, in the context of the arrival three years later of yet another Rus prince: 'κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον καὶ Βλαδίσιθλαβος, εἷς ὧν τῶν ἐν Ταυροσκυθικῇ δυναστῶν, σὺν παισὶ τε καὶ γυναικὶ τῇ αὐτοῦ δυνάμει τε τῇ πάσῃ αὐτόμολος ἐς Ῥωμαίους ἦλθε, χώρα τε αὐτῷ παρὰ τὸν Ἰστρον δεδωρηται, ἦν δὲ καὶ Βασιλικά πρότερον τῷ Γεωργίου παιδί, ὃς τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῶν ἐν Ταυροσκυθικῇ φυλάρχων εἶχε, προσελθόντι βασιλεὺς ἔδωκε.' ('At the same time [1165], Vladislav, one of the princes of Tauroscythia [i.e. Rus] came as a refugee to the Romans with his children and wife and all his authority, and a property along the Danube was given to him, the one which earlier the emperor had given to Vasilko the son of George [i.e. Iurii Dolgorukii], who had the seniority among the chiefs of Tauroscythia, when he came.'⁷) (Meineke 1836: 236-37) The fact that these episodes were mentioned in an official history indicates that they were noteworthy events of some importance in the life of the court.

⁶ On other cases of Rus princes going into exile in Byzantium see Bibikov 1997: 138-39.

⁷ Vladislav is otherwise unknown (Freidenberg 1959: 42). The name is not attested in the Rus princely clan, and Kinnamos may have mistakenly combined the elements Vlad- and -slav, which formed parts of many Slavonic names.

No other surviving Byzantine or Rus sources discuss Vsevolod's sojourn in the empire. He returned to Rus by 1170 when, having apparently reconciled with Andrei, he participated in one of his brother's campaigns against prince Mstislav Iziaslavich of Kiev (Shakhmatov 1998: 543). He may have made another trip to Byzantium a few years later, as a supplementary article in one manuscript of the younger recension of the *Novgorod First Chronicle* notes that 'на третии год приде изъ заморья из Селуня братъ его Всеволодъ' ('in the third year [after the death of Andrei in 1174] his brother Vsevolod arrived from overseas, from Thessalonika'⁸). (Nasonov 2000: 7, 468) In any case, Vsevolod succeeded Andrei as prince of Vladimir in 1176 and retained that position until his death in 1212. But despite the lack of direct evidence about Vsevolod's period in exile, clues can be gleaned from two references in the *Laurentian Chronicle*, another important source for the period which focuses on events in north-east Rus. It notes that in 1197, at the height of Vsevolod's power as prince of Vladimir, 'принесена [быѣ] дска ис Селуня. гробн^ая ста Дмитрия' ('the grave slab of St Demetrios was brought from Thessalonika'). More detail about this event is given in the chronicle's eulogy to Vsevolod following his death: 'и принесъ доску гробную изъ Селуня. ста^ѣ м^ѣнка Дмитрия. мюро непрестанно точащю. на здравьє немощн^ыѣ^х в тои ц^ркви постави. и сорочку того^ж м^ѣнка ту же положи.' ('And he brought the grave slab of the holy martyr Demetrios from Thessalonika, which continually exudes *myron*. For the healing of the sick, he erected it in the cathedral [of St Demetrios in Vladimir]. And he also placed there a shirt of the same martyr.') (*Lavrent'evskaia letopis'* 1997: 414, 437) Despite their brevity, these references betray considerable influence on Vsevolod by recent developments in the Byzantine cult of Demetrios and the prince's efforts to transfer certain innovative practices to Rus. Each of these relics – the 'grave slab', *myron* and shirt – had a complex history and had recently gained new prominence in Constantinople, as will be discussed below. Vsevolod's translation of these particular items to Vladimir followed similar actions by Manuel Komnenos, hinting at the prince's eagerness to recreate some aspects of the Byzantine religious culture which he had witnessed during his time in exile.

Vsevolod certainly did not introduce the cult of Demetrios to Rus, nor was he the first prince to undertake lavish displays of devotion to the saint. Indeed, Demetrios is one of the first saints mentioned in *The Primary Chronicle*, the earliest Rus historical work, which has been reconstructed on the basis of the later *Laurentian* and *Hypatian* chronicles. Its entry for 907, which describes the Varangian leader Oleg's attack on Constantinople, claims that 'убояшася гръци и рѣша

⁸ This statement should be treated with caution, since the supplementary article is significantly younger than the chronicle itself and seems to have been written in the early to mid-fifteenth century. It also identifies Vsevolod's wife Maria as Czech, although the older *Hypatian Chronicle* says that her sister was Ossetian, meaning it is safe to assume that Maria was Ossetian as well (Shakhmatov 1998: 624–25).

нѣсть се олеѣ но свѣтѣи дмитрии послан отъ бога на ны.’ (‘The Greeks [i.e. Byzantines] were afraid. And they said, ”This is not Oleg but St Demetrios sent against us from God.”’) (Ostrowski 2003: 1, 172–73) This story was probably written down in its surviving form about two hundred years after the event (Ostrowski 2003: 1, xvii–lxv), at approximately the same time as a life-size mosaic of the saint was commissioned by prince Sviatopolk Iziaslavich (a great-uncle of Vsevolod) and installed in the Cathedral of the Archangel Michael in Kiev (Lazarev 1973: 30). The corpus of princely seals shows that Demetrios was one of the most popular baptismal names for male members of the clan: twelve different types of seals have been found which bear the saint’s image, one of the largest number for any saint.⁹ (Ianin and Gaidukov 1970–98) Demetrios was also well represented in early hagiographic collections copied in Rus and on various types of minor arts (White 2013: 99–102, 106, 108–09, 124, 128). Yet the chronicle entries for 1197 and 1212 testify to Vsevolod’s promotion of a new form of veneration of the saint modelled on that which Manuel Komnenos pioneered in the years shortly before and during the prince’s exile.

Although Vsevolod’s devotion to Demetrios is clear, the nature of the item which he brought from Thessalonika is not. The term ‘grave slab’ is unusual in East Slavonic, meaning that scholars are divided about what the object in question actually was. The only other occurrence of the term is found in the *Hypatian* chronicle’s entry for 1134, which refers to an item taken from the fabric of the Holy Sepulchre and brought back to Rus. As A. P. Tolochko has demonstrated, this was probably a tile from a marble covering of the stone on which Christ’s body was thought to have been lain. (Tolochko 2009: 429–30). This definition is thus not applicable to the Demetrios ‘grave slab’ since, as will be discussed below, there was no clear indication about where the saint was originally buried. It is most likely that the object was the cover or lid of a casket in Demetrios’ cathedral in Thessalonika identified as the saint’s coffin. There can, in any case, be little doubt that the grave ‘slab’ was related to a relic referred to as the grave ‘covering’ (προκάλυμμα) of St Demetrios in various Greek sources. Manuel Komnenos requisitioned this item from the cathedral in 1149 and deposited it in his family monastery of the Pantokrator in Constantinople. This act broke with many established conventions in the imperial veneration of Demetrios and marked a new stage in his cult, in which the saint’s adherents in the capital launched an aggressive campaign against Thessalonika for his patronage.

Although much scholarly attention has focused on the role of Demetrios in the maintenance of Thessalonika’s civic identity and independence (Macrides 1990, Cormack 1989), Manuel’s actions show that the saint’s native city did not always win this struggle. The imperial authorities could and did ‘strike back’ in the tug-of-war with

⁹ For an analysis of the iconography of Rus seals, see White 2013: 114–18.

Thessalonika by removing some of the most prized mementos associated with the saint. Manuel's success in transplanting Demetrios' cult seems, in turn, to have influenced Vsevolod, who must have witnessed the results of the emperor's innovations during his Byzantine exile. Vsevolod's imitation of Manuel's deeds provides valuable evidence about the influences on the prince and the aspects of Byzantine culture which he was most eager to bring back to Rus, especially given the lack of other sources about this period in his life. The rulers' actions are best understood in the context of imperial veneration of Demetrios in earlier centuries and the related struggles and compromises between Thessalonika and Constantinople over the ownership of his cult. It will also be necessary to discuss the evolution of the physical trappings of the saint's cult in order to shed light on the origin and nature of the grave covering.

The historical facts about Demetrios, like those about many early martyrs, are few and uncertain. His earliest surviving *passio*, which seems to have been in circulation by the seventh century, describes him as preaching the Gospel and suffering martyrdom in Thessalonika during the persecution of Maximian, and his cult remained closely connected with his native city.¹⁰ (*BHG* 496; Delehay 1909: 259–63) Unusually for a saint with a strong local following, however, Demetrios' relics were not the focal point of his veneration. Indeed, the church authorities in Thessalonika actively discouraged the development of a cult of his relics, seemingly because their exact whereabouts were unknown. The oldest collection of miracle stories about Demetrios, written in the early seventh century by Archbishop John of Thessalonika, notes that the bodies of local martyrs, including that of Demetrios, were hidden so that pagans could not destroy them (*BHG* 504; Lemerle 1979: 1, 89). John does not deny that Demetrios' relics existed, but makes only vague references to them. In the first miracle story, for example, he remarks: 'φασί τινες κείσθαι ὑπὸ γῆν τὸ πανάγιον αὐτοῦ λείψανον' ('some say his relics repose under the earth [below the cathedral]'). (*BHG* 500; Lemerle 1979: 1, 66) The same collection describes the unsuccessful attempts of the emperors Justinian (reigned 527–65) and Maurice (reigned 582–602) to obtain the saint's relics. Although Justinian went so far as to sponsor an excavation to find them, the appearance of flames prevented the work from proceeding and he had to be content with earth from around the saint's purported burial place (*BHG* 504; Lemerle 1979: 1, 88–90). The lesson was apparently well learned: over a century later, the emperor Justinian II (reigned 685–95, 705–11) seems to have been resigned to the inaccessibility of the relics. In an edict issued in 688, he claimed that Demetrios had come to his aid during a recent battle in the vicinity of Thessalonika, in thanks for which he granted a saltpan to the cathedral. Although the text refers twice to the emperor's donation to

¹⁰ On the text's relationship to the later collections of miracle stories see Lemerle 1979: 2, 197–99.

‘τῷ σεπτῷ ναῷ τοῦ ἁγίου ... Δημητρίου ἐν ᾧ τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ κατάκειται λείψανον’ (‘the august church of the holy ... Demetrios in which his holy relics lie hidden’), the emperor does not seem to have attempted to obtain them for himself (Spieser 1973: 156–57).

It was not just emperors who attempted to remove Demetrios’ relics from his native city. An early version of the saint’s *passio* relates that a certain Leontios, eparch of Illyricum, wished to take his relics to Sirmium and deposit them in a church he had built there. Like many others, Leontios was rebuffed: the saint appeared to him in a dream and forbade him from carrying out his plan. As in the case of Justinian, however, Demetrios did not force Leontios to leave empty-handed. The saint allowed him to take his blood-stained *chlamys* (cloak) and part of his *orarium* (stole), which Leontios placed in a reliquary and donated to the church (BHG 497; Suysken 1780a: 94). The age of this text is unclear, with proposed dates ranging from before the composition of John’s miracle stories to the tenth century (Woods 2000). The story was, in any case, repeated by Symeon Metaphrastes, whose *Menologion*, or collection of extended versions of saints’ lives, was widely used in the Byzantine church following its compilation in the mid-tenth century (BHG 498; Suysken 1780b: 102). Within about one hundred years the *chlamys* had apparently made its way to Constantinople. A list of some of the relics of the city, originally written in Greek in the second half of the eleventh century but surviving only in a Latin and Old Norse translation, notes that ‘I miklagardi i pollutum enum fornum er ... kledi demetri martiris’ (‘In Constantinople in the ancient palace are ... the garments of the martyr Demetrios’). (Ciggaar 1976: 72–89; Simek 1990: 287–91). The miracle appears again in a collection attributed to Niketas, Archbishop of Thessalonika during the mid-twelfth century.¹¹ (Sigalas 1936: 333) The *chlamys* was thus, like the earth given to Justinian, a secondary relic (an object which had come into contact with the saint but not part of his body) which the Thessalonian church officially allowed to be taken out of the city. A number of other items associated with Demetrios’ cult seem, however, to have been more widely venerated.

In the absence of bodily relics, the focus of Demetrios’ early cult became the ciborium in his cathedral in Thessalonika. This hexagonal, freestanding enclosed structure in the nave of the cathedral seems to have undergone various modifications over the centuries and has not survived, although it is unclear when it was dismantled or destroyed. Descriptions in John’s miracle stories indicate that, in his time, it was made of wood overlaid with silver and contained a silver bed on which the martyr’s effigy reposed.¹² (BHG 500; Lemerle 1979: 1, 66,

¹¹ In this version of the story, Demetrios gives Leontios a ring in addition to part of his *chlamys*. Bakirtzis (2002: 180–81) accepts that Niketas was the author of the work, but see doubts expressed by Kazhdan 1991: 3, 1482. The collection does, in any case, date from the eleventh or twelfth century.

¹² The bibliography about questions relating to the size, shape, construction, location, depiction and archaeology of the ciborium is vast. For a summary see Bakirtzis 2002: 176–79.

114–15) The stories also refer obliquely to a belief that the ciborium contained Demetrios' relics. John notes in one story that the ciborium is said to comprise the 'memorial' (μνημείον) of the martyr, and in another story describes a man's vision of the ciborium guarded by attendants who declare, Ἐκείσε παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἠκούσαμεν κείσθαι θεοπρεπῶς τὸν ὑπερένδοξον ἀθλοφόρον Δημήτριον' ('We have heard from our fathers that the highly esteemed victory-bearer lies there'). (BHG 505, 509; Lemerle 1979: 1, 93, 115) It is clear from the texts, however, that the ciborium's importance and main attraction was not relics, which were not displayed in any case, but the fact that Demetrios was known to emerge from it in visions of the faithful, particularly in times of crisis.¹³ The structure thus offered the possibility of gaining something like physical proximity to the saint, filling a role similar to that of relics in the cults of other saints. The ciborium was, however, stationary, and any relics it was thought to contain remained inside, meaning that only those who lived in or could travel to Thessalonika could have direct contact with the saint. As Demetrios' popularity grew, this arrangement could not satisfy the increasing number of his adherents, and new means were devised to allow access to him. Three solutions to this problem are expressed in a silver reliquary which was made during the reign of Constantine X (1059–67) and possibly presented to him (illustration 1). The reliquary, now in the Moscow Kremlin, is a model of the ciborium. It depicts on one side the coronation of Constantine and his wife Eudokia by Christ, while an inscription on the other side states in part: 'Σαφῆς πέφυκα τοῦ κιβωρίου τύπος / τοῦ λογχονύκτου μάρτυρος Δημητρίου.' ('I am a true image of the ciborium of the martyr Demetrios, who was pierced by a spear.') The inscription also names the craftsman who made the reliquary as John Autoreianos.¹⁴

The reliquary and its inscription indicate that Demetrios' ciborium still existed in the mid-eleventh century, and that a model of it could be used to venerate the saint outside of Thessalonika. But in addition to the ancient locus of Demetrios' cult, the reliquary also invokes another, more recent aspect of it: the holy oil or *myron* which had begun to flow in his cathedral. Much remains unclear about when the oil appeared and where in the cathedral its source was located. One of its functions, however, was clearly to allow more of the faithful to have a form of physical contact with Demetrios while ensuring that his body remained hidden, as apparently still desired by the church authorities. The *myron* is not mentioned in John's collection of miracle stories,

¹³ The most famous of these incidents is recounted in miracle 15, in which a citizen has a vision of Demetrios refusing the command of archangels to leave the besieged city during the Avar-Slav invasions of the late sixth and early seventh centuries (BHG 514; Lemerle 1979: 1, 162).

¹⁴ Some scholars have been troubled by the fact that the reliquary has eight sides, whereas the ciborium had only six. Ioli Kalavrezou has pointed out, however, that in middle Byzantine thought a 'true copy' of an object needed only to recall a few important features, rather than every detail of the original (Evans and Wixom 1997: 77–78).

and Demetrios is first described as *myroblytes* or ‘oil-exuding’ in an account describing the Arab attack on Thessalonika in 904 (Frendo and Fotiou 2000: 6). By 1040, according to the Byzantine historian John Skylitzes, soldiers were smearing themselves with it before battle (Thurn 1973: 413). Another nearly contemporary reference to the *myron* is found on a silver box, now in the Vatopedi Monastery on Mt Athos, whose dimensions correspond exactly to an opening in the model ciborium in Moscow. It is thus likely, as André Grabar has noted, that the two items were originally part of the same work, made some time after the coronation of Constantine X and designed to hold a small amount of *myron*. On one side of the Vatopedi reliquary an inscription reads: ‘ἅγιον αἶμα ἅγιον μύρον’ (‘holy blood, holy *myron*’). On the three other sides, another inscription in a different handwriting declares: ‘Τὸ σεπτὸν αἶμα μάρτυρος Δημητρίου / Συντετήρηται ἐνταῦθα θεῖαν / πίστιν βεβαιοῦν Ἰωάννου καὶ πόθον.’ (‘The noble blood of the martyr Demetrios is guarded here, confirming the holy faith and longing of John.’¹⁵) (Grabar 1950: 7–16) Ioli Kalavrezou has argued that the entire ensemble was originally presented to the sickly Constantine X, since the *myron* was believed to have healing properties (Evans and Wixom 1997: 78).

Various other artefacts also indicate that Demetrios’ *myron* was thought to be related to his blood. At least three other Byzantine reliquaries, manufactured between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, have inscriptions which mention blood and *myron* (Grabar 1950: 6, 16–18; Grabar 1954). An inscription on the altar cross of the Rus princess Evfrosiniia of Polotsk, which she commissioned in 1161, claims that it contained, among other relics, the blood of St Demetrios, but does not mention *myron* (Rybakov 1964: 32–33). These inscriptions indicate that a compromise of sorts had been reached in the saint’s veneration. Blood was a type of relic known from many other saints, and its appearance seems to have satisfied the need of the faithful to have a physical memento from the body of Demetrios. Whether the blood was thought to have been combined with or miraculously transformed into the *myron*, its dissemination in the form of oil meant that the rest of the saint’s body could remain hidden without restricting the spread of his cult to the far corners of the Byzantine commonwealth, including Rus.

The appearance of the *myron* thus strengthened Demetrios’ cult and contributed to its popularity outside Thessalonika, including in elite circles. Yet the Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary is consistent with established tradition in imperial veneration of the saint which acknowledged Thessalonika as the centre of his cult. Following the setbacks suffered by Justinian and Maurice, who were not able to obtain his relics, later emperors set about instituting veneration of him in the capital without physical remains. This process was started in

¹⁵ The appearance of the name John on both reliquaries is another piece of evidence connecting them.

earnest by Leo VI (reigned 886–912), one of the most ardent imperial devotees of Demetrios, and continued by his successors. Their veneration took a variety of forms: church building, composition of hymns and *enkomia* and depiction of the saint in luxury arts, including manuscript illuminations and ivory carvings (Magdalino 1990; White 2013: 66–72, 78–86, 89–93). The emperors did not, however, forget the saint’s provincial connections, and a number of sources indicate their acceptance of the fact that he remained firmly tied to Thessalonika. The *Life* of Theophano, the first wife of Leo VI, relates that, during the couple’s imprisonment by Leo’s father, they had a vision of a youth dressed as a soldier who assured them of their release. This intercessor can probably be identified as Demetrios, since he said, ‘οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἑμαυτοῦ ἦκον ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλ’ ὑμεῖς ἐκ Θεσσαλονίκης ἐλθεῖν ἐποιήσατε.’ (‘I have not come here of my own will, but you have made me come from Thessalonika.’) (*BHG* 1794; Kurtz 1898: 10) Paul Magdalino has even argued that Leo’s ill-fated attempt to transfer the market for Bulgarian merchants to Thessalonika in 893 was part of his effort to show his gratitude to the saint for his release from prison (Magdalino 1990). According to the historian John Skylitzes, Basil II (reigned 963–1025) made a pilgrimage to the city to venerate Demetrios following the defeat of the rebel Bardas Skleros, and Michael IV (reigned 1034–41) resided there in the hope of being healed by the saint (Thurn 1973: 339, 408).

The incorporation of Demetrios’ *myron* into his imperial cult, as indicated by the Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary, is consistent with the saint’s veneration since Leo’s time. As is clear from the reliquaries associated with it, the *myron* was coveted throughout the empire and beyond, and it is not surprising that emperors wanted some of this miracle working substance for themselves. As was the case with the *chlamys* and the earth, which the saint allowed to be taken out of Thessalonika, the spread of the *myron* did not, for the moment, constitute a threat to his loyalty to his native city. The fact that the Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary was designed to resemble the ciborium indicates that this structure, with its strong local significance, remained the focal point of Demetrios’ cult. The saint’s ties to Thessalonika thus continued to be one of his most recognisable attributes for emperors and commoners alike. Like other adherents of Demetrios’ cult, rulers could enjoy closer ties to the saint by means of the *myron*, but could not dislodge him from his native city. Although members of the court clearly coveted his protective and healing abilities, they also acknowledged the primacy of Thessalonika.

As well as invoking Demetrios’ ciborium and holding his *myron*, the Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary recalls another relatively recent addition to the physical infrastructure of the saint’s cult: his ‘grave’ or ‘tomb’. The outside cover of the box from Vatopedi depicts the saint praying with outstretched arms (*orans*), and opens to reveal an interior portrait of the dead saint reposing in his grave. André Grabar has argued that this unusual iconography, which is found on at least six other

reliquaries made between the early eleventh and fourteenth centuries, represents an actual sarcophagus with a similar portrait of the saint on its lid which was located in the cathedral in Thessalonika. It was believed that Demetrios' body was in a separate subterranean chamber beneath the tomb (represented in the reliquaries by the recumbent figure), and that the body exuded *myron* which collected in the upper tomb and basins in other parts of the cathedral.¹⁶ (Grabar 1950: 12–15; Grabar 1954) Much remains unknown about the development of these beliefs: did references to relics below the earth, such as those found in Archbishop John's writings, encourage the faithful to erect a tomb, or was the tomb put in place independently, only to cause speculation that the saint's body lay beneath? The text from 904 which describes Demetrios as *myroblytes* does not mention a sarcophagus. The earliest of the reliquaries which represent the tomb was probably made in the early eleventh century,¹⁷ and the first written reference to it may be Skylitzes' description of Michael IV seeking a cure at the saint's tomb. Yet the ciborium still existed at that time: Constantine X was crowned in 1059, and the Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary could not have been made before then.

It is thus not clear when the tomb appeared and the ciborium disappeared, how each was related to the *myron* and each other, how they were arranged in the cathedral and how these relationships changed over time. Various explanations have been proposed, and revisiting this problem in detail would be beyond the scope of the present investigation (Bakirtzis 2002; Mentzos 1994; Walter 1977). The Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary suggests, however, that by the mid-eleventh century the tomb was thought to be the main vessel for collecting the *myron*, which exuded from Demetrios' relics. Significantly, however, the saint's body itself continued to be strictly off-limits. In an *enkomion* to Demetrios composed in the late twelfth century, Archbishop Eustathios of Thessalonika emphasised that, despite the appearance of the *myron* and the miracles worked by it, his relics remained hidden (BHG 539; Tafel 1964: 171). Perhaps for this reason, the tomb was perceived to have powers of its own which made it a focus of pilgrimage. For example, in the third collection of miracle stories about Demetrios, which was assembled by the twelfth century from material of uncertain date, a blind man from Adrianople seeks a cure at the tomb of the saint (BHG 528; Suysken 1780: 191–92). Although the *myron* could have been transported to Adrianople, proximity to the tomb seems to have been even more efficacious, making it worthwhile to travel to Thessalonika.

¹⁶ Grabar relates the iconography of the reliquaries to one of the miracle stories about Demetrios compiled by John Staurakios, *chartophylax* (archivist) of the cathedral in the late thirteenth century. The story describes a vision of the martyr's empty tomb, which was located directly above an underground tomb containing his relics (Iverites 1940). For other references to the tomb see Bakirtzis 2002: 180, 182–85.

¹⁷ Grabar (1950: 6) dates the reliquary to the tenth century, but more recent research suggests a date around 1000 (Evans and Wixom 1997: 161).

The Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary seems to represent an attempt to reproduce the healing and protective properties of the entire cultic ensemble in Demetrios' cathedral: ciborium, *myron* and tomb. With limited time for pilgrimages to Thessalonika, Constantine X and other members of the Constantinopolitan elite venerated the saint by means of such luxurious replicas. This arrangement was, however, unsatisfactory for a later emperor, Manuel Komnenos, who upset the delicate compromise between Thessalonika and Constantinople in the veneration of Demetrios. The Komnenoi were fervent devotees of the saint, as is shown by the fact that they were the first emperors to use his image on their coins. This practice was started by Alexios I (reigned 1081–1118) and continued by his son John II (reigned 1118–43) and grandson Manuel (Grierson 1982: 1025, 1026, 1029, 1035 [Alexios I]; 1078 [John II]; 1100 [Manuel I]). The depiction of saints other than the Mother of God on coins was not a common practice before the Komnenoi came to power, and their choice of Demetrios was significant, particularly given his well known associations with a provincial city. The Komnenoi also encouraged the composition of written works about Demetrios: a new *kanon* to the saint celebrating his *myron* was written by the court poet George Skylitzes during Manuel's reign and incorporated into the ecclesiastical *menaion*, or collection of hymns and readings for each day of the year.¹⁸ (Pétridès 1903: 460–82) Even more so than his father and grandfather, Manuel seems to have been determined to establish veneration of Demetrios in Constantinople on an equal footing with his cult in his native city. Apparently not content merely to commission new texts and works of art celebrating the saint, in the manner of his predecessors, Manuel went a step further by requisitioning the cover of Demetrios' tomb and bringing it to Constantinople – an act which was met with rejoicing in the capital in proportion to the outrage it doubtless caused in Thessalonika.

This episode is documented in a number of sources, the oldest and longest of which was written by an eyewitness. It was incorporated into the liturgical calendar of Constantinople, confirming the importance of both the text and the event it describes.¹⁹ (BHG 533; Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963: 4, 238–46) The narrative relates that Joseph, Hegumen of the Pantokrator Monastery, decided to seek out Manuel while the emperor was campaigning in the west. Finding him in the theme of Berrhoia, two days' ride from Thessalonika, Joseph entreated him to allow the grave covering to be taken to Constantinople. Manuel consented and ordered that a new covering of gold and silver be made to replace it. The original was then escorted to the capital, where it arrived on the saint's feast day and was met by jubilant crowds. There, it continued to exude *myron* and was believed to protect the city

¹⁸ Pétridès proposes that the *kanon* was composed in honour of the translation of the grave covering, although the poem does not mention the event.

¹⁹ Only one manuscript identifies the author as Nikasios the Deacon (Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963: 5, 400), but the account was clearly written by a monk of the Pantokrator monastery.

and ruler from their enemies. The other main account of the event is found in the collection of saints' lives compiled in the late eighteenth century by Nikodemos the Hagiorite. Most of the details of this text correspond with those in the older source, although it refers to the relic as an 'icon' rather than 'covering'.²⁰ (Nikodemos the Hagiorite 1868: 1, 191–93) It thus seems that the covering featured a depiction of Demetrios, probably in life size and in the *orans* pose as found on the outer lids of the reliquaries studied by Grabar.

The narrative presents the requisition as the initiative of the hegumen rather than the emperor. As head of the patronal foundation of the Komnenoi, however, Joseph was doubtless aware of Manuel's wishes and the saints he venerated most actively. The fact that the text was composed by a monk of the Pantokrator monastery may, moreover, have meant that Joseph's role in the requisition was given particular attention. Manuel's initiative seems all the more likely given his continued interest in such matters: twenty years after the translation of the grave covering, he brought the celebrated Stone of Unction, on which Christ's body was prepared for burial, from Ephesus and deposited it in the same monastery.²¹ It thus seems safe to assume that Manuel was closely involved with the planning and execution of the earlier event, which continued and expanded his family's tradition of veneration of Demetrios. Manuel's actions show that his determination to enlist Demetrios as a protector for himself and his capital far exceeded that of the Macedonian emperors or even his own ancestors. Since the disappointments of Justinian and Maurice, no emperor had succeeded in (or, it seems, even contemplated) forcibly removing any of the physical infrastructure of Demetrios' cult. The translations of the *chlamys* and the earth were given official sanction, while the Moscow/Vatopedi reliquary and others like it attempted to replicate one or more objects in the cathedral in Thessalonika. Such items were, however, clearly not acceptable to Manuel, who set his sights on an original artefact.

Perhaps the most radical aspect of Manuel's action was that the grave covering continued to exude *myron* in its new location. Whereas previous emperors, such as Constantine X, had acquired the oil in reliquaries, Manuel was apparently determined to have his own source. This was by far the most intrusive intervention into Demetrios' cult in its history. Given the fame of the *myron* and its association with Thessalonika, Manuel's requisition was surely a blow to local pride, and possibly the local economy: there could be no clearer sign that Demetrios and his powers were no longer the exclusive preserve of the city. Perhaps not surprisingly, the city's response to this indignity seems to have been to ignore it. As Paul Magdalino notes, the local literary tradition about the miracles of Demetrios makes no mention of

²⁰ V. Tăpkova-Zaimova (1978: 263) argues that this text also used another source with more precise details about the translation.

²¹ The translation of the Stone of Unction is described in, among others, Meineke 1836: 277; van Dielen 1975: 222.

the requisition (Magdalino 1993: 179). Indeed, the thirteenth-century Thessalonian author John Staurakios included what may have been intended as a revenge narrative in his collection of miracles stories. According to the text, a garment went missing from Manuel's wardrobe, only to be found in Demetrios' cathedral (*BHG* 532; Iverites 1940: 368–69). Manuel, however, seems to have remained in possession of Demetrios' *chlamys*. Given that the garment was on display in the palace some hundred years before his reign and continued to be mentioned in texts written in the following century, it is very likely that the relic was known to Manuel. Its perceived age and connection with Demetrios' early cult must have made it a prized part of the emperor's collection of physical mementos associated with the saint, and it is safe to assume that he was keen to promote and display it as part of his campaign to establish the veneration of Demetrios' relics in the capital.

This is all the more likely given that the *chlamys* was one of the items which made a profound impression on the young Vsevolod following his arrival in Constantinople. He probably took a particular interest in Demetrios as his personal patron saint, and clearly became well acquainted with his relics in the capital. Strikingly, according to the *Laurentian Chronicle's* entry for 1197, the items which Vsevolod imported to Vladimir replicated all of the prized relics of Constantinople: the grave covering with its *myron*-exuding properties and the saint's garment. The circumstances in which Vsevolod acquired these items, as well as their later history, are, unfortunately, unknown. The chronicle entry notes that the relics were brought from Thessalonika in 1197, some 20 years after Vsevolod returned to Rus from his Byzantine exile, but it is unclear whether Vsevolod himself or someone working for him acquired the items on a subsequent visit to the empire or received them as a gift from the emperor. Either scenario is possible: the accounts of Rus pilgrims to Constantinople in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries show that a wide variety of relics could be bought on the 'open market', and it was not unusual for emperors to present foreign rulers with relics, even highly prestigious items like fragments of the True Cross (Loparev 1899, Seemann 1970, Evans and Wixom 1997: 81). The 'shirt', in any case, is not mentioned again in Rus sources and may have been destroyed during the sack of Vladimir by the Mongols in 1238. The fate of the 'grave slab' is also not certain, although it has been identified with a large icon of Demetrios currently in the Cathedral of the Dormition in the Moscow Kremlin which was painted over in the eighteenth century.²² (Smirnova 1997) What is more certain about Vsevolod's relics is that, far from a random assortment of souvenirs, they represented both a thorough understanding of his patron's cult and

²² The eighteenth-century iconography depicts Demetrios standing and holding a spear in his right hand and a sword in his left, which Smirnova claims replicates the original iconography of the 'grave slab'. It seems more likely, however, that the 'grave slab' depicted Demetrios *orans*, since he appears in this pose on the lids of the Byzantine reliquaries which represent his tomb.

a desire, like that of Manuel, to transplant its most noteworthy features to his own capital. If Vsevolod was aware of the tug-of-war between Thessalonika and Constantinople over the relics of Demetrios, this was apparently not an impediment to his own acquisition of items which were once the exclusive preserve of the saint's native city. Manuel's effrontery seems to have broken the taboo surrounding the export of physical infrastructure associated with Demetrios, allowing Vsevolod to repeat the process in his own country.

Despite the indignity of losing Demetrios' grave covering and garment to a succession of outsiders, the citizens of Thessalonika could at least comfort themselves in the knowledge that they retained their patron's body in its entirety, safely hidden from rapacious rulers. Or could they? A pilgrim from Rus, Dobrynia Iadrekovich, who later became archbishop of Novgorod under the name Anthony, visited Constantinople in about 1200 and left a detailed account of the shrines and relics of the capital. His observations included the following: 'А толѣ святыи Димитреї лежить въ тѣлѣ, бѣлец; а образъ его аки свягаго Мины.' ('And then St Demetrios, a layman, is lying in state, and he looks like St Mina.')(Loparev 1899: 26) The existence of Demetrios' body in Constantinople is not mentioned in the sources related to the grave covering or any others, and it may well have been lost during the Fourth Crusade. Although the evidence is slight, it suggests that Manuel or a subsequent emperor, following the successful requisition of the grave covering, may have decided to complete the ensemble of Demetrios' relics by bringing something which was claimed to be the saint's body to the capital. If this occurred after 1149, the population of Constantinople would not have had long to enjoy the spoils before the sack of the city in 1204, and the Thessalonians may well have decided to continue their policy of ignoring the theft of their prized relics. Even if they temporarily lost the battle for Demetrios' body, they won the war: accounts from the late Byzantine period continue to refer to it reposing somewhere underneath the cathedral, but were emphatic that it remained hidden, as it always had been.²³

Literature

Bakirtzis, Charalambos. "Pilgrimage to Thessalonike: The Tomb of St. Demetrios". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 56 (2002): 175–92.

Бибиков, М.В., ред. *Византийский историк Иоанн Киннам о Руси и народах Восточной Европы: тексты, перевод, комментарий*. Москва: Ладомир, 1997.

Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1909.

²³ By the early fourteenth century it was believed that Demetrios' body had been thrown down a well near the cathedral, whence the *myron* flowed (Bakirtzis 2002: 185–86).

Ciggaar, Krijna. *Byzance et l'Angleterre*. PhD dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden, 1976.

Cormack, Robin. "The Making of a Patron Saint: The Powers of Art and Ritual in Byzantine Thessaloniki". In *World Art: Themes of Unity and Diversity*, 3 vols. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1989: 547–54.

Delehaye, Hippolyte. *Les légendes grecques des saints militaires*. Paris: Librairie Alphonse Picard et fils, 1909.

Evans, Helen C. and William D. Wixom, eds. *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era A.D. 843-1261*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997.

Fennell, John. *The Crisis of Medieval Russia, 1200-1304*. London: Longman, 1983.

Franklin, Simon and Jonathan Shepard. *The Emergence of Rus: 750-1200*. London: Longman, 1996.

Фрейденберг, М.М. „Труд Иоанна Кинама как исторический источник”. *Византийский Временник*, 16 (1959): 29–51.

Frendo, David and Athanasius Fotiou, eds., *The Capture of Thessaloniki*. Byzantina Australiensia, 12. Perth: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 2000.

Гладкая, М.С. *Рельефы дмитриевского собора во Владимире: опыт комплексного исследования*. Москва: Индрик, 2009.

Grabar, André. "Quelques reliquaires de saint Démétrios et le martyrium du saint à Salonique". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 5 (1950): 1–28.

Grabar, André. "Un nouveau reliquaire de Saint Démétrios". *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8 (1954): 307–13.

Grierson, Philip. *Byzantine Coins*. London: Methuen, 1982.

Hurwitz, Ellen S. *Prince Andrej Bogoljubskij: The Man and the Myth*. *Studia Historica et Philologica*, 12, Sectio Slavica, 4. Florence: Licosa Editrice, 1980.

Янин, В.Л. и П.Г. Гайдуков. *Актовые печати древней Руси X-XV вв.*, 3 тома. Москва: Наука и Интрада, 1970–98.

Iverites, Ioakeim, ed. "Ioannou Staurakiou logos eis ta thaumata tou hagiou Demetriou". *Makedonika*, 1 (1940): 324–76.

Kazhdan, Alexander P., ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Клосс, В.М., ред. *Типографская летопись*. Полное собрание русских летописей 24. Петроград: 2-я Государственная типография, 1921.

Kurtz, E. "Zwei griechische Texte über die Hl. Theophano, die Gemahlin Leos VI.". *Zapiski Imperatorskoi akademii nauk*, 8, 3/2 (1898): 1–80.

Лаврентьевская летопись. Полное собрание русских летописей 1. Переиздание. Москва: Языки Славянской Культуры, 1997.

Лазарев, В.Н. *Древнерусские мозаики и фрески XI-XV вв.* Москва: Искусство, 1973.

Lemerle, Paul. *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Démétrius*, 2 vols. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1979.

Лимонов, Ю.А. *Владими́ро-Суздальская Русь: очерки социально-политической истории*. Ленинград: Наука, 1987.

Лопарев, Х.М., ред. „Книга паломник: сказание мест святых во Царьграде”. *Православный Палестинский сборник*, 17 (1899): 1–94.

Macrides, Ruth. ”Subversion and Loyalty in the Cult of St. Demetrios”. *Byzantinoslavica*, 51 (1990): 189–97.

Magdalino, Paul. ”Saint Demetrios and Leo VI”. *Byzantinoslavica*, 51 (1990): 198–201.

Magdalino, Paul. *The Empire of Manuel Komnenos 1143-1180*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Martin, Janet. *Medieval Russia 980-1584*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Meineke, August, ed. *Ioannis Cinnami Epitome Rerum ab Ioanne at Alexio Comnenis Gestarum*. Bonn: Impensis Ed. Weberi, 1836.

Mentzos, Aristoteles. *To proskuneta tou hagiou Demetriou Thessalonikes sta vuzantina chronia*. Athens: Hetaireia ton philon tou laou, 1994.

Насонов, А.Н., ред. *Новгородская первая летопись старшего и младшего изводов*. Переиздание. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 2000.

Nikodemos the Hagiorite. *Synaxaristes ton dodeka menon tou eniautou*, 3 vols. Zakynthos: Typografeios ho Parnassos Sergiou Ch. Raftanh, 1868.

Ostrowski, Donald, ed. *The Pověst ’vremennykh lét: An Interlinear Collation and Paradosis*. Harvard Library of Early Ukrainian Literature, 10, 1-3. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.

Papadopoulos-Kerameus, A., ed. *Analekta ierosolimitikes stachuologias*, 4 vols. Repr. Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1963.

Pétridès, P. Sophrone. ”Deux canons inédits de Georges Skylitzès”. *Vizantiiskii Vremennik*, 10 (1903): 460–94.

Рыбаков, В.А. *Русские датированные надписи XI-XIV веков*. Археология СССР, Свод археологических источников, Е1-44. Москва: Наука, 1964.

Seemann, K., ed. *Khozhenie*. Slavische Propyläen, 36. Repr. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1970.

Sigalas, A. ”Niketa archiepiskopou Thessalonikes, eis ta thaumata tou hag. Demetriou”. *Epeteris Hetaireias Byzantinon Spudon*, 12 (1936): 517–60.

Suysken, Constantine, ed. *Miraculorum Liber III*. In *Acta Sanctorum*, October, IV. Brussels: Typis Regis, 1780: 191–92.

Suysken, Constantine, ed. *Passio altera*. In *Acta Sanctorum*, October, IV. Brussels: Typis Regis, 1780a: 90–95.

Suysken, Constantine, ed. *Passio tertia S. Demetrii M.*. In *Acta Sanctorum*, October, IV. Brussels: Typis Regis, 1780b: 95–104.

Шахматов, А. А., ред. *Ипатьевская летопись*. Полное собрание русских летописей, 2. Переиздание. Москва: Языки русской культуры, 1998.

Simek, Rudolf. *Altnordische Kosmographie*. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde, 4. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.

Смирнова, Э.С. „Храмовая икона дмитриевского собора. Святость солунской базилики во владимирском храме” // *Дмитриевский собор во Владимире: к 800-летию создания*. Москва: Modus Graffiti, 1997: 220–54.

Spieser, J.-M. ”Inventaires en vue d’un recueil des inscriptions historiques de Byzance”. *Travaux et Mémoires*, 5 (1973): 145–80.

Tăpkova-Zaimova, V. ”Quelques représentations iconographiques de Saint Démétrius et l’insurrection des Assenides – première scission dans son cult ‘oecuménique’”. *Byzantinobulgarica*, 5 (1978): 261–67.

Tafel, T. L. F., ed. *Eustathi Metropolitae Thessalonicensis Opuscula*. Repr. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1964.

Thurn, Hans. *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 5. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.

Толочко, А.П. „Доски гробные’: странные реликвии в домонгольской Руси” // *Краеугольный камень: Археология, история, искусство, культура России и сопредельных стран*, 2 тома. Санкт-Петербург: Российская Академия Наук 2009: 425–33.

Вагнер, Г.К. *Скульптура древней Руси: XII век, Владимир, Боголюбово*. Москва: Искусство, 1969.

van Dieten, J., ed. *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*. Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, 11/1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975.

Воронин, Н.Н. *Зодчество северно-восточной Руси XII-XV веков*, 2 тома. Москва: Академия Наук СССР, 1961–62.

Walter, Christopher. ”St Demetrios: The Myroblytos of Thessalonika”. In *Studies in Byzantine Iconography*. London: Ashgate Variorum, 1977: 157–78.

White, Monica. *Military Saints in Byzantium and Rus, 900-1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Woods, David. ”Thessalonica’s Patron: Saint Demetrius or Emeterius?”. *Harvard Theological Review*, 93 (2000): 221–34.

Wörn, Dietrich. ”Studien zur Herrschaftsideologie des Großfürsten Vsevolod III. ‘Bo6l’šoe gnezdo’ von Vladimir (1176–1212)”. *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*, n.s. 27 (1979): 1–40.

Моника Ваит

„Доска гробная” св. Димитрия между Византией и Русью

Резюме

Роль культа св. Димитрия в становлении местной идентичности и культурной независимости Солуни, второй столицы Византийской империи, неоднократно привлекала внимание исследователей. Важным средством формирования особого статуса города стало ограничение доступа к реликвиям святого. В отличие от останков других широко почитаемых святых, реликвии Димитрия не были доступны для поклонения, что позволяло церковным властям осуществлять строгий контроль над культом и всячески подчеркивать его связь с городом. По крайней мере с шестого века как императору, так и его подданным возбранялось (зачастую с применением силы) перемещать реликвии святого за пределы города. Таким образом, все возрастающее число почитателей св. Димитрия вынуждено было довольствоваться различными субститутами мощей, такими, например, как киворий святого, или миро с его гробницы. Впрочем, Солунь не всегда одерживала верх над Константинополем в борьбе за право регулировать культ Димитрия. Императоров из семьи Комниных, ревностных почитателей святого, решительно не устраивал тот порядок вещей, который сложился вокруг культа Димитрия при их предшественниках из Македонской династии. В середине XII столетия Мануил Комнин весьма агрессивно осуществил целую кампанию ради перенесения интересующего нас культа в столицу путем изъятия некоего предмета, описываемого как покровная часть гробницы Димитрия. Хотя сегодня невозможно в точности определить вид и природу этого объекта, очевидно, что речь идет о некоей прославленной, мироточивой реликвии, вокруг которой сформировался некий новый центр почитания, неподвластный церковным иерархам Солуни. Этот предмет сыграл, кроме того, заметную роль в биографии русского князя Всеволода Большое Гнездо, в 60-е годы XII в. находившегося в изгнании в Византии. По возвращении на Русь Всеволод в свое время привозит сходную реликвию для украшения города Владимира, причем это событие представлялось настолько значимым, что было запечатлено в двух погодных статьях Лаврентьевского летописного свода. Этот акт перенесения фрагмента гробницы («доски гробной») проливает свет на целый ряд особенностей религиозной культуры Руси позднего домонгольского времени: становится очевидной высокая степень осведомленности русской элиты о направлении эволюции культа св. Димитрия, яснее оказываются и политические интенции князя Всеволода, который, подобно Мануилу Комнину, стремится сосредоточить наиболее значимые для почитания святого объекты в своей собственной столице.

Ключевые слова: Всеволод Юрьевич, Мануил Комнин, Св. Димитрий, мощи, мощевики, доска гробная, агиография.

Submitted 18/02/2013.

Accepted for publishing 20/05/2014.