

**PIOUS KINGS AND RIGHT-BELIEVING QUEENS:  
An Encyclopedia of the Royal and Imperial Saints of  
the Orthodox Church**

**by Protopresbyter James Thornton  
With an Introduction by Archbishop Chrysostomos**

Publication Data: Belmont, MA: Institute for Byzantine & Modern Greek Studies, 2013.

Format: Softcover

Number of Pages: XXIV + 506

Dimensions (l × w × h): 23.8 cm × 16.3 cm × 3.2 cm

ISBN: 978-1-884729-98-0

Order from: <http://ibmgs.org/lives.html>

## Preface and Acknowledgements

The idea of writing a book of the lives of Royal Saints first entered my mind in the summer of 2005. At that time I had just completed the series of Sainly lives that was published the following year under the title *Made Perfect in Faith*. The thought occurred to me that a book on the lives of Royal Saints might be modeled on that earlier book, since I was at the time thinking in terms of perhaps fifty or so lives. In the summer of 2007, however, I began seriously researching material on Royal Saints, after setting down the guideline that I would include only Saints who had been Kings, Queens, Emperors, Empresses, ruling Princes or Princesses, ruling Dukes or Duchesses, or Saints who were the spouses or the children of monarchs. I have adhered for the most part to that rule, although I have made several exceptions for notable or interesting Saints who were members of the more extended families of ruling monarchs. When there were questions in my mind as to whether to include a particular Saint, I nearly always opted for inclusion. Following those guidelines, I discovered that there were *hundreds* of Saints who qualified for inclusion, and so a formidable task presented itself to me.

I decided in this work to include not only Saints from the Orthodox East, but also those of the pre-schism Orthodox West (as I also did in both volumes of *Made Perfect in Faith*), since these Saints are as worthy of honor as those of the East, and therefore should not be forgotten. Moreover, to

include them demonstrates the universality of Orthodoxy. One will therefore find in this book monarchs representative of many different races, nations, and cultures: Greek, Russian, Ukrainian, Serbian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Georgian, Armenian, African, Spanish, German, French, English, Welsh, Cornish, Breton, Scottish, Irish, and others. In addition, I have included Old Testament Kings and Queens who are regarded by the Church as Righteous or Saintly.

In dealing with the Western Saints who lived during the period *just before* the Western schism, I took pains to try to distinguish between those whose lives reflected true Orthodox piety and sanctity and those whose lives did not. The separation between the Eastern and Western Churches, it must be remembered, did not happen suddenly or instantaneously. We use the date 1054 as a matter of convenience. In actual fact the schism was gradual, and so it would be incorrect to assume that on a particular day in 1054, when the mutual excommunications were exchanged between Patriarch Michael Cerularios of Constantinople and the Pope's legate, Cardinal Humbert, Grace at that precise moment departed from the Western Church. The question is much more nuanced than that. Thus, it was necessary to examine the lives of certain of the men and women under consideration with care, to determine, insofar as the available material allowed, whether they should be included in this collection. Charlemagne, for example, is sometimes counted a Saint among Roman Catholics. Obviously, since he exhibited considerable hostility towards the Christian East, the Orthodox Church, and Orthodox teaching, he is not included here, even though he lived centuries before the Western Schism. Other figures among the Franks *are* included, since the accounts of their lives appear to reflect a genuine piety and sanctity not substantially different from that found among Eastern Royal Saints.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Should any of my readers know of Saintly monarchs who should have been included but were not, I must plead that I have used the resources at hand—my own fairly large library, the extensive library of the Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, the library of the University of California, and, with some element of caution, the Internet—to complete my work. Variations in spelling often caused difficulties in trying to find material on particular Saints; to give examples, in some places “Vladimir” is spelled “Volodymyr,” “Boris” is spelled “Borys,” and “Gleb” is spelled “Hlib.” There are many other examples as well. For Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Frankish Saints, the numbers of variant spellings of particular names was often bewildering and daunting. For the purposes of this collection I have generally chosen the standard, or most frequently used, modern English renditions of the Saints' names, yet in some few cases I have, for the sake of clarity, deviated from those. For example, I chose “Dmitri” rather than the frequently seen “Demetrius” for the Slavic Saints of that name—“Demetrius Donskoi” did not sound right to my ears. I chose to use the modern English spelling of the Anglo-

Now let us consider the Saints themselves. From time to time, there are questions raised with regard to the genuine sanctity of some Royal and Imperial Saints. First, let us note that many of these Saints have never been formally Glorified (“Canonized”), since many of them lived in the centuries before the formal process of Glorification had been set in place (that is true also of great numbers of the most renowned Saints of the early centuries of the Church, some of whom are counted among the Holy Church Fathers). Their elevation to Sainthood came from their popular veneration, that is, they were recognized as Saintly during their lifetimes by the Faithful of the Church and, upon their deaths, a cult of veneration grew up around them. Archbishop Chrysostomos of Etna has addressed this matter most succinctly. He notes that,

popular veneration ... is, indeed, an expression of the Church’s conscience, the most authentic verification of the sanctity of any personage. The listing of a Saint in the official annals of the Church, like a Saint’s Glorification, is merely a recognition of this veneration, not its validation or a sign of ‘official’ approval. When a person is designated as ‘Blessed,’ for example, this is not, in the Orthodox Church, a ‘stage’ in the movement towards Sainthood, as in the Roman Catholic Church. Such legalism is unknown in the East. By the same token, when a Saint is officially listed in the calendar, it does not mean that a *new* holiness has been attributed to his or her person. The holiness is revealed within the bosom of the Church and, whether recognized or not, has always been there. And ultimately, a Saint resides in the bosom of the Church because of that Saint’s memory and activity among the people. In short, no Saint can endure and live among the people simply because of an act of Glorification (‘Canonization’); but similarly, no Saint endures in the people’s hearts ... unless God so wills it. No Orthodox—whether under the guise of calendars, conservatism, personal perfection, or even theoretical

---

Saxon Saints, rather than the Old-English style (e.g., “Alfred” rather than “Ælfrǣd”). I ask readers please to overlook certain inconsistencies in these matters of spelling. When possible, I show variant spellings parenthetically near the beginning of each entry. When in an entry for a particular Saint I make reference to another Saint also included in this collection, I have placed the initial reference to the other Saint’s name in SMALL CAPITALS.

theological purity—should ever dare to question this spontaneous, mystical revelation of God’s Saints.<sup>2</sup>

Let us discuss briefly the matter of impeccability or sinlessness. No Saint herein included can be said to have been sinless, for as we say in the Orthodox Funeral Service, “there is no man that liveth and sinneth not.” Some of the Saintly monarchs who are included here committed grave sins during their lives; one might even say, in some cases, dreadful crimes. However, in every instance, sometime before their deaths, these men and women repented before God of their sins and errors and led exemplary lives afterwards. The Holy Prophet David, King of Israel, is the prototypical example of this, since he committed both adultery and murder, and yet repented and is, therefore, regarded as one of the great Saints of the Old Testament. Impeccability is not, has never been, and can never be, a prerequisite for Sainthood.

A few words related to geography and ethnography are apropos here. With the abandonment of Britain by the Romans in the early years of the fifth century, the island was divided into numerous independent tribal Kingdoms. *The Oxford History of Britain* puts it as follows: “After the break with Rome the Britains, we are told, lived under tyranny, or ‘usurpers,’ best interpreted as local potentates who had filled the vacuum left by the removal of legitimate authority.”<sup>3</sup> With the migration of the Anglo-Saxons to Britain, and of large numbers of Celts from Britain to Brittany, shortly after the Roman withdrawal, more territorial alterations and divisions took place. Some of those Kingdoms lasted for centuries, while others rose up and then disappeared after a few decades. The names of some of these Kingdoms will sound strange to modern ears: “Armorica,” “Bernicia,” “Bro-Weroc,” “Brycheiniog,” “Cerniw,” “Deira,” “Domnonia,” “Domnonée” (or, in some texts, “Dumnonia” and “Dumnonée”), and “Eynsham,” to name a few. These, of course, were the Principalities and Kingdoms of the Celts and the Anglo-Saxons in England and Brittany. Some others, such as Austrasia, Burgundy, and Nuestria, were Frankish Kingdoms of the medieval period. I have briefly explained the nature of these realms in the texts, giving their approximate location. In most history texts the terms “Briton” and “British” are used to designate the indigenous Celtic inhabitants of the British Isles

---

<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Chrysostomos of Etna, *Constantine the Ethnomartyr: Last Emperor of Byzantium* (Etna, CA:Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 1998), p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> *The Oxford History of Britain*, Kenneth O. Morgan, Editor (Oxford, UK: Oxford university Press, 1984), p. 58.

prior to the Anglo-Saxon migration. In these same texts, the term “English,” with regard to inhabitants of Great Britain, refers to the Anglo-Saxons.

Finally, let us discuss briefly the nature of monarchical rule. The throne of a Christian Emperor, King, or ruling Prince, is not an earthly contrivance but is of a much higher order. It is ordained and blessed by God and belongs to Him. It is written in the Old Testament that, “Solomon sat on the throne of the LORD.”<sup>4</sup> The throne, thus, was not Solomon’s but was God’s.<sup>5</sup> The thrones in all Christian monarchies are the same; they belong to God and are occupied by God’s anointed. In the Orthodox Church, the monarch is anointed in a Mysteriological (or “Sacramental”) act. At the coronation of Saint Edgar the Peaceable in 973, for example, “[t]he climax of the ceremony was not the crowning, but the anointing with holy oil which conferred near-priestly status...”<sup>6</sup> Precisely the same was true of the coronation of Saint Nicholas the Tsar Martyr in 1896, almost a thousand years later. As Bishop Nektary of Seattle (1905-1983) writes, “The Tsar was and is the anointed of God.”<sup>7</sup> After the anointing, the monarch’s person is sacred and, consequently, to lay violent hands on an Orthodox monarch is a grave sacrilege; in fact, among the worst sacrileges possible. Conversely, a monarch is held by God to a much higher standard than ordinary men and women, for the monarch holds, by God’s Grace, special powers in his hands, which powers he is sworn to use in a God-pleasing manner. He is also an example to his subjects, on which, if his example is a wholesome one, those subjects should model their own lives, to the extent possible. Monarchs, consequently, must use their powers with fear and trembling, not arbitrarily, and must be mindful that the eyes of God and of His people are ever upon him. The monarch’s purpose or role is to uphold the law of God in his country, to protect his country and people from adversaries, to shelter the poor, widows, and orphans, to contribute to the prosperity of his people, and to provide, through the Church and in cooperation with the Church, spiritual sustenance, thereby guiding his subjects to eternal salvation.

---

<sup>4</sup> 1 Chronicles 29:23

<sup>5</sup> I draw here from the writings of Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) in defense of monarchy without necessarily agreeing with him in every respect. See: James Harvey Robinson, *Readings in European History: A Collection of Extracts from the Sources, Chosen with the Purpose of Illustrating the Progress of Culture in Western Europe Since the German Invasions*, Vol. II: *From the Opening of the Protestant Revolt to the Present Day* (Boston, MA: Ginn & Company, 1906), pp. 272-277.

<sup>6</sup> *The Oxford History of Britain*, p. 105.

<sup>7</sup> Bishop Nektary of Seattle, “The Canonization of the New Martyrs and Confessors of Russia,” *Orthodox Word*, Vol. XXIV, No. 5-6 (September-December, 1988) p. 327.

For any errors that may appear in this work, this author is wholly at fault. For that which is of spiritual value in this work, many people must share the credit. I wish, first of all, to thank His Eminence, Archbishop Chrysostomos, for his continuous encouragement and advice during the time I was researching and writing this book. I thank my wife of forty-two years, Presbytera Elizabeth, for her patience in dealing with the horrendous clutter of books and papers necessary to the completion of this book, and for her assistance in my efforts. I thank my spiritual sons, Reader Peter Avisov and Andrew Roesell, for reading or listening to many of these lives and for offering their insightful suggestions and corrections. I must express my special thanks to a friend (who prefers anonymity) who presented me with a portable computer, which allowed me to work on the present volume while I was away from home. That gift allowed me to complete my efforts much more quickly than would otherwise have been the case. As always, my gratitude goes to the Fathers of the St. Gregory Palamas Monastery for their help in providing information on the lives of many of the Saints in this collection and for proofreading the final text and arranging it for publication.

*-Father James Thornton,*

*Feast of the Translation of the Relics of Saint John Chrysostomos, 2013*

## **Introduction**

By Archbishop Chrysostomos

In more enlightened times than our age, over which even many perennialist philosophers, so given to finding inexhaustible sources of truth and inspiration in what they consider the unremittingly *positive* spiritual evolution of man, have come to despair, a work such as the present volume would have been the apple of every publisher's eye. It is a monumental work and, though encyclopedic in nature, contains a wealth of information about a system of governance, monarchy, that dominated in the Christian West for the greater part of its history. If, in our arrogance and cultural myopia, we attribute to our democratic traditions the great strides forward of the western world, we must nevertheless yield to the data of history. These data confirm that, the fantasies that we hold about the ancient Greek world and its embodiment in the democratic principles of our epoch aside, if flowers grow from the soil in which they were nurtured, then the most beautiful artifacts of our cultural history indubitably blossomed on social flora with deep roots in Christian monarchical societies. Their legacy can be found not only in the

anachronism of extant monarchies, but also in the social and psychological values that the precepts of monarchism—as much as those of democracy and its relatively recent political offshoots—have bequeathed to our contemporary world. The darkness of our times, in which the majority of people stand miserably ignorant, for the most part, of the actual lessons of history, derives from our disinterest in our heritage, our indifference to what it can teach us, and our almost mechanical negative response to anything that calls us to examine ourselves in the light of the past and its virtues and visions. Our future, therefore, we have in many ways blackened by what one might justifiably call the moral and intellectual devolution of Christian societies.

It is no surprise, then, that the books that we buy and read, and make best sellers, are so often superficial justifications of our unexamined lives: the kinds of lives that the ancients to whom we pay such lip service would have considered abhorrent. A book about noble, virtuous, and pious monarchs is not simply uninteresting to us; it is, indeed, in many ways incomprehensible. We are increasingly unreligious, which makes us more and more impious and unresponsive to God, and we are also progressively possessed by our passions and turned away from our inner potentials, which proclivity makes a life of virtue literally unattainable. We care little about such a life and know less and less of it. Thus, if we can even imagine, given the negative reputation of monarchs today, any of them being virtuous, whatever it is that we might imagine would be odd or peculiar to us anyway. Not only do we lack the virtues to grasp the meaning of virtue—let alone in something like monarchy—but the few surviving monarchs who uphold traditional virtues are either far removed from anything that we have experienced or have been supplanted in our minds and experience by those venal creatures who, hardly even pretending to be monarchs, are all that we have become. So, we turn to the latest crime novel, stories about our degenerate popular heroes (the mercenary victims of drugs, self-indulgence, unfounded egotism, and the like), or indulge our own debauched carnality.

Yet, without succumbing to the myth of positive evolution and the deterministic inevitability of virtue rising like a phoenix from perennial good, I do believe that virtue can be recovered in our age and that what *devolves* can, through good efforts and the doing and emulation of good, *evolve* and change direction. In that process, the example of the virtuous monarchs of the past can aid us immensely. Even if we are tendentious in our view of royalty, whether because of the unworthy examples of such today or because of failed figures from the historical witness (once more, to the extent that it is known with any accuracy), by studying the virtues of pious and holy

monarchs of the past, we can draw on classical models of good that will help us to appreciate the possible role of virtue in our cultural, social, and personal lives. Setting aside the question of monarchy as a political system that is, and will probably remain, a limited phenomenon in modernity, we can nevertheless see in the lives of pious kings and queens from the past how they cultivated virtue in their subjects and how virtuous subjects, in turn, inspired selfless leadership in their rulers. This reciprocal relationship, centered, at least in Christian monarchies, on self-sacrifice and the concern of the monarch *and* his subjects for the goal of living a Godly earthly life in preparation for eternal perfection, is ideally reflected in the life of the family. The monarch, like a mother or father, cares for his or her subjects with love and concern, just as his or her subjects, like children looking up to a parent, feel an obligation to the monarch who nurtured and protected them. Monarchism, therefore, is intimately related to the family, a basic element in the structure of society, and draws on many of the same powers that have made the family such an enduring force in human history and in our personal formation.

Even as the ideals of monarchy fell flat over the course of western history, and as the search for perfection in the imperfection of a fallen world and of fallen humans waned with the advent of utopian notions of the amelioration of the human condition here and through social engineering, a lasting respect for nobility of character and sacrifice for the general good both in this life and in the next has somehow endured, as I noted earlier. So, too, the influence of the family—though challenged and somewhat compromised—has survived as a strong reinforcer of the idea of virtuous living and sacrifice for others. It is thus at the level of personal formation especially, in our day, that the pious kings and queens of the past have the most to say to us, since their struggles for virtue *directly* address a society in which egalitarian values and heretofore unimagined wealth have eaten away at the selfless and moral way of life and have made privilege, self-assertion, and the aims of the voluptuary accessible to an ever larger part of the population. What was once available only to a small class of elite nobles is now available to all, and this without the bridling effects of a sense of *noblesse oblige* and responsibility for others. Precisely because of this transformation in modern life, the virtuous royals speak to us with a degree of relevancy that exceeds that which they had in the past. Their efforts to forgo the temptations and lusts of power and privilege, their struggles against the corrupting force of arrogance, and their resolve to resist the fulfillment of every passion, uninhibited by social convention and even common law (from which they could easily have exempted themselves),



present a wonderful example to us as we face new liberties (or shackles) unavailable in the past. They sought to divest themselves of the very things that many today live to acquire. The responsibility for others that we wish to abandon to the state or to public welfare they imposed on themselves. They convict modern man, to whom much has been given in a material sense, of failing at good stewardship and nobility of soul and purpose. Their lesson is *stark*. To the extent that we remember and emulate these paradigms of virtue, they become icons of good that call us to the archetypes of virtue. To the extent that we dismiss them, we are counted among history's spiritual derelicts, having, alongside the *failed* monarchs of the past, squandered our opportunities to embrace virtue.

The most amazing lesson that we learn from the lives of the virtuous monarchs of our Orthodox Christian Faith is singular virtue of fearing, following, and then loving God. Our royal Saints were men and women who *feared the lure of the world* and ruled according to Divine precepts, *following the examples of the Saints*. Many of them, in so doing, came to such *love of God* that they became monastics at the end of their lives, giving up power and privilege for the simplicity, poverty, and humility of the angelic life. Virtue so transformed them that they became, in the parlance and thought of the modern world, social parasites. But as the very lives of these righteous royals aver, in the course of embracing virtue they elevated and benefited humanity and society, giving it essential life. They expose, by their example, those who eschew virtue, who suck the marrow from human life, exploiting it for the sake of selfish passions and personal gain, as the *real* parasites. Trading social preëminence for humility, wealth for poverty, leadership for obedience, and self-interest for self-transformation in Christ, the Orthodox royals who sacrificed their lives for their people, who set an example of Godly life and self-abnegation in abundance and luxury, and who, in the most severe and extreme expression of their commitment to God and others, embraced the monastic life—these extraordinary figures pose a challenge to our increasingly unreligious societies, to our materialistic and passion-centered way of life, and to our deviation from the path of achieving human perfection in selflessness. They throw down the gauntlet to all of us in an epoch where we have made depravity available to all, calling us to spiritual nobility, the lowly and the mighty alike; to an egalitarianism of humility; to a common aristocracy of virtue; and to an abandonment of the material world and the passions for the spiritual gifts of goodness and purity.

Though this book, as I asserted at the outset, should have been distributed throughout the world by major publishers and heralded as a contribution to the reassessment of the best that the past has offered us, as a

reminder of how we have squandered that best portion in the present, and as a useful tool in rebuilding and changing what seems to be a very tenebrous and bleak future, perhaps its more limited publication, albeit by a prestigious and important press, will nonetheless insure its availability to the next generation. For this gift to history, we must thank the author, the Very Reverend Father Dr. James Thornton, the Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, its director, the Reverend Father Dr. Asterios Gerostergios, and the spirit of its distinguished and renowned founder, the late Professor Constantine Cavarinos, who, in imitation of our greatest royals, at the end of his days entered the monastic life and departed this life among the nobles of our sadly ignoble age.

Ἅγιοι Βασιλεῖς, πρεσβεύσατε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. *Sancti reges et sanctæ reginæ, intercedite pro nobis.*

**(*Pious Kings and Right-Believing Queens* contains the lives of nearly six hundred Saints. Following is a small sample.)**

**Saint ALEXANDER Nevsky, Prince of Novgorod, Grand Prince of Vladimir:** One of the greatest heroes of the Russian nation and of all Orthodox Christianity, Saint Alexander Nevsky was the son of Yaroslav II and the grandson of Vsevolod III, both Grand Princes of Vladimir. Born May 30, in 1219 (or 1220), at Pereyaslavl, the Saint grew to adulthood at Novgorod where he was appointed Prince while still quite young. Saint Nicholas of Žiča writes that Saint Alexander’s “heart was drawn to God from his youth,”<sup>8</sup> which was natural for him since his parents were very pious, assiduously attending all the appointed Divine Services and contributing generously to the Church.

The bulk of Saint Alexander’s historical fame rests on his successful defeat of western invaders, who several times attempted to subjugate the Russian land and people. When Swedish forces launched an invasion in 1240, the Saint met them with his army at the River Neva. On the morning of the battle one of the Saint’s generals reported to him that he had had a vision of SAINTS BORIS AND GLEB, who promised to assist in achieving a Russian victory. Thus assured that the Heavenly Hosts were at his side,

---

<sup>8</sup> Bishop Nikolai Velimirović, *The Prologue of Ochrid: Lives of the Saints and Homilies for Every Day in the Year*, trans. Mother Maria, Pt. IV: *October, November, December* (Birmingham, UK: Lazarica Press, 1986), p. 232.

while reviewing his army before combat the Saint addressed his soldiers with the words, “God is not on the side of force, but on the side of justice and truth!”

On July 15, the Russians struck, taking the Swedish army by surprise. Up to that point, the enemy had been convinced that Saint Alexander was too weak to resist their conquests. The Swedes were defeated decisively, crushed, in fact, their commander, Birger Jarl, brother-in-law of the Swedish King, suffering a wound from Saint Alexander’s lance. It was said that a Swedish bishop, fighting in the battle (as was often the custom of Papal clerics), was killed, along with huge numbers of invading soldiers. It is from that famous battle that the Saint won his title “Nevsky” (“of the Neva”).

A year after the Battle on the Neva, Russia was invaded once again, this time by the Knights of the Teutonic Order, who had begun a crusade, at the connivance of Gregory IX, Pope of Rome, that sought forcibly to convert Russia to the Papal religion. The Westerners were at first successful, taking the city of Pskov. Saint Alexander met them at the Battle on Lake Chudskoye (also known as “the Battle on Lake Peipus”) on April 5, 1242. The Western army, made up of Estonians, Germans, Livonians, and Danes, and commanded by the Prince-Bishop of Dorpat (now Tartu, Estonia), Hermann von Buxhöveden, attacked across the frozen surface of the lake, charging the Russian line, hoping to overwhelm and shatter all resistance. However, despite the terrifying avalanche of armored knights on horseback, the Russian line held, after which the combatants engaged in a lengthy and tiring hand-to-hand combat. Seeing the exhaustion of the enemy, Saint Alexander ordered his reserve archers and cavalry into the fray, these reserves attacking both sides of the enemy’s flanks. Suddenly surrounded by fresh troops, the stunned Westerners panicked and were routed, fleeing for their lives. The confused retreat was made worse by the breaking up of the ice, strained beyond its limit by the heavily armored knights and the pounding hooves of their armored horses. Pulled down by the weight of their steel cuirasses, greaves, gauntlets, and helmets, many a proud knight sank helplessly to his doom in the dark, frigid waters of the lake. The unhappy Bishop von Buxhöveden managed barely to escape with his life and, later, he and his allies were compelled by Saint Alexander to “renounce all their conquests”<sup>9</sup> and remove themselves from Russian lands. Chastened

---

<sup>9</sup> Robert Nisbet Bain, in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition. (New York, NY: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1911), s.v. “Alexander Nevsky, Saint.”

by the defeat, the West would eschew another major *Drang nach Osten*<sup>10</sup> for some time.

Having saved his country from the greedy designs of foreigners and the minions of a foreign religion, the Saintly Prince now turned his attention eastward. Shortly before the battles with the Western invaders, the Mongols had invaded Russia from the east, subjugating large areas of the Slavic domains. The invasion was on a vast scale, so vast as to be irresistible and unlike anything that Russia or any other European land had known since the Hunnish invasions of the fifth century. The mounted Mongol archers alone constituted more than 150,000 men. To resist often meant the complete devastation of the land, the burning of cities, and a landscape dotted with pyramids of skulls—in short, utter ruin and cultural extinction. To fight Germans or Estonians whose numbers roughly equaled those of the Russians was one thing. To fight hundreds of thousands of ruthless Asiatic nomad-warriors was quite another.

The alternative was to pay tribute, which, largely speaking, satisfied the conquerors. Unlike the invaders from the West, the Golden Horde (the Russian term for the Mongols) had no interest in imposing an alien culture or religion on their subjects. To cities or regions that dutifully paid the prescribed tribute, the Mongols often granted a large measure of autonomy and complete religious tolerance.

Knowing that to defy the Mongols or to attempt to halt their advance was foolhardy in the extreme, and would, without question, bring immense suffering to his people, perhaps even their obliteration, Saint Alexander resolved to journey to the Great Khan of the Mongols, to save his nation and people. He asked his Metropolitan, Cyril of Vladimir, for a blessing to undertake the mission. His Eminence granted it, and the Prince set off on his long journey.

Once the Saint arrived and entered into the presence of the Khan, and after a few required courtesies, he humbly begged mercy for his people and promised the required tribute. The Khan apparently took a liking to the Saint, valuing “him for his wisdom, and his physical strength and beauty,”<sup>11</sup> In the end, a *modus vivendi* was arranged whereby the way of life of the Russian people was preserved. Yet for the hero of the Battles of the Neva and Chudskoye, to abase himself before this uncivilized heathen ruler could not have been easy.

---

<sup>10</sup> A German term, meaning “Drive towards the East,” which refers to German and Western attempts at colonizing and westernizing the lands of the Slavs.

<sup>11</sup> Bishop Nikolai Velimirovic, *The Prologue*, Pt. IV, p. 232.

An ancient work, a *Life of Saint Alexander Nevsky*, says of him that he “did not abandon the way of his father, for his people’s sake: for them he suffered much oppression. He did deny himself in great honor, giving away all his wealth, all his fortune to the aliens.”<sup>12</sup> The giving away of his fortune refers to the great sums he spent ransoming Russian captives of the Mongols. Saint Nicholas of Žiča adds that Saint Alexander “built many churches, and performed innumerable works of mercy.”<sup>13</sup>

In his final act of sacrifice for the Russian people, the Saint again journeyed to the Khan, at Sarai, the Mongol capital, to try to alleviate the burden caused by the payment of tribute and to end the conscription of Russian men by the Mongols. The Khan agreed to lighten the payment and to end the conscription. The great Saint and Prince never saw his home again, however. While *en route*, he reposed, during a visit to a monastery at Gorodets, November 14, 1263. At the solemn funeral, Metropolitan Cyril, in his eulogy, said that, with the death of the Saint, “the sun of Russia set.”<sup>14</sup>

Saint Alexander Nevsky, Prince of Novgorod and Grand Prince of Vladimir, was Glorified by the Russian Church in 1547. He is commemorated on November 14 and November 23, the last date being that of his burial. He is also commemorated on August 30, the day of the translation of his Relics.

**Saint BURIANA, Princess of Ireland:** Saint Buriana (also “Beriona,” “Bruinech,” “Burian,” “Buriena,” “Buryan,” *et. al.*), the daughter of King Crimthan of Munster, lived in the sixth century. She was the disciple of Saint Kieran, the founder of the great Monastery of Clonmacnoise, from whom she received her education and through whose influence she became a very devout lover of God.<sup>15</sup> After completing her education, the Saint is said to have “set up great schools for girls.”<sup>16</sup> She subsequently “migrated to Cornwall, and settled near the Land’s End,”<sup>17</sup> where she built a hermitage

---

<sup>12</sup> Quoted in G. P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind (II): The Middle Ages; 13<sup>th</sup> to the 15<sup>th</sup> Centuries*, ed. John Meyendorff, Vol. IV of *The Collected Works of George Fedotov* (Belmont, MA: Nordland Publishing Co., 1975), p. 166.

<sup>13</sup> *The Prologue*, Vol. 4, p. 232.

<sup>14</sup> *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Eleventh Edition. (New York, NY: The Encyclopaedia Britannica Company, 1911), s.v. “Alexander Nevsky, Saint.”

<sup>15</sup> Sabine Baring-Gould, *A Book of the West: Being An Introduction to Devon and Cornwall* (London, UK: Methuen & Co., 1900), p. 308.

<sup>16</sup> Agnes B. C. Dunbar, *A Dictionary of Saintly Women*, vol. 1 (London, UK: George Bell and Sons, 1904), p. 140.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

and lived a solitary, monastic life of particular strictness. Upon her death, she was buried in a small chapel at her hermitage. Four centuries later, during the reign of King Æthelstan the Glorious, a large church was constructed at that place by order of the King and dedicated to Saint Buriana. The present structure, an Anglican parish still named for Saint Buriana (although with the spelling “Buryan” and in the village of St. Buryan), mostly dates from the fifteenth century, with substantial alterations in later centuries, especially the nineteenth. Little, if anything, remains of the original buildings. Saint Buriana is commemorated May 1.

The Life of Saint Bruinech, a Saint commemorated on May 29, is virtually the same as that of Saint Buriana. It seems likely that the two are the same person. Agnes Baillie Cunninghame Dunbar, in her authoritative *Dictionary of Saintly Women*, regards them as the same. If they are indeed separate persons, their Lives are inextricably conflated.

**Saint CANUTE the Pious, King-Martyr of Denmark:** Saint Canute (also “Knud,” or “Knut”) ruled Denmark as King Canute IV from 1080 to 1086 and is that country’s patron Saint, known to Danes as “*Knud den Hellige*” (“Canute the Holy”). He was born in about 1043, the son of King Svend II of Denmark and grandnephew of King Canute the Great, who simultaneously ruled England, Denmark, and Norway in the early years of the eleventh century. Believing William the Conqueror to be a usurper of the English throne, Saint Canute twice sought to invade that country to liberate the Anglo-Saxon people from Norman oppression. He was thwarted in that endeavor by an act of treachery on the part of his brother, Olaf. An intensely pious man and ascetical in his personal life, during his short reign Saint Canute approved laws to protect the weak, orphans, and widows. "The happiness of his people and the interests of the Church were the objects he had most at heart."<sup>18</sup>

In 1086, a peasant rebellion erupted in the Kingdom. The Saint, at that time staying in Odense, on the island of Funen, took refuge in St. Alban’s Church. There, before the Altar, he, his brother, and seventeen of his men were slaughtered by the mob. It is said that he died while on his knees, praying before the Altar and that almost from the moment of his

---

<sup>18</sup> Patrick Ryan, S.J. “Canute IV (Cnut), Saint,” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Ed. Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, and John J. Wynne, S.J., Vol. III: *Brow-Clancy* (New York, NY:Robert Appleton Co., 1908), p. 307.

burial, miracles took place at his grave. Saint Canute is now entombed in the huge Saint Canute Cathedral in Odense. He is commemorated on January 19, and the commemoration of the translation of his Relics is July 10.

**Saint DAVID IV the Victorious, King of Georgia:** Holy King David (also “Davit”) IV is known as “the Victorious,” “the Builder,” or “the Restorer,” and is regarded by the Georgian people as the greatest of their monarchs. At that time, in the eleventh century, the Saljuk Turks had overrun much of the country, spreading destruction and misery in every direction. In 1089, the King, Giorgi II, overwhelmed by the ongoing catastrophe, abdicated in favor of his son, Saint David, then only sixteen years of age. Despite his young age, however, Saint David displayed an energy and a maturity that proved decisive to the future of his nation.

First, the Saint understood that to reverse the downward course of events, he must place his trust in God. It is said, for example, that his favorite reading was the Holy Scriptures and various spiritual works. These books he carried with him even when engaged in warfare, so essential to his mission did he consider them. He also undertook to support the Church generously since, to build up the Georgian Orthodox Church and its authority was to assure a crucial ally in his defense of Georgia, especially in the spiritual realm. In connection with that aim, he cleansed the Church of unworthy clergymen.<sup>19</sup>

Secondly, certain elements among the nobility insisted on localism, that is, independent or semi-independent authority under the leadership of the many feudal lords as opposed to unified authority under the King, a notion that naturally undermined any integrated response to the Turkish invaders. Some of these lords were even willing to serve as vassals to Turkish overlords rather than acknowledge the supremacy of their own monarch. Saint David actively suppressed all of these separatists. With unity achieved, the Turks could then be dealt with. Saint David electrified his troops with these words:

Soldiers of Christ! If we fight bravely for our Faith, we will defeat not only the devil’s servants, but the devil himself. We will gain the greatest weapon

---

<sup>19</sup> Archpriest Zakaria Machitadze, *Lives of the Georgian Saints*, David and Lauren Elizabeth Ninoshvili, trans, Lado Mirianashvili, ed. (Platina, CA: St. Herman of Alaska Brotherhood, 2006), p. 75.

of spiritual warfare when we make a covenant with the Almighty God and vow that we would rather die for His love than escape from the enemy.<sup>20</sup>

A series of great battles were fought, usually against a much superior Turkish enemy, insofar as sheer numbers are concerned. Yet, each time the Georgians were triumphant, which victories they ascribed to the help of the Great-Martyr Saint George, who was seen fighting along side the Saintly King and his forces. Victory followed victory, until, at last, in 1123, the country was free! Characteristically, after his victory he insisted that non-Christians, Muslims and Jews, in his Kingdom were not to be molested but treated with tolerance and dignity.

Saint David is renowned for building the Gelati Monastery and Theological Academy, and for countless churches he built across the length and breadth of Georgia. He is remembered as well for writing his major work, *Hymns of Repentance*, a magnificent series of psalms which convey the deep humility of the Saint. He sought also to elevate his people through education by establishing institutions of learning throughout the country, and by sending many young Georgians to Constantinople to receive their schooling. Saint David the Victorious is thus King, warrior, builder, restorer, educator, and Saint; a man very few in the history of the Church can equal. He reposed peacefully January 26, 1125, on which day he is commemorated. He left instructions that he was to be buried at the entrance of the Gelati Monastery so that all who entered there would walk over his grave. The stone atop the grave has a quotation from the Psalms of another King David: “Christ! This is my rest for ever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it!”<sup>21</sup>

**Saint EDMUND, Martyr-King of East Anglia:** Not a great deal is known about Saint Edmund, King of East Anglia, since the Great Heathen Army, that is, the Vikings, obliterated all records of the East Anglian Kingdom during their invasion of 869. It is unknown when the Saint was born, who his parents were, or when he ascended the throne. We know nothing of his reign. Medieval traditions place his birth about the year 840 and his enthronement as King in 854 or 855. Some believe that he is the son of his predecessor, King Æthelweard. Other believe that Æthelweard failed to produce an heir and that Saint Edmund was an “Old Saxon,” that is, he was brought to England from a noble family in Saxony, in Germany, to rule.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 78.

<sup>21</sup> Psalm 132:14 (KJV), (Psalm 131:14 [LXX]).



According to Asser, Bishop of Sherborne, in his *Life of King Alfred*, Saint Edmund met the advancing Vikings at the head of his army, was defeated, and subsequently killed by the victors. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* notes that the invading Viking army

went over Mercia to East Anglia, and took winter quarters at Thetford [the place of the King's residence]. In that year, St. Edmund the king fought against them and the Danes took the victory, killed the king, and overcame all the land. They destroyed all the churches they came to; the same time they came to Peterborough, they burned and broke, killed the abbot and Monks, and all they found there. They made that which was very great such that it became nothing.<sup>22</sup>

(In destroying all of the churches and monasteries, they effectively wiped out East Anglian history, since the churches and monasteries contained the historical archives.) A more detailed tradition states that the King was captured, humiliated, scourged, ordered to renounce Christ, which he refused to do, tied to a tree, shot through with many arrows, and finally beheaded.

The Saint's body was first interred at a church at Bury St. Edmunds (then called "Beadoriceworth)". The incorrupt Relics were translated to London in the early eleventh century, to protect them from the Vikings, but were taken back after three years to Bury St. Edmunds, where an Abbey honoring the memory of the martyred King had been established. An elaborate silver shrine was created to house the Holy Relics. The shrine was demolished during the Reformation but the Relics escaped destruction. A portion are said to be in the Basilica of St. Sernin in Toulouse, while the remainder are housed in the chapel of the Arundel Castle in Sussex. The Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds was closed during the Dissolution of the Monasteries under Henry VIII and was reduced to ruins. Saint Edmund is commemorated November 20<sup>th</sup>.

**Saint FULVIANUS-MATTHEW, Prince of Ethiopia:** It is believed that after Pentecost, when he received the Grace of the Holy Spirit, the Holy Apostle and Evangelist Saint Matthew preached Christ Jesus first in Palestine, and there wrote his Gospel. Afterwards, he went on to evangelize in Syria, Media, Persia, Parthia, and, finally, Ethiopia.

---

<sup>22</sup> *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, Anne Savage, translator, Christopher Pick, Editor (New York, NY: Barnes and Noble Books, 2000), p. 92.

The Lord appeared to Saint Matthew, giving him a wooden rod that he was told was to be taken to a particular place in Ethiopia and planted there. Saint Matthew set off for Ethiopia and came to the place described by Christ. There he met a Bishop named “Plato,” who resided there. The rod was planted, in accordance with the Lord’s instructions, and almost immediately sprouted leaves and grew into a beautiful tree, the fruit of which was delicious. A spring welled up nearby, the water of which could heal the sick.

Many Ethiopians were won over to Christ, although the local sovereign Prince, Fulvianus, a dedicated pagan, was violently opposed and by his order the Holy Apostle was arrested and burned at the stake. But, in time, the Prince developed doubts about his actions. He agonized over his horrific act, his conscience beckoning him towards Christ. Ultimately, he was converted and Baptized, taking “Matthew” as his Baptismal name. When the old Bishop Plato departed this life, Saint Fulvianus-Matthew was Consecrated Bishop to take his place. He spent his remaining years preaching the Holy Gospel and winning his people to the Church. Saint Fulvianus-Matthew is commemorated November 16.

**Saint GILDAS the Wise, Prince of Strathclyde, Abbot of Rhuy:** In a nineteenth-century translation of Saint Gildas’ works, J.A. Giles (1808-1884), the translator, writes that of this Saint “little or nothing is known,” and he goes on to say that we know nothing definite of his parentage, country, or the precise period in which he lived.<sup>23</sup> And, so we must speak in uncertainties about him. However, the eleventh-century *Vita Gildae* says that he was one of the five sons of the King of Strathclyde, Caunus or Caw, and was born early in the sixth century. He studied under Saint Illtud at Llanilltud, his monastery in Wales, and went from there to do missionary work in Ireland, where he was Ordained a Priest. He returned to Britain, “his teaching there confirmed by miracles.”<sup>24</sup> Some years later, he travelled to Rome on pilgrimage and, on his return journey, stopped in Brittany where he was asked to establish a monastery at Rhuy. There, after many years of

---

<sup>23</sup> *The Works of Gildas, Surnamed the Wise*, trans. J. A. Giles (London, UK: James Bohn, 1841), p. vii.

<sup>24</sup> Columba Edmonds, “Gildas, Saint,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Ed. Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, and John J. Wynne, S.J., Vol. VI: *Fathers-Gregory* (New York, NY: Robert Appleton Co., 1909)

prayer, study, and austerity, he reposed, about the year 570.<sup>25</sup> Many churches in Brittany are named for him as is the village of Saint-Gildas-de-Rhuys.

Saint Gildas is most famed for his work, *De Excidio et Conquestu Britannae* (*On the Ruin and Conquest of Britain*). The book is composed of three parts: a preface; a history of Britain from the Roman invasion to his own time; and a severe condemnation of the rulers of Britain who allowed the ruin of their country and people, along with a harsh indictment of many of the clergy of his time. Saint Gildas assumes the role of a Prophet of old, putting the blame for the chaos that swept Britain after the departure of the Romans on the incompetence of the British rulers and the sinfulness of the people. Yet, the work is not written in the spirit of pride and self-righteousness, but rather, like the writings of the Holy Prophet Jeremiah, the spirit is one of grief over the immense woes of his country. In his Preface the Saint begins:

Whatever in this my epistle I may write in my humble but well-meaning manner, rather by way of lamentation than for display, let no one suppose that it springs from contempt of others, or that I foolishly esteem myself better than they;—for alas! The subject of my complaint is the general destruction of every thing that is good, and the general growth of evil throughout the land;—but that I would condole with my country in her distress and rejoice to see her revive therefrom.<sup>26</sup>

The Saint is sometimes surnamed “Badonicus,” since, he wrote, he was born on the day of the Battle of Mount Badon, a battle in which the Britons defeated the Anglo-Saxons and temporarily halted their expansion into British territory. Saint Gildas is commemorated January 29.

**Saint HERMENEGILD, Prince of Spain:** Seeking protection against the Huns, the Visigoths, a Germanic people, moved *en masse* into the Roman Empire during the time of the Emperor Valens. Settling first in the Balkans, and traveling then into the Pelopennesus, Italy, and Gaul (a migration across southern Europe punctuated by many wars), a Visigothic Kingdom was eventually established on the Iberian peninsula (modern Spain and Portugal) in the late fifth century, with its capital at Toledo. That Kingdom lasted until the Arab conquest in the eighth century.

---

<sup>25</sup> That the Saint reposed at Rhuys and was buried there is in accordance with the eleventh-century *Vita Gildae*. A twelfth-century *Vita* says that he returned to Britain, reposed there, and was buried in Glastonbury Abbey.

<sup>26</sup> *The Works of Gildas, Surnamed the Wise*, trans. J. A. Giles, p. 1.

Now it happened that, in the fourth century, the Visigoths had been converted from paganism by the Arian Bishop, Ulphilas. A quite astonishing historical figure, and a sort of heretical “apostle of the Goths,”<sup>27</sup> Ulphilas began his efforts by inventing a Gothic alphabet and then translating the entire<sup>28</sup> Holy Bible and the Liturgy from Greek into the Gothic tongue. He spent the remaining forty years of his life in missionary work among these people. Not only were the Visigoths converted to Arian Christianity, but the Ostrogoths, and their cousins, the Vandals, as well. Consequently, the Visigothic Kingdom of Spain was officially Arian, although the indigenous Hispano-Roman population—the overwhelming majority—remained faithful to Orthodox Catholic Christianity.

That this majority remained Orthodox and resisted Arianism made them, and especially their Orthodox clergy, suspect in the eyes of their Visigothic overlords. Hostile to Orthodox Christianity and to the Roman (Byzantine) Empire, the Visigothic ruling class was unable either to convert or to trust their subjects. The harshness of their rule, especially their confiscation of huge tracts of land, contributed greatly to their difficulties. “The separation of the two peoples was rigidly maintained; intermarriage was illegal, and each lived under their own law.”<sup>29</sup> Thus, the rule of the Visigoths in Spain was always somewhat tenuous, held in place by brute force.

In 568, Leovigild became King. He is regarded by historians as “the greatest king of Visigothic Spain, pursuing by dint of wars on all sides the unification of the peninsula and the consolidation of the tottering royal authority.”<sup>30</sup> He was indeed surrounded by adversaries, external and internal.

There were the Suevi in the north-west, ...the Basques in the Cantabrian mountains, and the petty Hispano-Roman princes of the west-centre. There were the Byzantines in the south and the aggressive Franks in the north. Internally there were the discontented subject Catholics and, as hostile as any, the rival Visigothic nobles ....<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Ulphilas.”

<sup>28</sup> There was one exception. He evidently did not translate the Book of Kings, which glorified military exploits and, since the Visigoths were already too fond of war, Ulphilas did not wish further to encourage their excesses in this direction. *Ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History*, by C.W. Previté-Orton, Vol. I (Cambridge, UK:Cambridge University Press, 1952), p. 142.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 144.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*

Nonetheless, Leovigild triumphed over his enemies, or at least held them at bay, although his methods were ruthless: “executions and confiscations were his method of strengthening the monarchy: it seemed ferocious even to the Franks.”<sup>32</sup> And all the while the King held stubbornly, even fanatically, to the Arian creed.

Saint Hermenegild, Leovigild’s eldest son and thus Crown Prince and heir, married a Frankish Princess, Ingundis, in 579. Pressured by the Royal Court to convert to Arianism, Ingundis adamantly refused. Sent by Leovigild to Seville, the Crown Prince there came under the influence of Saint Leander, Archbishop of Seville. The Holy Bishop assisted Princess Ingundis in convincing the young Prince of the truth of Orthodox Christianity, to which holy Faith he converted. The King responded violently, Saint Hermenegild then joining in a revolt against his father’s savage rule.

Leovigild at first tried to conciliate his rebellious subjects by offering peace and tolerance to the Orthodox, even assembling a local synod of Arian and Orthodox Bishops in Toledo. However, when the Orthodox refused to compromise, the King “resorted to fierce persecution—banishment, death, and confiscation—without gaining many converts thereby.”<sup>33</sup>

In 585, King Leovigild captured Seville, which he had besieged for two years. His son, Saint Hermenegild, surrendered and was imprisoned. When, during his captivity, he was visited by an Arian Bishop, who sought to obtain his repudiation of Orthodoxy and return to the King’s religion, the Saint refused. He likewise refused Communion from the hands of an Arian Priest, reminding the Priest that the reception of Communion signifies (among other things) oneness of Faith. Since he would not assent to Arianism, he of course refused to Commune with an Arian heretic.

For King Leovigild, his son’s refusal to return to Arianism was the final straw. He ordered Saint Hermenegild’s immediate execution. The Saint went to his death on April 13, 585 in Christlike fashion, that is, with complete resignation.

The martyrdom of Saint Hermenegild led to the triumph of Orthodox Christianity among the Visigoths. In the year following King Leovigild died, which event marked “the death-knell of the Arianism he had championed.”<sup>34</sup> Leovigild’s second son, Recared, ascended the throne and

---

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

soon declared for Orthodox Christianity. Three years later, he assembled a Synod in Toledo, under the presidency of Saint Leander of Seville, which likewise upheld Orthodox Christianity and condemned Arianism. Revolts led by Arian bishops blazed forth, and in 603, the usurper, Witteric, murdered King Liuva II (Recared's son and successor) and briefly restored Arianism to official favor. But that was the heresy's last gasp. With Witteric's assassination in 610, Arianism disappeared as a force in Spanish political and ecclesiastical life. The Feast Day of Saint Hermenegild, Prince of Spain, is April 13.

**Saint IRENE, Empress of the Romans, Wife of Emperor John II Komnenos:** Saint Irene, named "Piroska" at her birth and sometimes called "Irene of Hungary," was the daughter of King Ladislaus I of Hungary. She converted to the Orthodox Faith (when she was given the name "Irene") and became the wife of Emperor John II Komnenos in 1104. Hagiographer Agnes B.C. Dunbar writes of her that she

showed, on the throne, that contempt for luxury and pleasure which she had learnt from her saintly father. Whatever her husband gave her she spent, not on herself or her children, but on the poor and the Church. She built a church and monastery for men, and dedicated it to the Pantocrator, the all-powerful God; and there by her own wish, she was buried in 1124.<sup>35</sup>

She is commemorated August 13.

**Saint JOHN III Doukas Vatatzes the Merciful, Emperor of Nicaea:** With the fall of Constantinople to Latin crusaders in 1204, what remained of the Christian Roman (Byzantine) Empire was fragmented into four parts. One of these was the Empire of Nicaea, which was organized in northern and western Asia Minor, occupying roughly a third of that land mass. Theodore I Laskaris was the first to occupy that throne. In November 1221, Emperor Theodore died and was succeeded by his son-in-law, Saint John the Merciful. Saint John was born *ca.* 1192 in Adrianople to a family of the Byzantine nobility. "His grandfather, Constantine Vatatzes, was commander-in-chief of the army of Emperor Manuel Comnenus, who reigned from 1143 to 1180."<sup>36</sup> He "was a ruler of the highest ability and

---

<sup>35</sup> Agnes Baillie Cunninghame Dunbar, *A Dictionary of Sainly Women*, Vol. 1 (London, UK: George Bell and Sons, 1904), p. 413.

<sup>36</sup> "The Life of the Blessed Emperor John Ducas Vatatzes, the Merciful," *Orthodox Life*, Vol. XXXII, No. 6 (November-December, 1982), p. 43.

great tenacity of purpose.”<sup>37</sup> The Saint “was an ardent protector of all victims of wrongdoing, a bastion of justice and a fount of mercy. It is no wonder he was called ‘the Merciful.’ Likewise, he was a zealot of piety and Orthodoxy....”<sup>38</sup> In his personal traits he “was of a meek, simple and peaceable disposition.”<sup>39</sup>

Saint John the Merciful reposed in 1254 and was buried at a monastery he founded at Sosandra, near Nymphaion, the Imperial capital. His Relics were later translated to Magnesia. When his tomb was opened seven years after his death, they were found to be completely incorrupt, looking exactly the same as the day he died. He is commemorated November 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Saint KENELM, King of Mercia, Child Martyr:** We consider here the traditional story of the child-Martyr King, Saint Kenelm of Mercia, who was the son of Kenulph, King of Mercia. King Kenulph died in 819 and was succeeded by his seven-year-old son, Saint Kenelm. Since the new King was a child, his sister, Quendryda, served as Regent. However, she was jealous of her brother and plotted his death with her lover, Askobert. About this time, the Saint had a dream

which he related to his nurse Wolwere: ‘I saw, O dearest mother, a tree that reached to the stars standing by my bed, and I stood on the top of it, from where I could see everything. It was most beautiful, having wide-spreading branches, and it was covered from top to bottom with all kinds of flowers and glowed with innumerable lights. But as I wondered at the sight, some of my people cut down the tree, and it fell with a great crash, and forthwith I made for myself white wings and flew up to heaven.’ ‘Alas,’ said the nurse, ‘my sweetest son whom I have nourished with my milk, I fear that the falling tree means the destruction of your life through the wicked plot of your sister and the treachery of your guardian, and the bird which went up to heaven signifies the ascension of your soul.’<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Michael J. Angold, “John III Vatatzes, emperor of Nicaea,” in *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Vol. II (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 1048.

<sup>38</sup> “The Life of the Blessed Emperor John Ducas Vatatzes, the Merciful,” *Orthodox Life*.

<sup>39</sup> Hieromonk Makarios of Simonos Petra, *The Synaxarion: The Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox Church*, Vol. II, November-December (Ormylia, Greece: Holy Convent of The Annunciation of Our Lady, 1999), p. 36.

<sup>40</sup> Vladimir Moss, *The Saints of Anglo-Saxon England*, Vol. I (Seattle, WA: St. Nectarios Press, 1992), p. 34.

Some days later, Askobert accompanied the little King on a hunting trip into the forest. After a few hours, the child became tired, and so rested under a tree and fell asleep. Askobert saw his chance, and began to dig a grave for the boy. When the Saint arose, he said to Askobert, "This is not the place ordained for you to kill me."<sup>41</sup> The murderer then took the child to another place deeper into the forest and there beheaded him. He buried the Saint, along with the murder weapon, and returned to Quendryda at the Royal residence, where the two of them rejoiced that they could now enjoy power and riches unimpeded.

Now it happened that when the Saint was killed, a white dove was present and, after the burial, flew off to Rome. One morning, while the Pope was celebrating Mass, the dove flew through a window and dropped a scroll onto the Altar-Table. The scroll said, "In Clent, in Cowbach, lieth under a thorn/ His head off shorn, Kenelm, king-born."<sup>42</sup> The Pope sent messengers to Archbishop Wulfred of Canterbury to investigate the revelation. After a thorough search of the area described in the scroll, they saw a bright light shining on a particular spot, the spot where Askobert had buried Saint Kenelm. Digging there, they found the poor boy's body, and the knife. The criminals were quickly brought to justice and the Saint was buried with great solemnity at Winchcombe Abbey. A thousand years later evidence supporting this traditional story of the Child-Martyr was brought to light.

In the year 1815 the fine old Abbot's House [at the former Winchcombe Abbey], which for many years had been used as a parish workhouse, was unfortunately demolished by its owner, Mr. Williams, and thus Winchcombe lost one of its most interesting relics. At the same time Mr. Williams made extensive excavations on what was supposed to be the site of the abbey, and in doing so he is stated to have clearly traced the deep and massive foundations of the first church erected there. At the east end of the interior of the church was discovered a small stone coffin, and close by it was another one of the usual size. 'Upon the removal of the flagstone which covered it,' writes one who was present at the discovery, 'there appeared a skull, with a few other larger bones, and a very long-bladed knife, which had become a mass of rust, and fell to pieces on being handled. The bones also vanished immediately they were exposed to the air. Speed<sup>43</sup> says that Kenelm was interred in the

---

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.* p. 35.

<sup>43</sup> Presumably this reference is to John Speed (1552-1629), an English cartographer and historian and the author of the *Historie of Great Britaine*.



monastery near to his father, and no two coffins except those before mentioned were found near together. This circumstance, therefore, combined with that of the knife, which it is possible the murderer left with the body, and which might have been removed and deposited with it, induces the celebrated antiquary, Fosbroke, to form the conclusion that the largest coffin was Kenulph's and the smaller Kenelm's'<sup>44</sup>

Saint Kenelm's Feast Day is July 17.

**Saint LUCIUS, King of Britain:** In his work, *The Greater Chronicle* (*Chronica maiora*), Saint Bede the Venerable of Wearmouth and Jarrow writes the following: "Lucius the king of Britain sent a letter to bishop Eleutherius<sup>45</sup> of Rome, seeking to be made a Christian."<sup>46</sup> The Saint dates that event, according to his system, in the year 4131, which is 179 A.D. Some years later, in his *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Saint Bede wrote of Saint Lucius in more detail:

In the year of our Lord 156 Marcus Antoninus Verus was made emperor together with his brother Aurelius Commodus. He was the fourteenth after Augustus. In their time, while a holy man called Eleutherius was bishop of the church at Rome, Lucius, a king of Britain, sent him a letter praying him that he might be made a Christian by a rescript from him. His pious request was quickly granted and the Britons preserved the faith which they had received, inviolate and entire, in peace and quiet, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian.<sup>47</sup>

The Saint drew his information in both cases from the *Liber Pontificalis*, a book of the history of the Popes of Rome.

---

<sup>44</sup> Rev. Peter H. Ditchfield, M.A., Editor, *Memorials of Old Gloucestershire* (London, UK: George Allen & Co., Ltd., 1911), p. 97.

<sup>45</sup> The name is more properly "Eleutheros." The Saint and Pope of Rome was a Greek, born in Nicopolis, Greece.

<sup>46</sup> Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People, The Greater Chronicle, & Bede's Letter to Egbert*, Bertram Colgrave, trans., Judith McClure and Roger Collins, eds, (London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 312.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 14. St. Bede's mention of the year 156 with which he begins that particular passage does not mean to indicate that St. Lucius wrote St. Eleutherius that year, since St. Eleutherius did not become Bishop of Rome until *ca.* 171. He merely indicates that the letter was written "in their time," that is, in the time of the Roman rulers whom he had just mentioned.

The legend<sup>48</sup> of Saint Lucius the King seems to have been accepted throughout the medieval period, as it has been by many authors in modern times. Today, however, modernist critics, using the positivist approach to Church history, insist that the story of this King is a fabrication (just as they regard as fiction the lives of Saint Christopher, SAINT CATHERINE OF SINAI, and others). Yet, no less an authority than the eighteenth-century scholar and hagiographer, Father Alban Butler, declared for the historicity of Saint Lucius in his multivolume *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and Other Principal Saints*, a gigantic work that cost the writer thirty years of study and toil. Father Butler writes that the events described by Saint Bede “must have happened about the year 182.”<sup>49</sup> He states further:

That Lucius was a Christian king in Britain, is proved by two medals mentioned by [Church of Ireland Archbishop James] Usher [in his book, *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*].... Bede tells us, that by his embassy to Eleutherius he obtained the effect of his pious request; and that the Britons enjoyed the light of faith in peace until the reign of Dioclesian<sup>50</sup>. Lucius therefore was the first Christian king in Europe....<sup>51</sup>

Further along in his entry, as additional evidence, he notes:

The testimonies of St. Justin, St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Eusebius, St. Chrysostom, and Theodoret, demonstrate that Christianity had got a footing in Britain very soon after Christ. We cannot, therefore, wonder that a prince should have embraced the faith in this island in the second century: nor do the objections which some have raised, deserve notice.<sup>52</sup>

The nineteenth-century Roman Catholic hagiographer, Father Richard Stanton (1821-1901), writes that, “The history of the conversion of King Lucius ... appears to contain nothing improbable, if by *Rex Britannia* we understand one of the lesser princes who governed parts of the island under the Romans ....”<sup>53</sup> Like Father Butler, Father Stanton accepts Saint Lucius

---

<sup>48</sup> A “legend” is not a fabricated story, but is a story handed down through the generations that is popularly accepted as historical, yet can no longer be authenticated.

<sup>49</sup> The Rev. Alban Butler, *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs and Other Principal Saints*, Vol. XII (Dublin, Ireland: James Duffy, 1866), p. 57.

<sup>50</sup> Father Butler uses an old-fashioned spelling of the Emperor Diocletian’s name.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.* 57-58.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.* p. 58.

<sup>53</sup> Richard Stanton, *A Menology of England and Wales or, Brief Memorials of the Ancient British and English Saints* (London, UK: Burns & Oats, Limited, 1887), p. 580.

the King as an authentic historical figure.

A third hagiographer, the Rev. Sabine Baring-Gould (1834-1924), an Anglican clergyman who wrote a twelve-volume *Lives of the Saints* (and later added four supplementary volumes), takes a generally dimmer view of the Saint Lucius legend. Nonetheless, in response to the notion that Saint Eleutherius of Rome sent missionaries to Saint Lucius as a result of the latter's appeal, Baring-Gould admits "it is not impossible that there may have been such an expedition."<sup>54</sup>

Among the Welsh, there is a tradition that the King's name was Lleuwg Mawr (Lucius the Great). To the missionaries sent by the Pope—four of them according to the tradition of that land—they have given the Welsh names "Saints Dyfan, Ffagan, Medwy, and Elfan." Baring-Gould says that "There are churches of very ancient foundation in Wales dedicated to Lleuwg, Dyfan, Ffagan, and Medwy."<sup>55</sup>

In the district of London known as Cornhill there is a church (now Anglican)—St. Peter-upon-Cornhill—which claims to be the oldest site of Christian worship in Britain and furthermore claims to have been founded by Saint Lucius in the second century. Those assertions apply to the site, not, of course, to the building. The present-day structure was built by Sir Christopher Wren in the 1680s after an earlier structure was destroyed in the Great Fire of London of 1666. In the vestry of that building is a brass plaque, written in antique English, on which are inscribed words that express the long tradition that this church was London's first Cathedral:

Be hit known to all men, that in the Yeerys of owr Lord God An. CLXXIX., Lucius, the fyrst Christen Kyng of this Lond, then callyd Brytayne, fowndyd the fyrst chyrch in London, that is to sey, the Chyrch of Sent Peter apon Cornhyl; and he fowndyd ther an Archbyshoppys See, and made that chyrch the Metropolitan and cheef Chyrch of this Kyngdom; and so enduryd the space of CCCC yeerys and more, unto the comyng of Sent Austin, an Apostyl of England, the which was sont into the Land by Sent Gregory, the Doctor of the Chyrch in the tyme of Kyng Ethelbert, and then was the Archbyshoppys See and Pol removyd from the aforeseyd Church of St. Peter apon Cornhyl unto Derebernum,<sup>56</sup> that now ys callyd Canterbury, and there

---

<sup>54</sup> The Rev. Sabine Baring-Gould, *The Lives of the Saints*, Vol. XII (London, UK: John Hodges, Publisher, 1877), p. 16.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> The reference here is to the old Roman name of what eventually became Canterbury, *Durovernum Cantiacorum*.

yt remeynyth to this Dey.<sup>57</sup>

So, let us review the fundamentals of this story. There was a King of the Britons, who lived in the second century whose name was Lucius (a name some think he may have adopted at his Baptism). He was the King not of the whole of Briton, but of some relatively small part, reigning over a semi-autonomous tributary state, or client state, of the Roman Empire. Somehow the King had learned of the teachings of Christianity—probably the work of a missionary or one of his Christian subjects—and, convinced by these teachings, petitioned the Bishop of the Imperial Capital to send someone who would teach the King and his people the fullness of Christian truth and, moreover, Baptize the King and those among his subjects who desired Baptism. It is said that Saint Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, in response to the plea, sent several missionaries who did as the King had requested. Presumably, at least one of these would have been a Priest or Bishop, essential to the performance of the Holy Mysteries.

The story of Saint Lucius has been much embellished over time, for example that he later abdicated and went to Chur (an ancient city, now part of the canton of Graubünden, Switzerland) where he was a missionary, was Consecrated Bishop, and was ultimately martyred. This is apparently a conflation of the lives of two Saints, the British tribal King, Saint Lucius, and the missionary Saint and Martyr, Saint Lucius of Chur (“Sankt Luzius von Chur” as he is known in Chur and in other German-speaking lands). Nineteenth-century historian, the Reverend Rice Rees, who was professor of Welsh at St. David’s College, Lampeter (now part of the University of Wales), wrote that the story of Saint Lucius abdicating and journeying to faraway Chur in what is now Switzerland is an “extravagance of fiction”<sup>58</sup> although he accepts without question that the Saint and British tribal King indeed existed. Father Richard Stanton writes similarly when he notes that the tradition that Saint Lucius of Britain and Sankt Luzius von Chur are the same person “does not appear to have been anciently known in Great Britain.”<sup>59</sup>

From at least the time of Saint Bede, few have doubted the genuineness of the story of Saint Lucius of Britain. Then, in 1904, the ultra-

---

<sup>57</sup> John Weever, *Ancient Funeral Monuments of Great-Britain, Ireland, and the Islands Adjacent* (London, UK: W. Tooke, 1767), p. 199.

<sup>58</sup> The Rev. Rice Rees, *An Essay On the Welsh Saints Or the Primitive Christians Usually Considered to Have Been the Founders of Churches in Wales* (London, UK: Longman, Rees, Orme, Brown & Longman, 1836), p. 83.

<sup>59</sup> Richard Stanton, *Menology*, p. 581.

liberal Protestant religious writer, Adolf von Harnack (1851-1930), published his essay “Der Brief des britischen Königs Lucius an den Papst Eleutherus”<sup>60</sup> in which he suggested that

the entry in the *Liber Pontificalis* was a scribal error and the word ‘Britannio’ should more correctly have been written ‘Britio’, apparently [referring to] the citadel of Edessa in the Roman province of Osrhoene. Harnack claimed the cited King Lucius was actually King Lucius Aelius Septimius Megas Abgarus VIII of Edessa...<sup>61</sup>

In our faithless age, Harnack’s thesis was quickly accepted as definitive, and, consequently, references to Saint Lucius thereafter have invariably included Harnack’s negative assessment and his relegation of the Saint to the realm of fantasy. However, that is not the end of the story.

In 2008, archaeologist, historian, and scholar David J. Knight published his book *King Lucius of Britain*, the product of ten years of research, in which he demonstrates that Harnack’s conjecture of a scribal error is, for several reasons, extremely improbable, so improbable as to be next to impossible. First, King Abgar VIII, although he had adopted the Roman *praenomen* “Lucius,” is never referred to by that name by any historians or writers, either ancient or modern. Rather, he has always been known as “Abgar,” “Abgarus,” or “Abgaros.” Second, King Abgar did not adopt the *praenomen* “Lucius” until Saint Eleutherius had been in his grave for many years. Third, King Abgar did not build the “Birtha” or “Britio”<sup>62</sup> (citadel) until well after the death of Saint Eleutherius. Fourth, Kings are not generally identified by a citadel or any other structure they build, but by the realms over which they reign: e.g., “King Lucius of Britain”; “King Abgar of Edessa.” Then there is the matter of the “scribal error” itself.

The *Liber Pontificalis* was actually a compilation of several earlier works. From time to time it was expanded to include additional biographies of men who had subsequently become Popes of Rome. One of these earlier works was the *Catalogus Felicianus*, which encompassed the lives of all of the Popes through Saint Felix IV (reigned 526-530). It is here that one first finds the sentence: “*Hic accepit epistula a Lucio Brittanio rege, ut*

---

<sup>60</sup> *Sitzungsberichte Der Königlich Preussischen Akademie Der Wissenschaften* (Berlin: Verlag Der Königlich Akademie Wissenschaften, 1904), pp. 909-916.

<sup>61</sup> David J. Knight, *King Lucius of Britain*, (Stroud, Gloucester, UK:Tempus Publishing, 2008), p. 22.

<sup>62</sup> “Britio,” or “Birtha,” are, according to Harnack, words that refer to the citadel built by King Abgar VIII near Edessa.

*Christianus efficerentur per ejus mandatum*”<sup>63</sup> (“He [Saint Eleutherius] received a letter from Lucius, King of Britain, who desired to become a Christian by his command.”). That information was transcribed into the *Liber Pontificalis*.

The production of the *Liber Pontificalis* was supervised by the statesman and scholar Flavius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator who, upon his retirement from public life, founded a monastery in southern Italy, the purpose of which was to glorify God by the copying of Holy Scripture, the works of the Holy Church Fathers, and the works of classical antiquity. The monastic scribes worked under his close guidance, which was sufficiently strict that “he even wrote useful instructions to his Monks on methods of copying texts accurately.”<sup>64</sup> Therefore, “one is confronted with having to believe Cassiodorus would allow so glaring a confusion, which certainly would have come to his notice....”<sup>65</sup> Knight concludes that “it is therefore untenable to assume that while under his guidance [the scribe] could have confused BIRTHA Edessenorum or even BRITIO Edessenorum for BRITANNIA.”<sup>66</sup> Insofar as the scribe himself is concerned, the author has this to say:

One could perhaps envisage a clerical error in the *Liber Pontificalis* if the original word was ‘Britannio’ and the cleric wrote ‘Britio.’ A contraction could be a conceivable error, but to imagine mistakenly expanding the word ‘Britio’ into ‘Britannio’ is very far-fetched.<sup>67</sup>

In addition to disputing Harnack’s somewhat convoluted thesis, Knight assembles all relevant details from the historical record relating to the Saint and King and concludes that, although hard proof no longer exists that Saint Lucius is an actual historical figure (which in fact is the case with any number of historical figures), nevertheless the preponderance of evidence points to the likelihood that he did exist, that he was a King in ancient Britain, and that the story of his letter to Saint Eleutherius of Rome

---

<sup>63</sup> Quoted in Mon. J.P. Kirsch, “Eleutherius (Eleutheros), Saint, Pope,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Ed. Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, and John J. Wynne, S.J., Vol. V: Diocese—Fathers (New York, NY: Robert Appleton Co., 1909), p. 379.

<sup>64</sup> David J. Knight, *King Lucius of Britain*, p. 24.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

is not fiction.

And so we see that reduced to its essentials and shorn of some of its medieval ornamentation, the story of Saint Lucius the King contains nothing that is unlikely or contrary to the historical record. At the same time, the fact that the tradition is so old and so persistent in historiography, while by no means conclusive, testifies in favor of its authenticity.

Tradition records that Saint Lucius reigned for 77 years, from 124 to 201. At his repose, he was buried first in Gloucester, at what is now the Church of St. Mary de Lode.<sup>68</sup> Sometime later his Relics were translated to the Church of St. Peter-upon-Cornhill, and, yet later, back to Gloucester, to a church that became part of a Franciscan monastery in the thirteenth century, the ruins of which are still extant.<sup>69</sup> On the old Welsh Calendar, Saint Lucius the King is commemorated twice: on May 28<sup>th</sup>, the day of his Baptism, and on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, the day of his repose.

**Saint MARCIAN, Emperor of the Romans:** Saint Marcian was born in Thrace about the year 390. Arriving in Constantinople a poor man, according to one account with only a pocketful of borrowed money, he later repeatedly distinguished himself as an officer on the battlefield. In time, he achieved the rank of tribune, was appointed Senator, and rose to prominence in Byzantine society and at the imperial court.

Upon the death of SAINT THEODOSIUS II, the Emperor's sister, SAINT PULCHERIA, assumed the duties of monarch. However, since at that time there was no precedent among the Romans for a woman ruling in her own right, she married Saint Marcian. At the time of their marriage, the Emperor was already sixty, while Pulcheria was fifty-one. She had taken a solemn vow of perpetual virginity and had for some time lived the monastic life. Their marriage, therefore, was a chaste one.

Just before his death, Saint Theodosius II had been visited by Saint Marcian, to whom the Emperor had said, "It has been revealed to me that

---

<sup>68</sup> The church of St. Mary de Lode is a thirteenth-century structure, although the nave was rebuilt in 1826. Excavations in 1979 suggest that the current edifice was built over an earlier church structure dating back at least to Anglo-Saxon times, and quite possibly much older. A local tradition claims that it is the oldest parish church in Gloucester and dates the founding to the second century.

<sup>69</sup> The Franciscan Greyfriars Monastery was closed during the Dissolution of the Monasteries in 1538 (under Henry VIII), and turned into to a brewery. It was substantially damaged during the Siege of Gloucester in 1643 (an episode in the English Civil War) and more or less fell unto complete ruin within a century after the Siege.

you will reign after me.”<sup>70</sup> The revelation proved true, Saint Pulcheria herself arranging the coronation, performed by the Patriarch, immediately after their marriage. “

Saint Marcian sponsored the Synod of Chalcedon, which opened in October 451 and is numbered the Fourth Œcumenical Synod. Initially planned for Nicaea, the site was moved to Chalcedon, just across the Bosphorus from Constantinople, since the Emperor was concerned about the ongoing threat from the Huns and needed to remain close to the capital.

The purpose of the great synod was to deal with the heresy of the Monk Eutyches, who taught that at the moment of the Incarnation there was but one Nature in Christ Jesus, the Divine, which, so to speak, overwhelmed, and completely absorbed, or obliterated, the human. The followers of this teaching came to be called Monophysites,” believers in the single Nature of Christ. Their theological error was, in fact, an exaggerated reaction to Nestorianism, denying, as it did, the Savior’s humanity, and a distortion of the theology formulated by Saint Cyril of Alexandria at the Synod of Ephesus twenty years before. The Synod of Chalcedon, attended by 630 Bishops from around the Empire, condemned Monophysitism, setting forth the Orthodox teaching that Christ Jesus is one *Prosopon* or Person with two Essences or Natures, one Divine and the other human—Christ is thus perfect God and perfect man. Those Natures, the Synod declared, are inextricably united, but nonetheless distinct and unconfused.

Unhappily, those who persisted in the Monophysite heresy, despite the declaration of the Œcumenical Synod, broke completely with the Orthodox Church to found their own separate ecclesiastical entity, a situation that endures to this day. Saint Marcian refused all attempts at compromise with Monophysitism, considering the findings and declarations of the Synod of Chalcedon final as well as binding on all imperial subjects. His decree stated: “All therefore shall be bound to hold the decisions of the sacred Council of Chalcedon and indulge in no further doubts.”<sup>71</sup>

Constance Head (1939-1985), in her wonderful little volume on Byzantine rulers, remarks that later Byzantine historians looked back upon the reign of Saint Marcian as a “golden age of peace and Orthodoxy...”<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> J.B. Bury. *The Later Roman Empire: From the Death of Theodosius I To the Death of Justinian*. Vol I (New York, NY: Dover Publications, 1958), p. 236.

<sup>71</sup> Leo Donald Davis, S.J.. *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325-787): Their History and Theology*, No. 21 of Theology and Life Series (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990) p. 191.

<sup>72</sup> Constance Head, *Imperial Byzantine Portraits: A Verbal and Graphic Gallery* (New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas Brothers, 1982) pp. 20-21.



The Huns, who were ravaging Northern and Western Europe, had been paid a subsidy by previous Emperors, a kind of bribe, by which the eastern portion of the Empire purchased temporary immunity from attack. Saint Marcian, calculating that this enemy already had its hands full in the West, stopped the subsidy, which was substantial, thus saving the treasury a sizeable fortune and restoring the prestige of the Empire. He moderated the previous extravagances of the imperial government, lowering government expenses and, most remarkably, lowering taxes, an obviously popular move and something rarely achieved by Byzantine rulers. And while he was parsimonious insofar as ordinary expenditures were concerned, where cities or towns had experienced some natural or man-made catastrophe he was always extraordinarily generous, seeking to restore all that had been damaged or destroyed. He is quoted as saying that the chief duty of the Emperor is “to provide for the care of the human race.”<sup>73</sup> At the same time he took vigorous measures to combat corruption in his government and sought to mitigate the excessive harshness of the judicial system.

With regard to Attila the Hun, during his attack on Italy in 452, which aimed at the conquest of Rome, Saint Marcian rushed Imperial troops from the East to defend the old capital, one of several reasons that impelled Attila to retreat. Early the following year, the “Scourge of God,” as the Hunnish leader was called, died suddenly. On the very night that Attila died, Saint Marcian had had a dream in which he saw the bow of his arch-enemy broken before his eyes. Most historians ascribe Attila’s death to natural causes, usually an internal or cerebral hemorrhage, while others hold that Emperor Saint Marcian had secretly arranged it. Whatever the case, the Empire was saved, for eventually, had Attila continued his rampages and scorched-earth methods, all of Europe would have been devastated until it was little more than a wasteland.

Saint Marcian lived on until 457, a popular Emperor, much loved by his people: loved for his heartfelt regard for them, loved for the soundness and integrity of his administration, and loved for his genuine piety and devotion to Holy Orthodoxy. He is commemorated, with his wife Saint Pulcheria, on February 17.

---

<sup>73</sup> Quoted in Adrian Fortescue, “Marcian (Marcianus, Μαρκιᾶνος,” in *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Ed. Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, and John J. Wynne, S.J., Vol. IX: Laprade—Mass (New York, NY: Robert Appleton Co., 1909), p. 644.

**Saint NEAGOE Basarab, Sovereign Prince of Wallachia:** Saint Neagoe Besarab, born the scion of the noble Craiovești family in about 1482, was the ruling Prince (*Voivode*) of Wallachia from 1512 to 1521. During that period, Wallachia was independent; however, to maintain that independence the country was required to pay a substantial tribute to the Turkish Sultan. The Saint, being highly skilled in diplomacy, maintained the stability of his country and kept the peace throughout his reign. He is remembered as a man of high culture and learning and most especially for his generous support of the Church and its monasteries. He is noted too for his authorship of one of the first Romanian literary works, *The Teachings of Neagoe Basarab to His Son Theodosie* (*Învățăturile lui Neagoe Basarab către fiul său Theodosie*), in which he begins by saying that one must praise and honor God day and night, at all times and in all places. The Saint is buried at the Cathedral of Saint Nicholas at Curtea de Argeș, the burial place of several Romanian monarchs. He fell asleep in the Lord September 15, 1521 and is commemorated on that day.

**Saint OLAF, King of Norway:** Saint Olaf (also “Olav”), lived from 995 to 1030. He was elected King of Norway in 1015. His father was Harald Grenske, who served as a petty King in Vestfold, Norway. His mother was Åsta Gudbrandsdatter. Upon his elevation as King, Saint Olaf, who had accepted Christianity and been Baptized in Rouen, France in 1010, sought thoroughly to uproot paganism by bringing Christian missionaries from abroad, particularly from England, and by systematically destroying pagan temples and replacing them with churches. So furious did the pagan clan leaders become that they rebelled and drove Saint Olaf from the throne. He spent two years in exile in Kiev and in Sweden.

The Saint then returned to his homeland with an army, intent on taking back his throne. He met the rebellious pagan nobles at the Battle of Stiklestad where he was killed. His incorrupt body was taken to the Church of St. Clement where it was enshrined. It was later taken to the Nidaros Cathedral in Trondheim where it was placed in a silver sarcophagus and became a popular place of pilgrimage. After the Reformation, the shrine at the Nidaros Cathedral was destroyed and the Saint’s Relics buried in an unmarked grave. Saint Olaf of Norway is commemorated July 29.

**Saint PETER I of Cetinje, Vladika of Montenegro:** Between 1696 and 1852, Montenegro, a state then an autonomous entity (although not fully independent) within Ottoman Empire, was ruled by a series of Prince-Bishops, six altogether. The official title was “Vladika of Montenegro.”

Among these was Saint Peter of Cetinje, the most beloved of all the rulers of that country. Saint Peter, born April 1, 1749, was the scion of the House of Petrović-Njegoš, the ruling family of Montenegro. At only twelve years of age, he was tonsured a monk and, at eighteen, Ordained a Deacon. In the years that followed he was Ordained Priest and elevated to the rank of Archimandrite. In that capacity he acted as assistant to Metropolitan Sava, at that time the Vladika of Montenegro. Upon Metropolitan Sava's death in 1782, the Saint was elected Metropolitan and thus became the secular Prince as well.

Saint Peter is remembered for his introduction of the first written laws in Montenegro, for his establishing of schools to uplift the people, and for his efforts at bringing unity to a people divided by continuous tribal friction. During the Saint's reign the army of his tiny nation defeated an invasion by the French, led by the Emperor Napoleon I, and several Ottoman attacks. Although a ruling Prince, Saint Peter was a dedicated ascetic, living "as a simple monk in a narrow cell, following an austere rule...."<sup>74</sup> Saint Peter of Cetinje reposed October 18, 1830 and is commemorated on that day. His wonder-working Relics are incorrupt and are enshrined at the historic Monastery of the Nativity of the Most Holy Theotokos at Cetinje.

**Saint RUPERT, Prince of the Franks, First Bishop of Salzburg, Abbot of St. Peter's Monastery<sup>75</sup>, Apostle to Bavaria and Austria:** Saint Rupert (also "Rupprecht" or "Ruprecht") was a Prince of the Royal Merovingian family. Born around 660, we first hear of him as Bishop of the city of Worms (now in the state of Rheinland-Pfalz, Germany) where "the fame of his learning and piety drew many from far and wide."<sup>76</sup> The Saint

was noted for simplicity, prudence, and the fear of God; he was a lover of truth in his discourse, upright in opinion, cautious in counsel, energetic in

---

<sup>74</sup> Hieromonk Makarios of Simonos Petra, *The Synaxarion: The Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox Church*, Vol. 1, September-October (Ormylia, Greece: Holy Convent of The Annunciation of Our Lady, 1998), p. 421.

<sup>75</sup> The combination of the offices of Abbot and Bishop was drawn from Celtic ecclesiastical custom, the influence of which was strong in Austria at that time. Abbot-Bishops continued in Salzburg until 987. (See N. Redington, "Introductory Note: Holy Austria," *Orthodox Life* Vol. XCIX, No. 3 (May-June 1999): pp. 21-22.

<sup>76</sup> Ulrich Schmid, "Rupert, Saint," in *The Catholic Encyclopedia: An International Work of Reference on the Constitution, Doctrine, Discipline, and History of the Catholic Church*, Ed. Charles G. Herbermann, Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Pallen, Thomas J. Shahan, and John J. Wynne, S.J., Vol. IX: Laprade—*Mass* (New York, NY: Robert Appleton Co., 1912), p. 229.

action, far-seeing in his charity, and in all his conduct a glorious model of rectitude.<sup>77</sup>

That reputation reached the ears of the Duke of Bavaria, Theodo II, who asked Saint Rupert to come to his land to preach the Gospel of Christ and thereby revive true Christianity. The Duke, though still a pagan, hoped to bring the benefits of order and civilization to his realm. The region had once been Christian, but, after subsequent barbarians invasions, had fallen back into darkness, at least in part. The Faith in Bavaria at the time had become intermixed with paganism or tainted by Arianism, the latter a heresy that had once been prevalent among many Germanic tribes.

Saint Rupert sending word that he would come, Duke Theodo met him at Regensburg (also “Ratisbon”) where he received him with much honor, after which the Saint convinced him to abjure paganism and accept Christianity. The Duke and his entire entourage, and many simple folk, received Holy Baptism. Saint Rupert then began his missionary efforts, traveling throughout the Duke’s domain. On one such journey, he came upon the town of Iuvavum (now Salzburg), long before founded by Celts and later made into a trading center by the Romans, but had since fallen into ruin. At the Saint’s request, Theodo gave the town and surrounding territory to him. There he built a cathedral church and monastery, dedicating both to Saint Peter. He later founded a convent on a nearby hill, now known as “Nonnberg” (meaning “Nun’s Hill”), placing the latter under his niece, SAINT EHRENTAUD.

Saint Rupert established a salt-mining industry to bring prosperity to the region. Large deposits of salt exist in the mountains there (“*Salzburg*” means “salt castle” or “salt fortress”) and salt was a precious commodity in those days, difficult to obtain in some places (the Saint is sometimes portrayed with a container of salt in his hand). He devoted the remainder of his life to the conversion of Bavaria and Austria, establishing numerous Churches, monasteries, and convents.

Saint Rupert fell asleep in the Lord on the Feast of the Lord’s Resurrection, the Sunday of Pascha, March 27, 718. He was entombed in the Church of his own Saint Peter’s Monastery. A portion of his Relics were later translated by Saint Virgilius, Abbot-Bishop of Salzburg, to the new Salzburg cathedral, dedicated to Saint Rupert, in 774. The oldest still-extant Church in Austria’s capital, Vienna, was founded in 740 and named for Saint Rupert. He is commemorated March 27.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*

**Saint STEPHEN Urosh III Dečanski, King-Martyr of Serbia:** Saint Stephen Urosh (also “Stefan Uroš”) III was the son of SAINT STEPHEN UROSH II, KING OF SERBIA. Because of an intrigue to prevent him from succeeding his father as King, one in which his father was told the lie that his son sought to overthrow him, Saint Stephen Urosh III was blinded. However, after the blinding, Saint Nicholas of Myra appeared to him telling him not to be afraid and that at the appropriate time he would be given back his sight. Five years later, Saint Nicholas appeared to him again, saying that he had returned to keep his promise. Then, making the Sign of the Cross over Saint Stephen’s sightless eyes, he restored Saint Stephen’s sight. In gratitude for that miracle, the Saint “built the monastery of Dečani, a rare example of the finest Byzantine work and one of the most famous memorials of Serbian devotion.”<sup>78</sup> Upon the death of his father, Saint Stephen Urosh III was crowned King. During his reign, from 1322 to 1331, he won many battles but, sadly, some members of his court disliked his policies, overthrew and imprisoned him, and eventually killed him. Saint Nicholas of Ochrid and Žiča says of him:

The holy King Stephen, St. Sava and the holy Prince Lazar make a trio of holiness, nobility and self-sacrifice, the gift of the Serbian people. He lived his time on earth as a martyr, and died a martyr in 1336, receiving the wreath of immortal glory from the Almighty whom he served so faithfully.<sup>79</sup>

Saint Stephen Urosh III Dečanski is commemorated November 11<sup>th</sup>. His Holy Relics are kept at the Dečani monastery he built.

**Saint THEODORE, Prince of Smolensk and Yaroslavl, and His Sons, Saints DAVID and CONSTANTINE of Smolensk:** Saint Theodore (also “Feodor”), born about the year 1230, was the son of Prince Rostislav of Smolensk. While still a youth he was made Prince of Mozhaysk. Upon the death of his father, he became Prince of Smolensk, and on his marriage to Maria Vasilievna of Yaroslavl, he became Prince of Yaroslavl as well. Sometime after the birth of a son, Michael, the Princess Maria died. The Saint’s son was reared by his grandmother, Princess Xenia.

---

<sup>78</sup> Bishop Nikolai Velimirović, *The Prologue of Ochrid: Lives of the Saints and Homilies for Every Day in the Year*, Vol. IV, trans. Mother Maria (Birmingham, UK: Lazarica Press, 1986), p. 185.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

Sometime later, Saint Theodore journeyed to Sarai, the capital of the Golden Horde of the Mongols, on state business. The Mongols (or Tatars) exercised at that time suzerainty over Russia because of their overwhelmingly vast army. As it happened, Saint Theodore was especially liked by the Mongol Khan, so much so that the Khan offered him his daughter in marriage. That offer was of tremendous significance, since it was indicative of the Mongol ruler's high esteem for the Prince and his people, elevating them to a kind of equality. The Saint accepted, and so the Khan's daughter was Baptized and given the name "Anna," and the two were married. The Princess Anna bore Saint Theodore two sons, David and Constantine. In 1290, the Saint received word that his son, Prince Michael, had reposed, and so he returned to Yaroslavl to assume his place as Prince of the city. During this period, he worked especially hard to assure an end to the fratricidal wars between the Russian Princes. Justice and mercy loomed large for Saint Prince Theodore, insofar as his subjects were concerned. He provided for the poor, the destitute, widows, and orphans. "He fasted like a Monk and gave himself zealously to prayer both privately and in the churches, which he richly adorned as true antechambers of heaven."<sup>80</sup>

In 1299, Saint Theodore fell seriously ill. Believing that the end of his earthly life was near, he ordered himself taken to the Savior-Transfiguration Monastery in Yaroslavl, where he was tonsured a Monk and given the Great Schema. During the ceremony of tonsuring, he asked that the service be interrupted and had himself taken into the courtyard, where many of the people of Yaroslavl had gathered. There he begged all of them to forgive him any offences he might have caused and forgave all who had offended him. He reposed September 19, 1299.

He was succeeded by his son, Saint Prince David, who followed in the pious footsteps of his father in all things. He died in 1321. His other son, Saint Prince Constantine, also a thoroughly pious man, had reposed some time before. More than a century and a half after the death of Saint Theodore, on March 5, 1463, the Holy Relics of the three Saints were uncovered. Miraculously, all three were found to be incorrupt and many miracles, even now, are reported at the site of their tomb. Saints Theodore, David, and Constantine are commemorated September 19<sup>th</sup> and the uncovering of their Relics is commemorated March 5<sup>th</sup>.

---

<sup>80</sup> Hieromonk Makarios of Simonos Petra, *The Synaxarion: The Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox Church*, Vol. I, September-October (Ormylia, Greece: Holy Convent of The Annunciation of Our Lady, 1998), pp. 140-141.

**Saint URSULA, Princess of Domnonia:** Saint Ursula was the daughter of King Dynod of Domnonia and lived during the fourth century. She was promised by her father to a nobleman of Amorica (modern Brittany) as his bride, a union to which she agreed. Her only stipulation was that she first be allowed to go on pilgrimage to Europe, which was allowed. During her journey to Cologne her party was attacked by Huns and the whole of the entourage massacred. Saint Ursula is said to have been killed by an arrow shot by the Hunnish chief. Her Feast Day is October 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Saint VLADIMIR I the Great, Grand Prince of Kiev, Baptizer of Rus' and Equal-to-the-Apostles:** Saint Vladimir (also "Volodymyr") was the son of Sviatoslav I of Kiev and the grandson of SAINT OLGA THE GREAT. He was a strong believer in his pagan religion, following its requirements assiduously and, therefore, in his early years as ruler, was disinclined to adopt the religion of his grandmother. It is written that he had many wives and established many idolatrous places of worship. Yet, perhaps because of his memories of Saint Olga and despite his faithfulness to the old ways, he was later attracted to the idea of exchanging his country's folk religion for one of the great religions of the world: Judaism, Islam, or Christianity. Therefore, in 987, the Prince sent his ambassadors to the lands where these other religions were dominant, with orders to observe these religions and to report their findings to him.

There is a story in the Russian *Primary Chronicle* of how Vladimir, Prince of Kiev, while still a pagan, desired to know which was the true religion, and therefore sent his followers to visit the various countries of the world in turn. They went first to the Muslim Bulgars of the Volga, but observing that these when they prayed gazed around them like men possessed, the Russians continued on their way dissatisfied. 'There is no joy among them,' they reported to Vladimir, 'but mournfulness and a great smell; and there is nothing good about their system.' Travelling next to Germany and Rome, they found the worship more satisfactory, but complained that here too it was without beauty. Finally they journeyed to Constantinople, and here at last, as they attended the Divine Liturgy in the great Church of the Holy Wisdom, they discovered what they desired. 'We knew not whether we were in heaven or on earth, for surely there is no such splendour or beauty anywhere upon earth. We cannot describe it to you: only this we know, that

God dwells there among humans, and that their service surpasses the worship of all other places. For we cannot forget that beauty.<sup>81</sup>

Additionally, when the Saint discovered that the Muslims forbade alcoholic drink and that both they and the Jews forbade the eating of pork, he was further dissuaded from considering these religions seriously.

It was about this time that Saint Vladimir seized the city of Cherson in the Crimea from the Byzantines and, simultaneously, asked the Byzantine Emperor for the hand of a Royal Princess in marriage, promising to return the conquered territory if the answer were in the affirmative. The Emperor, Basil II, responded that such a marriage would only be possible if the Grand Prince converted to Orthodox Christianity. The Emperor, Basil I, responded that such a marriage would only be possible if the Grand Prince converted to Orthodox Christianity. The Emperor perhaps realized the missionary possibilities if this barbarian Prince were to be won to the Church, and also the importance to the Christian Empire of winning the Rus' as allies instead of having to deal with them as fearsome enemies, since, in the recent past, they had wreaked havoc on Constantinople and its environs. Saint Vladimir, already duly impressed by Eastern Orthodox Christianity, agreed. And so it was that SAINT ANNA PORPHYROGENNETA was sent north to marry the Kievian Grand Prince. The Saint was Baptized and the Marriage ceremony completed. Saint Vladimir then ordered his people to report to the banks of the River Dnieper, there to be Baptized by Priests from Constantinople. The pagan shrines were destroyed, while the idols were first dragged through the mud, to show the people that they were powerless and undeserving of respect, and then destroyed.

It is astonishing how the new religion utterly transformed the formerly pagan Prince.

He gave himself wholeheartedly to two causes, the spreading of Christian education and the relief of distress among his people. Numerous schools were opened, monasteries were founded, and missionaries were sent to the farthest corners of the country. Learned Monks were invited from Byzantium and they brought with them many manuscripts and books so that soon a library was founded in Kiev. Beautiful churches were built and

---

<sup>81</sup> Timothy Ware, *The Orthodox Church* (Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books, Inc., 1963), p. 269.



the Church services held there in the Slavic language were an education in Christian doctrine and Christian living.<sup>82</sup>

In the past, the Saint particularly loved holding great feasts for himself and his court. Now, whenever a feast was held, he made certain that the poor were also invited to attend. For the sake of the sick and the infirm, he sent food throughout the city so that they too were not forgotten. The seed of the True Faith sprouted throughout the land and, along with that, Christianity's byproducts, high culture and civilization. A golden age dawned among the Rus'. Within a century, the country and its people underwent a dramatic metamorphosis. Few men in all of history have had such a profound and lasting effect on his people and nation as did this Saint. Saint Vladimir, the Grand Prince of Kiev, died on July 15, 1015 and is commemorated on that day.

**Saint WENCESLAUS I, Prince-Martyr of Bohemia:** Saint Wenceslaus (also "Václav," "Vyacheslav," "Wenceslas," or "Wenzel"), ruling Prince of Bohemia, was son of Prince Wratislav I and the grandson of SAINT LUDMILLA THE PRINCESS AND HOLY MARTYR. He was reared piously by his grandmother and, when his father died in 920, became ruling Prince. Because he had not yet reached his majority, his mother, Drahomíra, a nominal Christian but a pagan at heart, became Regent. When the Saint reached eighteen years of age, he assumed control of the government and, although young, ruled with wisdom and justice uppermost in his mind. Saint Wenceslaus was an educated man, well read in both Greek and Latin. He promoted Christianity, believing correctly that, among other things, Christianity would elevate and civilize his people. But there was still, at that time, much division in Bohemia in the matter of religion, with a powerful pagan faction among the nobles still intent on stopping the spread of the Christian Faith. That faction formed around Drahomíra and her second son, Boleslaus (known later as "Boleslaus the Cruel"). Boleslaus invited Saint Wenceslaus to a church to celebrate with him the Feast of Saints Cosmas and Damian, which the Saint accepted. However, when the Saint made his way to the church, henchmen of Boleslaus stabbed and beat him to death. The Saint had ignored the warnings of his servants, disbelieving that his brother would do him violence and, at the same time, trusting that whatever

---

<sup>82</sup> Sophie Koulomzin, *The Orthodox Christian Church Through the Ages* Vol. II: *New Frontiers* (New York, NY: Religious Education Department, Russian Orthodox Church in America, 1956), p. 127.

happened was God's will. Boleslaus succeeded to the throne, repented of his terrible sin, and ordered his brother's Relics translated to the Church of St. Vitus in Prague, a church built by Saint Wenceslaus during his reign. Saint Wenceslaus is the Patron of the Czech people and is commemorated September 28, and also March 4, the day of the translation of his Relics to Prague.

**Saint YAROSLAV I the Wise, Grand Prince of Novgorod and Kiev:**

Saint Yaroslav the Wise, known to historians as "Yaroslav I," was the son of SAINT PRINCE VLADIMIR THE GREAT. He is remembered for making war against his half-brother, Sviatopolk the Accursed, who was apparently responsible for the murders of his brothers, Svyatoslav, and SAINTS BORIS AND GLEB. Saint Yaroslav eventually defeated Sviatopolk, who died while on his way into exile in Poland. Saint Yaroslav married Ingegerd, Princess of Sweden and daughter of SAINT OLAF OF SWEDEN. Before her death she was tonsured a Nun and given the name "Anna." She is now remembered as "SAINT ANNA OF NOVGOROD." The marriage produced six sons, one of whom, SAINT VLADIMIR YAROSLAVICH, would succeed his father as Grand Prince of Novgorod and four daughters, Elizabeth, who became Queen of Norway, Anna Agnesa, who became Queen of France, Anastasia, who became Queen of Hungary, and (according to some accounts) Agatha, who married Edward the Exile, heir to the English throne.

The Saint, having a particular love of books and wishing to uplift his people, emphasized education and learning during his reign. The *Primary Chronicle*, a history of Kievan Rus' written early in the twelfth century by Saint Nestor the Chronicler, says of Saint Yaroslav:

He applied himself to books, and read them continually day and night. He assembled many scribes, and translated from Greek to Slavic. He wrote and collected many books through which true believers are instructed and enjoy religious education. ... For great is the profit from book learning. Through the medium of books, we are shown and taught the way of repentance, for we gain wisdom and continence from the written word. Books are like rivers that water the whole earth; they are the springs of wisdom. For books have an immeasurable depth; by them we are consoled in sorrow.<sup>83</sup>

Saint Yaroslav is remembered also for establishing the beginnings of the *Russkaya Pravda*, a codification of the laws of his realm. The period of

---

<sup>83</sup> Colin Wells, *Sailing From Byzantium: How a Lost Empire Shaped the World* (New York, NY:Bantam Dell, 2007), p. 241.

his rule is characterized as a “golden age” and a “time of commerce, expansion and church-building.”<sup>84</sup> In fact, he built “scores of churches”<sup>85</sup> the most famous of which is the Cathedral of Saint Sophia in Kiev.

Historians sometimes assert that Saint Yaroslav arranged the appointment of the first non-Greek as Metropolitan of Kiev specifically to defy Constantinople. With regard to that opinion, Professor Dimitri Obolensky (1918-2001) responds:

In 1051 Hilarion, a native Russian priest, was appointed to the see of Kiev by prince Yaroslav and an assembly of Russian bishops. The interest of this appointment is heightened by the fact that he [Hilarion] was a distinguished scholar and writer. Most modern historians believe that it was made in defiance of Byzantium’s wishes; some go so far as to argue that the Russian ruler attempted this action to assert the independence of his church from Byzantine control. The latter view is based on no convincing evidence, is at variance with what we know of the policy and behavior of both Yaroslav and Hilarion, and does not tally with the prevailing Russian attitude to Byzantium at the time. It is not impossible that the Russians elected their native candidate without consulting the Byzantine authorities. It is likely however—and circumstantial evidence can be found to support tis view—that the patriarchate was persuaded to ratify the choice either before or after Hilarion’s appointment.”<sup>86</sup>

Saint Yaroslav the Wise died in 1054 and is buried, with his wife, at the Cathedral of Saint Sophia in Kiev. He is commemorated February 20.

From *Pious Kings and Right-Believing Queens: An Encyclopedia of the Royal and Imperial Saints of the Orthodox Church*, Belmont, MA: Institute for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, 2013, Softcover, xxiv + 506 pages.

---

<sup>84</sup> C.W. Previté-Orton, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History*, Vol. II: *The Twelfth Century to the Renaissance* (Cambridge, UK:Cambridge University Press, 1952), p. 748.

<sup>85</sup> Colin Wells, *Sailing From Byzantium*, p. 241.

<sup>86</sup> Dimitri Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe, 500-1453* (London, UK: Sphere Books, 1974), Pp. 296-297.