http://dx.doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.04.17

Studia Ceranea 4, 2014, p. 261–275

Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova (Sofia)

Some Anti-Heretic Fragments in the 14TH Century Bulgarian Canon Law Miscellanies

The most important anti-heretic document from the times of the Second Bulgarian Empire is Tsar Boril's Synodicon, compiled for the needs of the Synod against the Bogomils in Tărnovo in 1211[1]. The very nature of the Synodicon as a work of Byzantine literature, created in relation to the events of 843 in order to keep alive the memory of the definitive victory of the Iconodules over the Iconoclasts, determines its character of a primordial source for the heresies. The Zakonopravilo of Saint Sava, or St. Sava's Nomocanon, established in 1219–1220, when the autocephalous Serbian archbishopric was constituted, and the Serbian translation of the Synodicon on the Sunday of Orthodoxy, proclaimed at the Synod of Žiča in 1221, also illustrate the strong presence of the anti-heretic theme on the South of the Slavs during the 13th century[2].

This subject remains topical in the Second Bulgarian Empire during the 14th century. Proof of this is not only the historical events – the anti-heretic councils in Tărnovo in 1350 and 1360 against Bogomils, Adamites, Barlaamites and Judaizers, authentic data about which can be found in the Life of the Venerable Theodosius of Tărnovo[3], but also the abundant manuscript production of that time. This article is dedicated to some typological aspects of the anti-heretic theme and to some relevant texts which testify its development in copies of Canon law miscellanies from the 14th century.

In the last years, thanks to the contributions in the description and the publication of manuscripts from the 14th century, and to several particular researches, it has been concluded that the separate miscellanies of juridical content made up part of the rich and various tradition of miscellanies – paterics, ascetics, encyclopedic,

[1] Ив. Божилов, А. Тотоманова, Ив. Билярски, *Борилов синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010.

[2] Вл. Мошин, *Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю православия. Анализ текстов*, ВВ 16, 1959, p. 317–394; Idem, *Сербская редакция Синодика в Неделю православия. Тексты*, ВВ 17, 1960, p. 278–353; М. Петровић, *Законоправило или Номоканон светога Саве. Иловички препис 1262 године.* Фототипија, Горњи Милановац 1991; J. Gouillard, *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie. Édition et commentaire*, TM 2, 1967.

[3] В.Н. Златарски, *Житие и жизнь преподобнаго отца нашего Теодосия*, СНУНК 2 (20), 1904, p. 4–41.

or of private reading for the royal family – that the contemporary science possess from the reign of John Alexander (1331–1371). They are inscribed in the overall process of spiritual renewal and revival, known as the Second Golden Age of Bulgarian literature and culture, whose inspirer and patron is the Tsar himself. John Alexander is a unique Bulgarian ruler, for whom the greatest portion of images and written material has been preserved today[1]. His reign has also the privilege of being the period best presented in matters of manuscripts, some of which after the Ottoman conquest make their way into Walachia, Moldova and the Russian lands. In the miscellanies of his epoch, despite their various content and purpose, one observes the repetition of one and the same texts, whose function is connected with the preservation of the true Orthodoxy and the regulation of the efforts for its dogmatic fundament. Some tendencies have been given priority: the encyclopedic one, maintained by the higher number of *erotapokríseis* in some miscellanies (in the Miscellany of hieromonk Laurentius from 1348, in particular[2]); the monastic and ascetic line, patronized by the strong support of the royal institution in favor of Bulgarian monasticism and his hesychast practices. The Canon law miscellanies enter in the scope of the 14th texts spread in the monastic milieu. So far, special attention has been paid to the various redactions of the confessional statement of the Creed and to the exposition of the Seventh Ecumenical Councils which are usually an obligatory part of the Slavonic nomocanon, or Kormčaja Kniga, but could be copied in other types of manuscripts as well (for instance, in the priest Philip's miscellany from 1345, in hieromonk Laurentius' miscellany from 1348, and others). However, they are not unique.

I shall focus on some text fragments from the following Canon law miscellanies:

1. The manuscript № 76 from the Hludov's collection of the State Historical Museum in Moscow (onward Hlud. 76), copied in about 1330–1350, a bipartite codex with a Bulgarian and a Serbian part[3]. The first 90 folia contain features of the middle Bulgarian orthography with two signs of nasals, specific to the Tărnovo school. On the basis of paleographic criteria, A.A. Turilov identifies one of the scribes in the Bulgarian part with priest Philip's follower, who, together with his maitre, is the main scribe of the famous copy of Constantine Manasses' Chronicle in the priest Philip's miscellany from 1344–1345, manuscript № 38 in the Synoptic collection from the State Historical Museum in Moscow[4]. The Russian scholar

[1] Ив. Божилов, *Фамилията на Асеневци (1186–1460). Генеалогия и просопография*, [2]София 1994, p. 163–164; Л. Живкова, *Четвероевангелието на цар Иван Александър,* София 1980, p. 39.
[2] К. Куев, *Иван Александровият сборник от 1348 г.*, София 1981, p. 27.
[3] Е. Белякова, *О составе Хлудовского номоканона (к истории сборника "Зинар"),* СЛ 37/38, 2007, p. 114–131; А. Попов, *Описание рукописей и каталог книг церковной печати библиотеки А. И. Хлудова,* Москва 1872, p. 200–201; С. Николова, М. Йовчева, Т. Попова, Л. Тасева, *Българското средновековно културно наследство в сбирката на Алексей Хлудов в Държавния исторически музей в Москва. Каталог*, София 1999, p. 82.
[4] А.А. Турилов, *К истории тырновского "царского" скриптория XIV в.*, СЛ 33/34, 2005, p. 305–328.

supposes that Hlud. 76 is also issued from a scriptorium, close to the capital of the Second Bulgarian Empire.

2. The miscellany of monk Pachomius from Lovetch, manuscript № 13.3.17 from Y.I. Yacimirskij's collection in the Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg (**from now on abridged as L**), created in a scriptorium around the metropolitan center Lovetch during the government of the pious despot John Alexander, his son Michael-Asen, and archbishop Simeon, that is to say prior to 1331, when the ruler's investiture takes place in Tărnovo[5]. Knowledge of this manuscript remains unsatisfactory, but it is already available on microfilm Мф 266/79 in the Library of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (in use for all observations furthermore). Its similarities with priest Philip's miscellany from 1345 and the hieromonk Laurentius' miscellany from 1348, in several aspects, are a subject of great importance too.

3. The manuscript № 1160 from the Church Historical and Archive Institute by the St. Synod of the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in Sofia (henceforth CHAI 1160) – the earliest known Canon law miscellany in contemporary Bulgarian repositories. It is catalogued as Nomocanon from the end of the 14th century[6]. Since 2009, it has been prototypically reproduced under the name of *Archivski nomocanon* with the same dating[7]. The main copyist has left a note on the last two lines of leaf 192a within the text field: **писавшаго сїѣ гⷭ҃и помѣни, въ цр҃твїи своемъ. Ѹмеѡ҃, тд҃ і҆ерѡмо҃нд҃.** On the basis of the watermark variant Mošin–Tralič № 1944 from 1352, the Romanian scholar R. Constantinescu refers CHAI 1160 to 1351–1360, and proposes localization in the town of Vidin[8]. N. Atanasova, in her dissertation on the watermarks in the 14th century manuscripts kept in Bulgaria, puts the codex in the framework of the 70th–80th years of the 14th century. The more specific dating is based on two watermarks, precisely identified from 1363–1366. One from the type of *ship* remains unidentified[9]. All these opinions allow the dating of CHAI 1160 to be approximately set between 1360s and 1380s.

As one can see, John Alexander is mentioned only in one of the given sources as a local feudal ruler with a despot title (in comparison with the 19 historical

[5] К.М. Куев, *Съдбата на Ловчанския сборник, писан преди 1331 г.*, [in:] *ТКШ*, vol. I, *1371–1971. Международен симпозиум Велико Търново, 11–14 октомври 1971*, ed. П. Русев, Г. Данчев, Е. Сарафова, Велико Търново 1974, p. 79–88.

[6] Б. Христова, Д. Караджова, А. Икономова, *Български ръкописи от XI до XVIII век, запазени в България. Своден каталог,* vol. I, София 1982, p. 55–56.

[7] *Архивски номоканон. Български ръкопис от XIV в. Фототипно издание*, ed. А. Кръстев, Цв. Янакиева, Шумен–София 2007; М. Цибранска-Костова, *Покайната книжнина на Българското средновековие IX–XVIII в. (езиково-текстологични и културологични аспекти)*, София 2011, p. 280–292.

[8] R. Constantinescu, *Vechiul drept românesc scris. Repertoriul izvoarelor 1340–1640*, Bucureşti 1984, p. 37, 107.

[9] Н. Атанасова, *Филиграноложки проблеми на български ръкописи от XIV–XV в. (запазени в България). Дисертация*, София 1984, p. 73.

notes preserved nowadays in 19 manuscripts where he was venerated as a Tsar)[10]. By presumed chronology, some of them step out from John Alexander's reign. In the matter of content as well, the analyzed miscellanies prove that his epoch did not engendered the appearance of the miscellany-prototype, but certainly increased the number of copies by enriching the primary compilation with supplementary works. Copying always signalizes actuality of the readings. The main textual corpus (the core of the miscellany) of all the given manuscripts is notable for its outlined anti-heretical direction, although the rest of the texts (the periphery of the miscellany) varies. The anti-heretic trends have their roots in the traditional self-identification of the Orthodoxy by denying every heresy, as well as in the concrete anti-heretical polemics in the Balkans during the 13th–14th centuries against the dualist doctrines (or the remains of them), and the Latins, to whom the strongest negative dispositions in the Byzantine and the Slavic society are especially addressed in the times of the Crusades. Other common reasons for keeping alive the anti-heretic tendency could be: the particular activity of 14th century heretic sects, such as the Adamites, the Barlaamites, and the Judaizers; the echo of the decisions of the Hagiorite assembly from 1344 against some Athonite and Thessalonian monks accused of having confessed to Bogomilism[11]; the profound influence of the hesychasm with its specific striving for a pure knowledge of God as a way to Salvation; the impending Muslim danger over the Balkans and the pressing necessity of preserving the Orthodox identity by the combined efforts of the State and the Church[12].

The manuscript diffusion of identical anti-heretic texts in a series of copies testifies to the existence of a common prototype and arises from the question of what Greek correspondent the Slavonic reception is based upon. Let's focus on the chosen textual fragments[13].

I. CHAI 1160: ff. 72a–74b; L: ff. 152b–154b; Hlud. 76: ff. 35a–37a.

Under the following title **Сѫ́го и вьселенскаго втораго събора** (variant in L **и пакы зри шпасно се. сѫ́го и вьселенскаго вътораго събора ѡ сырнѣ́ки недели. и ѡ прочїи́ нѣ́лѣ́ сказанїе**) begins: **Повелѣ́ваемь вьсѣ́комѹ хр̂тїа́нинѹпо сѫ́ѣ́ки па́сцѣ тж̃ вьсѧ сѣ́моницѧ ѿ нѣ́ла и̓ пакы до нѣ́лѧ ѳоминѫ, мирстїи чл҃ци да ꙗ́дѧ́т̃ мѧса, мниси же сы́рь и̓ ри́бѫ** (in L added **и ꙗица**). **и̓ пакы до сѫ́ѣ́ .н҃. тницѧ вьсѧ тж̃ седмоницѧ. и̓ пакы дрѹгѫ сѣ́моницѧ до в҃сѣ́ сѫ́ыи̯ по съше́ствии сѫ́го дх҃а такоже ꙗ́сти, и̓ пакы**

[10] Ив. Божилов, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

[11] A. Rigo, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo revolte agli esicasti ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, Firenze 1989 [= OV, 2]; idem, *L'assamblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili (ms. Vat. Gr. 604 ff.11r–12v)*, CS 5, 1984, p. 475–506.

[12] G. Podskalsky, *Theologische literature des Mittelalaters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865–1459*, München 2000, p. 124–143.

[13] Fragments are published according to CHAI 1160 which I have chosen as the main copy, verified *de visu*.

ѿ рождъства хв҃а до кръщенїа хв҃а (in L до ст҃ыи просвѣщенїи)[14] такоже ꙗ́сти[15]. и́ пакы не́ла є́же пр҃ѣмасопо́нжж не́. въ нѧже тръ́клатїи а҆рме́ни по́ст҃ѧ скверънныи свои по́, дръклатомъ (sic!) а҆рцивѳриоу. и́ тогда повелѣва҃е въсѣмь хр҃тїано́ ꙗ́сти такоже́ въса тж҃ седмоицѫ, а҆ не постити ꙗкоже є҆диномы́дръно съ еретикы. и҃ж и́ ср҃ѣ и́ п҃а ꙗ́сти мяса́. а҆ мини́си сы́ръ и́ ры́бы, ꙗ́ко҃ и́ ѡ҆ны дрѳгыа се́моицѫ а҆́же р҃ѣхомь пр҃ѣжде. а҆ проклатїи хан҃зиа́нїе (in L and Hlud. 76 ханзїзаре) по́ и́ жръ́твы тво́рать тогда въ тж҃ в҆сѧ се́моицѫ ѱсоу҃ нѣ́коемъ а҆рцивоу́рїоу, є҆же сѫ́ть арме́ни. тѣмже сего ради не до́ить на́м҃ нї еди́нь дн҃ь по́стити. Кто ли не послы́шае́ си́хъ пр҃ѣданїи ст҃ыи, иж и҃нако начнеть мы́ръствовати, а҆на́ѳема:~ ѡ҆ сы́рнѣки не́ли (in L without segmentation and the title keeps on и въса такоже́ сырнѧа не́ла ꙗсти сыра и ꙗецъ повелѣ ст҃ыи съворъ). Въса такоже́ сы́рнѧж не́ла ꙗ́сти сы́ръ повелѣ ст҃ыи съѣворъ. въ ср҃ѣ же и́ п҃а тож седмоицѫ пѣ́ти по́ваѳ҃ литѳргїѫ пр҃ѣжде́сщен҃нѧж въ .ѳ҃. ча́ дн҃е (in L въ вр҃ѣма девата́ часа по́бываеть пѣти часовы съ ве́рна)[16]. и́ потомь ꙗ́сти сы́ра и́ ꙗець, е҆́ретикь ради а҆нтонїанскыхъ (in L а҆нтонїаскыи designs a new paragraph) и савельанскы́ (added in the marginal space of CHAI 1160, a probable auto correction of the scribe; in L and Hlud. 76 in the principal text), и҆́же съхра́нѣмть въса сиж седмоицѫ не ꙗ́сти ничьсого. тѣмже повелѣ ст҃ыи и́ великыи и́ въселенскыи събо́ръ. да въса тж҃ се́моицѫ въсѣкь правосла́вныи безь в҆сѣ́кого рас҆жже́нїа ꙗ́сти сы́ра и́ ꙗець и́ рыбы. Ѥ҆ще же паче прокли́нати тръ́клатыа е́ретикы. пръ́ваго а҆рїа́ и́ съ нимь несто́рїа, и́ савелїа́. и́ ѳеѡ́ра, и́ ѳеѡдо́та, хоу́лныа владосло́вца. и́ вра́гы ст҃ѣи троици, и́ развѣкателѣ. и́ їѡа́н҃на антихристова пр҃ѣдитеча, и́ сънаслѣдника. маркиѡ́на же и́ зосимъ и́ петрѳ́сїа, си́ в҆сѣхъ прокли́нати. є҆ще же и́ .ѯ҃е. є҆ресеи и́ вса наставникы и́ и́ оу҃чителя. и́ ликопетра, и́ па́вла самосате́а (in L самѳса), и́ македонїа. и́ є҆вти́хыевы є҆диномы́дръникы. въкѳпѣ ѥ҆же и́ дїѡскора. и́ севириа́на (in L севрїани) и́ павла и́ оу҃ченикы его҆ павликїа́ны (in L павлике), и҆́же го́ршїи сѫ́ть па́че въсѣ́ е́ретикь. ꙗкоже и́ а҆рмени. и́ дрѳгыѫ е́ретикы кокѳври́кы. О сихъ въсѣхъ ст҃ии и́ пр҃ѣбнїи и́ бг҃оно́снїи ѡ҃ц҃и на́ши, събѡ́ры въсе́ленскыа и́ вели́кыѫ сътво́рившe въ костантини (in Hlud. 76 константинѣ) градѣ велицѣмь, и́ въсточны́ градѣ́. въ никии же и́ въ е҆́фесѣ, и́ въ халкидонѣ. въкѳпѣ же и́ съ правосла́вными и́ бг҃омы́дръными ц҃рїи на вр҃ѣме на которагожо́ и́ ц҃р҃ства. пото́ же и́ дрѳ́ѕїи събѡри ст҃ии бываѫщеи по лѣ́тѣ́, въ пола́та́ ц҃р҃кыи въ костантини градѣ. и́ въ въсто́чны́ ц҃рва́хъ вели́кыихъ. въ лаѡ́дикїи же и́ въ сардїи и́ въ гагрѣ́ (in Hlud. 76 гангрѣхъ). и́ въ антиѡхїи и́ въ кесарїи, и́ въ про́чїи́ вели́кы́ ц҃рква́ и́ градѣхъ. и҆же въсегда и҆стѧзаѫще ѡ҆ правосла́вии. и́ ѡ҆ исправлени и́ст҃и́нныхъ вѣ́ры, съпи́сашa и́ пр҃ѣдашa на́м҃ пр҃ѣда́нїа ст҃аа сѝ, възражаѫще въсѣ́кѫ е҆́ресь и́ проклинаѫще наста́вникы и́хъ, въсѣхъ и҆́же е҆диномы́дръствѳмть съ ними. и́ прога́нѣѫше влъ́кы па́гоѹбныа

[14] In the Moldavian manuscript № 636 from the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, which will be quoted further, one used the term до богоꙗвлениꙗ.

[15] *Ibidem*, addition .в҃і. дни.

[16] *Ibidem*, не по́ваѳ пѣти литѳргїа. ниже пр҃ѣжѥщенѫа. нж въ .ѳ҃. ча́ по ѡ҃поущени ве́рна. въхождѝ на трапезѫ.

ѝ дш҃етлѣ́нныѧ, ѿ словє́снаго ста́да хв҃а. и́же бл҃гословѧще хо́лнаа наꙋ́чишѧ. разсѣка́ѧще ѝ раꙁ҇ѣлѣ́ѧще ст҃ы́ѧ ѝ безнача́лныѧ ѝ единосу́щныѧ ѝ живото́ворѧщыѧ тро́и́цѣ. ѡ҆́ви же рѣ́шѧ ѿ ни́ҳ не испов҃ѣ́дати и́стинно в҃ц҃ѣ, пр҃тѣ́ѧ в҃ц҃ѣ вл҆́чцѣ нашѣ ѝ пр҃но дв҃ѣ мариѧ. къ сим же ѝ и́на мно́га развращенїа̀ ѝ хꙋ́лный на и́стинныѧ ѝ ст҃ы́ѧ ѝ правосла́вныѧ вѣ́рꙋ хв҃ꙋ. тѣ́мже ѝ мы̑,ꙗ҆́ко и́стиннїи посо́бници ѝ оу҆́ч҃ници ст҃ы́и а҆́пл҃ъ, є҆диномы́сленно съ сими ст҃ы́ми ѝ бг҃оно́сными ѿ҆цы̑ ѝспов҃ѣ́даемь ꙗ҆́же пр҃ѣда́ша намь ст҃ии а҆́пли, и́стинно. ꙗ҆́же по҆́твръ҆дишѧ ѝ оу҆́кр҃ѣпишѧ ст҃ии ѝ бг҃оно́снїи ѿ҆ц҃ѝ на́ши ѝ пр҃ѣдашѧ на҃ си́це въ правосла́внѣи ѝ и́стиннѣи вѣ́рѣ пр҃ѣвы́вати. ѝ не прикасати сѧ ниже ѝстѧзовати ѻ҆ тръклатыи̑ ѝ бг҃оми҃ръзꙋ́кы̑ ереникѡ́. нѫ҃ ѿ҃вѣ́ꙁати тѣ҃ ѝ странити сѧ ѿ҃ ни́ҳ ѝ проклинати и̑, ꙗ҆́ко наслѣ́днисы ѿ҃гню вѣ́чномꙋ ѝ съжи́тела дїа́воловы. плѣне́ныѧ дїаволѡ́҃, и гоуби́тела дш҃етлѣ́н҃ныѧ.

If we start from the text in L, where the title about the Cheese fare week is not a separate unity, it is obvious that the Second Ecumenical Council (the First from Constantinople, 381) was perceived as a canonical frame. In its 1st and 7th rules, the Council pronounced accusations against the actual heresies during the whole 4th century, namely the Macedonians (denying the divinity of the Holy Spirit, or Pneumatomachians), Sabellians, Eunomians, Markelians, Appolinarists, and others. These are Trinitarian Christological heresies, arisen from the non-orthodox view about the Holy Spirit. By their ideology they are close to the Arianism, condemned as early as on the First Ecumenical Council convened in Nicaea in 325. But the subsequent matter does not justify directly this frame because it consists explicitly of bylaws against the non-orthodox fasting. The text controverts the three-time-damned Armenians and their arajavor fast (a preliminary fast from the pre-Lenten penitential cycle, held during the week between the Sunday of the Publican and Pharisee and the Sunday of the Prodigal Son, as the text says **нєдѣлѧ єже пр҃ѣ мясопо́ѧ**). None of the holy councils of the Church has ever mentioned the arajavor fast, but its complicated and differently explained nature is well enough documented by Byzantine sources[17]. In our text, however, this fast is taught as closely connected with the Orthodox dogma of fasting; likewise it is quoted in the Lenten Triodion and the Typikon, without any references to the legendary narratives about the heretic Sergius and his dog, which the arajavor fast was named after. In contrast to the Armenians and other monophysite sects, such as the Jacobites, Copts, and Nestorians, during the week of the arajavor fast, orthodox Christians do not fast on Wednesday and Friday on pain of anathema (according to other prescriptions during the whole week the fasting should be broken, as the Slavonic text indicates: **сего ради не до́бить намъ҆ нїѣ единь дн҃ь постити**). The reason for the Armenian fast to be mentioned in a textual sequence for the Cheese-fare week

[17] A. SHARF, *Byzantine Orthodoxy and the Preliminary fast" of the Armenians*, [in:] BYZANTION. ΑΦΙΕΡΩΜΑ ΣΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΕΑ Ν. ΣΤΡΑΤΟ, vol. II, ΘΕΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΦΙΛΟΛΟΓΙΑ, ΑΘΗΝΑΙ 1986, p. 649–670.

might be seen in the common permission for the use of dairy products. Besides the Armenians, the Slavonic text emphasizes the so-called **хансисáнїе, хансїсаре.** As early as the first half of the 11th century, the Byzantine writer Demetrius, metropolitan bishop of Cyzicus in Asia Minor, wrote against them and other Armenian sects of Jacobites and Melhiti who venerated the death on the cross more than Jesus himself[18]. Fragments of his work constitute the 41st chapter of the St. Sava's nomocanon, followed by the famous 42nd chapter against the Bogomils, called Babuni. In this shape, they were set within the whole corpus of the earliest copy from Ilovica, dating from 1262.[19] Demetrius of Cyzicus compared those heresies to the Eutychian one, pointing out the common practice of eating meet during the Cheese-fare week. Thus, the micro textual insertion about the Cheese-fare week in the given fragment is a focus on the subject of the breaking of orthodox fasts and the ways to differentiate from the heretics by the established practices during the pre-Lenten period. As it is well known, after the Cheese fare Sunday the 40 days of Lent begins. The inserted list of heresiarchs confirms again that the core of the anti-heretical polemics is the Trinitarian Monophysite heresies and those of the Quartodecimans, who deviate from Orthodoxy by the way of celebrating Pasha, some of them similar to the Jews[20]. Indeed, the Second Ecumenical Council proclaimed accusations against the mentioned heresies. The list of the heresiarchs, condemned mostly prior to and on the Fourth Ecumenical council, traditionally starts with Arius, Nestorius and other famous monophysites, but one can likewise see outlined the name of Paul from Samosata and that of Lucopetros. Historically speaking, in those personalities one alludes both to monophysites and to dualist heresies, especially to the most popular one, Paulinism. For instance, Lucopetros was declared a teacher of the heretic Sergius, who was thought to have established the arajavor fast according to the legendary background; at the same time, Lucopetros was mentioned as a leader of the Bogomils–Phundagiagitae from the Byzantine theme Opsikion in northwestern Anatolia, Asia Minor during the first half of the 11th century, as stated by Euthymius of the Periblepton (or of Akmonia) in his famous 11th-century Epistle based entirely on authentic contemporary data[21]. The dualistic line is straightened on a nominative level by the use of the term **коукоуврики**, regularly keeping one and the same shape in all three copies and

[18] *PG*, vol. 127, col. 879–885.

[19] The Ilovica Kormčaja represents a 398 leaves parchment codex, copied by deacon Bogdan in Ilovica, the siege of Zeta metropolis, on Bishop Neophyte's order. Today, the manuscript is kept in the Library of Zagreb. It was reproduced in 1991; see М. ПетровиЋ, *op. cit.*, p. 205б–206а.

[20] *Правилата на Св. православна църква с тълкуванията им*, ed. et trans. Ст. Цанков, И. Стефанов, П. Цанев, София 1912, p. 424–425.

[21] G. Ficker, *Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Sektengeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters.* Leipzig, 1908, p. 165, 211–219; M. Angold, *Church and Society under Comneni 1981–1261.* Cambridge, 1995, p. 467; J. Gouillard, *L'hérésie dans l'Empire byzantin jusqu'au XII s.*, TM 1, 1965, p. 299–324; A. Sharf, *op. cit.*, p. 669–670.

associated with the name of the Manichean leader Kuvrick (Kubrick), or Mani[22]. One can presume the influence of 12th-century anti-heretic Byzantine discourse, when, together with the standard Trinitarian accusations, dualistic ones supplemented the vivid polemics, treating the Armenians as Manichaeans or Paulicians, because Paulinism flourished among the Armenian diasporas in Byzantium, in particular. Besides the accusations in Monophysite heresy and dualism, with regards to the Armenians, Byzantine literature from the epoch of the Crusades offers examples of having made associations between them and the Latins. Therefore, the Armenians were metaphorically called *the third colony of the Latins*, because of the similarities between the two denominations in dogmatic matters, against which the Orthodox Church had always fought, such as the use of unleavened Eucharistic bread (asymes) and pure wine in the Holy Communion. Anti-Armenian propaganda increased after the conquest of Thessalonica by the Normans in 1185.[23]

The Slavonic tradition gives multiple examples for the traditional anti-heretic trends against the Armenians and Bogomils, as they are attested in the St. Hilarion of Almopia's Life, composed by Patriarch Euthymius, or in the Berlin miscellany from the very beginning of the 14th century, with special references to **трьклѧ арьмени сквьрни пѹсть глим їрциѳдриевь**[24]. Consequently, the anti-Armenian and the anti-dualistic line were traditional for the historical period when the examined miscellanies were subjected to intensive copying.

II. CHAI 1160: ff. 87a-88a, L: ff. 155a–162a, Hlud. 76: ff. 47a–48a.

Повѣдаемъ же и злѫ вѣрѫ и лѫкавѫ иже безъквасное дрѫжѫще и слѫжѫще мрѫтво. сирѣ їако же, фрѫзи (the same in L and Hlud. 76) **и ини прочїи таковїи. иже неистийна є жрѫтва и бескрѫвнаа. и нѣ истийно** (in L and Hlud. 76 нѣистинно) **въѡбраженїе йхъ єже испов҃ѣдѫѫтъ, ѩ мр҃тва въѡбражаѫтъ сна бжїа. въсѣкое безъквасное и безъсолное мрѫтво є. їако и ѡни творѧ. и йноже блѧдословѧ злѣйшее, єже глѧ хѳлѫще** (in L and Hlud. 76 ниже блѧдословїе злѣишее глѧть хоулѫще). **їако стыи дхъ ѿ ѻц҃а и ѿ сна йсходи и рабольпно стго дха глѫще и пропов҃ѣдѫще. и ина мнѡга бг҃омрѫзска їаже имать. иже не въсхотѣшѧ покоритиѧ ст҃моу съборѹ и ѳченїю стыи ѿц҃ъ** (end in L)[25], **йхже послѣди събра въ коонстантїни градѣ ст҃аа и правѣнаа ѳеѡра ц҃рца, съ сномъ свои православныи ц҃ремъ михаилѡ. и съ тѣми великыми ѡц҃ы по ѡбразѹ великыи и пръвыи съборъ въселенскыи, пакы сътворше и съставлъше, православнѫ вѣрѫ оутвръдишѫ**

[22] А. Тотоманова, *За една парономазия в Бориловия синодик*, [in:] **Словеса прѣчюдната**, vol. XV, *Юбилеен сборник в чест на проф. И. Буюклиев*, София 2012, p. 36–42.

[23] M. Angold, *op. cit.*, p. 510.

[24] Х. Миклас, Л. Тасева, М. Йовчева, *Берлински сборник*, Sofia–Wien 2006, p. 56; Патриарх Евтимий, *Съчинения*, praefatio К. Янакиев, София 1990, p. 62.

[25] At this point, the text is interrupted purposely and continues with a sequence of canonical rules, mostly intended for monks: **Єреи на ловь исходѧи или псы храня…** After them, the text reverts to folio 161b.

и прѣдашѧ. ѿгнавше и проклавше въсѧ сѳемѫдрѣныѧ ѥретикы, и посты йхъ и йспов҃данїе. мы҃ же послѣдствѳѫще прѣданїѳ ст҃ый ѿц҃ъ и оучєнїѳ и҃. йспов҃дѳ҃ ст҃ѫѧ и живоначалнѫѧ и ѥдиносщнѫѧ тр҃ицѫ. равносла́вно ѿц҃а и с҃на и ст҃го дх҃а. ѡц҃а безначална. и с҃на събезначална. и дх҃а ст҃го равносщна. ѿц҃а нерѫжѥ́на. и с҃на рѫжѥ́на, и дх҃а ст҃го йсходѧща ѿ о҃ц҃а. и на сн҃ѣ прѣбываѫща. ѥдина си́ла. ѥдино съчетанїе, и ѥдино поклоненїе. ст҃ыѧ тр҃ицѫ. и тако гл҃ати на҃ ꙗко ѿ о҃ц҃а йсходѧща дх҃а ст҃го, и на сн҃ѣ прѣбываѫща. а҆ йже сице не мѫдрѣствѳѫщій, нѫ йнако по своемѳ сѳемѫдрѣномѳ разѳмоу гл҃ѫщій. таковый, а҆нѳема, а҆нѳема, а҆нѳе҃:~ (in L, added at the end Иже неповиноует сѧ написаныхъ ни послѳшаеть прѣданиишмь сі҃ написанный ѿ ст҃ый а҆пл҃ъ. и бг҃оносный и пр҃повны ѿц҃ь. нѫ инако начьне҃ ходити и жити кромѣ сі҃ написанный правѝ. анѳема).

Following the description of CHAI 1160, this textual insertion formally belongs to the group of collected texts entitled ѡ сырнѣки нѐли, which covers a wide range of fragments, including penitential rules[26], but in L, this sequence is not separated as an autonomous entity. The canons break the homogeneous structure in blocks of, generally speaking, *non-penitential* texts. The given state of L copy allows the presumption that the doctrinal reglamentations are components of one unity and that their segmentation might be conceived as a result of a latter transformation. This statement is supported the fact that the fragment is not particularly titled. It is framed by readings about orthodox fasts and ends with a triple anathema against the *the very abominable faith* of the so called **фрѫзи.** As I consider this term a key-word, the analysis should start from here.

Фрѫзи (in other copies **фрѧзи, фроузи**) is used one more time in all sources, again in close connection with the fourth Orthodox fasts – of Christmas, Paschal, of the Holy Apostles and of the Theotokos – situated in positional proximity with the above mentioned text without a special title. Given its position and contents, this fragment falls into the same rubric. Here it is: **Сего бо ради дръзнѫвше написахѡ҃.** да не винѫ нѣцїи йзъѡбрѣт҆ше, ꙗко хотѧтъ постити сѧ. и своймі начинан҆мі своѫ посты и ѳ҃ставы начне҃ творити которыиѫ́ ꙗкѡ҃ ѥретїици творѧ҃. не дръжѫще прѣданїа ст҃ый а҆пл҃ъ и ст҃ый бг҃оносны ѿц҃ъ. йже ѥгда҆ достои́тъ постити́ѫ, тогда́ не постят сѧ. и ѥгда лѣпо ꙗ҃ не постити сѧ. тогда́ постят сѧ. ѿ православнѫѧ и йстиннаѧ вѣры далѐ ѿстоѫще. и скврънѫѧ вѣрѫ своѫ развращенѫ дръжѫще. и ст҃ѫѧ тр҃ицѫ ѿц҃а и с҃на и ст҃го дх҃а, нечисто и неиспрáвлѣно йспов҃дѳѫще. ꙗкѡ҃ фрѫзи и а҆рмени проклатїи. и йни прочи таковїи, йже не прила́ѫть сѧ къ йстиннѣмѳ православїю. йже и великаго поста прѣвѫѧ нѐла мяса ꙗ҆дѫще. и ег҃а а҆ще кто хоще҃. йх же проклѧша ст҃їи съвори и ѿлѫчиша, пр҃повны́й и бг҃оносны́й ѿц҃ъ нашѝ (in L и хв҃и подражателя) < CHAI 1160: f. 86a; L: ff. 163a-b; Hlud. 76: ff. 46a–46b.

In the context of the early canonical definitions of the first Ecumenical councils, the term **фроуги, фроуги, фриги, фризи** refers to καὶ Μοντανιστὰς τοὺς

[26] Архивски номоканон, p. 13.

ἐνταῦθα λεγομένους Φρύγας, that is to say, to a heretic sect from the region of Phrygia in the central part of Asia Minor, unified by the founder Montanus and his disciples the Montanists (Phrygians), who preached the ideas of: dissolving marriages; disrespect to the Eucharist and its replacement with a Satanic sacrifice; the faith in the Paraclete (the Consoler, or the Holy Spirit), whose name was also appropriated to the leader of the sect. This heresy was brought in light of the seventh rule of the Second Ecumenical council and the eight rule of the Local council from Laodicea, about 343.[27] Epiphanius of Cyprus (†403), in his Panarion (Adversus haereses from 374–377), fragments from which took place in the St. Sava's Nomocanon, treated the mentioned heretics from the Second Ecumenical council as Montanists: **фриги ѿ мондана соуть, фриги монꙋданиты, катафригасте**[28]. But in the same primordial Slavonic source, the whole 51st chapter was dedicated to **франьзѣхъ и ѡ прочиⷯ латинѣхъ** (in the text, one can read the explanation **франзи иже герꙋмани нарицаетъ се**). Among the numerous condemnations against the Latins, or Germans, one lists the following: consumption of meat during the first week of the Lent; the ignorance of and the disrespect to the Cheese-fare week: **ни знаютъ что есть сырнаа нед҃ле**; the irregular observation of the Lenten fast, which, among different representatives of this denomination, varies from six, through eight, to ten weeks, and so on. Hence, identical or similar accusations could be addressed to different heretic denominations, to compare: **1.** According to the interpretations of the eighth canon of the Second Ecumenical council, the Eunomians, Sabellians and **фроугы**[29] were called *Wednesday people*, because they used meat in Wednesday, but fasted on Saturday; **2.** According to the Demetrius of Cyzicus' testimonies, Jacobites, Melhiti and **хансиза'нїе, хансїзаре въ ст҃ыи великыи по҃ въ сѳботѳ и въ нед҃лю млѣко и сирь и ѣица ѣдетъ. шпрѣсньки слоуже҃. въ вино воды не въливаютъ**[30]; **3.** On the other hand, fasting on Saturday, the use of azymes, and the heaviest possible deviation – the dogma about the proceeding of the Holy Spirit not only from the Father but also from the Son, the Filioque, – were obligatory arguments in the Byzantine anti-Latin polemics and therefore in its Slavonic adoption. Taking into consideration the content of the fragment in all three copies, testifying the use of the examined term, it seems plausible to refer **Фрѫзи** to Latins and to bind the text with the anti-Latin account, which, naturally, could not be emblematic for the canonical determinations of the Second Ecumenical council, but could be engendered by the nominative association between similarly sounding names. The fact that L, in one of its marginal notes on folio 78b, explicitly explained the term by the following: **їтали наричат сѧ фрѫзи** gives grounds

[27] *Правилата на Св. православна църква*, p. 418–419; *Правилата на Св. православна църква с тълкуванията им*, ed. et trans. Ст. Цанков, И. Стефанов, П. Цанев, София 1913, p. 789–790.
[28] Quoted according to the Bucharest Kormčaja from the same filiations, manuscript № 285 from the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, f. 285б.
[29] *Ibidem*, f. 61a.
[30] *Ibidem*, f. 153b.

for the proposed hypothesis. The adherence to the characteristic orthography for the overall codex allows the note to be determined as a contemporary one of the miscellany glossary.

Since the establishment of Charlemagne's Empire as Imperium Francorum, the whole Western world has been referred to as the Empire of Francs, from the Greek φράγκοι. Since 1204, the Latins and the crusaders were referred to in this way. Nikon of the Black Mountain (1025 – 1100/1110) left some significant details about that in his Taktikon, as the author himself witnessed of the conquest of Antioch by the warriors from the First Crusade. In the 38th chapter of his work, he spoke about τὸ ἔθνος τῶν φραγγῶν ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς Γερμανοὶ λεγόμενον[31]. According to him, they shared the same anti-heretical views with the Macedonians, Nestorians and, in particular, the Arians. The form **фрѫ́зи** was testified in Tsar John Asen's inscription from 1230 in Tărnovo's church "St 40th martyrs"; **фрѫгꙋ** could be read in St. Hilarion of Almopia's Prolog Life[32]. The forms **фрѫгы, фрѫзи, фрѫжьскыѫ** were attested in the St. Petka from Tărnovo's Life, written by Patriarch Euthymius. They corresponded to the described historical events during Tsar John Asen II's reign and designated the Latins, or the Francs, the habitants of the Latin Empire on the Balkans created after the Fourth Crusade, existing from 1204 to 1262. Despite the non-exhaustiveness of the given examples and their possible multiplication, one can conclude that the term circulated as a topical nomination in the literature of the Second Bulgarian Empire all over the 13th and 14th centuries.

The published fragment from CHAI 1160 targets the unleavened bread used by the Latins and the Filioque. In this purpose, the fragment lies upon the Council from 843, convened in Constantinople, on which, thanks to the Empress widow Theodora (842–867), regent of his son Michael, the logothete Theoktistos and other supporters of the regent council, the veneration of the holy icons was definitely restored[33]. On the 11th of March, 843, *on the first Sunday of Lent*, the Iconodules proclaimed publicly their victory and legitimized the renewal of the canonical dispositions from the Seventh Ecumenical council (the Second Nicean), held in 786–787. The council of 843 was its natural prolongation in the fight between Iconoclasts and Iconodules, having given the most actual dogmatic definition of

[31] W. J. Aerts, *Nikon of the Black Mountain, witness to the first crusade. Some remarks on his person, his use of language and his work, named Taktikon*, [in:] *Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta. East and West in the Medieval Eastern Mediteranean*, vol. I, ed. K. Ciggar, M. Metcalf, Leven–Paris–Dudley, MA, 2006, p. 424. The newest Bulgarian contribution in the study of the anti-Latin propaganda is: А. Николов, *Повест полезна за латините. Паметник на средновековната салвянска полемика срещу католицизма,* София 2011.

[32] В.Н. Златарски, *История на българската държава през Средните векове*, vol. III, *Второ българско царство. България при Асеневци (1187–1280),* [3]София 1994, p. 593–594.

[33] К. Куев, *Вселенски събори*, [in:] *КМЕ*, vol. I, p. 467; Ив. Божилов, А. Тотоманова, И. Билярски, *op. cit.*, p. 10–14; Ив. Билярски, *Палеологовият синодик в славянски превод,* София 2013, p. 7–11.

the Orthodox faith, and therefore, having turned into a basic ideological cushion for the anti-heretic theme, as the latter was given shape only and solely in opposition to the Orthodoxy, which means that, by use of antinomy, the broadest Orthodox perception defined the heretic as someone who merely was not an Orthodox[34]. In this way, the incompatible, at first sight, titles of the Bulgarian miscellanies found an internal logical order and organization. Obviously, it is to presume that the Slavonic text lies upon a concrete Greek prototype of compilative character, over which the rich centuries-long Byzantine anti-Latin controversy left its mark by using fundamental subjects and ideas. The strong anti-Latin propaganda had characterized the Byzantine society since the 12th century. All researchers having dealt with this period are unanimous that in the reign of the Komnenos dynasty, one observed an unprecedented wave of hostility against the Latins' errors, which turned into *religious hysteria and popular antipathy*[35]. The period of the 11th – to the beginning of the 13th centuries gave birth to the Lists of Latins' false beliefs, a very popular literary genre in Byzantine literature with a probable influence on the Slavonic tradition (see, for instance, the reference to the 30ty errors of the Latins in the Berlin miscellany: **а на латинѫ искладиваѥть .л҃. вынь злыхъ**)[36]. The anti-Latin theme gained official status on the Balkans in and through St. Sava's Nomocanon. Thus, the anti-Latin issue was also typical for the epoch of the spread of the examined miscellanies.

In the context of what has been said so far, it is scarcely surprising that the anti-heretic theme continues in the rubric **Отъ правилъ съвора Антиохиискаго** (CIAI 1160: f. 88b; Hlud. 76: f. 48b; L: f. 31a), in which there were two anathemas striving against the communication with Jews, Armenians, Jacobites, Muslims, and Paulicians (the latest endowed with the gloss **ѩже сѫ́ть прѡ́чїи таковїи, ѩже сѫ́ть патери́ини и҆ бг҃оми́ли**)[37]. Although in all the copies the fragments about the Cheese fare week indicated an unchangeable number of ѯ҃ѕ҃ (65) heresies, subjected to anathema, that is namely in the rubric **Отъ правилъ съвора Антиохиискаго**, where the explicit nomination of the Bogomils, unique in the overall miscellany scope, took place. In previous publications, I have already argued in favor of its translated character from a yet unknown Greek correspondent. I allowed myself, as well, to stress the fact that the source Cotelerius' Nomocanon pointed out as Greek (also known as Pseudo-Zonaras' nomocanon), could not have been the immediate source for the Slavonic translation[38], but might have been of the same manuscript

[34] J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon...*, p. 182.
[35] P. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos 1143–1180*, Cambridge 1993, p. 368; M. GALLAGHER, *Church Law and Church Order in Rome and Byzantium. A Comparative Study,* Birmingham 2002 [= BOM, 8], p. 173.
[36] Х. МИКЛАС, Л. ТАСЕВА, М. ЙОВЧЕВА, *op. cit.*, p. 68.
[37] М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, М. РАЙКОВА, *Богомилите в църковноюридическите текстове и паметници*, СЛ 39/40, 2008, p. 197–219.
[38] М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, *op. cit.*, p. 259–410.

tradition in the actual Byzantine Canon law literature from the 12th – to the beginning of the 13th centuries. The proximate position and the common threatened subject of all the texts investigated allow the supposition that a unified anti-heretic cycle was segmented in different ways in the given copies. The character of all anti-heretic texts bears a resemblance to a secondary compilation of various sources, originating in the Byzantine environment, not to a homogeneous corpus. Undoubtedly, they have a tangible accent in the *relation Armenians–Dualists–Latins*. The Slavonic anti-heretic cycle from the 14th century Bulgarian miscellanies has an as yet unidentified Greek counterpart. It nourishes the Slavonic manuscript tradition with the predominating Byzantine view upon the Orthodoxy as the true Faith of the Church, inherited from the tradition of holy Apostles and the holy Fathers. This is the reason for the largely pointed idea in the Bulgarian miscellanies that all Canon law prescriptions represent *the Holy patronymic legacy*. Starting from this point of view, one could explain the incompatibility between the titles of the Ecumenical councils and the relevant canonical issues which has never been alleged. On the other hand, the explicit presence of the issue of how to observe Orthodox fasts reveals the monastic milieu of the spreading of the miscellanies as well as of the appearance of their Slavonic translation. Therefore, the structural unities, ascribed in the leading copy CHAI 1160 as **Сѵ̃тѵ̃го и вьсєлєнскаго сѣбора** (ff. 72a–73a), **ѡ сырнѣки нє̑ли** (ff. 73a–88b), and **Отъ правиль сѣбора Ѧнтиохинскаго** (f. 88b), as well as probably some separate anathemas on other folia, constituted one thematically consistent unity in the Byzantine prototype. It influenced the Slavonic tradition by giving the concise collection of rules and anti-heretic texts whose popularity won its ascription of "the penitential Nomocanon of Slavia Orthodoxa". It is my understanding that further scholarly investigation should verify the hypothesis of the source of the Slavonic translation to have been not merely a nomocanon, but a homogenous Byzantine Canon law miscellany with a well-established anti-heretic core. The anti-heretic theme became obsolete only in some late Slavonic copies and the printed versions from the 16th century. On the contrary, it is to point out that in Walachia and Moldova, the same anti-heretic trends from the Bulgarian 14th century original found not only a particularly warm acceptance during the 15th–16th centuries, but also developed thematically with other anti-heretic works of various provenance, mostly southern Slavic and Russian. The perfect example to illustrate this statement is manuscript № 636 from the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences, written by Deacon Hilarion in 1557, with Moldavian script and Middle Bulgarian orthography in the Neamts monastery. All the texts mentioned above were separated in chapters and numbered following the book's content; some texts were given titles which did not exist in the previous 14th century copies, as follows:

1. Chapter 43rd: **Сѵ̃тѵ̃го и вьсєлєнскаго втораго сѣбора,** which contained only one canon with the incipit **аще кто ѿ пѫганы̑ ѧзыкъ прїидѣ҃ кр҃тити сѧ въ православнѭ вѣрѫ** (f. 77b).

2. Chapter 45th, called in the book content **О пѧтыхъ нѣ̂лѣхъ раздрѣшены̑.** It contained the first published text, including the fragment about the Cheese-fare week **о сырнѣи нѣ̂лѧ правило**.

3. Chapter 67th: **о постѧщихъ сѧ въ сѫбѡты.**

4. Chapter 68th: **О раздрѣшенѣ и срѣ̂ и пѧтѡ̑** to which the second published fragment was affiliated. It is worth mentioning that manuscript № 636 contained explicit data about the use of the term **фрѧзи** in a supplementary anti-Latin cycle, stepping out the frame of the so-called Psudo-Zonaras nomocanon. It has been recently studied in the light of the anti-Latin polemics in the Slavonic environment[39].

5. Chapter 70th was entitled **ѿ правилъ съѣвѡра антїохїискаго.** It consisted of only one canon delivering on anathema the communication of an Orthodox priest with Jewish people.

6. Chapter 71st **О ѣдѧщихъ съ еретикѡмь** referred to the mentioned rule against the Bogomils.

The Moldavian manuscript proves that the numbering of chapters and their titles were a secondary phenomenon in textual development, but it should be conceived as a result of the typological features and the thematic point of the overall Canon law miscellany. The anti-heretic line was one of its essential peculiarities. In Moldova, it found its real political meaning during the 16th century. In august 1551, the Moldavian ruler Stephen Rareş (1551–1552), together with the Orthodox clergy, undertook persecutions over Armenians, Catholics, Protestants and Jews, for the purpose of restoring the Orthodox faith betrayed by his brother Elias Rareş, who, earlier in the same year (30.05.1551), in Istanbul, committed the gravest crime for an Orthodox ruler, namely the denial of the Orthodox faith and the conversion to Islam[40]. The reasons for the Middle Bulgarian miscellany to have been widely copied beyond the Danube River were the same, which engendered its Slavonic translation: the protection of the Orthodoxy in difficult periods of its existence. The anti-heretic miscellany prototype with its wide range of anti-heretic issues served to compile a new true Orthodox encyclopedia against the heresies, whose fundament was set upon a Bulgarian 14th century textual matrix. The linguistic peculiarities of all early 14th century copies give enough proof for the Bulgarian origin of the translation. The preliminary study makes plausible the hypothesis of its coming to life into the chronological framework of the second half of the 13th – to the beginning of the 14th century. There can not be doubt that as early as the second quarter of the 14th century, this miscellany prototype recorded

[39] I. BOGDAN, *Cronice inedited atingătoare de istoria romînilor*, Bucureştĭ 1895, p. 79–102; a new attempt to reveal the rich content of № 636 was undertaken by A Nikolov, see: А. Николов, *op. cit.*, p. 79–85.

[40] *Călători străini despre Ţările Române*. Supliment I, *Foreign travelers about the Romanian principalities*, ed. Şt. ANDREESCU ET AL., Bucureşti 2011, p. 46; IDEM, *Presiune otomană şi reacţie ortodoxă în Moldova urmaşilor lui Petru vodă Rareş*, SMIM 27, 2009, p. 25–60.

a structural variety, rather in the peripheral texts than in the textual core. Therefore, the further logical steps in its study, no matter that this task seems difficult, should be concentrated on the identification of the sought after Greek prototype, which fostered the anti-heretic searches and traditions in the Second Bulgarian Empire.

Abstract. It is well known that the major anti-heretic written source from the Second Bulgarian Empire is the Tsar Boril's Synodicon, proved to have been compiled to serve the Synod against the Bogomils, convened in Tărnovo in 1211. However, the subsequent century is also marked by the anti-heretic line in various types of manuscripts which shape the image of the so called Second Golden Age of the Bulgarian literature and culture. The reign of John Alexander (1331–1371) is reputed to be the richest period of compiling miscellanies – encyclopedic, ascetic, and monastic, or for individual reading of the royal family and court. An important account of them is the manuscripts of legal content which vary from functional guides with Canon Law rules to complex compilations of material from diverse sources. They deserve to be investigated not only as a part of the cultural system but also as principal evidences how the mechanism of regulation in the tripartite relationship *Law-Society-Culture* has functioned. The latest discoveries and the up to day of the catalogued database of Slavonic manuscripts in the Bulgarian repositories and the Russian libraries proved the undisputable role of the Middle Bulgarian written tradition as transmitter of the official attitude against every deviation from the Orthodoxy in three main areas: 1. the traditional so called Christological heresies; 2. the heterodox dualist doctrines of Manicheans, Massalians and Paulicians, including Bogomils; 3. the Latins.

Keywords: Bulgarian anti-heretic texts, Canon Law miscellanies, Medieval Heresies, Orthodox-Catholic relations, Second Bulgarian Empire

Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova
Institute for Bulgarian Language
at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52 Shiptchenski prohod, bl. 17
1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
m.tsibranska@gmail.com