



<https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.13.10>

**RADU G. PĂUN, IVAN BILIARSKY, *Du combat pour la «juste foi» au péché politique. Pour une histoire du Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna 2022 [= Schriften zur Balkanforschung, 4], pp. 415.***

The book is the effect of many years of research by both authors. It is based on Ivan Biliarsky's discovery of a previously unknown, unique Romanian synodicon text printed as part of the Triodion in 1700 (p. 9). The introduction (p. 15–29) is not very extensive but, thanks to a thoughtful way of laying out the emphasis, sufficient. Much could be said about the origins of the synodicon itself, as a type of liturgical text, and the celebration of Orthodox Sunday. The authors provide a handful of the essential information, referring the more inquisitive reader to the most important publications on the subject (p. 15–16). They devote a little more attention to the structure of the synodicon and its historical development (p. 16–25), as well as to the origins of the Romanian synodicon (p. 25–29). In the introduction, we find a preview of all the main topics taken up in the main part of the publication. Here the authors also explain their understanding of the concept of 'political orthodoxy', which foreshadows the 'political sin' of the title, and which is important for their interpretation of the meaning of the synodicon text. Theology acquires political significance when the authorities stand up for orthodoxy, seeing it as an important element of society's cultural and institutional identity (p. 20–23). The Russian synodicon, in which the opponents of the tsars were castigated on a par with heretics, is particularly significant in this context (p. 192–201).

The book is divided into three parts. The first one discusses the history of the orthodox synodicon in the Balkans (chapter 1, p. 33–62)

and among the Eastern Slavs (chapter 2, p. 63–95). The authors show the diversity of regional versions of this document. They have carried out a very extensive query of literature and sources. Perhaps the most interesting cited example of such 'regional variation' is the Cypriot synodicon (MS Panagia Kameriotissa no. 44), in which, in the polychronion, the Patriarch of Rome is mentioned first and only after him the one from Constantinople (the period in question is the thirties to forties of the fourteenth century, p. 34–35). The history of the synodicon after the fall of Constantinople is discussed, which naturally includes the subsequent printed versions, as well as the testimonies of the contemporaries about how the Feast of Orthodoxy was celebrated. The focus on the history of the text provides an opportunity to recall a number of interesting figures, including the Calvinist patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril Loukaris. The celebration of the Feast of Orthodoxy brought more than one theological dispute to a head, which is discussed in this chapter.

Part two focuses on the history of the synodicon in Romanian countries (p. 99–201). In the context of the Buzău synodicon, the authors point out, among other things, that the synodicon was translated from Slavonic and not Greek (at the time, Dositheus of Jerusalem was the patriarch, who showed meticulous attention to dogmatic issues, and he frequently resided in Bucharest). The history of the Romanian synodicon also includes the history of the text's absence from the liturgical practice of the Romanian-speaking Church. It did not


appear until 1700 and was probably withdrawn from use fairly quickly.

The last part of the publication under review (p. 205–296) contains an edition of the first Romanian-language version of the synodicon originally printed in 1700 in Buzău as part of the Triodion (*Triodion ce să zice Tripeasneț*). The text is printed here in Latin transcription. It is equipped with an apparatus to facilitate understanding and interpretation of the text. Part Three opens with a chapter (p. 205–227) discussing the linguistic specificity of the monument. This is all the more valuable as the text is not easy to read and poses difficulties even for those skilled in old Romanian. The translator of the Buzău edition, as the authors of the study point out, did not fully understand the Orthodox Slavonic original. Being unfamiliar with theological topics, he repeatedly gave an unclear or inadequate translation. The next chapter (8, p. 229–234) details the principles of transliteration of the text, followed by a presentation of the content of the synodicon and its comparison with the Orthodox Slavonic and Greek versions (chapter 9, p. 233–234). The Orthodox Slavonic tradition is represented by the text printed in Lviv in 1664, and the Greek tradition by the manuscripts collected in Jean Gouillard's edition and the triodion printed in Venice in 1559. Pages 235–253 are taken up by the

text of the Romanian version of the synodicon. The footnotes below the line indicate extraneous grammatical and lexical forms, presumed explanations of unintelligible passages, biblical quotations with teachings from the Bucharest Bible, basic notes on persons mentioned in the text and more difficult-to-identify events. The personal footnotes are only three in this section, as the relevant prosopographical data on the persons condemned or commemorated are found in the next, 11<sup>th</sup> chapter (*Petit dictionnaire prosopographique*, p. 255–287). The decision to place the prosopographical notes separately was the right one; the extended footnotes below the line would have been less readable.

The book is enriched by annexes containing the Slavonic text of the synodicon (version from the Lviv Triodion, 1664, p. 299–313), the canon of Patriarch Methodius I in Romanian (p. 315–332), as well as the bibliography and index.

*Jan Mikołaj Wolski (Łódź)\**

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1052-9111>

\* University of Lodz, Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe, *Ceraneum*

