

STUDIA CERANEA



7, 2017

Herb's
- CERANEUM -

STUDIA CERANEA



Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre

for

the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area
and South-East Europe

7, 2017

 WYDAWNICTWO
UNIwersytetu
ŁÓDZKIEGO

Łódź 2017

Studia Ceranea
Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture
of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe
7, 2017
University of Łódź, Poland

Editorial Board:

Georgi Minczew (Editor-in-Chief), Mirosław J. Leszka (Co-Editor-in-Chief), Kiril Marinow (Scientific Secretary), Małgorzata Skowronek (Scientific Secretary), Andrzej Kompa (Subject Editor, Byzantine studies), Agata Kawecka (Subject Editor, Slavic studies), Ivan N. Petrov (Secretary)

Address of the Editorial Board:

ul. Jana Matejki 32/38, pok. 319
90-237 Łódź, Polska
www.ceraneum.uni.lodz.pl
s.ceranea@uni.lodz.pl

Editorial Council:

Hana Gladkova (Charles University in Prague), James Douglas Howard-Johnston (Corpus Christi College, Oxford), Ewald Kislinger (University of Vienna), Eliza Małek (University of Łódź), Józef Naumowicz (Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw), Szymon Olszaniec (Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń), Stefano Parenti (Pontifical Athenaeum of St. Anselm, Rome), Günter Prinzing (Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz), Rustam Shukurov (Lomonosov Moscow State University), Yuri Stoyanov (University of London)

Reviewers (vol. 7, 2017):

Ivan Biliarsky (Institute of History, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences), Dariusz Brodka (Jagiellonian University, Cracow), Jean-Claude Cheynet (Paris-Sorbonne University), Ivan Christov (St. Clement of Ohrid University of Sofia), Thomas Daiber (Justus Liebig University, Giessen), Marcello Garzaniti (University of Florence), Eugen Hill (University of Cologne), Nayda Ivanova (St. Clement of Ohrid University of Sofia), Piotr Kochanek (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin), Rafał Kosiński (University of Białystok), Anna Kotłowska (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań), Aleksandar Loma (University of Belgrade), Anna Marciniak-Kajzer (University of Łódź), Zdzisław Pentek (Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań), Werner Seibt (Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna), Krassimir Stantchev (Roma Tre University in Rome), Piotr Szczur (John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin), Nicolina Trunte (University of Cologne), Cynthia M. Vakareliyska (University of Oregon), William R. Veder (University of Amsterdam), Norbert Widok (University of Opole), Natalya Zapolskaya (Lomonosov Moscow State University / Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences)

Language editing:

For English – Marek Majer (Harvard University)

Cooperation:

Zofia Brzozowska (University of Łódź), Paweł Filipczak (University of Łódź)

Cover designed by:

Sebastian Buzar

Typesetting:

Tomasz Pietras

On the cover:

The throne room, 10th century, Preslav. Phot. K. Marinow

Wersja drukowana czasopisma jest jego wersją podstawową (pierwotną) / The printed version of this journal is to be treated as primary

“**Studia Ceranea**” is indexed in Web of Science™ Core Collection (Emerging Sources Citation Index): USA; EBSCOhost Research Databases: USA; Google Scholar Bibliographic Database: USA; Publishers International Linking Association Inc. (Crossref): USA; Network of Library Content and Services (WorldCat): USA; Slavic Humanities Index: Canada; European Reference Index for the Humanities and the Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS): Norway; Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL): Germany; Information Matrix for the Analysis of Journals (MIAR): Spain; Bibliographic Database of Polish Academic Journals from Humanities and Humanistic Social Studies (BazHum): Poland; Central European Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (CEJSH): Poland; Index Copernicus Journals Master List (IC): Poland; Polish Scholarly Bibliography and POL-Index (PBN): Poland; Polish Scientific and Professional Electronic Journals (ARIANTA): Poland; Scientific Communication Portal (INFONA): Poland; University of Łódź Repository: Poland

Zadanie: Wydanie anglojęzycznych wersji zeszytów rocznika “Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe” finansowane w ramach umowy nr 501/1/P-DUN/2017 ze środków Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego przeznaczonych na działalność upowszechniającą naukę / **Task:** Publication of English-language versions of the volumes of the yearly *Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe* financed through contract no. 501/1/P-DUN/2017 from the funds of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education devoted to the promotion of scholarship

Łódź University Press

© Copyright by Authors, Łódź 2017

© Copyright for this edition by Uniwersytet Łódzki, Łódź 2017

All rights reserved

ISSN: 2084-140X

e-ISSN: 2449-8378



**Ministry of Science
and Higher Education**
Republic of Poland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ARTICLES

- SYMEON ANTONOV, *The Byzantine Office of Ἐπι τῶν κρίσεων and Its Holders (in the Light of Sphragistic Evidence and Written Sources)* 9
- SŁAWOMIR BRALEWSKI, *The Pious Life of Empress Helena, Constantine the Great's Mother, in the Light of Socrates of Constantinople and Sozomen* 27
- KAZIMIERZ GINTER, *The Trisagion Riots (512) as an Example of Interaction between Politics and Liturgy* 41
- NIKOLAY HRISIMOV, *Food of Plant Origin in the Life of Early Medieval Bulgarians (End of 7th – Beginning of 11th Century)* 59
- AMIR KAPETANOVIĆ, *Languages and Their Registers in Medieval Croatian Culture* 79
- MACIEJ KOKOSZKO, KRZYSZTOF JAGUSIAK, JOLANTA DYBAŁA, *The Chickpea (ἑρέβινθος; Cicer arietinum L) as a Medicinal Foodstuff and Medicine in Selected Greek Medical Writings* 99
- FREDERICK LAURITZEN, *The Layers of Composition of the Synodikon of Alexius Studites* 121
- MIROŚLAW J. LESZKA, *On the Reliability of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' Account of the "Flight" of Prince Časlav from Bulgaria* 129
- MAREK MAJER, *A Note on the Balto-Slavic and Indo-European Background of the Proto-Slavic Adjective *svętъ 'Holy'* 139
- IRENEUSZ MILEWSKI, *A Few Remarks on the Ransom Paid for Releasing Captives in Selected Early Byzantine Hagiographic Texts* 151
- YAVOR MILTENOV, *A Note on the Adoption of the Byzantine Models in Medieval Bulgaria (9th–10th Centuries). The Case with the Chrysorrhoeas Collection* 161

ANNA-MARIA TOTOMANOVA, *The Synodikon of Orthodoxy in Medieval Bulgaria* 169

MARIYANA TSIBRANSKA-KOSTOVA, *Paulicians Between the Dogme and the Legend* 229

BOOK REVIEWS

ZOFIA RZEŹNICKA, MACIEJ KOKOSZKO, *Ab ovo ad γάλα. Jajka, mleko i produkty mleczne w medycynie i w sztuce kulinarnej (I–VIII)*
– KRZYSZTOF JAGUSIAK 267

АНЕТА ДИМИТРОВА, *Златоструят в преводаческата дейност на старобългарските книжовници* – АГАТА КАВЕЦКА 271

MARCIN BÖHM, *Rola flot obcych w procesie ostatecznego rozkładu sił morskich cesarstwa bizantyńskiego (1118–1204)* – MIROŚLAW J. LESZKA 272

Τεοφύλακτος Σιμοκάττης, *Οικουμενική Ιστορία* / Teofilakt Simokatta, *Historia powszechna, przekład, wstęp, komentarz i indeksy Anna Kotłowska, Łukasz Różycki* – MIROŚLAW J. LESZKA 274

MATEJ GOGOLA, *Mandylion z Edessy. Rukou-nestvorený obraz a jeho miesto v byzantskom umení a duchovnej kultúre* – ADAM MESIARKIN 276

ABBREVIATIONS 283

GUIDELINES FOR THE AUTHORS 289

ARTICLES

Symeon Antonov (Veliko Tŕrnovo)

THE BYZANTINE OFFICE OF *Ἐπι τῶν κρίσεων* AND ITS HOLDERS (IN THE LIGHT OF SPHRAGISTIC EVIDENCE AND WRITTEN SOURCES)

In the middle of the 11th century, the Byzantine Empire began to experience the difficulties that eventually culminated in the catastrophe of the 1070s. Meanwhile, the state administration evolved in an attempt to adjust to the new conditions. One of the firm steps towards this goal was the creation of the office (σέκρετον) of ἐπί τῶν κρίσεων by emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055) somewhere between 1043 and 1047. This institution is the topic of the current paper, which aims to summarize the evidence from primary sources and the major contributions from the end of the 19th century to the present day. The main part, however, consists of a list of officials in this position, compiled using the available data from different sources – rhetorical, epistolary, documentary and sphragistic.

The only historical source for the establishment of the *epi ton kriseon* and its initial functions is the *History* by Michael Attaleiates¹. According to this account, the newly founded office was to deal with private legal cases (δικῶν ἰδιωτικῶν); furthermore, provincial judges (τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν δικασταί) were supposed to send copies or notes (τῶν σχεδαρίων) to inform the official about their decisions, in order to be free of any suspicion concerning their equity.

The institution under discussion has been studied quite thoroughly for more than a century. Among the most important contributions are those by Karl Eduard Zachariä von Lingenthal², Helene Ahrweiler³, Nikos Oikonomidès⁴, Michael

¹ MICHAEL ATTALEIATES, *History*, ed. A. KALDELLIS, D. KRALLIS, Cambridge MA–London 2012, p. 36: Ἐκαίνισε δὲ καὶ σέκρετον δικῶν ἰδιωτικῶν, ἐπὶ τῶν κρίσεων κακέσας τὸν τούτου προέχοντα· ἐν τούτῳ οἱ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν δικασταί καὶ συντάττουσι τὰ ποιητέα ἐγγράφως καὶ τὰ τῶν σχεδαρίων ἐναποτιθέασιν ἴσα δι' ὑποψίας ἀπαλλαγὴν.

² K.E. ZACHARIÄ VON LINGENTHAL, *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*, Berlin 1892, p. 374–378.

³ H. GLYKATZI-AHRWEILER, *Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IX^e–XI^e siècles*, BCH 84, 1960, p. 70–71.

⁴ N. OIKONOMIDÈS, *L'évolution de l'organisation administrative de l'empire byzantine au XI^e siècle (1025–1118)*, TM 6, 1976, p. 134–135.

Angold⁵, Aikaterine Christophilopoulou⁶, Stauroula Chondridou⁷, Andreas Gkoutzioukostas⁸. Two major suggestions dominate the secondary sources as regards the primary function of these civil servants. Partly, at least, they coincide and complement one another; the chief difference between them is whether the *epi ton kriseon* is taken as a purely judicial position, overseeing the legal activity of provincial judges, or as one related to provincial administration in a more general sense⁹. It is widely accepted that the official in question was a supreme judge of sorts, one of four in Constantinople at that time, the others being the *droungarios tes viglas* (δρουγγάριος τῆς βίγλας), the *eparch of the City*¹⁰ (ἑπαρχος τῆς Πόλεως) and the *quaestor* (κοιαιστωρ)¹¹. In a mid-12th century source, the *Ecloga Basilicorum*, the *epi ton kriseon* is mentioned among the ‘great judges’ (μεγάλους δικαστές)¹². The judicial activity of these officials is well-attested in sources from the 11th–12th century¹³.

Ahrweiler points out that, with the available data, it is impossible to specify the nature of the dependency of the thematic *kritai* (θεματικοί κριταί) on the *epi ton kriseon*. A useful piece of information is found in a passage from the work of Kekaumenos; here, once again, we read about the notes (σχεδαρίων) that a thematic judge was obliged to dispatch to his colleagues in the capital (τῶν πολιτικῶν δικαστῶν). Unfortunately, the original text breaks off, which makes it impossible to reconstruct the rest¹⁴. However, Ahrweiler implies that the *epi ton kriseon* probably did not have the right to veto the decisions of thematic judges, although they were subordinate to him in a certain way. Furthermore, the scholar advances the

⁵ M. ANGOLD, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204. A Political History*, London–New York 1997², p. 62–66.

⁶ ΑΙ. ΧΡΙΣΤΟΦΙΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Τα βυζαντινά δικαστήρια κατά τους αιώνες Γ-ΙΑ*, ΔΕΒΜΜ 4, 1986/1987, p. 174–176.

⁷ Σ.Δ. ΧΟΝΔΡΙΔΟΥ, *Ο Κωνσταντίνος Θ΄ Μονομάχος και η εποχή του*, Αθήνα 2002, p. 127–140.

⁸ Α.Ε. ΓΚΟΥΤΖΙΥΚΩΣΤΑΣ, *Η απονομή δικαιοσύνης στο Βυζάντιο (9^{ος}–12^{ος} αιώνες). Τα κοσμικά δικαιοδοτικά όργανα και δικαστήρια της πρωτεύουσας*, Θεσσαλονίκη 2004, p. 202–207 [= ΒΚΜε, 37].

⁹ Karl Eduard Zachariä von Lingenthal confuses τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν δικασταί in Attaleiates’ text with the judges of the velon and the Hippodrome in the capital, suggesting they were both responsible to the *epi ton kriseon*, which is obviously not true (K.E. ZACHARIÄ VON LINGENTHAL, *Geschichte...*, p. 374). Rather, the Byzantine text refers to provincial judges. For a very short survey of the issue, cf.: Α. ΚΑΖΗΔΑΝ, R.J. MACRIDES, *Epi ton kriseon*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. I, p. 724–725.

¹⁰ I.e. *the new Rome* – Constantinople.

¹¹ These four court officials appear together in the scholia on the Basilika dating from the reign of Constantine X Doukas (1059–1067). Cf. K.E. ZACHARIÄ VON LINGENTHAL, *Geschichte...*, p. 374, fn. 349.

¹² R.J. MACRIDES, *The Competent Court*, [in:] *Law and Society in Byzantium. Ninth–Twelfth Centuries*, ed. A.E. LAIOU, D. SIMON, Washington D.C. 1994, p. 119–120; Α.Ε. ΓΚΟΥΤΖΙΥΚΩΣΤΑΣ, *Η απονομή δικαιοσύνης...*, p. 207.

¹³ Α.Ε. ΓΚΟΥΤΖΙΥΚΩΣΤΑΣ, *Η απονομή δικαιοσύνης...*, p. 206–207.

¹⁴ КЕКАВМЕН, *Советы и рассказы, Поучение византийского полководца XI в.*, ed., trans. Г.Г. Литаврин, Санкт-Петербург²2003, p. 148, 8–10.

idea that this official was more of an administrator than a judge in the pure sense of the word, which relates to the second hypothesis concerning his main functions – that of combined judicial and administrative powers¹⁵.

Another renowned Byzantinologist, Nikos Oikonomidès, suggests that *epi ton kriseon* assisted thematic judges in resolving more complicated cases, which was indeed necessary in view of their insufficient legal competence and education¹⁶. His explanation is rational and could be indirectly corroborated by the information about the deficiency of specialist education among thematic judges. This was one of the main reasons behind the establishment of a law school in Constantinople by Constantine IX, presided initially by *nomophylax* Ioannes Xiphilinos¹⁷. Angold takes a similar stance, linking the creation of the *epi ton kriseon* with the need for stricter control of the activity of provincial judges, whose lack of proper education had led to an unequal treatment of otherwise identical cases. However, he thinks of this office as more than simply law-related, involving authority over the thematic judges as well¹⁸.

Christophilopoulou suggests that the primary impulse behind the foundation of the institution was the need to impose the authority of the central administration over provincial judges. The main purpose was to prevent legal offenses – a common issue at the time, it would seem. Despite that, the *epi ton kriseon* was one of the *σεκρετικά*, who were state officials distinct from judges¹⁹.

Chondridou views the establishment of this position in a wider context, as part of a reform project initiated by emperor Constantine IX himself and backed by the court dignitaries and intellectuals around him. The *epi ton kriseon* had the authority to dismiss provincial judges and to impose other penalties. He was mainly concerned with the *schedarion* in order to thwart illegal actions, mostly matters of property appropriation and financial fraud. Thus, according to Chondridou, he would also deal with economic and fiscal issues²⁰.

The most recent approach to this topic comes from another Greek scholar, Andreas Gkoutzioukostas, who summarizes all of the previous theories. The author implies that the *epi ton kriseon* was an official with various functions; however, there are scarce (if any) data confirming his alleged non-judicial powers. This dearth of evidence opens the way for different speculations, so that the issue is bound to remain uncertain²¹.

¹⁵ H. GLYKATZI-AHRWEILER, *Recherches sur l'administration...*, p. 70–71.

¹⁶ N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *L'évolution de l'organisation administrative...*, p. 134–135.

¹⁷ As an example, we may mention Michael Psellos, who was still very young when appointed thematic judge in several *themata* in Asia Minor; he had just finished his education and his overall legal knowledge was rather limited. Cf. M. ANGOLD, *The Byzantine Empire...*, p. 64–66.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 61–65.

¹⁹ ΑΙ. ΧΡΙΣΤΟΦΙΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, *Τα βυζαντινά δικαστήρια...*, p. 174–175.

²⁰ Σ.Δ. ΧΟΝΔΡΙΔΟΥ, *Ο Κωνσταντίνος...*, p. 127–140.

²¹ Α.Ε. ΓΚΟΥΤΖΙΚΩΣΤΑΣ, *Η απονομή δικαιοσύνης...*, p. 202–207.

In order to make all these statements more consistent with the facts, we have to review some of the principal developments of the theme military and administrative system after the death of emperor Basil II (976–1025).

The theme system, established as early as in the late 7th–8th century as a purely military-related enterprise, eventually resulted in both military and civil authority being concentrated in the hands of one person – the thematic *strategos*²². It remained very much this way until the reign of Basil II, when most of the internal *themata* were deprived of their military population (the so called *stratiotai*), which came to be concentrated predominantly in the peripheral military administrative units near the empire's borders²³. This inevitably undermined the power of the *strategoï* in their own regions, raising the significance of the civil administrators, and of the judges in particular. This process proceeded even further once Basil II was gone, when military expeditions and the pressure on the borders were carried out by professional units (*tagmata*) in the capital and the provinces, as well as by the military population in the borderlands of Southern Caucasus, Asia Minor, Syria, the Balkans and Southern Italy. Meanwhile, the military duties of the remaining *stratiotai* were progressively transformed into fiscal ones for purely financial reasons²⁴.

The foundation of the office of *epi ton kriseon* could also be interpreted as a continuation of these processes. It legitimized the authority of thematic judges, reducing their power from virtually unchecked to controlled by this newly created institution based in the capital. To M. Angold, this was an attempt to restructure the provincial administration and the army, which is indeed a reasonable suggestion²⁵. The list of officials in the bureau of *epi ton kriseon*, presented below, should illustrate some of the important problems concerning both these individuals and the office itself.

²² On the establishment of this novel institution in the light of sphragistic data, cf. J.-C. CHEYNET, *La mise en place des thèmes d'après les sceaux: les stratèges*, SBS 10, 2010, p. 1–14.

²³ On some of the earlier changes during the reign of Basil II and the reasons behind them, cf. J.V.A. FINE, *Basil II and the Decline of the Theme System*, [in:] *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujčev*, vol. I, ed. P. DINEKOV et al., Sofia 1988, p. 44–47.

²⁴ W. TREADGOLD, *Byzantium and Its Army, 284–1081*, Stanford 1995, p. 39–40; M. ANGOLD, *The Byzantine Empire...*, p. 27, 62–63.

²⁵ M. ANGOLD, *The Byzantine Empire...*, p. 63.

List of individuals holding the position of ἐπί τῶν κρίσεων²⁶:**I. Before 1204:****1. Michael, magistros²⁷, vestes²⁸, and epi ton kriseon (mid-11th century)²⁹**

Known from a single lead seal in the former collection of the late Georges Zacos³⁰.

Obv: inscription in four lines, reading: Κύριε βοήθει τῷ σῶ δούλῳ Μιχαήλ.

Rev: inscription in five lines: μαγίστρῳ βέστη καὶ ἐπί τῶν κρίσεων.

In view of the dating of this *molybdoboullon* (middle of the 11th century), as well as the presence of the titles of *magistros* and *vestes*, it is possible to assume that Michael was one of the first known *epi ton kriseon*. However, it is not improbable that he presided over the office later than № 2 and № 3 in the list, since the dating of the seal allows for a wider chronological window from the late 1040s to the early 1060s³¹. Unfortunately, the scarce data from this single seal can contribute neither to a more precise dating nor to the identification of the Michael in question with any other known figure, which would help reconstruct his *cursus honorum*.

2. N., epi ton kriseon (1056)³²

One of the four officials (together with the *protasekretis*, the *nomophylax*, and the *skribas*) who participated as judges in the trial concerning the annulment

²⁶ The list follows the chronological principle to the extent it is possible; sometimes this turns out problematic, since most of the data come from sphragistic specimens and consequently lack precise dating.

²⁷ For the title of *magistros*, cf. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles*, Paris 1972; A. ΚΑΖΗΔΑΝ, *Magistros*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. II, p. 1267. On its devaluation in the 11th century, cf. H. Κῆνεβ, *Византийската титла магистър през IX–началото на XII в. Приносът на сфрагистиката за съставяне на листа на носителите на титлата магистър*, [in:] *ΙΔΕΜ, Византинобългарски студии*, Велико Търново 2013, p. 238–243; *ΙΔΕΜ, Приносът на сфрагистиката за разкриване на девалвацията на византийските почетни титли в йерархията на т.нар. система на премитство от средновизантийския период – примерите с титлите магистър и патрикий (границата на VIII/IX – границата на XI/XII в.)*, [in:] *ΙΔΕΜ, Византинобългарски студии...*, p. 299–308.

²⁸ For the dignity of *vestes* and its devaluation, cf. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *Les listes de préséance...*, p. 294; A. ΚΑΖΗΔΑΝ, *Vestes*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. III, p. 2162–2163.

²⁹ *Prosopography of the Byzantine World*, ed. M. JEFFREYS et al., London 2016 (cetera: PBW), *Michael 20193*.

³⁰ V. LAURENT, *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, vol. II, *L'administration centrale*, Paris 1981, № 899; G. ZACOS, J.W. NESBITT, *Byzantine Lead Seals*, vol. II, Bern 1984, № 1013.

³¹ I would like to use this opportunity to thank Dr. Nikolay Kanev, who helped me with this more precise dating. He read the preliminary version of the text and made some valuable remarks, which are greatly appreciated by the author.

³² PBW, *Anonymus 2112*.

of the engagement between Michael Psellos' adopted daughter Euphemia and Elpidios Kenchres in August 1056. In the end, this peculiar tribunal, of which the unnamed *epi ton kriseon* was part, decided that Psellos should either prove his point more emphatically in order to justify the annulment or pay a fine of 15 *litrai*; he eventually did the latter³³.

3. N., *epi ton kriseon* in exile (1060–1066)³⁴

The information about this former state official comes from a letter of Michael Psellos. The author was trying to put an end to his exile, to which the emperor (Constantine X Doukas (1059–1067) was well disposed, but was waiting for the right moment to act³⁵. It is plausible that he is to be identified with № 2, but this is impossible to prove.

4. N., *proedros* and *epi ton kriseon* (1062)³⁶

He is mentioned in a *praktikon* dealing with the possessions of the monastery of Iveron. It was composed by *asekretis* Petros following the order of Nikolaos Serblias, *krites tou Hippodromou, tou velou, Boleron, Strymon and Thessalonike* in August 1062. The *epi ton kriseon* and the other supreme judges (τῶν πολιτικῶν δικαστῶν) participated in the resolution of the case³⁷.

5. *Niketas*, *proedros*³⁸ and *epi ton kriseon* (second half of the 11th century)³⁹

He is known from at least two sphragistic pieces with the same iconography and text⁴⁰.

³³ MICHAEL PSELLOS, *Orationes forenses et acta*, ed. G.T. DENNIS, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1994, Ὑπόμνημα.

³⁴ PBW, *Anonymus 2407*.

³⁵ *Michaelis Pselli scripta minora magnam partem adhuc inedita*, vol. II, ed. E. KURTZ, F. DREXL, Milano 1941 (cetera: PSELLOS, *Scripta minora*), № 85, p. 114. For a summary of the letter and dating, cf. *The Letters of Psellos. Cultural Networks and Historical Realities*, ed. M. JEFFREYS, M.D. LAUXTERMANN, Oxford 2017, p. 211.

³⁶ The person is absent from PBW.

³⁷ *Actes d'Iveron*, vol. II, ed. J. LEFORT et al., Paris 1990 [= *Archives de l'Athos*, XVI] (cetera: *Iveron*), № 35, p. 98–104.

³⁸ For the title of *proedros* and its derivative *protoproedros*, cf. N. ΟΙΚΟΝΟΜΙΔΗΣ, *Les listes de préséance...*, p. 299; A. KAZHDAN, A. CUTLER, *Proedros. Proedros as Civilian Dignity*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. III, p. 1727. On the devaluation of both titles, cf. Н. Кънев, *Титлата проедър като част от първоразредните почетни титли във Византия през IX–XI в. Проедри, засвидетелствани по сфрагистични данни*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *Византинобългарски студии...*, p. 156–179.

³⁹ PBW, *Niketas 2015A*.

⁴⁰ V. LAURENT, *Le corpus...*, № 900; G. ZACOS, J. W. NESBITT, *Byzantine Lead Seals...*, № 654. Cf. also the digitalized specimen from the collection of Dumbarton Oaks: www.doaks.org/resources/seals/byzantine-seals/BZS.1951.31.5.340.

Obv: Theotokos Nikopoios standing, holding Baby Jesus in her left arm. The iconographic type is identified in the inscription: Μήτηρ Θεοῦ ἡ Νικοποιός.

Rev: inscription in seven lines, reading: Θεοτόκε βοήθει Νικήτα προέδρω καί ἐπί τῶν κρίσεων.

The dating could be made more precise – around 1060–1070, mostly on the grounds of the rank with which this *epi ton kriseon* is attested. At that time, the *proedroi* comprised a wide range of members of the military and civil service élite, and their numbers grew even more starting with the reign of Constantine X Doukas⁴¹.

6. **Konstantinos (Keroularios)**⁴², *protoproedros/sebastos*⁴³ and *epi ton kriseon* (1074–1078)⁴⁴

Konstantinos was a nephew of ex-patriarch Michael I Keroularios (1043–1058) and a state functionary in the second half of the 11th century, holding various offices and dignities in this period. He served as *epi ton kriseon* during the reign of emperors Michael VII Doukas (1071–1078) and his successor Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078–1081), which fact is known from three letters sent to him by Michael Psellos.

The first one, dated about 1074–1075, contains Psellos' congratulations for Konstantinos and his wife on the occasion of the birth of their son⁴⁵. The second letter was written in 1078. It refers to Psellos' promotion to *kouropalates*, which caused Konstantinos' jealousy. Once he got the required apologies, Psellos send an encomiastic message to Konstantinos. The title of the letter reads: *To the protoproedros and epi ton kriseon, who was very dear to me, but had acted in a rather jealous way*⁴⁶.

⁴¹ Н. Кънев, *Титлата проедър...*, p. 164–169.

⁴² This family name was never used either by Konstantinos or by his brother Nikephoros. However, since they were sons of Michael Keroularios' elder brother, they can be assumed to have had the same name. Therefore, where the name is used in the text, it is purely for the purposes of convenience, in order to avoid the repetition of longer phrases. On Konstantinos' biography and career, cf. A.-K. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, *Die Neffen des Patriarchen Michael I. Kerullarios (1043–1058) und ihre Siegel. Ikonographie als Ausdrucksmittel der Verwandtschaft*, BMD 2, 2011, p. 107–113; and most recently: M. JEFFREYS, *Constantine, Nephew of the Patriarch Keroularios and His Good Friend Michael Psellos*, [in:] *The Letters of Psellos...*, p. 59–88.

⁴³ For the title of *sebastos* in the pre-Kommenian period, cf. A. KAZHDAN, *Sebastos*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. III, p. 1862–1863; W. SEIBT, *Der byzantinische Rangtitel Sebastos in vorkommenischer Zeit*, TM 16, 2010, p. 759–764.

⁴⁴ PBW, *Konstantinos 120*.

⁴⁵ Μιχαήλ Ψελλοῦ ἱστορικοί λόγοι, ἐπιστολαί καί ἄλλα ἀνέκδοτα, ed. K.N. ΣΑΘΑΣ, Βενετία 1876 [= MBi, 5], № 157, p. 409–412. For a summary and commentary, cf. *The Letters of Psellos...*, p. 387.

⁴⁶ Εἰς τὸν πρωτοπρόεδρον καί ἐπί τῶν κρίσεων φίλιτατον μὲν αὐτῷ τυγχάνοντα, βραχὺ δέ τι παραβασκήναντα (P. GAUTIER, *Quelques lettres de Psellos inédites ou déjà éditées*, REB 44, 1986, № 21, p. 167–170). Cf. *The Letters of Psellos...*, p. 163–164.

The third message of Psellos is also dated to the same year (1078). Here, the elderly intellectual juxtaposes Konstantinos' crowded household with his own solitude (using a somewhat elegiac tone). At the time, Konstantinos held the superior title of *sebastos*⁴⁷. He was among the first bearers of this new and extremely high rank at that time known to us by name; others are Alexios Komnenos, the future emperor (1081–1118), and his elder brother Isaakios⁴⁸.

It is also worth mentioning that Konstantinos' brother Nikephoros might have been *epi ton kriseon* as well, judging by an ambiguous lead seal with a metrical legend attributed to him by Wassiliou Seibt. Though quite feasible, this surmise is unverifiable, because the expression used in the legend might refer to any of the supreme Constantinopolitan judges⁴⁹.

7. N. *Aristenos*, *epi ton kriseon* (last third of the 11th century)⁵⁰

There are several lead seals belonging to this person, all of them with metrical texts⁵¹.

Obv: inscription in five lines: Τῶν κρίσεων λαχόντα τὰς ψήφους φέρειν.

Rev: inscription in five lines: τὸν Ἀριστηνὸν πρᾶξις ἢ νῦν δεικνύει.

From approximately the same time (late 11th–early 12th century), there are seals of officials with the same second name, but holding the offices of *eparchos* (N. Aristenos⁵²) and *logothetes tou dromou* (Michael Aristenos⁵³). A certain *proedros* Gregorios Aristenos is known as a participant in the trial against Ioannes Italos (1082) and in the synod of Blachernae (1094)⁵⁴. In all likelihood, the anonymous *epi ton kriseon* is identical with the person attested as *eparchos*. It is plausible that this was either Michael or Gregorios Aristenos, but in order to prove this inference we would certainly need more evidence, currently lacking⁵⁵.

⁴⁷ PSELLOS, *Scripta minora*, № 214, p. 254–255. Cf. *The Letters of Psellos...*, p. 164.

⁴⁸ E. MCGEER, J. NESBITT, N. OIKONOMIDES, *Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art*, vol. V, Washington, D.C. 2005, 25.2, p. 60.

⁴⁹ A.-K. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, *Die Neffen...*, p. 114; EADEM, *Corpus der byzantinischen Siegel mit metrischen Legenden*, vol. II, *Siegellegenden von Ny bis inclusive Sphragis*, Wien 2016, № 1573.

⁵⁰ PBW, *Anonymus 20117*.

⁵¹ V. LAURENT, *Le corpus...*, № 901; J.-C. CHEYNET, C. MORRISON, W. SEIBT, *Sceaux byzantins de la collection Henri Seyrig*, Paris 1991, № 103. There is another seal in the Dumbarton Oaks collection, digitalized but not yet published: <http://www.doaks.org/resources/seals/byzantine-seals/BZS.1951.31.5.119>.

⁵² PBW, *Anonymus 20241*.

⁵³ PBW, *Michael 20286*.

⁵⁴ PBW, *Gregorios 103*.

⁵⁵ For more details on the members of this family, cf. A.K. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, W. SEIBT, *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich*, vol. II, *Zentral- und Provinzialverwaltung*, Wien 2003, № 13, p. 41; № 56, p. 84–85.

8. *N.*, *protoproedros* and *epi ton kriseon* (1087)⁵⁶

This anonymous *epi ton kriseon* took part in the resolution of a dispute concerning the *proasteia* on the island of Leros. This dispute is described in a *chrysoboullon* of Alexios I Komnenos, issued in May 1087. With this document, the emperor donated the island of Leipsos and part of the possessions on Leros to Christodoulos of Patmos and his monastery on the homonymous island⁵⁷.

It is conceivable that he is to be identified with № 7, described above, but this claim is – again – impossible to prove due to the lack of sound evidence.

9. *Georgios Nikaeus*, *kouropalates*⁵⁸, [*krites tou velou*], and *epi ton kriseon* (1112)⁵⁹

The information about him comes from the acts of the Athonite monastery of Iveron. The first document, which dates back to January 10th, 1093, refers to the will of Symbatios Pakourianos, deposited in the church of *Theotokos en to phoro* in Constantinople in the presence of Georgios Nikaeus, then *protoproedros*, *krites tou velou*, and *koiaistor*⁶⁰.

Another document containing the name of the same functionary was composed on the next day (January 11th, 1093). In it, Georgios certified the right of Kale (monastic name: Maria), the wife of the deceased Symbatios Pakourianos, to be the executor of her husband's will⁶¹.

This particular document is preserved in a copy from 1112; its authenticity is confirmed by Georgios Nikaeus at the bottom. At the time, he was *kouropalates*, *krites tou velou*, and *epi ton kriseon* – a rise in both titular hierarchy and in service⁶².

10. *Ioannes Karianites*, *protokouropalates* and *epi ton kriseon* (1166)⁶³

Ioannes Karianites attended the second session (March 6th, 1166) of the synod in Constantinople, summoned in order to reconsider the relationship between the Father and the Son, referring to Christ's words: *My Father is greater than I* (Io 14, 28). It was an initiative of emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143–1180), who took part in that same session in person. It was then that the final decisions were made and signatures were collected from representatives of both high clergy and secular authorities; among the latter was the *epi ton kriseon* under discussion⁶⁴.

⁵⁶ PBW, *Anonymus* 617.

⁵⁷ For the complete text of this *chrysoboullon* and the critical apparatus, cf. *Βυζαντινά έγγραφα τῆς μονῆς Πάτμου 1. Αὐτοκρατορικά*, ed. Ε.Λ. ΒΡΑΝΟΥΣΗΣ, Αθήνα 1980, № 5, p. 40–54.

⁵⁸ For the title of *kouropalates* and its derivative *protokouropalates*, as well as the change in their use in the 11th–12th century, cf. Α. ΚΑΖΗΔΑΝ, *Kouropalates*, [in:] ODB, vol. II p. 1157.

⁵⁹ PBW, *Georgios* 140.

⁶⁰ *Iveron*, № 44, p. 150–156.

⁶¹ *Iveron*, № 46, p. 167–169.

⁶² *Iveron*, p. 169.

⁶³ PBW, *Ioannes* 20293.

⁶⁴ Σ.Ν. ΣΑΚΚΟΣ, *Ὁ πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστίν*, vol. II, *Ἐριδες καί σύνοδοι κατὰ τὸν 12^ο αἰῶνα*, Θεσσαλονίκη 1968, p. 155. This source is not available to me; it is cited after PBW (*vide*: fn. 63).

11. *N.*, *epi ton kriseon* (ca. 1185)⁶⁵

There is an allusion to an anonymous *epi ton kriseon* (mentioned with the epithet θαυμάσιον) in a letter of Michael Choniates to Euthymios Malakes, bishop of Neai Patrai⁶⁶. We could deduce from it that the person in question was an acquaintance of both the author of the letter and its recipient.

12. *Niketas Choniates*, *sebastos*, [*logothetes ton sekreton*], and *epi ton kriseon* (ca. 1194–1195)⁶⁷

This is the famous Byzantine historian and dignitary from the late 12th–early 13th century, who held the position of *epi ton kriseon* for a certain period of time. The evidence concerning his tenure comes from a letter sent to him by his elder brother Michael; in the *Codex Baroccianus*, the letter titles the addressee as τῷ ἀυταδέλφῳ σεβαστῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κρίσεων κυρῷ Νικήτῃ⁶⁸.

Somewhat later, probably, Niketas Choniates delivered a speech dedicated to Isaac II Angelos (1185–1195). It reflects its author's rise in the ranks of civil service; by that time, he was *logothetes ton sekreton* and *epi ton kriseon*, while his previous offices of *ephoros* and *krites tou velou* are also indicated in the title⁶⁹.

II. After 1204:1. *Ioannes Chalkutzes*, *epi ton kriseon of the Great Church*⁷⁰ (1277–1285)⁷¹

He is mentioned as holding the office of *epi ton kriseon of the Great Church* in a document from 1277⁷² and, once again, among the participants in the synod

⁶⁵ Missing in *PBW*. The dating follows: *Michaelis Choniatae Epistulae*, ed. F. KOLOVOU, Berlin–New York 2001 [= *CFHB*, 41] (cetera: MICHAEL CHONIATES), № 20, p. 61*.

⁶⁶ MICHAEL CHONIATES, № 20, p. 26, 92–93.

⁶⁷ *PBW*, *Niketas 25001*. This entry is in need of substantial expansion. Furthermore, Niketas Choniates' service as *epi ton kriseon* is not mentioned in it.

⁶⁸ Cf. MICHAEL CHONIATES, p. 49*, fn. 4. For the text of the letter cf. MICHAEL CHONIATES, № 1, p. 3–4.

⁶⁹ *Nicetae Choniatae orationes et epistulae*, ed. J.A. VAN DIETEN, Berlin–New York 1972 [= *CFHB*, 3], A, 3–6. On the differences in dating, cf. W. TREADGOLD, *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke 2013, p. 426, fn. 23.

⁷⁰ This expression (ἡ Μεγάλη ἐκκλησία) refers to the Hagia Sophia church in Constantinople. During this period, the office of *epi ton kriseon* was subordinate to the patriarchate of Constantinople and was entirely dissociated from secular authorities, even though it retained its initial judicial character. Because of this major transformation, the corresponding prosopographic section only contains the most vital information and references, omitting a proper analysis. For further details on this institution, cf. J. DARROUZÈS, *Recherches sur les ὀφφίκια de l'Église byzantine*, Paris 1970, p. 377–378 [= *AOC*, 11].

⁷¹ *PLP*, 30518 *Chalkutzes Ioannes*.

⁷² *Dossier grec de l'union de Lyon (1273–1277)*, ed. V. LAURENT, J. DARROUZÈS, Paris 1976, p. 471 (unavailable to me; cited after *PLP*).

of Blachernae from 1285⁷³. Ioannes Chalkutzes was a cleric with the rank of deacon.

2. **Michael Balsamon**, *ekdikos ton kriseon of the Great Church/epi ton kriseon of the Great Church, exarchos, presbyteros, and tabouliarios* (1357–1362)⁷⁴

There is substantial evidence concerning his activities during the period between 1357 and 1380. Michael Balsamon appears as *ekdikos ton kriseon of the Great Church* among those who signed the patriarchal message of Kallistos (1350–1353, 1354–1363) in 1357⁷⁵. He is mentioned as *epi ton kriseon of the Great Church* in a donation charter for the Athonite monastery of Vatopedi, issued by *megas stratopedarches* Demetrios Tsamplakos and his wife Eudokia Palaeologina Tsamplakina (1362). Michael was a witness of this pious act⁷⁶.

3. **N. Machetares**, *epi ton kriseon* (1383)⁷⁷

Presbyter Machetares is attested as *epi ton kriseon* in a synodal act of condemnation of clergymen (20th January 1383)⁷⁸.

4. **Konstantinos Timotheos**, *epi ton kriseon of the Great Church* (1406)⁷⁹

Deacon Konstaninos Timotheos is mentioned in a synodal act concerning the planned union between the patriarchate of Constantinople and the Church of Cyprus⁸⁰.

* * *

This short review of the holders of the *epi ton kriseon* office, in the period when it constituted a secular judicial and presumably also administrative function (mid-11th century–1204), allows for certain conclusions and assumptions to be made. Overall, we know of 12 individuals; in addition, there are one or two others who might have held the position as well, but the available information is rather dubious⁸¹.

⁷³ V. LAURENT, *Les signataires du second synod des Blakhernes (Été 1285.)*, EO 26, 1927, p. 149.

⁷⁴ PLP, 2121 Balsamon Michael.

⁷⁵ ADGMA, vol. I, ed. F. MIKLOSICH, I. MÜLLER, Wien 1860, p. 369–374; *Registrum Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani*, ed. J. KODER et al., Wien 2001 [= CFHB, 19/3], p. 396–409.

⁷⁶ Γ.Ι. ΘΕΟΧΑΡΙΔΗΣ, *Οί Τζαμπλάκωνες*, Μακ 5, 1963, p. 138–141.

⁷⁷ PLP, 17531 Machetares; probably also: PLP, 17534 Machetarios.

⁷⁸ ADGMA, vol. II, ed. F. MIKLOSICH, I. MÜLLER, Wien 1862, p. 48–49.

⁷⁹ PLP, 28199 Timotheos Konstantinos.

⁸⁰ *Ἐκθέσεις παλαιογραφικῶν καί φιλολογικῶν ἐρευνῶν ἐν Θράκῃ καί Μακεδονίᾳ*, ed. Α. ΠΑΠΑΔΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ-ΚΕΡΑΜΕΥΣ, ΚΕΦΣ 17, 1886, p. 48–51.

⁸¹ Besides Nikephoros, discussed in the entry dedicated to his brother Konstantinos (№ 6), a certain Euthymios is mentioned in several lead seals, considered a probable *epi ton kriseon* by the editor

The known titles they bore varied according to the development of the hierarchical system of the empire, which was in a state of constant evolution. It was affected by the devaluation of honorary ranks in the middle of the 11th century, which could also be observed among the officials surveyed above: their titles changed consecutively from high to nominally higher from the rule of Constantine IX to that of Alexios I. The first *epi ton kriseon* in our list was *magistros and vestes* (№ 1), while the later ones, as far as we can tell, were usually *proedros* (№ 4) and *protoproedroi* (№ 6, 8). By the time of emperor Alexios I Komnenos, probably on the eve of the 12th century, the usual rank of an *epi ton kriseon* was that of *kouropalates* (№ 9), and by the time of his grandson Manuel I it might have been *protokouropalates* (№ 10); this is, again, a sign of certain titular devaluation similar to that observed in the 11th century. In two isolated cases, separated by more than a century (№ 5 and № 12), we encounter the rank of *sebastos*. In fact, it had a very different weight in 1078 (when it was the top rank accessible to people from outside the imperial family) and in 1194–1195. The significance of this title changed during the reign of Alexios I, when it became the basis for his adapted hierarchy of honorific ranks. It maintained its value during the Komnenian period, but devaluated significantly by the time of the Angeloi at the end of the 12th century (which is the time that the case of Niketas Choniates dates from).

In the rare occasions where the position of the *epi ton kriseon* was combined with another office – all of the known instances date from the 12th century – the other function was either another judicial post in the capital (*krites tou velou* – № 9) or one of the *logothesia* (*logothetes ton sekreton* – № 12). However, we have to bear in mind that Niketas Choniates was a quite exceptional case, as he lived long after the institution had been created and as such he is situated at the very periphery of the specified timeframe.

The position of the *epi ton kriseon* was usually the pinnacle of the career of high magistrates; this was true especially in the 11th century. In this period, we see few examples of a transition to this position from purely administrative departments. An exception is the case of Konstantinos, the nephew of Michael Keroularios, whose *cursus honorum* can be traced back in great detail. He passed through various positions; some of them were administrative or fiscal in nature, rather than judicial (*megas kourator of the sekreton of Mangana* and *sakelarios*), while at the same time he held other legal posts such as *krites tou velou* and (*megas*) *droungarios (tes Viglas)*. His nomination as *epi ton kriseon* happened about two decades into his career in the palace, which is also indicative of the elevated status of these

Jordanov (I. JORDANOV, *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, vol. III, Sofia 2009, № 941–944). This view has recently been rejected by Wassiliou-Seibt (A.-K. WASSILIOU-SEIBT, *Corpus...*, № 2404–2405).

high-ranking government officials in that period. The same applies to his brother Nikephoros, if we are to agree with the possible interpretation of the lead seal attributed to him⁸².

On the eve of the 12th century, Georgios Nikaeus was involved in administrative and juridical state service, advancing from *koiastor* and *krites tou velou* to *epi ton kriseon*. Again, the latter was the most superior of his known positions, as well as the latest one in chronological order. We shall not delve into the case of Niketas Choniates, whose career is abundant in offices and titles – as already pointed out above, his tenure is too remote from the time when the function in question was established.

Of all the twelve individuals who served as *epi ton kriseon* before 1204, merely four (№ 2, 4, 8, 9) are known from judicial reports or documents directly related to their duties. In the first case (№ 2), the official resolved a controversy of matrimonial law. In the second and the third (№ 4, 8), the issues were related to landed property, while in the last case (№ 9), the *epi ton kriseon* authenticated a document concerning an inheritance with his signature. Only one of the cases was directly connected to the capital. In most of these situations, we see the *epi ton kriseon* serving as the highest instance, which once again manifests his privileged position as one of the supreme judges during the second half of the 11th (and probably all of the 12th) century not only in Constantinople, but also in the provinces, as the geographic spread clearly shows.

Scarce though they may be, the data presented above permit certain conclusions concerning the institution of *epi ton kriseon* at the time of its establishment and during the subsequent century and a half.

The control imposed by *epi ton kriseon* on the thematic judges seems irrefutable. The major doubt concerns its nature – was it purely judicial or simultaneously judicial and administrative? The latter statement seems more plausible; the creation of this office may have been caused, on the one hand, by the thematic judges' growth in significance and unsettled status, and on the other hand by their lack of proper education (in the majority of cases). Therefore, the aim of Constantine IX Monomachos and his associates was to impose stricter control over what was happening in the *themata*. Thus, this institution, based in the capital, was associated with a level of authority that had to be reckoned with; it permeated both the judicial and the administrative sphere not only in Constantinople, but also in the most distant provinces of Byzantium. Certain pieces of the evidence are related to the elevated position of these state officials, appointed directly by the *basileus* (for the proof, see № 3).

⁸² See the notes in the entry on Konstantinos.

However, despite the relatively influential position in the government of the empire, no particular *epi ton kriseon* is ever mentioned in a historiographic text from the Byzantine era. In a way, Konstantinos (Keroularios) (№ 5) furnishes an exception; there is a lot of information about him in various sources from the 11th–12th century, including in historiographic works. Nonetheless, none of it refers to his capacity as *epi ton kriseon*. This is not surprising, however: it was part of the Byzantine historiographic tradition to pay attention primarily to military matters, court intrigues, changes of emperors and their deeds, as well as to the most important figures of the Church hierarchy. In such narratives, officials of the central administration and the courts based in the capital rarely found themselves in the spotlight as such, unless they were involved in political matters outside their sphere of competence and jurisdiction. It was common for dignities, positions, and sometimes even names (as is often the case in Michael Psellos' *Chronographia*, for instance) to be omitted, which additionally blurs our knowledge about those who held the office of the *epi ton kriseon*. However, the extant firm evidence concerning their activity, their high ranks, as well as their appearance in the correspondence and works of such a prominent intellectual as Psellos (№ 2, 3, 6) provide unequivocal proof for their important position in the life of Constantinople. Also quite evident are the social ties between the *epi ton kriseon* and the bureaucratic élite in the capital, which they were part of from the 1040s until the disaster of 1204. These functionaries were an indelible element of the knotty fabric of Byzantine society of that time.

Bibliography

Sources

- Actes d'Iviron*, vol. II, ed. J. LEFORT et al., Paris 1990 [= *Archives de l'Athos*, XVI].
- ADGMA, ed. F. MIKLOSICH, I. MÜLLER, vol. I, Wien 1860; vol. II, Wien 1862.
- Bydžantiná éggrafa tēs monēs Pátmou 1. Aytokratoriká*, ed. E.L. BRANOUSÈS, Athēna 1980.
- Dossier grec de l'union de Lyon (1273–1277)*, ed. V. LAURENT, J. DARROUZÈS, Paris 1976.
- Ékthesis palaiografikōn kai filologikōn ereynōn en Thákē kai Makedonia*, ed. A. PAPAĐOPOULOS-KERAMEYS, "Ο ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος" / "Ο en Kōnstantinouπόλει Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος" 17, 1886, p. 3–64.
- GAUTIER P., *Quelques lettres de Psellos inédites ou déjà éditées*, "Revue des études byzantines" 44, 1986, p. 111–197.
- KEKAVMEN, *Sovety i rasskazy. Poučenie vizantijskogo polkovodca XI v.*, ed., trans. G.G. LITAVRIN, Sankt-Peterburg ²2003.
- LAURENT V., *Les signataires du second synod des Blakhernes (Été 1285.)*, "Échos d'Orient" 26, 1927, p. 129–149.
- MICHAEL ATTALEIATES, *History*, ed. A. KALDELLIS, D. KRALLIS, Cambridge, MA–London 2012.

- MICHAEL PSELLOS, *Orationes forenses et acta*, ed. G.T. DENNIS, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1994.
- Michaēl Pselloú istorikoi lógoi, epistolai kai álla anékdota, ed. K.N. SATHAS, Venetia 1876 [= *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη*, V / *Mesaiōnikē Bibliothēkē*, V].
- Michaelis Choniatae Epistulae, ed. F. KOLOVOU, Berlin – New York 2001 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 41].
- Michaelis Pselli scripta minora magnam partem adhuc inedita, vol. II, ed. E. KURTZ, F. DREXL, Milano 1941.
- Nicetae Choniatae orationes et epistulae, ed. J.A. VAN DIETEN, Berlin–New York 1972 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 3].
- Registrum Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, ed. J. KODER et al., Wien 2001 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 19/3].

Secondary Literature

- ANGOLD M., *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204. A Political History*, London–New York 1997².
- CHEYNET J.-C., *La mise en place des thèmes d'après les sceaux: les stratèges*, “Studies in Byzantine Sigillography” 10, 2010, p. 1–14.
- CHEYNET J.-C., MORRISSON C., SEIBT W., *Sceaux byzantins de la collection Henri Seyrig*, Paris 1991.
- CHONDRIDOU S.D., *O Kōnstantinos TH' Monomachos kai ē epochē tou*, Athēna 2002.
- CHRISTOFILOPOULOU AI., *Ta byzantiná dykasteria katá tous aiōnes I–IA'*, “Δίπτυχα Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Μελετών” / “Diptycha Etaireias Byzantinōn kai Metabyzantinōn Meletōn” 4, 1986/1987, p. 163–177.
- DARROUZÈS J., *Recherches sur les offikia de l'Église byzantine*, Paris 1970 [= *Archives de l'Orient chrétien*, 11].
- FINE J.V.A., *Basil II and the Decline of the Theme System*, [in:] *Studies on the Slavo-Byzantine and West-European Middle Ages. In memoriam Ivan Dujčev*, vol. I, ed. P. DINEKOV et al., Sofia 1988, p. 44–47.
- GKOUTDZIGKŌSTAS A.E., *Ē aponomē dikaiosynēs sto Byzántio (9^{ος}–12^{ος} aiōnes). Ta kosmiká dikaiodotiká organa kai dikastēria tēs prōteýousas*, Thessalonikē 2004 [= *Βυζαντινά Κείμενα και Μελέτες / Byzantiná Keimena kai Melétes*, 37].
- GLYKATZI-AHRWEILER H., *Recherches sur l'administration de l'empire byzantin aux IX–XI^e siècles*, “Bulletin de correspondance hellénique” 84, 1960, p. 1–111.
- JEFFREYS M., *Constantine, Nephew of the Patriarch Keroularios and His Good Friend Michael Psellos*, [in:] *The Letters of Psellos. Cultural Networks and Historical Realities*, Oxford, 2017, p. 59–88.
- JORDANOV I., *Corpus of Byzantine Seals from Bulgaria*, vol. III, Sofia 2009.
- KAZHDAN A., *Kouropalates*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. KAZHDAN et al., vol. II, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 1157.
- KAZHDAN A., *Magistros*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. KAZHDAN et al., vol. II, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 1267.
- KAZHDAN A., *Sebastos*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. KAZHDAN et al., vol. III, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 1862–1863.
- KAZHDAN A., *Vestes*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. KAZHDAN et al., vol. III, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 2162–2163.

- KAZHDAN A., CUTLER A., *Proedros. Proedros as Civilian Dignity*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. KAZHDAN et al., vol. III, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 1727.
- KAZHDAN A., MACRIDES R.J., *Epi ton kriseon*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. KAZHDAN et al., vol. I, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 724–725.
- KÄNEV N., *Prinosät na sfragistikata za razkrivane na devalvacijata na vizantijskite početni titli v jerarchijata na t.nar. sistema na premistvo ot srednovizantijskija period – primerite s titlite magistär i patrikij (granicata na VIII/IX – granicata na XI/XII v.)*, [in:] IDEM, *Vizantinobälgarski studii*, Veliko Tärново 2013, p. 299–308.
- KÄNEV N., *Titlata proedär kato čast ot pärvorazrednite početni titli väv Vizantija prez IX–XI v. Proedri, zasvidetelstvani po sfragistični danni*, [in:] IDEM, *Vizantinobälgarski studii*, Veliko Tärново 2013, p. 144–227.
- KÄNEV N., *Vizantijskata titla magistär prez IX – načaloto na XII v. Prinosät na sfragistikata za sästavjane na lista na nositelite na titlata magistär*, [in:] IDEM, *Vizantinobälgarski studii*, Veliko Tärново 2013, p. 228–298.
- LAURENT V., *Le corpus des sceaux de l'empire byzantin*, vol. II, *L'administration central*, Paris 1981.
- The Letters of Psellos. Cultural Networks and Historical Realities*, ed. M. JEFFREYS, M.D. LAUXTERMANN, Oxford, 2017.
- MACRIDES R.J., *The Competent Court*, [in:] *Law and Society in Byzantium. Ninth–Twelfth Centuries*, ed. A.E. LAIOU, D. SIMON, Washington D.C. 1994, p. 117–129.
- MCGEER E., NESBITT J., OIKONOMIDES N., *Catalogue of Byzantine Seals at Dumbarton Oaks and in the Fogg Museum of Art*, vol. V, Washington, D.C. 2005.
- OIKONOMIDÈS N., *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IX^e et X^e siècles*, Paris 1972.
- OIKONOMIDÈS N., *L'évolution de l'organisation administrative de l'empire byzantine au XI^e siècle (1025–1118)*, “Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines” 6, 1976, p. 125–152.
- Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, ed. E. TRAPP et al., Wien 2001.
- Prosopography of the Byzantine World*, ed. M. JEFFREYS et al., London 2016.
- SAKKOS S.N., *Ho patër mou meidzön mou estin*, vol. II, *Érides kai sýnodoi katá tón ib' aiõna*, Thessalonikë 1968.
- SEIBT W., *Der byzantinische Rangtitel Sebastos in vorkommenischer Zeit*, “Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines” 16, 2010, p. 759–764.
- THEOCHARIDÈS G.I., *Hoi Tdzampläkõnes*, “Μακεδονικά. Σύγγραμμα Περιοδικόν τῆς Ἑταιρείας Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν” / “Makedoniká. Sýggramma Periodikón tēs Hetaireias Makedonikõn Spoudõn” 5, 1963, p. 125–183.
- TREADGOLD W., *Byzantium and Its Army, 284–1081*, Stanford 1995.
- TREADGOLD W., *The Middle Byzantine Historians*, Basingstoke 2013.
- WASSILIOU-SEIBT A.-K., *Corpus der byzantinischen Siegel mit metrischen Legenden*, vol. II, *Siegellenden von Ny bis inclusive Sphragis*, Wien 2016.
- WASSILIOU-SEIBT A.-K., *Die Neffen des Patriarchen Michael I. Kerullarios (1043–1058) und ihre Siegel. Ikonographie als Ausdrucksmittel der Verwandtschaft*, “Bulgaria Mediaevalis” 2, 2011, p. 107–119.
- WASSILIOU-SEIBT A.-K., SEIBT W., *Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich*, vol. II, *Zentral- und Provinzialverwaltung*, Wien 2003.

VON LINGENTHAL K.E. ZACHARIÄ, *Geschichte des griechisch-römischen Rechts*, Berlin 1892.

ZACOS G., NESBITT J.W., *Byzantine Lead Seals*, vol. II, Bern 1984.

Abstract. The paper investigates the establishment of the office of the *epi ton kriseon* during the reign of emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1055), analysing the reasons behind its creation and its initial character. In addition, a list of all holders of this office is provided, based on all available sources – sphragistic, epistolary, rhetorical, documentary, etc. The list is divided into two parts – before and after the sack of the Byzantine capital by the Crusaders in 1204. Certain conclusions are reached at the end of the paper based on the data from the first part of the list. Different aspects of the problem are examined, including the honorific titles of the *epi ton kriseon*, their other offices, activities and social bonds. Individuals who held this position include prominent figures such as Konstantinos, nephew of patriarch Michael I Keroularios (1043–1058) and the addressee of many letters from Michael Psellos, as well as the 12th–13th century historian Niketas Choniates. In the 11th–12th century, these officials were an indelible part of the Byzantine bureaucratic élite and the Constantinopolitan society; they exerted their power not only in the capital, but also in the provinces.

Keywords: *epi ton kriseon*, Byzantine supreme courts, Byzantine central and provincial administration, Byzantine 11th century.

Symeon Antonov

Department of Ancient and Medieval History
“St Cyril and St Methodius” University of Veliko Tarnovo
Teodosiy Tärnovski St № 2
5000, Veliko Tärnovo, Bulgaria
s.antonov1990@abv.bg

Sławomir Bralewski (Łódź)

THE PIOUS LIFE OF EMPRESS HELENA, CONSTANTINE THE GREAT'S MOTHER, IN THE LIGHT OF SOCRATES OF CONSTANTINOPLE AND SOZOMEN

Helena, the famously pious mother of emperor Constantine the Great, is one of the most celebrated empresses of the Roman Empire. Hans A. Pohlsander even saw her as *one of the most remarkable women in all of ancient history*¹; in Leslie Brubaker's opinion, the augusta Helena was *an important symbol in Byzantium*², who *had supplied the model for elite female appropriation of sanctity*³. Her holiness was viewed by subsequent generations as being due to her piety⁴. In Rome, as is well known, *pietas* was not only one of the fundamental virtues, but also belonged to the most important ideas of the state. According to Roman beliefs, *pietas* guaranteed divine blessing and the ensuing good fortune to the Roman people⁵. Helena's reputation was, on the one hand, linked to her son's conversion to Christianity (which marked the beginning of the Christianization of the empire's state structures), and on the other hand – to the legend of her discovering the relics of the True Cross. Her worship has developed throughout the universal Church over time, and she has been recognized worthy of veneration in both the East and West. Unfortunately, however, the source data regarding her accomplishments are rather modest⁶. Perhaps this is why so few monographs exploring her

¹ H.A. POHLSANDER, *Helena. Empress and Saint*, Chicago 1995, p. 1.

² L. BRUBAKER, *Memories of Helena. Patterns in Imperial Female Matronage in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, [in:] *Women, Men and Eunuchs. Gender in Byzantium*, ed. L. JAMES, London–New York 1997, p. 52.

³ L. BRUBAKER, *Memories of Helena...*, p. 64.

⁴ According to Hartmut LEPPIN (*Von Constantin dem Grossen zu Theodosius II. Das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret*, Göttingen 1996, p. 58): *auch die Kaisermutter Helena, mit deren Namen die Auffindung des Kreuzes verbunden ist, wird nicht als Heilige geschildert, mag auch ihre fromme Demut noch so gerühmt werden.*

⁵ Cf. M.P. CHARLESWORTH, *The Virtues of a Roman Emperor. Propaganda and the Creation of Belief*, PBA 23, 1937, p. 105–133; J.R. FEARS, *The cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology*, [in:] ANRW, vol. II.17.2, Berlin–New York 1981, p. 864sqq; A. WALLACE-HADRILL, *The Emperor and His Virtues*, Hi 30, 1981, p. 298–323.

⁶ Among the most important sources related to Helena are: EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 25–47, ed. F. WINKELMANN, Berlin–New York 2008 [= GCS, 7], p. 94–104; AMBROSIUS

life and achievements exist in the general scholarly literature⁷ – let alone in Polish-language scholarship, where only a handful publications have been devoted to Constantine's mother⁸.

The important sources referring to Helena notably include the *Ecclesiastical history* by Socrates of Constantinople. On the other hand, the *Ecclesiastical history* by Sozomen – while only slightly younger – is generally considered to be of little use due to its secondary nature⁹. It is true that Sozomen, writing his *Ecclesiastical history*, relied heavily on Socrates' work¹⁰; still, did he merely duplicate the latter's depiction of the empress? I will try to clarify this point in the present paper.

MEDIOLANENSIS, *De obitu Theodosi*, 43–48, ed. A. KOTŁOWSKA, K. ILSKI, Poznań 2008, p. 42–47; PAULINUS NOLANUS, *Epistulae*, 31, ed. G. DE HARTEL, Vindobonae 1894 [= CSEL, 29], p. 267–275; RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, X, 7–8, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, T. MOMMSEN, F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1999 [= GCS, *Neue Folge*, 6], p. 969–971; SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, ed. G.C. HANSEN, Berlin 1995 [= GCS, *Neue Folge*, 1], p. 55–57; THEODORETUS CYRENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 18, ed. L. PARMENTIER, G.Ch. HANSEN, Berlin–New York 2009 [= GCS, *Neue Folge*, 5], p. 63–65; GELASIUS CYZICENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. M. HEINEMANN, G. LOESCHCKE, Leipzig 1918 [= GCS, 28].

⁷ Cf. A.-M. ROUILLON, *Sainte Hélène*, Paris 1908; R. COUZARD, *Sainte Hélène d'après l'histoire et la tradition*, Paris 1911; J. MAURICE, *Sainte Hélène*, Lille 1927; H.H. LAUER, *Kaiserin Helena. Leben und Legenden*, München 1967; J.W. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta, the Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Her Finding of the Cross*, Leiden–New York–København–Köln 1992; H.A. POHL-SANDER, *Helena*....

⁸ Cf. A. SZYMAŃSKI, *Św. Helena cesarzowa*, Poznań 1933; E. ZWOLSKI, *Helena, matka Konstantyna Wielkiego w świetle historii*, ZNKUL 5, 1962, p. 53–76; H. FROS, *Święta Helena*, Kraków 1995; M.B. LESZKA, *Helena – matka Konstantyna Wielkiego*, MW 2002, 4, p. 30–32; Z.A. BRZOZOWSKA, *Ideał chrześcijańskiego władcy – św. św. Konstancyn i Helena w kulturze duchowej i politycznej Bizancjum (337–843 r.)*, *Thi* 36/37, 2009, p. 152–164.

⁹ Cf. S. BERGEHAMMAR, *How the Holy Cross was found. From Event to Medieval Legend*, Stockholm 1991, p. 29; L. WOJCIECHOWSKI, *Drzewo przenajszlachetniejsze. Problematyka Drzewa Krzyża w chrześcijaństwie zachodnim (IV–połowa XVII w.). Od legend do kontrowersji wyznaniowych i piśmiennictwa specjalistycznego*, Lublin 2003, p. 4.

¹⁰ The relation between the texts by Sozomen and Socrates has been discussed a number of times. Cf. G.C. HANSEN, *Einleitung*, [in:] SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. I. BIDEZ, G.Ch. HANSEN, Berlin 1995 [= GCS, *Neue Folge*, 4], p. XLV–XLVII; G.F. CHESNUT, *The First Christian Histories. Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*, Paris 1977, p. 205; G. SABBAAH, *Introduction*, [in:] SOZOMÈNE, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, vol. I, ed. B. GRILLET, G. SABBAAH, Paris 1983 [= SC, 306], p. 59; F. YOUNG, *From Nicaea to Chalkedon*, London 1983, p. 32; T.D. BARNES, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge 1993, p. 206; T. URBAINCZYK, *Observations on the differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen*, *Hi* 46, 1997, p. 355–356. P. VAN NUFFELEN (*Un Héritage de Paix et de Piété. Étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Leuven–Paris–Dudley 2004) devoted a whole monograph to the analysis of differences and similarities between the two *Ecclesiastical histories*. According to P. JANISZEWSKI (*Żywioły w służbie propagandy, czyli po czyjej stronie stoi Bóg. Studium kłesk i rzadkich fenomenów przyrodniczych u historyków Kościoła w IV i V w.*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia źródłoznawcze*, ed. T. DERDA, E. WIPSYCKA, vol. III, Kraków 2000, p. 153), Sozomen aimed to write a text that would compete with Socrates' account, closer to the canons of classical literature and to the tastes of the

Socrates¹¹ starts his narrative about Helena¹², the mother of emperor Constantine, from the information about Drepanum being raised to the status of a city and renamed (in her honour) Helenopolis¹³; this proves Constantine's love and

intellectual circles of Constantinople. In my opinion, however, the dependence of Sozomen's work on Socrates's text was due to the former's involvement in conflicts inside the Church, which peaked after the Second Council of Ephesus (*Latrocinium Ephesinum*) in 449. His *Ecclesiastical history*, dedicated to emperor Theodosius II, may have been an attempt to persuade the ruler to change his ecclesiastical policy; but if it was to be successful, it had to be written quickly. Hence, Sozomen simply reinterpreted and broadened the existing work by Socrates. Cf. S. BRALEWSKI, *Obraz papiewstwa w historiografii kościelnej wczesnego Bizancjum*, Łódź 2006, p. 274–278.

¹¹ It was long believed that one of Socrates's key sources was the (only partially extant) *Ecclesiastical history* by Gelasios of Caesarea. Such a conjecture was expressed by A. GLAS (*Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia, die Vorlage für die beiden letzten Bücher der Kirchengeschichte Rufinus*, Leipzig–Berlin 1914, p. 79–82). It was presented as a certainty by F. WINKELMANN (*Das Problem der Rekonstruktion der Historia ecclesiastica des Gelasius von Caesarea*, FF 10, 1964, p. 311–314; IDEM, *Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia*, Berlin 1966 [= SDAWB.KSLK, 3]; IDEM, *Charakter und Bedeutung der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia*, BF 1, 1966, p. 346–385), and later upheld, among others, by T.D. BARNES (*Athanasius and Constantius...*, p. 89); J.H.W.G. LIEBESCHUETZ (*Ecclesiastical Historians on Their Own Times*, SP 34, 1993, p. 151–163); G.C. HANSEN (*Einleitung*, [in:] SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, p. XLV–XLIX; IDEM, *Mutmassungen über die Kirchengeschichte des Sokrates*, ZAC 3, 1999, p. 278–285); M. WALLRAFF (*Der Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates. Untersuchungen zu Geschichtsdarstellung, Methode und Person*, Göttingen 1997, p. 137). However, according to T. URBAINCZYK (*Socrates of Constantinople. Historian of Church and State*, Michigan 1997, p. 51) *if Socrates had access to Gelasius' work (...) it is unclear why he should acknowledge Rufinus but not Gelasius*; besides, *[i]t also seems odd that Socrates should decide to use Rufinus if the original Greek version [Gelasius of Caesarea] had been available* (p. 102). Similar doubts were expressed by P. VAN NUFFELEN (*Gélose de Césarée, Un compilateur du cinquième siècle*, BZ 95.2, 2002, p. 627), in whose opinion the historical Gelasius of Caesarea was not the author of the *Ecclesiastical history* attributed to him; rather, it was written by someone impersonating him – a Pseudo-Gelasius of sorts – as late as in the second half of the 5th century (p. 630, 634).

¹² H.A. POHLSANDER (*Helena...*, p. 1) saw in her *one of the most remarkable women in all of ancient history*. According to P. MARAVAL (*SOCRATE DE CONSTANTINOPLE, Histoire ecclésiastique*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, P. PÉRICHON, P. MARAVAL, Paris 2004 [= SC, 477], p. 175, fn. 5), when writing the chapter devoted to Helena, Socrates relied mostly on the accounts of Rufinus of Aquileia (RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, X, 7–8, p. 969–971) and Eusebius of Caesarea (EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 25–47, p. 94–104). J.W. DRIJVERS (*Helena Augusta...*, p. 3) suggests that *as metropolitan bishop of Palestine, Eusebius no doubt accompanied her on her travels through his province*.

¹³ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 1, p. 55. Neither Eusebius nor Rufinus mention Drepanum at all. PROCOPIUS (*De aedificiis*, V, 2, 1, ed. H.B. DEWING, G. DOWNEY, London 1940, p. 320) remarks that Helena was born in the town, which Socrates does not include in his account. Pohlsander, like many other researchers, subscribes to the view that Drepanum was indeed Helena's birthplace (H.A. POHLSANDER, *Helena...*, p. 3–5), but J.W. DRIJVERS (*Helena Augusta...*, p. 12) cautions that *other places besides Drepanum have been suggested: Naissus, Caphar Phacar in Mesopotamia, Edessa, Trier and even Colchester. As in the case of Drepanum, none of these places can be seriously considered Helena's place of origin*. Cf. also: V. VATCHKOVA, (*Saint Helena of Sofia. The Evolution of the Memory of Saint Constantine's Mother*, [in:] *The Reception of Byzantium in European Culture since 1500*, ed. D. SMYTH, P. MARCINIAK, Farnham 2016, p. 81–91. According to PHILOSTORGIUS (*Historia ecclesi-*

respect towards her. Socrates's account also indicates the empress's close relationship with God: she received a number of prophetic visions¹⁴, which she understood as summoning her to travel to Jerusalem¹⁵. There, she started the zealous search for the sepulchre of Christ, which was, at the same time, the place of His resurrection¹⁶. The empress encountered a number of difficulties – which Socrates summarised with the sentence *it was not easy for her* (δυσχερῶς)¹⁷ – but with the help of God she eventually did find the True Cross¹⁸. As far as the sepulchre is concerned, the empress seems not to have had any major problems locating it, since Christians had treated this place¹⁹ with great respect²⁰. The emperor's mother

astica, ed. I. BIDEZ, F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1981 [= GCS, 21], p. 24), Helena founded the city and called it Helenopolis for no other reason than that St. Lucian was buried there. In Cyril Mango's interpretation (C. MANGO, *The Empress Helena, Helenopolis, Pylae*, TM 12, 1994, p. 147), *that surely implies that in the eyes of Philostorgius Helena had not been born there*.

¹⁴ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 1, p. 55. Rufinus of Aquileia also mentions the vision (*divinis admonita visionibus* – RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, X, 7, p. 969), and Ambrose of Milan (AMBROSIUS MEDIOLANENSIS, *De obitu Theodosi*, 43, p. 42) writes about inspiration from the Holy Ghost (*infudit ei spiritus*).

¹⁵ There is no scholarly consensus regarding the date of her journey to Jerusalem. Cf. H.A. POHL-SANDER, *Helena...*, p. 84–85. Some scholars date it to 324–325 (S. BORGEHAMMAR, *How the Holy Cross...*, p. 137–140), others to the spring of 327 AD (E.D. HUNT, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312–360*, Oxford 1982, p. 28–49; J.W. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta...*, p. 55–72).

¹⁶ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 1, p. 55. Eusebius of Caesarea (EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 25–28, p. 94–96) called the sepulchre of Christ *the blessed place of Saviour's Resurrection* (σωτηρίου αναστάσεως μακαριστότατον τόπον) or *the Cave of Salvation* (σωτήριον άντρον). Cf. L. PIETRI, *Constantin et/ou Hélène, promoteurs des travaux entrepris sur le Golgotha: les comptes rendus des historiens ecclésiastiques grecs du V^e siècle*, [in:] *Historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, ed. B. POUDERON, Y.–M. DUVAL, Paris 2001, p. 371–380; E.D. HUNT, *Constantine and Jerusalem*, JEH 48, 1997, p. 405–424.

¹⁷ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 2, p. 55.

¹⁸ The first reference to the discovery of the True Cross in Jerusalem during Constantine's reign is found in a letter from Cyril of Jerusalem to emperor Constantius II, cf. E. BIHAIN, *L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la vision de la croix* (BGH 413), B 43, 1973, p. 287. Until recently, it was believed that the first to write about finding of the Holy Cross was the above-mentioned Gelasius of Caesarea, from whose *Ecclesiastical history* Socrates would have drawn his information about the legend of Helena. Cf. J.W. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta...*, p. 96–99; S. BORGEHAMMAR, *How the Holy Cross...*, p. 26–29. This notion was rejected by P. VAN NUFFELEN (*Gélase de Césarée...*, p. 630). S. HEID (*Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalem*, JAC 32, 1989, p. 62) draws attention to the role of pilgrims in the Holy Land in spreading the legend. Concerning the history of research on the legend of the *inventio crucis*, cf. *The Finding of the True Cross the Judas Kyriakos Legend in syriac*, ed. H.J.W. DRIJVERS, J.W. DRIJVERS, Louvain 1997, p. 17–20; M. VAN ESBROECK, *Hélène à Edesse et la Croix*, [in:] *After Bardaisan. Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Prof. Han J. W. Drijvers*, ed. G.J. REININK, A.C. KLUGKIST, Leuven 1999, p. 107–115.

¹⁹ Socrates does not use the name Golgotha when referring to Christ's Sepulchre. On its use in the literature of the 4th century, cf. J.E. TAYLOR, *Christians and the Holy Place*, Oxford 1993, p.120–121.

²⁰ According to SOCRATES (*Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 2, p. 55), pagans had covered the Tomb of Christ with earth and built a temple devoted to Aphrodite at the site, placing her statue inside. An

is a key figure in the further part of Socrates' account. It was she who learnt about the deeds of pagans, who had built a statue of Aphrodite at the place; she ordered it removed and the sepulchre unearthed. It was she who finally found three crosses there, one of which had belonged to the Saviour, and the other two to the villains crucified with Him²¹. God himself indicated which of the three crosses belonged to Christ by curing a dying woman with its touch²². Helena divided the relics of the Holy Cross, which she had obtained in a quite miraculous way, into parts. One of them was, in accordance with her wish, placed in a silver reliquary and remained in Jerusalem; another was sent to her son, Constantine, so that he could include it in his statue on the top of the Porphyry Column at the centre of the Forum of Constantine, which became a palladium ensuring the eternal existence of the city²³. The empress also sent her son the nails with which Christ had supposedly been fastened to the Cross; Constantine used them as an element of his protective armour²⁴. Socrates emphasizes the fact that Helena commissioned the construction of a number of churches in Palestine, such as the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the Church on the Mount of Olives²⁵. As pointed out by the historian, all of the building materials were provided by the emperor, who even urged Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, to accelerate the construction works²⁶.

earlier account of this comes from Eusebius of Caesarea (EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 26, 3, p. 95). On the buildings on Golgotha after the Bar Kochba Revolt, cf. S. GIBSON, J.E. TAYLOR, *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Archaeology and Early History of Traditional Golgotha*, London 1994, p. 68–69.

²¹ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 3, p. 56. The relics of the Holy Cross were probably found in the third decade of the 4th century, but the tradition associating their discovery with Helena is several dozen years later, cf. J.W. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta...*, p. 89, 93; S. BORGEHAMMAR, *How the Holy Cross...*, p. 31–53. B. BAERT, *A Heritage of Holy Wood. The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image*, Leiden – Boston 2004, p. 23–37.

²² SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 5–6, p. 56. According to Ambrose of Milan (AMBROSIUS MEDIOLANENSIS, *De obitu Theodosi*, 45, p. 42–44) the identification of the Holy Cross was possible thanks to the plate with Christ's accusation (*titulus*). Socrates also mentions its discovery (I, 17, 4, p. 56), as does Rufinus of Aquileia (RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, X, 7, p. 969), joining the two traditions concerning distinguishing the True Cross from the crosses of the villains: the use of the *titulus* and the miraculous recovery. Rufinus, according to S. HEID (*Der Ursprung der Helenalegende...*, p. 70), relied directly on the text of Ambrose.

²³ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 8, p. 56–57. Cf. S. BRALEWSKI, *The Porphyry Column in Constantinople and the Relics of the True Cross*, SCer 1, 2011, p. 87–100.

²⁴ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 10, p. 57.

²⁵ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 7; 11, p. 57. Eusebius of Caesarea (EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 43, 1–4, p. 101–102) only attributes the foundation of two churches to Helena: one in Bethlehem and another on the mount of the Ascension of Jesus (the Mount of Olives), although he ascribes the discovery of the appropriate places for their construction to the emperor (III, 41, p. 101).

²⁶ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 10, p. 57. Eusebius of Caesarea includes a letter from the emperor to Macarius concerning this matter in the *Vita Constantini* (III, 30–32, p. 97–99). It only mentions the basilica that the emperor ordered to be built at the site of Christ's Passion.

The historian emphasizes the great piety with which the ruler's mother got involved in the foundations. At the same time, however, she did not feel superior to others, as is indirectly pointed out by Socrates in a fragment describing her prayers among other women²⁷. Her modesty and humility disposed her to organise feasts for sacred virgins, during which she would serve them at the table. She was also said to take care of churches and the poor, often supporting them with donations. Socrates considers her whole life to have been pious (εὐσεβῶς)²⁸. He adds that after her death, she was buried among emperors in imperial Rome²⁹.

The information about Helena provided by Hermias Sozomen seems to be very similar; in fact, however, the historian introduced some significant changes compared with Socrates's account. First of all, it was Constantine who initiated the construction of the church in Jerusalem, near Golgotha, as a votive offering for the unification of the Church after the Council of Nicaea and as an expression of gratitude for blessings received by himself, his children and the state. The empress, at this time, only went to Jerusalem on a pilgrimage, in order to pray and visit the sacred places of the area³⁰. Thus, according to Sozomen, her journey harmonized with the emperor's activities aimed at showing gratitude towards God for all the blessings he had received. This account is compatible with the information on this topic supplied by Eusebius of Caesarea³¹. Sozomen emphasizes that the excavations in search of the sepulchre of Christ were commissioned by the emperor and that they resulted in the discovery of the relics of the Cross. Thus, the historian

²⁷ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 12, p. 57: Οὕτω δε εἶχεν εὐλαβῶς περὶ ταῦτα, ὡς καὶ συνεύχεσθαι ἐν τῷ τῶν γυναικῶν τάγματι. Eusebius mentions (EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 45, p. 103) that the empress could be seen dressed very modestly, mingling with the crowd.

²⁸ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 13, p. 57.

²⁹ SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 17, 13, p. 57. Eusebius (EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 47, 1, p. 103) does not specify the name of the place where Helena was buried, only mentioning that her funeral took place in an imperial city. Concerning Helena's death and burial site, cf. J. WORTLEY, *The "Sacred Remains" of Constantine and Helena*, [in:] *Byzantine narrative. Papers in honour of Roger Scott*, ed. J. BURKE, U. BETKA, P. BUCKLEY, K. HAY, R. SCOTT, A. STEPHENSON, Melbourne 2006 [= BAus, 16], p. 362–367.

³⁰ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 1, 1–2, p. 47.

³¹ According to Guy Sabbah, Eusebius of Caesarea (EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 42, 1, p. 101) shows that Helena was ordered by the emperor to inspect the eastern Churches. In fact, Constantine's biographer only wrote about her journey to the eastern provinces, during which she visited cities and people in the splendour of imperial authority – μεγαλοπρεπεία βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας (III, 44, p. 102). Still, it was her own initiative, motivated by her piety and her sense of duty, to give thanks to God on behalf of her son and grandchildren. To H.A. POHLSANDER (*Helena...*, p. 84), Eusebius's account proves that *Helena undertook this pilgrimage not as a private person but as the representative of her son and as Augusta*. Cf. also: J.W. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta...*, p. 67. For A. PIGANIOL (*L'Empire chrétien (325–395)*, ed. A. CHASTAGNOL, Paris 1972, p. 39); H. CHADWICK (*The Fall of Eusebius of Antioch*, JTS 49, 1948, p. 32–33); T.D. BARNES (*Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981, p. 221) and E.D. HUNT (*Holy Land...*, p. 33–34) the pilgrimage of the empress – who was involved in the assassination of Fausta, the wife of Constantine – was of an expiatory nature.

does not attribute their recovery directly to the empress. Again, he corrects the account provided by Socrates by relying on the chronicle of Eusebius of Caesarea. According to the latter, the emperor, inspired by the Saviour, understood it as his duty to build a house of worship at the site of God's Resurrection in Jerusalem, in order to make it renowned and praiseworthy³².

From his chronicle, it can be concluded that the search for the wood of the Cross was Helena's idea; according to the historian, the empress was so zealous about the Christian teachings that there was nothing she desired more than finding the relics³³. Sozomen did, however, express the belief that God indicated the place where the searches should be carried out through miraculous signs and dreams³⁴, but he did not associate them directly with Helena. Similarly, the emperor's mother was merely an assistant of Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem, when he tested the recovered crosses by touching the seriously ill woman with them³⁵. Under Sozomen's account, Helena did not participate directly in the division of the uncovered relics, but only took some of them to her son³⁶. Although Sozomen, unlike Socrates, does not attribute the construction of the Golgotha temple to her, he points out – relying on the account by Eusebius of Caesarea³⁷ – that she had built two other churches in Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives³⁸. Even more than Socrates,

³² EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 25, p. 95. L. PIETRI (*Constantin et/ou Hélène...*, p. 371–380) supposes that the accounts of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret about Helena depend on two traditions. One was based on the information found in the *Vita Constantini* by Eusebius of Caesarea, while the other stemmed from Jerusalem and was associated with a number of testimonies – by Cyril of Jerusalem (CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS, *Epistula ad Constantiam imperatorem*, [in:] E. BIHAIN, *L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la vision de la croix* (BGH 413), B 43, 1973, p. 286–291; and catechesis bishop: 4, 10, 13), John Chrysostom (JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMOS, *In Iohannem Homiliae*, 85, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1862, col. 461 [= PG, 59]), Ambrose of Milan (AMBROSIUS MEDIOLANENSIS, *De Obitu Theodosi*, 43–48, p. 42–47) and Paulinus of Nola (PAULINUS NOLANUS, *Epistulae*, 31, p. 267–275). According to the former one, the instigator of the work undertaken on Golgotha was Constantine; according to the latter one, it was Helena.

³³ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 1, 2, p. 47. It is noteworthy that Eusebius of Caesarea does not mention the recovery of the relics of the Cross at all. On this issue, cf. J.W. DRIJVERS, *Helena Augusta...*, p. 83–89; H.A. DRAKE, *Eusebius on the True Cross*, JEH 36, 1985, p. 1–22; S. BORGHAMMAR, *How the Holy Cross...*, p. 116–117. According to Jan POLLOK (*Narodziny koncepcji "Ziemi Świętej". Palestyna w teologicznej refleksji Euzebiusza z Cezarei i Cyryla Jerozolimskiego*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia źródłoznawcze*, ed. T. DERDA, E. WIPSYCKA, Warszawa 1997, p. 99–122), at the end of his life Eusebius began to consider some of the places connected with the activity of Christ holy, to which the discovery of the Lord's Tomb and the True Cross by Helena was also linked. According to B. BAERT (*A Heritage of Holy Wood...*, p. 41), Eusebius perceived the Cross not as a relic but as a symbol (*tropaion, vexillum*): a triumph over the pagans on the one hand (as Constantine also used it) and a triumph over death on the other (the Resurrection).

³⁴ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 1, 4, p. 48.

³⁵ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 1, 7, p. 49.

³⁶ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 1, 8–9, p. 49.

³⁷ EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 43, p. 101–102.

³⁸ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 2, 1, p. 50.

Sozomen highlights Helena's piety and godliness, demonstrated on numerous occasions. As an example, he mentions her service during feasts for sacred virgins, also described by Socrates. However, Sozomen develops his predecessor's description and points out, following Rufinus of Aquileia³⁹, that Helena would fulfil the role of a servant during the feast, serving dishes, pouring water for cleaning hands and performing other duties characteristic of the waiting staff⁴⁰. While Socrates writes about such feasts in the plural, Sozomen speaks of one particular supper during the empress's visit to Jerusalem, just like Rufinus of Aquileia describes one such deed of Constantine's mother⁴¹.

In addition to this fragment, Sozomen, in comparison with Socrates, enhances the information about Helena's other charitable deeds that she performed during the aforementioned visit to the cities in the East. Sozomen, following Eusebius⁴², stresses that Helena received from her son the authority to use the imperial treasury freely⁴³, a fact not included in Socrates' account. On the one hand, it proves Constantine's trust in Helena; on the other hand, it also enabled her to develop her charity work. Thus, according to Sozomen's account, the empress honoured some of the local churches with appropriate votive offerings, she made many poor people wealthy, donated ample food supplies to the starving and liberated a number of convicts from a long prison sentences, exile or labour in mines⁴⁴. These offerings corresponded to Constantine's intention to repay God for all the blessings he had received along with his family and the whole country. One of the means by which he intended to accomplish this was to build the basilica on Mount Golgotha. The others were acts of mercy shown to the impoverished, those suffering from famine and even those convicted to exile, imprisonment or devastating labour in mines. By mentioning Helena's access to the imperial treasury, Sozomen suggests that the virtue of showing generosity to the subjects stemmed from Constantine himself. Either way, there emerges a picture of a woman sensitive to people's suffering, doing her best to help them.

In the final conclusions concerning the empress' life, Sozomen states that it could not have been lived better, since she spent it in the absolutely optimal way. She also received due reward during her earthly life, when she was proclaimed Augusta and her image was imprinted on gold coins. Even her death was glorious, as she lived to be around 80 years old, a fact emphasized by Socrates. Sozomen, unlike his predecessor, stressed that upon her death, she left her son together with her grandsons, the caesars, ruling over the whole united Roman Empire. The expression she left her son means that he perceived the unification of the *Imperium*

³⁹ RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, X, 8, p. 970–971.

⁴⁰ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 2, 2, p. 50. Cf. H. LEPPIN, *Von Constantin...*, p. 165.

⁴¹ RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, X, 8, p. 970–971.

⁴² EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, III, 47, 3, p. 103.

⁴³ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 2, 4, p. 51.

⁴⁴ SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 2, 3, p. 50–51.

Romanum under the reign of her descendants as a result of her pious life. In accordance with what the Ecclesiastical History says concerning God's blessings being brought about by the devoutness of the rulers, the effect of Helena's piety is seen as procuring the prosperity of the united, internally peaceful empire and the success of her family – her son reigned over a huge country in alliance with her grandsons. According to Sozomen, Helena was appropriately commemorated, since as many as two cities – one in Bithynia and another in Palestine – had been named in her honour. In this fragment, Sozomen also complemented Socrates' account, which only mentions one city honoured in this way.

In his Ecclesiastical history, Socrates depicts Helena as a pious, strong and independent woman, the mother of the emperor, realizing her own ideas and acting as a tool in the hands of God – the ultimate inspiration of her actions. The emperor, her son, only supported her in her undertakings. According to Socrates, Helena travelled to Jerusalem to answer God's call; there, she organized the search for the Sepulchre and the Holy Cross and found them. She was supported by Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem, who, after God's intervention, distinguished the True Cross from the crosses of the two villains. The empress divided the relics and sent some of them to her son to Constantinople; moreover, in the Holy Land, she built three basilicas connected with the life of Christ. Finally, Socrates mentions her piety and discusses the place of her burial. Conversely, in Sozomen's account of the recovery of Christ's Sepulchre and the relics, the main role is played by emperor Constantine, who wished to repay God for his blessings; he ordered the search and the construction of the basilica on Mount Golgotha. His mother only supported him in his plans, led by her devoutness, to which Sozomen pays more attention than his predecessor – he emphasizes Helena's sensitivity to human poverty and suffering. The emperor was also involved in her generous deeds and gave her access to the imperial treasury. Thus, as indicated by Sozomen, Helena's piety brought prosperity both to her family and to the whole Roman Empire.

Bibliography

Sources

- AMBROSIUS MEDIOLANENSIS, *De obitu Theodosi*, ed. A. KOTŁOWSKA, K. ILSKI, Poznań 2008.
- CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS, *Epistula ad Constantiam imperatorem*, [in:] E. BIHAIN, *L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la vision de la croix (BGH 413)*, B 43, 1973, p. 286–291.
- EUSEBIUS CAESARIENSIS, *Vita Constantini*, ed. F. WINKELMANN, Berlin–New York 2008 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte*, 7].
- GELASIUS CYZICENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. M. HEINEMANN, G. LOESCHCKE, Leipzig 1918 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte*, 28].

- IOANNES CHRYSOSTOMOS, *In Iohannem Homiliae*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1862, col. 23–485 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, 59].
- PAULINUS NOLANUS, *Epistulae*, ed. G. DE HARTEL, Vindobonae 1894 [= *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiarum latinorum*, 29].
- PHILOSTORGIUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. I. BIDEZ, F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1981 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte*, 21].
- PROCOPIUS, *De aedificiis*, ed. H.B. DEWING, G. DOWNEY, London 1940.
- RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, T. MOMMSEN, F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1999 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge*, 6].
- SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. I. BIDEZ, G.Ch. HANSEN, Berlin 1995 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge*, 4].
- SOZOMÈNE, *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, vol. I–II, ed. B. GRILLET, G. SABBAB, Paris 1983 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 306].
- SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, Berlin 1995 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge*, 1].
- SOCRATE DE CONSTANTINOPLE, *Histoire ecclésiastique*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, P. PÉRICHON, P. MARAVAL, Paris 2004 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 477].
- THEODORETUS CYRENSIS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. L. PARMENTIER, G.Ch. HANSEN, Berlin–New York 2009 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte, Neue Folge*, 5].

Secondary Literature

- BARNES T.D., *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire*, Cambridge 1993.
- BARNES T.D., *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge 1981.
- BAERT B., *A Heritage of Holy Wood. The Legend of the True Cross in Text and Image*, Leiden–Boston 2004.
- BIHAIN E., *L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la vision de la croix (BGH 413)*, "Byzantion. Revue internationale des études byzantines" 43, 1973, p. 264–296.
- BORGEHAMMAR S., *How the Holy Cross was found. From Event to Medieval Legend*, Stockholm 1991.
- BRALEWSKI S., *Obraz papieżstwa w historiografii kościelnej wczesnego Bizancjum*, Łódź 2006.
- BRALEWSKI S., *The Porphyry Column in Constantinople and the Relics of the True Cross*, "Studia Cereana. Journal of the Waldemar Cera Research Center for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-Eastern Europe" 1, 2011, p. 87–100.
- BRUBAKER L., *Memories of Helena. Patterns in Imperial Female Matronage in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries*, [in:] *Women, Men and Eunuchs. Gender in Byzantium*, ed. L. JAMES, London–New York 1997, p. 52–75.
- BRZOWSKA Z.A., *Ideal chrześcijańskiego władcy – św. św. Konstantyn i Helena w kulturze duchowej i politycznej Bizancjum (337–843 r.)*, "Teki Historyka" 36/37, 2009, p. 152–164.
- CHADWICK H., *The Fall of Eustathius of Antioch*, "The Journal of Theological Studies" 49, 1948, p. 27–35.
- CHARLESWORTH M.P., *The Virtues of a Roman Emperor: Propaganda and the Creation of Belief*, "Proceedings of the British Academy" 23, 1937, p. 105–133.

- CHESNUT G.F., *The First Christian Histories. Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*, Paris 1977.
- COUZARD R., *Sainte Hélène d'après l'histoire et la tradition*, Paris 1911.
- DRAKE H.A., *Eusebius on the True Cross*, "Journal of Ecclesiastical History" 36, 1985, p. 1–22.
- DRIJVERS J., *Helena Augusta, the Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Her Finding of the Cross*, Leiden–New York–København–Köln 1992.
- ESBROECK M. VAN, *Hélène à Edesse et la Croix*, [in:] *After Bardaisan. Studies on Continuity and Change in Syriac Christianity in Honour of Prof. Han J. W. Drijvers*, ed. G.J. REININK, A.C. KLUGKIST, Leuven 1999, p. 107–115.
- FEARS J.R., *The cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology*, [in:] ANRW, vol. II.17.2, Berlin–New York 1981, p. 827–948.
- The Finding of the True Cross the Judas Kyriakos Legend in syriac*, ed. H.J.W. DRIJVERS, J.W. DRIJVERS, Louvain 1997.
- FROS H., *Święta Helena*, Kraków 1995.
- GIBSON S., TAYLOR J.E., *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Archaeology and Early History of Traditional Golgotha*, London 1994.
- GLAS A., *Die Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia, die Vorlage für die beiden letzten Bücher der Kirchengeschichte Rufinus*, Leipzig–Berlin 1914.
- HANSEN G.C., *Mutmassungen über die Kirchengeschichte des Sokrates*, "Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum" 3, 1999, p. 278–285.
- HEID S., *Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalem*, "Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum" 32, 1989, p. 41–71.
- HUNT E.D., *Constantine and Jerusalem*, "Journal of Ecclesiastical History" 48, 1997, p. 405–424.
- HUNT E.D., *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire AD 312–360*, Oxford 1982.
- JANISZEWSKI P., *Żywioty w służbie propagandy, czyli po czyjej stronie stoi Bóg. Studium klęsk i rzadkich fenomenów przyrodniczych u historyków Kościoła w IV i V w.*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia źródłoznawcze*, ed. T. DERDA, E. WIPSYZKA, vol. III, Kraków 2000.
- LAUER H.H., *Kaiserin Helena. Leben und Legenden*, München 1967.
- LEPPIN H., *Von Constantin dem Grossen zu Theodosius II. Das christliche Kaisertum bei den Kirchenhistorikern Socrates, Sozomenus und Theodoret*, Göttingen 1996.
- LESZKA M.B., *Helena – matka Konstantyna Wielkiego*, "Mówią Wieki" 2002, 4, p. 30–32.
- LIEBESCHUETZ J.H.W.G., *Ecclesiastical Historians on Their Own Times*, "Studia Patristica" 34, 1993, p. 151–163.
- MANGO C., *The Empress Helena, Helenopolis, Pylae*, "Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 12, 1994, p. 143–158.
- MAURICE J., *Sainte Hélène*, Lille 1927.
- NUFFELEN P. VAN, *Un Héritage de Paix et de Piété. Étude sur les histoires ecclésiastiques de Socrate et de Sozomène*, Leuven–Paris–Dudley 2004.
- NUFFELEN P. VAN, *Gélase de Césarée, Un compilateur du cinquième siècle*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift" 95.2, 2002, p. 621–639.
- PIGANIOL A., *L'Empire chrétien (325–395)*, ed. A. CHASTAGNOL, Paris 1972.
- PIETRI L., *Constantin et/ou Hélène, promoteurs des travaux entrepris sur le Golgotha: les comptes rendus des historiens ecclésiastiques grecs du V^e siècle*, [in:] *Historiographie de l'Église des premiers siècles*, ed. B. POUDERON, Y.-M. DUVAL, Paris 2001, p. 371–380.

- POHLSANDER H.A., *Helena. Empress and Saint*, Chicago 1995.
- POLLOK J., *Narodziny koncepcji "Ziemi Świętej". Palestyna w teologicznej refleksji Euzebiusza z Cezarei i Cyryla Jerozolimskiego*, [in:] *Chrześcijaństwo u schyłku starożytności. Studia źródłoznawcze*, ed. T. DERDA, E. WIPSYZKA, Warszawa 1997, p. 99–122.
- ROUILLON A.-M., *Sainte Hélène*, Paris 1908.
- SZYMAŃSKI A., *Św. Helena cesarzowa*, Poznań 1933.
- TAYLOR J.E., *Christians and the Holy Place*, Oxford 1993.
- URBAINCZYK T., *Observations on the differences between the Church Histories of Socrates and Sozomen*, "Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte" 46, 1997, p. 355–373.
- URBAINCZYK T., *Socrates of Constantinople. Historian of Church and State*, Michigan 1997.
- YOUNG F., *From Nicaea to Chalcedon*, London 1983.
- VATCHKOVA V., (Saint) *Helena of Sofia. The Evolution of the Memory of Saint Constantine's Mother*, [in:] *The Reception of Byzantium in European Culture since 1500*, ed. D. SMYTH, P. MARCINIAK, Farnham 2016, p. 81–96.
- WALLACE-HADRILL A., *The Emperor and His Virtues*, "Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte" 30, 1981, p. 298–323.
- WALLRAFF M., *Der Kirchenhistoriker Sokrates. Untersuchungen zu Geschichtsdarstellung, Methode und Person*, Göttingen 1997.
- WINKELMANN F., *Das Problem der Rekonstruktion der Historia ecclesiastica des Gelasius von Caesarea*, "Forschungen und Fortschritte" 10, 1964, p. 311–314.
- WINKELMANN F., *Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia*, Berlin 1966 [= *Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst*, 3].
- WINKELMANN F., *Charakter und Bedeutung der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisareia*, "Byzantinische Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik" 1, 1966, p. 346–385.
- WOJCIECHOWSKI L., *Drzewo przenajszlachetniejsze. Problematyka Drzewa Krzyża w chrześcijaństwie zachodnim (IV–połowa XVII w.). Od legend do kontrowersji wyznaniowych i piśmiennictwa specjalistycznego*, Lublin 2003.
- WORTLEY J., *The "Sacred Remains" of Constantine and Helena*, [in:] *Byzantine narrative. Papers in honour of Roger Scott*, ed. J. BURKE, U. BETKA, P. BUCKLEY, K. HAY, R. SCOTT, A. STEPHENSON, Melbourne 2006 [= *Byzantina Australiensia*, 16], p. 351–367.
- ZWOLSKI E., *Helena, matka Konstantyna Wielkiego w świetle historii*, "Zeszyty Naukowe KUL" 5, 1962, p. 53–76.

Abstract. In his Ecclesiastical history, Socrates depicts Helena as a pious, strong and independent woman, the mother of the emperor, realizing her own ideas and acting as a tool in the hands of God – the ultimate inspiration of her actions. The emperor, her son, only supported her in her undertakings. According to Socrates, Helena travelled to Jerusalem to answer God's call; there, she organized the search for the Sepulchre and the Holy Cross and found them. She was supported by Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem, who, after God's intervention, distinguished the True Cross from the crosses of the two villains. The empress divided the relics and sent some of them to her son to Constantinople; moreover, in the Holy Land, she built three basilicas connected with the life of Christ. Finally, Socrates mentions her piety and discusses the place of her burial. Conversely, in Sozomen's account of the recovery of Christ's Sepulchre and the relics, the main role is played by emperor Constantine,

who wished to repay God for his blessings; he ordered the search and the construction of the basilica on Mount Golgotha. His mother only supported him in his plans, led by her devoutness, to which Sozomen pays more attention than his predecessor – he emphasizes Helena's sensitivity to human poverty and suffering. The emperor was also involved in her generous deeds and gave her access to the imperial treasury. Thus, as indicated by Sozomen, Helena's piety brought prosperity both to her family and to the whole Roman Empire.

Keywords: Helena, Constantine the Great, Socrates, Sozomen, Holy Cross

Sławomir Bralewski

Uniwersytet Łódzki
Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny
Instytut Historii
Katedra Historii Bizancjum
ul. Kamińskiego 27a
90–219 Łódź, Polska/Poland
sbralewski@o2.pl

Kazimierz Ginter (Rome)

THE *TRISAGION* RIOTS (512) AS AN EXAMPLE OF INTERACTION BETWEEN POLITICS AND LITURGY

The masses celebrated by St. Pope John Paul II in Poland enabled the Polish people to regain their faith and to consolidate their overwhelming power, contributing to the downfall of the communist system. This example demonstrates how liturgy can genuinely influence the social and political world. The question must be asked whether it was a one-time case or whether there have been other moments in the history of the Church when liturgy evidently had such an impact on the political life of the society.

To answer this question properly, in the present article I would like to analyse one of the most stunning cases of interdependence between liturgy and politics, namely the so-called *Trisagion* riots¹, which took place in Constantinople AD 512. It was the way Christians responded to changes in Eucharistic liturgy – regarded as heretical – proclaimed by emperor Anastasius I. In order to better understand this phenomenon, we must describe the historical, cultural and political contexts of those times.

The emperor and his Church

It is necessary to begin our deliberations with a few remarks on the role the emperor played in the Eastern Orthodox Church in the 5th and 6th centuries, since the contemporary reader may perhaps be surprised by the fact that the emperor was free to add various expressions to the prayers sung in the official liturgy of the Church. When Constantine the Great proclaimed the Edict of Milan – establishing religious toleration for Christianity – in 313, the situation of Christians in the Roman Empire changed significantly. From that moment onwards, the Church had the support of the imperial state and Constantine called himself *a bishop of those outside the Church*².

¹ Ever more often, one encounters the name *Staurotheis* riot. Cf. J. DIJKSTRA, G. GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius* (with a Reedition of “O.Mon.Epiph.” 59), *Mil* 6, 2009, p. 243sqq.; M. MEIER, *Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des Byzantinischen Reiches*, Stuttgart 2010, p. 262sqq.

² EUSEBIUS, *Über des leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, III, 54, rec. F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1975 [= GCS, 6]. Cf. D. DE DECKER, G. DUPUIS-MASSAY, *L'épiscopat de l'empereur Constantin*, B 50, 1980, p. 118–157;

Soon, the emperor's influence also became visible in the sphere of doctrine. In the 4th century, during the Arian controversy, the emperor could not afford to let the Church be torn apart by doctrinal disputes, as he expected it to serve as the unifying force within the empire's borders. This explains why he played such an important role during the First Council of Nicaea in 325³.

The state and the Church entered into a close union, so that Constantine the Great's successors felt obliged to show their interest in religious matters. This fact had certain practical consequences: internal dissensions among believers would bring about problems in the Empire⁴.

Furthermore, there were close ties between the imperial court and certain elements of liturgy. The most famous Christian churches from the 4th and 5th centuries – the basilicas – were not similar in shape to pagan temples. Rather, they resembled imperial basilicas, i.e. buildings used by the imperial administration. The 4th-century imperial palace played a decisive role in the development of Christian iconography. It served as a model for the image of Christ on the throne, the ruler of the universe surrounded by angels and saints. Just as the imperial throne gave other officials in the empire the authority to rule, Jesus Christ was portrayed in the act of passing the new law to St. Peter⁵.

When the Church became a public institution in the 4th century, all bishops enjoyed the status of high-ranking imperial officials. In the 4th century, members of the clergy wore the same attire as any other Roman officials⁶. On the other hand, we must not forget that a bishop could have the position of a *de facto* imperial official⁷. All this indicates that the relationship between the temporal and the spiritual power was so close that mutual interferences between them were regarded as something usual and familiar.

C. RAPP, *Imperial ideology in the making. Eusebius of Caesarea on Constantine as "Bishop"*, JTS 49, 1998, p. 685–695; CH. PIETRI, *La conversione: propaganda e realtà*, [in:] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. II, *La nascita di una cristianità (250–432)*, ed. CH. PIETRI, L. PIETRI, Roma 2000, p. 219.

³ T.G. ELLIOTT, *The Christianity of Constantine the Great*, Scranton, PA 1996, p. 27–28.

⁴ The best example of this phenomenon is, perhaps, the Monophysite conflict, which facilitated the Muslim conquest of the predominantly Monophysite Egypt: the Egyptians preferred the Muslim invaders to Byzantine officials. Cf. *The Chronicle of John, bishop of Nikiu*, ed. R. CHARLES, London 1916, p. 184; G. DAGRON, *La Chiesa e la cristianità bizantine tra invasioni e iconoclasmo (VII secolo – inizi dell' VIII)*, [in:] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. IV, *Vescovi, monaci e imperatori (610–1054)*, ed. G. DAGRON, Roma 1999, p. 44.

⁵ H. WYBREW, *The Orthodox liturgy. The development of the eucharistic liturgy in the Byzantine rite*, Crestwood, NY 1990, p. 29–31.

⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 32; B. NEUNHEUSER, *Storia della liturgia attraverso le epoche culturali*, Roma 1983 [= BEL Subsidia, 11], p. 49.

⁷ J. MEYENDORFF, *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*, Crestwood–New York 1989, p. 14–19; H.S. ALVISATOS, *Die Kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I*, Aalen 1973, p. 52–66; J.H.W.G. LIEBESCHUETZ, *Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, Oxford–New York 2001, p. 224.

The greatness of the empire was also expressed through liturgy. It is no coincidence that the most impressive structure of the Empire – built by emperor Justinian – was the Hagia Sophia church, or that a significant part of *De aedificiis* by Procopius of Caesarea is devoted to the description of churches erected by the illustrious emperor⁸.

It follows logically from the above-mentioned examples that emperors were evidently involved in the problems of liturgy. It can be seen perfectly clearly in the *Ecclesiastical history* by Evagrius Scholasticus of Antioch⁹, specifically in his portrayal of emperor Marcian (convener of the Council of Chalcedon, held in 451). According to Evagrius's account, the emperor's greatest wish was to make all people live in peace and praise God together¹⁰ (i.e., in liturgy). We can assume that Marcian was fully aware of the importance of liturgy in the process of integration (or disintegration) of the society.

The development of the hymn

At this point, it will be useful to take an overall look at the history of the *Trisagion* hymn. Its central and oldest part – Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος σαβωθ, πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ γῆ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ – stems from the Book of Isaiah (Is 6.3.2)¹¹. Hereinafter, it will be referred to as the *Biblical Trisagion*.

During the first centuries, Christians alluded to this hymn very often. Already at the end of the 1st century, a direct reference to the *Biblical Trisagion* may be found in the Apocalypse of St. John – the four living creatures recite day and night: Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Apoc. 4,8). Other references are to be found, for example, in the writings of St. Clement of Rome¹².

In pre-Constantinian times, the *Biblical Trisagion* was conceived of as a direct appeal to God the Father – such an interpretation appears in the works of Origen¹³. In Antioch, on the other hand, it was interpreted as addressing Jesus Christ¹⁴. While the Patricentric reading of the hymn seems quite obvious to a contemporary

⁸ AV. CAMERON, *Procopius and the sixth century*, London 1985, p. 86: *It could be said to have three main themes – church building (especially as instrumental in advancing the process of conversion to Christianity), fortifications and water-supply.*

⁹ *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with Scholia*, ed. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, London 1898 (cetera: EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS), II, 1, p. 38.

¹⁰ EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, II, 1, p. 38. Cf. S. BRALEWSKI, *Sobór w Chalcedonie w polityce wewnętrznej cesarza Marcjana*, AUL.FH 44, 1992, p. 53–74.

¹¹ Cf. K. GINTER, *Spór o 'Trisagion'*, ReH 14, 2002, p. 221–231.

¹² CLEMENS ROMANUS, *Épître aux Corinthiens*, 34, 6, ed. A. JAUBERT, Paris 1971 [= SC, 167], p. 156. Cf. K. GINTER, *Spór...*, p. 224.

¹³ *Origenes vier Bucher von den Prinzipien*, 8, ed. H. GORGEMANN, H. KARPP, Darmstadt 1976, p. 2sq.

¹⁴ R. TAFT, *The Interpolation of Sanctus into the Anaphora*, 1, OCP 57, 1991, p. 281–308; 2, OCP 58, 1992, p. 83–121. Cf. K. GINTER, *Spór...*, p. 224.

student, its Christological interpretation may appear somewhat peculiar. This alternative way of understanding the hymn may have been influenced by certain fragments of the Apocalypse, especially the above-mentioned passage (Apoc 4,8), in which the God who arrives (ἐρχόμενος) is in fact Christ¹⁵.

Along with the development of Christian theology, the Patricentric exegesis was transformed – probably in a natural way – into a Trinitarian one. The very triple repetition Ἅγιος ἅγιος ἅγιος invited this kind of reading. According to this construal, each of the three instances of ἅγιος referred to one person of the Trinity. Probably originating in Alexandria¹⁶, this interpretation quickly became the classical one. Moreover, in Italy and in Africa, it had become widespread perhaps even before it entered liturgy¹⁷. This interpretation is found in the works of certain Fathers of the Church, such as St. Athanasius¹⁸ or St. Gregory of Nazianzus¹⁹, among others²⁰. It is hardly surprising, then, that the Church Fathers sometimes resorted to the *Biblical Trisagion* in their anti-Arian polemics. The Antiochene (Christological) reading of the hymn might have also been applied for anti-Arian purposes, as it laid special emphasis on the divine character of Christ²¹.

These interpretations, both acceptable to a Christian, existed side by side in the Roman World and shaped the believers' sensitivity. As regards liturgy, even in those parts of the Empire where we know that the *Biblical Trisagion* was understood in the Trinitarian sense, certain liturgical rites of Eastern provenance were also in use; there, the hymn was construed in the Christological manner. Put differently, one interpretation did not exclude the other²².

It is not entirely clear when and how the *Biblical Trisagion* entered the liturgy. Some scholars, like A. Baumstark, claim that it happened towards the end of the 2nd century due to influence from synagogue worship. The evidence adduced in support of this notion includes the testimony by the 6th-century monk Job, who, in his treatise *De verbo incarnato*, describes how a certain Jew used the *Biblical*

¹⁵ Cf. Ap 1,7 and Ap 22, 20. A. GERHARDS, *Le phenomene du Sanctus adresse au Christ. Son origine, sa signification et sa persistance dans les Anaphores de l'eglise d'Orient*, [in:] *Le Christ dans la liturgie*, ed. A.M. TRIACCA, A. PISTOIA, Rome 1981, p. 68–69.

¹⁶ R. TAFT, *The Interpolation...*, 2, p. 111.

¹⁷ A. GRILLMEIER, *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, Roma 1982–2001, vol. II.2, p. 331.

¹⁸ ATHANASIUS THEOLOGUS, *In illud: Omnia mihi tradita sunt*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1857 [= PG, 25], col. 217, 49: τῆ τρισα γιότητι δοξάζοντα.

¹⁹ GREGORIUS NAZANENSIS, *In theophania (orat. 38)*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1858 [= PG, 36], col. 320, 27–32: Οὕτω μὲν οὖν τὰ Ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, ἃ καὶ τοῖς σεραφίμ συγκαλύπτεται, καὶ δοξάζεται τρισὶν ἁγιασμοῖς, εἰς μίαν συνιοῦσι κυριότητα καὶ θεότητα· ὃ καὶ ἄλλω τινὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν πεφιλοσόφηται κάλλιστά τε καὶ ὑψηλότατα.

²⁰ Cf. K. GINTER, *Spór...*, p. 224.

²¹ *Les homiliae cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche*, 125, ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris 1961 [= PO, 29] (cetera: SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS), p. 249.

²² Cf. S. JANERAS, *Les Byzantins et le Trisagion christologique*, [in:] *Miscellanea Liturgica in onore di sua Eminenza il cardinale Giacomo Lercaro*, vol. II, Roma 1967, p. 469–499, esp. p. 477–485.

Trisagion to protect himself from pagans²³. As noted by Grillmeier, however, there are far more reasons speaking against such an interpretation; it appears unlikely that the introduction of the *Trisagion* into Christian liturgy was related to Jewish influence²⁴.

Be that as it may, in Egypt the hymn penetrated the Liturgy of the Eucharist in the 3rd century; soon afterwards, in the 4th century, it was also introduced in other places²⁵. A striking example of its popularity in the liturgy in the early 5th century is found in one of the homilies by St. John Chrysostom. This eminent Father, in his interpretation of the Book of Isaiah, testifies to the presence of the *Biblical Trisagion* in liturgy in the capital city of the empire²⁶.

The New *Trisagion* (*Sanctus Deus Sanctus Fortis*)

In the first part of the 5th century, the *Biblical Trisagion* underwent certain substantial changes. A new, fundamentally changed version of the text appeared – ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς – nowadays perfectly well-known in Western culture as *Sanctus Deus Sanctus Fortis*. Spreading across the Christian world, this variant partly replaced the previous version and partly entered liturgy as an independent hymn. The expression ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς (*have mercy on us*) suggests that this version was conceived as a liturgical hymn²⁷.

We may surmise with a reasonable dose of probability that this version of the hymn arose in the 530s and was included in liturgy thanks to Proclus, patriarch of Constantinople (434–446). This is, at least, the testimony of the Byzantine Orthodox tradition²⁸. For this reason, we shall call this hymn the *Trisagion of Proclus*.

John of Damascus († 749) relates the circumstances of the hymn's emergence in the following manner:

Now, those who have compiled the history of the Church relate how once, when Proclus was archbishop, the people of Constantinople were making public entreaty to avert some threat of the divine wrath²⁹, and it happened that a child was taken up out of the crowd and

²³ JOBIOUS MONACHUS, *De Verbo incarnato commentarius*, [in:] PHOTIUS, *Bibliothèque*, cod. 222, vol. III, ed. R. HENRY, Paris 2003, p. 180–181.

²⁴ A. GRILLMEIER, *Gesù...*, II.2, p. 331. Cf. C.W. DUGMORE, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, Oxford 1944, p. 107sqq.

²⁵ R. TAFT, *The Interpolation...*, 2, p. 120.

²⁶ Ἄνω τὰ Σεραφίμ τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ἀναβοᾷ· κάτω τὸν αὐτὸν ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναπέμπει πληθὺς κοινὴ τῶν ἐπουρανίων καὶ τῶν ἐπιγείων συγκροτεῖται πανήγυρις· μία εὐχαριστία, ἓν ἓν ἀγαλλίασμα, μία εὐφρόσυνος χοροστασία. JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *In illud: Vidi dominum*, 1.34, [in:] JEAN CHRYSOSTOME, *Homélie sur Ozias*, Paris 1981 [= SC, 277].

²⁷ A. KARIM, *The Meaning of the Trisagion in East and West*, MSt 105, 2014, p. 28.

²⁸ Cf. K. GINTER, *Spór...*, p. 225–226.

²⁹ The event referred to here is the earthquake of 438. Cf. B. CROKE, *The Early Byzantine Earthquakes and Their Liturgical Commemoration*, B 41, 1981, p. 122–147.

by some angelic choirmasters was taught the Thrice-Holy Hymn after the following fashion: 'Holy God, Holy Strong, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us.' When the child came back again and told what he had been taught, the whole crowd sang the hymn and the threat was averted.³⁰

The same story is transmitted in the *Liber Heraclidis* by Nestorius (although Abramowski claims that this information is a later interpolation)³¹. Job likewise attributes the hymn to Proclus³². A few years after Proclus's death, we encounter the new *Trisagion* used as an acclamation at the time of the Council of Chalcedon. During the first session (October 8th, 451), the Eastern bishops rejoiced in the deposition of patriarch Dioscorus I of Alexandria: *Many years to the senate! Holy God, Holy Almighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy on us*³³.

Although Severus thought that the hymn originated in Antioch³⁴, and it seems that Grillmeier concurred with this opinion³⁵, it is much more probable that this *Trisagion* emerged in Constantinople in the time of Proclus. Events such as earthquakes have a profound and lasting impact on the collective memory of a society and it is difficult to imagine how an interpolator could have added blatantly false information concerning such facts. On the other hand, adding new words to the *Trisagion* hymn was a grave matter, which required justification. An event like an earthquake served very well for this purpose. Thus, we can presume that Proclus inserted the hymn at the beginning of the mass, i.e. in a very prominent position³⁶.

In effect, from the 5th century onwards, the term *Trisagion* denoted two different hymns, which may seem a bizarre situation at first glance. Note, however, that it is nowadays customary to use the word *Creed* to refer to two discrete prayers – the Symbol of the Apostles and the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed. To the inhabitants of the Empire, the *Trisagion of Proclus* was a kind of elaborated version of the *Biblical Trisagion*; in other words, it was the same hymn with assorted “explanatory comments” added. For this reason, all interpretations and

³⁰ JOANNES DAMASCENUS, *Expositio Fidei*, [in:] *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. B. KOTTER, vol. II, Berlin–New York 1973, p. 130. English translation: JOHN DAMASCENE, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, trans. F.H. CHASE, Washington, DC 1958, p. 288–289.

³¹ NESTORIUS, *Bazaar of Heracleides*, trans. O. DRIVER, L. HODGSON, Oxford 1925, p. 364; L. ABRAMOWSKI, *Untersuchungen zum “Liber Heraclidis” des Nestorius*, Louvain 1963 [= CSCO, 224, Subs. 22], p. 130–132.

³² JOBIUS MONACHUS, p. 181.

³³ ACO, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, vol. II, *Concilium Chalcedonense (451)*, Berlin 1962, II, 1, p. 195. English translation in: A. KARIM, *The Meaning...*, p. 27–28.

³⁴ SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS, p. 249.

³⁵ A. GRILLMEIER, *Gesù...*, II.2, p. 332.

³⁶ S. JANERAS, *Le Trisagion: une formule brève en liturgie comparée*, [in:] *Acts of International Congress. Comparative Liturgy fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)*, ed. F. TAFT, G. WINKLER, Roma 2001 [= OCA, 265], p. 497–498.

explanations provided by the Fathers to explicate the *Biblical Trisagion* were automatically considered valid for the new hymn as well³⁷. A similar kind of ambiguity is observed in the *Expositio fidei* by St. John of Damascus, in which he interprets the words of the *Trisagion of Proclus* by resorting to the teachings of the Fathers of the 4th century, who obviously only discussed the *Biblical Trisagion*³⁸.

Logically, this had to cause problems: the *Biblical Trisagion* was compatible with a range of interpretations, while Proclus' version could only be construed in the Trinitarian way, significantly divergent from the traditional Antiochene exegesis. Nonetheless, both readings seemed valid: today, we find a vestige of the Antiochene interpretation in the liturgy of Good Friday³⁹.

As has already been mentioned, the *Trisagion of Proclus* was applied in the liturgy from its inception. In a homily from April 518, St. Severus the Great of Antioch, the most important Greek Monophysite theologian (in the Oriental Orthodox Churches, also considered a Father of the Church and a saint) stated that it was used in liturgy across the Roman Empire and that it had appeared recently. This is perfectly coherent with the information that the hymn arose in the time of Proclus. Nowadays, in the Byzantine rite, it is sung during the Divine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom, accompanying the Entrance procession⁴⁰.

Trisagion and the Monophysite Conflict

The religious unity within the Roman Empire, visibly present during the rule of Theodosius I, was later destroyed not only in the West (as a consequence of the appearance of the Arian kingdoms), but also in the East (as a result of the Nestorian and later Monophysite crises). The background for both conflicts was the old rivalry between the Alexandrine and Antiochene schools, which vied for influence within the Church.

The Arian controversy led to the Alexandrine school reinforcing its position, owing especially to St. Athanasius of Alexandria. The moment of Alexandria's greatest triumph came at the Council of Ephesus (431): there, Cyril of Alexandria overpowered Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, who at the same time represented the Antiochene School⁴¹.

³⁷ Cf. K. GINTER, *Spór...*, p. 226–227.

³⁸ JOANNES DAMASCENUS, *Expositio Fidei*, 54, p. 131.

³⁹ S. JANERAS, *Les Byzantins...*, p. 477–480.

⁴⁰ H. WYBREW, *The Orthodox liturgy...*, p. 77.

⁴¹ J. MEYENDORFF, *Imperial Unity...*, p. 165–167. However, already in 443, the agreement between Cyril and the Antiochenes introduced an equilibrium between the Alexandrine and Antiochene Christology. Cf. Ch. FRAISSE-COUÉ, *Da Efeso a Calcedonia: "la pace illusoria" (433–451)*, [in] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. III, *Le chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432–610)*, ed. L. PIETRI, Roma 2000, p. 30–31.

This conflict rekindled after Cyril's death in 442, when Dioscorus, significantly less far-sighted than his predecessor, became the new patriarch of Alexandria. This time, the situation changed radically: the patriarch's lending support to the imprudent and radical Monophysite monk Eutyches and contributing to the death of patriarch Flavianus during the so-called *Latrocinium* (449) culminated in the convocation of another ecumenical council in Chalcedon by the new emperor Marcian. The council condemned Dioscorus; Alexandria suffered a devastating defeat⁴². But the victor was not so much the Antiochene patriarchy as Rome and pope Leo the Great, owing to whom the Christological doctrine became obligatory in the whole Church. The patriarchy of Constantinople grew in importance and was declared to be the second after Rome⁴³.

We can presume that, in such a context, the *Trisagion of Proclus* was understandably treated as a symbol of the rising power of the capital. It became a token of the struggle against the Monophysites: as mentioned above, during the first session of the Council of Chalcedon (October 8th, 451), the Oriental bishops used the *Trisagion* to expedite the dismissal of Dioscorus⁴⁴. The Antiochenes, needless to say, hardly appreciated this. Thus, there is nothing extraordinary in that the bishops' actions worried not only the Monophysites, but also all other people who favoured the Christological interpretation of the hymn.

In this fashion, the *Trisagion of Proclus* acquired the reputation of a formula that could be utilized in theological battles or in conflicts related to Church politics. Hence, Severus, a leading representative of the Monophysite point of view, declared that the *Trisagion of Proclus* had developed in Antioch⁴⁵. In this way, he intended to neutralize its anti-Monophysite message. At that point, the interpretation of the *Trisagion of Proclus* ceased to be a mere question of theology and became an issue of ecclesiastical politics, simultaneously constituting a source of discord between the Monophysites and the Chalcedonians and between the Antiochene and Constantinopolitan patriarchies.

It is precisely in this context that we must analyse the addition of the phrase \acute{o} σ ταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς to the hymn. These words were first included in the *Trisagion of Proclus* around the year 480 in the work of Peter Fullo, patriarch of Antioch in the years 468–488⁴⁶. Thus, this version will henceforth be called the *Trisagion of Peter Fullo*.

When, after the expulsion of Peter Fullo, the Orthodox Calendion (479–484) became the patriarch of Antioch, he introduced the expression Χριστέ βασιλεύ

⁴² Here, I share the view of: L. DUCHESNE, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, vol. III, Paris 1911, p. 457.

⁴³ J. MEYENDORFF, *Imperial Unity...*, p. 179–181.

⁴⁴ ACO, II, 1.1, p. 195, v. 29–31: Οἱ Ἀνατολικοὶ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτοῖς εὐλαβέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι εἶπον· Πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῆς συγκλήτου. ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. πολλὰ τὰ ἔτη τῶν βασιλέων. ὁ ἀσεβῆς αἰεὶ φεύγει· Διόσκορον ὁ Χριστὸς καθεῖλεν.

⁴⁵ SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS, p. 249.

⁴⁶ A. GRILLMEIER, *Gesù...*, II.2, p. 333–334.

to the hymn in order to remove the ambiguity found in the supplement added by his predecessor⁴⁷. From then on, the *Trisagion* was sung in Antioch as follows: ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ἅγιος ἰσχυρός, ἅγιος ἀθάνατος, Χριστέ βασιλεῦ ὁ σταυρωθεὶς δι' ἡμᾶς, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς. Owing to the judicious emendations implemented by Calendonius, the *Trisagion* of Peter Fullo became entirely harmonious with the traditional Christological interpretation born in Antioch, at the same time excluding the possibility of construing the hymn in a theopaschist way. Predictably, with Peter Fullo's return (485–488), this second addition was removed⁴⁸. It must be borne in mind, however, that the problem was not relevant for the Antiochenes, also Chalcedonians.

Notably, Peter Fullo's behaviour shows that at least for some Monophysites, the conflict with the Chalcedonians (Catholics) was more than just a verbal one⁴⁹. The deliberate removal of the expression Χριστέ βασιλεῦ cannot be interpreted in any other way than as a suggestion on the part of the patriarch that the whole Trinity suffered in the moment of crucifixion⁵⁰. This explains why, outside Antioch, the *Trisagion* of Peter Fullo was perceived as radically Monophysite. It became popular thanks to two illustrious Monophysites who had no match in the Chalcedonian camp⁵¹, i.e. Philoxenus of Mabbug and Severus, mentioned above as patriarch of Antioch.

Anastasius I

In all likelihood, Peter Fullo's *Trisagion* would never have been considered important had it not been for Anastasius I, who came to power in 491. His predecessor, Zeno, strived to find a compromise to solve the Monophysite problem. To this end, during his reign, he published a new document – the so-called *Henotikon* – in which he attempted to devise a solution intermediate between the Antiochians and the Chalcedonians⁵².

When Zeno died, empress Ariadna accepted the marriage proposal from Anastasius I, who reigned in Byzantium between 491 and 518. The new Emperor was a perspicacious ruler. During his reign, the Eastern Roman frontier was significantly reinforced, which included the construction of Dara, a stronghold aimed to counterbalance the Persian fortress of Nusaybin⁵³. Anastasius engaged in the Isaurian War against the usurper Longinus⁵⁴ as well as in the war against Sassanid

⁴⁷ *Ibidem*.

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*. Cf. THEODORES ANAGNOSTES, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, Berlin 1971 [= GCS, 54], 427–428, p. 118; *Theophanis Confessori Chronographia*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig 1883, p. 134, 9–11.

⁴⁹ K. GINTER, *Spór...*, p. 228. Cf. J. LEBON, *Le Monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain 1909, p. 480–486.

⁵⁰ Cf. W.H.C. FREND, *The Rise of Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge 1972, p. 168.

⁵¹ Ch. MOELLER, *Le chalcedonisme et neo-chalcedonisme en Orient de 451 a la fin du VI siecle*, [in:] *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, ed. A. GRILLMEIER, R. BACHT, vol. 1, Würzburg 1951, p. 643.

⁵² J. MEYENDORFF, *Imperial Unity...*, p. 199.

⁵³ F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I. Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, Cambridge 2006, p. 65–70.

⁵⁴ M. MEIER, *Anastasios...*, p. 75–84.

Persia⁵⁵. Crucially, however, he also happened to be an ardent Monophysite, actively supporting his Monophysite subjects across the empire. Born of a Manichean mother, he had had the reputation of a heretic long before he became emperor⁵⁶.

Until 508, the religious policy of Anastasius was almost the same as that of his predecessor, Zeno⁵⁷. The deposition of the staunchly anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Constantinople, Euphemius (496), as well as the enthronement of Macedonius (patriarch 495–511, died ca. 517), a moderate Chalcedonian who had signed the *Henotikon*⁵⁸, may also be interpreted in this way.

After 508, the aging emperor's policy changed⁵⁹. That year, the fanatical Monophysite monk Severus arrived in Constantinople, accompanied by other monks from Palestine, and lent support to the Monophysite party⁶⁰. That is when the conflict between the patriarch and the emperor erupted. Anastasius did his utmost to force Macedonius to take a stance against the Council of Chalcedon, but all his flatteries and threats were futile. Quite on the contrary, Macedonius convened a council at which the documents signed at the Council of Chalcedon were confirmed in writing. He also supported the Chalcedonians in Syria, and in 510, he refused to enter in communion with the patriarch of Alexandria, who had not accepted the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon⁶¹. Last but not least, when the emperor demanded a condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, Macedonius replied that this could only be done by an Ecumenical Council presided over by the bishop of Rome⁶².

The conflict grew ever more intense. The followers of Severus added fuel to the fire by singing the *Trisagion of Peter Fullo* in many of the capital's churches, which caused unrest in the city⁶³. In the end, Macedonius was accused of plotting against the emperor; soon afterwards, he was deposed (511) and exiled to Euchaita in Asia Minor⁶⁴. In the meantime, we may add, the government had accused him of sexual abuse⁶⁵.

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 174–221.

⁵⁶ P. CHARANIS, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518*, Thessaloniki 1974, p. 39–43; *PLRE*, vol. II, p. 134 (Anastasius IV).

⁵⁷ According to Frend, the change in policy came in the year 510. W.H.C. FRENDE, *The Rise...*, p. 192.

⁵⁸ Cf. F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 136–139; M. MEIER, *Anastasios...*, p. 84–92; P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 54–60; J. DIJKSTRA, G. GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics...*, p. 223–264 (on Euphemius: p. 227–230; on Macedonius: p. 230–232).

⁵⁹ F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 139–145 – explains the political reasons that influenced this change.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 141–142; J. DIJKSTRA, G. GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics...*, p. 232–233.

⁶¹ F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 147; P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 66.

⁶² F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 147; P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 66.

⁶³ F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 147–148; P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 67; J. DIJKSTRA, G. GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics...*, p. 235–236.

⁶⁴ Cf. G. GREATREX, *The Fall of Macedonius Reconsidered*, SP 44, 2010, p. 125–132; A. GRILLMEIER, *Gesù...*, II.1, p. 382; F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 150–151; P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 70–71; J. DIJKSTRA, G. GREATREX, *Patriarchs and Politics...*, p. 236–239.

⁶⁵ EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, III, 32.

Nevertheless, the people of Constantinople felt loyal to the Council of Chalcedon and to their patriarch. This being the case, it is easy to imagine how the Monophysite emperor's aggressive engagement against the moderate pro-Chalcedonian patriarch provoked vast popular resistance – particularly among the capital's clergy, well aware of the emperor's support for Severus.

The emperor also deposed moderate bishop Flavianus of Antioch (511), replacing him with Severus. Dispatched by Anastasius to occupy the vacant Antiochene patriarchate, Severus inaugurated his tenure by solemnly issuing an anathema against Chalcedon in his church⁶⁶.

The Trisagion riots

Violent turbulences in the cities of the late Roman Empire were nothing uncommon. In particular, Alexandria was famous for the short temper of its inhabitants. At the close of the 4th century, the citizens burnt down the Serapeum⁶⁷. The famous Neoplatonic philosopher Hypatia⁶⁸ was lynched by a mob; twenty years later, the archbishop Proterius suffered the same fate⁶⁹. Antioch witnessed similar acts of violence as well (in 511, the clashes between Chalcedonians and Monophysite monks in the city resulted in a bloodshed⁷⁰), as did Constantinople (the most infamous unrest – the *Nika* riots – erupted on January 11th, 532 at the Hippodrome⁷¹). Without doubt, the *Trisagion* riots may be included among the most notable of such events as well. Taking into account the proclivity to riot found widely among the citizens of the empire's great metropolises (cf. above), as well as their famous theological passions, it is not difficult to understand the phenomenon. Contemporary authors like Evagrius Scholasticus had no trouble identifying its causes.

When Timothy became patriarch, he was not able to restore order in the capital, as many refused to collaborate with him. At that point, the emperor resolved to take the initiative. On Sunday, November 4th, 512, the *Trisagion of Peter Fullo*⁷² was accepted through an imperial edict. Evagrius Scholasticus described the situation as follows:

⁶⁶ F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 155–156; P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 72–77.

⁶⁷ R. MORGAN, *History of the Coptic Orthodox People and the Church of Egypt*, Victoria 2016, p. 94–97.

⁶⁸ On Hypatia: M. DZIELSKA, *Hypatia of Alexandria*, Cambridge 1996.

⁶⁹ Cf. T.E. GREGORY, *Vox Populi. Violence and Popular Involvement in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century AD*, Columbus, Ohio 1979, p. 163–201; P. MARAVAL, *La ricezione di Calcedonia nell'impero d'Oriente*, [in:] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. III, *Le chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432–610)*, ed. L. PIETRI, Roma 2000, p. 124–126; Ch. HASS, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity*, Baltimore–London 1997, p. 317–319.

⁷⁰ EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, III, 32, p. 130–131.

⁷¹ M. MEIER, *Anastasios...*, p. 270–271. Cf. *Nika Revolt*, [in:] *ODB*, vol. II, col. 1472–1473.

⁷² F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 156; P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 78.

And at Byzantium, when the emperor wished to make an addition to the *Trisagion* of the phrase, 'Who was crucified for us', a very great disturbance occurred on the grounds that the Christian worship was being utterly nullified.⁷³

The most violent riot took place in the Hagia Sophia. Once the choir began to sing the *Trisagion of Peter Fullo* in accordance with the emperor's edict, the crowd responded with the *Trisagion of Proclus*. A brawl erupted, culminating with the death of many people and the arrest of numerous others. The riots continued on Monday in the church of St. Theodore⁷⁴.

On November 6th, the true unrest started⁷⁵:

Since, consequently, the people were carried out of control, those in authority came into mortal peril and many prominent places in the city were burnt. And when the populace found in the house of Marinus the Syrian a certain countryman who pursued the monastic life, they chopped off his head, saying that the phrase had been added at his suggestion; after affixing his head to a pole they contemptuously shouted: 'This indeed is the conspirator against the Trinity.'⁷⁶

Amidst the riots, the rebellious people were searching for a new emperor; on November 7th, 512, Areobindus, the husband of Anicia Juliana, was chosen⁷⁷.

And the disturbance reached such a pitch, plundering everything and exceeding all constraint, that the emperor was compelled to come to the Hippodrome in a pitiful state, without his crown; he sent heralds to the people proclaiming that with regard indeed to the imperial power, while he would abdicate this most readily, it was a matter of impossibility that all should ascend to this, since it was quite unable to tolerate many men, but that it would assuredly be a single man who took the helm of it after him. On seeing this spectacle, the populace turned about, as if from some divine intervention, and begged Anastasius to put on his crown, promising to remain quiet.⁷⁸

As soon as Anastasius regained control of the state, he inflicted severe punishment on the instigators. This marked the end of the revolt. Nevertheless, the conflict persisted and continued to escalate. The European provinces were definitely pro-Chalcedonian. In 512, the bishops of Illyricum wrote to the pope to reaffirm their fidelity to the Council of Chalcedon. In the following years, other European bishops joined the pope⁷⁹.

⁷³ EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, III, 44 p. 146. English translation: *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, trans. M. WHITBY, Liverpool 2000, p. 195.

⁷⁴ M. MEIER, *Anastasios...*, p. 272–273.

⁷⁵ F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 156–157; M. MEIER, *Anastasios...*, p. 271–284 (with a detailed analysis of the sources); P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 78.

⁷⁶ EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, III, 44, p. 146; trans. M. WHITBY, p. 196.

⁷⁷ P. CHARANIS, *Church...*, p. 79.

⁷⁸ EVAGRIUS SCHOLASTICUS, III, 44, p. 146; trans. M. WHITBY, p. 196.

⁷⁹ W.H.C. FREND, *The Rise...*, p. 231.

In 514, Vitalian, one of the army commanders, rebelled and occupied Scythia, Moesia and Thrace⁸⁰. Among his demands was the restoration of the *Trisagion of Proclus*⁸¹. Although suffering a serious defeat in 516 (which brought overwhelming joy to Severus in Antioch⁸²), Vitalian remained a permanent menace for the administration as long as Anastasius was alive.

The emperor's death marked the end of the conflict. Justin I, an Orthodox, came to power; Severus was deposed from the patriarchate of Antioch; a festival celebrating the Council of Chalcedon was established in Constantinople under popular pressure (518). During the first celebration, the *Trisagion of Proclus* was solemnly sung⁸³. Ever since that moment, it has been sung in the Byzantine liturgy in this version.

On the other hand, the decline of the *Trisagion of Peter Fullo* seemed definitive even among the Monophysites. In 518, Severus IV lamented the lack of acceptance for the addition even in Egypt⁸⁴.

Predictably, although it had failed in Constantinople, the rebellion did not vanish entirely. The *Trisagion of Peter Fullo* was still sung in churches in Syria that followed the Monophysite traditions; with time, it also extended to churches in Egypt. The issue of the *Trisagion* made frequent appearances in Monophysite and anti-Monophysite polemical texts. It was commented on by Justinian⁸⁵ as well as by St. John of Damascus (who devoted a separate treatise to the hymn⁸⁶, along with a chapter in the *Expositio fidei*⁸⁷). On the Monophysite side, it was discussed in the *Chronicle* by John of Nikiu⁸⁸, a Coptic bishop from Egypt. The *Trisagion of Peter Fullo* was finally condemned by the Council in Trullo⁸⁹.

⁸⁰ F.K. HAARER, *Anastasius I...*, p. 164–179; M. MEIER, *Anastasios...*, p. 295–311.

⁸¹ W.H.C. FRIEND, *The Rise...*, p. 231–232.

⁸² Severus wrote a hymn on the tyrant Vitalian and on the victory of the Anastasius-loving Christ. Cf. JAMES OF EDESSA, *The Hymns of Severus and Others, 136 a 365*, ed. E.W. BROOKS, Paris 1911 [= PO, 7], p. 710sqq.

⁸³ S. JANERAS, *Le Trisagion...*, p. 497 ; A. GRILLMEIER, *Gesù...*, II, 2, p. 334–335.

⁸⁴ W.H.C. FRIEND, *The Rise...*, p. 229–230; SEVERUS ANTIOCHENUS, p. 249.

⁸⁵ For example: FLAVIUS IUSTINIANUS, *Contra monophysitas*, 192,3–192,6, [in:] *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians*, ed. M. AMELOTTI, R. ALBERTELLA, Milano ²1973, p. 6–78: τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος ἀμαρτάνουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ αὐτὴν βλασφημοῦσιν τὴν ὁμοούσιον τριάδα. καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ λέγειν Σευῆρος ἐτόλμησεν ὅτι ὁ τρισάγιος ὕμνος εἰς μόνον ἀναφέρεται τὸν υἱὸν μὴ κοινωούντων τῆι δοξολογίαι τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

⁸⁶ JOANNES DAMASCENUS, *Epistula de hymno trisagio*, [in:] *Die Schriften des Johannes Damaskos*, ed. B. KOTTER, Berlin 1981, p. 304, 332.

⁸⁷ JOANNES DAMASCENUS, *Expositio Fidei*, 54, p. 129–131.

⁸⁸ JOHN OF NIKIU, p. 126.

⁸⁹ A.A. KING, *The Rites of Eastern Christendom*, vol. I, Piscataway, NJ 2007, p. 147.

Conclusions

Let us now reflect on the broader context of the strife. We can see that one and the same prayer implemented in the liturgy in its cultural function may be interpreted as orthodox or heterodox. This entails that the meaning of a formula used in the liturgy cannot be judged without its *Sitz im Leben*. We may consider many of the Monophysite supporters of Peter Fullo heretics; but to the majority of Antiochenes, the formulation of the *Trisagion of Peter Fullo* was fully acceptable, since they were accustomed to interpreting the *Trisagion* as a Christological prayer, not a Trinitarian one.

The conflict surrounding the *Trisagion* is an excellent illustration of the connections between liturgy and politics in late antiquity. Victories and defeats in battles, changes on the imperial throne, conflicts among the empire's cities and patriarchs, popular revolts – all of these elements could influence the form of the prayers used in the liturgy.

On the other hand, we may see how liturgical formulae could play an important role in shaping religious identity (Monophysite or Catholic). They had the power to unite or to divide society. The famous rule of *lex orandi lex credendi* was more profoundly valid in the Byzantine society than we can imagine today.

Translated by Adrianna Grzelak-Krzymianowska

Bibliography

Sources

- Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*, ed. E. SCHWARTZ, vol. II, Concilium Chalcedonense (451), Berlin²1962.
- ATHANASIUS THEOLOGUS, *In illud: Omnia mihi tradita sunt*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1857, col. 209–220 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, 25].
- The Chronicle of John, bishop of Nikiu*, ed. R. CHARLES, London 1916.
- CLEMENS ROMANUS, *Épître aux Corinthiens*, ed. A. JAUBERT, Paris 1971 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 167].
- The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, trans. M. WHITBY, Liverpool 2000.
- The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with Scholia*, ed. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, London 1898.
- EUSEBIUS, *Über des leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, ed. F. WINKELMANN, Berlin 1975 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte*, 6].
- FLAVIUS IUSTINIANUS, *Contra monophysitas*, [in:] *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians*, ed. M. AMELLOTTI, R. ALBERTELLA, Milano²1973, p. 6–78.
- GREGORIUS NAZANENSIS, *In theophania (orat. 38)*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1858, col. 311–334 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, 36].

- JAMES OF EDESSA, *The Hymns of Severus and Others, 136 a 365*, ed. E.W. BROOKS, Paris 1911 [= *Patrologia orientalis*, 7], p. 595–802.
- JEAN CHRYSOSTOME, *Homélie sur Ozias*, Paris 1981 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 277].
- JOANNES DAMASCENUS, *Epistula de hymno trisagio*, [in:] *Die Schriften des Johannes Damaskos*, ed. B. KOTTER, Berlin 1981.
- JOANNES DAMASCENUS, *Expositio Fidei*, [in:] *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos*, ed. B. KOTTER, vol. II, Berlin–New York 1973.
- JOBIBUS MONACHUS, *De Verbo incarnato commentarius*, [in:] PHOTIUS, *Bibliothèque*, cod. 222, vol. III, ed. R. HENRY, Paris 2003.
- JOHN DAMASCENE, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, trans. F.H. CHASE, Washington, DC 1958, p. 165–406.
- NESTORIUS, *Bazaar of Heracleides*, trans. O. DRIVER, L. HODGSON, Oxford 1925.
- Origenes vier Bucher von den Prinzipien*, ed. H. GORGEMANNS, H. KARPP, Darmstadt 1976.
- Les homélies cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche*, ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris 1961 [= *Patrologia orientalis*, 29].
- THEODORES ANAGNOSTES, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. HANSEN, Berlin 1971 [= *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte*, 54].
- Theophanis Confessori Chronographia*, ed. C. DE BOOR, Leipzig 1883.

Secondary Literature

- ABRAMOWSKI L., *Untersuchungen zum "Liber Heraclidis" des Nestorius*, Louvain 1963 [= *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium*, 224, Subs. 22].
- ALVISATOS H.S., *Die Kirchliche Gesetzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I*, Aalen 1973.
- BRALEWSKI S., *Sobór w Chalcedonie w polityce wewnętrznej cesarza Marcjana*, "Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica" 44, 1992, p. 53–74.
- CAMERON AV., *Procopius and the sixth century*, London 1985.
- CHARANIS P., *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First, 491–518*, Thessaloniki 1974.
- CROKE B., *The Early Byzantine Earthquakes and Their Liturgical Commemoration*, "Byzantion. Revue internationale des études byzantines" 41, 1981, p. 122–147.
- DAGRON G., *La Chiesa e la cristianità bizantina tra invasioni e iconoclasmo (VII secolo – inizi dell' VIII)*, [in:] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. IV, *Vescovi, monaci e imperatori (610–1054)*, ed. G. DAGRON, Roma 1999, p. 28–76.
- DE DECKER D., DUPUIS-MASSAY G., *L'épiscopat de l'empereur Constantin*, "Byzantion. Revue internationale des études byzantines" 50, 1980, p. 118–157.
- DIJKSTRA J., GREATREX G., *Patriarchs and Politics in Constantinople in the Reign of Anastasius (with a Reedition of "O.Mon.Epiph." 59)*, "Millennium. Jahrbuch zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n.Chr. / Yearbook on the Culture and History of the First Millennium C.E." 6, 2009, p. 223–264.
- DUCHESNE L., *Histoire de l'Eglise*, vol. III, Paris 1911.
- DUGMORE C.W., *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, Oxford 1944.
- DZIELSKA M., *Hypatia of Alexandria*, Cambridge 1996.

- ELLIOTT T.G., *The Christianity of Constantine the Great*, Scranton, PA 1996.
- FRAISSE-COUÉ Ch., *Da Efeso a Calcedonia: "la pace illusoria" (433–451)*, [in:] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. III, *Le chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432–610)*, ed. L. PIETRI, Roma 2000, p. 29–92.
- FREND W.H.C., *The Rise of Monophysite Movement. Chapters in the History of the Church in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*, Cambridge 1972.
- GERHARDS A., *Le phenomene du Sanctus adresse au Christ. Son origine, sa signification et sa persistance dans les Anaphores de l'église d'Orient*, [in:] *Le Christ dans la liturgie*, ed. A.M. TRIACCA, A. PISTOIA, Rome 1981, p. 65–83.
- GINTER K., *Spór o 'Trisagion'*, "Res Historica" 14, 2002, p. 221–231.
- GREATREX G., *The Fall of Macedonius Reconsidered*, "Studia Patristica" 44, 2010, p. 125–132.
- GREGORY T.E., *Vox Populi. Violence and Popular Involvement in the Religious Controversies of the Fifth Century AD*, Columbus, Ohio 1979, p. 163–201.
- GRILLMEIER A., *Gesù il Cristo nella fede della Chiesa*, Roma 1982–2001.
- HAARER F.K., *Anastasius I. Politics and Empire in the Late Roman World*, Cambridge 2006.
- HASS Ch., *Alexandria in Late Antiquity*, Baltimore–London 1997.
- JANERAS S., *Le Trisagion: une formule brève en liturgie comparée*, [in:] *Acts of International Congress. Comparative Liturgy fifty Years after Anton Baumstark (1872–1948)*, ed. R. TAFT, G. WINKLER, Roma 2001 [= *Orientalia Christiana Analecta*, 265], p. 495–562.
- JANERAS S., *Les Byzantins et le Trisagion christologique*, [in:] *Miscellanea Liturgica in onore di sua Eminenza il cardinale Giacomo Lercaro*, Roma 1967, vol. II, p. 469–499.
- KARIM A., *The Meaning of the Trisagion in East and West*, "Musicological Studies" 105, 2014, p. 23–38.
- KING A.A., *The Rites of Eastern Christendom*, vol. I, Piscataway, NJ 2007.
- LEBON J., *Le Monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain 1909.
- LIEBESCHUETZ J.H.W.G., *Decline and Fall of the Roman City*, Oxford–New York 2001.
- MARAVAL P., *La ricezione di Calcedonia nell'impero d'Oriente*, [in:] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. III, *Le chiese d'Oriente e d'Occidente (432–610)*, ed. L. PIETRI, Roma 2000, p. 119–153.
- MEIER M., *Anastasios I. Die Entstehung des Byzantinischen Reiches*, Stuttgart 2010.
- MEYENDORFF J., *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions*, Crestwood–New York 1989.
- MOELLER Ch., *Le chalcedonisme et neo-chalcedonisme en Orient de 451 a la fin du VI siecle*, [in:] *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, ed. A. GRILLMEIER, R. BACHT, vol. 1, Würzburg 1951, p. 637–721.
- MORGAN R., *History of the Coptic Orthodox People and the Church of Egypt*, Victoria 2016.
- NEUNHEUSER B., *Storia della liturgia attraverso le epoche culturali*, Roma 1983 [= *Bibliotheca Ephemerides liturgicae. Subsidia*, 11].
- PIETRI CH., *La conversione: propaganda e realtà*, [in:] *Storia del Cristianesimo*, vol. II, *La nascita di una cristianità (250–432)*, ed. CH. PIETRI, L. PIETRI, Roma 2000, p. 187–223.
- RAPP C., *Imperial ideology in the making. Eusebius of Caesarea on Constantine as "Bishop"*, "The Journal of Theological Studies" 49, 1998, p. 685–695.
- TAFT R., *The Interpolation of Sanctus into the Anaphora*, 1, "Orientalia Christiana Periodica" 57, 1991, p. 281–308; 2, "Orientalia Christiana Periodica" 58, 1992, p. 83–121.
- WYBREW H., *The Orthodox liturgy. The development of the eucharistic liturgy in the Byzantine rite*, Crestwood, NY 1990.

Abstract. This article explores the political and cultural context of the riots provoked by changes in the *Trisagion* (512). Along with the advancing integration of the Byzantine Empire with Christianity, the state's interest in theological problems increased; these problems were also reflected in the liturgy. Worship was used as a tool of imperial policy. This mutual interaction between politics and liturgy can be observed particularly clearly in the history of the *Trisagion*. This hymn, in its primitive form appearing in the book of Isaiah (as the familiar *Sanctus Sanctus Sanctus*), had two interpretations from the first centuries. According to the first one, the hymn referred to God, or – with the development of theology – to the whole Holy Trinity. According to the second interpretation (probably originating from Antioch), it referred to Christ. Already in the 4th century, the *Trisagion* entered the liturgy.

In the middle of the 5th century, we encounter a new version of the *Trisagion* (known as *Sanctus Deus, Sanctus Fortis*), which was an elaboration of the above-mentioned hymn. It also found use in the liturgy and originally had a Trinitarian sense. The Monophysites, in order to give the hymn an anti-Chalcedonian sense, added to it the expression *who was crucified for us*; this makes the hymn unambiguously Christological, but it may also suggest theopaschism (all of the Trinity was crucified). In Antioch, where the *Trisagion* first appeared in that form (and where the hymn had always been interpreted as referring to Christ), this addition did not provoke protests from the Chalcedonians. However, when the Monophysite emperor Anastasius decided to introduce this version to the liturgy in Constantinople, the inhabitants of the capital – accustomed to understanding the *Trisagion* in the Trinitarian sense – interpreted the change as an offence against the Trinity. This caused the outbreak of the *Trisagion* riots (512). Not long afterwards, restoring the anthem in the version without the addition became one of the postulates of military commander Vitalian's rebellion against Anastasius. Thus, in the case under analysis, we see theology and liturgy blending with current politics; one and the same hymn could be understood as heretical in one city and as completely orthodox in another.

Keywords: *Trisagion*, liturgy, Antioch, Constantinople, Anastasius I, Monophysitism, theopaschism, state-Church relations, Ecclesiastical politics

Kazimierz Ginter

Pontificia Università della Santa Croce
Istituto di Liturgia,
Via dei Farnesi, 83, 00186 Roma
k.ginter@pusc.it

Nikolay Hrisimov (Veliko Tŕrnovo)

FOOD OF PLANT ORIGIN IN THE LIFE OF EARLY MEDIEVAL BULGARIANS (END OF 7TH – BEGINNING OF 11TH CENTURY)

Regardless of historical period or habitat, human beings have always needed food, as it is an integral part of their everyday life – whatever their social status may be. In the early Middle Ages, feeding habits in the Balkans were quite unlike those in Antiquity. This was mainly due to the rise of a new predominant population in the territory of the First Bulgarian Empire, with feeding habits markedly different from those of the local population of late Antiquity. Therefore, in order to understand what foods were consumed by the population of the Bulgarian state from the 7th to the beginning of the 11th century, one must first consider the nutritional habits of the two main components underlying the Bulgarian nation – Slavs and Bulgars. No less important is another factor – the change in the aforementioned populations' diet that occurred after the conversion to Christianity.

Concerning the Slavs' food habits, the *Strategikon of Maurice* says the following: [*The Slavs*] possess an abundance of all sorts of livestock and produce, which they store in heaps, especially common millet and Italian millet¹. On this basis, it could be argued that the Slavs subsisted on a diverse diet combining vegetable and animal elements. This information is supplemented by the *Miracles of St. Demetrius*, where it is stated that the besieged Thessalonians went with ten ships to the Belegezites inhabiting the vicinity of Thebes and Demetrius to buy some grain from them². In addition, the archaeological evidence of Slavic settlements also confirms the consumption of food of both plant and animal origin.

The diet of the Bulgars – a people with a nomadic lifestyle – mainly involved meat and dairy, just like that of any other nomadic society.

¹ *Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, XI, 4, ed. G.T. DENNIS, Vindobonae 1981 [= *CFHB*, XVII]; *Псевдомаврикий*, [in:] *FGHB*, vol. II, ed. Ив. ДУЙЧЕВ et al., София 1959, p. 281–282 and fn. 1 on p. 281. English translation quoted from: *Maurice's Strategikon. Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy*, trans. G.T. DENNIS, Philadelphia 1984, p. 120.

² P. LEMERLE, *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Demetrius et la penetration des slaves dans le Balkans*, vol. I, *Le texte*, Paris 1979, p. 203 [254].

In order to determine what the food of the population of the First Bulgarian Empire was like, it is first necessary to review the foodstuffs that were certainly familiar to the people inhabiting these lands at that time.

The present paper focuses on the food eaten by the common people of the First Bulgarian Empire. Parts of it were present on the tables of the Bulgarian aristocracy as well, but we should not forget that, in view of their financial capacities, members of the latter group were able to acquire a range of other imported items, not common in the region. Moreover, various exotic foods were probably present at the royal court, arriving *via* orders, gifts and purchases.

An examination of food of plant origin must take into the account the paleoclimatological characteristics of the region, since these determine the presence or absence of a given species³. Furthermore, an important factor for the inclusion of any food in the menu of a certain people are the latter's nutritional habits: it is possible for a food item to be exclusive to a given ethnic group, while at the same time being absent from the diet of other peoples inhabiting the same area. A prime example in this regard is the consumption of pork by Christians and its non-consumption by Muslims living in the same parts of the world simultaneously.

The following review of food items covers the entire territory of the First Bulgarian Empire. Certain areas feature specific kinds of food, which will be discussed separately. Moreover, regrettably, it must be noted that – with a few exceptions – the examination of paleobotanical samples has not been among the priorities of Bulgarian archaeologists working on objects from the period in question. As a result, the available data in this regard are remarkably scanty.

Grains

Wheat. Known in our lands since the Neolithic⁴, it has been used without interruption as a main staple crop to this day. It has been the basic raw material for the production of bread from the inception of its cultivation to modern times. Wheat is known from many finds from the early Middle Ages, both from the territory of the capitals and from other sites⁵. In the medieval period, two main varieties were used – emmer and hexaploid/durum⁶. It is characterized by high protein content and calorific value⁷.

³ This claim is based on the opinion of Associate Professor Dr. Tsvetana Popova, expressed in private communication.

⁴ Ц. ПОПОВА, *Каталог на археоботаническите останки на територията на България (1980–2008)*, ИИЗ 20–21, 2009, p. 95 onwards.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 141–142; К. КОНСТАНТИНОВ, *Храните с растителен произход на плисковската трапеза*, ТКИБ 7, 2004, p. 16–17.

⁶ Ц. ПОПОВА, *Каталог...*, p. 141–142, tabl. 2; Й. ПАНАЙОТОВ, М. МИХОВ, *Кратка характеристика на основните продоволствени и технически култури*, [in:] *Дуранкулак*, vol. I, ed. X. ТОДОРОВА, София 1989, p. 216.

⁷ J. MCCORRISTON, *Wheat*, [in:] *The Cambridge World History of Food*, vol. I, ed. K.F. KIPPLE, K.C. ORNEALS, Cambridge 2000, p. 158–159.

Rye. In the Middle Ages, rye turns out to be a very important crop for many parts of Europe⁸. Evidently it was the case in early medieval Bulgaria as well, for traces of rye were found during the excavations of the Royal Church in Preslav⁹, as well as in Pliska (by the northern gate and in the mortar of the Great Basilica¹⁰) and in the early medieval settlement on the island near Durankulak¹¹.

Millet. The cultivation of this grain – likewise used for the production of bread and known in our lands since ancient times – in the early Middle Ages is documented by paleobotanical research¹². It became widespread during the Roman period and was grown in large quantities until the mid-19th century¹³. Millet was the main raw material for the production of bread used by the poor population until maize started being cultivated in our lands. Even after the replacement of millet with maize, bread made of maize flour traditionally continued to be called *prosenik* (“millet bread”)¹⁴. Due to the nature of millet grains, this bread was markedly flaky and was therefore avoided among the aristocracy. The use of such bread had one main goal – to satisfy hunger.

Barley. Seeds of barley were found during the excavations of the early medieval settlement on the island near Durankulak¹⁵.

Spelt. Seeds of the latter were likewise found in the excavations of the early medieval settlement on the island near Durankulak¹⁶.

Rice. The presence of rice in our lands is only attested archaeologically from the 11th century onwards¹⁷. As such, it cannot be counted among food items consumed by an ordinary Bulgarian of the First Empire. But unlike the regular Bulgarian, whose diet did not include this plant, aristocrats and in particular the inhabitants of the palace were evidently familiar with rice and used it as food. This is confirmed by a reference in the early, short version of the *Romance of Alexander*, preserved as part of the *Hellenic and Roman Chronicle*¹⁸. Despite the strongly Russianized vocabulary of the text, some of the words are preserved in an unchanged

⁸ H. KÜSTER, *Rye*, [in:] *The Cambridge...*, p. 151.

⁹ Ц. ПОПОВА, *Каталог...*, p. 141.

¹⁰ К. ШКОРПИЛ, *Домашний быт и промысел*, ИРАИК 10, 1905, p. 316.

¹¹ Й. ПАНАЙОТОВ, М. МИХОВ, *Кратка характеристика...*, p. 216.

¹² Ц. ПОПОВА, *Каталог...*, p. 141–142; Й. ПАНАЙОТОВ, М. МИХОВ, *Кратка характеристика...*, p. 216.

¹³ J.M.J. DE WET, *Millets*, [in:] *The Cambridge...*, p. 118.

¹⁴ Д. МАРИНОВ, *Народна вяра и религиозни обичаи*, София 1994, p. 97.

¹⁵ Й. ПАНАЙОТОВ, М. МИХОВ, *Кратка характеристика...*, p. 216.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 216.

¹⁷ Material from the grave from the mound by the village of Vinica, near the city of Parvomay: Ц. ПОПОВА, *Каталог...*, p. 141.

¹⁸ *Летописец еллинский и римский*, vol. I, *Текст*, ed. О.В. ТВОРОГОВ, Санкт-Петербург 1999, p. 85–178.

Bulgarian version. One of such words, not subject to Russianization, is the noun *оризъ*¹⁹. Rice was presumably delivered to the royal palace from or *via* Byzantium.

Vegetables

Plants of the subfamily *Allioideae*. Here belong onion, garlic and leek. These plants, which are common on all continents of the Old World, are undemanding as regards climate conditions. Used both as staple foods and as spices in various dishes, they were apparently the only vegetables carefully distinguished from others.

The so-called *Sermon of the Interpreter* (*Слово на Тълкувателя*) makes it clear that garlic was used not only as a food item, but also for certain pagan rituals of the newly baptized Bulgarians in the time immediately following Christianization²⁰. Theophylact of Ohrid, albeit speaking of a somewhat later period, also claimed that Bulgarians used a lot of onion and garlic in their food²¹.

Widely accessible and easy to grow, these vegetables were patently widespread and used as daily food by early medieval Bulgarians. This position of the plants of the subfamily *Allioideae* apparently remained unchanged until recent times, because in folk conceptions onions, garlic or leek are treated as ready-to-eat meals²².

Bean family (*Fabaceae*). The main modern representative of this family, beans, only appeared much later, after the discovery of America. However, representatives of the family were not missing from the diet of early medieval Bulgarians. John the Exarch mentions bean plants in the *Hexameron*²³. Lentils and peas were widely grown in medieval Europe²⁴. In our country, traces of peas from the period under discussion are known from Drastar²⁵, and of lentils – from the settlement on the island near Durankulak²⁶. The consumption of broad beans is attested in Byzantium, at a later period. Apparently, the paleoclimatological optimum from that time allowed the cultivation of a more thermophilic legume – chickpeas, called

¹⁹ *Летописец еллинский и римский*, р. 142; *Словарь русского языка XI–XXVII вв.*, Москва 1987, р. 68.

²⁰ А. КАЛОЯНОВ, Т. МОЛЛОВ, *Слово на Тълкувателя – един неизползван източник за старобългарската митология*, БЕТ 28.4, 2002, р. 25–41.

²¹ И. САКЪЗОВ, *Храната на старите българи*, УМ 9.7, 1928, р. 433.

²² И. ПАВЛОВ, *Присъствия на храненето по българските земи през XV–XIX в.*, София 2001, р. 29.

²³ ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, ed., trans. Н.Ц. КОЧЕВ, София 2000, р. 122.

²⁴ Л. КАРЛАН, *Beans, Peas and Lentils*, [in:] *The Cambridge...*, р. 278–279.

²⁵ Ц. ПОПОВА, *Каталог...*, р. 142.

²⁶ Й. ПАНАЙОТОВ, М. МИХОВ, *Кратка характеристика...*, р. 218.

*slanutak*²⁷; these are mentioned as a staple food of St. John of Rila during his eremitic life in the Rila mountain²⁸.

The cruciferous family. This family includes Cabbage (known in the Balkans since the time before Christ), different varieties of turnips as well as mustard (used for the preparation of the homonymous relish)²⁹. Direct written or archaeological evidence for the consumption of these plants by the population of the Bulgarian state in the 7th–10th century is wanting; nevertheless, given their use in Byzantium³⁰, we can also suspect their presence on the Bulgarian table. Besides, it is likely that in the Old Bulgarian language the words corresponding to modern *zele* and *zлак* had collective value and designated vegetables in general³¹.

The gourd family. Although pumpkin itself was only brought from America, the table of the early medieval Bulgarian did feature certain representatives of the family. The excavations in the inner city of Pliska revealed watermelon and melon seeds in a ceramic vessel³². Whether these fruiting vegetables were part of the daily summer diet of the population of the First Bulgarian Empire is hard to say; given the location of the find, it can rather be surmised that it contained food remnants or sowing seeds associated with the palace.

Wild plants

Dock, lettuce and nettle. No direct data confirm the use of these plants as food during the period in question, but given the fact that they are frequently found and that they have long been known as food items, it is possible that they were consumed both in Bulgaria and in the Byzantine Empire³³.

Spices. It is likely that certain wild plants (still used as spices in modern times) were employed for flavoring food. These presumably included savory, thyme etc.

²⁷ Н. ГЕРОВЪ, *Речникъ на българския езикъ*, vol. V, Пловдивъ 1904, p. 190.

²⁸ И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Рилският светец и неговата обител*, София 1947, p. 102; *Стара българска литература*, vol. IV, ed. Кл. ИВАНОВА, p. 131–132.

²⁹ R.C. FIELD, *Cruciferous and Green Leafy Vegetables*, [in:] *The Cambridge...*, p. 288.

³⁰ Д. ДИМИТРОВ, *Масата събира, масата разделя: храната и храненето във Византия и различията по отношение на хранителните навици през Средновековието*, [in:] *Стандарти на всекидневието през Средновековието и Новото време*, ed. К. МУТАФОВА, Н. ХРИСТОВА, И. ИВАНОВ, Т. ГЕОРГИЕВА, Велико Търново 2012, p. 24.

³¹ I. TARNANIDIS, *The Psalter of Dimitri the Oltarnik*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, Thessaloniki 1988, p. 91–100; Б. ВЕЛЧЕВА, *Новооткрити ръкописи в Синайския манастир "Св. Екатерина"*, РВг 12.3, 1988, p. 126–129.

³² С. СТАНЧЕВ, *Разкопки и новооткрити материали в Плиска през 1948 г.*, ИАИ 20, 1955, p. 192.

³³ Д. ДИМИТРОВ, *Масата...*, p. 25.

However, the chief application of herbs (including spices) at the time was for healing purposes. Herbs were widely used for treating various diseases and wounds. This is evident from the only book of cures dating to the period in question found thus far. It is preserved on three inserted pages (f. 141 A, B and C) in the so-called *Psalter of Dimitar Oltarnik*, discovered in St. Catherine's monastery in Sinai³⁴. Among the items found there are рѣпѣи (burdock), лѡѡѡѡ (onion), корєи (root) and others.

Mushrooms. Mushrooms were probably used as food mainly by the Slavic component of the population of the Bulgarian state, because ethnic groups with a nomadic lifestyle consider this type of food repulsive³⁵. The word *gāba* (mushroom) itself, as well as the names of most individual species of fungi in Bulgarian, is of Slavic origin³⁶.

Food plants specific to particular regions

Olives. *Wood oil*, i.e. olive oil, is mentioned by John the Exarch in the *Hexameron*³⁷. Given that the period of the existence of the First Bulgarian Empire featured a paleoclimatological maximum, it can be concluded that olive trees were grown in the southern areas of the country, just as they are now in these same territories.

Fruit

Apples. This fruit was known and consumed already by Ancient Egyptians³⁸. Also in the Balkans, it is one of the most traditional fruit trees (as well as fruits), known to the ancient Greeks and Thracians. Apple is one of the fruits most frequently mentioned (besides its use a Biblical symbol) in John the Exarch's *Hexameron*³⁹.

Grapes. Vines or grapes – besides being among the earliest cultivated plants – also appear to have been one of the most commonly consumed fruits in the Middle Ages, in the form of wine. Medieval people obtained from it much of the sugar supply necessary for the organism; but on the other hand, it is known to sometimes cause serious discords and disasters. Perhaps is it due to the latter reason that khan Krum outlawed winegrowing⁴⁰. Moreover, after Christianization, wine

³⁴ I. TARNANIDIS, *The Psalter...*; Б. ВЕЛЧЕВА, *Новооткрити ръкописи...*, *passim*.

³⁵ According to the information provided by Caucasologist Prof. V.B. Kovalevskaia.

³⁶ А.С. БУДИЛОВИЧ, *Первобытные славяне в их языке, быте и понятиях по данным лексикальным*, Киев 1878, p. 85–87.

³⁷ ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, p. 231.

³⁸ Т. РОРОВА, *Archaeobotanic data about the origin of the fruit trees on the territory of Bulgaria. A view of the past*, АБу 9.1, 2005, p. 39.

³⁹ ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, p. 106, 108, 111, 129.

⁴⁰ *Свидас*, [in:] *FGHB*, vol. V, ed. Г. ЦАНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА et al., София 1964, p. 310.

became an integral part of the church ritual, symbolizing the *blood of God*. Thus, it is no accident that – just like apples – vine, grapes and wine are among the plants frequently mentioned by John the Exarch⁴¹.

Fig. This southern fruit is also frequently referred to by John the Exarch (in the *Sermon on the Third Day* in the *Hexameron*⁴²). Thanks to the paleoclimatological temperature maximum, it is possible that this tree was grown in early medieval Bulgaria; nonetheless, the possibility that fig fruit were imported from the neighbouring Byzantium for the needs of the local aristocracy should not be excluded.

Pear. Another fruit mentioned by John the Exarch as part of the plant kingdom created by God and thus clearly known to the early medieval Bulgarian⁴³.

Cherry. Is not found among the fruit trees listed by John the Exarch, but its presence in the flora surrounding early medieval Bulgarians and its culinary use by the latter population is evidenced by paleobotanical research⁴⁴. In fact, it is attested already in the earlier periods of the presence of Bulgarians on the Lower Danube.

Mulberry. Likewise not found among the fruit trees listed by John the Exarch, but again confirmed by paleobotanical analysis of early medieval archeological material⁴⁵.

The possibility should not be excluded that wild berries such as raspberries, blackberries, rosehips and others (all still found in forests of the Balkan Peninsula today) were consumed as well.

Nuts. Almonds and walnuts. These are mentioned by John the Exarch among the trees known to early medieval Bulgarians as providing edible fruit⁴⁶. Probably hazelnut was also found in wild state.

* * *

The above-mentioned varieties probably do not exhaust the full range of foods of plant origin actually consumed in medieval Bulgaria, but the written sources, supported by paleobotanical data (extremely limited for the place and period in question), yield such a picture.

The aristocracy (especially the royal court) also made use of various imported items, supplied from different regions, predominantly from the Byzantine Empire. The diversity of food of plant origin in the southern neighbour of the First

⁴¹ ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, p. 105–107, 126, 129.

⁴² ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, p. 106, 108, 111, 128.

⁴³ ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, p. 108.

⁴⁴ Ц. ПОПОВА, *Каталог...*, p. 142.

⁴⁵ Т. РОРОВА, *Archaeobotanic data...*, p. 41, table 1.

⁴⁶ ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, p. 106, 110, 127.

Bulgarian Empire is eloquently documented by the *Geoponica*, a Byzantine agricultural encyclopedia⁴⁷; additional material is provided by Simeonov's research on fruit consumption in the empire⁴⁸.

According to the claims made by the anonymous author of the vita of St. Clement of Ohrid, there were only uncultivated trees in the Bulgarian lands before the advent of the saint⁴⁹. It is plausible that the population of Slavs and Bulgars, both new to the Balkans, did not know how to cultivate fruit trees. Given the Slavs' hunter/gatherer way of life in their ancient homeland, as well as the nomadic economy of the Bulgars, there is nothing unusual in the practice being unknown to them. Thus, the author of the vita states that St. Clement of Ohrid ...*transferred from the land of the Greeks all kinds of cultivated trees*⁵⁰. This makes it possible to suggest that these cultivated species included some that were absent from Bulgarian lands at that time, but had been present here during the Roman and Byzantine Ages. This would apply to peaches, apricots, plums, etc.⁵¹

Based on the frequency of references to different kinds of crops in the *Farmer's Laws* – one of the first Byzantine laws to be translated and implemented in the Bulgarian state – it could be argued that the primary focus of the Bulgarian farmer in the period following Christianization was on fields with cereal crops (of various kinds) and vineyards. Fruit trees and their cultivation remained somewhat peripheral to the interests of both the farmers themselves and those who caused damage to them⁵².

* * *

Not a single recipe for a dish or a drink from the period under discussion has survived to our time, but based on certain indirect evidence an attempt may be made to reconstruct some of them.

Food from cereals

After being harvested, crops were threshed with threshing boards⁵³ and grain was stored in pots specially made for this purpose, or more usually in pits dug out

⁴⁷ *Геопоники. Византийская сельскохозяйственная энциклопедия X века*, ed., trans. Е.Э. Липшиц, Москва–Ленинград 1960.

⁴⁸ G. SIMEONOV, *Obst in Byzanz. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Ernährung im östlichen Mittelmeerraum*, Saarbrücken 2013.

⁴⁹ Ц. КРИСТАНОВ, И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Естествознанието в средновековна България*, София 1954, p. 52–53.

⁵⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 52–53.

⁵¹ Т. РОРОВА, *Archaeobotanic data...*, p. 41, table 1; ЕАДЕМ, *Каталог...*, p. 133–141.

⁵² *Земеделски закон*, [in:] *FGHB*, vol. III, ed. Ив. ДУЙЧЕВ et al., София 1960, p. 209–220.

⁵³ Michael the Syrian informs us about the use of threshing boards, but for purposes quite different from threshing, by emperor Nicephorus I during his stay in the Bulgarian capital in 811. He recounts

in the floor of the house. Storing cereals in pots is a tradition inherited from Antiquity; its application should be ascribed to influence from the Byzantine Empire or to related local traditions. This practice, requiring the production of special grain storage vessels, was more labour-consuming, but also provided better storage for the grain. Pottery finds show that this method of storing grain was typical of palace centres⁵⁴ as well as aristocratic homes and monastery complexes.

Ordinary people in Bulgaria in the 7th–10th century kept their grain reserves at home or outside in special pits. Considering the small size of these pits and the fact that the necessary supply of grains for a family of at least four people is significantly larger than the amount that would fit into such a pit, it can be assumed that only short-term reserves of grain were stored in this way. Most probably, settlements included separate structures used as barns (recalling the *horrea* known from late antique settlements) where common stocks of cereal foods could be stored.

Bread and cereal foods. Since prehistoric times, bread in its many varieties has been one of humanity's basic foodstuffs, irrespective of differences pertaining to class or wealth.

Before it can be turned into bread, grain first needs to be ground into flour. Depending on their social status, the various classes of society consumed bread of different quality and composition; probably, aristocracy ate wheat bread, while the bread of ordinary people was made of flour obtained from wheat mixed with other grains (rye, barley, oats, millet), or from yet different grain crops. The situation regarding the distribution of bread was similar in the neighbouring Byzantium⁵⁵.

Grinding grain into flour was done in mills. Animal-driven mills were likely used, known since Antiquity. Besides, an innovation appeared during the period under discussion – watermills⁵⁶. The existence of these two types of mills is well documented in the *Farmer's Laws*⁵⁷. The only prerequisite for the construction of a mill was for it to be placed on a level ground. A watermill, on the other hand, had to be built on a deep or swiftly-flowing river that could drive the waterwheel, no matter whether the latter was positioned horizontally or vertically. The suggestion that watermills may have been located on the Asar-dere and generally in Pliska⁵⁸ is too daring and unprovable, given the extremely low flow rates of this and the surrounding rivulets as well as their seasonal nature.

that the atrocities of the emperor went as far as ordering the use of threshing boards for crushing small children. *Vide: Chronique de Michel le Syrien patriarch jacobite d'Antioch 1166–1199*, ed. J.-B. СНАВОТ, vol. III, Paris 1905, p. 17.

⁵⁴ See, for example, such pots found in Pliska: С. СТАНЧЕВ, *Разкопки...*, p. 191, fig. 10.

⁵⁵ Д. ДИМИТРОВ, *Масага...*, p. 22–23.

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 22.

⁵⁷ *Земеделски закон*, p. 219–220.

⁵⁸ К. КОНСТАНТИНОВ, *Храните...*, p. 19.

While the above-mentioned two ways of grinding grain are only documented by written sources, the use of the most primitive method of grinding grain – with quern-stones – is attested archaeologically both in the palace complex of Pliska⁵⁹ and in the inner city⁶⁰, as well as in other settlements of the First Bulgarian Empire⁶¹. In view of the small size and weight of these quern-stones, the grain was ground quite coarsely, yielding an output rather similar to fine groats. In order to achieve a finer grain, it was probably necessary to pass it through the quern-stones several times.

For obtaining fine flour free of husks, the palace complex and the monastery near the Great Basilica in Pliska used large stone mortars in accordance with the ancient tradition⁶². In this technique, the grain is wetted and crushed with a hammer in the mortar in order to remove the husks.

The Old Bulgarian word *бръшно* denotes *food, something to eat*⁶³. Based on this broader meaning of the word, one could try to connect it with other possibilities of the culinary use of grains. For example, the easiest way of preparing ready-to-eat food out of grain is by boiling it. This is the oldest, least labour-consuming and quickest way of cooking cereals suitable for human consumption. Grain (or groats obtained from it by grinding with quern-stones or crushing) could be cooked into a kind of porridge or into a drier form. The resulting product could be consumed on its own, seasoned with spices, or alongside meat, etc. It is precisely grain cooked into porridge that was the main food of Romans in the period of the Kingdom, for which reason they were called *porridge-boilers* by surrounding tribes⁶⁴. Another variant of porridge, but one prepared from rice – pilaf – was the

⁵⁹ Т. МИХАЙЛОВА, *Сгради и съоръжения на запад от Тронната палата в Плиска. X–XI в.*, [in:] *Плиска – Преслав*, vol. V, ed. Р. РАШЕВ, Шумен 1993, p. 170–184.

⁶⁰ Л. ДОНЧЕВА-ПЕТКОВА, *Сгради при южния сектор на западната крепостна стена на Плиска*, [in:] *Плиска – Преслав*, vol. V, p. 133, fig. 27.

⁶¹ С. МИХАЙЛОВ, Г. ДЖИНГОВ, В. ВЪЛОВ, В. ДИМОВА, *Ранносредновековно селище при с. Стърмен*, [in:] *Разкопки и проучвания*, vol. VII, София 1982, p. 17 (fig. 3, 8, 9, 10), p. 26, fig. 18–20; Х. ТОДОРОВА, *Архитектурата на средновековното селище*, [in:] *Дуранкулак...*, p. 45–48, fig. 12, 13.

⁶² К. ШКОРПИЛ, *Домашный быт...*, p. 307; П. ГЕОРГИЕВ, С. ВИТЛЯНОВ, *Архиепископията – манастир в Плиска*, София 2001, p. 145, fig. 77.

⁶³ *Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI вв.)*, ed. Э. БЛАГОВА, Р.М. ЦЕЙТЛИН, Р. ВЕЧЕРКА, Москва 1994, p. 101; М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, *Покаяната книжнина на Българското средновековие IX–XVIII в.*, София 2011, p. 72. As for the opinion expressed by К. Maksimovich, according to which the word is a “Moravism”, it obviously cannot be deemed correct, since all words previously defined by him as “Moravisms” have turned out to be of South Slavic origin. On the native origin of all of Maksimovich’s “Moravisms” cf. Р. СТАНКОВ, *О лексических моравизмах в древних славянских рукописях*. 3, *ПКШ* 10, 2008, p. 40–71. Moreover, Tsibranska-Kostova has located the word in question in the so-called *Tsarkovno skazanie (Church Legend)* – a text translated (possibly by Constantine of Preslav) into Old Bulgarian during the reign of Simeon – which may in fact completely invalidate Maksimovich’s claims. *Vide*: М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, *Покаяната книжнина...*, p. 73.

⁶⁴ М.Е. СЕРГЕЕНКО, *Ремесленники Древнего Рима*, Ленинград 1968, p. 5–7 (and the sources cited therein).

main food of the Ottomans in the 15th–19th century; couscous fulfilled a similar role for the Bedouins. A remnant of this way of eating in traditional Bulgarian cuisine is the *kolivo* – boiled wheat. According to Dimitar Marinov, not a single vow or rite (related to religion, death etc.) could be performed without the *kolivo*. On par with bread, it was subject to great religious reverence⁶⁵. The link between boiled wheat and religious rite shows the great conservatism of this food and demonstrates once again that it is the predecessor of bread, playing an important role in the religious beliefs of our people.

Also related to the above-mentioned wide use of grain pulps as a staple food of the Bulgarians in the early Middle Ages is the distribution of quern-stones and their use in the settlements of the First Bulgarian Empire. As has been mentioned here already, in Pliska and some other settlements (Starmen, Durankulak) the existence of specific complexes with quern-stone grounds on which grain was milled has been well documented. In some other settlements, quern-stones have not been found at all⁶⁶. In yet different ones – some of which are identifiable as Slavic (Popina, Garvan, Kladentsi, Huma)⁶⁷ – fragments of quern-stones or whole quern-stones have been found, but not on quern-stone grounds and not used for the original purpose in the households. Instead, they were utilized as construction material, as well-carved stones. Basically, parts of quern-stones were used as furnace walls within dwellings⁶⁸ or for shaping the area in front of the furnace⁶⁹. The finding place of other quern-stone pieces discovered within houses is not specified⁷⁰. Vazharova explicitly states that only fragments were found, not whole quern-stones⁷¹.

The above unambiguously indicates that the quern-stones discovered in these Slavic and Slavic-Bulgar settlements were not used for their original purpose, i.e.

⁶⁵ Д. МАРИНОВ, *Народна вяра...*, p. 96, 716.

⁶⁶ В. ЙОТОВ, Г. АТАНАСОВ, *Скала. Крепост от X–XI в. до с. Кладенци, Тервелско*, София 1998; Т. ТОТЕВ, *Средновековна Виница*, Шумен 1996.

⁶⁷ Ж. ВЪЖАРОВА, *Славянски и славянобългарски селища в българските земи от края на VI–XI в.*, София 1965, p. 105; ЕАДЕМ, *Средновековното селище с. Гарван, Силистренски окръг VI–XI в.*, София 1986, p. 60–61; С. ВАКЛИНОВ, С. СТАНИЛОВ, *Кладенци ранносредновековно българско селище*, София 1981; Р. РАШЕВ, С. СТАНИЛОВ, *Старобългарското укрепено селище при с. Хума, Разградски окръг*, [in:] *Разкопки и проучвания*, vol. XVII, София 1987.

⁶⁸ Ж. ВЪЖАРОВА, *Славянски и славянобългарски селища...*, p. 105 (dwellings № 48, 55 and the three furnaces at dig XIII); ЕАДЕМ, *Средновековното селище...*, p. 99 (dwelling № 22), 100 (dwelling № 25), 131 (dwelling № 60), 140 (dwelling № 70), 164 (dwelling № 95), 166 (furnace under dwelling № 96); С. ВАКЛИНОВ, С. СТАНИЛОВ, *Кладенци...*, p. 19 (dwelling № III).

⁶⁹ Ж. ВЪЖАРОВА, *Славянски и славянобългарски селища...*, p. 21 (dwelling № 6); ЕАДЕМ, *Средновековното селище...*, p. 115 (dwelling № 42), 133 (dwelling № 63), 136 (dwelling № 66), 140 (dwelling № 70), 162 (dwelling № 92), 173 (dwelling № 102).

⁷⁰ Ж. ВЪЖАРОВА, *Средновековното селище...*; Р. РАШЕВ, С. СТАНИЛОВ, *Старобългарското укрепено селище...*, p. 32–33 (dwellings № 15, 16).

⁷¹ Ж. ВЪЖАРОВА, *Средновековното селище...*, p. 60.

for grinding grain into flour, but rather as handy building material (*spolia*), found near the settlement⁷².

Grain porridges, whether consumed only with seasoning or in conjunction with meat, constitute a nutritious food, a kind of bundle of bread and main dish. It takes less time to prepare than bread combined with another separate dish and requires much less effort and skill. In an age when quantity (or the very presence) of food was far more important than taste qualities, it was an essential circumstance. The consumption of porridges by the population of early medieval Bulgaria is mentioned by John the Exarch⁷³.

The above considerations on the status of quern-stones and the ways of consuming cereals are in full accord with the observations by Balabanov, who discovered quern-stones during the excavation of a settlement in the southwest corner of the outer city of Pliska. The fragments of quern-stones found at this site are made of hard sedimentary limestone with very large pores (up to 1 cm)⁷⁴. According to him, such quern-stones would not have been suitable even for grinding kibble; they must have served chiefly for removing husks from grains. These grains, which were merely husked, were not suitable for making bread, but could only serve for the preparation of a crude porridge⁷⁵. Subsequently, the author comes to the same conclusions as reached here, observing that the main food of the ordinary population of early medieval Bulgaria was comprised of various kinds of porridge.

For the group of villages where quern-stone platforms were found together with obvious traces of their use it can be claimed with confidence that their residents used and made bread. More interesting is the other group of settlements, where quern-stones have never been found or where they were used for purposes quite different from the original ones. This group includes settlements certainly identified as Slavic – Garvan and Popina, which is blatantly incompatible with the notion that Slavs were traditional producers and consumers of bread⁷⁶.

As regards the baking of bread, it is generally assumed that special ceramic pans were used, such as traditionally found in Slavic settlements; ethnographic parallels with the so-called *podnitsa* (a traditional earthenware vessel) have been pointed out⁷⁷. This parallel with the *podnitsa* is dubious, however; technologically,

⁷² As a rule, settlements from the time of the First Bulgarian Empire were established on top of earlier ones from Thracian or Roman times.

⁷³ ЙОАН ЕКЗАРХ, *Шестоднев*, p. 108.

⁷⁴ Т. БАЛАБАНОВ, *Селище в югозападната част на Външния град на Плиска*, [in:] *Плиска – Преслав*, vol. X, ed. P. РАШЕВ, Варна 2004, p. 156.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁶ F. CURTA, *The Making of Slavs. History and Archaeology of Lower Danube Region, c. 500–700*, Cambridge 2001, p. 295–297.

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 295; В. БАВИЋ, *Срепунја, срепна, podnica – posebno značajan oslonac za atribuciju srednjovekovnih arheoloških nalazišta Balkanskog poluostrva Slovenima poreklom sa istoka*, [in:] *Materijali IX. Simpozijum srednjovekovne sekcije Arheološkog društva Jugoslavije*, Belgrade 1972, p. 101–123; С. ВРИОНИС, *Славянското общество на Балканите*, София 1999, p. 68–69.

the manufacturing of Slavic cooking pans and that of the *podnitsa* are quite dissimilar. Cooking pans were products of pottery workshops, the same ones that produced the other major ceramic form typical for the Slavs – pots. The same composition of clay and an identical way of firing was employed for the production of both cooking pans and pots⁷⁸.

Unlike cooking pans, which were part of the output of pottery workshops, *podnitsas* were – according to data from popular culture – invariably the products of the work of each individual family. They were obligatorily made on the feast day of St. Jeremiah, and on that day only. Clay was brought and mixed by the younger girls and brides of the family, along with those of the whole village; this process was universally accompanied by ritual songs and dances. Then, back at home, the mixed clay was delivered into the hands of the older (and hence more skilled) women; they molded the *podnitsa* and the *vrashnik* (a cone-shaped object used as a cover) for the family and left them to dry in the sun⁷⁹. The production of the *podnitsa* concludes at this stage; after drying, the *podnitsa* is ready for baking bread. If exposed to poor weather conditions for a longer time, it begins to crumble.

The common ritual songs and dances that accompanied the collecting and mixing of clay reveal the archaism of this ritual. This is further confirmed by the fact that each family prepared their *podnitsa* individually. Marinov emphasizes that the production of the *podnitsa* was only taken over by professional potters toward the end of the 19th century⁸⁰.

In view of the above-mentioned differences in the technology of making Slavic cooking pans on the one hand and the *podnitsa* on the other hand, it could be argued that these cooking pans had a different purpose than what has been thought so far, i.e. baking bread⁸¹. Note that one more compulsory element of the ethnographic picture of bread production is missing in these cooking pans: the *vrashnik*⁸². This is yet another argument against the theory postulating a relationship between early medieval cooking pans and the *podnitsa*.

Nonetheless, *podnitsas* from the times of the First Bulgarian Empire do exist; but they are static. They have been found in close proximity to the above-mentioned quern-stone equipment. Other objects found nearby typically include furnaces for baking bread⁸³. These complexes can already be connected with bread production with a high degree of certainty.

⁷⁸ On clay composition and firing methods in both types of vessels *vide*: И.П. РУСАНОВА, *Славянские древности VI–VII вв.*, Москва 1976.

⁷⁹ Д. МАРИНОВ, *Народна вяра...*, p. 192, 625–626.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 625–626.

⁸¹ F. CURTA, *The Making...*, p. 295; С. ВРИОНИС, *Славянското общество...*, p. 68–69 – who cites a study by Babić published in 1977.

⁸² Д. МАРИНОВ, *Народна вяра...*, p. 625–626.

⁸³ Т. МИХАЙЛОВА, *Сради...*, p. 170–184, fig. 3, 9, 17, 18, 19; С. МИХАЙЛОВ, Г. ДЖИНГОВ, В. ВЪЛОВ, В. ДИМОВА, *Ранносредновековно селище...*, p. 84, fig. 14, 16; А. МИЛЧЕВ, *Материали, открити*

Bread consumption may be associated with different population groups, but not categories. Thus, the population can be grouped in two highly distinct parts according to the way grains were used: consumed in the form of bread or as porridge. Whether these groups can be associated with particular regions or some other characteristics would have to be determined by future (more specific) research.

What kind of bread was produced and consumed in pagan early medieval Bulgaria – leavened or unleavened – can only be guessed at. Following the adoption of Christianity as the official religion through Constantinople, the consumption of unleavened bread was hardly possible⁸⁴, except in the short period of time when papal missionaries were present. The alleged use of both types of bread, and especially the prevalence of unleavened over leavened, are unprovable conjectures⁸⁵.

Concerning the method and stages of the preparation of bread, nothing definite can be said. The ethnographically attested use of rolling pins does not automatically entail their presence and application in the early Middle Ages, contrary to the opinion of Konstantinov⁸⁶. The first mention of them – and at the same time the earliest information about them – only dates back to the Ottoman era. Rolling pins are associated with the making of *banitsa* (a type of traditional filo pastry), on which there is no information dating back to the Middle Ages; again, evidence for this type of pastry only comes to light in Ottoman times⁸⁷.

Thus, bread was baked in the above-mentioned *podnitsa* or on ante-furnace platforms within the housing. In both cases it was necessary to preheat these spaces using embers. After a certain temperature was achieved, the embers were removed and the bread was put inside in their place for baking⁸⁸. The variant suggested by Konstantinov, involving baking the bread over the hot embers, is out of the question⁸⁹. Putting the bread directly on the embers would merely have led to the burning of the dough; no bread could ever be obtained in this way.

Apart from the *podnitsa*, bread was also baked in furnaces, much larger than the standard ones used for heating the house⁹⁰.

в занаятчийските и търговските помещения северно от Южната порта на Вътрешния град, [in:] *Плиска – Преслав*, vol. I, ed. Д. АНГЕЛОВ, Ж. ВЪЖАРОВА, София 1979, p. 150–155, fig. 41; Т. БАЛАБАНОВ, *Селище...*, p. 141, fig. 33/6.

⁸⁴ Д. ДИМИТРОВ, *Масата...*, p. 23.

⁸⁵ К. КОНСТАНТИНОВ, *Храните...*, p. 19.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 20.

⁸⁷ И. ПАВЛОВ, *Присъствия...*, p. 16.

⁸⁸ The author's own observations.

⁸⁹ К. КОНСТАНТИНОВ, *Храните...*, p. 20.

⁹⁰ *Vide*: Г. ДЖИНГОВ, *Археологически проучвания във Вътрешния град на Плиска*, [in:] *Плиска – Преслав*, vol. V, p. 111–113, fig. 7.

Apparently, the emergence and consolidation of bread as a staple food of the Bulgarians should be dated to the time of Byzantine rule, as it occurred under Byzantine influence. In the 12th century, Gregory Antiochus wrote about several different types of bread among the Bulgarians, the most common being the one with ashes sticking to it⁹¹, i.e. bread baked in a *podnitsa* or in the ante-furnace space (as described above).

In view of the above comparison concerning the way of making bread and porridge from grains and added meat, as well as the adduced examples confirming the fact that certain “classic” peoples that created empires used porridges as their staple food, it can be claimed that the population of the First Bulgarian Empire subsisted predominantly on porridges.

There was no reason for this way of preparing the staple food not to be preserved until the times following Christianization. It was repeatedly pointed out above that the porridge obtained after boiling could be prepared both with and without meat. Moreover, the plants from the bean family – lentils, broad beans, peas and chickpeas (all well-known to – and widely used by – the population of the First Bulgarian Empire), are also convenient and could be used to make porridges and soups as they still are now. Besides, next to the salty variants, these porridges can easily be made sweet through the addition of fruit or honey.

Vegetables in food. Vegetables – the separate kinds of which were few in number and rarely explicitly distinguished – were collectively referred to as *zele* (i.e., the word now meaning *cabbage* in Bulgarian). They were probably used both as sides accompanying other meals and as separate dishes. John the Exarch’s alleged reference to garlic being cooked, purportedly present in older translations of his *Hexameron* and baffling scholars such as Trifonov⁹², has proved false and has been subsequently corrected.

Fruit. In the seasons when various fruits ripen, they were picked and consumed fresh or as a supplement to other foods. In late autumn, winter and early spring, the population made use of fruit dried during the warm parts of the year; these were consumed directly or in the form of a stew or compote. Items that could be used for this purpose included apples, pears, grapes and figs. It is probable that certain spices were also preserved and used in this same way.

* * *

⁹¹ J. DARROUZES, *Deux lettres de Gregoire Antiochos ecrites de Bulgarie vers 1173*, Bsl 23.2, 1963, p. 280, 283; Григорий Антиох, [in:] FGHB, vol. VII, ed. Г. ЦАНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА et al., София 1968, p. 266; Г. ЦАНКОВА-ПЕТКОВА, П. ТИВЧЕВ, *Нови данни за историята на Софийската област през последните десетилетия на византийското владичество*, ИИИ 14/15, 1964, p. 315–324.

⁹² Ю. ТРИФОНОВЪ, *Сведения изъ старобългарския животъ в Шестоднева на Йоана Екзарха*, СБАН 35, 1926, p. 17–18; К. КОНСТАНТИНОВ, *Храните...*, p. 22.

According to our scarce data, food of plant origin in the diet of an ordinary early medieval Bulgarian was characterized by simplicity and modest variety, reduced to the bare essentials. The resulting picture enables the assertion that the basis of the diet was comprised of porridge made of grains, diversified and supplemented with vegetables, fruit and meat.

A wide variety of fruits and vegetables whose existence or use in the period of the First Bulgarian Empire is not supported by any direct proof may perhaps be implicitly posited for the diet of the early medieval Bulgarian, in view of their being well-documented in the neighboring Byzantium.

Bibliography

Sources

- Chronique de Michel le Syrien patriarch jacobite d'Antioch 1166–1199*, ed. J.-B. CHABOT, vol. III, Paris 1905.
- Geoponiki. Vizantijskaja seliskochozjajstvennaja ènciklopedija X veka*, ed., trans. E.È. LIPŠIĆ, Moskva–Leningrad 1960.
- Grigorij Antioh*, [in:] *FGHB*, vol. VII, ed. G. CANKOVA-PETKOVA et al., Sofija 1968, p. 264–272.
- JOAN EKZARH, *Šestodnevi*, ed., trans. N.C. KOČEV, Sofija 2000.
- Letopiseć ellinskij i rimskij*, vol. I, *Tekst*, ed. O.V. TVOROGOV, Sankt-Peterburg 1999.
- Maurice's Strategikon. Handbook of Byzantine Military Strategy*, trans. G.T. DENNIS, Philadelphia 1984.
- Psevdomavrikij*, [in:] *FGHB*, vol. II, ed. IV. DUJČEV et al., Sofija 1959, p. 273–290.
- Stara bālgarska literatura*, vol. IV, ed. KL. IVANOVA, Sofija 1986.
- Svidas*, [in:] *FGHB*, vol. V, ed. G. CANKOVA-PETKOVA et al., Sofija 1964, p. 308–310.
- Das Strategikon des Maurikios*, ed. G.T. DENNIS, Vindobonae 1981 [= *Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae*, 17].
- Zemedelski zakon*, [in:] *FGHB*, vol. III, ed. IV. DUJČEV et al., Sofija 1960, p. 209–220.

Secondary Literature

- BABIĆ B., *Crepulja, crepna, podnica–posebno značajan oslonac za atribuciju srednjovekovnih arheoloških nalazišta Balkanskog poluostrva Slovenima poreklom sa istoka*, [in:] *Materijali IX. Simpozijum srednjevekovne sekcije Arheološkog društva Jugoslavije*, Belgrade 1972, p. 101–123.
- BALABANOV T., *Selište v jugozapadnata čast na Vāšnija grad na Pliska*, [in:] *Pliska – Preslav*, vol. X, ed. R. RAŠEV, Varna 2004, p. 101–166.
- BUDILOVIĆ A.S., *Pervobytnye slavjane v ich jazyke, byte i ponjatijach po dannym leksikal'nym*, Kiev 1878.
- CANKOVA-PETKOVA G., TIVČEV P., *Novi dannii za istorijata na Sofijskata oblast prez poslednite desetilelija na vizantijskoto vladičestvo*, “Известия на Института за Историја” / “Izvestija na Institutata za Istorija” 14/15, 1964, p. 315–324.

- CIBRANSKA-KOSTOVA M., *Pokajnata knižnina na Bălgarskoto srednovekovie IX–XVIII v.*, Sofija 2011.
- CURTA F., *The Making of Slavs. History and Archaeology of Lower Danube Region, c. 500–700.*, Cambridge 2001.
- DARROUZES J., *Deux lettres de Gregoire Antiochos ecrites de Bulgarie vers 1173*, “Byzantinoslavica. Revue internationale des études byzantines” 23.2, 1963, p. 276–284.
- DE WET J.M.J., *Millets*, [in:] *The Cambridge World History of Food*, vol. I, ed. K.F. KIPLE, K.C. ORNEALS, Cambridge 2000, p. 112–121.
- DIMITROV D., *Masata săbira, masata razdelja: hranata i hraneneto vāv Vizantija i različitajata po otnošenie na hranitelnite navici prez Srednovekovieto*, [in:] *Standarti na vsekidnevieto prez Srednovekovieto i Novoto vreme*, ed. K. MUTAFOVA, N. HRISTOVA, I. IVANOV, G. GEORGIEVA, Veliko Tărnovo 2012, p. 21–32.
- DONČEVA-PETKOVA L., *Sgradi pri južnija sektor na zapadnata krepostna stena na Pliska*, [in:] *Pliska – Preslav*, vol. V, ed. R. RAŠEV, Šumen 1993, p. 124–145.
- DUJČEV I., *Rilskijat svetec na negovata obitel*, Sofija 1947.
- DŽINGOV G., *Arheologičeski proučvanija vāv Vătrešnija grad na Pliska*, [in:] *Pliska – Preslav*, vol. V, ed. R. RAŠEV, Šumen 1993, p. 105–123.
- FIELD R.C., *Cruciferous and Green Leafy Vegetables*, [in:] *The Cambridge World History of Food*, vol. I, ed. K.F. KIPLE, K.C. ORNEALS, Cambridge 2000, p. 288–298.
- GEORGIEV P., VITLIJANOV S., *Arhiepiskopijata – manastir v Pliska*, Sofija 2001.
- GEROV N., *Rečnikă na bălgarskija ezikă*, vol. V, Plovdiv 1904.
- JOTOV V., ATANASOV G., *Skala. Krepost ot X–XI v. do s. Kladenci*, Tervelsko, Sofija 1998.
- KALOJANOV A., MOLLOV T., *Slovo na Tălkuvatelja – edin neizpolzvan iztočnik za starobălgarskata mitologija*, “Bălgarska etnologija” / “Bălgarska etnologija” 28.4, 2002, p. 25–41.
- KAPLAN L., *Beans, Peas and Lentils*, [in:] *The Cambridge World History of Food*, vol. I, ed. K.F. KIPLE, K.C. ORNEALS, Cambridge 2000, p. 271–281.
- KONSTANTINOV K., *Hranite s rastitelen proizvod na pliskovskata trapeza*, “Трудове на катедрите по история и богословие” / “Трудове на катедрите по istorija i bogoslovie” 7, 2004, p. 16–24.
- KRISTANOV C., DUJČEV I., *Estestvoznaniето v srednovekovna Bălgarija*, Sofija 1954.
- KÜSTER H., *Rye*, [in:] *The Cambridge World History of Food*, vol. I, ed. K.F. KIPLE, K.C. ORNEALS, Cambridge 2000, p. 149–152.
- LEMERLE P., *Les plus anciens recueils des miracles de saint Demetrius et la penetration des slaves dans le Balkans*, vol. I, *Le texte*, Paris 1979.
- MARINOV D., *Narodna vjara i religiozni običaji*, Sofija 1994.
- MCCORRISTON J., *Wheat*, [in:] *The Cambridge World History of Food*, vol. I, ed. K.F. KIPLE, K.C. ORNEALS, Cambridge 2000, p. 158–174.
- MIHAJLOV S., DŽINGOV G., VĂLOV V., DIMOVA V., *Rannosrednovekovno selište pri s. Stărmen*, [in:] *Razkopki i proučvanija*, vol. VII, Sofija 1982.
- MIHAJLOVA T., *Sgradi i săorăženija na zapad ot Tronnata palata v Pliska. X–XI v.*, [in:] *Pliska – Preslav*, vol. V, ed. R. RAŠEV, Šumen 1993, p. 170–184.
- MILČEV A., *Materiali, otkriti v zanajatčijskrite i tărgovskrite pomeštenija severno ot Južnata porta na Vătrešnija grad*, [in:] *Pliska – Preslav*, vol. I, ed. D. ANGELOV, Ž. VĂŽAROVA, Sofija 1979, p. 139–175.
- PANAJOTOV J., MIHOV M., *Kratka karakteristika na osnovnite prodovolstveni i tehničeski kulturi*, [in:] *Durankulak*, vol. I, ed. H. TODOROVA, Sofija 1989, p. 213–222.

- PAVLOV I., *Prisästvija na hraneneto po bälgarskite zemi prez XV–XIX v.*, Sofija 2001.
- POPOVA T., *Archaeobotanic data about the origin of the fruit trees on the territory of Bulgaria. A view of the past*, "Archaeologia Bulgarica" 9.1, 2005, p. 37–45.
- POPOVA C., *Katalog na arheobotaničeskite ostanki na teritorijata na Bälgarija (1980–2008)*, "Интердисциплинарни изследвания" / "Interdisciplinarni izsledvanija" 20/21, 2009, p. 71–166.
- RAŠEV R., STANILOV S., *Starobälgarskoto ukrepno selište pri s. Huma, Razgradski okräg*, [in:] *Razkopki i proučvanija*, vol. XVII, Sofija 1987.
- RUSANOVA I.P., *Slavjanskije drevnosti VI–VII vv.*, Moskva 1976.
- SAKÄZOV I., *Hranata na starite bälgari*, "Учителска мисъл" / "Učitel'ska misälä" 9.7, 1928, p. 429–437.
- SERGEENKO M.E., *Remeslenniki Drevnego Rima*, Leningrad 1968.
- SIMEONOV G., *Obst in Byzanz. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Ernährung im östlichen Mittelmeerraum*, Saarbrücken 2013.
- Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XXVII vv.*, Moskva 1987.
- STANČEV S., *Razkopki i novootkriti materiali v Pliska prez 1948 g.*, "Известия на Археологическия институт" / "Izvestija na Arheologičeskija institut" 20, 1955, p. 183–227.
- STANKOV R., *O leksičeskich moravizmach v drevnich slavjanskich rukopisjach*. 3, "Преславска книжовна школа" / "Preslav'ska knižovna škola" 10, 2008, p. 40–71.
- Staroslavjanskij slovar' (po rukopisjam X–XI vv.)*, ed. È. BLAGOVA, R.M. SEJTLIN, R. VEČERKA, Moskva 1994.
- ŠKORPIK K., *Domašnyj byt i promysel*, "Известия русского археологического института в Константинополе" / "Izvestija russkogo archeologičeskogo instituta v Konstantinopole" 10, 1905, p. 301–317.
- TARNANIDIS I., *The Psalter of Dimitri the Oltarnik*, [in:] IDEM, *The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, Thessaloniki 1988, p. 91–100.
- TODOROVA H., *Arhitekturatata na srednovkovnoto selište*, [in:] *Durankulak*, vol. I, ed. H. TODOROVA, Sofija 1989, p. 29–109.
- TOTEV T., *Srednovkovna Vinica*, Šumen 1996.
- TRIFONOV Ju., *Svedenija iz starobälgarskija život v Šestodneva na Joana Ekzarha*, "Списание на Българската академия на науките" / "Spisanie na Bälgarskata akademija na naukite" 35, 1926, p. 1–26.
- VAKLINOV S., STANILOV S., *Kladenci rannosrednovkovno bälgarsko selište*, Sofija 1981.
- VÄŽAROVA Ž., *Slavjanski i slavjanobälgarski selišta v bälgarskite zemi ot kraja na VI–XI v.*, Sofija 1965.
- VÄŽAROVA Ž., *Srednovkovnoto selište s. Garvan, Silistrenski okräg VI–XI v.*, Sofija 1986.
- VELČEVA B., *Novootkriti räkopisi v Sinajskija manastir "Sv. Ekaterina"*, "Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика" 12.3, 1988, p. 126–129.
- VRIONIS S., *Slavjanskoto obštestvo na Balkanite*, Sofija 1999.

Abstract. The article surveys the available data on food of plant origin used in the period of the First Bulgarian Empire. The information is based on written sources and paleobotanical data, which show the presence of diverse plants used for food. It is also evident that these data are rather scarce compared to those from Byzantium. No food recipes have survived from this period, but there is some secondary evidence allowing the reconstruction of some foods. It suggests that grain porridges, rather than bread, were the main food.

Keywords: First Bulgarian Empire, food, vegetables, grains, fruits, sources, palaeobotanics, Porridge, bread and bread making

Nikolay Hrisimov

Chair of Ancient and Medieval History

Faculty of History

“St. Cyril and St. Methodius” University of Veliko Tarnovo

2 Teodosiy Tarnovski Str.

5000 Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria

hrisimov@gmail.com

Amir Kapetanović (Zagreb)

LANGUAGES AND THEIR REGISTERS IN MEDIEVAL CROATIAN CULTURE*

1. Introduction

1.1. The *lingua vernacula* and other languages. The area between the Drava, the Danube and the Adriatic Sea, where the ancestors of the Croats settled in the early Middle Ages, was located at the intersection of the Latin and Greek cultures. Of the languages spoken in the area, the one that left the most traces in Slavic was the Romance idiom of Dalmatia (known as the Dalmatian or Dalmatic language); its variants existed along the Eastern coast of the Adriatic side by side with Croatian (until the 15th cent. in Dubrovnik, and until as late as the 19th cent. on Krk). A number of Dalmatian words entered the literary texts composed by Croatian writers of the relevant period, e.g. *kelomna* ('pillar', Nalješković) or *močira* ('stone wall', Marulić)¹.

The Latin tongue established itself among the ancestors of the Croats as the language of liturgy, law, diplomacy and literature. From the late 9th or early 10th cent. onwards, however, it finds itself in competition with literary Church Slavic in the domains of liturgy and literature. Constituting part of the *Pax Slavia Latina*, the ethnic territory of Croatia saw significant Latin-Slavic bilingualism during the Middle Ages². Next to these two languages, the living Common Slavic speech also existed within the Croatian community, giving rise to all three dialects of Croatian (Čakavian, Štokavian and Kajkavian) towards the end of the 11th cent. Old Croatian, with assorted dialectal characteristics, proved itself worthy of a literary language already in the Middle Ages: *Very early on, the lingua vernacula won over its rights, and if we value medieval Croatian literature for its democratic spirit, its popular character, its horizontal orientation, it is primarily due to its language, and only secondarily – or at most in parallel – due to its thematic directions*³.

* The present article was written as part of the project entitled DOCINEC (2698 *Documentation and Interpretation of the Earliest Croatian*) with financial support from the Croatian Science Foundation (HRZZ).

¹ In the subsequent periods, Croatian was – to a certain degree – influenced by contacts with various other non-Slavic languages (Italian, German, Hungarian, Turkish), depending on region and time.

² M. MIHALJEVIĆ, *Položaj crkvenoslavenskoga jezika u hrvatskoj srednjovjekovnoj kulturi*, [in:] *Zbornik na trudovi od Megjunarodniot naučen sober* [Ohrid, 4.–7.11.2010], ed. I. VELEV, A. GIREVSKI, L. MAKARIOSKA, I. PIPERKOSKI, K. MOKROVA, Skopje 2011, p. 229–238.

³ E. HERCIGONJA, *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, Zagreb 1975, p. 30.

1.2. The Slavic languages in medieval Croatian linguistic culture: *diglossia/triglossia*. The interrelations of Church Slavic and Old Croatian were rather dynamic and quite intricate. The *Vienna Folia* (11th–12th cent.), a Glagolitic manuscript containing fragments of the Sacramentary, are considered to be the earliest text written in the Croatian recension of Church Slavic⁴. Old Croatian, with an array of dialectal bases, was used in everyday life (in the family, in the company of acquaintances and friends, at work) as well as, undoubtedly, in the unrecorded medieval oral literature⁵. The co-existence of Church Slavic and Old Croatian constituted an instance of *diglossia*⁶.

From the 14th cent. onwards, the contact between Church Slavic and Old Croatian in the sphere of the literary language led to their blending, giving rise to a third idiom – a hybrid variety of the literary language (Cr. *kontaktni/hibridni jezičnoknjiževni varijetet*). This language was not subject to a strict norm: the realization of the Church Slavic and Old Croatian components was conditioned by

⁴ The influence of Croatian on Church Slavic in this text is visible primarily in the area of phonological developments (*/y/ > /i/* [*věki < věky*], */q/ > /u/* [*vъsuda < vъsoda*], */e/ > /e/* [*pametъ < pametъ*]).

⁵ The contemporary conception of medieval Croatian literature, and of language use at that time, is significantly distorted due to its being based solely on currently extant literary texts. The actual complexity of the situation can be gleaned from testimonies like the one in Šižgorić's *De situ Illyriae et civitate Sibenici* (1487): the work mentions a wide variety of poetic forms completely absent from surviving medieval Croatian poetry (funeral songs, love songs, workers' and shepherds' songs, Christmas songs, dancing songs).

⁶ The literature on *diglossia* is vast (cf., for instance, the survey of literature up to 1990 in: M. FERNÁNDEZ, *Diglossia. A Comprehensive Bibliography 1960–1999 and supplements*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 1993). Apart from the classic works by Ferguson (Ch.A. FERGUSON, *Diglossia*, *Wo* 15, 1959, p. 325–340) and Fishman (J.A. FISHMAN, *Bilingualism with and without diglossia, diglossia with and without bilingualism*, *JSI* 23.2, 1993, p. 29–38), it is necessary to take into account certain works dealing with *diglossia* in the Slavic world, particularly in Rus', e.g. В.А. УСПЕНСКИЙ, *Диглоссия и двуязычие в истории русского литературного языка*, *IJSLP* 27, 1983, p. 81–126; Г. ХЮТЛЬ-ФОЛЬТЕР, *Диглоссия в Древней Руси*, *WSJ* 24, 1978, p. 108–123; D.S. WORTH, *On diglossia in Medieval Russia*, *WS* 23, 1978, p. 371–393; K.-D. SEEMANN, *Die 'Diglossie' und die Systeme der sprachlichen Kommunikation im alten Russland*, [in:] *Slavistische Studien zum IX. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Kiev*, Köln–Wien 1983, p. 553–561; G. THOMAS, *The Role of Diglossia in the Development of the Slavonic Literary Languages*, *SR* 37, 1989, p. 273–282; И.С. УЛУХАНОВ, *О языке Древней Руси*, Москва 1972. For a critique of Uspenskij's theory, cf. М.И. ШАПЕР, *Теория "церковнославянско-русской диглоссии" и ее сторонники. По поводу книги Б.А. Успенского "История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)"*, *RLin* 13.3, 1989, p. 271–309. For the purposes of the present work, and the study of the linguistic situation in medieval Croatia in general, it is impossible to employ Tolstoj's model of the 'genre pyramid': the latter was designed for the *Pax Slavia Orthodoxa* and is not suitable for the *Pax Slavia Latina*. Tolstoj himself addresses the issue as follows: *Код Словена који су спадали у други културни ареал Pax Slavia Latina била је другачија културна-књижевна хијерархија (Among those Slavs who belonged to the other cultural area, the Pax Slavia Latina, there existed a different cultural/literary hierarchy)*. Н.И. ТОЛСТОЈ, *Однос старог српског књишког језика према старом словенском језику (У вези са развојем жанрова у старој српској књижевности)*, *NSSVD* 8.1, 1982, p. 18.

a number of factors, such as genre, content, aims and target audience. In this way, in the late medieval period, the Church Slavic/Old Croatian *diglossia* transformed into an instance of *triglossia*⁷. Accordingly, the new hybrid variety of the literary language occupies a position on par with Church Slavic and Old Croatian as such. In view of these complex and shifting relations among the two or three similar, closely related languages, the attribution of a given text to one of them is bound to pose problems.

1.3. Determining the proportion of each Slavic language. A set of linguistic criteria for the division of texts into Church Slavic and Old Croatian has been proposed by Anica Nazor⁸. We find a description of some of the pivotal linguistic traits in her study on the 15th cent. *Ivančić Miscellany*. Concluding her investigations, Nazor states:

The linguistic analysis of the *Ivančić Miscellany* shows that this text cannot be considered as Church Slavic in its entirety, since some of its parts (*Treatise on the seven deadly sins, Exodus, Confession*) are almost fully based on living speech, while certain others (*Contemplation, Words of life [and] salvation, Sermon on love, Explanation of the mass, Words from the teachings of the holy fathers, Questions and answers, Blessing of the table*, but also *Miracles of Virgin Mary*) largely have that basis too. Only one-third of the *Ivančić Miscellany* comprises texts that retain Church Slavic linguistic traits (two epistles on Saint Jerome, *Miracles of Mary Magdalene*, the prayers: St. Augustine, St. Mary, Mother of God of Seven Joys, Blessed Bede, St. Thomas, Pope Clement, Blessed Bernard).⁹

Disregarding the fact that some of the criteria established by Nazor could be contested from the standpoint of modern scholarship¹⁰, her findings remain

⁷ M. MIHALJEVIĆ, *Položaj...*, *passim*.

⁸ A. NAZOR, *Jezični kriteriji pri određivanju donje granice crkvenoslavenskog jezika u hrvatskoglagoljskim tekstovima (Prilog diskusiji o problemima crkvenoslavenskog thesaurusa)*, Slo 13, 1983, p. 68–86. The consideration of the issue has led to the rise of certain practical questions, e.g. whether all or only some texts from the Glagolitic miscellany should be included in the corpus on which the dictionary of Croatian Church Slavic would be based.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 85.

¹⁰ Although Nazor's analysis leads her to the correct conclusions, today we could dispute the validity of some of her criteria. For example, the forms of the Church Slavic conditional mood (*bim, biš...*) do not diverge from the typical Čakavian paradigm. The reflex /e/ > /a/ is not consistent in the Čakavian dialects, so that its absence (respectively, the reflex /e/ > /e/) cannot be considered an indicator of a lower share of Čakavian traits. Besides, the dichotomy *Church Slavic–Old Croatian* does not constitute a relationship *literary–colloquial* or *older–younger* (cf., for example, the treatment of texts with *čvto* instead of *ča* as older). The basic fallacy in older Croatian philological literature consists in the claim that the Croatian language emerged as a result of long-term influence of the spoken language on Church Slavic (Old Croatian was recognized as a language of literature already in medieval times!) and that Old Croatian developed from Church Slavic. Thus, for example, in the introduction to her work, Nazor writes (A. NAZOR, *Jezični kriteriji...*, p. 68) that Old Croatian and Church Slavic coexisted throughout the entire medieval period and got to intertwine in many texts;

highly valuable. The language of the Glagolitic miscellany cannot be analyzed as a monolith – every text requires a separate investigation: *each part of the miscellany is, from the linguistic point of view, a problem in itself, which therefore has to be solved individually*¹¹.

In recent times, the Slavic idioms of medieval Croatian texts have been studied by Stjepan Damjanović. According to his theory, the basic language of the *Baška tablet* is Church Slavic, and not Old Croatian, as claimed by virtually all earlier philologists¹². However, a new study¹³ draws attention to the fact that all analogical epigraphic and legal texts were written in Old Croatian; moreover, most of the linguistic material of the *Baška tablet* may be analyzed as belonging to both idioms (all the same, the text is too short to warrant a conclusion based on statistics). The concept of a Church Slavicized popular language has also been proposed – an occasional (irregular) blend of two Slavic linguistic systems existing in a state of *diglossia*. This amalgam is a product of conscious effort: the author introduces Church Slavic elements in order to enable the Old Croatian language to achieve the same level of expressivity that is inherent in donation documents written in Latin and in other legal documents composed in accordance with the *ars dictandi*¹⁴.

1.4. Division of the languages. The distribution of the relevant languages corresponding to the three functional styles was described by Damjanović as follows: *Liturgical and legal texts stand on opposite sides as regards the use of Croatian and Croatian Church Slavic. [...] However, there are also belletristic texts among them, their language by no means as predictable and invariant*¹⁵. Developing this position, Mihaljević speaks of two distinct periods. During the first one (11th–14th cent.), Church Slavic:

nevertheless, further (p. 70) we read that *the Church Slavic linguistic core started to erode more and more, to finally transform into a vernacular one*. For certain similar positions, cf. the recent survey of Croatian linguistic history: R. KATIČIĆ, *Hrvatski jezik*, Zagreb 2013, p. 47–58.

Conservative writers retained a larger proportion of Church Slavic elements, especially in those texts that were more related closely to Church matters or those which they wished to make more elegant in style. Even this, however, cannot be the basis for an *a priori* conclusion that the texts in question must be old. Besides, in the work under discussion, Nazor only uses her criteria to classify texts as Church Slavic or vernacular; the notion of the ‘hybrid language’ had not yet entered scholarly debate at the time when the study was written.

¹¹ A. NAZOR, *Jezični kriteriji...*, p. 69.

¹² S. DAMJANOVIĆ, *Jezik hrvatskih glagoljaša*, Zagreb 2008.

¹³ A. KAPETANOVIĆ, *Reflections of Church Slavonic-Croatian diglossia on the Baška tablet: a new contribution concerning its language and linguistic layers*, ZSl 60.3, 2015, p. 335–365.

¹⁴ E.R. CURTIUS, *Evropska književnost i latinsko srednjovjekovlje*, trans. S. MARKUŠ, ed. T. LADAN, Zagreb 1971; J. STIPIŠIĆ, *Pomoćne povijesne znanosti u teoriji i praksi*, Zagreb 1972; A. STAMAĆ, ‘Bašćanska ploča’ kao književno djelo, Cro 26/28, 1987, p. 17–27.

¹⁵ S. DAMJANOVIĆ, *Jezik...*, p. 36.

played the role of the literary language. This was the language in which both liturgical and non-liturgical literary works were written, which, unfortunately, only survive in fragments [...] The colloquial Croatian (Čakavian) language only gets to be written as dictated by everyday, practical necessity: in legal texts, epigraphy, graffiti, colophons and rubrics of liturgical books, as well as in notes on the margins of manuscripts. [...] Latin fulfils all the functions peculiar to a literary language: it is the language of liturgy, literature and business dealings. The functions of Church Slavic and Čakavian are clearly distributed, the two idioms complementing each other [that is, Church Slavic is the language of liturgy and literature, while Čakavian functions as the language of the law – A.K.].¹⁶

In the third quarter of the 14th cent., Mihaljević claims, the situation changes due to the emergence of the hybrid language (Čakavian-Church Slavic) and the transformation of the Slavic *diglossia* into the state of *triglossia*. Latin and Church Slavic are employed in liturgy; literature is the domain of Latin and the hybrid language, occasionally also Čakavian; legal texts are composed in Latin and in Čakavian. In this connection, Mihaljević observes:

This hybrid type of language is primarily used in belletristic works. From the beginning of the 15th cent. onwards, Čakavian and Church Slavic are further joined by Kajkavian elements. [...] Church Slavic elements, usually stylistically marked, are much more widespread in the biblical context; however, the exchange of Church Slavic, Kajkavian and Čakavian features may have a purely stylistic function – aimed at avoiding repetitions and making the narrative more dynamic and interesting.¹⁷

The *Baška tablet* is not the only text to have spawned theoretical and classification-related questions. For instance, it remains unclear how the Čakavian and Štokavian lectionaries from the 15th and early 16th centuries (e.g. the *Lectionary of Bernardin of Split* or the *Lectionary of Nikša Ranjina*) should be categorized, since scholars have not considered the possibility of liturgical texts (such as lectionaries) being written in Old Croatian. Such examples draw our attention to the necessity of a more fine-grained analysis of the linguistic situation in the Middle Ages. Damjanović goes even further and asks the question (left without a definitive and unambiguous answer): are Croatian Church Slavic, the hybrid language and Old Croatian (*functional*) styles of the same language? If so, which one? Or are we dealing with three separate languages?¹⁸

Later in the study, we shall likewise address the issue of the stratification of the linguistic reality in the Middle Ages. However, we shall choose a somewhat different approach than our predecessors. We will attempt to analyze the linguistic situation of medieval Croatia employing the concept of three registers¹⁹ (high, middle

¹⁶ M. MIHALJEVIĆ, *Položaj...*, p. 230.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 231.

¹⁸ S. DAMJANOVIĆ, *Jezik...*, p. 24.

¹⁹ Idioms whose use is conditioned by the functional situation are called registers (D. BIBER, *Dimensions of register variation: a cross-linguistic comparison*, Cambridge 1995, p. 7; *Sociolinguistic per-*

and low). These registers were inherited from the old arts of rhetoric²⁰ and poetics and were held in high esteem in the Middle Ages. Such an investigation would allow us to reach certain conclusions regarding the use of the three idioms in various functions in the speech community. Regrettably, however, no study of this sort has been undertaken so far, in spite of the long-apparent need for a fundamental investigation of medieval Croatian stylistics²¹.

2. The Slavic *triglossia* and the three registers

2.1. Low (colloquial) register. Today, it is difficult to say exactly how Croats expressed themselves in their everyday life in the Middle Ages. We may claim with certainty that Church Slavic was the language of books and it was only spoken to a limited extent in liturgy. Consequently, it should be assumed that the Old

spectives on register, ed. D. BIBER, E. FINEGAN, New York 1994, p. 3-4; Ch.A. FERGUSON, *Dialect, register, and genre: working assumptions about conventionalization*, [in:] *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register...*, p. 16; A. WILLI, *The Languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*, Oxford 2003, p. 8). The term 'register' seems more correct than 'style', since "styles are not necessarily defined by a situation: it is possible to speak of the 'style' of an author or of a literary epoch" (A. WILLI, *The Languages...*, p. 8]. Besides, the term 'register' needs to be distinguished from the term 'genre', because a "'register' is the linguistic code that is used in the creation of a text that belongs to a 'genre'". The meaning of the linguistic term 'register' is close to the one used in music (a set of sounds that are formed in a like manner and have a common timbre). Nevertheless, many linguists use the terms 'style' and 'register' completely indiscriminately. This needs to be emphasized particularly due to the fact that a special tradition of the use of the term 'register' exists in Russian-language scholarly literature. In this connection, our conception of this term follows neither Tolstoj (for whom the term had two meanings: 1. 'corpus of texts', 2. 'list of linguistic differences', cf. Н.И. ТОЛСТОЙ, *Однос...*, p. 17, 23) nor Živov (who uses the theory of register to replace the theory of *diglossia*, cf. В.М. ЖИВОВ, *Язык и культура в России XVIII в.*, Москва 1996). ŽIVOV (В.М. ЖИВОВ, *Язык...*, p. 39) distinguishes the standard register (characteristic of the religious sphere and high culture) and the hybrid register (characteristic of the lay sphere and low culture). On the other hand, we discriminate among three registers (high – literary and (para)-liturgical; middle – legal and business-related; low – colloquial), relating them to the three languages (respectively: Church Slavic, the hybrid variety, and Old Croatian), used in various literary genres (respectively: Biblical books and lectionaries; statutes and documents; passing remarks on the margins of codices, inscriptions related to everyday life).

²⁰ No information on any Croatian rhetorician or any original Croatian rhetoric work from the Middle Ages has survived to our time. Rhetoric as such falls outside the scope of the present work; that being said, we need to acknowledge the fact that medieval literature generally followed the division into three registers known from ancient rhetoric. We would not like to project certain contemporary (usually more complex) classifications onto the medieval situation.

²¹ A new study on stylistics is called for by Hercigonja, e.g. in the following fragment: *One should appreciate this effort on the part of medieval Croatian writers to make their message easily, clearly and vividly interpretable, to place it at an appropriate level of literary culture, i.e. the conception of the communicatively functional, aesthetic and expressive language of their works, of new ways of communicating old topics. Future systematic research on syntax and stylistics will uncover the true image of this Glagolitic tradition of ours and reveal where its weaknesses – as well as its merits – are located.* E. HERCIGONJA, *Nad iskonom hrvatske knjige. Rasprave o hrvatskoglagoljskom srednjovjekovlju*, Zagreb 1983, p. 439.

Croatian vernacular speech (Cr. *vernakular*) permeated all social classes, as the instrument of everyday interaction and the vehicle of oral/popular literature. Thus, it was realized primarily *via* oral communication. As far as written texts are concerned, the colloquial (or low-register) language is typical of incidental, marginal notes and of texts of a practical nature:

(1) B(ož)e! To pisa Petar pop Panceta kada staše Barbane kalonih 1447. meseca oktembra dni 16²².

(2) Se pisa Kirin žakan, Bog mu pomagaj i sa vsimi ki budu va nje peti, amen. V ime Božje amen, let gospodnjih 1359., kada te knjigi biše pisani i dopisaše se v svetom Kuzmi i Damjani v Senji.²³

(3) Jebi ga vrag, amen!²⁴

(4) Kušah kako pero piše²⁵.

(5) Va ime Božje i svete Marije amen! Kada umri blaženi muž papa Martin na 12 dan miseca pervara ki dan slnce pomrče [...] Va toj vrime pride Isak vojevoda s Turci i porobi Vlahe i Hrvate. Tu zimu pozeboše masline i vse smokve. Pšenica pogibe i ina žita pogiboše. Malo kadi sime osta i bi do zime velik glad [...].²⁶

(6) Ot kače, koga uji: Prekriži krstom, omočiv ga v seru, ka je v uhi desnom, zada omaži, kadi je rana, i ne će otok moć više [...] Koga uji zmija, ali ki ti pově, r'ci da stoji s mirom, i okruži mu okolu nogi desne i vzdigni nogu i piši ove rěči: karo karuce, karo in kruce, sanom reducet, – imreducet, sanom Imanuel Paraklitus, – omo (= homo) vivens, serpens morietur † v ime † Oca † i Sina † i Duha † Svetoga † amen†.²⁷

²² Transcr. A.K. following: B. Fučić, *Glagoljski natpisi*, Zagreb 1982, p. 38: *O God! This was written by Petar pop Panceta while he was canon in Barban in the year 1447, in the month of October, on the 16th day.*

²³ Colophon of the *Lobkowitz Psalter*, 1395: *This was written by deacon Kirin, God help him, along with all those who will sing beside him, amen. In the name of God, amen, in the year of our Lord 1359, when this book was written and completed in [the church of] St. Cosmas and Damian in Senj.*

²⁴ Code slave 11, 14th cent.: *May the devil screw him, amen!*

²⁵ HAZU archive, manuscript IVd 55, 10b, 15th cent. *Hrvatska književnost srednjega vijeka. Od XII. do XVI. stoljeća*, ed. V. ŠTEFANIĆ, B. GRABAR, A. NAZOR, M. PANTELIĆ, Zagreb 1969, p. 169: *I was trying out the pen.*

²⁶ HAZU archive, Fragm. Glag. 32/a, 15th cent., transcr. A.K. following: V. ŠTEFANIĆ, *Glagoljski rukopisi Jugoslavenske akademije, I dio: Uvod, Biblija, apokrifi i legende, liturgijski tekstovi, egzorcizmi i zapisi, molitvenici, teologija, crkveni govori (homiletika), pjesme*, Zagreb 1969, p. 109: *In the name of God and Saint Mary amen! When the blessed lord pope Martin died on the 12th day of the month of February, on which day the sun got dimmed [...]. At that time, duke Isaak came with the Turks and subdued the Vlachs and the Croats. That winter, all olive and fig trees froze. Wheat perished and other crops perished. Grain remained barely anywhere and there was great hunger until the [next] winter.*

²⁷ HAZU archive, manuscript IVd 55, 14th cent., transcr. A.K. following: R. STROHAL, *Folkloristički prilozi iz starije hrvatske knjige, ZNŽOJS 15.1, 1910*, p. 127: *On the snake [and the person] whom it bit: Cross yourself with the cross, having dipped it in wax which is in the right ear, smear from the back, where the wound is, and there will be no edema [...]. Who was bitten by a snake, tell him to stand calm and make a circle around his right leg, and lift the leg, and spell the following words: karo karuce, karo in kruce, sanom reducet, – imreducet, sanom Imanuel Paraklitus, – omo [= homo] vivens, serpens morietur, † in the name of † the Father † and Son † and the Holy Ghost † amen.*

In the above-mentioned examples, we are dealing with secular events and topics (irrespective of the invocations of God, the devil, the Holy Trinity as well as the use of the lexeme *amen*), which is a crucial feature of the colloquial register.

Furthermore, this register is characterized by spontaneity and the absence of restraining factors in discourse structuring (for instance, the vulgarism *jebati* ‘screw, *futuere*’, *sera* [< *srati*] ‘earwax’); the Italian borrowings *kalonih* [‘canon’], *oktembar* [‘october’], mocking nickname *Panceta* [‘bacon’]).

Apart from graffiti (1), this register covers complex colophons (2), obscene expressions (3), everyday-life comments (4), expressions that recount certain (past) events in a vivid, brief and spontaneous way (5) as well as clear, concrete advice on how to heal or read spells (6). The latter type is further characterized by the presence of corrupt Latin expressions²⁸.

In connection with the first example, it should be noted that the spontaneous language of graffiti is fundamentally distinct from the language of inscriptions, on which Fučić comments as follows: *Behind each graffito – as opposed to inscriptions – is only one person. He is at the same time the initiator and the executor. A graffito is a special instance of writing, created without grand preparations; it results from the impulse of the moment and as such it is usually affectively tinged*²⁹. Still, in order to achieve a more precise classification of medieval Croatian texts, it is necessary to note that not all graffiti are written in Old Croatian – even if at times produced spontaneously, as a reaction to events or scenes presented in a church fresco. There exists a type of graffiti containing Biblical quotations or paraphrases written in Church Slavic³⁰; cf.:

(7) Sveti tvoji vradujut!³¹

(8) Govori prorok se děva v čřěvě³².

On the other hand, certain characteristics of the register under discussion may also be discovered in the middle register. In administrative and legal texts, for example, we find instances of direct speech that reflect communication belonging to the low register. Consider the following fragment:

(9) V tom špan počē govoriti: “**Hod’te simo, sudci!**” i počē ih pripravljati. V tom rekoše sudci: “**Dobro sliši, pristave i vi plemeniti ljudi, kih je godi totu Bog prnesal: Ča smo sudili,**

²⁸ There existed certain Latin curses, e.g. M. BARADA, *Tabella plumbea Traguriensis*, VAMZ 16.1, 1935, p. 11–18; P. GUBERINA, *Tabella plumbea Sisciensis*, NVj 45, 1936–1937, p. 4–23.

²⁹ B. FUČIĆ, *Glagoljski natpisi...*, p. 20.

³⁰ On this cf. J. REINHART, *Biblijski citati na hrvatskoglagoljskim natpisima*, [in:] *Az grišni diak Branko pridivkom Fučić*, ed. T. GALOVIĆ, Malinska–Rijeka–Zagreb 2011, p. 445–456.

³¹ Transcr. A.K. following: B. FUČIĆ, *Glagoljski natpisi...*, p. 195: [Let] *your saints rejoice* (Ps. 149:5).

³² Transcr. A.K. following: B. FUČIĆ, *Glagoljski natpisi...*, p. 135: *The prophet says: behold, a virgin in the womb [will conceive and give birth to a son]* (Is. 7:14).

sudismo, i ne pačamo se va tu vodu!” V tom toga idoše Mišljenovići i s ljudi i s španom na suplotje Grgino i neĝa bratje. I poča ih Grga ustavlĝati s svojimi pravi pored s bratju, pravi ke imaše do našega stola, i listi kraļa Lauša i kraļice Marije [...]. I totu reće knez Juraj Mišljenović: **“Usrani su ti listi!”**³³

In poems written in the high register, e.g. in the mystery entitled *The Passion of our Savior* (11a–11b), we encounter a dialogue which – owing to the manner of expression and choice of words – is reminiscent of a scene of daily bargaining in the market:

(10) Tu Magd(a)l(e)na, kad dojde k spicijaru, reci:
Toj pomasti ča je cina,
da ne bude mej nami hina?

Spicijar reci:
Toj pomasti cinu stavĝu,
trista dukat ja vam pravĝu.

Magd(a)lena oĝledavši pom(a)st, reci specijaru:
Ova pomast, ča mi se mni,
prijateĝu, vridna to ni.
Zato rec' mi sada, brajne,
ča ju oćeš dat najmañe.

Specijar reci:
Odpušćam vam od te cine
jedan dukat ja od mañe.

Magdalena reci:
Vele s' tanak stanovito,
sam dobro znaš: vridna ni to,
da pokle diš, neć' inako,
kako s' rekal, budi tako.

Spicijar reci:
Prisežu vam verom na to,
niš' je otil dati za to,
kupili je niste drago
zač je vridna vsako blago.

³³ Transcr. A.K. following: E. HERCIGONJA, *Srednjovjekovna književnost...*, p. 405: *Then the lord [= feudal master] started speaking: “Come here, judges!” and started preparing them. Then the judges said: “Well, listen, clerks, and you, noble people, all whom God brought here: What we have judged, we have judged, and we are not meddling with this anymore!”. Then the Mišljenovići went with the people and with the lord to the shelter of Grga and his brothers. And Grga together with his brothers started stopping them with their documents – documents that they had received from our curia, and letters from king Lauš and queen Marija [...]. And here [= then] king Juraj Mišljenović said: “Screw these letters!”.*

Magd(a)lena pinezi dajući reci:
 Na t' dukate, da t' je broju,
 da na targu već ne stoju.³⁴

2.2. Middle (moderate) register. The middle register covers the intermediate sphere of language use between the two extremes – the high and low register. It should be noted that the middle register, which constitutes a variety of Old Croatian, cannot be equated with the hybrid literary language. The surviving examples of written language (and the unrecorded spoken language) of this register were characterized by the pursuit of clarity, distinctness and integrity. Here belong legal, administrative and business-related texts. Put differently, this was the language of work and administration, spanning documents from wills through account books to military orders. We are not dealing with relaxed interaction with friends or acquaintances, but rather with public communication; its aim is, primarily, to inform or consult partners, clients, associates etc. The discourse of this register strives for formality and an official tone.

To exemplify this register, we shall, first of all, adduce fragments from three legal documents – from the famous Cyrillic *Charter of Povelja* (1250), a Glagolitic document from Lika (1433) and a Cyrillic will. The language of the *Charter of Povelja* is rather archaic, containing Church Slavisms. On the other hand, the latter are absent from the chronologically later Glagolitic document and Cyrillic will, where the language is generally more innovative.

(11) Az Blasi, slišav od piskupa Mikule, od kneza Vlaščina, od župana Čeprnie, od sudje Luke **potvrjaju i ukkladaju ruku moju**³⁵.

(12) Mi Antol Ivković i Ivan Herendić, knezi vlaški, Paval vojvoda i sutci vlaški po imeni Dijan Mušković [...] i vsi dobri Vlasi svete krune krajevstva ugarskoga v Hrvatih damo viditi

³⁴ A. KAPETANOVIĆ, D. MALIĆ, K. ŠTRKALJ DESPOT, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno pjesništvo: pjesme, plačevi i prikazanja na starohrvatskom jeziku*, Zagreb 2010, p. 632–633: Here [= then] Magdalena, as she approaches the doctor [pharmacist], says: / What is the price of this ointment, / so that there is no deceit between us? / The doctor says: / On this ointment I put the price / of three hundred ducats, I'm telling you. / Taking a look at the ointment, Magdalena says to the doctor: / This ointment, it seems to me, / my friend, is not worth this much. / So, tell me, brother, / what is the least for which you are ready to give it to me. / The doctor says: / I will lower the price for you / by one ducat. / Magdalena says: / You are most stingy, / and you yourself know very well that it is not worth this much, / but if you are saying that it won't be otherwise, / let it be as you said. / The doctor says: / I swear by my faith that / I did not want to sell it – / and you did not buy it – for an excessive price, / because it is worth a fortune. / Magdalena, giving him the money, says: / Here are your ducats, let me count them for you, / so that I do not need to stand in the market anymore.

³⁵ D. MALIĆ, *Povaljska listina kao jezični spomenik*, Zagreb 1988: I, Blaž, hearing from bishop Mikula [= Nicholas], prince Vlaščin, župan Čeprnja, judge Luka, confirm and lay my hand.

vsim kim se dostoji **pred kih obraz ta naš list pride** da učinismo slobodščinu vsemu iminju svetoga Ivana crikve v Lici na Gori³⁶.

(13) Va ime Božje. Amen. Ja Radoslav, sin Vladisava Radišića, bude **zdrav u pameti**, a **nemoćan u puti**, nadije se odstupiti od sega svita i činu **poslidni taštamenat**³⁷.

Among the linguistic traits typical of the moderate (middle) register, reflected in the fragments presented above, we should point out elements of official jargon such as *pred obraz list prići* ('bring to someone's attention'), idiomatic expressions such as *učiniti slobodščinu* ('free'), *zdrav u pameti*, *nemoćan u puti* ('of sound mind but weak body'), as well as pleonasms and synonyms such as *potvrjati* and *ukladati ruku* ('confirm').

The register under discussion also covers regulations (laws and normative acts) issued by religious convents and other communities (e.g., brotherhoods). As an example of texts of this kind, we may mention the rule of the Benedictine Order (*Rule of Saint Benedict*), the regulations concerning the admission of nuns from Zadar into the Dominican Order (*Order and Rules of the Dominican Nuns of Zadar*), the rule of the Franciscan Order (*Constitution of the Third Order of Franciscans*) as well as a fragment from the rule of a brotherhood from Baška:

(14) Prazdnost je neprijatelj duši i zato na vrmena narejena dlžni **sut** bratja i rukama dčlati, a na druge godine čtite svete knjige. I tako mnimo pravadno narediti 2 vrmeni: to jest jamše ot Vazma do **kalendi** oktobra izjutra po primi dari do **terce**, a čto jest potriba delajte, a po terci i po misi budite do **šekste** v čten'ji. A po šeksti obėdvajte, a po obėdi vstavše počivajte vsaki vi svojej postilji tvrdim mlkom. Ako li ki hoće čisti v svojej postelji, tako čti, da druga ne budi.³⁸

(15) I svršena molitva. **Ustanet** se žena ona i postaviti ruke svoje meju ruke **prijure** i družih sestara. I tako jima reći ona žena: "V ruke vaše priporučuju dušu i tilo moje." I ovo jima reći trikrat ona žena: "V ruke vaše..." I **odgovoret** vse sestre i reku: "Primi tebe Isukarst, spasitelj segaj mora, i postavi na desnu pristolja slave svoje! I mi tebe veseleći se prijmemo u družbu

³⁶ Transcr. A.K. following: J. VONČINA, *Četiri glagoljske isprave iz Like*, RstI 2, 1955, p. 217–218: *We, Anton Ivković and Ivan Herendić, Vlach princes, duke Paval and Vlach judges by the name of Dijan Mušković [...] and all good Vlachs of the holy crown of the Kingdom of Hungary in Croatia, bring to the attention of all whom this letter of ours shall reach that we have done everything to free the property of St. Ivan by the church in Lika na Gori.*

³⁷ Transcr. A.K. following: S. Ivšić, *Hrvatski ćiriliski testament Radoslavca Vladišića iz god. 1436. u prijepisu iz god. 1448*, ČHP 1.1/2, 1943, p. 86: *In the name of God, amen. I, Radoslav, the son of Vladislav Radišić, of sound mind but weak body, hoping to leave this world, am preparing my last will.*

³⁸ *Hrvatska književnost...*, p. 103: *Idleness is an enemy of the soul and, therefore, brothers should do manual work during the indicated time, while at other times, you should read holy books. Thus, it is necessary to distinguish two times of the day: accordingly, in the period from Easter until the beginning of October, starting at one hour [in the early morning, around 6–7 o'clock] until three hours [around 9 o'clock] — work, and after three hours and the mass, occupy yourselves with reading until six hours [noon]. Afterwards, dine, and following dinner, rest — each of you in your own bed, in strict silence. If someone wishes to read in their bed, let him read, but so as not to disturb others.*

svetu i skrušenu našu i dilnicu činimo naših molitav, mis, psalam, pisan i petja, svetoga **žežinanja**, pripovidanja i vsakoga dobrog a sveto[ga] našega činjenja i mojenja duhovnoga, pojuci i veseleći se u sarcah naših Gospodinu Bogu.”³⁹

(16) 38. kapitul: Ki bi govoril za stolom brez prošćen’ja kada se obedva ali vičera, tomu pokora: ne dajte mu vino piti on dan za onim jidēn’jem. Ako bi potom toga brez prošćen’ja govoril blagajući, pokora mu jedna **dišiplina**. Potom toga ako veće krat prěstupi tu zapovid, imij mu se ta pokora **duplati**.⁴⁰

(17) Ot računa, kako **kaštaldi** imu dati. 13. [kapitul]. Budući bratija na kup, stvoret račun ot vsega ča su prijali i stratili. I vsagda brez protivu dlžni budite na račun ča Bog da da prebiva, prikazivati i ne mozite nigdare pinez brašćinskih nikomure zajati brez videnija opata i inih.⁴¹

The language of the first example (14) is characterized by linguistic archaisms and the use of multiple Church Slavisms. In each section of the text, they serve primarily to underscore the learned environment in which the text was created, as well as to indicate that it is a copy based on an old translation. The number of Church Slavisms in the remaining sample texts is not overly large; for example, the morphological Church Slavism *-t* (3rd person present) in the *Order and Rules of the Dominican Nuns of Zadar* reflects the tendency to distinguish the text stylistically against the backdrop of the everyday Chakavian dialect. Aside from the presence of Church Slavisms (to a lesser or greater extent), the language of this register is characterized by the influence of assorted kinds of Romance terminology (differing from text to text): *terca*, *šeksta*, *kalenda*, *prijur*, *psalam*, *žežinjanje*, *dišiplina*, *kaštald*, etc.

The middle register also comprises laws (legal acts) and charters of certain municipalities. The language in which these texts are composed features Old Croatian – or even Proto-Slavic – terminology (*svidok* ‘witness’, *kmetić*

³⁹ *Najstariji hrvatski latinički spomenici (do sredine 15. stoljeća)*, ed. D. MALIĆ, Zagreb 2004, p. 4: *The prayer is finished. And that woman rises and places her hands between the hands of the prioress and of the other nuns. And that woman says the following: “Into your hands I am entrusting my soul and my body”. And that woman says the following three times: “Into your hands...”. And all the nuns answer her, saying: “May Jesus Christ, the savior of this sea, accept you and place you at the right hand of the throne of his glory! And, rejoicing, we are accepting you into our holy and humble community, and we are making you a fellow participant of our prayers, masses, psalms, songs and chants, holy fasting, sermons and all our good and holy deeds and spiritual prayers; we are singing and rejoicing in our Lord God in our hearts”.*

⁴⁰ *Hrvatska književnost...*, p. 108: Chapter 38. *Who speaks at the table without asking during the time of dinner or supper, receives penance: do not allow him to drink wine during those meals on that day. And if, after that, he speaks without asking during the meal, let him receive punishment [beating]. Subsequently, if he violates this ban multiple times, let him receive double punishment.*

⁴¹ Transcr. A.K. following: I. MILČETIĆ, *Prilozi za literaturu hrvatskih glagoljskih spomenika. II. Zakon brašćine svetoga duha u Baški*, Star 25, 1892, p. 146: *On the report that the administrators need to file. [Chapter] 13. Having gathered, the brothers should calculate all they received and spent. And you should always indicate everything that God gave, without quarreling; and never lend the brotherhood’s money without the knowledge of the abbot and others.*

‘disenfranchised servant’), with the discourse clearly structured by the syntax (*if someone..., whoever...*). We shall illustrate this type of text with the following fragment of the *Poljica Statute*:

(18) Osud za psost. Tko bi opsovao svoga druga listo budi gdi hoćeš prez uzroka podobna, upada libar 5. [...] Tko bi opsovao kmetić svoga gospodina, dužan je da mu se jezik uriže, ali se iskupi libar 100.⁴²

The language of some of the texts may reach the high register (the language of the *Baška tablet*, for example, belongs to the latter). Thus, the note on the destruction of Modruš in the *Novi Missal fragment* of the 15th cent. is written in the middle register, whereas the *Record of Father Martinac* attains the high register (note the emotional tinge of the discourse, caused by the contemporary author’s impressions on the experienced event):

(19) 1493. bi rasap grada Modruša, koga Turci porobiše, popališe, is koga pobiže častni gospodin Kristofor, biskup modruški ali karbavski i s nekoliko kanonici starešimi, ki došavši simo v Novi grad va Vinodol, i ustani se tu i učini sebi prebivanje i štolicu v crkvi svetih Filipa i Jakova apoštoli, i tih kanonici učini delnike od vsih prihoda te plovanije skupa s plovanom, ostavivši za se samo pol desetini [...] Sije pisah ja pop Petar Vidaković, plovani.⁴³

(20) v vrème svetago otca v Božé pape Aleksandra Šestago i v vrème Maksimilijana, kralja rimskago, i v vrème kralja Laclava češkoga i ugarskago i v vrème našega gospodina kneza Brnardina Frankapana i njega sini, kneza Matij a i kneza Krštofora i kneza Feranta, i v duhovnom našego gospodina i otca gospodina biskupa Krstopora Dubrovčanina, biskupa modruškago i krbavskago i pročaža [...] Täгда že poběždena bisi čest krstjanska, täгда že uhićeš bana hrvatskoga ošće živuća täгда že ubiše bana jajačkoga.⁴⁴

Numerous medieval texts – even legal ones – tend to express subjective opinions and experiences of their authors. Not uncommonly, the volitional and

⁴² *Poljički statut*, ed. M. PERA, Split 1988, p. 442: *Condemnation for indecent words. Whoever offends his neighbor with indecent language, regardless of the consequences, shall pay 5 libra. [...] If a servant utters indecent words towards his master, his tongue shall be cut out, or he shall pay 100 libra.*

⁴³ *Novi Missal fragment*, 25v, 15th cent.: *1493 saw the destruction of the town of Modruš, which was captured and burned down by the Turks. Honorable lord Kristofor, bishop of Modruš or Krbava, fled the town with some older canons. Having come here to the town of Novi in Vinodol, he settled here, taking accommodation and position in the church of the holy apostles James and Philip. He made these canons participants of all income of the parish, along with the parish priest, leaving for himself only half of the tithes. [...] This is what I myself wrote – pop Petar Vidaković, parish priest.*

⁴⁴ *Hrvatska književnost...*, p. 82, 84: *In the time of the Holy Father in God pope Alexander VI, and in the time of Maximilian, Roman king, and in the time of Czech and Hungarian king Laclav, and in the time of our lord prince Bernardin Frankopan and his sons – prince Matij, prince Krštofor, prince Ferant, and our spiritual lord and father bishop Krstopor Dubrovčanin, bishop of Modruš and Krbava etc. [...] At that time the Christian forces were defeated, at that time they captured the Croatian ruler alive, at that time they killed the ruler of Jajce.*

expressive function is visible (an emotional or provocative effect on the recipient of the message)⁴⁵.

Although the majority of the medieval literary monuments belonging to the middle register are written in the Old Croatian language (some of them with a greater or smaller number of Church Slavisms), it is necessary to emphasize that some texts pertaining to canon law were composed in Croatian Church Slavic. For example, the *Petris Miscellany* (122–170b) features a number of canonical texts; some of them are written in Čakavian with Kajkavisms or Church Slavisms, but certain others display such a level of conservatism that they have been described as follows: *In general, the language of these canonical regulations seems to hark back to the Moravian period*⁴⁶.

2.3. High (elevated) register

The high register is typical of biblical/liturgical language (*Vienna Folia*, *Split fragment of the Glagolitic missal*) as well as the language of literature (*Acts of Paul and Thecla*), written in the prestigious Croatian Church Slavic language:

(21) **Vъsuda** tvoego radi eže (es)мъ **vъzeli** m(o)litvami ap(osto)lъ (t)voihъ ihъže **pametъ** čt(emъ) pom(i)lui **ni**⁴⁷.

(22) (Měse)ca **dektebra** 7 d(ъ)нъ Anъbro(s)iě, pēs[ni] i ap(osto)la i ev(an)je(li)ě iště [na] Měkulěnъ d(ъ)нъ. M(i)sa. **Blaženoga** Anbrosiě **isповідnika tvoega** i ar[h]jieriě na vsaki d(ъ)н[ъ] [...].⁴⁸

(23) Otroci že i děvice priněse drva i seno da Těklu užgut. Jegda že izvěse ju nagu, proslzi se knez i divi se sući dobrotě jeje. Skladoše že drva i povelěše jej ljudije vzlěsti na nja. Ona že stvorši obraz Hrstov.... Ljudije že vžgnětiše oğanj.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ What is meant here is the appearance of an emotional tone in medieval historical and legal texts, causing them to approach the status of literary works. Some examples are supplied by Damjanović (S. DAMJANOVIĆ, *Jezik...*, p. 25), who notes that *at that time, the function of effect was allotted significantly more space relative to the communicative function*.

⁴⁶ V. ŠTEFANIĆ, *Glagoljski rukopisi otoka Krka*, Zagreb 1960, p. 369.

⁴⁷ V. Jagić following: J. НАММ, *Staroslavenska čitanka*, Zagreb 1971, p. 56: *For the sake of your communion, which we received, according to the prayers of your apostles, whose memory we honor, have mercy on us*.

⁴⁸ V. ŠTEFANIĆ, *Splitski odlomak glagoljskog misala starije redakcije*, Slo 6/8, 1957, p. 60: *In the month of December, on the 7th day, of Ambrosius, look for songs and apostle and gospel for the day of Mikula. Service. The prayer of blessed Ambrosius, your confessor and bishop, delights us every day [...]*.

⁴⁹ *Hrvatska književnost...*, p. 131: *Children and maidens brought wood and hay for virgin Thecla to be burnt. When they got her naked, the prince cried out in admiration of her beauty. Having put down the wood, the people ordered her to climb it. She did this in the name of Christ... The people lit the fire*.

We are dealing with the literary (developed and carefully crafted) language. It is quite far removed from the spontaneous, everyday use of language in the society in general. A similar kind of discourse was produced in the Middle Ages by intellectuals or people with particular aesthetic/emotional inclinations, expressed in the form of the text. Texts of the high register, particularly literary texts in the narrow sense, are characterized by richness of language, achieved through figures of speech and the adherence to the principles of ancient rhetoric and poetics. It is a premeditated, structurally complex, reflected discourse, the content of which touches upon non-trivial topics. Here, language use is a matter of tradition; the established linguistic practice is retained, stable in expressing particular kinds of content within the framework of medieval genres. Medieval Croatian literature does not know the epic; it lacks the most precious of the ancient components of literature, written in the elevated register. Serious-themed content is more appropriate for this register and it is valued higher than satire. The range of literary works of the high register could be further divided into a number of subordinate levels (depending on genre and topic).

At first, the medieval high register is associated with Croatian Church Slavic and Old Croatian (in the sphere of oral and folk literature), and later – from the 14th cent. onwards – also with the hybrid language.

The high register also covers everyday-life texts, which, however, are not of a spontaneous nature, but pre-designed. The authors of such texts introduced Church Slavic elements into them, meant to signify the power of the language of liturgy.

(24) Zaklinam vas vrazi prokleti † Bogom Ocem † Sinom † Duhom Svetim i vsěmi svetimi Božjimi i Sudnjim dnem, i slncem i lunu, i zvezdami nebeskim i treskom i gromom i 20 i 4-mi starci i vsu tajnu Božiju, da vi ne mozite škoditi semu **rabu** Božiju [...] i ni v jedinom městě ne mozite mu škoditi ni nad njim ni v njem se obrěsti, **razvě** otpadite ot **ńego**. V ime Oca i Sina i Duha **Svetago** amen! Evanjelje “iskoni bě slovo” napiši i odperi blagoslovljenu vodu i daj tadaje běsnomu i do konca da je popje.⁵⁰

Some Glagolitic inscriptions were not created spontaneously, but rather reflected a previously thought-out structure with the use of high linguistic register – as exemplified by the rhythmical repetition of ends of words and the form [-]biše

⁵⁰ HAZU archive, manuscript IVd 55, 15th cent., transcr. A.K. following: I. MILČETIĆ, *Stari glagolski recepti, egzorcizmi i zapisi*, VSAK 1, 1913, p. 64: *I beseech you, wretched demons, accursed by † God the Father † the Son † and the Holy Ghost, and by all of God's saints, by the Judgment Day, by the sun and the moon and the stars of heaven, and by lightning and thunder, and by the 24 elders and the Divine mystery, that you shall not inflict harm on this servant of God [...] and you shall not harm him anywhere or find fault in him, and you shall step back from him. In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, amen! Write the gospel “in the beginning was the word” and wash with holy water, and let the demoniac drink it.*

at the end of syntactic constructions in the *Bužim inscription* (Čakavian dialect of Old Croatian):

(25) Ta grad sazid(a)l iz fudumenta izibrani knez Juraj Mikuličić. U 'no vrime va vsej hrvatskoj zemlji bolega č(ově)ka ne biše, zač u kraja Matijaša u veliki počtenji biše, zač ot cara turskoga ugrskoj zemlji mir našal biše. I car rimski, ta ga dobrim č(ově)kom zoviše. I vs(a)ki od tih poglavit dar dal mu biše. A Hrvati ga za nenavist hercegom Ivanišem pogubiše. Ki li se oće takim č(ově)k(o)m zvati, neka takov grad iz fudumenta ima izzidati tere ima sebi tak(o).⁵¹

Some medieval texts were written both in Croatian Church Slavic and in Old Croatian, such as e.g. the eschatological liturgical song *Dies irae*:

(26) Quid sum miser tunc dicturus?	Čto okan[']nik' t'gda reku Takmo o[t']cu pom[o]u se	Ča oću grišnik ondi reći Ku li milost tada steći
Quem patronum rogaturus, Cum vix justus sit securus?	Jegda jedva pr[a]v[e]dni sp[a] sen budet? ⁵²	Gdi budu dobri teško uteći? ⁵³

This song differs from oral literary and popular (secular and religious) poetry (*Još pojdoh ravnim poljem / Bratja, u mladost ne ufajte / Svit se konča*):

(27) Još pojdoh ravnim poljem,
susrite me devojka,
tanka boka, visoka,
a na bili rumena...⁵⁴

(28)... Vele oholo ja ushohaj
jer se smrti mlad ne bojah.
Sada mladost moju zgubih,
dobra dēla nebog pustih,
iskrniēga ja ne ljubih,
moju dušu grihom ubih.
Moja družbo, ka si bila,
nut pogledaj moga tila!
Moja rebra vsa ogrūila,
zato plači, družbo mila!

⁵¹ B. FUČIĆ, *Glagoljski natpisi...*, p. 112: *This city was built from the foundations by prince Juraj Mikuličić. At that time, there was no better man in all of Croatian lands; he was regarded highly by king Matijaš, since he concluded the peace between the Turkish emperor and the Hungarian land. Even the Roman emperor called him a good man. And all of them brought him gifts. But the Croats killed him out of envy, aided by duke Ivaniš. Who wants to be called a man like this, let him erect a city like this from the foundations.*

⁵² *Misal po zakonu Rimskoga dvora*, ed. M. PANTELIĆ, Zagreb 1971.

⁵³ A. KAPETANOVIĆ, D. MALIĆ, K. ŠTRKALJ DESPOT, *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno pjesništvo...*, p. 148.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 333: *I went through an even field, / a girl came across me, / slim and tall, / with pink cheeks...*

Moji vlasi opuznuli,
oči su mi osunuli,
bela lica oplihnula,
vsa je lipost pobignula...⁵⁵

(29) ... Grdinali, biskupi i opati
misle, Boga ostavivše, lè o zlati.
Duhovna rěč ot njih se ne more iměti
ako im se pènezi prije ne plati...⁵⁶

3. Conclusion

It follows from the above that in medieval times, there was no clear-cut division among the three languages according to function, and that the languages themselves did not constitute registers. The linguistic situation was quite diverse and dynamic.

Bearing in mind that the hybrid variety and Church Slavic did not exist as every-day (in)formal business/colloquial codes, they did not contribute to the development of the middle and low linguistic registers.

When we speak of the literature of the Middle Ages, it is necessary to consider secular oral and folk literature, which – though not committed to writing – must have existed; it is, in fact, indirectly reflected in written medieval literary works⁵⁷.

In the Middle Ages, oral communication and memory occupied a more central role than in modern times. The literature that has been preserved in written literary monuments features the kind of content that was of prime importance to the clergy: copies and translations of biblical liturgical books in the Croatian Church Slavic language. The vernacular Old Croatian language is used in certain late medieval liturgical texts (lectionaries) and literature; from as early as the 14th cent. onwards, we have Old Croatian texts preserved in which a high level of expression is achieved (e.g. *Šibenska molitva* / *Šibenik prayer*, *Vatikanski hrvatski molitvenik* / *Vatican Croatian Prayer Book*). Here, Church Slavisms are, more or less, the markers of the high register. Accordingly, the Old Croatian language possessed all three registers (high, middle, low). The bulk of Croatian linguistic culture of the Middle Ages was characterized by the use of the Old Croatian vernacular, although, in view of the number of extant liturgical and (usually religious)

⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 17-30: ... *I went very boldly, / since, being young, I did not fear death. / Now I have lost my youth, / left my good deeds. / I did not love my neighbor, / I killed my soul with sin. / My former friends, / look at my body! / My ribs are all rotten, / so cry, my dear friends! / My hair has all fallen out, / my eyes have collapsed, / my white cheeks have grown thin, / all my beauty is gone...*

⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 328: ... *Cardinals, bishops and abbots, / having abandoned God, they only think about gold. / One cannot get a spiritual word out of them / unless one pays them first...*

⁵⁷ M. BOŠKOVIĆ-STULLI, *Usmena književnost*, [in:] M. BOŠKOVIĆ-STULLI, D. ZEČEVIĆ, *Usmena i pučka književnost*, Zagreb 1978, p. 68-152.

literary texts – meticulously copied and protected by the clergy – one usually gets the impression that this linguistic milieu was dominated by Church Slavic.

In the above examples, we have shown that even graffiti (the type of text closest to the low register) could be written in the Church Slavic language under certain circumstances (biblical quotations/paraphrases). The same applies to some texts of canonical law (non-liturgical and non-belletristic texts of the middle register). In literary and legal texts (high and middle register), it is possible to find expressions that originate in the low register or are constructed according to this register's linguistic usage (as exemplified by the document from Lika or the communicative informality of the dialogue in the *Muke Spasitelja našega / Passion of our Savior*). Besides, certain Old Croatian legal texts display an evident increase of the volitional and expressive function of the text, as well as of the careful choice of phrasing (*ars dictandi*); from the point of view of a modern scholar, this renders such texts closer to the high register of literature. We have even adduced an example of a liturgical text translated into both Church Slavic and Old Croatian (*Dies irae*); such cases make it clear that certain variants of literary texts composed in the vernacular language were specially stylized.

The general analysis indicates that already in the Middle Ages, the Old Croatian language – with its variegated dialectal base – possessed all three registers (high, middle and low). Consequently, the view that the creation and development of the early Croatian literary language constituted a gradual transformation of Church Slavic should be finally abandoned.

Translated by Marek Majer

Bibliography

- BARADA M., *Tabella plumbea Traguriensis*, "Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu" 16.1, 1935, p. 11–18.
- BIBER D., *Dimensions of register variation: a cross-linguistic comparison*, Cambridge 1995.
- BOŠKOVIĆ-STULLI M., *Usmena književnost*, [in:] M. BOŠKOVIĆ-STULLI, D. ZEČEVIĆ, *Usmena i pučka književnost*, Zagreb 1978.
- CHJUTI'-FOL'TER G., *Diglossija v Drevnej Rusi*, "Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch" 24, 1978, p. 108–123.
- CURTIS E.R., *Evropska književnost i latinsko srednjovjekovlje*, trans. S. MARKUŠ, ed. T. LADAN, Zagreb 1971.
- DAMJANOVIĆ S., *Jezik hrvatskih glagoljaša*, Zagreb 2008.
- FERGUSON Ch.A., *Diglossia*, "Word" 15, 1959, p. 325–340.
- FERGUSON Ch.A., *Dialect, register, and genre: Working assumptions about conventionalization*, [in:] *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register*, ed. D. BIBER, E. FINEGAN, New York 1994, p. 15–30.
- FERNÁNDEZ M., *Diglossia. A Comprehensive Bibliography 1960–1999 and supplements*, Amsterdam–Philadelphia 1993.

- FISHMAN J.A., *Bilingualism with and without diglossia, diglossia with and without bilingualism*, "Journal of Social Issues" 23.2, 1993, p. 29–38.
- FUČIĆ B., *Glagoljski natpisi*, Zagreb 1982.
- GUBERINA P., *Tabella plumbea Sisciensis*, "Nastavni vjesnik" 45, 1936/1937, p. 4–23.
- HAMM J., *Staroslavenska čitanka*, Zagreb 1971.
- HERCIGONJA E., *Srednjovjekovna književnost*, Zagreb 1975.
- HERCIGONJA E., *Nad iskonom hrvatske knjige. Rasprave o hrvatskoglagoljskom srednjovjekovlju*, Zagreb 1983.
- Hrvatska književnost srednjega vijeka. Od XII. do XVI. stoljeća*, ed. V. ŠTEFANIĆ, B. GRABAR, A. NAZOR, M. PANTELIĆ, Zagreb 1969.
- IVŠIĆ S., *Hrvatski ćirilski testament Radoslavca Vladišića iz god. 1436. u prijepisu iz god. 1448*, "Časopis za hrvatsku poviest" 1.1/2, 1943, p. 83–87.
- KAPETANOVIĆ A., MALIĆ D., ŠTRKALJ DESPOT K., *Hrvatsko srednjovjekovno pjesništvo: pjesme, plačevi i prikazanja na starohrvatskom jeziku*, Zagreb 2010.
- KAPETANOVIĆ A., *Reflections of Church Slavonic-Croatian diglossia on the Baška tablet: a new contribution concerning its language and linguistic layers*, "Zeitschrift für Slawistik" 60.3, 2015, p. 335–365.
- KATIČIĆ R., *Hrvatski jezik*, Zagreb 2013.
- MALIĆ D., *Povaljska listina kao jezični spomenik*, Zagreb 1988.
- MIHALJEVIĆ M., *Položaj crkvenoslavenskoga jezika u hrvatskoj srednjovjekovnoj kulturi*, [in:] *Zbornik na trudovi od Megjunarodnot naučen sobir [Ohrid, 4–7.11.2010]*, ed. I. VELEV, A. GIREVSKI, L. MAKARIJOSKA, I. PIPERKOSKI, K. MOKROVA, Skopje 2011, p. 229–238.
- MILČETIĆ I., *Prilozi za literaturu hrvatskih glagoljskih spomenika. II. Zakon braščine svetoga duha u Baški*, "Starine, na sviet izdaje Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb" 25, 1892, p. 138–151.
- MILČETIĆ I., *Stari glagoljski recepti, egzorcizmi i zapisi*, "Vjesnik Staroslavenske akademije u Krku" 1, 1913, p. 61–69.
- Misal po zakonu Rimskoga dvora*, ed. M. PANTELIĆ, Zagreb 1971.
- Najstariji hrvatski latinički spomenici (do sredine 15. stoljeća)*, ed. D. MALIĆ, Zagreb 2004.
- NAZOR A., *Jezični kriteriji pri određivanju donje granice crkvenoslavenskog jezika u hrvatskoglagoljskim tekstovima (Prilog diskusiji o problemima crkvenoslavenskog thesaurusa)*, "Slovo" 13, 1983, p. 68–86.
- Poljički statut*, ed. M. PERA, Split 1988.
- REINHART J., *Biblijski citati na hrvatskoglagoljskim natpisima*, [in:] *Az grišni diak Branko pridivkom Fučić*, ed. T. GALOVIĆ, Malinska–Rijeka–Zagreb 2011, p. 445–456.
- SEEMANN K.-D., *Die 'Diglossie' und die Systeme der sprachlichen Kommunikation im alten Russland*, [in:] *Slavistische Studien zum IX. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Kiev, Köln–Wien 1983*, p. 553–561.
- Sociolinguistic perspectives on register*, ed. D. BIBER, E. FINEGAN, New York 1994.
- STAMAČ A., *'Bašćanska ploča' kao književno djelo*, "Croatica" 26/28, 1987, p. 17–27.
- STIPIŠIĆ J., *Pomoćne povijesne znanosti u teoriji i praksi*, Zagreb 1972.
- STROHAL R., *Folkloristički prilozi iz starije hrvatske knjige*, "Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena" 15.1, 1910, p. 120–132.

- ŠAPIR M.I., *Teorija "cerkovnoslavjansko-ruskoj diglossii" i ee storonniki. Po povodu knigi B.A. Uspenskogo "Istorija ruskogo literaturnog jazyka (XI–XVIII vv.)"*, "Russian linguistics" 13.3, 1989, p. 271–309.
- ŠTEFANIĆ V., *Splitski odlomak glagoljskog misala starije redakcije*, "Slovo" 6/8, 1957, p. 54–133.
- ŠTEFANIĆ V., *Glagoljski rukopisi otoka Krka*, Zagreb 1960.
- ŠTEFANIĆ V., *Glagoljski rukopisi Jugoslavenske akademije. I dio: Uvod, Biblija, apokrifi i legende, liturgijski tekstovi, egzorcizmi i zapisi, molitvenici, teologija, crkveni govori (homiletika), pjesme*, Zagreb 1969.
- THOMAS G., *The Role of Diglossia in the Development of the Slavonic Literary Languages*, "Slavistična revija" 37, 1989, p. 273–282.
- TOLSTOJ N.I., *Odnos starog srpskog knjiškog jezika prema starom slovenskom jeziku (U vezi sa razvojem žanrova u staroj srpskoj književnosti)*, "Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane" 8.1, 1982, p. 15–25.
- ULUCHANOV I.S., *O jazyke Drevnej Rusi*, Moskva 1972.
- USPENSKIJ V.A., *Diglossija i dvujazyčie v istorii ruskogo literaturnog jazyka*, "International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics" 27, 1983, p. 81–126.
- VONČINA J., *Četiri glagoljske isprave iz Like*, "Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta" 2, 1955, p. 213–230.
- WORTH D.S., *On diglossia in Medieval Russia*, "Die Welt der Slaven" 23, 1978, p. 371–393.
- WILLI A., *The Languages of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*, Oxford 2003.
- ŽIVOV V.M., *Jazyk i kul'tura v Rossii XVIII v.*, Moskva 1996.

Abstract. The linguistic situation in medieval Croatia was fairly dynamic. The present article discusses the stratification of linguistic culture in the Middle Ages as regards its division into the three registers (high, middle, low) inherited from ancient rhetoric and poetry and received in the Middle Ages. We conclude that there was no strict division among the three languages according to function in the Middle Ages, and that the languages themselves did not constitute styles or registers. The Old Croatian language possessed all three registers (high, middle, low) already in the Middle Ages. However, the hybrid Čakavian-Church Slavic variety as well as the Croatian redaction of Church Slavic were not used as everyday (in)formal business/colloquial codes, so that they did not develop a middle and low linguistic register.

Keywords: register, *diglossia*, *triglossia*, medieval Croatia, Old Croatian, Croatian Church Slavic

Amir Kapetanović

Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics
Republike Austrije 16, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
akapetan@ihjj.hr

Maciej Kokoszko (Łódź)
Krzysztof Jagusiak (Łódź)
Jolanta Dybała (Piotrków Trybunalski)

THE CHICKPEA (ἐρέβινθος; CICER ARIETINUM L) AS A MEDICINAL FOODSTUFF AND MEDICINE IN SELECTED GREEK MEDICAL WRITINGS

1. Introduction

Leguminous plants, referred to as *óspria* (ὄσπρια) in Greek, were a crucially important element in the Mediterranean diet since time immemorial¹, as is evidenced in research concerning their role as a foodstuff². As such, these plants were second only to cereals³ and so they were in the early Middle Ages, as is

¹ C. PERLÈS, *Les stratégies alimentaires dans les temps préhistoriques*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 42 (lentils).

² Cereals, especially wheat, formed the basis of the diet throughout the period under scrutiny. For antiquity, see for instance: F. BRAUDEL, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, vol. I, Paris 1966, p. 215; M.-C. AMOURETTI, *Villes et campagnes grecques*, [in:] *Histoire de...*, p. 133–150; C. GROTTANELLI, *La viande et ses rites*, [in:] *Histoire de...*, p. 117–118 (bread versus meat); G. SASSATELLI, *L'alimentation des Étrusques*, [in:] *Histoire de...*, p. 184–186; P. GARNSEY, *Food and society in classical antiquity*, Cambridge 2002, p. 12–19, see in particular p. 18, 119–121; J.M. WILKINS, P. HILL, *Food in the ancient world*, Oxford 2006, p. 113–139, especially p. 11 (general conclusions), p. 120. For the Byzantine period, see: PH. KOUKOULES, *Byzantinon bios kai politismos*, vol. V, *Hai trofai kai ta pota...*, Athènes 1952, *passim*, especially p. 12–35; E. KISLINGER, *Les chrétiens d'Orient: règles et réalités alimentaires dans le monde byzantin*, [in:] *Histoire de...*, p. 327–332, 337–430; J.-C. CHEYNET, *La valeur marchande des produits alimentaires dans l'Empire byzantin*, [in:] *Byzantinon diatrohi kai mageireiai. Praktika imeridas "Peri tis diatrophis sto Byzantio"*. *Food and cooking in Byzantium. Proceedings of the symposium "On food in Byzantium"*. Thessaloniki Museum of Byzantine Culture 4 November 2001, ed. D.D. PAPANIKOLA-BAKIRTZI, Athens 2005, p. 35–39; J. KODER, *I kathemerini diatrophis sto Byzantio me basi tis piges*, [in:] *Byzantinon diatrohi kai...*, p. 19–21; IDEM, *Stew and salted meat – opulent normality in the diet of every day?*, [in:] *Eat, drink and be merry (Luke 12:19). Food and wine in Byzantium. In honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer*, ed. L. BRUBAKER, K. LINARDOU, Aldershot 2007, p. 65–66, 72; D. STATHAKOPOULOS, *Between the field and the plate: how agricultural products were processed into food*, [in:] *Eat, drink...*, p. 114; C. BOURBOU, *Health and disease in Byzantine Crete (7th–12th centuries AD)*, Farnham–Burlington 2010, p. 128; M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki Konstantynopola*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyńskim*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Warszawa 2011, p. 474–485, especially p. 474 (general considerations).

³ There is an extensive bibliography concerning the role of leguminous plants in the ancient diet, see for example: J. ANDRÉ, *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome*, Paris 1961, p. 35–42 (the diet of the

illustrated in the research of such historians as Phaedon Koukoules⁴, Johannes Koder⁵, Andrew Dalby⁶, Marcus Louis Rautman⁷ or Ilias Anagnostakis⁸.

Research indicates that these plants were domesticated early in history and were widely cultivated. Their use was not limited to the domesticated varieties, but included also wild-growing types, although these were regarded as having slightly different properties. In the timeframe under consideration, that is from the fourth century BC to the seventh century AD, they were a crucially important staple in the diet. In the context of this inquiry, it is also important to note that according to medical writings preserved from antiquity and the early Byzantine period leguminous plants were considered to be an accessible source of substances which could be applied in therapeutics. Such plants were referred to as *fármaka* (φάρμακα). One of the most commonly mentioned leguminous plants was the chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) known under the Greek name of *erébinthos* (ἐρέβινθος).

Romans); L. FOXHALL, H.A. FORBES, *Sitomereia: the role of grain as staple food in classical antiquity*, Chi 12, 1982, especially p. 41–2, 89–90; P. DAR, *Food and archeology in Romano-Byzantine Palestine*, [in:] *Food in antiquity*, ed. J. WILKINS, D. HARVEY, M. DOBSON, Exeter 1995, p. 328, 330–331 (Palestine in the early imperial period); V. NUTTON, *Galen and the traveler's fare*, [in:] *Food in...*, p. 360, 364 (Galen's remarks on the consumption of leguminous plants in Egypt); M.-C. AMOURETTI, *Villes...*, p. 139, 143 (the diet of the Greeks); E. BRESCIANI, *Nourritures et boissons de l'Égypte ancienne*, [in:] *Histoire de...*, p. 66 (Egypt); G. SASSATELLI, *L'alimentation...*, p. 186–187 (Etruscans); A. SPANÒ GIAMMELLARO, *Les Phéniciens et les Carthaginois*, [in:] *Histoire de...*, p. 87 (Phoenicians); K.B. FLINT-HAMILTON, *Legumes in ancient Greece and Rome: food, medicine or poison*, He 68, 1999, p. 371–385 (its role as a foodstuff and a medicine); P. GARNSEY, *Food...*, p. 20–21, 37–38 (its role in the diet in antiquity); A. DALBY, *Food in the ancient world from A to Z*, London–New York 2003, p. 194; J.P. ALCOCK, *Food in the ancient world*, Westport–London 2006, p. 14–15, 35–38 (the characteristics of the most important leguminous plants in antiquity); J.M. WILKINS, P. HILL, *Food...*, p. 112–139 (the role of cereals and leguminous plants in the diet); A. DALBY, *The flavours of classical Greece*, [in:] *Flavours and delights. Tastes and pleasures of ancient and Byzantine cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 19 (lentils as a staple food of the Greeks).

⁴ PH. KOUKOULES, *Byzantinon trophai kai pota*, *ΕΕΒΣ* 17, 1941, p. 70–71; IDEM, *Byzantinon bios...*, p. 96–97.

⁵ J. KODER, *I kathemerini...*, p. 23; IDEM, *Stew and...*, especially p. 61, 67, 69–70; IDEM, *Everyday food in the middle Byzantine period*, [in:] *Flavours and...*, p. 141, 149.

⁶ A. DALBY, *Flavours of Byzantium*, Totnes 2003, p. 80–81.

⁷ M.L. RAUTMAN, *The daily life in the Byzantine Empire*, Westport–Oxford 2006, p. 252.

⁸ I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, *Pallikaria of lentils. The "brave boys" of beans*, [in:] *Flavours and...*, p. 133–137; IDEM, *"The raw and the cooked": ways of cooking and serving food in Byzantium*, [in:] *Flavours and...*, p. 175–176, 180–181. See also: M. KOKOSZKO, *Smaki...*, p. 485–487; M. KOKOSZKO, Ł. ERLICH, *Rola roślin strączkowych (όσπρια) w diecie późnego antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (IV–VII w.) na podstawie wybranych źródeł*, *ZW* 17, 2012, p. 8–18; M. KOKOSZKO, Z. RZEŹNICKA, K. JAGUSIAK, *Rola roślin strączkowych (όσπρια) w świetle źródeł medycznych pomiędzy II a VII w.*, [in:] *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II VII w.)*, vol. II, *Pokarm dla ciała i ducha*, ed. M. KOKOSZKO, Łódź 2014, p. 67–75; M. KOKOSZKO, J. DYBAŁA, K. JAGUSIAK, Z. RZEŹNICKA, *Dieta mnichów syryjskich. Komentarz do terminu ospria (όσπρια) w Historia religiosa Teodoret z Cyru*, *BPT* 7, 2014, p. 115–143; IDEM, *Dieta monastyczna w świetle nauki medycznej. Teodoret z Cyru i medycy o soczewicy*, *VP* 34, 2014, p. 297–329.

The study at hand aims to present the views of Greek medicine concerning this plant in the period under discussion (fourth century BC – seventh century AD) by concentrating on its dietary role, pharmacological properties and therapeutic uses. The reason for this selection is due to the fact that this particular branch of knowledge was developed primarily by Greek medical doctors.

2. The dietary-pharmacological characteristics of the chickpea

The views on the properties of the chickpea evolved over centuries. It was described as early as in the fourth century BC in the work titled *De diaeta*, where it was characterized as laxative, diuretic and nutritious⁹, and included into the category of kathartic substances¹⁰.

Athenaeus of Naucratis wrote that Diocles of Carystus (late fourth or early third century BC) believed in its warming qualities and the ability to attract (the matter deeply ingrained in tissues)¹¹; reportedly, he also estimated that the white chickpea is more powerful than the black, much in the same way as the green and the Milesian is more powerful than the *kriós* (κρίός) chickpea, or that soaked is more potent than dried¹². It has to be emphasized that it was at such an early date that this plant was regarded as being a *phármakon*, which is evidenced in a letter by Diocles discussing the prophylactic approaches to various diseases preserved in the seventh-century medical encyclopaedia compiled by Paul of Aegina. The author recommended drinking a chickpea decoction as one of the basic therapeutic

⁹ *Hippocratis de diaeta*, 45, 5–7, ed. R. JOLY, S. BYL, Berlin 2003 (cetera: *De diaeta*).

¹⁰ *De diaeta*, 54, 49–52.

¹¹ The interpretation presented in this paper is based on a translation different from that proposed by K. Bartol and J. Danielewicz (ATENAJOS, *Uczta mędrców*, trans., ed. K. BARTOL, J. DANIELEWICZ, Poznań 2010, p. 166). From our point of view, Diocles cannot have suggested that the chickpea ‘triggered fermentation processes in the body’. The later medical writings do not support this observation. We have assumed hypothetically that the adjective *zymotikós* (ζυμωτικός) in Diocles’s narrative is used with a different meaning and does not imply that the given substance was regarded as an acidifying or fermenting agent. This assumption has been made on two accounts: first, as illustrated in this article, the views of medical writers were very consistent from antiquity to the Byzantine period, and second, Diocles himself seems to remain perfectly in line with other physicians (he documented the use of this medicament for ailments mentioned in the later medical writings). This semantic aspect may be explained by considering the description of *zýme* (ζύμη) in the *De materia medica* by Dioscorides, where leaven/yeast is described as having the ability to warm up and attract, much in the same way as may be found in the descriptions of the chickpea – *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque*, II, 85, 2, 5–8, ed. M. WELLMANN, vol. I–III, Berolini 1906–1914 (cetera: DIOSCURIDES, *De materia medica*). It appears that the adjective *zymotikós* should be translated differently, in line with the statement of Diocles, who believed that the chickpea is similar to *zýme* in its functioning, i.e. in being a warming agent and having the ability to attract fluids from deep down in the body.

¹² *Athenaei Naucraticae dipnosopistarum libri XV*, II, 55b (44, 44–48 KAIBEL), rec. G. KAIBEL, vol. I–III, Lipsiae–Berolini 1887–1890 (cetera: ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS, *Deipnosopistae*).

devices in curing gastric problems¹³. On the other hand, for dealing with malfunctions of urinary system, he advised to drink water used for soaking chickpea beans mixed with some wine¹⁴. In Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* we also find a remark that Diphilus of Siphnus (the first half of the third century BC) characterized the chickpea as difficult to digest, detoxifying, diuretic and carminative¹⁵. All of the above properties are mentioned in later writings dealing with the plant, which supports the claim that the medical theory concerning this issue at the turn of the fourth and the third centuries was fairly advanced.

But the fully developed set of views related to the chickpea appeared only in the first century AD, which is accredited to Dioscorides and his *De materia medica*. His discussion of the subject is relatively extensive and detailed. The author knew of two basic varieties of *erébinthos*¹⁶: one was domesticated – with two subvarieties, *orobías* (ὀροβίαια) and *kriós*¹⁷ – whereas the other grew in the wild¹⁸. The treatises of the doctor of Anazarbos demonstrate that the main part of the plant used as a pharmacological ingredient was the beans (or a bean-based decoction). Roots and leaves were used to a much lesser degree, but were applied both in internal as well as external use (most often in the form of cataplasms)¹⁹.

The first observation concerning the dietary-pharmacological characteristics of the chickpea included in Dioscorides' work emphasizes its beneficial effects on the digestive system and the formation of urine, but also mentions that it causes flatulence²⁰.

¹³ *Paulus Aegineta*, I, 100, 1, 1–6, 28, ed. I.L. HEIBERG, vol. I–II, Lipsiae–Berolini 1921–1924 (cetera: PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*; the fragment on gastric problems – I, 100, 4, 1–17; the chickpea – I, 100, 4, 13–14).

¹⁴ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 100, 5, 1–14 (the chickpea – I, 100, 5, 9–10).

¹⁵ ATHENAEUS OF NAOCRATIS, *Deipnosophistae*, II, 55b (44, 43–44 KAIBEL).

¹⁶ A passage concerning the plant – DIOSCORIDES, *De materia medica*, II, 104, 1, 1–2, 11.

¹⁷ The author seems to suggest that both varieties, *orobías* and *kriós*, were domesticated.

¹⁸ In his *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, he distinguishes between the white and the black variety, without proposing any links between these two classifications. For the black and the white chickpea, see *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, II, 58, 2, 7, [in:] *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque*, ed. M. WELLMANN, vol. III, Berlin 1914 (cetera: DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*). A link, however, existed and we know it from the work of Galen, who wrote that the black variety (with its characteristically small beans) was grown in Bithynia and called *kriós*. It was regarded as a highly effective remedy for renal calculi and administered to patients in the form of a decoction – *Galenii De alimentorum facultatibus libri III*, 533, 12–16, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. VI, Lipsiae 1823 (cetera: GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*). It follows that the other variety, i.e. *orobías*, should be identified with the brightly coloured chickpea.

¹⁹ See below.

²⁰ The latter of the analysed treatises of Dioscorides includes the chickpea (and a chickpea-based decoction) in the category of *ouretiká* (οὐρητικά), which according to the author was a group of substances administered to people suffering from urinary problems resulting from the calculi formed in their urinary system. It was also used as a supplementary remedy for hydrops and jaundice – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, II, 119, 1, 1–5, 10 (the chickpea and the decoction – II, 119, 4, 1).

In addition to that, the plant gives the skin a proper colouring²¹, induces menstruation, accelerates childbirth²² and facilitates lactation²³. The doctor of Anazarbus also believed that both *orobías* and *kriós* were highly effective diuretic agents and argued that for this reason a chickpea decoction seasoned with rosemary was used as a cure for jaundice²⁴ and hydrops²⁵ (even though, as he admitted, this medicine was damaging to ulcerated bladders and kidneys)²⁶. The author observed that the leaves of domesticated and wild varieties of the chickpea are similar in shape. Despite its pungent smell and the fact that its fruit was slightly different from that of the varieties found in agriculture²⁷, the medicinal properties of all these varieties were virtually identical²⁸.

Galen (second century AD) wrote even more extensively on the subject. The characteristics included in his *De alimentorum facultatibus* is primarily concerned with the dietary qualities of the plant, while a list of pharmacological uses is given in the *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus*. The description of the plant in the former treatise begins with the statement that the chickpea is no less carminative than broad beans, but is far more nutritious²⁹. At the time it was used to arouse sexual desire and stimulate the production of semen; for this reason it was administered to male horses before mating. Galen also wrote that it had a litholytic effect, much more powerful than broad beans, and as such it was used in crushing kidney stones (the *kriós* variety with its characteristically small black beans was particularly used to this end; Galen recommended that a decoction based on *these beans*³⁰ should be given to people suffering from renal calculi). The

²¹ Boiled chickpeas appear on the list of foodstuffs having a beneficial effect on the skin, DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 105, 1, 1–3 (the chickpea – I, 105, 1, 1).

²² The same application was discussed in the other work by Dioscorides. It should be noted that both remedies were qualified as highly effective – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, II, 79, 1, 1–80, 3, 5 (the chickpea, the decoction – II, 80, 3, 2–3).

²³ DIOSCORIDES, *De materia medica*, II, 104, 1, 1–3. Consequently, the chickpea appears also in the *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis* as a foodstuff particularly effective in inducing lactation – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 130, 1, 1–2, 9 (the chickpea – I, 130, 1, 2).

²⁴ In the other treatise, Dioscorides reported that both the black and the white lentils (and a lentil-based decoction) were used as a remedy for jaundice – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, II, 58, 1, 1–7, 8 (the chickpea – II, 58, 2, 7). He also noted that the treatment method included using a rosemary decoction administered with (boiled?) chickpeas after a walk, which was an integral part of the process of healing – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, II, 58, 3, 7.

²⁵ In his *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis* Dioscorides wrote that boiled chickpeas were part of the diet which supplements the doctrine expounded in the *De materia medica* – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, II, 65, 1, 1–8, 8 (the chickpea – II, 65, 3, 4).

²⁶ DIOSCORIDES, *De materia medica*, II, 104, 2, 1–4.

²⁷ The author, however, did not specify the nature of the difference.

²⁸ DIOSCORIDES, *De materia medica*, II, 104, 2, 9–11.

²⁹ Described earlier in the text of the *De alimentorum facultatibus*.

³⁰ GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 533, 8–16.

doctor of Pergamum noted that Unripe chickpeas were also used as a foodstuff and that their qualities were analogous to those of other plants before they were fully developed³¹. He also observed that chickpea beans were at times roasted (in a way similar to broad beans), which made them less carminative, but more difficult to digest; as such they impinged on the functioning of intestines. The discussion ends with a remark that roasted chickpeas produced a foodstuff characterized by dense fluids³².

The main pharmacological characteristics of the chickpea is contained in the *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus* and supplements the information included in the *De alimentorum facultatibus*. In this treatise, Galen wrote about the carminative effects of the plant, but also about its nutritious value, positive impact on the digestive system and other properties, such as stimulating urination, lactation, production of semen and inducing menstruation. Also in this work the author emphasized that the *kriós* variety was the most effective diuretic agent: a decoction based on chickpea beans was supposed to have a powerful therapeutic effect in crushing renal calculi. The *orobias* variety in its turn was accredited with the ability to attract (the matter deeply ingrained in the body), diaphoretic, cutting and cleansing. The doctor also remarked that by its very nature the chickpea had warming and slightly desiccative effects, while its admixture of bitterness helped to detoxify the spleen, liver and kidneys. Besides, not only did it remove scabies, lichen planus and contusions, but also induced diaphoresis, which helped, for instance, in curing testicular lumps. When applied with an admixture of honey, it was believed to heal ulcerating wounds³³. The wild variety was, in turn, deemed to be more effective than the domesticated varieties: for instance, it was supposed to have more powerful warming and desiccative effects and to be more piquant and bitter in taste³⁴.

In the *Collectiones medicae* of Oribasius, the dietary and pharmacological features of the chickpea are mentioned at several instances, beginning with Book I., Book III, which contains a discussion of various classes of foodstuffs divided according to their dominant features, also includes some references to the chickpea. Further comments can be found in Books XIV and XV. The main dietary characteristics are included in Book I and are based on the doctrine of Galen as expounded in the *De alimentorum facultatibus*. Thus, we also find a discussion of the carminative effects and nutritious value, its aphrodisiac potential and the

³¹ He does not explain the point any further at this particular instance, but later physicians must have understood his intention, since they mentioned, among other things, the capacity of the unripened beans to ensure appropriate hydration of the body.

³² GALEN, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, 534, 1–7.

³³ *Galenii de simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus libri XI*, 876, 12 – 877, 5, vol. XI, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. XI–XII, Lipsiae 1826–1827 (cetera: GALEN, *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus*).

³⁴ GALEN, *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus*, 877, 6–9, vol. XI.

ability to boost the production of semen as well as its role as a cleansing agent (particularly as a remedy for renal calculi)³⁵. The work of Oribasius illustrates the popularity of the claims concerning the aphrodisiac qualities of the plant among medical doctors of the time. We find him quoting passages from the writings of Rufus of Ephesus (second century) containing a more detailed discussion of this issue and, as opposed to other authors, a physiological explanation of the phenomenon in question. The doctor believed that sexual prowess was boosted by flatulence resulting from having eaten a meal containing chickpeas. In the same passage we read that the carminative effect was mitigated by rue, which had a negative impact on the readiness for having sex³⁶.

Book III provides the reader with analogous information to what we have discussed above, but contains some additional elements borrowed from Dioscorides and Galen which were not included in the main characteristics of the plant in Book I. Thus, we read that green chickpeas (that is unripened) were categorized as rich in indigestible moisture and as such included into the class *perittomatiká* (περιττωματικά)³⁷. No wonder, then, that the plant was also included into the category of moisturising foodstuffs³⁸. The doctor classified the chickpea in the group of products containing the most important nutritious substances and agreed with Galen that it was more nourishing than broad beans³⁹. Oribasius was sceptical about including the chickpea in the category of *eúchyma* (εὐχυμα), that is, having the ability to induce production of proper (that is well-balanced) humours on account of its taste and smell. On the other hand, he did not consider the plant to be a typical representative of the *kakóchyma* (κακόχυμα) group and suggested that in this respect it did not bring about extremely detrimental effects⁴⁰. The plant appears also in the catalogue of foodstuffs which are difficult to digest⁴¹ and have carminative effects⁴². Finally, in Book III of Oribasius' writings, we see the author mentioning the cleansing features of the plant and emphasising the role of the black variety, particularly effective in this respect (above all, it helped in crushing renal calculi)⁴³.

Other therapeutic qualities of the chickpea are discussed in Books XIV and XV of the *Collectiones medicae*. The characteristics may be inferred from Oribasius' discussion of the meaning of colours with regard to the substances used as

³⁵ *Oribasii collectionum medicarum reliquiae*, I, 20, 1, 1–3, 4, ed. I. RAEDER, vol. I–IV, Lipsiae–Berolini 1928–1933 (cetera: ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*).

³⁶ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, VI, 38, 1, 1–30, 5 (the quoted passage – VI, 38, 16, 4–7; the chickpea – VI, 38, 16, 5).

³⁷ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 11, 1, 16 (the chickpea – III, 11, 1, 1).

³⁸ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 34, 1, 1–8, 2 (the chickpea – III, 34, 7, 8).

³⁹ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 13, 1, 1–13, 2 (the chickpea – III, 13, 8, 1).

⁴⁰ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 16, 1, 1–18, 3 (the chickpea – III, 16, 8, 2).

⁴¹ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 18, 1, 1–13, 1 (the chickpea – III, 18, 11, 2).

⁴² ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 23, 1, 1–9, 4 (the chickpea – III, 23, 1, 1).

⁴³ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, III, 24, 1, 1–16, 7 (the chickpea – III, 24, 1, 2–3).

nourishment or medicine. For instance, yellow and red substances were believed to be more warming than those of white colouring. It has to be noted that *erébinthos* was mentioned as an example of foodstuffs characterized by intense and warm colouring⁴⁴. This conclusion is confirmed further in the same book, where the author enumerates warming substances without discriminating between various degrees of warming capacity⁴⁵.

The chickpea (domesticated as well as the wild-growing varieties) was included in the category of unblocking (*ekfrattiká*; ἐκφραττικά) and deeply detoxifying agents (*diakathartiká*; διακαθαρτικά)⁴⁶. The author briefly discussed its functioning towards the end of the chapter and explained that medicaments of this sort mitigate the negative effects of viscous and thick humours. They were believed to be particularly helpful in diluting and releasing the noxious substances present in the chest and lungs; also, they were used in unblocking the liver and restoring the proper functioning of the spleen⁴⁷.

The chickpea, particularly the *kriós* variety, was included in the category of *ouretiká* (οὐρητικά) as it stimulated the production of urine and affected the urinary system in a number of ways⁴⁸. It is worth mentioning that this classification is repeated in a passage borrowed by Oribasius from Zopyrus (second – first century BC), who described the plant as particularly effective (especially *orobías*, the white variety) in releasing noxious substances from kidneys⁴⁹. To remove all doubts concerning the position of the chickpea as the most effective agent used for purifying kidneys, the author of *Collectiones medicae* discussed the subject once more, this time drawing on the work of Galen. The doctor of Pergamum attributed to the chickpea not only detoxifying, but also lytic qualities, which meant that in addition to crushing renal calculi it helped to excrete them from the body together with urine⁵⁰.

Following Galen, Oribasius mentions the chickpea (domesticated and wild-growing) in a passage in Book XIV, while discussing the substances which attract fluids to the surface of the body (*helktiká*; ἑλκτικά) or work in the opposite direction (*apokroustiká*; ἀποκρουστικά). In his account, the plant belonged to the former category. On this occasion Oribasius skilfully drew on the writings of his predecessor⁵¹ and went into greater detail in discussing the characteristics of

⁴⁴ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 7, 1, 1–3, 5 (the chickpea – XIV, 7, 2, 2).

⁴⁵ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 14, 1, 1–17, 2 (the chickpea – XIV, 14, 9, 4).

⁴⁶ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 47, 1, 1–3, 4 (the chickpea – IV, 47, 1, 6).

⁴⁷ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 47, 2, 1–3, 4.

⁴⁸ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 49, 1, 1–12, 4 (the chickpea – XIV, 49, 1, 9–10).

⁴⁹ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 50, 1, 1–3, 4 (the passage on detoxifying the kidneys – XIV, 50, 3, 1–4; the chickpea – XIV, 50, 3, 4).

⁵⁰ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 53, 1, 1–2, 5 (the chickpea – XIV, 53, 2, 4).

⁵¹ Oribasius reworked the relevant fragments of the *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus* in an innovative way. He expanded the doctrine of Galen by including substances with these properties – among them, he mentioned both the wild-growing and the domesticated chickpea.

this sort of substances. He argued that all *helktiká*, by their very nature, have warming qualities and are composed of small particles. It is their warmth that has the ability to attract, while the particle-based composition of these substances makes it a more powerful warming agent⁵². Still referring to Galen, the doctor of emperor Julian discussed the medicine's stimulating or impeding the production of semen. He included the chickpea to the former class, because, as he explained, semen was produced from the usable food remainders (ἐκ χρηστοῦ περιττώματος) and the plant on account of being carminative and nutritious supplied such useful substances⁵³. In Book XV of the *Collectiones medicae*, the doctor no longer referred to Galen's writings in presenting the main dietary-pharmacological characteristics of the chickpea and instead chose the *De materia medica* by Dioscorides in a slightly simplified version⁵⁴. There is no need to discuss it further as it has been already quoted in its original form.

The description of the chickpea contained in the work of the sixth-century medical doctor Aetius of Amida is based directly on Oribasius. The main dietary-pharmacological characteristics do not differ from that of the author of *Collectiones medicae*, which means that the description was rooted in the doctrine of Dioscorides⁵⁵. Book I of his encyclopaedia preserves the considerations concerning the relationship between the warming qualities of foodstuffs and their colour, which generally indicate that the chickpea was regarded as a warming agent⁵⁶. The dietary qualities of the plant are systematically mentioned in Book II of the *Iatricorum libri*, where Aetius of Amida enumerates the various categories of substances grouped according to their dominant feature. The chickpea is thus mentioned among foodstuffs which have warming qualities⁵⁷, a considerable nutritious value⁵⁸, carminative⁵⁹ and detoxifying effects⁶⁰ and, in the case of green chickpeas, work as a moisturising agent⁶¹.

⁵² ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 59, 1, 1–10, 2 (the chickpea – XIV, 59, 2, 3; the chickpea as a remedy from the *helktiká* group – XIV, 59, 1, 1–2, 1).

⁵³ ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XIV, 66, 1, 1–7, 6 (the quoted explanation – XIV, 66, 3, 6–4, 1; the chickpea – XIV, 66, 4, 1).

⁵⁴ He preserved all the most important features, but eliminated the passages which referred to specific diseases. Thus, we read that the domesticated chickpea has attractive, diaphoretic and cutting properties and is a moderately hydrating agent. The wild-growing variety is more powerful: warmer, rather dehydrating, more spicy and bitter – ORIBASIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XV, 1:5, 28, 1–29, 3.

⁵⁵ *Aetii Amideni libri medicinales I–VIII*, I, 145, 1–8, ed. A. OLIVIERI, Lipsiae–Berolini 1935–1950 (cetera: AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*).

⁵⁶ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, *Prolegomena*, 354–357.

⁵⁷ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 198, 1–13 (the chickpea – II, 198, 10).

⁵⁸ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 250, 1–21 (the chickpea – II, 250, 13).

⁵⁹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 259, 1–9 (the chickpea – II, 259, 1).

⁶⁰ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 260, 1–26 (the chickpea – II, 260, 2–3).

⁶¹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 270, 1–5 (the chickpea – II, 270, 4).

The pharmacological catalogues of Book II include additional information about the plant. According to the author, the chickpea was a relatively effective warming agent (its external cover, leaves and fruit were included in the second degree of effectiveness in this respect)⁶², had the ability to attract (the organic juices from deep down in the body)⁶³ and stimulated the production of semen (due to its nutritious value as well as carminative and warming properties)⁶⁴. Finally, he concluded that green (that is, unripe) chickpeas contained a fair amount of indigestible moisture and as such belonged to the group *perittomatika*⁶⁵.

The work of Paul of Aegina explicitly demonstrates the persistence of the dietary-pharmacological doctrine developed in antiquity. A brief dietary characteristic with some elements of pharmacological description is contained in Book I of his work, in the chapter devoted to all leguminous plants⁶⁶. The main description of the plant can be found in Book VII of his encyclopaedia and is in line with the canon of classical and Byzantine medicine⁶⁷.

3. The therapeutic uses of the chickpea

In discussing the therapeutic uses of the chickpea, it seems worthwhile to begin with the works of Dioscorides, even though some of these have been mentioned already in the characteristics included in the *De materia medica*. At this particular instance, the remaining part of the material needs to be taken into consideration. Dioscorides recommended that in most cases the chickpea should be applied externally. The *orobías* variety, boiled and mixed with honey, was applied in the form of a cataplasm for testicular inflammations⁶⁸, dermatological problems

⁶² AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 200, 1–7 (the chickpea – II, 200, 5–6).

⁶³ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 234, 1–8 (the chickpea – II, 234, 2).

⁶⁴ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 237, 1–6 (the chickpea – II, 237, 3).

⁶⁵ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, II, 248, 1–6 (the chickpea – II, 248, 3).

⁶⁶ The chickpea was thus described as a carminative and detoxifying agent which stimulated the production of semen and boosted sexual prowess. When roasted, it was less carminative, but more difficult to digest – PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 79, 1, 1–15 (the chickpea – I, 79, 1, 7–9).

⁶⁷ The chickpea was described as being carminative, nutritious, beneficial for the stomach, diuretic, and stimulating lactation, menstruation and the production of semen. According to the author, the *kriós* variety was a powerful diuretic agent; he recommended a chickpea-based decoction for crushing renal calculi. *The orobíai* had a more powerful warming effect and were slightly bitter. The wild-growing chickpea was believed to be more effective than the domesticated variety. See: PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, VII, 3, 5, 88–94.

⁶⁸ The latter work of the doctor contained statements which were formulated in a more precise manner. For testicular inflammations Dioscorides recommended chickpea flour boiled in *melikraton* (μελίκρατον) and a cataplasm based on chickpea beans; DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 132, 1, 1–2, 10 (the chickpea – I, 132, 1, 5–6). The author noted that apart from chickpea beans the young leaves of the plant were used as a medicine. They were applied in the form of a compress in the initial stage of all kinds of inflammation – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 136, 1, 1–2, 6 (chickpea leaves – I, 136, 2, 5–6).

known as *áchor* (ἄχωρ; it manifested itself in a variety of ways of flaking off of the epidermis), various kinds of lichen, scabies⁶⁹, subcutaneous warts of the *myrmekíai* (μυρμηκία) type and cancerous ulcerations⁷⁰. While discussing the *myrmekíai* and *akrochórdones* (ἀκροχόρδονες; a kind of elongated warts), Dioscorides noted that some people would touch them with chickpea beans (one per each wart), put them in a cloth, tie it up and throw it behind their back, which was supposed to make the warts disappear⁷¹. The author, as suggested in his narrative, seems to have been sceptical about this method⁷².

The other memorable work of Dioscorides, the *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, repeats the doctrine expounded in the *De materia medica*, and supplements the discussion with only two pieces of additional information. The first of these indicates that the chickpea was recommended as a foodstuff beneficial for chronically affected liver⁷³, whereas the other suggests that chickpea roots were used for compresses applied to reduce persistent swelling⁷⁴.

The prescriptions recommended by Galen demonstrate that the medicinal uses of the chickpea were similar in the second half of the second century AD. The doctor of Pergamon, in keeping with the general pharmacological characteristics of the plant, recommended it for curing various conditions of the skin. Thus, he prescribed a mixture of fenugreek flour, sweet clover and a chickpea decoction (or chickpea seeds without any additional ingredients) for *psydrákia* (ψυδράκια; pimples on the head), *achór*, *helkýdria* (ἐλκύδρια; small wounds or ulcers) and *eksanthémata* (ἐξανθήματα; that is various lesions)⁷⁵. This medicament must have

⁶⁹ Similar skin conditions are discussed in the *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, where Dioscorides recommended the chickpea as a remedy for lesions, rash and other ailments generically referred to as dandruff (all affecting the skin on the head) – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 99, 1, 1–2, 8. The treatment consisted in administering a chickpea-based decoction and a cataplasm based on boiled chickpea beans – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 99, 2, 3. In the same treatise one can find another use of the chickpea: chickpea beans boiled in vinegar were applied on wounds caused by leprosy – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 121, 1, 1–3, 10 (the chickpea – I, 121, 2, 1–2). A decoction based on chickpea roots helped to heal red spots on the skin which were referred to as *erysipélata* (ἐρυσιπέλατα) – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 160, 1, 1–4, 7 (chickpea roots – I, 160, 4, 7).

⁷⁰ DIOSCORIDES, *De materia medica*, II, 104, 1, 3–2, 1. The other treatise contained a recipe for a cataplasm for ulcers. It was based on boiled chickpea beans and vetches mixed with honey – DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 193, 1, 1–2, 6 (the chickpea – I, 193, 1, 5–6).

⁷¹ DIOSCORIDES, *De materia medica*, II, 104, 2, 4–8. The therapeutic methods applied in the treatment of *myrmekíai* and *akrochórdones* are also repeated in the *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 167, 1, 1–3, 7 (chickpea therapy – I, 167, 1, 3–2, 1).

⁷² We refer here to the word *énoi* (*Énoi*) used by the author. It indicates the fact that this method was accepted only by some physicians or was simply used in folk medicine.

⁷³ DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, II, 60, 1, 1–4, 6 (the chickpea – II, 60, 4, 4).

⁷⁴ DIOSCORIDES, *Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, I, 138, 1, 1–3, 8 (chickpea roots – I, 138, 3, 1).

⁷⁵ *Galenii de compositione medicamentorum secundum locos libri X*, 496, 6–497, 5, vol. XII, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. C.G. KÜHN, vol. XII–XIII, Lipsiae 1826–1827 (cetera: GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos*) (the chickpea – 496, 14–16, vol. XII).

been applied as a cataplasm. While referring to his predecessor Archigenes (the turn of the first and the second centuries AD), he quoted a number of his prescriptions, including a medicine used for dark blemishes, particularly around the eyes: *hypóphia* (ὕπωπια). The *orobias* variety was mentioned as a remedy for this condition; it should have been soaked in wine, mashed and applied as a compress⁷⁶.

The doctor of Pergamon also left a fair amount of information about the treatment of jaundice with the use of the chickpea. He included in his account a diuretic prescription found in Asclepiades (the turn of the second and the first century BC), but apparently attributable to Nikeratos. It was administered to people suffering from jaundice, as is illustrated by the fact that the cure was described in a fairly long fragment of the *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos* devoted to the treatment of this particular disease. It was composed of dried chickpea beans, rosemary, dill and wild asparagus roots. The ingredients were first boiled in water and then drained off. The decoction was administered as a beverage to quench thirst, also when the sick suffered from high fever. If the fever did not complicate the process of treatment, the medicine was mixed with some diluted wine⁷⁷. Another prescription documented by Galen recommended using dry chickpea beans, a bunch of *adiantum* (that is, the maidenhair fern) and the same amount of wild asparagus. It is implied that it was prepared and administered in a similar way to that described above⁷⁸. Archigenes also prescribed a different medicament for jaundice, namely soaked chickpea beans of the *orobias* variety exposed to the sun. The obtained liquid was administered as a beverage, whereas the beans were eaten for two consecutive days, one portion in the morning and the other in the evening. Having completed this procedure, the patients were told to drink *melikraton* (μελίκρατον) with an admixture of wormwood for three days⁷⁹.

Among the many uses of the plant, the doctor of Pergamon mentioned an intriguing and untypical dental practice. While discussing the ways of extracting molar teeth, he prescribed a mixture of chickpea flour and garden spurge juice. It was to be applied on the tooth and covered with ivy leaves. An hour later, the extraction could begin, which apparently, according to Galen, would not lead to any major problems. The same procedure could be used for extracting other types of teeth. It also included the use of the ointment called *keroté* (κηρωτή)⁸⁰.

⁷⁶ GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos*, 807, 14–814, 15, vol. XII (the quoted passage – 813, 16–814, 1, vol. XII; the chickpea – 814, 1, vol. XII).

⁷⁷ GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos*, 231, 15–233, 2, vol. XIII (the quoted recipe – 232, 13–18, vol. XIII; the chickpea – 232, 14, vol. XIII).

⁷⁸ The quoted recipe – GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos*, 232, 18–233, 2, vol. XIII (the chickpea – 232, 18, vol. XIII).

⁷⁹ GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos*, 234, 4–236, 14, vol. XIII (the quoted recipe – 236, 5–8, vol. XIII; the chickpea – 236, 5, vol. XIII).

⁸⁰ GALEN, *De compositione medicamentorum secundum locos*, 883, 6–10, vol. XII (chickpea flour – 883, 6, vol. XII).

The *Collectiones medicae* by Oribasius, likewise his *Eclogae medicamentorum*, contain only a few prescriptions for the therapeutic use of the chickpea. Nevertheless, in conjunction with the dietary and pharmacological characteristics discussed above, they allow to observe that the plant was still used in the treatment of analogous conditions. Oribasius preserved the formula for this medicament in the form of a compress referred to by this author as *epíplasma* (ἐπίπλασμα) used in this kind of hydrops. It was made of chopped rue leaves mixed with boiled honey and chickpea flour⁸¹.

Oribasius analysed the writings of Galen and in the *Collectiones medicae* presented a selection of his doctrine concerning the treatment of scleroses and swellings. Among other things, he quoted the already mentioned statements of the doctor of Pergamon on the effectiveness of the chickpea as a remedy for mumps and testicular inflammations (presumably, it involved using therapeutic softening-diaphoretic compresses)⁸². The treatise *Eclogae medicamentorum* testifies that still in the fourth century the plant was often applied in the treatment of the latter condition. In the chapter dedicated to the therapy of scrotal hernia, the doctor referred to healing testicular inflammations with chickpea flour mixed with boiled *melikraton*. The mixture must have been applied as a compress on the glands, hardened (as we know from other sources) by the inflammation⁸³.

We can also infer from the writings of Oribasius that the chickpea was a very popular remedy in the treatment of jaundice. A decoction based on the white variety was administered as a beverage to the sick⁸⁴. Another medicament was prepared by boiling chickpeas with a bunch of dill, until the ingredients were completely soft. The plants were then removed and the decoction was mixed with *oinómeli* (οἰνόμηλι) and given to the patient⁸⁵. The *Eclogae medicamentorum* recommend that women having irregular periods should eat (presumably boiled) chickpea beans⁸⁶; this prescription can also be found in both earlier and later medical writings.

The medical procedures described in the first half of the sixth century demonstrate that the chickpea was still used in much the same way as previously. It is worth noting, however, that the work of Aetius of Amida preserves a particularly significant number of methods of treatment based on the therapeutic qualities attributed to this plant. As illustrated in the *Iatricorum libri*, *erébinthos* was still believed to be a very effective aphrodisiac: Book XI includes references to

⁸¹ ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, IX, 39, 1, 1–2, 3 (chickpea flour – IX, 39, 2, 3).

⁸² ORIBASIIUS, *Collectiones medicae*, XLIV, 27, 1, 1–15, 6 (the chickpea as an anti-inflammatory agent, see – XLIV, 27, 6, 1–20).

⁸³ *Oribasii eclogae medicamentorum*, 84, 1, 1–133, [in:] *Oribasii collectionum medicarum reliquiae*, ed. I. RAEDER, vol. IV, Lipsiae–Berolini 1933 (cetera: ORIBASIIUS, *Eclogae medicamentorum*) (testicular inflammations – 84, 11, 1–5; a medicine with the chickpea – 84, 11, 3–4).

⁸⁴ ORIBASIIUS, *Eclogae medicamentorum*, 50, 1, 1–12, 10 (the chickpea – 50, 4, 3).

⁸⁵ ORIBASIIUS, *Eclogae medicamentorum*, 50, 9, 1–2.

⁸⁶ ORIBASIIUS, *Eclogae medicamentorum*, 146, 1, 1–17, 3 (the chickpea – 146, 14, 9).

the writings of Rufus of Ephesus on the factors increasing sexual prowess (the chickpea is mentioned there as one of the particularly important foodstuffs in this respect)⁸⁷. The author repeats this suggestion in the same book and explains that people suffering from problems with potency should include the chickpea in their diet on account of its warming and carminative properties⁸⁸.

Aetius of Amida discussed the detoxifying qualities of the plant, which had been described previously by earlier medical writers, and included a decoction based on the chickpea as a powerful laxative used to empty the small intestine⁸⁹. Its anti-inflammatory properties are also mentioned by the author of *Iatricorum libri*, who made references to the practice of using a decoction of the white chickpea as a remedy for chronic hepatic inflammations⁹⁰. For the urinary system malfunctions, he recommended a decoction based on the black (that is *kriós*) chickpea as a powerful medicine from the *tmetiká* (τμητικά) group, which was a highly effective remedy for renal calculi (it also helped to excrete the stones with urine)⁹¹. He prescribed the same medicament (but with an admixture of thymes) for problems with the bladder and warned that this medicine had a powerful and nearly immediate therapeutic effect⁹². When seasoned with pepper and rue, it induced menstruation⁹³; without any additional components, it was administered to women who had low body temperature because of their temperament, which caused irregular periods⁹⁴. The author of the *Iatricorum libri* promoted the use of the plant as a remedy for speech organ disorders. For problems with the throat, which might potentially lead to loss of voice, he recommended using a decoction based on the chickpea mixed with styrax. Aetius of Amida borrowed this information from Antonius Musa (first century BC)⁹⁵.

His work contains a number of prescriptions for the external use of the plant. For instance, the author recommended using a cataplasm for healing wounds caused by bloodletting. It was prepared on the basis of chickpea flour (or an analogous product based on fenugreek, barley and broad beans) boiled in *oinelaíon* (οἶνελαῖον – a mixture of water, wine, wine must and rose oil). The compresses were warmed up and applied on skin (the doctor recommended that they should be changed frequently)⁹⁶. He also mentioned cataplasms prepared on the basis

⁸⁷ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, III, 8, 1–71 (the chickpea – III, 8, 57).

⁸⁸ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XI, 35, 1–18 (the chickpea – XI, 35, 8).

⁸⁹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, III, 145, 1–18 (the chickpea – III, 145, 3).

⁹⁰ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, III, 146, 1–7 (the chickpea – III, 146, 4–5).

⁹¹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, III, 149, 1–9 (the chickpea – III, 149, 3). Aetius of Amida also observed that a lentils-based decoction was an effective remedy for renal calculi – AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XI, 5, 1–99 (the chickpea – XI, 5, 50).

⁹² AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XI, 22, 25–26.

⁹³ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, III, 154, 1–18 (the chickpea – III, 154, 4).

⁹⁴ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XVI, 52, 1–53 (the chickpea – XVI, 52, 22).

⁹⁵ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VIII, 56, 1–38 (the chickpea – VIII, 56, 3).

⁹⁶ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XII, 26, 1–15 (the chickpea – XII, 26, 10).

of the same kind of flour, but mixed with some *melíkraton* (μελίκρατον) or pork fat⁹⁷. For people suffering from excessive amount of phlegm, the doctor prescribed compresses based on chickpea and birthwort⁹⁸. Another medicament in the form of a compress was applied on painless lumps and was made of maidenhair fern, nettle, althaea and other plants mixed with chickpea flour, bread and (vegetable or animal) fats⁹⁹. In the sixth century, the plant was also used as a remedy for various skin conditions. For instance, Aetius recommended using it to remove dandruff and similar ailments, with or without exudations. The treatment was preceded with detoxifying the whole body with appropriate medicaments (such as whey) and bloodletting (if necessary). The text implies using a wide range of medicines, including some of the most simple nature such as a compress made of boiled chickpea beans and a chickpea decoction used for rinsing the skin on the head¹⁰⁰.

Aetius of Amida, in addition to the dermatological uses mentioned above, included several Recipes for cosmetics. One of these was called *stílboma prosópou* (στίλβωμα προσώπου) and was used to brighten the skin on the face and give it a faint blush¹⁰¹. It was made of ground vetch, broad beans, lupine, barley, chickpeas, durum wheat and narcissus bulbs. All ingredients were crushed, thoroughly sifted and mixed with egg white. The mixture was then formed into pills and dried in a shady place. It was diluted in water and applied on the skin after bath¹⁰². Dark colourings were treated with a peeling made of frankincense, thoroughly rinsed white lead, iron oxide rinsed in a decoction of the white chickpea, starch, filings of white marble, mastix, potassium salpêtre, sepia shells, Gallic soap and egg white¹⁰³. A significant part of Book VIII of the *Iatricorum libri* is devoted to cosmetic recipes borrowed from Crito (second century AD) for protecting the skin from overheating. One of these was made of iron oxide thoroughly bleached in the sun in a chickpea decoction, Nepalese cardamom, *kassía* cinnamon, spikenard leaves, alum and iris¹⁰⁴. Book IV contains a detailed recipe for removing unwanted hair. It was made of rice, peas, chickpeas, barley, quicklime, arsenic trioxide, myrrh, mastix and balm tree resin¹⁰⁵. According to the author, the basic ingredients (rice, peas and chickpeas) were boiled and then mixed with heated quicklime

⁹⁷ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XII, 30, 1–24 (the chickpea – XII, 30, 18).

⁹⁸ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XII, 37, 1–56 (the chickpea – XII, 37, 33).

⁹⁹ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XII, 48, 1–77 (the quoted passage – XII, 48, 32–41; the chickpea – XII, 48, 35).

¹⁰⁰ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VI, 68, 1–95 (the chickpea – VI, 68, 37).

¹⁰¹ Perhaps the issue at stake was to protect oneself from the burning sunlight and hence to preserve a fair complexion.

¹⁰² AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VIII, 6, 17–22 (the chickpea – VIII, 6, 18).

¹⁰³ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VIII, 6, 63–68 (the chickpea – VIII, 6, 65).

¹⁰⁴ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VIII, 7, 1–44 (the quoted passage – VIII, 7, 11–14; the chickpea – VIII, 7, 12).

¹⁰⁵ *Balsamodendron opobalsamum* Kunth.

and arsenic trioxide. The myrrh, mastix and balm tree resin must have been used to give a pleasant scent to the mixture¹⁰⁶.

Book XVI in its turn preserved a recipe which is both medicinal and culinary, namely a therapeutic *garum* used to intensify digestive processes and made of water, salt, black chickpeas, *amanítai* mushrooms and dried figs. All ingredients were mixed and left to mature. After some time, the mixture was sifted and stored¹⁰⁷.

The medical encyclopaedia of Paul of Aegina indicates that the chickpea continued to be used in the traditional way at the turn of the sixth and the seventh centuries. One of the cosmetological remarks contained in his work was an observation that the pallor of the face disappeared owing to joy and an appropriate diet, which, as he recommended, should include green chickpeas¹⁰⁸. As far as the *sui generis* early Byzantine sexology is concerned, Paul of Aegina proved to be yet another medical writer who incorporated the already quoted reflections of Rufus of Ephesus which emphasized the role of the chickpea in the diet recommended for people wishing to improve their potency¹⁰⁹. In addition to that, he described (in Book III) a stimulant made of chickpea beans, black pine, rocket, pepper and honey. The ingredients were ground, mixed with wine and administered as a beverage¹¹⁰.

The doctor of Aegina also discussed using the chickpea in the treatment of testicular inflammations¹¹¹. Some details included in his encyclopaedia had not been mentioned by earlier authors. There is for instance a recipe for a cataplasm made of henbane leaves mixed with wheat or chickpea flour, which was applied on the inflamed glands in acute orchitis¹¹². Another medicine of this sort was more complicated as the recipe involved using pitted raisins, boiled chickpea beans, cumin, sulphur, soda and resin, all crushed and mixed with honey¹¹³. Still in the seventh century the chickpea was used as a diuretic agent. It was also recommended for inducing menstruation¹¹⁴. Paul of Aegina prescribed the *kriós* variety as a remedy for kidney stones; he provided a detailed explanation of the etiology of the disease and of the reasons for the use of this plant¹¹⁵. His encyclopaedia contains also

¹⁰⁶ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, VI, 64, 1–23 (the quoted passage – VI, 64, 9–14; the chickpea – VI, 64, 10).

¹⁰⁷ AETIUS OF AMIDA, *Iatricorum libri*, XVI, 141, 1–3 (the chickpea – XVI, 141, 1–2).

¹⁰⁸ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 27, 1, 1–9 (the chickpea – I, 27, 1, 2–3).

¹⁰⁹ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 35, 1, 1–34 (the chickpea – I, 35, 1, 19).

¹¹⁰ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, III, 58, 1, 1–18 (the quoted passage – III, 58, 1, 13–14; the chickpea – III, 58, 1, 13).

¹¹¹ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, III, 54, 1, 1–2, 19.

¹¹² PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, III, 54, 2, 8–10.

¹¹³ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, III, 54, 2, 12–15.

¹¹⁴ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, III, 61, 1, 1–5, 17 (the chickpea – I, 61, 5, 10).

¹¹⁵ Dense fluids turned solid owing to the heat characteristics of the kidneys and the bladder. Thus the treatment was based on cutting substances which did not increase body temperature, PAUL

a recipe for crushing renal calculi: it was called *foúska* (φοῦσκα) and was made of a black chickpea decoction, asparagus roots, celery and maidenhair fern. Mixed with wine vinegar, it was administered to patients during hot bath¹¹⁶.

Other uses mentioned by the author included using chickpea flour for cataplasms applied on painful inflammations. If the pain was moderate, the cataplasms were made of green cabbage and celery, but when the situation deteriorated, the inflamed spot was coated with a medicine made of fenugreek flour, darnel and chickpeas mixed with *melikraton* (or wine) and a tinge of alkanet (or spikenard) oil¹¹⁷. The chickpea also appeared on the list of compresses effective in the treatment of scabies¹¹⁸ and lichen planus¹¹⁹. It should also be noted that cataplasms made of chickpea flour (or other flours, made of, for example, broad beans, lupine, barley or barley groats) were used as a remedy for inflamed lesions of hard tissues¹²⁰. The physician observed that a chickpea decoction and chickpea beans were believed to have a detoxifying effect and could be used as an antidote for unsafe drinking water¹²¹. There was also a chickpea-based antidote for spider bites of the *falángia* (φαλάγγια) type: a decoction based on wild-growing chickpeas mixed with wine was administered during bath¹²².

4. Conclusions

The first conclusion to be drawn from the material presented above is that the ancient and early Byzantine physicians had a profound knowledge about the chickpea. They all regarded the plant as both a *fármakon* (a therapeutic substance) and a foodstuff, which is typical of the medical writings of the time on account of the established doctrine.

Secondly, it has to be concluded that the chickpea was one of the most basic foodstuffs, given that it was given so much attention by the authors of theoretical treatises since the fourth century, who consistently indicated the same dietary characteristics of the plant. The theory concerning its role in the diet evolved into a fully developed form only in the first century, as is illustrated in the work of Dioscorides. Galen, who lived in the second century, did not modify these

OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, III, 45, 1, 1–3, 22 (explanations concerning the nature of renal calculi and the expectations related to therapeutic substances – III, 45, 2, 6–17; the chickpea – III, 45, 2, 12–13).

¹¹⁶ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, VII, 11, 48, 1–12 (the recipe – VII, 11, 48, 7–10; the chickpea – VII, 11, 48, 7).

¹¹⁷ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, III, 78, 1, 1–19, 22 (the quoted passage – III, 78, 15, 1–13; the chickpea – III, 78, 15, 4).

¹¹⁸ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, IV, 2, 3, 1–4 (the chickpea – IV, 2, 3, 3).

¹¹⁹ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, IV, 3, 1, 1–14 (the chickpea – IV, 3, 1, 4).

¹²⁰ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, IV, 54, 1, 1–10, 5 (the quoted passage – IV, 54, 4, 11–16; the chickpea – IV, 54, 4, 13).

¹²¹ PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, I, 50, 1, 1–41 (the chickpea – I, 50, 1, 38–39).

¹²² PAUL OF AEGINA, *Epitome*, V, 6, 1, 1–2, 12 (the chickpea – V, 6, 2, 7–8).

observations. The foundational doctrine of these two physicians became part of the medical encyclopaedias of the early Byzantine period, which preserved the ancient theories on the subject and did not create a separate body of knowledge.

Thirdly, medical writings may serve as a proof that the chickpea remained a key element in the Mediterranean diet throughout the period from the fourth century BC to the seventh century AD. Had it been otherwise, the physicians would not have paid so much attention to this plant. The analysed material demonstrates the use of the same basic varieties of the *erébinthos* throughout the period, even though some local variants were also identified, as illustrated by the remark by Diocles of Carystus. The consistency of the data also suggests that the scale and methods of cultivation of this plant remained unchanged. The culinary uses of the chickpea must also have been the same throughout the period, given that the writers discussed similar uses of the plant as a foodstuff. This means, among other things, that it was used primarily in boiled dishes, seasoned with some local herbal additives¹²³.

Fourthly, the source material presented above demonstrates that the medicinal properties of the chickpea and its therapeutic use were discussed by Greek physicians as early as in the fourth century BC. It seems that it was a readily accessible medicament and thus used in therapy also by those who could not afford more sophisticated medicines. Symptomatically, it was only Aetius of Amida who mentioned the chickpea in the context of imported medicinal ingredients, which must have been more expensive (see the passage of the *Iatricorum libri* based on the work of Crito)¹²⁴. These remarks, however, referred only to cosmetics, not to the therapeutic uses. The luxury additives were supposed to give a distinctly pleasant smell to these specifics and as such they served as aromatic ingredients rather than *fármaka* in the strict sense.

The presented material also illustrates the fact that a significant number of medicinal *recipes* which involved using the chickpea were formulated between the second century BC and the second century AD. Byzantine physicians avidly used these formulas in their practice, but failed to develop them in a significantly innovative way.

Finally, it has to be noted that the list of ailments treated with various chickpea specifics was fairly long and remained roughly the same throughout the whole period under scrutiny. Its first exhaustive version can be found in the writings of Dioscorides, who drew attention to the use of the plant in the therapies of urinary system malfunctions (particularly renal calculi). In addition to that, the chickpea was used for jaundice, hepatic problems, and cutaneous conditions (for instance, it reduced various kinds of edema). The medicines produced on the

¹²³ See the remark concerning rue as an additive reducing the carminative effect of the chickpea. These include for instance Nepalese cardamom, *kassia* cinnamon, spikenard leaves, myrrh and balm tree resin.

¹²⁴ Cf. information on rue.

basis of the plant often took the form of a compress, whereas a decoction made of chickpea beans was applied in internal use. The surviving medical writings make it possible to conclude that the chickpea was believed to be a highly effective medicine and as such worthy of cultivation, which only testifies to the general popularity of the plant.

Bibliography

Sources

- Aetii Amideni libri medicinales I–VIII*, ed. A. OLIVIERI, Lipsiae–Berolini 1935–1950.
- ATENAJOS, *Uczta mędrców*, trans., ed. K. BARTOL, J. DANIELEWICZ, Poznań 2010.
- Athenaei Naucraticae dipnosopistarum libri XV*, rec. G. KAIBEL, vol. I–III, Lipsiae–Berolini 1887–1890.
- Galenii De alimentorum facultatibus libri III*, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. VI, Lipsiae 1823.
- Galenii de compositione medicamentorum secundum locos libri X*, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. C.G. KÜHN, vol. XII–XIII, Lipsiae 1826–1827.
- Galenii De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus libri XI*, [in:] *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, ed. D.C.G. KÜHN, vol. XI–XII, Lipsiae 1826–1827.
- Hippocratis de diaeta*, ed. R. JOLY, S. BYL, Berlin 2003.
- Oribasii collectionum medicarum reliquiae*, ed. I. RAEDER, vol. I–IV, Lipsiae–Berolini 1928–1933.
- Oribasii elogae medicamentorum*, [in:] *Oribasii collectionum medicarum reliquiae*, ed. I. RAEDER, vol. IV, Lipsiae–Berolini 1933.
- Paulus Aegineta*, ed. I.L. HEIBERG, vol. I–II, Lipsiae–Berolini 1921–1924.
- Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque*, ed. M. WELLMANN, vol. I–III, Berlin 1907–1914.
- Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei Euporista vel de simplicibus medicinis*, [in:] *Pedanii Dioscuridis Anazarbei De materia medica libri quinque*, ed. M. WELLMANN, vol. III, Berlin 1914.

Secondary literature

- ALCOCK J.P., *Food in the ancient world*, Westport–London 2006.
- AMOURETTI M.-C., *Villes et campagnes grecques*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 133–150.
- ANAGNOSTAKIS I., *Pallikaria of lentils. The “brave boys” of beans*, [in:] *Flavours and delights. Tastes and pleasures of ancient and Byzantine cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 133–137.
- ANAGNOSTAKIS I., *“The raw and the cooked”: ways of cooking and serving food in Byzantium*, [in:] *Flavours and delights. Tastes and pleasures of ancient and Byzantine cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 175–181.
- ANDRÉ J., *L'alimentation et la cuisine à Rome*, Paris 1961.

- BOURBOU C., *Health and disease in Byzantine Crete (7th–12th centuries AD)*, Farnham–Burlington 2010.
- BRAUDEL F., *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, vol. I–II, Paris 1966.
- BRESCIANI E., *Nourritures et boissons de l'Égypte ancienne*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 61–72.
- CHEYNET J.-C., *La valeur marchande des produits alimentaires dans l'Empire byzantin*, [in:] *Byzantinon diatrohi kai mageireiai. Praktika imeridas "Peri tis diatrophis sto Byzantio"*. *Food and cooking in Byzantium. Proceedings of the symposium "On food in Byzantium"*. Thessaloniki Museum of Byzantine Culture 4 November 2001, ed. D.D. PAPANIKOLA–BAKIRTZI, Athens 2005, p. 31–45.
- DALBY A., *Flavours of Byzantium*, Totnes 2003.
- DALBY A., *Food in the ancient world from A to Z*, London–New York 2003.
- DALBY A., *The flavours of classical Greece*, [in:] *Flavours and delights. Tastes and pleasures of ancient and Byzantine cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 17–35.
- DAR P., *Food and archeology in Romano-Byzantine Palestine*, [in:] *Food in antiquity*, ed. J. WILKINS, D. HARVEY, M. DOBSON, Exeter 1995, p. 326–335.
- FLINT-HAMILTON K.B., *Legumes in ancient Greece and Rome: food, medicine or poison*, "Hesperia. The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens" 68, 1999, p. 371–385.
- FOXHALL L., FORBES H.A., *Sitomereia: the role of grain as staple food in classical antiquity*, "Chiron. Mitteilungen der Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts" 12, 1982, p. 41–90.
- GARNSEY P., *Food and society in classical antiquity*, Cambridge 2002.
- GROTTANELLI C., *La viande et ses rites*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 117–132.
- KISLINGER E., *Les chrétiens d'Orient: règles et réalités alimentaires dans le monde byzantin*, [in:] *Histoire de l'alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 325–344.
- KODER J., *I kathemerini diatrophi sto Byzantio me basi tis piges*, [in:] *Byzantinon diatrohi kai...*, p. 17–30.
- KODER J., *Stew and salted meat – opulent normality in the diet of every day?*, [in:] *Eat, drink and be merry (Luke 12:19). Food and wine in Byzantium. In honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer*, ed. L. BRUBAKER, K. LINARDOU, Aldershot 2007, p. 59–72.
- KOKOSZKO M., *Smaki Konstantynopola*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyńskim*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Warszawa 2011, p. 471–575.
- KOKOSZKO M., ERLICH Ł., *Rola roślin strączkowych (όσπρια) w diecie późnego antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (IV–VII w.) na podstawie wybranych źródeł*, "Zeszyty Wiejskie" 17, 2012, p. 8–18.
- KOKOSZKO M., RZEŹNICKA Z., JAGUSIAK K., *Rola roślin strączkowych (όσπρια) w świetle źródeł medycznych pomiędzy II a VII w.*, [in:] *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, vol. II, *Pokarm dla ciała i ducha*, ed. M. KOKOSZKO, Łódź 2014, p. 67–75.
- KOKOSZKO M., DYBAŁA J., JAGUSIAK K., RZEŹNICKA Z., *Dieta mnichów syryjskich. Komentarz do terminu ospria (όσπρια) w Historia religiosa Teodoretą z Cyru*, "Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia" 7, 2014, p. 115–143.
- KOKOSZKO M., DYBAŁA J., JAGUSIAK K., RZEŹNICKA Z., *Dieta monastyczna w świetle nauki medycznej. Teodoret z Cyru i medycy o soczewicy*, "Vox Patrum" 34, 2014, p. 297–329.
- KOUKOULES PH., *Byzantinon bios kai politismos*, vol. V, *Hai trofai kai ta pota...*, Athènes 1952.

- KOUKOULES PH., *Byzantinon trophai kai pota*, “Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν” / “Eperitis tes Hetaireias Byzantinon Spoudon” 17, 1941, p. 3–112.
- KOUKOULES PH., *Everyday food in the middle Byzantine period*, [in:] *Flavours and delights. Tastes and pleasures of ancient and Byzantine cuisine*, ed. I. ANAGNOSTAKIS, Athens 2013, p. 139–155.
- NUTTON V., *Galen and the traveler’s fare*, [in:] *Food in antiquity*, ed. J. WILKINS, D. HARVEY, M. DOBSON, Exeter 1995, p. 359–370.
- PERLÈS C., *Les stratégies alimentaires dans les temps préhistoriques*, [in:] *Histoire de l’alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 29–46.
- RAUTMAN M.L., *The daily life in the Byzantine Empire*, Westport–Oxford 2006.
- SASSATELLI G., *L’alimentation des Étrusques*, [in:] *Histoire de l’alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 183–195.
- SPANÒ GIAMMELLARO A., *Les Phéniciens et les Carthaginois*, [in:] *Histoire de l’alimentation*, ed. J.-L. FLANDRIN, M. MONTANARI, Paris 1996, p. 85–99.
- STATHAKOPOULOS D., *Between the field and the plate: how agricultural products were processed into food*, [in:] *Eat, drink and be merry (Luke 12:19). Food and wine in Byzantium. In honour of Professor A.A.M. Bryer*, ed. L. BRUBAKER, K. LINARDOU, Aldershot 2007, p. 27–38.
- WILKINS J.M., HILL P., *Food in the ancient world*, Oxford 2006.

Abstract. Leguminous plants were a crucially important element in the Mediterranean diet, and, as such, these plants were second only to cereals. It is also important to note that according to medical writings preserved from antiquity and the early Byzantine period they were considered to be an accessible source of substances which could be applied in therapeutics. One of the most commonly mentioned legumes was the chickpea.

The source material demonstrates that the medicinal properties of the chickpea and its therapeutic use were discussed by Greek physicians as early as in the fourth century BC. It seems that the plant was a readily accessible medicament and thus used in therapy also by those who could not afford costly medicines. The authors argue, however, that the medical theory concerning its role in therapeutics evolved into a fully developed form only in the first century AD (thanks to Dioscorides) and was not modified by Galen. The doctrine of these two physicians became part of the medical encyclopaedias of the early Byzantine period. The presented material also illustrates the fact that a significant number of medicinal Recipes which involved using the chickpea were formulated between the second century BC and the second century AD. Byzantine physicians avidly used these formulas in their practice, but failed to develop them in a significantly innovative way. The surviving medical writings make it possible to conclude that the chickpea was believed to be a highly effective medicine and as such worthy of cultivation, which only testifies to the general popularity of the plant.

Medical writings may serve as a proof that the chickpea remained a key element in the Mediterranean diet throughout the period from the fourth century BC to the seventh century AD. The analysed material demonstrates the use of the same basic varieties of the *erébinthos* throughout the period, even though some local variants were also identified. The consistency of the data also suggests that the scale and methods of cultivation of this plant remained unchanged. The culinary uses of the chickpea must also have been the same throughout the period, given that the writers discussed similar uses of the plant as a foodstuff.

Keywords: food history; ancient medicine; Byzantine medicine; the chickpea as a medicament; Diocles of Carystus; Dioscorides; Galen; Aetius of Amida; Paul of Aegina; Athenaeus of Naucratis

Maciej Kokoszko

Uniwersytet Łódzki
Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny
Instytut Historii
Katedra Historii Bizancjum
ul. Kamińskiego 27 a
90-219 Łódź, Polska/Poland
mkokoszko@komanador.pl

Krzysztof Jagusiak

Centrum Badań nad Historią i Kulturą
Basenu Morza Śródziemnego
i Europy Południowo-Wschodniej
im. prof. Waldemara Cerana, *Ceraneum*
ul. Matejki 32/38, sala 319
90-237 Łódź, Polska/Poland
krzysztof_jagusiak@o2.pl

Jolanta Dybała

Uniwersytet Jana Kochanowskiego
Filia w Piotrkowie Trybunalskim, Biblioteka
ul. J. Słowackiego 114/118
97-300 Piotrków Trybunalski, Polska/Poland
j.dybala@vp.pl

Frederick Lauritzen (Venice)

THE LAYERS OF COMPOSITION OF THE *SYNODIKON* OF ALEXIUS STUDITES

The *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* has many layers of composition. Scholars, such as Gouillard¹, have divided the *Synodikon* into at least three phases (Macedonian, Comnenian, and Palaeologan). The new edition of the 11th century *Synodikon*² yields information about the layers of composition between the 9th and 11th centuries. This article explores the numerous layers which may be detected in the earliest *Synodikon* (*Synodikon* of Alexius Studites).

In 1980 Cyril Mango claimed³ that the text of the *Synodikon* had not changed between 843 and 1082 when the anathemas directed against John Italus were added⁴. He based his claim on the research of Gouillard who had subdivided the text into *Synodikon M*, *C* and *P*. Within *Synodikon M* he also added the anathemas of Italus which were, however, issued under Alexius I Comnenus (1081–1118) and not under the Macedonian dynasty (868–1056)⁵. The anathemas appear in three manuscripts which do not reflect the earlier version of the *Synodikon*. Moreover, he did not indicate that the six earliest manuscripts contain a rather stable text which may be dated to the patriarchate of Alexius Studites⁶. The recent critical edition based on a new reading of the manuscripts has the advantage that it reflects a text present in the manuscripts. The difficulty of employing Gouillard's text is that it is fundamentally a composite edition of numerous versions including variants

¹ J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon de L'orthodoxie: Édition et Commentaire*, TM 2, 1967, p. 1–316.

² *Synodikon of Alexios Studites (1025–1043)*, ed. F. LAURITZEN, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1] (cetera: *Synodikon of Alexios Studites*), p. 375–394.

³ C. MANGO, *Byzantium: the Empire of New Rome. History of Civilisation*, London 1980, p. 102.

⁴ *Synod of 1082*, ed. F. LAURITZEN, [in:] *The Great Councils...*, p. 71–84.

⁵ L. CLUCAS, *The Trial of John Italos and the Crisis of Intellectual Values in Byzantium in the Eleventh Century*, Munich 1982.

⁶ F. LAURITZEN, *Against the Enemies of Tradition: Alexios Studites and the Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, [in:] *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Byzantium. The Definition and the Notion of Orthodoxy and Some Other Studies on the Heresies and the Non-Christian Religions. Proceedings of the XX Annual Conference of Saint Tikhon University*, ed. A. RIGO, P. ERMILOV, Rome 2010, p. 41–48.

originating from local churches. Therefore, the new text reflects the *Synodikon* as it was in the period 1034–1043. This *Synodikon* of Alexius Studites has a stable text with few variants from one manuscript to another, even if one may detect a number of alterations since the first text of 843/844. It is difficult to know when they were added but one can here isolate them. Once isolated, they indicate a clear date after which they were added. Since the *Synodikon* of Alexius Studites is dated to a period between 1034–1043 that is the date before which they were added.

The preamble of the *Synodikon* describes an event which occurred one year after the end of the iconoclast controversy⁷. Indeed, the *Synodikon* is fundamentally the commemoration of the end of iconoclasm. Therefore, the basic framework is from 844. The structure of the text is constituted of six sections: 1. introduction; 2. blessings; 3. saints; 4. anathemas; 5. emperors; 6. patriarchs.

The first and second sections appear to have biblical quotations and theological references to the questions more or less related to icons and therefore are difficult to date. It is possible that this part of the text was not altered after 844.

Section three has a preamble which may be original (3.1–15) and then a section dedicated to the patriarchs considered blessed in 844 (3.16–18). It also adds a paragraph on subsequent patriarchs: Ignatius (847–857; 867–877), Photius (858–867; 877–886), Stephen (886–893), Anthony (893–901) and Nicholas (912–925) (3.19–20 and 3.21–23). It is clear that the list of patriarchs in the current form dates to a time after 925 (death of Nicholas I). Gouillard indeed had considered a second redaction of the *Synodikon* dating to the first half of the 10th century. Moreover, the anathema ‘against all enemies of tradition’ is inserted after this list of patriarchs (3.24–26) and also appears in the *Tomos of Union* of 920⁸. Therefore, section three is divided into two sections: 3.1–18, dated to mid 9th century and 3.19–26, added after 925. Gouillard does not appear interested in the list of saints mentioned at 3.27–42⁹ and does not devote specific notes to these saints:

3.27: Euthymius, Theophilus, Aemilianus – Euthymius, bishop of Sardis († 840) under Theophilus; Theophilus, bishop of Ephesus; Aemilianus, bishop of Cyzicus († 820) under Leo V;

3.29: Theophylact, Peter, Michael, Joseph metropolitans – Theophylact, bishop of Nicomedia († 846); Peter of Atroa († 837, worked with Ioannicius); Michael, bishop of Synada († 821); Joseph, bishop of Thessalonica († 830, brother of Theodore Studites);

3.31: John, Nicholas, George Confessors archbishops – John Confessor, abbot of monastery of Katharon († 839); Nicholas Confessor, abbot of Studios († 868); George, bishop of Mytilene († 821);

⁷ *Synodikon of Alexios Studites*, l. 1–3; p. 377.

⁸ On this anathema *vide*: F. LAURITZEN, *Against the Enemies of Tradition...*, p. 41–48.

⁹ Even though the text is different, the reference is: J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon...*, l. 120–133.

3.34: Theodore Studite († 826);

3.35: Isaac Wonderworker and Ioannicius – Isaac († 396), abbot of Dalmatou; Ioannicius the Great († 846);

3.37: Hilarion, archimandrite and abbot of Dalmatou († 845);

3.39: Symeon Stylites (of Lesbos, † 844);

3.40: Stephen the Younger († 764);

3.41: Germanus, ecumenical patriarch († 740).

The list of saints reveals that most concerned with the period of the second iconoclasm (814–842). However there are a few names which cannot have been included in the earliest version of the text: Theophylact of Nicomedia († 846); Nicholas of Studios († 868); Ioannicius († 846); Hilarion, abbot of Dalmatou († 845); Symeon Stylites of Lesbos († 844). These must have been added after the original text was composed, probably in a period 845–870. It is striking that the two last names are to be found only in one manuscript and that they refer to persons who died during the first iconoclasm. The section, otherwise, commemorates saints actively involved in the second iconoclasm (814–842). Moreover, there is an important addition of the role of the Dalmatou¹⁰ and Studios¹¹ monasteries. This insight is further confirmed by an event concerning the *Synodikon* mentioned as the revolt of Mermentulus in the chronicle of John Scylitzes for the year 1044:

Μιχαὴλ δὲ ὁ πατριάρχης ἅμα τῷ χειροτονηθῆναι τὸν πάπαν Ῥώμης τῶν διπτύχων ἐξέβαλε, τὸ τῶν ἀζύμων ζήτημα ἐπενεγκὼν αὐτῷ τῆς ἐκβολῆς αἰτίον· συνήργει δὲ τούτῳ Πέτρος τε ὁ Ἀντιοχείας πατριάρχης καὶ Λέων ὁ Βουλγαρίας ἀρχιεπίσκοπος καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἅπαν ἔλλογιμώτερον. προσκρούον δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν τηρικαῦτα τῆς μονῆς τοῦ Στουδίου ἡγούμενον Μιχαὴλ, ᾧ Μερμέντουλος τὸ ἐπώνυμον, τοῦ ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας ἀναγινωσκομένου συνοδικοῦ τὸν ἐν ἀγίοις Θεόδωρον τὸν Στουδίτην ἐξέβαλε. μὴ ἐνεγκὼν δὲ ὁ Μερμέντουλος τὸ γεγονός, τῷ βασιλεῖ προσελθὼν τοῦτο αὐτῷ διανήγγειλε. διὸ προστάξει βασιλικῇ ἀνεγνώσθη τὸ συνοδικὸν τῇ κυριακῇ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πάντα κατὰ τὸ ἔθος ἀνεγνώσθησαν, τὸ δὲ τοῦ μεγάλου Θεοδώρου ὄνομα ὁ πατριάρχης ἀναστὰς ἐξεφώνησε μεγάλη καὶ διατόρω φωνῇ· καὶ οὕτω κατενύσθη ἡ περὶ τούτου τῶν τε μοναχῶν καὶ τοῦ Μερμεντούλου στάσις¹².

¹⁰ A.-M. TALBOT, *Dalmatou Monastery*, [in:] *ODB*, p. 579.

¹¹ O. DELOUIS, *Saint-Jean-Baptiste de Stoudios à Constantinople. La contribution d'un monastère à l'histoire de l'Empire byzantin (v. 454–1204)* (in press).

¹² *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*, 9.7.3–13, ed. I. THURN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1973, p. 433–434. As soon as Michael was elected patriarch he removed the pope of Rome from the diptychs, alleging the question of the unleavened bread as the reason for exclusion; Peter, patriarch of Antioch collaborated with him and Leo, metropolitan of Bulgaria, and all the most intellectual section of the church. He attacked also Michael, surnamed Mermentulus, the abbot of that time of the monastery of Studios, and while he [Cerularius] was reading the *Synodikon* in church he removed the name of Saint Theodore Studites. Mermentulus could not bear this event, went to the emperor and reported the event to him.

This text reveals that Studite influence on the *Synodikon* was important. Indeed, the patriarch thought he had the authority to remove something he considered an addition. This behaviour may reveal his attitude towards his predecessor who had been a Studios monk (Alexius Studites). However, it does reveal that, according to Cerularius, the text of the *Synodikon* had been altered to increase the importance of the Studios monastery. To give him the benefit of the doubt, he may have even been reading an ancient manuscript which did not contain the name of Theodore: but this is speculation. What is certain is that in 1043–1044, the most usual text included the name of the Studios monk.

The introduction to section 4 (4.1–5) and the anathemas (4.6–43) may have been part of the document of 844, since they concern specifically the iconoclast question. Here one finds additional anathemas (4.44–53 and 4.57–64). Gouillard in his apparatus did also identified them as coming from the acts of the council of 869–870 and must have been added after 870. Between the two sets of anathemas from the council of 869, one finds also the three anathemas against all heretics, all Jacobites and all Nestorians (4.54–56). These fit remarkably well with the interests of Alexius Studites who had often attacked the Jacobite community. Dagron pointed out that the Syriac community became more prominent within the Byzantine Empire after the year 1025¹³. It would seem that the reference to Jacobites could easily be associated with the redaction of the *Synodikon* of Alexius Studites. The same may be said for the twenty-three anathemas present in the oldest manuscript of the *Synodikon* (4.70–141). They are directed against a dualist sect. Among the synods of Alexius Studites can be found also references to the Euthymius of Akmonia who wrote in the Peribleptos monastery at the time of Romanus III (1028–1034)¹⁴. While it is true that the account of Cosmas the Priest in Slavonic is earlier, the question here is about a document issued in Constantinople about perceived threats originating from heresies. Before Euthymius of Akmonia or Peribleptos it is not clear how aware Constantinople was of the dualist question in the Balkans and Eastern Anatolia. The fourth section of the *Synodikon* has an original nucleus of the mid 9th century (4.1–43; 4.65–69), a part after 870 (4.44–53; 4.57–64), 11th century section (4.54–56; 4.70–141).

The fifth section of the *Synodikon* has a list of invocations (5.1–4) and prayers for the emperor Michael III and his mother Theodora (5.9–10) which must be original. Next is a list of emperors, ending with Romanus III (1034) and a list of empresses before the empress Zoe († 1050) which were modified later on (at the latest in the 11th century) (5.11–16).

Therefore, the Synodikon was read by imperial order on the Sunday of the Samaritan woman. And the rest was read according to custom, and the patriarch stood and cried out the name of the great Theodore with a loud and clear voice. Thus the rebellion of the monks and Mermentulus was put to rest.

¹³ G. DAGRON, *Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du X^e siècle et au XI^e siècle l'immigration syrienne*, TM 6, 1976, p. 177–216.

¹⁴ A. KAZHDAN, *Euthymios of Akmonia*, [in:] ODB, p. 756.

The sixth section has a list of patriarchs of Antioch from the year 960 to 1010 (6.1–2). This seems to reflect the situation resulting in the re-conquest of Antioch in 969. It is unknown why the list ends with Elias II (1010). Moreover, the list appears in only one of the manuscripts and may reflect a specific interest of that version. The list is followed by a list of patriarchs of Constantinople such as was available in 844 (6.3–4) and another more complete and recent list from Ignatius to Eustathius (1025) (6.5–8).

It is clear that there are numerous layers of the *Synodikon* of Alexius Studites. One may summarize them as follows:

- a) possibly original text of 844: 1; 2; 3.1–18; 4.1–43; 4.65–69; 5.1–3; 5.9–10; 6.3–4;
- b) modification after 845: 3.27–42;
- c) modification after 870: 4.44–53; 4.57–64;
- d) modifications after 925: 3.19–26;
- e) modifications between 1010–1043: 4.54–56; 4.70–141; 5; 6.1–2; 6.5–8.

It is therefore a fact one may detect numerous layers in the *Synodikon* of Alexius Studites. The list above provides a simple *post quem*, after which date, these modifications must have been added. It shows how a number of passages cannot have been present in the text of 844. The real question is: why modify the text?

The overall structure of the *Synodikon* is obviously original. All six sections seem to have texts which could date to 844. It appears that section 1 and 2 may possibly be original. The modifications after 845 (3.27–42) seem to concern the struggle against iconoclasm specially during the period 814–842. The reference to theologians / Confessors from the Dalmatou and Studios monastery seems to imply their importance in promoting the *Triumph of Orthodoxy* after 843. Considering the importance of the monasteries outside Constantinople during iconoclasm, it is clear these two Constantinopolitan monasteries wished to play a role in the restoration of Orthodoxy by promoting their saints who had fought against iconoclasm. For this reason, the additions may be rather soon after 845. The next series of additions concern the anathemas recited at the council of 869 (4.44–53; 4.57–64). These anathemas concern specifically iconoclasts of the first iconoclasm (730–787). Kountoura Galake has pointed out that the persons singled out in some of these anathemas (4.48–53) have surnames. She is exploring the possibility that Constantine V promoted the use of surnames, but here it reveals a homogeneous group of persons identified in a similar manner¹⁵. At 4.45 the Isaurian dynasty (717–802) is singled out. The fact a dynasty is singled out, may indicate the presence of a new dynasty. Given that these anathemas appear after 869 it would appear that it is the Macedonian dynasty (867–1056). If that were the case it would probably be

¹⁵ E. KOUNTOURA GALAKE, *Iconoclast Officials and the Formation of Surnames during the Reign of Constantine V*, REB 62, 2004, p. 247–253, esp. p. 250.

under Basil I (867–886) or Leo VI (886–912). It is striking that the anathemas concern specifically the first period of iconoclasm and this in itself may reveal a later addition. The additions undertaken after the death of Nicholas I Mysticus (925) are taken from the synod of 920 on the fourth marriage of the emperor (*tetragamia*). The anathemas (3.19–26) are taken from the section of the anathemas of the text of 920¹⁶. The last additions appear to date the time of Alexius Studites specifically. His interest in dualist heresies and attacking both Nestorians and Jacobites is well reflected in the synod decrees of his rule (1025–1043).

To summarize: there are four phases of additions which reflect different mentalities:

- 1) after 845 – monastic interest in the Dalmatou and Studios monasteries;
- 2) after 870 – iconoclasts of Isaurian dynasty of first iconoclasm;
- 3) after 920 – anathemas of Nicholas Mysticus;
- 4) after 1025 – dualist heresies and Nestorians/Jacobites.

Schematically there are two main periods of modifications: the period 845–925 and the period 1010–1043. Gouillard had indicated a first revision in the early 10th century. However, one cannot compress the first three phases of composition, since they have different aims. The first promotes the action of monasteries of Constantinople, the second is concerned with first iconoclasm and the third integrates the anathemas of the synod of 920 into the *Synodikon*. For this reason, it would appear that rather than one modification proposed by Gouillard, one should look at four phases after the original composition. While these gradual additions reflect different interests, attitudes and concerns, it is also clear that the reedition of a stable text under Alexius Studites indicates that in the second quarter of the 11th century the five different phases (one original and four modifications) reflected a single cohesive spirit. It was for this reason that the *Synodikon* of Alexius Studites, and not a previous version, is the text from which originate the translations into Georgian¹⁷, Bulgarian¹⁸, Serbian¹⁹ and Russian²⁰.

¹⁶ Ἄπαντα τὰ κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατριαρχῶν Γερμανοῦ, Ταρασίου, Νικηφόρου καὶ Μεθοδίου γραφέντα ἢ λαληθέντα, ἀνάθεμα. Ἄπαντα τὰ κατὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατριαρχῶν Ἰγνατίου, Φωτίου, Στεφάνου, Ἀντωνίου καὶ Νικολάου γραφέντα ἢ λαληθέντα, ἀνάθεμα. Ἄπαντα τὰ παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν καὶ ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἀοιδίμων πατέρων καινοτομηθέντα καὶ πραχθέντα ἢ μετὰ τοῦτο πραχθησόμενα, ἀνάθεμα. NICHOLAS MYSTICUS, *The Tome of Union*, [in:] *Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople. Miscellaneous Writings. Greek Text and English Translation*, ed. L.G. WESTERINK, Washington, D.C. 1981 [= *CFHB*, 20], p. 70.

¹⁷ *Synodicum Georgicum*, ed. B. MARTIN HISARD, [in:] *The Great Councils...*, p. 397–425.

¹⁸ *Synodicum Bulgaricum 1211*, ed. A. ΤΟΤΟΜΑΝΟΒΑ, [in:] *The Great Councils...*, p. 426–468.

¹⁹ *Synodicum Serbicum*, ed. T. SUBOTIN-GOLUBOVIĆ, [in:] *The Great Councils...*, p. 469–476.

²⁰ *Synodicum Russicum*, ed. K.A. ΜΑΚΣΙΜΟΒΙČ, [in:] *The Great Councils...*, p. 477–518.

Bibliography

Sources

- Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis Historiarum*, ed. I. THURN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 1973.
- NICHOLAS MYSTICUS, *The Tome of Union*, [in:] *Nicholas I, Patriarch of Constantinople. Miscellaneous Writings. Greek Text and English Translation*, ed. L.G. WESTERINK, Washington, D.C. 1981 [= CFHB 20], p. 56–85.
- Synod of 1082*, ed. F. LAURITZEN, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 71–84.
- Synodicum Bulgaricum 1211*, ed. A. TOTOMANOVA, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 426–468.
- Synodicum Georgicum*, ed. B. MARTIN HISARD, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 397–425.
- Synodicum Russicum*, ed. K.A. MAKSIMOVIČ, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 477–518.
- Synodicum Serbicum*, ed. T. SUBOTIN-GOLUBOVIĆ, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 469–476.
- Synodikon of Alexios Studites (1025–1043)*, ed. F. LAURITZEN, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 375–394.

Secondary Literature

- CLUCAS L., *The Trial of John Italos and the Crisis of Intellectual Values in Byzantium in the Eleventh Century*, Munich 1982.
- DAGRON G., *Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du X^e siècle et au XI^e siècle l'immigration syrienne*, "Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 6, 1976, p. 177–216.
- DELOUIS O., *Saint-Jean-Baptiste de Stoudios à Constantinople. La contribution d'un monastère à l'histoire de l'Empire byzantin (v. 454–1204)* (in press).
- GOUILLARD J., *Le Synodikon de L'orthodoxie: Édition et Commentaire*, "Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 2, 1967, p. 1–316.
- KAZHDAN A., *Euthymios of Akmonia*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A.P. KAZHDAN, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 756.
- LAURITZEN F., *Against the Enemies of Tradition: Alexios Studites and the Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, [in:] *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Byzantium. The Definition and the Notion of Orthodoxy and Some Other Studies on the Heresies and the Non-Christian Religions. Proceedings of the XX Annual Conference of Saint Tikhon University*, ed. A. RIGO, P. ERMILOV, Rome 2010, p. 41–48.
- MANGO C., *Byzantium: the Empire of New Rome. History of Civilisation*, London 1980.

KOUNTOURA GALAKE E., *Iconoclast Officials and the Formation of Surnames during the Reign of Constantine V*, "Revue des études byzantines" 62, 2004, p. 247–253.

TALBOT A.-M., *Dalmatou Monastery*, [in:] *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A.P. KAZHDAN, New York–Oxford 1991, p. 579.

Abstract. The *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, in its earliest version (*Synodikon* of Alexius Studites), has at least five different layers of composition. Beside the original one of 843/844, there is one after 845, another after 870, a fourth after 925 and finally one between 1034–1043. Since each date represents a *post quem*, they could be grouped together. However, the layers of composition represent different interests and objectives and therefore are difficult to conflate. On the contrary, each stratum reveals that by the 11th century the characteristic of the *Synodikon* was to unify different objectives and strategies into one text. It is also for this reason that the text continued to expand after Alexius Studites' version of 1034–1043.

Keywords: *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, Alexius Studites, textology

Frederick Lauritzen

Scuola Grande di San Marco, Venezia

To contact the author, please write to the editorial board of the journal.

Mirosław J. Leszka (Łódź)

ON THE RELIABILITY OF CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS' ACCOUNT OF THE “FLIGHT” OF PRINCE ČASLAV FROM BULGARIA*

The present text aims to reflect on the reliability of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' account about the departure of Časlav, a Serbian prince, from Bulgaria at the beginning of the reign of Peter I, the successor of Symeon. The passage devoted to this event is located in the *De administrando imperio* by the learned emperor¹. One needs to stress that this is the only source referring to this event, which places the researcher in a difficult position.

Before I proceed to analysing the passage in question, in order to make the following arguments easier to follow I will first devote some attention to the Bulgarian-Serbian relations during the final phase of Symeon's reign. Said ruler has undertaken steps to subordinate the Serbs to Preslav. A Bulgarian intervention in Serbia took place in most likely 923. It was a consequence of changing of sides by Pavle of Serbia, son of Bran, who was until then a Bulgarian ally. For reasons unknown, and in unclear circumstances, he sided with the Byzantines. In this situation, Symeon decided to remove him from the throne and replace him with yet another nominee of his choosing. Zacharias, son of Pribislav, having been held by the Bulgarian ruler for several years, became this candidate. Thanks to Bulgarian support he was able to remove Pavle. Having attained power, however, the new ruler of Serbia rejected his alliance with Bulgarians and approached the empire instead.

* This article has been written under the research project financed by the National Science Centre (Poland). Decision number: DEC-2014/14/M/HS3/00758 (*The Bulgarian State in 927–969. The Epoch of Tsar Peter I the Pious*).

¹ CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De administrando imperio*, 32, ed. G. MORAVCSIK, trans. R.J.H. JENKINS, Washington 1967, p. 159, 161 (cetera: *DAI*). The work was created between 944 and 952 (perhaps as late as 959), although some of its parts may have been written earlier, e.g. Љ. МАКСИМОВИЋ (*Структура 32. главе снуса De administrando imperio*, ЗРВИ 21, 1982, p. 31) suspects that chapter 32, devoted to Serbs, was created between 927/928 and 944. Relatively recently, T. ŽIVKOVIĆ thoroughly analysed fragments of *De administrando imperio*, regarding Serbs and Croats (*De conversione Croatorum et Serborum. A Lost Source*, Belgrade 2012, p. 38–42), including those about relations with the Bulgarians.

A few years earlier Zacharias was Romanus Lecapenus' candidate for the ruler of Raška². Perhaps this change of loyalties that Symeon had not anticipated was due to personal reasons (Zacharias' long stay in Constantinople could have resulted in strong ties with the imperial court; it was the Bulgarian ruler who previously prevented him from taking the Serbian throne and kept him prisoner in Preslav). Perhaps it was an attempt of gaining independence with Byzantine aid. However, we do not have any sources that would allow us to verify these hypotheses. Regardless of what motives were behind Zacharias' decision, he must have expected Symeon's reaction to his protege's betrayal. The Bulgarian ruler sent against him an army led by Marmais and Theodore Sigriztes. Their expedition ended in a complete fiasco, the clearest proof of which was the death of both Marmais and Sigriztes. Their heads, as Constantine Porphyrogenitus informs, were sent along with weapons to Constantinople as proof of victory³.

In response to the events in Serbia Symeon decided to organise another expedition against Zacharias (924?)⁴, accompanied by another candidate to the Serbian throne. This time it was Časlav, son of Klonimir and a Bulgarian woman whose name we do not know⁵. Hearing the news of the approaching Bulgarian army, Zacharias abandoned Raška and fled to Croatia. The Bulgarians took control of Serbia and, what is noteworthy, did not place Časlav on the throne⁶, but subjected

² *DAI*, 32, p. 158. On the subject of this event cf. also: КОНСТАНТИН VII ПОРФИРОГЕНИТ, *Спис о народима*, FBHPJS, vol. II, ed. В. FERJANČIĆ, Beograd 1959, p. 55, fn. 184–185; И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Цар Симеон Велики (893–927). Златният век на Средновековна България*, София 1983, p. 138; J.A.V. FINE, *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor–Michigan 1983, p. 152; Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Јужни Словени под византијском влашћу 600–1025*, Београд 2002, p. 416. On Zacharias – Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Портрети владара раног средњег века. Од Властимира до Борића*, Београд 2006, p. 57–63.

³ *DAI*, 32, p. 158.

⁴ Also in this case the dating of the Bulgarian expedition can be argued either way. It may have taken place in 924 or 925, perhaps even in 926 (thus e.g. Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Јужни Словени...*, p. 419, fn. 1423). The Bulgarian troops were led according to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus by (*DAI*, 32, p. 158): Kninos (Κνήνος), Himnikos (Ἰμνῆκος), Itzboklias (Ἰτζβόκλιος). Constantine's relation suggests that these were the names of Bulgarian commanders. Most likely, however, these were names of positions or dignities – В. ЗЛАТАРСКИ, *История на българската държава през средните векове*, vol. I.2, *Първо българско царство. От славянизацията на държавата до падането на Първото царство*, София 1927, p. 475–476, fn. 1. On the subject of Ἰμνῆκος cf. also Т. СЛАВОВА, *Владелец и администрация в ранносредновековна България. Филологически аспекти*, София 2010, p. 105–109 (chief – one of the commanders of Bulgarian mounted troops; his duties related not only to leading the war effort, but also to participating in peace negotiations).

⁵ About this Serbian ruler – Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Портрети...*, p. 49–57.

⁶ It seems Časlav was used in order to neutralise any stronger opposition from the Serbian notables, who may have given up their support for their current ruler Zacharias more easily knowing that he will be replaced with their compatriot. Constantine Porphyrogenitus (*DAI*, 32, p. 158) writes that Serbian *župans* were summoned under the pretext of acknowledging a new ruler, only to be subsequently imprisoned by the Bulgarians. Časlav, meanwhile, was transported to Bulgaria, where he remained until the end of Symeon's reign and throughout the beginning of Peter's.

it to their own governance. Part of the Serbian populace was relocated into Bulgaria. It is clear, then, that Symeon drew conclusions from his previous policy towards Serbia. Maintaining an alliance by placing his own candidate on its throne did not work; in this situation the only way of maintaining influence in Raška was to incorporate it into the Bulgarian state. Perhaps this move was partially influenced by the tense relations with Croatia⁷.

* * *

In the beginning of tsar Peter's reign (927–969) Bulgarian-Serbian relations altered. Časlav left Bulgaria and journeyed to the Serbian lands. As was mentioned earlier, the only author to mention this was Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Due to its unique nature, I will quote the account in full:

Seven years afterwards Tzeëslav escaped from Bulgarians with four others, and entered Serbia from Preslav, and found in the country no more than fifty men only, without wives or children, who supported themselves by hunting. With these he took possession of the country and sent message to the emperor of the Romans asking for his support and succour, and promising to serve him and be obedient to his command, as had been the princes before him. And thenceforward the emperor of the Romans continually benefit him, so that the Serbs living in Croatia and Bulgaria and the rest of the countries, whom Symeon had scattered, rallied to him when they heard of it. Moreover many had escaped from Bulgaria and entered Constantinople, and these the emperor of Romans clad and comforted and sent to Tzeëslav.⁸

This passage was examined many times already, however not all the questions it raises have been settled. The first of these is the dating of Časlav's departure from Preslav. Scholarly works place it between 928 and 933/934⁹. This chronological quandary is a consequence of two uncertainties. Firstly, it is unclear from which point one should count the seven years (even leaving aside the question of how accurate that information is). Secondly, the dating of the events marking the opening point of this situation is ambiguous as well. Ostrogorsky dated Časlav's departure from Bulgaria to 928, thinking that Constantine Porphyrogenitus counted the seven years from Zacharias' bid for power in Serbia (920/921)¹⁰. Other scholars

⁷ Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България през втората и третата четвърт на Х в. Политическа история*, София 2006 [PhD thesis], p. 196.

⁸ *DAI*, 32, p. 158, 160 (English translation – p. 159, 161).

⁹ Cf. Г. ОСТРОГОРСКИ, *Порфиrogenитова хроника српских владара и њени хронолошки подаци*, [in:] *ИДЕМ, Сабране дела Георгија Острогорског*, vol. IV, *Византија и словени*, Београд 1970, p. 84–86; И. БОЖИЛОВ, В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, *История на средновековна България. VII–XIV в.*, София 2006, p. 279; Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България...*, p. 194.

¹⁰ Г. ОСТРОГОРСКИ, *Порфиrogenитова хроника...*, p. 84–86. Ostrogorsky's supposition was accepted by, i.a.: И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Отношенията между южните славяни и Византия през X–XII в.*, [in:] *ИДЕМ, Избрани произведения*, vol. I, *Византия и славянския свят*, София 1998, p. 64–65; P. STERPHENSON, *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*,

saw the beginning of the seven year period in the transferring of the Serbian lands under direct Bulgarian rule and imprisonment of Časlav in Preslav. Due to differences in the dating of this event (between 924 and 926) scholars pointed to years between 931 and 933¹¹ as the moment during which Časlav left Bulgaria. This question cannot be resolved although because of the logic of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' argument¹², I am leaning towards the dating which takes as its starting point the imposition of direct control over Serbia by Symeon (most likely in 924). It needs to be pointed out, however, that from the perspective of Časlav's actions and their results, the significance of when exactly he left Preslav is secondary. It will suffice to say that it happened during the first years of tsar Peter's reign.

Constantine Porphyrogenitus presents Časlav's actions, which ultimately resulted in the regaining of independence by Serbs, albeit with the acknowledgement of Byzantium's authority. According to the learned emperor, the Serbian prince acted against the will and interests of the Bulgarian ruler, whose oversight he managed to evade, and achieved success thanks to the Byzantine emperor's support. Modern scholars fairly universally accept this version of events as true, stressing that the loss of Serbian lands during the early years of Peter's reign was a major setback for the tsar¹³. It would seem, however, that one may have certain doubts as to the veracity of this account. Caution is advised due to the clear hostility of Constantine Porphyrogenitus towards Bulgarians. The issue was discussed some time ago by Litavrin¹⁴. The emperor, it would seem, negatively evaluated the 927 peace treaty between Bulgaria and Byzantium. He expressed it through criticism of the marriage, arranged as a result of the conclusion of peace, between tsar Peter and Maria, daughter of Christopher and granddaughter of Romanus Lecapenus¹⁵.

Cambridge 2000, p. 27; Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България...*, p. 194. Criticism of this view – Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Јужни Словени...*, p. 421, fn. 1428.

¹¹ И. БОЖИЛОВ, В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, *История...*, p. 279; Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Јужни Словени...*, p. 421. A compromise solution was recently proposed by П. ПАВЛОВ (*Години на мир и "ратни бедни" (927–1018)*, [in:] Г. АТАНАСОВ, В. ВАЧКОВА, П. ПАВЛОВ, *Българска национална история*, vol. III, *Първо българско царство (680–1018)*, Велико Търново 2015, p. 422) according to whom Časlav's flight took place in 928, and the Byzantines extended help to him in 931.

¹² It would seem the learned emperor is writing about the seven years in the context of Časlav. The latter most recently appeared in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' narrative in a passage devoted to the occupation of Serbian lands by Bulgarians.

¹³ Until recently, such was the view of the one writing these words – M.J. LESZKA, K. MARINOW, *Carstwo bułgarskie. Polityka – społeczeństwo – gospodarka – kultura*. 866–971, Warszawa 2015, p. 154.

¹⁴ Г. ЛИТАВРИН, *Константин Багрянородний о Болгари и Болгарах*, [in:] *Сборник в чест на акад. Димитър Ангелов*, ed. В. ВЕЛКОВ, София 1994, p. 30–37; cf. Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България...*, p. 195.

¹⁵ DAI, 13, p. 72. Vide: J. SHEPARD, *A Marriage too Far? Maria Lekapena and Peter of Bulgaria*, [in:] *The Empress Theophano. Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, ed. A. DAVIDS, Cambridge 1995, p. 121–149; Т. ТОДОРОВ, *Константин Багрянородни и династичният брак между владетелските домове на Преслав и Константинопол от 927 г.*, ПКСИ 7, 2003, p. 391–398; А. ПАРОЊ, "Trzeba, abyś tyimi oto słowami odparł i to niedorzeczne żądanie" – wokół *De administrando imperio* Konstantyna VII, [in:] *Causa creandi. O pragmatyce źródła historycznego*,

Constantine Porphyrogenitus formulated a view, *nota bene* contrary to some of the facts he presented, that the Serbian ruler was never subject to the prince of Bulgaria, and always accepted the authority of the Byzantine emperor¹⁶. With such attitude of the emperor one might expect that he presented the story of Časlav's departure from Preslav and his return to Serbian lands in a manner unfavourable to the Bulgarians and highlighting the prince's subordination to Byzantium, thanks to which he was able to take over Serbia.

Todorov¹⁷ also pointed out that the learned emperor's narrative about the Serbs ended with this event. It is doubtful indeed that no further information concerning the Serbian ruler in the following two decades would have reached the emperor, particularly when the ruler in question acknowledged the emperor's authority. This may indicate (a thought that the Bulgarian scholar did not state clearly) that the subsequent fate of the Serbs (until the time when *DAI* was written) was omitted by the emperor as it would have starkly clashed with the statement about the Serbs' subordination to Byzantium. Nonetheless, it cannot be ruled out that the reason for the narrative's sudden end was not intentional, and that chapter 32 was simply not finished, like the vast majority of chapters in the work of Constantine Porphyrogenitus¹⁸.

Aside from the story's timbre, our doubts may be raised by some of its particular details. It is difficult, in my opinion, to imagine that the Bulgarians would have allowed Časlav, with a group of his companions, to flee Preslav. The story is strikingly similar to an implausible account according to which Byzantines have taken John, Peter's brother, away from Preslav, without the latter's agreement¹⁹. The Serbian prince was, one might presume, too important and potentially dangerous to Bulgarian interests in Serbia to have been left without adequate guard.

ed. S. ROSIK, P. WISZEWSKI, Wrocław 2005, p. 345–361; В. ГЮЗЕЛЕВ, *Значението на брака на цар Петър (927–969) с ромейката Мария-Ирина Лакапина (911–962)*, [in:] *Културните текстове на миналото – носители, символи, идеи*, vol. I, *Текстовете на историята, история на текстовете. Материали от Юбилейната международна конференция в чест на 60-годишнината на проф. д.и.н. Казимир Попконстантинов, Велико Търново, 29–31 октомври 2003 г.*, София 2005, p. 27–33; Z.A. BRZOWSKA, *Rola carycy Marii-Ireny Lekapeny w recepcji elementów bizantyńskiego modelu władzy w pierwszym państwie bułgarskim*, *VP* 66, 2016, p. 443–458; ЕАДЕМ, *Cesarzowa Bułgarów, Augusta i Bazylisa – Maria-Irena Lekapena i transfer bizantyńskiej idei kobiecy-władczyni (imperial feminine) w średniowiecznej Bułgarii*, *SMer* 17, 2017, p. 1–28.

¹⁶ T. ŽIVKOVIĆ (*De conversione...*, p. 178) thinks that this passage *had originally belonged to the Constantine's primary source on the Serbs*. Even if this was so, the learned emperor fully shared the view about the Serbs being subject to Byzantium. The topic appeared several times in the earlier parts of chapter 32, although without the Bulgarian context (*DAI*, 32, p. 152, 154, 158).

¹⁷ Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България...*, p. 195.

¹⁸ T. ŽIVKOVIĆ, *De conversione...*, p. 23–24.

¹⁹ *Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, 136.60, ed. S. WAHLGREN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 2006; *Theophanes Continuatus*, ed. B.G. NIEBUHR, I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1838, p. 419 (cetera: *ThC*); *Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, ed. I. THURN, Berlin 1973, p. 225 (cetera: SKYLITZES).

It would also be difficult to accept as truth that the Byzantines, soon after concluding the peace that put an end to a lengthy armed struggle with Bulgaria, would have taken the risk of entering a new conflict with tsar Peter – which, after all, could have led to renewed military operations. The description of Časlav's taking control of Serbian lands by likewise appears far from the truth and heavily manipulated in order to highlight Byzantium's role. The text states that after arriving on Serbian lands Časlav encountered no more than *fifty men only, without wives or children, who supported themselves by hunting*²⁰, and it was only thanks to the Byzantine emperor's support that he managed to encourage the Serbs to return to their country.

The doubts presented above allow, one might think, to view Časlav's departure from the Bulgarian capital in a different light. It cannot be ruled out that he returned to Serbian lands with an agreement, or perhaps even at the behest of tsar Peter, with Byzantine aid. At the time when a permanent Bulgarian-Byzantine alliance was in effect, Serbian lands ceased to be an area of rivalry between the two states. One might add that the Croatian threat had been neutralised²¹, that threat having been one of the reasons why in the past Symeon decided to introduce direct Bulgarian rule over Serbian lands. It could be said that tsar Peter returned to the policy of enthroning in Serbia rulers friendly to Bulgaria. Časlav, a half-Bulgarian, may have given hope that he would act according to Bulgarian interests, which were not contrary to those of the Byzantines²².

²⁰ *DAI*, 32, p. 158 (trans. p. 159). This fragment is in accord with an earlier passage of *DAI*, stating that after the Bulgarian expedition of 924 *the country was left deserted* (trans. p. 159). One has to agree with Е.П. НАУМОВ (*Становление и развитие сербской раннефеодальной государственности*, [in:] *Раннефеодальные государства на Балканах. VI–XII вв.*, ed. Г.Г. ЛИТАВРИН, Москва 1985, p. 201–208; cf. КОНСТАНТИН БАГРЯНОРОДНЫЙ, *Об управлении империей*, ed. Г.Г. ЛИТАВРИН, А.П. НОВОСЕЛЬЦЕВ, Москва 1991, p. 382, fn. 48) that this is most certainly an exaggeration. Constantine Porphyrogenitus thus deprecated the subjugation of Serbia to Bulgaria. On the Serbian prisoners of war in Bulgaria – У.М. ХРИСТОВ, *Prisoners of War in Early Medieval Bulgaria (Preliminary reports)*, *SCer* 5, 2015, p. 90–91; ИДЕМ, *Военнопленниците в българо-сръбските отношения през ранно средновековие*, *Епо* 23.1, 2015, p. 86–98. Cf. also remarks about the lack of Bulgarian garrisons in Serbia – П. КОМАТИНА, *О српско-бугарској граници у IX и X в.*, *ЗРВИ* 52, 2015, p. 36.

²¹ The sources lack information about Bulgarian-Croatian fighting at the beginning of Peter's reign; there is only information about the anti-Bulgarian coalition which also included Croatia, which, as is known, did not take any action (*ThC*, p. 412; SKYLITZES, p. 221; *Ioannis Zonarae Epitome historiarum libri XIII–XVIII*, ed. Th. BÜTTNER-WOBST, Bonn 1897, p. 473). It is thought that a peace treaty was concluded between Bulgaria and Croatia, as a result of the activity of the papal legates Madalbert and John. Cf. И. ДУЙЧЕВ, *Отношенията...*, p. 63; D. MANDIĆ, *Croatian King Tomislav defeated Bulgarian Emperor Symeon the Great on May 27, 927*, *JCrS* 1, 1960, p. 32–43; Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Јужни Словени...*, p. 419, fn. 1423; M.J. LESZKA, *Symeon I Wielki a Bizancjum. Z dziejów stosunków bułgarsko-bizantyjskich w latach 893–927*, Łódź 2013, p. 223–224; Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България...*, p. 116, 196.

²² Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България...*, p. 196.

Our knowledge of Časlav's reign is practically non-existent, aside perhaps for its finale. In the work of the so-called Priest of Duklja we find a Serbian ruler named Časlav²³ who is identified with Časlav from *DAI*. It is known that he fought with Hungarians and after initial successes he was defeated, and was imprisoned by them in Srem²⁴. He was then to have been drowned by them in the river Sava. The Serbian-Hungarian conflict is considered by some scholars to be a consequence of the Serbian alliance with Byzantium against a Bulgarian-Hungarian coalition²⁵. The very existence of the latter, however, is far from obvious. On the contrary, it seems that at least until the early 940s Bulgaria and Byzantium had a common policy towards the Hungarians, who threatened both of the states²⁶. In fighting Hungarians, the Serbs were promoting not only Byzantine, but also Bulgarian interests²⁷. Časlav's death occurred ca. 943/944²⁸ and one might think that at least until that time (and possibly until the end of tsar Peter's reign) Serbia maintained ties with both Bulgaria and Byzantium²⁹.

While the above reconstruction of the events is, of course, merely a hypothesis, one may, with a high degree of certainty, state that Constantine Porphyrogenitus' relation about the "flight" of Časlav to Serbia should be treated as manipulated, and approach it with considerable caution.

Translated by Michał Zytka

Bibliography

Sources

CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, *De administrando imperio*, ed. G. MORAVCSIK, trans. R.J.H. JENKINS, Washington 1967.

²³ *Gesta regum sclavorum*, XXIII, vol. I–II, ed. T. ŽIVKOVIĆ, Beograd 2009. Analysis of the Priest of Duklja's relation about Časlav – vol. II, p. 204–209.

²⁴ It is not certain whether the cited author had in mind the Srem settlement or the region. Cf. *Historia Królestwa Słowian czyli Latopis Popa Duklanina*, trans. J. LEŚNY, Warszawa 1988, p. 152, fn. 135.

²⁵ X. ДИМИТРОВ, *Българо-унгарски отношения (927–1019)*, ИПр 50/51.2, 1994/1995, p. 6–7; ИДЕМ, *Българо-унгарски отношения през средновековието*, София 1998, p. 73–74.

²⁶ This view is presented by T. ТОДОРОВ (*България...*, p. 197–201), supported with strong arguments.

²⁷ Е.П. НАУМОВ – КОНСТАНТИН БЯГРЯНОРОДНЫЙ, *Об управлении империей...*, p. 382, fn. 53; Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Јужни Словени...*, p. 422; Т. ТОДОРОВ, *България...*, p. 199; П. ПАВЛОВ, *Години на мир...*, p. 428.

²⁸ Т. ЖИВКОВИЋ, *Јужни Словени...*, p. 422; 423; ИДЕМ, *Портрети...*, p. 72. Other dates of Časlav's death are also present in the scholarly works – e.g. X. ДИМИТРОВ, *Българо-унгарски отношения през...*, p. 74 (between 950 and 960).

²⁹ Cf. remarks of T. ŽIVKOVIĆ (*On the Northern Borders of Serbia in Early Middle Ages*, [in:] ИДЕМ, *The South Slavs between East and West. 550–1150*, Belgrade 2008, p. 255) on the subject of Belo, the legendary successor to Časlav (*Gesta regum sclavorum*, LXXII).

- Gesta regum sclavorum*, vol. I–II, ed. T. ŽIVKOVIĆ, Beograd 2009.
- Historia Królestwa Słowian czyli Latopis Popa Duklanina*, trans. J. LEŚNY, Warszawa 1988.
- KONSTANTIN BAGRJANORODNYI, *Ob upravljenii imperiej*, ed. G.G. LITAVRIN, A.P. NOVOSEL'CEV, Moskva 1991.
- KONSTANTIN VII PORFIROGENIT, *Spis o narodima*, FBHPJS, vol. II, ed. B. FERJANČIĆ, Beograd 1959, p. 9–74.
- Ioannis Scylitzae Synopsis historiarum*, ed. I. THURN, Berlin 1973.
- Ioannis Zonarae Epitome historiarum libri XIII–XVIII*, ed. Th. BÜTTNER-WOBST, Bonnae 1897.
- Symeonis Magistri et Logothetae Chronicon*, ed. S. WAHLGREN, Berolini–Novi Eboraci 2006.
- Theophanes Continuatus*, ed. B.G. NIEBUHR, I. BEKKER, Bonnae 1838.

Secondary Literature

- BOŽILOV I., *Car Simeon Veliki (893–927). Zlatnijat vek na Srednovekovna Bălgarija*, Sofija 1983.
- BOŽILOV I., GJUZELEV V., *Istorija na srednovekovna Bălgarija VII–XIV v.*, Sofija 2006.
- BRZOWSKA Z.A., *Cesarzowa Bułgarów, Augusta i Bazylisa – Maria-Irena Lekapena i transfer bizantyńskiej idei kobiety-władczyni (imperial feminine) w średniowiecznej Bułgarii*, “Slavia Meridionalis” 17, 2017, p. 1–28.
- BRZOWSKA Z.A., *Rola carycy Marii-Ireny Lekapeny w recepcji elementów bizantyńskiego modelu władzy w pierwszym państwie bułgarskim*, “Vox Patrum. Antyk Chrześcijański” 66, 2016, p. 443–458.
- DIMITROV H., *Bălgaro-ungarski otnošenija (927–1019)*, “Исторически преглед” / “Istoričeski pregleđ” 50/51.2, 1994/1995, p. 3–21.
- DIMITROV H., *Bălgaro-ungarski otnošenija prez srednovekovieto*, Sofija 1998.
- DUJČEV I., *Otnošenijata meždu južnite slavjani i Vizantija prez X–XII v.*, [in:] IDEM, *Izbrani proizvedenija*, vol. I, *Vizantija i slavjanskija svjat*, Sofija 1998, p. 45–86.
- FINE J.A.V., *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century*, Ann Arbor–Michigan 1983.
- GJUZELEV V., *Značenieto na braka na car Petăr (927–969) s romejkata Marija-Irina Lakapina (911–962)*, [in:] *Kulturnite tekstove na minaloto – nositeli, simvoli, idei*, vol. I, *Tekstovete na istorijata, istorija na tekstovete. Materiali ot Jubilejnata meždunarodna konferencija v čest na 60-godišninata na prof. d.i.n. Kazimir Popkonstantinov, Veliko Tărnovo, 29–31 oktovvri 2003 g.*, Sofija 2005, p. 27–33.
- HRISTOV Y.M., *Prisoners of War in Early Medieval Bulgaria (Preliminary reports)*, “Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Center for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-Eastern Europe” 5, 2015, p. 73–105.
- HRISTOV Y.M., *Voennoplennicite v bălgaro-srăbskite otnošenija prez ranno srednovekovie*, “Епохи” / “Epoхи” 23.1, 2015, p. 86–98.
- KOMATINA P., *O srpsko-bugarskoj granici u IX i X v.*, “Зборник Радова Византолошког Института” / “Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta” 52, 2015, p. 31–42.
- LESZKA M.J., *Symeon I Wielki a Bizancjum. Z dziejów stosunków bułgarsko-bizantyńskich w latach 893–927*, Łódź 2013.

- LESZKA M.J., MARINOW K., *Carstwo bułgarskie. Polityka – społeczeństwo – gospodarka – kultura*. 866–971, Warszawa 2015.
- LITAVRIN G.G., *Konstantin Bagrjanorodnyj o Bolgarii i Bolgarach*, [in:] *Sbornik v čest na akad. Dimităr Angelov*, ed. V. VELKOV, Sofija 1994.
- MAKSIMOVIĆ Lj., *Struktura 32. glave spisa De administrando imperio*, "Зборник Радова Византолошког Института" / "Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta" 21, 1982, p. 25–32.
- MANDIĆ D., *Croatian King Tomislav defeated Bulgarian Emperor Symeon the Great on May 27, 927*, "Journal of Croatian Studies" 1, 1960, p. 32–43.
- NAUMOW E.P., *Stanovlenie i razvitie serbskoj rannefeodal'noj gosudarstvennosti*, [in:] *Rannefeodal'nye gosudarstva na Balkanach. VI–XII vv.*, ed. G.G. LITAVRIN, Moskva 1985, p. 189–218.
- OSTROGORSKI G., *Porfirogenitova hronika srpskih vladara i njeni hronološki podaci*, [in:] IDEM, *Sabrane dela Georgija Ostrogorskog*, vol. IV, *Vizantija i sloveni*, Beograd 1970, p. 79–86.
- PAROŃ A., "Trzeba, abys tymi oto slowami odparł i to niedorzeczne żądanie" – wokół *De administrando imperio* Konstantyna VII, [in:] *Causa creandi. O pragmatyce źródła historycznego*, ed. S. ROSIK, P. WISZEWSKI, Wrocław 2005, p. 345–361.
- PAVLOV P., *Godini na mir i "ratni bedi" (927–1018)*, [in:] G. ATANASOV, V. VAČKOVA, P. PAVLOV, *Bălgarska nacionalna istorija*, vol. III, *Părvo bălgarsko carstvo (680–1018)*, Veliko Tărново 2015, p. 403–672.
- SHEPARD J., *A Marriage too Far? Maria Lekapena and Peter of Bulgaria*, [in:] *The Empress Theophano. Byzantium and the West at the Turn of the First Millennium*, ed. A. DAVIDS, Cambridge 1995, p. 121–149.
- SLAVOVA T., *Vladetel i administracija v rannosrednovjekovna Bălgarija. Filologičeski aspekti*, Sofija 2010.
- STEPHENSON P., *Byzantium's Balkan Frontier. A Political Study of the Northern Balkans, 900–1204*, Cambridge 2000.
- TODOROV T., *Bălgarija prez vtorata i tretata četvărt na X v. Političeska istorija*, Sofija 2006 [PhD thesis].
- TODOROV T., *Konstantin Bagrenorodni i dinastičnijat brak meždū vladetelskite domove na Preslav i Konstantinopol ot 927 g.*, "Преславска книжовна школа" / "Preslavska knižovna škola" 7, 2003, p. 391–398.
- ZLATARSKI V., *Istorija na bălgarskata dăržava prez srednite vekove*, vol. I.2, *Părvo bălgarsko Carstvo. Ot slavjanizacijata na dăržavata do padaneto na Părvoto Carstvo*, Sofija 1927.
- ŽIVKOVIĆ T., *De conversione Croatorum et Serborum. A Lost Source*, Belgrade 2012.
- ŽIVKOVIĆ T., *Južni Sloveni pod vizantijskom vlašću (600–1025)*, Beograd 2002.
- ŽIVKOVIĆ T., *On the Northern Borders of Serbia in Early Middle Ages*, [in:] IDEM, *The South Slavs between East and West. 550–1150*, Belgrade 2008.
- ŽIVKOVIĆ T., *Portreti vladara ranog srednjeg veka. Od Vlastimira do Borića*, Beograd 2006.

Abstract. The present text aims to reflect on the reliability of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' account about the departure of Časlav, a Serbian prince, from Bulgaria at the beginning of the reign of Peter I, the successor of Symeon. The passage devoted to this event is located in the *De administrando imperio* (32, p. 159, 161) by the learned emperor. Constantine Porphyrogenitus' relation about the "flight" of Časlav to Serbia should be treated as manipulated and approached with considerable caution.

Keywords: Časlav, Simeon the Great, tsar Peter, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, Bulgaria in the 10th century, Byzantium in the 10th century

Mirosław J. Leszka

Uniwersytet Łódzki
Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny
Instytut Historii
Katedra Historii Bizancjum
ul. Kamińskiego 27a
90–219 Łódź, Polska/Poland
mirleszka@poczta.onet.pl

Marek Majer (Cambridge, MA)

A NOTE ON THE BALTO-SLAVIC AND INDO-EUROPEAN BACKGROUND OF THE PROTO-SLAVIC ADJECTIVE *svęťь ‘HOLY’

The linguistic, literary, cultural and religious significance of the Proto-Slavic¹ lexeme *svęťь (yielding Old Church Slavic² *svęťь*, Russian³ *svjatŏj*, Polish *święty* and other familiar cognates) is perfectly well-known to anyone even superficially interested in the Slavic world, be it in the sphere of *Slavia Orthodoxa* and the Mediterranean region or anywhere else where the influence of Slavic⁴ heritage is noticeable. There is, likewise, no lack of clarity as regards the etymological source of the word, primarily because – as described in more detail in the ensuing paragraph – it demonstrates exact cognates in other branches of Indo-European⁵, and can be segmented into an independently known root and a productive adjective-forming suffix. The objective of the present brief study is, however, to enhance the standard analysis by providing a more fine-grained insight into the word-formation patterns and general morphological context that shaped this important Sl. term.

It is universally recognized⁶ that PSl. *svęťь ‘holy, saint’ has a perfect etymological match in the sister branch, Baltic⁷, namely in Lithuanian⁸ *šveñtas* and Old Prussian⁹ *swints*, both ‘holy, saint’. As such, the word can be reconstructed as PBSl.

¹ Cetera: PSl.

² Cetera: OCS.

³ Cetera: Ru.

⁴ Cetera: Sl.

⁵ Cetera: IE.

⁶ Vide: I. JANÝŠKOVÁ et al., *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, vol. XV, Prague 2010, p. 910; R. DERKSEN, *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden–Boston 2008, p. 476; М. ФАСМЕР, *Этимологический словарь русского языка*, ed. О.Н. ТРУБАЧЕВ, Б.А. ЛАРИН, vol. III, Москва 1987, p. 585; similarly in other reference works.

⁷ Cetera: Balt. The existence of a Proto-Balto-Slavic (cetera: PBSl.) language as a common ancestor of Sl. and Balt. is taken for granted here.

⁸ Cetera: Lith.

⁹ Cetera: OPr. It is disputed whether OPr. *swints* a real cognate inherited from Baltic (with a development of *-enC- to -inC-; thus e.g. W. SMOCZYŃSKI, *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*,

**śwentas*¹⁰. Crucially, a precise cognate of this item is also found in Avestan¹¹ *spənta-* ‘life-giving, holy’¹²; together with the BSL. term, this enables the reconstruction of (at least dialectal) Proto-Indo-European¹³ **k̑wento-*¹⁴.

Within Sl., the sequence **svēt-* presents itself as an indivisible unit (lexical morpheme); next to the adjective **svētъ* ‘holy, saint’, we find typical productive derivatives of the type **svētiti* **svēt’o* **svētiti*¹⁵ ‘celebrate’ or **svētyn’i* ‘holiness, temple’, all transparently obtained from the base **svēt-*. This is not so, however, in Av., where the cognate *spənta-* is clearly segmentable into a root *spən-* (itself still directly represented by the root noun *spān-* ‘life, vital power’) and an adjectival suffix *-ta-* (< PIE **-to-*). The underlying PIE root, **k̑wen-*, is reconstructible for the proto-language with the approximate range of meanings ‘swell (with life); live; be vital, sacred’¹⁶.

² (manuscript), p. 1474, <https://rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński> W. Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego.pdf [22 VI 2017]) or a later borrowing from Pol. *święty* (thus e.g. W. HOCK et al., *Alllitauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, Hamburg 2015, p. 1060). See also the discussion: R. DERKSEN, *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden–Boston 2015, p. 456 (with further references). Cf. also the OPr. onomastic evidence showing the sequence *-en-*: *Swent* (hydronym), *Swente-garben* (toponym); at least this portion of the OPr. material is generally considered inherited. On the other hand, Latvian (cetera: Latv.) *svēts* ‘holy, saint’ is uncontroversially identifiable as a borrowing from East Slavic (cf. Ru. *svyatŏj*).

¹⁰ Cf. R. TRAUTMANN, *Baltisch-slavisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen 1923, p. 311 (*šūenta-* ‘heilig’).

¹¹ Cetera: Av.

¹² The exact denotation – and translation – of this pivotal term depends heavily on the analysis of the religious system encoded in the Avesta; for the background of the gloss provided here, cf. P.O. SKJÆRVO, *The Spirit of Zoroastrianism*, New Haven–London 2011, p. 578 (*life-giving*, Av. *spənta-*, *epithet of good entities in the world of thought implying fertility and growth*; Pahl. *abzōnīg* ‘making (things) increase’) and *passim*. The word is also commonly translated simply as ‘holy’ *vel sim.*, cf. ‘heilig, sanctus’ – Ch. BARTHOLOMAE, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg 1904, p. 1619–1621.

¹³ Cetera: PIE.

¹⁴ Actually, PSl. **svētъ* could, in accordance with regular sound laws, go back to both PIE **k̑wen-to-* and PIE **k̑w̑n-to-*. However, since Lith., OPr. and Av. all point towards the former, it is natural to assume that the PSl. formation is historically identical. (On OPr. *swints* *vide* fn. 9) The geographically and cladistically closest reflex of **k̑w̑n-C-* is Gothic *hunsl* ‘offering’ < **k̑w̑n-slo-* (assuming this etymological analysis is correct). Incidentally, in the word **k̑wen-to-* the presence of the apophonic full-grade (i.e. the vowel **-e-* in the root) is somewhat unexpected, since in PIE adjectives built by means of the suffix **-to-* usually selected the zero-grade (i.e. vocally reduced) form of the root; hence, a pre-form like **k̑w̑n-to-* would in fact have been easier to motivate than the actually reconstructible **k̑wen-to-*. Some parallels for **-to-* adjectives taking the full-grade in the root (and likewise associated with the so-called ‘Caland System’, *vide* below) can be pointed out, however. Compare, for example, Proto-Germanic (cetera: PGmc.) **blauþa-* ‘weak, timid’ – Old English *blēað* ‘id.’, Old High German (cetera: OHG) *blōdi* ‘id.’, etc. – pointing to a pre-form like **b^hleh₂u-to-* or **b^hlaw-to-*, likewise with a full vowel in the root in spite of suffixation with **-to-* (contrast Gr. φλαῦρος ‘petty, bad’ < **b^hleh₂u-ro-* or **b^hlaw-ro-*, where the same root occurs with a different Caland suffix).

¹⁵ Sl. verbs are cited in the infinitive, 1st and 3rd singular present.

¹⁶ Cf. the (nowadays partially obsolete) presentation of the key material: J. POKORNY, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, Bern 1969, p. 630.

It should be noted, however, that the Av. adjective *spən-ta-* demonstrates certain further interesting properties beyond the mere possibility of a historical analysis along the lines described above. Namely, even at the synchronic level the word forms certain derivatives not from the actual stem of the adjective (*spənta-* < **kwentō-*), but rather directly from the root (*spən-* < **kwen-*), as though “bypassing” the adjective-forming suffix (*-ta-* < **-to-*). Thus, the abstract noun¹⁷ in *-ah-* (< PIE **-es-*) has the shape *spān-ah-* ‘life-giving knowledge’¹⁸ rather than making use of the adjective stem *spənta-*¹⁹. Even the (essentially inflectional and not derivational) forms of the comparative²⁰ and superlative²¹ of the adjective are built in this same fashion, i.e. directly from the root: cpv. *span-iiāh-* ‘more life-giving, holier’, superl. *spən-išta-* ‘most life-giving, holiest’ (using the regular cpv. and superl. suffixes *-iiāh-* < PIE **-yos-* and *-išta-* < PIE **-isth₂o-*, respectively)²².

The situation described above is, however, nothing particularly unusual in Av. or other archaic Indo-European²³ languages such as Vedic Sanskrit²⁴ or Ancient Greek²⁵. The practice of reaching for the root directly and omitting adjective-forming suffixes in the formation of derivatives and some inflectional forms (such as the cpv. and superl.) – in particular in quality adjectives denoting property-concepts²⁶ and states – is part of the so-called ‘Caland System’²⁷, a set of synchronically anomalous morphological peculiarities reconstructible for PIE and still observed in the most conservative daughter languages (especially in Greek

¹⁷ Cetera: abstr.

¹⁸ On the meanings/glosses of the Av. items presented in this paragraph cf. the comments and references in fn. 12.

¹⁹ Contrast the situation in Sl., as described in the preceding paragraph.

²⁰ Cetera: cpv.

²¹ Cetera: superl.

²² This is, again, at variance with the situation in Sl., where the cpv. and superl. are of course formed fully regularly from the stem **svet-*; cf. OCS cpv. *svetĭ*.

²³ Cetera: IE.

²⁴ Cetera: Ved.

²⁵ Cetera: Gr.

²⁶ I.e. qualities such as dimensions, physical properties, colors, speed, age, value, “human propensities” (‘friendly’, ‘hungry’, ‘ambitious’, etc.) and similar domains. For more discussion of this term and related issues, cf. R.M.W. DIXON, *Adjective classes in typological perspective*, [in:] *Adjective Classes. A Cross-linguistic Typology*, ed. R.M.W. DIXON, A.Y. AIKHENVALD, Oxford–New York 2004, p. 1–49; J. RAU, *Indo-European Nominal Morphology. The Decads and the Caland System*, Innsbruck 2009, p. 78–79; IDEM, *Notes on state-oriented verbal roots, the Caland System, and primary verb morphology in Indo-Iranian and Indo-European*, [in:] *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. A Festschrift for Alan J. Nussbaum*, ed. A.I. COOPER, J. RAU, M. WEISS, Ann Arbor–New York 2013, p. 255–273; I. BALLEs, *Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion. Form – Funktion – Ursprung*, Bremen 2006, p. 269ff. (all with further literature).

²⁷ Cetera: CS. The term derives from the surname of Dutch Iranist Willem Caland, who pointed out certain elements of the pattern toward the end of the 19th century; however, the modern term has a significantly broader meaning and scope than what Caland described. For further details see the references in fn. 28.

as well as the Indo-Iranian branch). The essence of the phenomenon involves suffix alternations precisely of the type described above for Av. *spəṇ-ta-* vs. *spān-ah-*, *span-iaah-*, *spən-išta-*, where the positive adjective suffix *-ta-* (< PIE **-to-*) is omitted from the derived/inflected forms; other adjective suffixes frequently found to be circumvented in a similar fashion in CS-driven alternations include **-ro-*, **-u-*, **-mo-*, **-no-*, **-e/ont-* and a number of others²⁸ (cf. e.g. Gr. κῦδ-ρό-ς ‘wonderful, glorious’ vs. cpv. κῦδ-ίωv ‘more wonderful, more glorious’, not making use of the stem κῦδ-ρο-). In some cases, the effect of the CS can even be described synchronically as suffix substitution rather than deletion; in particular, an element **-i-*²⁹ steps in for adjective-forming suffixes in first members of compounds³⁰ (cf. Av. *dərəz-ra-* ‘firm’, compound *dərəz-i-raθa-* ‘having a firm chariot’; Gr. κῦδ-ρό-ς ‘wonderful’, derivative κῦδ-ι-άvειρα ‘making men wonderful’). Two representative examples illustrating CS-related alternations are provided below in Table 1 (spanning several Indo-European languages) and Table 2 (within a single language, here Gr.). In both instances, it is evident how the suffix used to form the positive of the adjective (**-ro-*, **-u-*, **-o/ent-* etc.) is absent, i.e. “deleted” respectively “substituted” in the derived/inflected forms, even though the latter could be expected to be synchronic derivatives from the positive adjective:

Table 1

CS reflexes of **b^herǵh-* ‘great, tall’ in IE languages³¹

Form	PIE transposition	Reflex	Gloss of reflex
adj. <i>*-ro-</i>	<i>*b^herǵh-ro-</i>	Toch. B <i>pärkare</i>	‘long’
adj. <i>*-u-</i>	<i>*b^herǵh-u-</i>	Hitt. <i>parkuš</i>	‘tall’
adj. <i>*-o/ent-</i>	<i>*b^herǵh-o/ent-</i>	Ved. <i>brhánt-</i>	‘tall, great’
cpv. <i>*-yos-</i>	<i>*b^herǵh-yos-</i>	Av. <i>barəziiah-</i>	‘taller’

²⁸ For a detailed description of the workings of the CS, vide: J. RAU, *Indo-European Nominal Morphology...*; F. DELL’ORO, *Leggi, leghe suffissali e sistemi “Di Caland”: storia della questione “Caland” come problema teorico della linguistica indoeuropea*, Innsbruck 2015; T. MEISSNER, *Das “Calandsche Gesetz” und das Griechische – nach 100 Jahren*, [in:] *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen: Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, Innsbruck, 22–28. September 1996, ed. W. MEID, Innsbruck 1998, p. 237–253 (all with further literature).

²⁹ This element may quite likely be identified with an abstract noun in **-i-*, replacing the corresponding positive adjective stem due to certain independently motivated morphological rules of PIE. For details see the references in fn. 28, as well as: TH. LINDNER, *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. IV, *Wortbildungslehre (Derivationsmorphologie)*, pars 1.1, *Komposition*, Heidelberg 2011, p. 68–70.

³⁰ Cetera FCM (= First Compound Member).

³¹ Hitt. = Hittite; Toch. = Tocharian; SCM = Second Compound Member; stat. = stative verb.

Table 1 (cont.)

Form	PIE transposition	Reflex	Gloss of reflex
superl. *-isth ₂ o-	*b ^h erǵ ^h -isth ₂ o-	Av. <i>barəzišta-</i>	'tallest'
abstr. *-es-	*b ^h erǵ ^h -es-	Av. <i>barəzah-</i>	'height'
FCM *-i-	*b ^h ǵ ^h -i-	Av. <i>bərəzi-caxra-</i>	'having tall wheels'
SCM *-es-	*-b ^h erǵ ^h -es-	Ved. <i>dvi-bārhas-</i>	lit. 'double-great'
stat. *-eh ₁ -(ye-)	*b ^h ǵ ^h -eh ₁ -(ye-)	⇒ Hittite <i>parkēšš-zi</i>	'become great'

Table 2

CS reflexes of *kewhd- 'wonderful, glorious' in Gr.

Form	Reflex	Gloss of reflex
adj. *-ro-	κῦδ-ρό-ς	'glorious'
adj. *-no-	κῦδ-νό-ς	'glorious'
cpv. *-yos-	κῦδ-ίων	'more glorious'
superl. *-isth ₂ o-	κῦδ̄-ιστος	'most glorious'
abstr. *-es-	κῦδ-ος -εος	'glory'
FCM *-i-	κῦδ-ι-άνειρα	'making men glorious'
FCM *-es-	ἐπι-κῦδ-ής	'distinguished in glory'

Accordingly, the Av. forms discussed above, when transposed into PIE phonological shape, can be analyzed as a Caland adjective in *-to- (**kwen-to-*) with a set of suffix-omitting offshoots (cpv. **kwen-yos-*, derived abstr. **kwen-es-* as well as – in a sense – the root noun abstr. **kwen-*)³².

³² Although surfacing in clearly attested Caland sets relatively rarely, root nouns are probably what diachronically underlies most CS-related phenomena (that is to say, the synchronically unmotivated, arbitrary alternations observed in early IE languages likely reflect the morphologization of erstwhile productive suffixation applied to root nouns; the ensuing loss of most of such root nouns led to the creation of the CS as a peculiar, synchronically unobvious pattern). For details – ultimately, however, amounting to a story more complicated than the one presented in the previous sentence – cf. especially J. RAU, *Indo-European Nominal Morphology...*, p. 127–131.

It is now time to return to the point of departure, i.e. the prehistory of PSl. *svęťь, and to verify if the above contextualization of its Av. cognate – in particular its crystal-clear participation in the inherited set of morphological alternations known as the Caland System – helps achieve a more insightful analysis. It must be emphasized that, traditionally, the CS has not been considered overly relevant for the study of the late-attested and largely innovative BSl. branch. However, recent research³³, expanding on earlier scholars' studies and excursions dispersed in the existing literature, suggests a quite significant survival of various kinds of CS-related phenomena in BSl., both as lexicalized archaisms and as living morphological processes³⁴. In principle, therefore, it would not be unreasonable to surmise that BSl. might have inherited some CS-related behavior in the family of words under discussion, given that its Caland status is directly visible in another branch.

As is evident from the discussion of the available material at the outset of this study, the CS status of the root in question in BSl. is not demonstrable in any direct fashion in the nominal domain. However, it is possible that it can be established on the basis of data from the verbal sphere, coming from Balt.³⁵ The key formation is the Latv. verb *svinēt svin svinēja*³⁶ 'celebrate, venerate'. Though obviously cognate with the family of Lith. *šveĩtas* and PSl. *svęťь (this inherited adjective itself is lost in Latv.³⁷), from a formal point of view the item is rather curious, since it appears to be lacking the (originally suffixal) element *-t-*. This recalls the overall situation in Av., and would conform to a Caland pattern. The verb belongs to the Balt. conjugation in short **-i-* with an infinitive stem in **-ē-* (type Lith. *minėti mini minėjo* 'mention'). This verbal type, at least under the most persuasive of the many existing interpretations, ultimately goes back to PIE zero-grade root athematic middles (3. sg. **-or*)³⁸, a verbal formation closely associated with the CS³⁹. It can be pro-

³³ M. MAJER, *The Caland System in the North: Archaism and Innovation in Property-Concept / State Morphology in Balto-Slavic* [PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2017]. For a basic bibliography and the presentation of certain preliminary results, cf. M. MAJER, *Pozostałości praindoeuropejskiego 'Systemu Calanda' w języku prasłowiańskim – wybrane przykłady*, [in:] *Symposium Etymologicum – Śladami myśli etymologicznej. W stulecie urodzin wybitnego slawisty i etymologa Profesora Franciszka Sławskiego* (in press).

³⁴ Beyond the references provided in fn. 33, cf. the examples provided in Table 4 and Table 5 towards the end of this paper.

³⁵ The Baltic aspect of the present topic (treated below in a rather condensed way) will be dealt with in greater depth in a forthcoming study.

³⁶ Latv. and Lith. verbs are cited in the infinitive, 3rd present and 3rd preterite form.

³⁷ Cf. fn. 9.

³⁸ On the development from PIE root athematic middles (in 3rd singular **-or*, e.g. **m̥n-or* 'have in mind, think' from the root **men-* 'think') to BSl. verbs in **-ī-* with an infinitive stem in **-ē-* (cf. Lith. *minėti mini minėjo* 'mention', PSl. **m̥nēti *m̥n'ŕ *m̥nīb'* 'think'), vide: J. JASANOFF, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*, Oxford–New York 2003, p. 155–159, with further literature (including references to alternative theories; the issue remains contested in Indo-European studies).

³⁹ Cf. J. RAU, *Notes on state-oriented verbal roots...*; J. JASANOFF, *Hittite...*, p. 157 (especially fn. 350). Numerous adjectives participating in Caland alternations display a root athematic middle (sometimes reflected as a BSl. verb in **-ī-*).

visionally concluded that a trace of a Caland relationship is preserved in the BSL languages between the adj. seen in PSŁ. **svęŗŗ*, Lith. *švęŗŗtas* ‘holy, saint’ on the one hand and Latv. *svinēt svin svinēja* ‘celebrate’ on the other hand. Put differently, for the PBSŁ. period one could reconstruct not only the adjective **šwenta-* ‘holy, saint’, but the inherited root **šwen-* as a whole, with the aforementioned adjective still being perceived as a morphologically transparent formation (**šwen-ta-*) and with other derivatives being formed directly from the root.

However, the shape of the root as it appears in the Latv. form under discussion is somewhat peculiar, displaying the shape *svin-* (as though from PIE **k̑w̑n̑-*) in antevocalic position (infinitive *svin-ēt*, 3rd singular present *svin* < **svin-i*, etc.). The apophonic zero-grade, i.e. the reduction of the vowel in the root, is fully expected in an athematic middle in PIE (cf. **b^hud^h-or* from the root **b^hewd^h-* ‘be vigilant, observe’, **lip-or* from the root **leyp-* ‘stick’ etc.⁴⁰). However, the zero-grade from the root **k̑wen-* would have been **k̑un-* in antevocalic position (**k̑un-V-*, expected to yield BSL. **šun-V-*) and **k̑w̑n-* in anteconsonantal position (**k̑w̑n-C-*, expected to yield BSL. **švin-C-*). Since the original paradigm of a root athematic middle would have involved both vowel-initial and consonant-initial morphemes added to the stem, the latter would have alternated between the allomorphs **k̑un-* and **k̑w̑n-* (e.g. 3rd singular **k̑un-or* vs. 1st plural **k̑w̑n-med^hh₂*). Evidently, the latter shape (**k̑w̑n-*) got generalized in BSL. in this paradigm, ultimately leading to Latv. *svin-*, which now looks deceptively “out of place” in view of the fact that all morphemes appearing to the right are vowel-initial in the modern language⁴¹.

The formal details cannot be discussed here in their entirety⁴², but it can be concluded that Latv. *svinēt svin svinēja* may continue a root athematic middle **k̑un-or* (stem alternating with **k̑w̑n-C-*, cf. 1st plural **k̑w̑n-med^hh₂*), with a meaning approximating ‘be in a state of celebration’ or similar. The development of **k̑un-or* (plural **k̑w̑n-med^hh₂*) to Latv. *svinēt svin svinēja* is roughly parallel to that of PIE

⁴⁰ Vide: J. JASANOFF, *Hittite...*, *passim*.

⁴¹ The presence of the anteconsonantal type of reflex in this verb is noted by other authors as well, though the motivation for it is hardly addressed. W. SMOCZYŃSKI (*Słownik etymologiczny...*, p. 1338) writes: Latv. *svinēt, svinu* ‘celebrate a holiday’ shows the introduction of **švin-C* into the antevocalic position (Łot. *svinēt, svinu* ‘święcić święto’ pokazuje wprowadzenie **švin-C* w pozycję antewokaliczną), citing cases like Lith. *ištviróti* ‘endure’ alongside *tvirtas* ‘hard, durable’ as a purported parallel (showing the allomorph *tvir-* both before a vowel and before a consonant). However, this correlation is less than perfect. Lith. *tvirtas* is built on the zero-grade **tw̑rh-* of the PIE root **twerh-* ‘hold’. The root ends in a laryngeal, i.e. it is consonant-final; accordingly, the shape **tw̑rh-* phonologically yields Lith. *tvir-* in both anteconsonantal and antevocalic position. Besides, if the derivative *ištviróti* *ištvirója* *ištvirójo* ‘endure’ is not overly ancient (as is very likely), its root shape has ample support in the *tvir-* of *tvirtas* and other derivatives. On the other hand, Latv. *svinēt* stands isolated, with no detectable cases of **k̑w̑n-C-* anywhere in all of BSL. (Such formations from the root in question are found elsewhere in IE, however; vide fn. 13). No morphological explanation is offered in: R. DERKSEN, *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic...*, p. 456; except for the mere statement that [i]nterestingly, the zero grade of the root may be present in Latv. *svinēt* ‘celebrate’.

⁴² Vide: fn. 35.

**m̥n-or* ‘think, have in mind’ to Latv. *minēt min minēja* ‘mention’ (= Lith. *minėti m̥ni minėjo*, ≈ PSl. **m̥nēti* **m̥n’o* **m̥niti*)⁴³. This indicates the survival of the root **kwen-* in BSl. outside of the lexicalized adjective **kwen-to-* ‘vital, holy’, and together with the Av. evidence it makes it possible to claim an important Caland configuration for this root, as presented in Table 3 below⁴⁴:

Table 3

CS-like reflexes of **kwen-* ‘vital, prosperous, holy’ in Av. and BSl.⁴⁵

Form	PIE transposition	Reflex	Gloss of reflex
adj. *-to-	* <i>kwen-to-</i>	Av. <i>spənta-</i> , Lith. <i>šveñtas</i> , PSl. * <i>svęť</i>	‘life-giving’, ‘holy’
cpv. *-yos-	* <i>kwen-yos-</i>	Av. <i>spaniiah-</i>	‘more life-giving’
abstr. *-es-	* <i>kwen-es-</i>	Av. <i>spānah-</i>	‘life-giving knowledge’
mid. *-or	* <i>kun-or</i> (~ * <i>kwn-med^h</i>)	Latv. <i>svinēt svin svinēja</i>	‘celebrate, venerate’

This strongly recalls other reconstructible Caland sets including BSl. material, as exemplified below Table 4 and Table 5⁴⁶:

Table 4

CS-like reflexes of **d^heb^(h)*- ‘heavy, thick’⁴⁷

Form	PIE transposition	Reflex	Gloss of reflex
adj. *-elo-	* <i>d^heb^(h)-elo-</i>	PSl. * <i>debelь</i>	‘thick’
adj. *-ro-	* <i>d^hob^(h)-ro-</i>	PGmc. * <i>dapraz</i>	‘heavy’ ⁴⁸

⁴³ Again, cf. fn. 38 for references on the formal details.

⁴⁴ An alternative hypothesis could also be proposed, namely that Latv. *svinēt svin svinēja* is a later creation, roughly from PBSl. or later times (though hardly Latv.-internal), formed at a stage when the descendant of the root **kwen-* still participated in CS alternations like the ones seen at work in Av. Thus, a new verbal creation built to **kwen-to-*, **kwen-yos-* and possible other derivatives would have been able to “reach” for the root directly, bypassing the Caland suffixes. Still, in order for the stem **švin-* to be inferred, one would expect at least some members of that hypothetical CS set to be of the structure **kwn-C-*.

⁴⁵ Mid. = middle verb.

⁴⁶ For more details on the facts and analyses presented briefly in the tables below, *vide* fn. 33.

⁴⁷ Interestingly, the root illustrated in this table is of “North Indo-European” (= Balto-Slavic and Germanic) scope only, which would confirm the prolonged robustness of Caland processes in these branches.

⁴⁸ OHG *tapfer* ‘strong’, Old Norse *dapr* ‘sad’.

Table 4 (cont.)

Form	PIE transposition	Reflex	Gloss of reflex
adj. *-lo-	*d ^h ob ^(h) -lo- ⁴⁹	Latv. <i>dabls</i>	‘strong’
cpv. *-yos-	*d ^h eb ^(h) -yos-	PSl. * <i>deb</i> ’-bš-	‘thicker’
abstr. *-es-	*d ^h eb ^(h) -es-	→ Latv. <i>depsis</i>	‘fat child’
mid. *-or	?*d ^h eb ^(h) -or	PSl. * <i>debēti</i> * <i>debitb</i> ⁵⁰	‘sit, remain’

Table 5

CS-like reflexes of *delh₁- ‘long’⁵¹

Form	PIE transposition	Reflex	Gloss of reflex
adj. *-g ^h o-	*d ^h h ₁ -g ^h o-	Ved. <i>dīrghá-</i> , PSl. * <i>db</i> lg ^h	‘long’
adj. *-to-	*d ^h h ₁ -to-	OAlb. <i>glatë</i>	‘long’
cpv. *-yos-	*dl(e)h ₁ -yos-	PSl. * <i>dbl</i> ’-bš-	‘longer’
abstr. *-i-	*dolh ₁ -i-	→ Gr. <i>δολιχός</i>	‘long’
abstr. *-u-	*dolh ₁ -u-	→ Hitt. <i>daluki-</i>	‘long’
caus. *-eye-	*d(o)lh ₁ -eye-	⇒ PSl. * <i>deliti</i>	‘lengthen’

This, in turn, would imply that at least in BSl. times, the item **šwenta-* (ultimately to become the familiar PSl. **svętъ*) was not yet “frozen” or independently lexicalized as an indivisible lexeme meaning ‘holy’, but rather was couched in a Caland system of alternations centered around the root inherited from PIE **kwen-*.

The match with the usually cited exact cognate – Av. *spənta-* – of course still stands, but both BSl. **šwenta-* and Av. *spənta-* first of all need to be analyzed in their own, language- or branch-internal contexts, as well as against the general background of Caland System morphology.

⁴⁹ Aslo → PSl. **dobl’ъ*, Latv. *dabš* ‘id.’

⁵⁰ Formal match, uncertain in view of the semantic gap.

⁵¹ Caus. = causative verb; OAlb. = Old Albanian.

Bibliography

Secondary literature

- BALLES I., *Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion. Form – Funktion – Ursprung*, Bremen 2006.
- BARTHOLOMAE Ch., *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg 1904.
- DELL'ORO F., *Leggi, leghe suffissali e sistemi "Di Caland": storia della questione "Caland" come problema teorico della linguistica indoeuropea*, Innsbruck 2015.
- DERKSEN R., *Etymological Dictionary of the Baltic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden–Boston 2015.
- DERKSEN R., *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden–Boston 2008.
- DIXON R.M.W., *Adjective classes in typological perspective*, [in:] *Adjective Classes. A Cross-linguistic Typology*, ed. R.M.W. DIXON, A.Y. AIKHENVALD, Oxford–New York 2004, p. 1–49.
- FASMER M., *Étimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*, ed. O.N. TRUBAČEV, B.A. LARIN, vol. III, ²Moskva 1987.
- HOCK W. et al., *Alllitausisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, Hamburg 2015.
- JANYŠKOVÁ I. et al., *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského*, vol. XV, Prague 2010.
- JASANOFF J., *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*, Oxford–New York 2003.
- LINDNER Th., *Indogermanische Grammatik*, vol. IV, *Wortbildungslehre (Derivationsmorphologie)*, pars 1.1, *Komposition*, Heidelberg 2011.
- MAJER M., *Pozostałości praindoeuropejskiego 'Systemu Calanda' w języku prasłowiańskim – wybrane przykłady*, [in:] *Symposium Etymologicum – Śladami myśli etymologicznej. W stulecie urodzin wybitnego slawisty i etymologa Profesora Franciszka Sławskiego* (in press).
- MAJER M., *The Caland System in the North: Archaism and Innovation in Property-Concept / State Morphology in Balto-Slavic* [PhD thesis, Harvard University, 2017].
- MEISSNER T., *Das "Calandsche Gesetz" und das Griechische – nach 100 Jahren*, [in:] *Sprache und Kultur der Indogermanen: Akten der X. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Innsbruck, 22.–28. September 1996*, ed. W. MEID, Innsbruck 1998.
- POKORNY J., *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, Bern 1969.
- RAU J., *Indo-European Nominal Morphology. The Decads and the Caland System*, Innsbruck 2009.
- RAU J., *Notes on state-oriented verbal roots, the Caland System, and primary verb morphology in Indo-Iranian and Indo-European*, [in:] *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. A Festschrift for Alan J. Nussbaum*, ed. A.I. COOPER, J. RAU, M. WEISS, Ann Arbor–New York 2013, p. 255–273.
- SKJÆRVO P.O., *The Spirit of Zoroastrianism*, New Haven–London 2011.
- SMOCZYŃSKI W., *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*, ² (manuscript), <https://rromanes.org/pub/alii/Smoczyński.W.Słownik.etymologiczny.języka.litewskiego.pdf> [22 VI 2017].
- TRAUTMANN R., *Baltisch-slavisches Wörterbuch*, Göttingen 1923.

Abstract. The standard etymological explanation of the Proto-Slavic adjective **svęrb* 'holy, saint' – a word of extreme literary, cultural and religious importance in the Slavic world – concentrates on the formal match with Lithuanian *šveĩtas* 'id.' and Avestan *spęnta-* 'life-giving, holy' (PIE **kwen-to-*, from the root **kwen-*). This article highlights the verbal formation seen in Latvian *svinēt*

svin svinějo 'celebrate, venerate', generally recognized as another reflex of the root **kwen-* in Balto-Slavic, but without due attention to the formal implications. It is argued that both in Av. and in BSL the adjective *spənta-/svętb* behaves as an item participating in the so-called 'Caland System' (a set of arbitrary morphological alternations reconstructible for Proto-Indo-European).

Keywords: saint, etymology, Proto-Slavic, Proto-Indo-European, Caland System

Marek Majer

Harvard University
Department of Linguistics
Boylston Hall, 3rd floor
02138 Cambridge, MA, USA
marekmajer@fas.harvard.edu

Ireneusz Milewski (Gdańsk)

A FEW REMARKS ON THE RANSOM PAID FOR RELEASING CAPTIVES IN SELECTED EARLY BYZANTINE HAGIOGRAPHIC TEXTS*

Brigandage in all its forms existed and developed throughout antiquity, including in the Roman world. To a large extent, it was a symptom of the state's weakness and the various sorts of problems it suffered from. This applied especially to frontier areas, many of which had never been civilized enough: they had not yielded to Romanization (as, for instance, the territories inhabited by the Isaurians¹), nor had they been included under efficient administration within the borders of previous kingdoms. Another problem arises with the decline of antiquity in the West, where, after the year 410 AD, the Roman state functioned capably only in Italy. In the other provinces, engulfed by chaos and taken over by barbarians, brigandage and piracy spread freely; it was also practiced by barbarian invaders, particularly by Visigoths and Vandals in the western parts of the Mediterranean Sea². Without delving into the broader context of issues related to brigandage, the following study will present records of several instances focusing on the monetary transactions involved: that is, the ransom paid for releasing captives.

Melania the Younger and piracy in the Mediterranean Sea

The first of the reports under analysis stems from Gerontius of Jerusalem, who describes Melania the Younger's journey from Italy to Africa. Having just sold a considerable part of her estates in Italy, she heads south to reach Palestine through Africa, Cyrenaica, and Egypt. Although the notion of religious reasons behind her desire to visit Egyptian monks may be maintained – since they were swarmed by

* This article was written with the financial support of the Polish National Science Centre (UMO-2015/17/B/HS3/00135).

¹ K. TOMASCHITZ, *Unpublizierte Inschriften Westkilikiens aus dem Nachlass Terence B. Mitffords*, Wien 1998, p. 35sq; K. FELD, *Barbarische Bürger. Die Isaurier und das Römische Reich*, Berlin–New York 2005, p. 102sq, 183sq, 194sq.

² Ph. DE SOUZA, *Piracy in the Graeco–Roman World*, Cambridge 2002, p. 225.

hysterically pious Roman matrons such as Melania – her stay in Africa Proconsularis was due to purely economic causes³. Melania sought to liquidate some of her estates there and to transfer the acquired resources to Palestine in order to cover the costs of the enterprises she planned there. On her way to Africa, she stayed for a while in Sicily, where she also sold her estates (a fact left unmentioned by Gerontius). At this point, for unknown reasons, Melania decided not to continue her journey towards Africa; instead, she turned back to Campania, to her cousin Paulinus, bishop of Nola. On the way there, due to inclement weather, her ship landed on an island (not mentioned by name) which had just been ravaged by pirates. A large part of the inhabitants of the island had been abducted⁴. The pirates (referred to by Gerontius as οἱ βάρβαροι) demanded a huge sum of gold (...καὶ ἀπῆτουν αὐτὸς φανερὸν χρυσίον; no exact amount is specified) for releasing them, or else they threatened to murder the hostages and pillage the town once again⁵. The latter statement should rather be taken a sign of literary exaggeration. Captives were “merchandise” too valuable to be slaughtered; those who would not be ransomed would be taken to slave markets. Whether in antiquity or in other periods, it was piracy, along with wars of conquest, that constituted the main source of slavery⁶.

The bishop mentioned in Gerontius’s report, only able to raise a small part of the demanded sum, asked Melania and Pinianus for help. The couple shelled out the remaining 2,500 solidi (...δισχιλίων πεντακοσίων νομισμάτων) and even ransomed a certain elderly noble woman from the hands of the pirates. It appears from Gerontius’s account that she was the victim of another raid and none of her relatives had helped her; 500 solidi were demanded for her release⁷. Melania gave another 500 solidi (νομίσματα πεντακόσια) to support the prisoners rescued from the hands of the pirates – or actually, the “barbarians” (...ἐκ τῶν βαρβάρων)⁸. The historical accuracy of the event described by Gerontius is challenging to evaluate. The only islands on the route from Sicily to Campania are the Aeolian Islands, an area tormented by piracy throughout antiquity. Needless to say, the islands were not alone in that respect, as the shores of all Italy were raided by sea brigands⁹. The apogee of the attacks occurred in the period from the beginning of the 5th century

³ Cf. also: L.L. COON, “Through the Eye of a Needle”. *Wealth and Poverty in the Lives of Helena, Paula, and Melania the Younger*, [in:] EADEM, *Sacred Fictions. Holy Women and Hagiography in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia 1997, p. 95sqq.

⁴ Gerontius states that the pirates abducted: τοὺς μεγάλους τῆς πόλεως μετὰ γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων. GERONTIUS, *Vita Melaniae iunioris*, 19, 168, ed. D. GORCE, Paris 1962 [= SC, 90].

⁵ GERONTIUS, *Vita Melaniae iunioris*, 19, 168.

⁶ L. SCHUMACHER, *Sklaverei in der Antike. Alltag und Schicksal der Unfreien*, München 2001, p. 34sqq.

⁷ GERONTIUS, *Vita Melaniae iunioris*, 19, 168: ...γυναϊκά τινα ἐπίσημον ἐξ αὐτῶν, κατεχομένην ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων, παρεσχικήτης νομίματα πεντακόσια ἐξηγόρασαν.

⁸ GERONTIUS, *Vita Melaniae iunioris*, 19, 168.

⁹ Ph. WARD, *The Aeolian Islands*, New York 1974, p. 7.

(Maximus of Turin describes pirate attacks on the Ligurian Sea and the invasions of Gundobad, king of Burgundians¹⁰) up to the early 7th century¹¹.

It is unclear whether the instance of piracy related by Gerontius could be ascribed to the Vandals, who only arrived in the vicinity of Sicily later. Rather, the account either reflects a case of piracy committed by neighbors from nearby islands or it is a mere topical story, of which there are many in hagiographic texts, especially in the early medieval Latin West¹². As Gerontius observes, the local communities were decimated by pirate attacks and tried to ransom the captives by their own means. That responsibility, known in Roman law as *redemptio captivorum*, fell on the local bishop if the community lacked sufficient funds. If he was not able to secure the required sum either, he would request support from third parties¹³. This is exactly what the unnamed bishop did when Melania was asked to contribute the missing amount.

As for the sums of money demanded by the pirates in Gerontius's report, there is no reason to question their validity. Melania had just conducted the sale of her Sicilian estates; besides, she had large amounts of gold acquired from the sale of her Roman assets. Moreover, in the later part of the *Vita*, Gerontius mentions that Melania sent money (...ἀπέστειλαν τὰ χρήματα) to ransom captives while she was in Africa¹⁴. He does not specify, however, whether in this case we are also dealing with victims of piracy, or whether the events were related to land brigandage or to the Visigoth raids ravaging Italy.

How do the ransom sums mentioned by Gerontius (500 and 2,500 solidi) correlate with analogical data known from other sources? Certain other accounts come to our aid here, e.g. the testimony of Gregory the Great. His letters – an invaluable source for the history of Italy at the turn of the 6th and 7th centuries – provide a considerable amount of information on the topic of the rampant brigandage and recurring barbarian raids plaguing the country. They also sometimes quote exact amounts of ransom paid for releasing captives. Thus, Gregory mentions the sums of 8 solidi (for ransoming a certain Stephanus, otherwise not quite known to

¹⁰ A. MERKT, *Maximus I. von Turin. Die Verkündigung eines Bischofs der frühen Reichskirche im zeitgeschichtlichen, gesellschaftlichen und liturgischen Kontext*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997, p. 39–47 (the chapter *Tumultus bellorum. Turin angesichts der Barbareneinfälle der Jahre 401–412*).

¹¹ Cf. GREGORIUS MAGNUS, *Epistula*, 5, 36, ed. D. NORBERG, Turnhout 1982 [= CC.SL, 140]. Cf. also: W. KLINGSHIRN, *Caesarius of Arles and the Ransoming of Captives in Sub-Roman Gaul*, JRS 75, 1985, p. 183sq; H. GRIESER, *Der Loskauf Gefangener im spätantiken christlichen Italien, [in:] Gefangenensloskauf im Mittelmeerraum. Ein interreligiöser Vergleich. Akten der Tagung von 19. bis 21. September 2013 an der Universität Paderborn, Hildesheim 2015*, p. 25sq.

¹² Cf. F. GRAUS, *Die Gewalt bei den Anfängen des Feudalismus und die "Gefangenbefreiungen" der merowingischen Hagiographie*, JWg 1, 1961, p. 61sq; E. HERMANN-OTTO, *Der spätantike Bischof zwischen Politik und Kirche. Das exemplarische Wirken von Epiphanius von Pavia*, RQ 90, 1995, p. 198sq.

¹³ H. GRIESER, *Der Loskauf...*, p. 28, 35.

¹⁴ GERONTIUS, *Vita Melaniae iunioris*, 20, 168.

us)¹⁵, 130 solidi (for two daughters of a man called Faustinus)¹⁶ or even 11 pounds of gold (for two clergymen of the bishopric in Fermo), which amounts to a total of almost 800 solidi¹⁷.

The kidnapped Syrian bishops in the *Historia religiosa*

The second of the reports under discussion is found in Theodoret of Cyrus's *Historia religiosa* and concerns two kidnapped Syrian bishops. Isaurian robbers had threatened northern Syria, as well as the areas of Pontus and eastern Cappadocia, during the entire period of Roman administration¹⁸, but their raids surged especially in the middle of the 4th century. The circumstances of these most intensified attacks were described by Ammianus Marcellinus. Theodoret relates that the Isaurians rose in rebellion in 353 AD, after a certain number of their kinsmen had been caught during a raid and slain in an amphitheater. Isaurian bands assaulted towns on both sides of the Taurus mountains and even mounted a siege of Seleucia¹⁹. The raiders escalated their incursions in 359 AD and especially in 367 AD, when they wreaked havoc in the neighboring Cilicia. As the Roman armies were engaged in operations in the central Danube region, the task of repelling the invaders was entrusted to Musonius, the vicar of the province of Asia; however, he was trapped and defeated by the Isaurians. It was not until Valens sent his legions to the area that the marauders were driven back to their mountains²⁰. Zosimos informs us of an Isaurian raid in Lycia and Pamphylia in 375 AD. Yet again, armies sent by emperor Valens from Antioch (where they had been stationed due to a planned expedition against the Persians) pushed the Isaurians back to their mountain dwellings²¹.

In the records from the years 403–408 AD, we learn of yet another threat from the Isaurians. Their activity might have been caused by the doings of Tribigild, a Roman general of Ostrogothic origin who rebelled at the end of the 4th century and ravaged southern Anatolia²². According to Philostorgius, the Isaurians revolted once again, this time spreading over the Asia Minor provinces of Caria and Pamphylia, northern Syria, the lands of Armenia Secunda, Syria and Phoenicia²³,

¹⁵ GREGORIUS MAGNUS, *Epistula* 9, 85.

¹⁶ GREGORIUS MAGNUS, *Epistula*, 7, 35.

¹⁷ GREGORIUS MAGNUS, *Epistula*, 9, 52.

¹⁸ K. FELD, *Barbarische...*, p. 87sqq.

¹⁹ AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Rerum gestarum libri*, XIV, 2, 1–20 (ed. W. SEYFARTH, Stuttgart 1996).

²⁰ AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Rerum gestarum libri*, XXVII, 9, 6–7.

²¹ ZOSIMOS, *Nova Historia*, IV, 20, 1–2 (ed. F. PASCHOUD, vol. II, Paris 1979).

²² ZOSIMOS, *Nova Historia*, V, 14, 5; V, 15, 4–17 (ed. F. PASCHOUD, vol. III, Paris 1986).

²³ Cf. SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, VIII, 25, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1864 [= PG, 67], col. 1580–1581: (...) *a band of robbers from Isauria* (οἱ δὲ ἐν Ἰσαυρίᾳ ληστοὶ) *ravaged cities and villages as far as Caria and Phoenicia*. Cf. also: AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Rerum gestarum libri*, XXVIII, 2, 11–14; SOCRATES, *Historia ecclesiastica*, II, 33, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1864 [= PG, 67]; HIERONYMUS, *Chronicon*, a. 352 (ed. R. HELM, Berlin 1956).

allegedly reaching as far as Cyprus on ships²⁴. Isaurian raiding parties even encroached into Palestine, threatening Jerusalem itself²⁵.

Towards the end of antiquity, the Isaurians, echoing their previous actions (it will suffice to mention Pompey's attempts to deal with Cilician pirates²⁶), engaged in maritime brigandage and terrorized the eastern shores of the Mediterranean²⁷. Their expeditions had the form of typical raids²⁸. It was not until the beginning of the 5th century that the situation was brought more or less under control; but even for that period, reading John Chrysostom's accounts concerning the Isaurian threat, one could get a wholly different impression. Due to the perpetual menace from them, John had his exile destination changed, since it was considered undesirable for a deportee to be taken captive (he would then need to be ransomed back; besides, the political aspects of Chrysostom's exile played a role too). Incidentally, John Chrysostom redeemed captives from the hands of Isaurian robbers as well²⁹. Already in the first decade of the 5th century, however, the Isaurians were subdued by Arbazaios, a Roman commander of Armenian or perhaps even Isaurian origin³⁰. For the following years, sources cease to mention any raids on a similar scale. It was not until 441 AD that the crisis caused by the Hun invasion led to an Isaurian invasion of Syria once again³¹.

²⁴ PHILOSTORGIUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, XI, 8, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1864 [= PG, 65]; THEODORETUS, *Historia Religiosa / Histoire des mones de Syrie*, X, 5, ed. P. CANIVET, A. LEROY-MOLINGHEN, Paris 1977 [= SC, 234].

²⁵ PALLADIUS, *Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome*, XI, 16, eds A.M. MALINGREY, P. LECLERCQ, Paris 1988 [= SC, 341–342]; JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Epistolae ad Olympiadem / Lettres d'exil a Olympias et a tous les fidèles*, VI, 1; IX, 2–4; XVI, 1; XVII, 1, ed. A.-M. MALINGREY, Paris 1964 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 103]. Cf. also: JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Epistolae*, 52, 57, 68, 72, 108, 114, 120, 127, 131, 135, 142, 146, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1862 [= PG, 52]; HIERONYMUS, *Epistulae*, 114, 1, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1845 [= PL, 22]: (...) *multa in medio* (...) *praecipue urbs Hierosolymae*. Cf. also: K. FELD, *Barbarische...*, p. 169–170.

²⁶ K. FELD, *Barbarische...*, p. 197sq.

²⁷ AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Rerum gestarum libri*, XIV, 2, 3 (expedition to Cyprus); PHILOSTORGIUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, XI, 8 (expedition to Rhodos). Cf. also: K. FELD, *Barbarische...*, p. 197–200.

²⁸ K. FELD, *Barbarische...*, p. 193sq.

²⁹ Cf. SOZOMENUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, VIII, 27, col. 1592 – where we read that during his exile, Chrysostom had ample monetary resources at his disposal (... χρημάτων γὰρ ἔχων ἀφθονίαν), and – supplied with money by Olympias and by other supporters – he redeemed numerous captives from the hands of the Isaurians (... πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους παρὰ τῶν Ἰσαύρων ὠνεῖτο), restoring them to their families (... καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀπεδίδου). Vide also: C. RAPP, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 2005, p. 228–232.

³⁰ K. FELD, *Barbarische...*, p. 171–192.

³¹ MARCELLINUS COMES, *Chronicon*, a. 441, [in:] *Chronica minora*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, Berolini 1894 [= MGH.AA, 11.2]. Concerning further problems with the Isaurians, including Isaurian robbers in early Byzantium, see the recent article by: M.J. LESZKA, *Jan Kyrtyos – pogromca Izauryjczyków*, [in:] *W kręgu antycznych politei. Księga Jubileuszowa ofiarowana profesorowi Janowi Ilukowi*, ed. W. GAJEWSKI, I. MILEWSKI, Gdańsk 2017, p. 204–211.

For the Isaurian robbers, captives abducted for ransom constituted a considerable source of income, along with the loot itself. If there was nobody to ransom a given prisoner, or if the demanded sum was too high, they would end up at a slave market. Chiefly, the Isaurians tried to kidnap people from higher social classes or those enjoying universal respect, such as eremites. A substantial ransom could be hoped for in the case of their abduction. Exactly such a case is reported in Theodoret's *Historia religiosa*; it concerns Theodosius, a monk from northern Syria. It was the fear of kidnapping, among other factors (such as securing safety) that determined Theodosius's evacuation to the safe haven of Antioch³². During the very same raid, the Isaurians captured two bishops from Syria. Theodoret does not mention their names or provide any chronological clues that would allow us to establish the time of the event. As mentioned above, other sources report that Isaurian raiding parties reached the territories of Syria, Phoenicia and even Palestine during raids that occurred between 403 AD and 408 AD. Therefore, the incident described by Theodoret may also be dated to the same period with a high dose of certainty. As for the two bishops, they were released after long negotiations, their bishoprics agreeing to pay 40,000 solidi – an exorbitant sum at the time³³. Theodoret mentions Isaurians kidnapping people for ransom in other parts of his work as well³⁴.

Nevertheless, the Isaurians were inhabitants of the Roman Empire. On the other hand, in late antiquity, the southern periphery of the state – Egypt – was subject to raids by borderland peoples, such as the Blemmyes³⁵. Their pillaging expeditions reached Thebaid³⁶ and even Sinai³⁷, escalating in the thirties and

³² THEODORETUS, *Historia Religiosa*, X, 6, p. 446.

³³ THEODORETUS, *Historia Religiosa*, X, 6, 9–10, p. 446: (...) τετρακισχίλιους δὲ καὶ μυρίουσ ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων δεξάμενοι χρυσοῦς.

³⁴ THEODORETUS, *Historia Religiosa*, XII, 6; XXI, 27. A possible sum of money for releasing captives is also disclosed by Procopius of Caesarea. According to his account, the Persian king Chosroes purportedly captured as many as 12,000 inhabitants when conquering the city of Sura. Subsequently, he offered Candidus, bishop of the nearby Sergiopolis, to ransom them for the staggering sum of 2,000 *kentaria* of gold, cf. PROCOPIUS, *Bellum Persicum*, II, 5, 28, ed. J. HAURY, G. WIRTH, Leipzig 1963. *Vide also*: A. CAMERON, *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1985, p. 163. Other sums reported by Procopius in his *Persian War* pertain not to ransom, but to tribute for lifting the siege of a city.

³⁵ *Notitia Dignitatum*, 31, 49, [in:] *Notitia Dignitatum. Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae. Latercula Provinciarum*, ed. O. SEECK, Frankfurt am Main 1983, p. 65; *Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, 1, 2, ed. A.J. FESTUGIÈRE, Bruxelles 1971, p. 9–10. Cf. also: M. WEBER, *Blemyer*, [in:] *RAC, Supplement-Lieferung*, Stuttgart 2002, p. 7–28.

³⁶ PALLADIUS, *Historia Lausiaca*, 32, ed. C. BUTLER, vol. II, Cambridge 1904, p. 95, 2–5.

³⁷ V. CHRISTIDES, *Pre-islamic Arabs in byzantine illuminations*, *Mu* 83, 1970, p. 176sq; J. DESANGES, *Les raids des Blemmyes sous le règne de Valens en 373/74*, *MNe* 10, 1972, p. 32–34. R. SOLZBACHER, *Mönche, Pilger und Sarazenen. Studien zum Frühchristentum auf der südlichen Sinaihalbinsel*, Altenberge 1989, p. 212sq, 234–242; T. POWER, *The Red Sea from Byzantium to the Caliphate. Ad 500–1000*, Cairo 2012, p. 47 (fn. 5–6).

forties of the 5th century, as reported by Shenoute of Atripe. If his account is to be trusted, during one such raid the Blemmyes acted in a particularly cruel way. The population, left on their own (supposedly in the number of 20,000), took shelter in the Sohag monastery under the custody of Shenoute. The archimandrite guaranteed their protection and upkeep and ransomed 100 captives from the Blemmyes³⁸. One of the victims of the Blemmyes' raid of 435 AD was Nestorius, the bishop of Constantinople, who was an exile in Siwa Oasis at the time³⁹. The Blemmyes continued their attacks in the later decades as well⁴⁰.

The above study offers a detailed analysis of two reports (by Gerontius of Jerusalem and Theodoret of Cyrus, respectively) concerning various forms of brigandage in late antiquity. Although the phenomenon developed widely during the whole period of antiquity (and not only then), the crisis and progressive decline of Roman administration in the West could only lead to the increase of its scale and intensity. The sources analyzed – both of them hagiographic texts – reflect the atmosphere of the *époque*: an infirm (often helpless) state facing growing crime, the effects of migration, as well as pirate raids launched from neighboring barbarian lands. Despite a certain lack of precision, the accounts under discussion are valuable sources of knowledge. They depict everyday life in the provinces, reflecting “stories” left untold in “great history”, allowing a reconstruction of the social and political history of the later Roman Empire.

Bibliography

Sources

- AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, *Rerum gestarum libri*, vol. I–II, ed. W. SEYFARTH, Stuttgart 1996.
- EVAGRIUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, ed. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, Amsterdam 1964.
- GERONTIUS, *Vita Melaniae iunioris*, ed. D. GORCE, Paris 1962 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 90].
- GREGORIUS MAGNUS, *Epistulae*, ed. D. NORBERG, Turnhout 1982 [= *Corpus christianorum, Series latina*, 140].
- HIERONYMUS, *Chronicon*, ed. R. HELM, Berlin 1956.
- HIERONYMUS, *Epistulae*, ed. J.-P. MIGNÉ, Paris 1845, col. 235–1182 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina*, 22].
- Historia monachorum in Aegypto*, ed. A.J. FESTUGIÈRE, Bruxelles 1971.

³⁸ Cf. J. LEIPOLDT, *Berichte Schenutes über Einfälle der Nubier in Ägypten*, ZÄSA 40, 1902, p. 126–140; R.T. UPDEGRAFF, *A Study of the Blemmyes*, Ann Arbor 1978, p. 107sqq.

³⁹ EVAGRIUS, *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 7, 13, ed. J. BIDEZ, L. PARMENTIER, Amsterdam 1964. Cf. also: F. HAASE, *Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen*, Leipzig 1925, p. 382; R.T. UPDEGRAFF, *A Study...*, p. 109–110; I. MILEWSKI, *Depozycje i zsyłki biskupów w Cesarstwie Wschodniorzymskim (lata 325–451)*, Gdańsk 2008, p. 365–366.

⁴⁰ M. WEBER, *Blemyer...*, p. 21sqq.

- JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Epistolae*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1862, col. 529–791 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, 52].
- JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, *Epistolae ad Olympiadem / Lettres d'exil a Olympias et a tous les fidèles*, ed. A.-M. MALINGREY, Paris 1964 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 103].
- MARCELLINUS COMES, *Chronicon*, [in:] *Chronica minora*, ed. Th. MOMMSEN, Berolini 1894, p. 37–108 [= *Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores antiquissimi*, 11.2].
- Notitia Dignitatum*, [in:] *Notitia Dignitatum. Notitia urbis Constantinopolitanae. Latercula Provincia-rum*, ed. O. SEECK, Frankfurt am Main 1983, p. 1–102.
- PALLADIUS, *Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome*, eds A.M. MALINGREY, P. LECLERCQ, Paris 1988 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 341–342].
- PALLADIUS, *Historia Lausiaca*, ed. C. BUTLER, vol. II, Cambridge 1904.
- PHILOSTORGIUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1864, col. 459–638 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, 65].
- PROCOPIUS, *Bellum Persicum*, ed. J. HAURY, G. WIRTH, Leipzig 1963.
- SOCRATES, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1864, col. 28–842 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, 67].
- SOZOMENUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1864, col. 843–1630 [= *Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca*, 67].
- THEODORETUS, *Historia Religiosa / Histoire des mones de Syrie*, ed. P. CANIVET, A. LEROY-MOLINGHEN, Paris 1977 [= *Sources chrétiennes*, 234].
- ZOSIMOS, *Historia nova*, ed. F. PASCHOD, vol. I–III, Paris 1971–1986.

Secondary Literature

- CAMERON A., *Procopius and the Sixth Century*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1985.
- CHRISTIDES V., *Pre-islamic Arabs in byzantine illuminations*, “Le Muséon” 83, 1970, p. 167–181.
- COON L.L., “Through the Eye of a Needle”. *Wealth and Poverty in the Lives of Helena, Paula, and Melania the Younger*, [in:] EADEM, *Sacred Fictions. Holy Women and Hagiography in Late Antiquity*, Philadelphia 1997, p. 95–119.
- DESANGES J., *Les raids des Blemmyes sous le règne de Valens en 373/74*, “Meroitic Newsletter” 10, 1972, p. 32–34.
- FELD K., *Barbarische Bürger. Die Isaurier und das Römische Reich*, Berlin–New York 2005.
- GRAUS F., *Die Gewalt bei den Anfängen des Feudalismus und die “Gefangenbefreiungen” der merowingischen Hagiographie*, “Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte” 1, 1961, p. 61–156.
- GRIESER H., *Der Loskauf Gefangener im spätantiken christlichen Italien*, [in:] *Gefangeneloskauf im Mittelmeerraum. Ein interreligiöser Vergleich. Akten der Tagung von 19. bis 21. September 2013 an der Universität Paderborn*, Hildesheim 2015, p. 25–54.
- HAASE F., *Altchristliche Kirchengeschichte nach orientalischen Quellen*, Leipzig 1925.
- HERMANN-OTTO E., *Der spätantike Bischof zwischen Politik und Kirche. Das exemplarische Wirken von Epiphanius von Pavia*, “Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte” 90, 1995, p. 198–214.
- KLINGSHIRN W., *Caesarius of Arles and the Ransoming of Captives in Sub-Roman Gaul*, “Journal of Roman Studies” 75, 1985, p. 183–203.

- LEIPOLDT J., *Berichte Schenutes über Einfälle der Nubier in Ägypten*, "Zeitschrift der Ägyptischen Sprache und Altertumskunde" 40, 1902, p. 126–140.
- LESZKA M.J., *Jan Kyrtyos – pogromca Izauryjczyków*, [in:] *W kręgu antycznych politei. Księga Jubileuszowa ofiarowana profesorowi Janowi Ilukowi*, ed. W. GAJEWSKI, I. MILEWSKI, Gdańsk 2017, p. 204–211.
- MERKT A., *Maximus I. von Turin. Die Verkündigung eines Bischofs der frühen Reichskirche im zeitgeschichtlichen, gesellschaftlichen und liturgischen Kontext*, Leiden–New York–Köln 1997.
- MILEWSKI I., *Depozycje i zsyłki biskupów w Cesarstwie Wschodniorzymskim (lata 325–451)*, Gdańsk 2008.
- POWER T., *The Red Sea from Byzantium to the Caliphate. Ad 500–1000*, Cairo 2012.
- RAPP C., *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley 2005.
- SCHUMACHER L., *Sklawerei in der Antike. Alltag und Schicksal der Unfreien*, München 2001.
- SOLZBACHER R., *Mönche, Pilger und Sarazenen. Studien zum Frühchristentum auf der südlichen Sinaihalbinsel*, Altenberge 1989.
- SOUZA DE Ph., *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*, Cambridge 2002.
- TOMASCHITZ K., *Unpublizierte Inschriften Westkilikiens aus dem Nachlass Terence B. Mittfords*, Wien 1998.
- UPDEGRAFF R.T., *A Study of the Blemmyes*, Ann Arbor 1978.
- WARD Ph., *The Aeolian Islands*, New York 1974.
- WEBER M., *Blemyer*, [in:] *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. T. KLAUSER, *Supplement-Lieferung*, Stuttgart 2002, p. 7–28.

Abstract. The article analyzes certain early Byzantine hagiographic texts concerning various forms of brigandage (both maritime and land-based). Two such accounts are studied in detail, one by Gerontius of Jerusalem and another by Theodoret of Cyrus. The instances described unveil the weakness of Roman state structures at the borders of the state as well as in lands harassed by barbarian raids, including piracy. Despite certain flaws (mostly the lack of precision), the accounts under discussion constitute valuable and reliable sources of historical knowledge.

Keywords: late antiquity, early Byzantium, brigandage in antiquity, money.

Ireneusz Milewski
Uniwersytet Gdański
Wydział Historyczny
Instytut Historii
Zakład Historii Starożytnej
ul. Wita Stwosza 55
80-308 Gdańsk
Polska/Poland
hisim@univ.gda.pl

Yavor Miltenov (Sofia)

A NOTE ON THE ADOPTION OF THE BYZANTINE MODELS IN MEDIEVAL BULGARIA (9TH–10TH CENTURIES) THE CASE OF THE *CHRYSORRHOAS* COLLECTION

In the first quarter of the 10th century the first Slavic collection of homilies of John Chrysostom was compiled. It was called *Zlatostruy*, which means *Chrysorrhoeas* or *Golden Stream*. In previous studies *Zlatostruy* was noted mostly for its *Preface* (Прилогъ самияго христолюбиваеяго цѣсаря Сѣмеона), whereby the Bulgarian king Symeon (893–927) is named initiator of the gathering the initial *corpus Chrysostomicum* and author of its name:

The pious tsar Symeon, it states, after examining all the books of the Old and New Testament, and others of the Christian and non-Christian authors, as well as the morals, customs and wisdom of the Church Fathers, was amazed by the verbal wisdom and grace of the Holy Spirit (embodied in the works) of the blessed John Chrysostom; getting into the habit of reading all of his books and after choosing all the homilies from all of his books, he gathered them in this collection giving it the name *Zlatostruy*.

The evidence in the *Preface* puts the collection in a unique position among the other early Slavic translations for it suggests reliable timeframe and moreover offers a valuable insight into a comprehensive cultural policy in this period. The *Preface* introduces the basic concepts underlying the popular idea about this specific historical period featuring the enlightened monarch, the royal library, the state support for literature, the personal involvement of the ruler with these works to be collected, selected, translated and distributed. According to this evidence it was the judgment of the king himself that the content of these texts was useful for nourishing the Christian morality and spirituality of the Bulgarian people in a time when a new Christian identity was being formed according the Byzantine models.

The importance of the *Zlatostruy* collection is supported not only by the *Preface*, which may be considered of more or less ideological value. It was substantiated by means of a comprehensive text-critical and comparative analysis that endeavors to reconstruct the history of the collection and reveal further detail

about the textual history of the homilies from the Byzantine originals to the later Slavic copies¹. In this paper I shift the focus to those features that are related to the flourishing of the 10th century Bulgarian literary tradition and the successful adoption of the Byzantine literary models.

Among the most notable elements of the early history of the *Zlatostruy* are the scope, compilation strategy and its impact on the medieval Bulgarian literature. The original corpus contained an impressive number of homilies ascribed to John Chrysostom (more than 120) that were gathered from typologically different Byzantine codices. Its core was built by works found in Greek miscellanies of stable content containing the Chrysostom's homiletic series on the Acts and Epistles², Gospels³, and Genesis⁴; additionally, Greek homiletic miscellanies of mixed content can be considered sources for a number of other (Chrysostomian and pseudo-Chrysostomian) texts⁵. Comparative analysis shows clearly, that this Greek manuscript collection was – as claimed in the *Preface* – used with a critical eye. As concerns the homiletic series, only certain homilies or parts of homilies or even individual passages were selected. Usually it was the *ethica* (the morally instructive

¹ Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй: старобългарски хомилетичен свод, създаден по инициатива на българския цар Симеон. Текстологическо и извороведско изследване*, София 2013. Cf. F.J. THOMSON, *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica. A Preliminary Study of the Sources of the Chrysorrhoeas (Zlatostruy) Collection*, Сур 6, 1982, p. 1–65; А. ДИМИТРОВА, *Златоструят в преводаческата дейност на старобългарските книжовници*, София 2016.

² From *In Acta Apostolorum* series (CPG 4426) seventeen homilies were translated partly or in full (*homiliae* I, II, III, IV, XII, XVIII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVI, XXVIII, XXIX, XXXIV, XXXVI, XXXVII, XLIV, XLV, XLVIII). In *Epistulam ad Ephesios* (CPG 4431) is represented by three translated texts (*homiliae* II, III, IV); In *Epistulam ad Hebraeos* (CPG 4440) is represented by six (I, III, X, XXVIII, XXXI, XXXII); In *Epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432) by two (III, XIII); In *Epistulam ad Romanos* (CPG 4427) by ten (V, VII, VIII, XII, XIII, XIV, XVIII, XXIII, XXV, XXXI); In *Epistulam ad Titum* (CPG 4438) by one (*homilia* III); In *Epistulam primam ad Corinthios* (CPG 4428) by sixteen (I, VIII, IX, X, XI, XVII, XXIII, XXIV, XXVII, XXXII, XXXVI, XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, XLIV); In *Epistulam secundam ad Corinthios* (CPG 4429) by four (IV, IX, X, XXII); In *Epistulam primam ad Timotheum* (CPG 4436) by three (VI, XIV, XV); In *Epistulam secundam ad Timotheum* (CPG 4437) by four (I, II, VII, VIII).

³ The initial corpus contained at least five translations from *In Matthaеum* series (CPG 4424), viz. *homiliae* XXIII, XXXVII, LIV, LVI, LXXVI (and probably *homiliae* LXI and LXVIII too). It had also at least two texts taken from *In Iohannem* (CPG 4425), viz. *homiliae* IV and LXXXVII.

⁴ From the *Homiliae in Genesim* series (CPG 4409) three were used (XIII, XXXI, XXXV). Three translations are attested from the *Sermones in Genesim* (CPG 4410) series too (III, VI, VII).

⁵ It is obvious that for example *Quomodo animam acceperit Adamus* (CPG 4195), *Homilia in dimissionem Chananaeae* (CPG 4529), *Admonitiones spirituales* (CPG 4670) and *De s. hieromartyre Phoca* (CPG 4364, BHG 1537) could not have been taken from one and the same book. The same applies to tens of other homilies, which are not part of series. It worth mentioning also that the initial Slavic corpus included translations of some texts, which are unedited or poorly attested in the Greek manuscripts, such as *In patriarcham Abraham* (CPG 4992, BHG 2354m), *In s. Paulum apostolum* (CPG 5067, BHG 1462s), *Quod filii debeant parentes honorare* (CPG 5092), *In secundum adventum Domini nostri Iesu Christi et de eleemosyna* (CC.SG 4, № 5, 5), among others.

concluding parts of the homilies) that were translated while dogmatic and argumentative parts were omitted. In other cases, however, whole texts were translated or parts of them were used for compilations. Individual homilies, which are not included in series, are, as a rule, represented in full.

Recent studies of the manuscript sources show that probably the corpus of Slavic translations did not reach us in a one and only codex. Most probably such a codex never existed. It seems plausible that initially the texts were stored unbound⁶ and were further supplemented with other (pseudo-)Chrysostomian works to serve as a master copy for compilation of other miscellanies. Thus, the compiler of the so-called 'longer' *Zlatostruy* took 45 homilies from the original corpus⁷. This selection was copied for some time and at a certain point of its transmission another 10th century compiler expanded it to 138 homilies with one of the sources being again the archetypal corpus⁸. A compiler of another collection, the so-called 'shorter' *Zlatostruy*⁹, selected 81 homilies, 14 of which are not found in the 'longer' version, which means that he used the initial corpus independently. The major characteristic of the 'shorter' *Zlatostruy* is that its compiler has edited and abridged the available Slavic translations without consulting the Greek originals. In the next stages of transmission this collection was supplemented twice with additional groups of texts at the end taken from other homiletic collections.

Both 'longer' and 'shorter' *Zlatostruy* were transmitted as miscellanies of stable content in which transpositions and alterations occur very rarely. They were very popular and widely distributed (especially in medieval Rus') and contain all the texts that could be considered part of the original corpus. However, there are a number of other witnesses that are also important for shedding light onto the

⁶ As suggested by some chance confluences of texts and excerpts in the earliest stage of transmission.

⁷ On this collection see most recently А. Димитрова, *Златоструят...*, *passim*.

⁸ There were, however, other sources too. The compiler included twenty-nine of the *Eclogae ex diversis homiliis* (CPG 4684), ascribed to Theodore Daphnopates, in a translation, which disseminates in longer collection of *Chrysorrhoeas* only (for a complete and better translation, which still remains unstudied, see for example MS 213 from the Monastery of the Miracle of the Archangel Michael at Chonae – or Chudov monastery – collection, kept in the State Historical Museum in Moscow). He included also some homilies with no traced Greek original, ascribing them to Chrysostom. Most probably they have Slavic origin and attribution to Clement of Ochrida or his followers has been proposed for some of them (*vide*: Я. Милтенов, *Непроучено Слово за прелюбодейците и двуженците, вероятно принадлежащо на Климент Охридски*, БРе 22.2, 2016, p. 25–34; ИДЕМ, *Бележки върху текстологическата история на Слово за Света Троица, и за сътворението, и за съда, приписвано на Климент Охридски*, ИИБЕ 29, 2016, p. 47–89; ИДЕМ, *Слово за засушата и за Божиите наказания – текстологическо и извороведско изследване*, ИИБЕ 30, 2017, p. 214–261).

⁹ Cf. В. Малинин, *Исследование Златоструя по рукописи XII в. имп. Публичной библиотеки*, Киев 1878. The editions: В. Малинин, *Десять слов Златоструя XII в.*, Санкт-Петербург 1910; Т. Георгиева, *Златоструй от XII в.*, Силистра 2003; *Великие Минеи Четии, собранные Всероссийским митрополитом Макарием. Ноябрь, дни 13–15*, Санкт-Петербург 1899, col. 1180–1579.

functional mode of the original Slavic Chrysostomian corpus. These collections – known from single copies – do not contain unknown versions of the homilies, but they give different selections and different ordering of texts. Most important is that they bear evidence of textual versions that are closer to the Byzantine originals. Only two Serbian codices compiled in the Hilandar Monastery were subject of detailed critical examination so far: № 386 from the collection of the Hilandar Monastery and Voskr. 115-bum. kept at the State Historical Museum in Moscow¹⁰. At least three Russian miscellanies, which still remain unstudied, contain large selections deriving from the initial corpus or at least from the earliest stages of its transmission, viz. codex № 45 from the Zonal Scientific Library of the Saratov State University, codex № 8190 from the Museum collection (f. 178) and codex № 1280 from the V.M. Undol'skiy coll. (f. 310) both from the Russian State Library in Moscow.

As mentioned above, the initial Slavic Chrysostomian corpus was used as a base for the compilation of other collections which did not include works of Chrysostom only. Excerpts from *Zlatostruy* are found in early Slavic *florilegia* such as the so-called *Knyazheskii Izbornik* and the *Izbornik of John the Sinner*. So far 11 such excerpts have been identified¹¹. Interesting and important is the relationship of the *Zlatostruy* to the Lenten homiliaries. The earliest and most authoritative manuscripts contain a number of texts that are common to the ones found in the *Zlatostruy*¹². In the majority of cases, the translations are the same but the texts in the homiliaries stay closer to the respective archetypes. This proves that the *Zlatostruy* collections that descend from the initial corpus actually contain not only second but sometimes even third generation text versions with respect to the corresponding Slavic archetypes. It is therefore not surprising that the main characteristic of these secondary collections is the careful adaptation of the translations. The deviation from the Byzantine tradition took place in the very beginning, when

¹⁰ Кл. Иванова-Константинова, *Неизвестна редакция на Златоструя в сръбски извод от XIII в.*, ЗИК 10, 1976, p. 89–107; Y. MILTENOV, *A New Source for Studying the Symeonic Zlatostruy Collection*, SeS 8/9, 2010, p. 387–404; Я. Милтенов, *Златоструй...*, *passim*.

¹¹ Cf. Я. Милтенов, *Общите пасажии между колекцията Златоструй и Княжеския Изборник*, СЛ 49/50, 2014, p. 28–45. *Vide*: А. Димитрова, *Сборникът Златоструй и Изборникът от 1076 г. De precatioe oratio II от Йоан Златоуст в две старобългарски версии*, Sla 82.4, 2013, p. 408–422; М.С. Мушинская, *Изборник 1076 г.: текстология и язык*, Санкт-Петербург 2015, p. 96–97, 160–174; Н.В. Савельева, *К вопросу об источниках Изборника 1076 г. Первая часть. Три новые параллели к чтениям Изборника. Изборник и Златоструй*, Pbg 40.2, 2016, p. 49–73.

¹² Mihanovic and Gomirje homiliaries (codex № III.c.19 from the Croat Academy of Sciences and Arts and codex R-71 from the Croat Historical Museum respectively) have eighteen texts common with *Zlatostruy*, Hludov's *Zlatoust* (codex № 55 from the A.I. Hludov collection of the State Historical Museum in Moscow) has five, Damian's *Zlatoust* (codex № 390 from the Hilandar monastery) has sixteen, Jagic *Zlatoust* (codex № Q.п.I.56 in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg; 1f. in National Library of France, № Slav. 65) has five.

the translations were made, by selecting certain homilies, parts of homilies and individual passages, as mentioned above, or independent Slavic compilations were formed by combining certain passages. For example, the *Homily on Torments* that is found in all *Zlatostruy* collections and in the Lenten homiliaries, is formed by combining eleven excerpts from different Chrysostomian works¹³; *Sermon that the Torment is Eternal* has six, *Sermon for Those Who Aspire to Unnecessary Benefits* has four, and so on. After examining the relations between Greek originals and their Slavic versions the overall impression is that a) in some cases in the Greek codices that were used passages were marked for translation or b) in other cases full Slavic translations were abridged or fragmented.

The features of the *Zlatostruy* collection mentioned above are important not only to understand the mechanisms in which the medieval Bulgarian literature adopted the achievements of the Byzantine exegetical tradition, but also to shed light on the ground-breaking effort of the Slavs to construct their own literary tradition. The compilation of anthologies is the main and perhaps the most important step in this effort. Typologically *Zlatostruy* is close to collections that represented the essence of the theological thought through specifically selected excerpts for individual reading. It has much in common with the *Knyazheskii Izbornik*. On the one hand, the *Knyazheskii Izbornik* got some excerpts from *Zlatostruy*, as was noted above, on the other hand, parts of *Zlatostruy* and *Knyazheskii Izbornik* are sometimes found in same codices, but probably the most important thing to mention here is that both *Zlatostruy* and *Izbornik* collections (which emerged at the same time) share very similar compilation strategies. Their authors were closely linked with the capital and the ruler, they used common sources, worked with partial translations or excerpts from already available extensive translations and created new miscellanies according their own choice and aims by using Slavic corpora of translations.

Having in mind these particular features and recent scholarly achievements in the study of the adoption of Byzantine models, it seems that the main driving force behind the tsar Symeon's project for cultural prosperity was the preliminary work on collecting and selecting the authoritative works of the Byzantine tradition, followed by various mechanisms of adaptation, transformation, abridgement and fragmentation. The case with the *Zlatostruy* collection shows that in the beginning of 10th century there already existed the necessary base for these processes to start and bear fruit.

¹³ Vide: Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Пъзел с единадесет елемента. Източници, текстология и значение на старобългарската компилация Слово о мжкахъ, приписвана на Йоан Златоуст*, Psl 20.1, 2012, p. 291–303. Comprehensive data on the compilations and their sources vide: F.J. THOMSON, *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica...*, p. 1–65; Я. МИЛТЕНОВ, *Златоструй...*, *passim*.

Bibliography

Secondary Literature

- DIMITROVA A., *Sbornikät Zlatostruj i Izbornikät ot 1076 g. De precatione oratio II ot Joan Zlatoust v dve starobälgarski versii*, "Slavia" 82.4, 2013, p. 408–422.
- DIMITROVA A., *Zlatostrujat v prevodačeskata dejnost na starobälgarskite knižovnici*, Sofija 2016.
- GEORGIEVA T., *Zlatostruj ot XII v.*, Silistra 2003.
- IVANOVA-KONSTANTINOVA KL., *Neizvestna redakcija na Zlatostruja v sräbski izvod ot XIII v.*, "Зборник историје књижевности. Одељење језика и књижевности" / "Zbornik istorije književnosti. Odeljenje jezika i književnosti" 10, 1976, p. 89–107.
- MALININ V., *Desjat' slov Zlatostruja XII v.*, Sankt-Peterburg 1910.
- MALININ V., *Issledovanie Zlatostruja po rukopisi XII v. imp. Publichnoj biblioteki*, Kiev 1878.
- MILTENOV Y., *Beležki värhu tekstologičeskata istorija na Slovo za Sveta Troica, i za sätvorenieto, i za säda, pripisvano na Kliment Ohridski*, "Известия на Института за бългaрски език" / "Izvestija na Instituta za bälgarski ezik" 29, 2016, p. 47–89.
- MILTENOV Y., *Neproučeno Slovo za preljubodejcite i dvužencite, verojatno prinadležašto na Kliment Ohridski*, "Българска реч" / "Bälgarska reč" 22.2, 2016, p. 25–34.
- MILTENOV Y., *A New Source for Studying the Symeonic Zlatostruy Collection*, "Scripta & e-Scripta" 8/9, 2010, p. 387–404.
- MILTENOV Y., *Obštite pasaži meždu kolekcijata Zlatostruj i Knjažeskija Izbornik*, "Старобългарска литература" / "Starobälgarska literatura" 49/50, 2014, p. 28–45.
- MILTENOV Y., *Päzel s edinašeset elementa. Iztočnici, tekstologija i značenie na starobälgarskata kompilacija Slovo o mäkah, pripisvana na Joan Zlatoust*, "Palaeoslavica" 20.1, 2012, p. 291–303.
- MILTENOV Y., *Slovo za zasuhata i za Božiiite nakazanija – tekstologičesko i izvorovedsko izsledvane*, "Известия на Института за бългaрски език" / "Izvestija na Instituta za bälgarski ezik" 30, 2017, p. 214–261.
- MILTENOV Y., *Zlatostruj: starobälgarski homiletičen svod, säzdaden po iniciativa na bälgarskija car Simeon. Tekstologičesko i izvorovedsko izsledvane*, Sofija 2013.
- MUŠINSKAJA M.S., *Izbornik 1076 g.: tekstologia i jazyk*, Sankt-Peterburg 2015.
- SAVEL'eva N.V., *K voprosu ob istočnikach Izbornika 1076 g. Pervaja čast'. Tri novye paraleli k čtenijam Izbornika. Izbornik i Zlatostruj*, "Palaeobulgarica" / "Старобългаристика" 40.2, 2016, p. 49–73.
- THOMSON F.J., *Chrysostomica palaeoslavica. A Preliminary Study of the Sources of the Chrysorrhaoas (Zlatostruy) Collection*, "Cyrillomethodianum" 6, 1982, p. 1–65.
- Velikie Minei Četii, sobrannnye Vserossijskim mitropolitom Makariem. Nojabr', dni 13–15*, Sankt-Peterburg 1899, col. 1180–1579.

Abstract. The paper aims at examining the first Slavic collection of homilies of John Chrysostom, called *Zlatostruy* (i.e. *Chrysorrhaoas* or *Golden Stream*). The peculiarities of its content, compilation strategy and impact on the medieval Bulgarian literature, revealed in previous studies, allow us to extract features that are related to the flourishing of the 10th century Bulgarian literary tradition and the successful adoption of Byzantine models.

Keywords: John Chrysostom, medieval Slavonic translations, *Zlatostruy*, adoption of Byzantine models in medieval Bulgaria

Yavor Miltenov

Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. L. Andreychin”
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52 Shipchenski prohod blvd., bl. 17
Sofia 1113, Bulgaria

Anna-Maria Totomanova (Sofia)

THE SYNODIKON OF ORTHODOXY IN MEDIEVAL BULGARIA

The *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* was first translated in Bulgaria by order of tsar Boril (1207–1218), who convoked a synod against the Bogomils in the capital city of Tărnovo on the 11th of February 1211. For this reason, the Bulgarian *Synodikon* is usually referred to as *Boril's Synodikon*. Here, I am not going to delve into the circumstances that compelled a Uniate monarch to convoke an Orthodox synod¹; neither am I going to speculate whether the translation of the *Synodikon* was completed prior to the synod or whether the work on it only began afterwards².

¹ First of all, it is not clear why he would resort to such a measure right at that moment: were heretics really the central domestic political issue of Boril's reign, as suggested by the unknown chronographer whose story became part of the *Bulgarian Synodikon*? (*There sprung like some evil thorn the thrice-cursed and god-hated Bogomilism which was started then by the foulest priest Bogomil and his disciples, just as with Jannes and Jambres who once resisted Moses. And they like fierce wolves mercilessly wasted Christ's flock for which He shed his most holy blood* – D 202v4–12). And if so, why had Boril's predecessors not paid any attention to this heresy? Unfortunately, the extant sources expand more on the doctrine itself than on the practices of Bogomilism, so that we are unaware of the specific political developments that led to the convening of the synod.

The very date of the synod (*the year 6781, indiction 14, moon year 11, year of the solar circle 15 in the month of February (296) on the 11th day – Friday of the Quadragesima*) is given according to the Latin chronology (rather than Byzantine). This not only points to an established Uniate tradition in the royal chancellery, but also adds to the plausibility of the assumption by Bulgarian scholar Pavel Stefanov that the synod against the Bogomils might have been related to the persecutions of the Cathars in Southern France, beginning in 1208 and inspired by Pope Innocent III (1198–1216) (П. СТЕФАНОВ, *Нов поглед към унията между Българската и Римската църква през XIII в.*, ПКШ 5, 2001, p. 345). However, the name of Primate Basil, who was at the helm of the Bulgarian Church for almost forty years, is not on the list of the memories of the First Bulgarian Hierarchs. Possibly it was removed from the list later, following the re-establishment of the Bulgarian Patriarchate and the termination of the union in 1235; but on the other hand, tsar Kalojan, who was the prime mover behind the signing of the union, is praised therein for his many victories over the Latins and the Greeks (И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010, p. 50).

² The chronographer says (P 29r4–14): *After that the pious king Boril ordered the Synodikon to be translated from Greek to his language, Bulgarian. And following his orders this Holy Synod was also*

The first Bulgarian translation draws on the Comnenian redaction of the Constantinople version of the *Synodikon* (C – according to the classification of Gouillard)³, but the extant text does not agree completely with any of the known representatives of this redaction. The earliest witness of the text (Palauzov's copy in НБКМ 289, cetera: P) is dated to the end of the 14th century and reveals strong editorial intervention, traces of which can be seen on various levels.

First of all, the editor(s) undertook a thorough linguistic revision in order to put the orthography and the grammar of the text in line with the norms of the so-called Tărnovo School, led by prominent Bulgarian spiritual leader patriarch Euthymius⁴.

Second, they inserted some fragments that are not to be found in the Greek original. In general, the translated part of the *Synodikon* (P 2r13–22r13, §§ 1–65⁵) agrees with the critical edition by Gouillard (G. 1–571), with some minor omissions, re-orderings and additions⁶. The sole insertion in the positive canonical part is at 5v5–8: *All who came to our Orthodox faith from the unholy Armenian faith: May their memory be eternal!*⁷, and it is obviously thematically related to the anathema upon those sharing the Armenian heresy in the added text in P 24r10–12 (§ 90). This eternal memory is repeated almost literally in P 5v20–22: *All who accepted Orthodox Christian faith: May their memory be eternal!* The periphrasis bridges the positive and the negative canonical parts. Undoubtedly, the most important addition to the negative canonical part are the anathemas upon the Bogomils (P 13v6–15v19, §§ 39–52), the source of which is the *Letter of Patriarch Cosmas* [Cosmas I, 1075–1081 or Cosmas II Atticus, 1146–1147] *to the dearest metropolitan of Larisa in connection with the ungodly heretics*⁸, preserved in Marcianus gr. II 74 (Coll. 1454 olim Nanius 96), ff. 77v–79v of the 15th

entered among the Orthodox Synods to be read on the first Sunday of the holy lent like the holy fathers have taught since the very beginning of the Catholic and Apostolic Church. In the latter case, the chronographic account is presumably not completely reliable, the more so because the story of the synod apparently copies Anna Comnena's account of the trial against the Bogomils initiated by her father Alexius I Comnenus. Cf. ANNE COMNÈNE, *Alexiade*, XI–XV, vol. III, ed. B. LEIV, Paris 1945, ²1967, p. 218.28–228.29. Cf. И. БОЖИЛОВ, *Византийският свят*, София 2008, p. 623–628.

³ J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie: édition et commentaire*, TM 2, 1967, p. 3.

⁴ On this matter see: А. ТОТОМАНОВА, *Езикът на XIV в. и съставът на Палаузовия сборник*, Pbg 36.1, 2012, p. 24–37.

⁵ The paragraphs are referred to according to Table 1. The initial capital letters designate the respective manuscripts.

⁶ The real order of the translated parts is G. 1–183, 752–762, 185–249, 395–403, 424–509, 517–532, 537–571, 752–755.

⁷ Here and afterwards, the fragments are quoted from the English translation by M. Paneva in: И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев синодик...*, p. 337–377.

⁸ J. GOUILLARD, *Une source grecque du Synodik de Boril: la lettre du patriarche Cosmas*, TM 4, 1970, p. 361–374.

century. It is not clear how the Bulgarian translator obtained the text of the letter, but he obviously saw the richness of the information it contained and replaced the anti-Bogomil anathemas in C by including the introductory part and, with some re-ordering, the text of the twelve anathemas⁹. The latter are thematically connected with the anathema upon Basil the Doctor (P 15v20–16r3, § 53), which is also missing in the Greek *Synodikon*¹⁰. After the anathema on Basil the Doctor, the Bulgarian text continues according to the Constantinople redaction of the *Synodikon*. Then, at P 16r4–16v5 (§ 54), it includes only the third anathema on Eustratius of Nicaea, condemning those who deny the union of the two natures of Jesus Christ (G. 395–403), although the rubric does not mention his name explicitly¹¹. The next 14 anathemas (P 16v6–22r13, §§ 54–65) follow G. 424–571, with the omission of three anathemas (G. 510–516, 533–535, 536) connected with the synod dedicated to Christ's words Πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστίν (Io 14,28).

After the anathema on Gerontius of Lambé (P 9r12–20, § 19), seven general anti-iconoclastic anathemas have been inserted (P §§ 20–25), which in the Byzantine *Synodikon* occupy lines G. 752–762 in P, after the anathema on Gregory Palamas. They have been taken from the *horos* of the Seventh Ecumenical Council¹²; the first one is an anathema upon all heretics. Gouillard observes that in some C version manuscripts these anathemas are included as well¹³. At the end of Comnenian text, our *Synodikon* repeats the first three anathemas (P §§ 66–68, G. 752–755), with some minor textological variations. These repetitions (not word for word, as they had already been included in the main text), however, suggest that the editors must have had at their disposal the Palaeologan version of the *Synodikon*. This is supported by the fact that on f. 27 (the exact place in the book cannot be identified with certainty; disagreeing with the text of version P) there are anathemas upon Barlaam, Acindynus, Prochorus Cydonius, Fudul and his teacher Piropoul (P §§ 176–177).

The ensuing personal anathemas (P 22r21–23r16, §§ 69–78) were not part of the initial translation of the *Synodikon* either. We believe that they were also

⁹ Cf. the opinion of Božilov in: И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов синодик...*, p. 29–31.

¹⁰ Where the information about the trial against Basil the Doctor was drawn from is a most interesting question. If the compiler of the Bulgarian *Synodikon* was also the author of the chronographic account about the synod, his source could well have been the *Alexiada* by Anna Comnena. But if the story was written afterwards, the information is most likely to have come from the work *Panoplia Dogmatica* by Euthymius Zigabenus, which was known in Slavic literary circles but has only survived in later copies of the 15th–16th cc. (Г. МИНЧЕВ, *Бориловият синодик 800 години по-късно*, Pbg 35.2, 2011, p. 74–77).

¹¹ В.А. МОШИН, *Сербская редакция синодика в неделю православия. Анализ текстов*, ВВ 16, 1959, p. 343.

¹² J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon...*, p. 92 (№ 308).

¹³ *Ibidem*, p. 21–22.

inserted by the scholars who revised the text of *Boril's Synodikon* to make it part of a canonical-liturgical compilation, which also included some liturgical services (all to be carried out by the patriarch) as well as the *horoi* of three ecumenical councils (IV, VI and VII) and of two local councils (of patriarch Menas and *Tomos of Union*), containing the main dogmas of Orthodoxy. They were especially selected so as to prove the need of restoration of the veneration of icons¹⁴. The eparchial metropolitans, who were in charge of performing the ritual of the Triumph of Orthodoxy, were provided with a similar type of collections of *horoi* of the ecumenical and local councils in Byzantium¹⁵. The linguistic evidence shows that the *horoi* were translated specifically for the occasion and share common orthographic and grammatical features with the revised text of the *Synodikon* itself. The text of the services, on the other hand, does not show any traces of editorial intervention.

The anathemas on Theodore of Pharan, Sergius and Pyrus, Peter and Paul – patriarchs of Constantinople, Honorius – pope of Rome, Cyrus of Alexandria, Macarius of Antioch and his disciple Stephen (P 23r1–7), which are missing from the Greek *Synodikon*, have been taken directly from the *horos* of the 6th Ecumenical Council¹⁶. We believe that almost the entire list of anathematized heretics in this part was mostly drawn from the *horoi* of the 7th and the 6th ecumenical councils as well as, to a lesser extent, from the *horos* of the 4th Ecumenical council and of the council of patriarch Menas¹⁷. Only five out of the 30 names of Byzantine heresiarchs are missing from the above-mentioned *horoi*: Symeon Magus, *Kukuvrik Manent*, Eusebius, Naucratius and Jacob. Since we have no data on the dissemination of the *horos* of the council of 843 (the origin of which has not been fully clarified by Byzantologists¹⁸) in the Slavic language, and bearing in mind that it does not contain the names of Eusebius, Jacob and Naucratius, it follows that the missing five names – including the names of Symeon Magus and Mani – have probably come from a different source¹⁹.

¹⁴ For details on the content of the collection, which also contains the Greek text of the *horoi* and four noted Greek chants, *vide*: И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов синодик...*, p. 58–62.

¹⁵ Cf. also А. ТОТОМАНОВА, *Синодик царя Борила в сборнике Палаузова (НБКМ № 289)*, [in:] *XXI ежегодная богословская конференция. Церковно-историческая исследования в контексте современной науки*, Москва 2011, p. 165–166.

¹⁶ For the coinciding texts *vide*: А. ТОТОМАНОВА, *Синодик царя Борила...*, p. 167.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 170–171. See there also our polemics with Božilov, who considers the *horos* of the Council of 843 published by J. GOUILLARD (*Le Synodikon...*, app. 1, p. 293–298) to be the main source of this part.

¹⁸ J. GOUILLARD, *Le Synodikon...*, app. 1, p. 291.

¹⁹ On the mocking nickname for Mani, who is called *Kukuvrik* in the Bulgarian *Synodikon*, *vide*: А. ТОТОМАНОВА, *За една параномасия в Бориловия синодик*, [in:] *Словеса прѣчюдныя. Юбилеен сборник в чест на проф. Иван Буюклиев*, ed. А. ТОТОМАНОВА, Р. ВЛАХОВА-РУЙКОВА, София 2012, p. 36–43.

Upon all the heretics: Anathema at P 23r17 (§ 79) opens the next part, which contains 26 rubrics with anathemas and praises (P 23r17–25v17, §§ 80–104). Seventeen of them are anathemas upon basic Bogomil beliefs and practices; these generally repeat the 12 anti-Bogomil anathemas (P 13v6–15v19, §§ 39–52) in simpler language, more accessible to the faithful. Two anathemas (P 25r20–25v8, §§ 101–102) curse those who devote themselves to sorcery, one (P 25v15–17, § 104) condemns all thieves, murderers and robbers²⁰, and the anathema at 24r10–12 (P § 90) is directed against those sharing the Armenian faith. The first eternal memory is for those who renounced all heresies in the name of the Orthodox faith (P 24r6–9, § 89), the second (P 25r9–19, § 100) – for those who retain the Orthodox faith according to the Gospels, while the third one is for all boyars, priests and monks and all the people who piously keep their devotion to the king and to the archbishops pure and righteous. This part, which likewise has to be the result of 14th-century editing, ends with the exclamation (P 25v18–19, § 105): *Christ is victory, Christ rules, Christ is the joy of Christian faith. God save Christian faith!*²¹, which is to be repeated thrice.

The commemorative part of *Boril's Synodikon* starts with a list of Byzantine rulers and their wives (P 25v20–26v20, §§ 106–109). It does not completely agree with the list in the Greek *Synodikon*; it begins with a praise to Constantine the Great and his mother Helena (P 25v20–26r3, § 106) and contains the names of four rulers (Theodosius, Honorius, Theodosius II and Marcianus) which are also missing in the Greek original. Undoubtedly, the addition of the name of Marcianus is connected to his wife Pulcheria's being included in the list of empresses. Here, too, the connection between the text and the *horoi* can be detected, since Marcianus is mentioned repeatedly as a 'new Constantine' and Pulcheria as a 'new Helena'²². The list of Bulgarian rulers begins with the name of prince Boris²³ (D 201v16–19), who made Bulgaria part of the Christian world; his praise is, in a way, a reminiscence of the praise to Constantine the Great. As regards the names of the rulers of the First and the Second Bulgarian Tsardoms, three rubrics (D 202r5–202r17, §§ 88–90) of the commemorative part are devoted to the memory of the Holy Brothers Cyril and Methodius, who translated the Holy Scripture into Bulgarian, and to their disciples Clement, Gorazd, Sava and Nahum. The commemorative part comprises two chronographic accounts: *an account of the synod against the*

²⁰ We find a similar anathema on f. 27r1–8 (P § 175), before the anathemas upon Acindynus and Barlaam.

²¹ The exclamation is strongly reminiscent of the refrain of the *laudes regiae* (*Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat*) and comes from the Byzantine ceremonial. I feel obliged to express my gratitude to my colleague Michael Želtov, who located the phrase in Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De Ceremoniis*.

²² А. ТОТОМАНОВА, *Синодик царя Борила...*, p. 168–199.

²³ The list is restored according to the so-called Drinov copy (*cetera: D*), which shares this part with P; see below.

Bogomils convened by tsar Boril (P 29r4–30v2, §§ 110–112)²⁴ and *an account about the re-establishment of the Bulgarian Patriarchate in 1235 under tsar Ivan Asen II* (P 30r3–32v10)²⁵. The list of tsarinas (P 34r1–35v3, §§ 117–128) includes only the names from the times of the Second Bulgarian Tsardom; it ends with the wife and children of the last Bulgarian monarch, Ivan Šišman, whose name is missing on the list of rulers²⁶. It is followed by the names of servants to the royal family²⁷ (P 35v4–33r16, §§ 129–137), an incomplete commemorative list of Bulgarian patriarchs²⁸, and a list of metropolitans (P 37r1–39r21, §§ 150–155) containing a total of 140 names. The eternal memory of all spiritual leaders of the Bulgarian nation (P 39v1–4, § 165) is logically followed by a praise to all boyars (P 39v5–9, § 165) and a list of names of so far unidentified persons.

It was believed until recently that the text of *Boril's Synodikon* has another extant witness D, included in a *Damaskin* compilation from the 16th century (НБКМ 432)²⁹. In fact, D contains the most important insertions and additions of the first translation: the anti-Bogomil anathemas (D §§ 47–59) drawn from the *Letter of Patriarch Cosmas* and the anathema on Basil the Doctor (D § 60) following the anathemas on John Italus (D § 45) and Nilus Cabasilas (D § 46), coinciding with P §§ 36–37. The second one, in fact, repeats D § 36 above, but in a different redaction. The text after these anathemas (D §§ 61–67) agrees completely with the text of Boril's translation and corresponds to G. 395–403, 424–471, 537ff. The anathema on Constantine of Bulgaria, metropolitan of Cercyra (D § 67) lacks the ending due to the loss of some folia, but the ensuing text (D §§ 68–81) comprises fifteen out of the 26 anathemas preceding the list of rulers in *Boril's Synodikon*. We do not know how many folia are missing, but it seems that D might have contained the personal anathemas of P as well. Drinov's text also includes the final exclamation *Christ is victory, Christ rules, Christ is the joy of Christian faith. God*

²⁴ The above-mentioned rubrics, as well as the beginning of the narrative about the Synod in 1211, did not survive in Palauzov's copy and were restored according to D; see below.

²⁵ In all likelihood, these accounts, too, were added during the final redaction of the text in the 14th century. Cf. А. ТОТОМАНОВА, *Езикът...*, p. 35–36. The end of the list of rulers was restored according to the other witness.

²⁶ On the reasons for this and other omissions in this list, *vide*: И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов синодик...*, p. 48–50.

²⁷ At P 35v4–7 (§ 129–130), there is a later addition connected with the use of the book in Wallachia after Bulgaria's fall under Ottoman rule. A similar addition with the names of two Moldavian rulers of the 16th century is to be found at P 40r8–13 (§ 172–174). Concerning these additions cf. И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов синодик...*, p. 376, fn. 197–199.

²⁸ It is preceded by two rubrics (P 36r1–5, § 138–139) containing the names of two ecumenical patriarchs of the end of the 13th century. Cf. И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилов синодик...*, p. 375, fn. 186, 187.

²⁹ Both witnesses are kept in the St.St. Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia and bear the names of prominent historians Spiridon Palauzov (1818–1872) and Marin Drinov (1838–1906), who discovered the respective manuscripts and were the first to study them.

save Christian faith! (D § 82), the whole list of Byzantine rulers, and parts of the list of Bulgarian rulers, comprising the historical accounts, cf. P §§ 106–116 and D §§ 83–93³⁰.

The rest of the text of Drinov's *Synodikon*, as compared to the text of Palauzov's copy, shows numerous differences in terms of word order, Stylistics and lexis³¹. A hand of the 17th century transmitted to us a part of the lost beginning of P, having copied the fading first rows on the wooden book cover:

† пророческииѣ послѣдоуѣще оученииѣ. и апѣльскимъ же| наказанииѣмъ подобаше с[а]|
ѣвѣльскаа писанїа навѣкъш[е]. ѡбнавленїюу днѣ прѣзвѣнїиѣ. | ісаїа въ рече ѡбнавѣти| се
ѡстрѡвѣмъ кѣ бѡу еж ѡ е|зикъ назнаноуе| црѣквѣ. сецнїїи ѡ...³²

The parallel text in D 184r4–8 reads:

Пррѣчьскыи послѣдоуѣще глаѡ. апѣльскимъ же| вѣщанїи приводїи. и ѣвѣльскыи повѣда|нїе
прилагаѣще се. ѡбновленїа днѣ прѣзвѣнїе. | ісаїа въ ѡбѡ рѣ, ѡбнавѣти се ѡстрѡвѣмъ кѣ бѡ. | иже
ѡ ѣзкыи навѣдѣ црѣквы. сѣ же црѣквы...

Once again, this proves that the initial part of D must have come from a different redaction.

In fact, the initial part of Drinov's *Synodikon* shares some important features with the text of the South-Slavonic *Synodikon* kept in Romania (BAR MS. SL. 307, cetera: R), which unequivocally belongs to the Palaeologan version of the *Synodikon* (P according to Guillard). The fragments §§ 1–42 (G. 1–170, 395–471, 171–249, 479–532) are common to both D and R; unlike P, they contain the memory of St. Andrew of Crete in the positive part (D 188r8–9 and R 6r24–25) and an anathema connected to the problem of incarnation (D § 16) in the negative part. The latter is also missing in P and G., but was included in both Greek and Slavonic printed triodia³³. The inclusion of eternal memory to both St. Theodore Studites and St. Theophanes the Confessor in R 6v12–13, missing from the Greek *Synodikon* as well as from P and the printed triodia³⁴, is the only structural difference between D and R in this initial part. At the same time, this part lacks the

³⁰ Both manuscripts are severely damaged in this part (cf. the comments on P § 10 and D § 93; P § 116 and D § 94, D § 103), but the extant texts complement each other and allow us to presume that they come from a common source.

³¹ The variant readings are duly reported in the edition: И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев синодик...*; as well as in: *Synodicum Bulgaricum 1211*, ed. А. ТОТОМАНОВА, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. А. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 426–468.

³² И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев синодик...*, p. 66.

³³ И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Палеологовият синодик в славянски превод*, София 2013, p. 27.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 75, fn. 17.

insertions typical of P (anti-Armenian anathemas and praises of those who came back to the Orthodoxy from the heresies, as well as the entire part drawn from the *horos* of the 7th ecumenical council; G. 752–762). This means that, following the anathema on Constantine of Bulgaria, metropolitan of Cercyra (D § 44), the text of D must have comprised the anathemas on Constantine's followers and on John Irenicus and by all means the above-mentioned seven general anti-iconoclastic anathemas. The idea that the so-called Drinov copy in fact represents another version of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* was first promoted by I. Biljarski and M. Tsi-branska-Kostova, who noticed that – alongside structural similarities – the text in D and the *Synodikon* from Bucharest (R) also share some peculiar terminological features. These involve three compound words with the first part *въкоупо-* instead of traditional literary *ѣдно-*, such as *въкоупобожьнъ*, *въкоупославьнъ*, *въкоупопрѣстолюбъ*³⁵. This similarity suggests that D and R might have had a common antigraph. In his edition of the extant text of R, Ivan Biljarski presumes that Drinov's copy belongs to the Palaeologan redaction as well³⁶. In fact, the comparison of the extant text of Drinov's *Synodikon* with the other two versions P and R proves that it represents a rather mechanical compilation of the new translation (partially preserved in BAR MS. SL. 307) and the *Synodikon* of tsar Boril in its 14th century version. This explains why some of the rubrics in D are repeated in different redactions: the anathema on Nilus Cabasilas D § 36 according to redaction P and D § 43 – according to C. Cf. also D §§ 17–21 and D §§ 61–66, where the anathema on Michael is omitted in the text that belongs to the redaction P, but it is preserved in the older redaction (D § 62, G. 424–434) as well as in P § 52. We do not think that the anathemas on Barlaam, Acindynus and their followers (together with the following text preserved in R §§ 55–65) were part of D: it is clear that the unknown compiler of D relied on a Bulgarian source similar to P for the second part (which includes the anti-Bogomil anathemas and the list of the rulers)³⁷. The conclusion that D can be divided in two parts – the initial

³⁵ The above-mentioned lexemes are to be found in the rubrics related to the dogmatic argument about Πατήρ μου μείζων μου ἐστίν (Io 14,28). Actually, only §§ 39, 40 in D and R share this feature, while D § 63 does not agree with R § 44 and displays the compound *ѣднобжню*, thus coinciding with P § 63 (И. БИЛЯРСКИ, М. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, *За един композитен тип и за Палеологовия вариант на славянския Синодик в Неделята на православие*, Pbg 36.1, 2012, p. 53–55). Cf. also p. 5 above on the coinciding parts of D and P.

³⁶ И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Палеологовият синодик...*, p. 15–18, 48–50.

³⁷ In fact, the compiler replaced the anti-heretical part of R with its anti-Bogomil (anti-Messalian) anathemas (R § 54), drawn from the so-called *Mount Athos Epistle*, containing the decisions of the General Athonite Assembly of 1344. The text has been identified by: A. RIGO, *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli isicasit ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomilismo*, Firenze 1989 [= OV 2]. For the Greek text vide: A. RIGO, *L'Assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili (ms. Vat.Gr. 604 ff. 11r–12v)*, CS 5, 1984, p. 505, fig. 31–56.

one Palaeologan and the second Bulgarian, based on the Comnenian redaction – leads us to some other important inferences. First, it means that the translation of the Palaeologan version of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* is an integral part of the tradition of the Bulgarian *Synodikon*. Second, the unknown compiler, who chose Bulgarian sources to complete his work with anti-heretical anathemas and lists of rulers, was in all likelihood addressing a Bulgarian audience and he himself must have had Bulgarian origins. In all probability, the compilation was done to meet the needs of the Bulgarian population at the end of the 14th century. Based on certain linguistic features of D (first of all the traces of the Middle Bulgarian confusion of nasal vowel letters and the use of the letter *jat* for marking palatal consonants before the vowel *a*), Popruženko claims that the copyist of D used a Bulgarian antigraph³⁸. It is worth mentioning that traces of Bulgarian Tărnovo orthography are to be found in both parts of D and not only in the added Bulgarian part (as one might have expected given the fact that R observes the Resava rules with no exceptions). Therefore, the Palaeologan version of the *Synodikon* obviously circulated in two orthographic recensions – those of the Resava and Tărnovo schools. This fact allows us to conjecture that the common Palaeologan antigraph of D and R must have been written in Bulgarian orthography, given the fact that Resava norms were only established by Constantine of Kostenets in 15th century, after the fall of the Bulgarian Tsardom under Ottoman rule. If our reasoning is correct, it follows that the translation of the South-Slavic Palaeologan *Synodikon* must have been carried out at a literary centre that used Bulgarian orthography and was connected to Mount Athos. It is the latter location where, according to Biljarski, the Greek Palaeologan protograph arose around 1366 – after the death of Jacob, the only metropolitan of Ierisso, whose memory is mentioned the last in the list of metropolitans preserved in R 20v15–17³⁹. This centre cannot have been Tărnovo, where in the end of 14th century only a revision of the early 13th century translation was undertaken. We can only speculate whether it was the Bulgarian monastery on Mount Athos or some other monastic centre.

³⁸ М.Г. ПОПРУЖЕНКО, *Синодикъ царя Борила*, БСт 8, 1928, р. XXVIII–XXIX.

³⁹ И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Палеологовият синодик...*, р. 43–54.

Table 1

Content and structure of the manuscripts

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
2r13–21	1	The beginning is missing in P. P r1–12 features neumes (Greek musical notation).	184r1–3 ДѢЖНОѢ КЪ БѢ	1	
† пророческииꙗꙗ послѣдоꙗꙗще ꙗꙗченнеꙗꙗ . и апѣтскимъ же наказаниемъ подо-баше с[а] еѡльскаа писанїа навѣкш[е] . ѡбнавлєнїюу днѣ ꙗꙗзноꙗꙗнїа. ꙗꙗсаїа въ рече ѡбнавлѣти се ѡстроꙗꙗнїа къ бѡꙗ еж ѡ е зикъ назнменоꙗꙗе цркви . сециїа въ...		The text is written on the wooden cover of the book by a hand of the 17 th century. The rest is missing.	184r4–184v5 Пррѣчьскїиꙗꙗ послѣдꙗꙗꙗще глѡ.		
			184v6–184v11 Лѣто и всенъ тн съза іа помѣни сїа.		
2v1–13 Помѣни гн поношенїе		P 2v1–13 is not segmented	184v12–15 Помѣни гн поно-шение		
			184v15–19 Измѣненїе ѡб		Unlike in P, the text in D 184v15–185v6 is segmented.
2v14–15 Крѣта ради		P 2v16–3r6 Greek musical notation	184v19–20 крѣтѡ же		
3r7–1v7 Стратемь и чюдесе-ль его		Missing text between P 3v and 1r, corresponding to D 185v2–10.	184v20–185v6 стратемь и чюдсе		

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
2r3–6 [Дѣлѣноє къ бѣ лѣпноє влагод]аренїе,	1		G. 1–3
2r7–2v19 [Пѣррѣчьскыи послѣк] дѣюще глгомы.			G. 4–19
2v10–18 Лѣто ѡ вєснѣ тѣхъ сѣздѣа [помѣни сѣа.			G. 19–23
2v19–22 Помѣни гѣи поношєниє			G. 23–28
2v23–3r9 Извѣнїєнїє же оубо		Textological differences in comparison with D.	
3r9–3v9 [Θεω] δѣо поношєнїє			G. 28–29
3v9–11 Крѣтъ Г[рѣвь дѣа]			G. 29–60
3v11–14 Вѣнцѣ . G[амѣ то сѣнїє]			

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
1v8–12 И ѿже пльѣтноѡ бѣжѣа слова	2		186r7–8 Иже пльѣтѣскоѡ бѣ слова	2	
1v13– Вѣдѣшиль хъво ѣдино	3	The end is missing.	186r9–15 Вѣдѣшиль хъва ѣдиноѡ	3	
	4	missing	186r15–19 Вѣрѣшющѣи	4	
	5	missing	186r20–186v5 Иже слово ѡсвѣ- щающѣи ѡстни	5	
	6	missing	186v6–12 Вѣдѣши тако жѣзль и скрижѣа.	6	
	7	missing	186v13–18 Иже прѣчкаа вѣниа.	7	
	8	missing	186v19–187r3 Разсмѣкющѣи мѡвѣею	8	
		missing	187r4–6 Ѣже вѣ испрѣва		
		missing	187r7–14 И пѡкы пѡкѡ дрѣзы слова ѡченици		
4r1–11	9	The beginning of the rubric corresponding to D 187r14–20 is missing.	187r14–20 Прѣри пѡкѡ видѣши	9	

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek Synodikon
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
3v14–17 Г[іе] днѣ [трѣжкство]			
3v17–18 Ктѣ бѣ [велиіако бѣ]			
3v18 Ты ѣси бѣ н[а]			
3v19–4r14 Оукорителю ево твоєє сл[авы]			
4r14–18 Иже п[а]тьскоє б[а] [слова]	2		G. 61–62
4r18–4v2 Вкдѣши х[в[а] ідиногo]	3		G. 66–67
4v3–8 Екрюции	4		G. 68–71
4v9–16 Иже словомъ ѡсцѣлющій оустны	5		G. 72–75
4v16–25 Вкдѣши іако жъзль и скрижал[ъ]	6		G. 76–81
5r1–8 [Иже пррчкаа вѣнїа.	7		G. 82–86
5r9–15 [Разумю]ши мѡѡсею	8		G. 87–90
5r15–19 Ѣже вѣ испрѣва.			G. 90–92
5r19–5v4 И пакы пакѣ дроузи. [слова] оученици.			G. 92–97
5v4–13 Пррци [іакѣ видѣв]ше	9		G. 98–102

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy			
1	2	3	4	5	6	
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:	
			187v1-6 Въ словесѣ по читающе			
4r11-14 Си вѣра апска.		4r15-4v5 Greek musical nota- tion in neumes.	187v6-8 Сѣ вѣра апска			
4v6-10 По сиже бл҃гоучѣтїю проповѣдникомъ	10		187v8-11 Къ сѣ, иже бл҃гоучѣтїа	10		
4v11-17 Герману. тарасїю.			187v11-15 Герман. тарасїю.			In D text in red ink (возвизай десною рѣкою и показѣи прѣстѣмъ по ѡбви- чаю вѣчнаа памѣ), missing in BAR MS. SL. 307 and in G.
4v18-21 Игнатїю. фотїю.			187v15-17 Игнатїю. фотїю.			
5r1-5 Въск іже на ст҃ых патрїархы			187v17-19 Въса іже на ст҃їе патрїархїи.			
5r6-10 Въск іже кр҃вомъ цр҃ковнаго			188r1-4 Въса іже чр҃къъ цр҃ковнаго			
5r11-13 Стефану проповѣд- никоу			188r5-6 Стефан прѣповѣд- никъ			
5r14-17 Євѣмїю. ѳеѡфїлоу.			188r6-7 Євѣмїю. ѳеѡфїлоу.			
5r18-20 ѳеѡфїлактоу. пѣтру.			188r7-8 ѳеѡфїлактъ. петръ			
			188r8-9 Идрѣо проповѣдникъ			
5r1-5v4 Іванноу. никола.			188r9-11 Іванъ николаъ			

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek Synodikon
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
5v13–20 [ε: Вѣъ словѣ]сѣ почитающе			G. 103–105
5v20–22 Ἐὶὰ βῆρα ἀπῆλκε .			G. 106–107
5v22–6v1 Вѣъ сѣмь [иже] бл҃гочестїа проповѣдники	10		G. 108–109
6r1–4 [Γέρμανς, тарасїю, никифорς ἰ μεωδῆϊю			G. 110–111
6r5–7 [Ἰγнатїю, фотїю			G. 112–113
6r8–12 [Вѣса ѿже на ст҃їе пат]рїархы			G. 114–116
6r12–16 Вѣса ѿже чр҃късь цр҃к[в]наго]			G. 117–119
6r16–18 Ἐτῆφανῖ [Ἐτῆφάνς прѣпѣвнїи] къ			G. 120
6r18–21 Ἐνϕίλιϑ . φεω[φίλ]ς.			G. 121–122
6r21–23 ϕεωφїлѣактς • пѣтрυ •			G. 123–124
6r24–25 [Ἰνдрѣ]оу прѣпѣвнїи			
6v1–4 Ἰωα[ннς, никѣлаς,			G. 125–126

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
5v5–8 Въсѣкъ иже ѿ скверъныа вѣры аримѣнскыа					
5v9–10 Фѣѡроу въспрѣб- ноу			188r12 Фѣѡрѡ въспрѣб- номѡ		
5v11–12 Ісакію чудотворцу			188r13 Ісакію чудотворцу		
5v13–15 Іариноу прѣб- ноу			188r14–15 Илариноу прѣб- номѡ		
5v16–17 Сѣменову прѣб- ноу			188r16–17 Сѣменову прѣб- вѣишомѡ		
5v18–19 Фѣѡфану прѣб- ноу			188r17–18 Фѣѡфану прѣб- вѣишомѡ		
5v20–22 Въсѣкъ пришед- шій					
6r1–11 Сѣа іако бл҃венїа ѿць	11	P 6v featuring neumes and severely damaged.	188r19–188v4 Сѣа іако бл҃венїа ѿчка	11	
6r11–1 Словомъ оубо			188v4–9 Иже словѡ		
7r1–8	12	The beginning of the text damaged.	188v9–14 Иже гл҃ѡ недписанна- го зл҃ѣ'прилагающї се.	12	
7r9–7v4 Иже оубо пррчьскаа видѣнїа	13		188v14–189r3 Иже пррчьскаа ѡво видѣнїа	13	

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
6v5–6 ϕεώδορος въсѣпр[ѣпѣоеномѣ]			G. 127
6v6–8 [Ісаκίου] чюдотворѣцѣ			G. 128–129
6v8–10 [Иларіѡнѣ прѣпѣоеномѣ]			G. 130–131
6v10–11 [Θυμεώνѣ прѣпѣѡ] енѣкишомѣ			G. 132
6v12–13 ϕεώδορος ѡ ϕεώфанѣ, [...]]исповѣдникѡ ѡ напи[...]	10	Missing in P, D and G.	
6v14–15 ϕεώфанѣ прѣпѣоенкишомѣ			G. 133
6v15–22 Θ[τα ἰακο βλβε]ν[τα] ѡчѣскаа	11		G. 134–137
6v22–7r2 И[же] слов[омѣ]			G. 138–140
7r3–8 [Иже гла ѡ неѡписан[наго] за] ѣ прилагаю[щнѣ се.]	12		G. 141–144
7r8–19 Иже [прѣческаа збо ви]дѣн[та]	13		G. 145–150

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
7v5–7v15 Слышѣшиахъ г҃а	14		189r3–8 Иже слышеѣши г҃а	14	No segmentation
7v16–8r4 И҃ко г҃ави сѧ, г҃ако пожитъ			189r8–14 г҃ако видѣхъ бѣ. г҃ако сѣ въ вѣкъ поживе		
8r5–8v11 Прѣбывающіи въ икѡноворѣки	15		189r15–189v12 Прѣбывающіи въ икѡноворѣской	15	
			189v12–18 Въводѣщій ѡ неиз- рѣнѣномѣ плътскомѣ сѣмѡтрѣнїе.	16	
		Compare this in P 16r4–16v5 (§ 54).	189v19–190r12 Иже не въсакѣи говѣниѣ	17	Repeated in D 197v4–17 (§ 61).
		Compare this in P 17r10–17v5 (§ 56).	190r13–190v4 Гл҃бшій г҃акѡ въ врѣмѣ мироѡспителнїе сѣр҃тїи	18	Repeated in D 198r12–198v2 (§ 63).
		Compare this in P 17v6–16 (§ 57).	190v4–11 Иже на кр҃жѡ проно- силою' жрѣтвѣ	19	Repeated in D 198v3–9 (§ 64).
		Compare this in P 17v17–18v6 (§ 58).	190v11–191r11 Иже слышеѣщій	20	Repeated in D 198v9–199r9 (§ 65).
		Compare this in P 18v7–21 (§ 59).	191r12–191v4 Иже врѣмѣннаг҃а растоанїа	21	Repeated in D 199r9–21 (§ 66).
8v12–16 И҃наста́сїа. кѡстан- дина	16		191v4–7 И҃наста́сїа. кѡс- танѣдіа	22	
8v17–20 Фѣѡта. анѡнїа. іѡана.	17		191v7–9 Фѣѡта. анѡнїа. іѡана.	23	
8v21–9r11 Павла иже въ савла	18		191v9–16 Павла иже въ савла	24	

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek Synodikon
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
7r20–7v2 [Иже слыше]ше ꙗ	14	No segmentation	G. 151–158
7v2–9 ꙗко вид[ѣнь бы ꙗко съ чѣкы поживе.]			
7v9–8r4 Прѣви]вающѣ въ ꙗкѡн[оборѣскои	15		G. 159–170
8r5–11 [Въводещѣ ѡ] ѿнейзрѣнно ^ѡ пльско ^ѡ	16		The Greek text in Popruženko (p. 18–19, §16).
8r12–8v3 [Иже не] съ вѣсакы ^ѡ говѣнїемъ	17		G. 395–403
8v4–17 Глѡщѣ ꙗко ѿже въ врѣме м[ироспїте]лныє стꙋтї	18		G. 435–443
8v18–25 Иже на кѣждо приносилѡ жрѣтв[ѣ]	19		G. 444–448
9r1–25 [Иже слышещѣ]	20		G. 449–462
9r25–9v16 Иже врѣмѣннаа раст[ѡанїа]	21		G. 463–471
9v17–20 ѿнастѣсїа, констандї[на]	22		G. 171–172
9v20–23 Фѣдо[та] и антѡнїа . и їѡанн[а]	23		G. 173–174
9v24–10r7 Павла ѿже въ сѡвѣ	24		G. 175–179

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
10r7–14 Γερὸν Διά Ἰῆζε [ῶ λαμβν]	25		G. 180–183
			G. 752
			G. 753
			G. 754–755
			G. 756–757
			G. 758
			G. 759–760
			G. 761–762
10r14–24 Ἰῆζε ῶνοῦ δὲ ἀρχίναю [цїї]	26		G. 185–189
10r24–10v5 Ἰῆζε Ἐλγочѣство [ва]ти	27		G. 190–192
10v5–14 Ἰῆζε воу[юю вѣнѣшныхъ] любомоу дръцѣ	28		G. 193–197
10v15–24 Ἰῆζε вѣщѣ безначелнѣ	29		G. 198–202

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
11r5–19 Глѣщихъ, ꙗко ѣлин- стїи мѣдрѣци	30		192v8–18 Глѣщихїи ꙗко ѣлин- ци прѣмѣдрѣци	30	
11r20–11v9 Или нечистоѡ вѣроѡ	31		192v18–193r5 Иже съ вѣроѡ и чѣтїю	31	
11v10–20 Иже ѣлинскаа про- хѣдѣщихъ	32		193r6–12 Иже ѣлинскаа прохѣ- дѣщїи	32	
11v21–12r12 Иже съ инѣми лѣжисловесн(ы)ми	33		193r13–20 Иже съ иними и васними бледни	33	
12r13–12v13 Глѣщїи ꙗко нѣ послѣднее ѡбще вѣсѣренїе	34	P 12r17–19 are damaged.	193v1–13 Глѣщїи ꙗко вѣсѣ кончнѡ и ѡбщенїе	34	
12v14–13r13 Иже прїимають и прѣдають	35		193v13–194r4 Прїемающїи и прѣ- дающїи	35	
		All three exclama- tions might have been located on the missing folios between the 18 th and 19 th ff. in the extant manuscript. See be- low for the restored text between § 59 and § 60.	194r4–6 Надченїѡ вивше ѡ инѡка нїла	36	See P 13v3–5 (§ 37) and D 195v18–19 (§ 44).
			194r6–9 Иже неправѣ етѣи надчитѣ	37	
			194r10–16 Прїемающїи истин- наго бѣ гѣ	38	
		See P 18v7–21 (§ 59).	194r17–194v12 Помишлѣющїи и вѣщающїи. ѡво- женїа прїетїа.	39	Corresponds to P 18v7–21 (§ 59), whose beginning is lost.
		See P 19r5–20 (§ 60).	194v12–195r3 Глѣщїи ꙗко пѣ гѣна	40	Corresponds to P 19r5–20 (§ 60).

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek Synodikon
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
10v24–11r11 Глѹ[щій] ꙗко ѓлинеѣти прѣвѣдѹщѣи	30		G. 203–208
11r11–20 Иже съ вѣрою чистою	31		G. 209–213
11r21–11v3 [Иже ѓл]ли[не]каа прохѣдещѣи	32		G. 214–218
11v4–13 Иже съ ѣными бѣсньными [владми]	33		G. 219–224
11v13–12r4 [Глѹщій ꙗко] въ коньчнѣ и ѡвѣщѣ	34		G. 225–233
12r5–20 [прѣѣмлющѣи и] прѣвѣдѹщиа	35		G. 234–242
12r20–22 Нлоуѣченнѣ бѣвшемиъ [ѡ ии] ѡка нѣла	36		G. 248–249
12r23–12v2 [Иже неправѣ еѣы]хъ оуѣчи- тель	37		G. 479–481
12v3–11 Прѣѣмлющѣи истиннаго бѣ [гѣ]	38		G. 482–487
12v11–13r5 П[омишлѣкѹщѣи и ве]щѹщѣи ѡ[воженѣа прѣѣтѣа]	39		G. 488–497
13r5–20 Глѹщій, ꙗко пѣль гѣна	40	Discrepancies with D. The text coincides with the Russian printed triodion.	G. 498–504

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
		See P 19r21–19v9 (§ 61).	195r4–8 Ѣмѣтающї етъиѣ ѡцѣ гласѣ	41	Corresponds to P 19r21–19v9 (§ 61).
		See P 19v10–20v2 (§ 62).	195r9–195v12 Непрїѣмающї истинѣ- наго бѣ	42	Corresponds to P 19v10–20v2 (§ 62).
13r14–13v2 Иже свѣкне хрїстїан- скыж	36		195v12–17 Иже свѣкне хрїстїан- скїе	43	
13v3–5 Наоученыихъ зловѣр- но ѡ мнїха нїла	37		195v18–19 Набченныѣ зловѣрно ѡ мнїха нїла	44	Repeated in D 194r4–6 (§ 36), but in a different redaction, which coincides with P 13v3–5 (§ 36).
13v6–11 Понеже въсєлжжав- ныи	38		195v19–196r3 Понѣ въсєлжжавїи	45	
13v12–14r4 Попа бѣ҃гомїла	39		196r3–11 Пѡпа бѣ҃гомїла	46	
14r5–8 И въсє иже въ ѣреси тѡи	40		196r12–14 И въсє иже въ ѣрєси тѡи	47	
14r9–12 Любѡщиѣ сѧ съ ниини	41		196r14–16 Любєщїи сє съ нїиї	48	
14r13–19 Иже іоуїїа ѡца кѣд днѣ	42		196r17–20 Иже іѡнїа ѡца кѣд днѣ	49	
14r20–14v3 Иже сатанѣ ви- дїлѣи твари творца	43		196v1–3 Иже сатанѣ видїлѣи тварї творца	50	
14v4–5 Глѡщїихъ ѡдѣма и ѣвѣж	44		196v4 Глѡщїиѣ ѡдѣма и ѣвѣж	51	
14v6–19 Иже мѡўсєа бѣ҃о- вїдѣца.	45		196v5–13 Иже мѡўсєа бѣ҃о- вндѣца	52	

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
13r20–13v2 Сѣлагающій єтъкѣ[ѡцѣ] глѡвы	41	The order of the memories differs from the one in D.	G. 505–509
13v3–14r5 Непріѣмающій, истиннаг[о бѣ']	42	Minor textological differences with D.	G. 517–532
			G. 243–246
			G. 248–249
			Patriarch Cosmas 369.3–371.27
			Patriarch Cosmas 9
			Patriarch Cosmas 10
			Patriarch Cosmas 11
			Patriarch Cosmas 4
			Patriarch Cosmas 1
			Patriarch Cosmas 2
			Patriarch Cosmas 3

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
14v20–15r6 Глѣщені іако жена зачинаеть	46		196v14–19 Глѣщені іако жена зачінаѣ	53	
15r7–13 Иже крѣтителю іуанноу	47		196v19–197r3 Иже крѣтителю іаннѣ	54	
15r14–19 Иже въ црѣвахъ сѣенныхъ	48		197r4–7 Иже въ црѣвѣ сѣенныі	55	
15r20–15v3 Иже стѣжъ и сѣеннѣа слоужевѣ	49		197r7–10 Иже стѣю и сѣенноѡ сѣжкѣѣ	56	
15v4–10 Иже причестіе чест- наго тѣла	50		197r11–14 Иже причестіе честна- го тѣла	57	
15v11–14 Иже ѡмѣтаютъ са покланѣніа	51		197r15–17 Иже ѡмѣтаютъ се покланѣніа	58	
15v15–19 Иже приѣмлатъ котораго	52		197r17–20 Иже пріѣмающій Котораго	59	
15v20–16r3 Василіа врача	53		197r20–197v3 Василіа врача	60	
16r4–16v5 Иже не съ вѣсѣцѣ- мь благоговѣніемь	54		197v4–17 Иже не съ вѣсацѣ блѣгоговѣніѣ	61	
16v6–17r9 Вънесена и глава ѡ миѡанна	55		197v17–198r12 Вънесенаж и глава ѡ миѡанна	62	
17r10–17v5 Глѣщихъ іако іаже въ врѣмѣ миросѣеннѣ стѣрѣти	56		198r12–198v2 Глѣющій іако іаже въ врѣмѣ миросѣеніѣ стѣрѣты	63	
17v6–16 Иже жже по вѣсеіа приносимѣа жрѣт- вѣ	57		198v3–9 Иже жже по вѣсеіа приносимѣю жрѣтѣѣ	64	

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
			Patriarch Cosmas 4
			Patriarch Cosmas 5
			Patriarch Cosmas 6
			Patriarch Cosmas 7
			Patriarch Cosmas 8
			Patriarch Cosmas 12
			G. 395–403
			G. 424–434
			G. 435–443
			G. 444–448

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
17v17–18v6 Слышѣиѣихъ оубо спса	58		198v9–199r9 Слышѣиѣихъ ѡбо спа	65	
18v7–21 Иже лѣтнаа разсто- анїа	59	The end, correspond- ing to D 199r18–21, is missing.	199r9–21 Иже лѣтнаа разсто- анїа	66	
*Иже неправѣ стѣиѣ наѡчитѣ		The text is restored according to D 194r6–9 (§ 37).			
*Прїемлющїи ист- иннаго ба га и спа нашего		The text is restored according to D 194r10–16 (§ 38).			
*Помишлѣющїи и вѣщающїи. ѡвоженїа прїетїа 19r1–4 ...сега въводѣщи или мѣчтанїе		The beginning is restored according to D 194r17–194v9, the end in P 19r1–4 coincides with D 194v9–13 (§ 39).			
19r5–20 Глѣцими тако плѣтъ гнѣ	60	Coincides with D 194v12–195r3 (§ 40).			
19r21–19v9 ѡмѣтажцихъ стѣихъ ѡцѣ гласы	61	Coincides with D 195r4–8 (§ 41).			
19v10–20v2 Непрїемлющїихъ истиннаго ба	62	Coincides with D 195r9–195v12 (§ 42).			
20v3–21v6 Бывшаго митропо- лита керкирскаго	63		199v1–20 Бывшаго митропо- лита керкирскаго	67	The end of the text is missing due to loss of folios. The next text coincides with P 24r12 sq.

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
			G. 449–462
			G. 463–471
			G. 479–481
			G. 482–487
			G. 488–497
			G. 498–504
			G. 505–509
			G. 517–532
14г6–10 [...и нечѣстивѣ ѿ бѣвшаго] [митро]лита керькіскаѧ,	43		G. 533–536
14г11–14у20 бывшемъ митро ^л итѣ кер ^к ѣ ^р скомъ,	44		G. 537–558

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
14v21–25 Въсѣ̄ ѣдиноуѣдрѣствѣющѣ̄ то́моу кон'стандинѣ̄ ѣже вльгар'скоиѣ̄	45		G. 558–561
15r1–16 [нендоуѣ]наго [лъ]же̄ӣно́ка сѣвѣорна̄а̄ [гѣ]анна̄ ирѣнӣка	46		G. 562–571
			G. 752
15r16–17 Шетѣвше [сѣ... сѣво]риѣ	47	See P 9v1–2 (§20).	G. 753
15r18–20 [Прием]лющѣ̄ ѣже̄ ѿ̄ вжѣт'вна̄а̄ писанѣ̄а̄	48	See P 9v3–6 (§21).	G. 754–755
15r21–22 Приѣвѣща̄ющѣ̄ сѣ̄ въ̄ рѣзѣлк̄,	49	See P 9v7–9 (§22).	G. 756–757
15r23–24 Глѣ̄ощѣ̄ ꙗ̀ко̄ во̄гво̄вѣ̄ хрѣ̄тѣ̄ане̄	50	See P 9v10–12 (§23).	G. 758
15r24–15v1 Глѣ̄ощѣ̄, ꙗ̀к̄ развѣ̄ хѣ̄ бѣ̄ наше̄го̄	51	See P 9v13–15 (§24).	G. 759–760
15v1–4 Др[ъзвѣзвѣщѣ̄хъ] глатӣ сѣ̄вѣор- нѣ̄ю̄ црковѣ̄	52	See P 9v16–20 (§25).	G. 761–762
15v5–7 ѣ̄ще̄ ктѣ̄ хрѣ̄тѣ̄анѣ̄ ѣ̄корѣ̄телн [он̄ ересӣ сѣ̄]	53		G. 763–764
15v7–16r21 гла̄се̄[...] І̄ѡсѣ̄фа̄ ѣ̄же̄ ѿ̄ крѣ̄та̄ сѣ̄ща̄	54	<i>Holy Mount Epistle</i> of 1344 (Ἁγιορειτικὸν γράμμα)	A. RIGO, <i>L'Assemblea gene- rale...</i> , p. 505, fig. 31–56.
16r22–16v19 гла̄вы̄ на̄ а̀кѣ̄ндѣ̄ина̄ ~ Варлаа̄ма̄ ӣ а̀кѣ̄ндѣ̄ина̄, ӣ оӯченӣкы̄	55	Cf. P 27r10–27v6 (§176).	G. 573–584

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
22r21–22v2 Синишна влѣхѣва прѣваго ѣретика	69				
22v3–7 Кочковрика маненда	70				
22v8–10 Македонїа и аполнарїа	71				
22v11–13 Несторїа злочети- ваго	72				
22v14–17 Дївскора Александрїискаго	73				

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek Synodikon
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
16v20–25 Єще тѣ моудръствѣющіи и	56	No ending due to loss of folios.	G. 585–587
17r1–8 [Прѣреченнаго же В]арлаама	57	Memory to Andronicus III Palaeologus.	G. 687–691
17r9–24 [Всѣ]ль иже ѿ православіи	58		G. 714–732
17r25–18r7 Григоріѣ стѣкишемѣ митро- литѣ	59		G. 692–709
18r8–18 Исповѣдающіи єдиного бѣ тристѣстѣвна	60		G. 724–729
18r19–18v3 Исповѣдающіи бѣ . іакѡ по соуществу	61		G. 730–734
18v3–20 Исповѣдающіи [про]стѣави нейзрѣнно свѣтъ	62		G. 735–743
18v20–19r10 Слѣвещіи свѣтъ гѣна прѣвѣбра- женіа	63		G. 744–751
			G. 295.74–75
			G. 295.76–78
			G. 296.79–81
			G. 296.79–82

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
22v18–21 Орнгена безоумнаго	74				
23r1–7 Феѡра фаранскаго ѣпѣпа	75				
23r8–10 Павла самосадскаго.	76				
23r11–13 Александра ковача,	77				
23r14–16 Петра кападокїнскаго дѣдца	78				
23r17 Въса ѣретики, анаѡна:~	79	Compare P 22r14 (§ 66).			
23r18–23v1 Иже правѣ и благо- честивѣ невѣроу- щихъ	80				
23v2–4 Въсѣхъ творящихъ сѣна гдѣ	81				
23v5–7 Иже не исповѣдоуетъ	82				
23v8–10 Прилагающихъ къ бжтвоу	83				
23v11–13 Иже сѣна бжтѣ нет- лѣннѣхъ плѣтъ	84				
23v14–15 Иже дѣвѣхъ и бѣж прѣстѣхъ женѣхъ	85				

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
23v16–18 Неисповѣдоуѣщихъ въсѣдоушно	86				
23v19–24r1 Невѣроуѣщій хотѣшомоу быти въскрсеііоу	87				
24r2–5 Въсѣхъ ѿже законоу бѣжѣоу	88				
24r6–9 ѿже ѿ каковы либо ѣреси	89				
24r10–12 Въсѣхъ приобшаж- щихъ (sic!) сѧ къ ѧрикрестѣи вѣрѣ	90				
24r13–15 Глѣщихъ іако не пріемлетъ бѣ	91		200r1–2 Глѣщій іако не пріемлѣ бѣ	68	
24r16–17 Наричащихъ миро- дръжца быти	92		200r2–3 Наричеши миродрѣца быти	69	
24r18–19 Неисповѣдоуѣщій сѧ бѣжѣа	93		200r4–6 Неисповѣдѣщій сѧ бѣжѣа	70	
24r20–24v2 Невѣроуѣщійхъ іѡанноу крѣлю	94		200r4–6 Невѣрѣщій іѡаннѣ крѣлю	71	
24v3–5 Непріемлѣщихъ сѣѣ причащеніе	95		200r7–8 Непріемлющій сѣѣ причѣщеніе	72	
24v6–10 Некланѣщихъ сѧ сѣѣхъ мошеі (sic!)	96		200r8–11 Некланѣщій сѣ сѣѣхъ мошеі	73	

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
24v11–14 Некланѣжцихъ сѧ ѡтноу ѡ жи- вотворѣнїюу крѣсту	97		200r11–13 Некланѣжци сѧ ѡтноу ѡ жи- вотворѣнїюу крѣсту	74	
24v15–19 Иже сѣты бѣжѣа цркви	98		200r13–16 Иже сѣте бѣжѣа цркви	75	
24v20–25r8 Иже сѣтинь црква- ль ѡпѣаа же	99		200r16–200v2 Иже сѣтѣ црква ѡпѣаа же	76	
25r9–19 Бѣсѣа дръжжци- нь православнѣхъ вѣрѣ	100		200v2–9 Бѣсѣа дръжжциѣ православнѣхъ вѣрѣ	77	
25r20–25v4 Иже каковѣа нѣ оуѣхѣнїемъ	101		202v9–13 Иже каковѣа нѣ ѡхѣнїемъ	78	
25v5–8 Иже вѣхѣванїемъ	102		202v13–16 Иже вѣхѣванїемъ	79	
25v9–14 Бѣсѣа волѣрѣ	103		202v16–19 Бѣсѣа волѣрѣ	80	
25v15–17 Бѣсѣа иже татѣ	104		202v20–21 Бѣсѣа иже татѣ	81	
25v18–19 Хѣ повѣда. хѣ црѣвѣтѣ.	105		203r1–2 Хѣ повѣда. хѣ црѣвѣтѣ.	82	

Table 1 (cont.)

BAR MS. SL. 307			Greek <i>Synodikon</i>
7	8	9	10
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rows:
19r14–18 Мнѡга лѣта црѣнь ~ гѣ	66	The exclamation is followed by instructions in red ink, missing in G.	G. 767
19r19–20 Мнѡга лѣта црѣнь. ~ гѣ ~ Бѣ да съхранѣи дръжавѣ ѡ хъ ~ бѣ црѣво ѡ да смѣритъ •	67		
19r21–22 възгласи' ~ Нѣныи црѣю, Зел- льныи нашѣ црѣ съхранѣи ~ гѣ.	68		

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
25v20–26r3 Кѡнстантїнѡ вели- колѡѡ ѡ лїтри	106		201r3–5 Кѡн'стантїнѡ ве лїколѡѡ црѡѡ ѡ лїтри	83	
26r4–26v9 Фѡдѡрїоу вели- колѡу црїю	107		201r6–16 Фѡдѡрїѡ великолѡѡ црїю	84	
26v10–19 Плакилѡ црїци	108		201r16–20 црїце грѡчьскїи. Плакилѡ црїци	85	
26v20– Фѡдѡрїа великаа ѡ сѡтаа црїца	109	The end of the <i>Synodikon</i> . The extant text coincides with D 201r20–201v1 (§ 86).	201r20–201v15 Фѡдѡрїа великаа ѡ сѡтаа црїца	86	
			201v16–19 начѡло влѡгарскїи црїѡ: Борѡсѡ прѡвѡмѡѡ	87	
			201v20–202r4 Сїлѡѡнѡ сѡнѡ ѡрѡ. ѡ петрѡѡ		
			202r4–5 Млїрїи дрѡвнѡи црїци влѡгарскїи		

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
			202r5–11 Кѣрилѣ философѣ	88	
			202r12–14 Мѣѡдїю братѣ его	89	
			202r14–17 Климентѣ оученикѣ	90	
			202r18–19 Іѡаннѣ аскѣнѣ црѣ вѣлѣгнѣю	91	
			202r20–202v2 Фѣѡрѣ нарѣннѡмѣ петрѣ	92	
28r1–29r4		The beginning of the story about the Synod of 1211, corresponding to D 202v3–14, is missing. P 28r1–8v21 coincides with D 202v14–203r20.	202v3–203r20 По сїи дѣѡ іако прѣ сестрѣ сестричици	93	The end of the story about the Synod, corresponding to P 29r–32v, is missing.
29r4–16 И по сѣмѣ повелѣ	110				
29r16–29v2 Сѣ же вѣсѣ сѣтѡворишѣ сѣ					
29v2–7 И сїа вѣсѣ добрѣ оурѡдивѣ					
29v8–17 Трѣклѡтаго вѡго- мѡла	111				
29v18–30r2 Вѣсѣмѣ архїерѡмѣ. и епѣмѣ	112				
30r3–30v2 Іѡаннѣ аскѣнѣ црѣ вѣлїкѣи	113				

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
30v3–14 Прѣсѣщенни въсе- ленскыи патрїархъ германъ					
30v15–17 Сѣмь вѣсѣсѣ- щенни па трїархъ. антїохїѣ					
30v17–19 Нїколае вѣсѣсѣ сѣщенни патрїархъ					
30v20–31r3 Силь оубо вѣсѣсѣ- щенниинь патрїархъинь					
31r4–31v8 Самодръжавное црѣтво наше					
31v8–17 Герману вѣселен- скому патрїарху	113				
31v18–32v3 Сїа же вѣспрїемъ црѣ грѣчьскыи					
32v3–7 Сего ради оубо въ сѣнь православи въписахѣ					
32v7–10 Семоу іѡанну асѣню великому					
32v11–15 Калиману бл҃говѣр- ному црю.	114				
32v16–19 Александрѣ севасто- кратору	115				

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
32v20– Κωνσταντίνου βλγο- χρηστικου(ου)	116	The end of the glorification is missing, as are the glories to the next Bulgarian tsars partially preserved in D 203r20–203v19 (§ 94).			
			203r20–203v4 ... ἀ ἵζηε ποложив'- шомъ дшѣ своѣ	94	It seems to be the end of the glory to Constantine Asen (1258–1277).
			203v4–5 Гѣѡргіѡ тертеріѡ старомъ	95	
			203v6 Шшманъ блговѣр- номъ црѣ	96	
			203v7– Фѣѡрѣ свѣславѣ	97	
			203v8 Гѣѡргіѡ тертеріѡ блгохрестикомъ	98	
			203v9–10 Страцимирѣ деспотѣ.	99	
			203v10–11 Миханъ блгохрестикомъ	100	
			203v11–12 Іѡан'нѣ стѣпанѣ	101	
			203v13–17 Сѣмь ѣво правовѣр- нѣ. ѣ блгохрестивѣѣ.	102	
			203v18–20 Слѣко по силѣ ѣдино нѣкоѣ	103	The end of the glorification is missing, as is the end of the <i>Synodikon</i> , in D.

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
34r1-5 Єленѣ новѣи благо- чєстивѣи	117				
34r6-12 Йнѣнѣ црци	118				
34r13-15 Марїи хрѣтолюбивѣи црци	119				
34r16-17 Євфросини блговер- нѣи црци	120				
34r18-34v2 Кєраци блгочєстивѣи дєспотици	121				
34v3-7 Фєодѡрѣ блгочєс- тивѣи црци	122				
34v8-17 Фєодѡрѣ блгочєс- тивѣи црци ... сж- щон ѿ рода єврєиска	123				
34v18-35r9 Кєра фамари	124				
35r10-11 Гжї дєсиславѣ и гжї василиси	125				
35r12-14 Кїра марїи	126				
32r15-19 Гжї дєсиславѣ матєри	127				
35r20-35v3 Кєраци. дѣщєри	128				
35v4-6 Дѡмцѣ. тѡца. Вели- каго їѡана	129				

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
35v7 Зѡжъ лѡ-ѡетицѡ вѣнѡа еи памѣ:+	130	The lower half of the folio is empty.			
33r1–3 Мѡнахоу сѡвестрѡ.	131				
33r4–5 Мѡнахоу ѡѡѡсѡу.	132				
33r6 Прѡтокелѡитиноу прѡданкоу	133				
33r7–9 Прѡтокелѡитиноу прѡгаздѣ	134				
33r10 Цамѡлакоу	135				
33r11–13 Вѡлікому вѡѡѡдѣ кѡнстантѡиноу.	136				
33r14–16 ...ѡѡтѡ вѡлікомѡ дѡѡрѡмѡрѡ	137				
36r1–3 ѡрсѡнѡу ѡрхѡпѡкоу	138				
36r4–5 ѡсѡнѡу новоѡу нѡѡѡѡдѡникоу	139				
36r6–8 Лѡѡнтѡу. дѡли- трѡу. сѡргѡу	140				
36r9–12 прѡѡсѡѡеннѡи па- трѡрѡси трѡновоу					
36r10–12 ѡѡѡкиѡу прѡѡѡѡу	141				

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
36r13–15 Василіюу. іуакимюу. ігнатіѡ.	142				
36r16–18 Макаріюу тръбела- женномуу	143				
36r19–21 Іуакимюу. дорѡѡеюу.	144				
36v1–2 Іуанікіѡ	145				
36v3–4 Сѡмешноу	146				
36v5–6 Феодѡсеюу	147				
36v7–8 Іуанікіюу	148				
36v9–10 Сѡѡміѡ	149				
37r1–5 мітрополіте пръслав- стїи:~	150				
37r19–20; 38r1 мітрополіте чръ- венкнстїи:~	151				
37v6–8 мітрополіте ло- вечкстїи:~	152				
37v19–20 мітрополіте срѣ- дечкстїи:~	153				
38r11–12 мітрополіте ѡвечкстїи+	154				
38v1–3 мітрополіте дръкстєр- стїи+	155				

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
38v15–19 ⲁ ⲗⲓⲗⲉ ϫⲟϥⲉⲙⲗ ⲛⲓⲛⲉⲕ ⲡⲟⲗⲉⲕⲛⲁⲗⲧⲓ	155				
38v20–39r1 Ⲑⲛⲧⲱⲛⲓⲉ. ⲉⲁⲛⲓⲛⲗ.	156				
39r2–3 Ⲑⲛⲁⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲉ. ⲉⲡⲓⲑⲁⲛⲓⲉ. ⲉⲁⲛⲓ ⲛⲧⲣⲓⲉ.	157				
39r4–5 Ⲑⲱⲁⲛⲓⲕⲓⲉ. ⲥⲉⲣⲓⲉ.	158				
39r6–7 Ⲑⲁⲕⲱⲱⲱ. ⲡⲟⲣⲑⲓⲣⲓⲉ. Ⲑⲱⲁⲛⲓⲕⲓⲉ.	159				
39r8–10 Ⲙⲁⲱⲁ. ⲟⲉⲟⲉⲁⲱⲥⲓⲉ. ⲉⲁⲛⲓⲧⲣⲓⲉ	160				
39r11–12 Ⲕⲱⲣⲓⲗ. ⲉⲁⲱⲛⲓⲥⲓⲉ.	161				
39r13–15 Ⲙⲧⲉⲑⲁⲛⲗ. ⲕⲗⲓⲙⲉⲛⲧⲗ. Ⲑⲱⲥⲓⲑⲗ.	162				
39r16–17 Ⲙⲱⲙⲉⲱⲛⲗ ⲙⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲟⲗⲓⲧⲗ	163				
39r18–21 Ⲕⲁⲥⲓⲗⲓⲉ. ⲙⲁⲣⲕⲟ. ⲛⲓⲕⲟⲉⲛⲓⲗ.	164				
39v1–4 Ⲕⲱⲥⲕⲁⲙⲗ ⲙⲓⲧⲣⲟⲡⲟⲗⲓⲧⲗ ⲓ ⲓⲛⲕⲓⲱⲱ	165				
39v5–9 Ⲕⲱⲥⲕⲁⲙⲗ ⲱⲟⲗⲉⲣⲱⲱⲗ ⲙⲁⲗⲱⲛ	166				
39v10–15 Ⲙⲉⲙⲓⲣⲟⲩ. ⲓⲱⲛⲕⲱ. ⲉⲁⲱⲣⲟⲙⲓⲣⲟⲩ.	167				

Palauzov's copy			Drinov's copy		
1	2	3	4	5	6
Rubrics:	§	Notes:	Rubrics:	§	Notes:
39v16–21 Ѡрцѣ трoшанoу. рѠтeнoу.	168				
40r1–2 СтефанѠ новoсѣн- нолѠ	169				
40r3 ВѠлкашиноу крѠлю, вѠчнаѠ пѠ~	170				
40r4 ДеспoтѠ оу҃глешoу,	171				
40r8–9 СтефанѠ мжлѠдѠс- кoлѠ гѠподѠрѠ	172				
40r10–11 ѠвѠ Петрoу мѠдѠдѠвѠ- кoлѠ гѠподѠрѠ	173				
40r12–13 Ѡ гѠпoжѠ Ѡ елѠнѠѠ	174				
27r1–8 ВѠсѠ Ѡже дѠмѠ хрѠстѠанскѠж	175				
27r10–27v6 ѠкинѠина варлѠаѠѠ.	176				
27v7–20 Фoу҃дoу҃лѠѠ. Ѡ oу҃чи- телѠѠ ѠгѠѠ	177				

Description: Columns 1, 4, 7 contain the incipits of the rubrics in Palauzov's (P), Drinov's (D) and Romanian (R) versions, taking into account the real segmentation according to the initial and red letters. The new edition of the *Synodikon* of tsar Boril as well as the edition of the Palaeologan *Synodikon* reflect the same segmentation. Columns 2 and 5 show the paragraphs in the edition by Popruženko (M.Г. ПОПРУЖЕНКО, *Синодикъ царя Борила...*), while column 8 shows the paragraphs in R, thus linking the new editions with the edition by Popruženko.

Bibliography

Sources

- ANNE COMNÈNE, *Alexiade*, vol. III, ed. B. LEIB, Paris 1945, ²1967.
- BOŽILOV I., TOTOMANOVA A., BILJARSKI I., *Borilov sinodik. Izdanie i prevod*, Sofija 2010.
- GOUILLARD J., *Le Synodikon de l'Orthodoxie: édition et commentaire*, "Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 2, 1967, p. 1–316.
- MOŠIN V.A., *Serbskaja redakcija sinodika v nedelju pravoslavija. Teksty*, "Византийский временник" / "Vizantijskij vremennik" 17, 1960, p. 278–353.
- Synodicum Bulgaricum 1211*, ed. A. TOTOMANOVA, [in:] *The Great Councils of the Orthodox Churches. From Constantinople 861 to Moscow 2000*, ed. A. MELLONI, vol. I, Turnhout 2016 [= CC.COGD 4.1], p. 426–468.

Secondary Literature

- BILJARSKI I., *Paleologovijat sinodik v slavjanski prevod*, Sofija 2013.
- BILJARSKI I., CIBRANSKA-KOSTOVA M., *Za edin kompoziten tip i za Paleologovija wariant na slavjanskija Sinodik v Nedeljata na pravoslavieto*, "Palaeobulgarica" 36.1, 2012, p. 51–65.
- BOŽILOV I., *Vizantijskijat svjat*, Sofija 2008.
- GOUILLARD J., *Une source grecque du Synodik de Boril: la lettre du patriarche Cosmas*, "Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 4, 1970, p. 361–374.
- MINCZEW G., *Borilovijat sinodik 800 godini po-käsno*, "Palaeobulgarica" 35.2, 2011, p. 68–84.
- MOŠIN V.A., *Serbskaja redakcija sinodika v nedelju pravoslavija. Analiz tekstov*, "Византийский временник" / "Vizantijskij vremennik" 16, 1959, p. 317–394.
- POPURŽENKO M.G., *Sinodik carja Borila*, "Български старини" / "Bälgarski starini" 8, 1928.
- RIGO A., *L'Assemblea generale atonita del 1344 su un gruppo di monaci bogomili* (ms. Vat.Gr. 604 ff. 11r–12v), "Cristianesimo nella Storia. Ricerche storiche, esegetiche, teologiche" 5, 1984, p. 475–506.
- RIGO A., *Monaci esicasti e monaci bogomili. Le accuse di messalianismo e bogomilismo rivolte agli isicasit ed il problema dei rapporti tra esicasmo e bogomislismo*, Firenze 1989 [= OV 2].
- СТЕФАНОВ Р., *Nov pogled kām unijata meždu Bälgarskata i Rimskata cārka prez XIII v.*, "Преславска книжовна школа" / "Preslavska knižovna škola" 5, 2001, p. 343–352.
- TOTOMANOVA A., *Ezikāt na XIV v. i sāvstāvāt na Palauzovija sbornik*, "Palaeobulgarica" 36.1, 2012, p. 24–37.
- TOTOMANOVA A., *Sinodik carja Borila v sbornike Palauzova (NBKM № 289)*, [in:] *XXI ežegodnaja bogoslovskaja konferencija. Cerkovno-istoričeskie issledovanija v kontekste sovremennoj nauki*, Moskva 2011, p. 165–171.
- TOTOMANOVA A., *Za edna paronomazija v Borilovija sinodik*, [in:] *Slovesa prečjud'naja. Jubileen sbornik v čest na prof. Ivan Bujukliev*, ed. A. TOTOMANOVA, R. VLAHOVA-RUKOVA, Sofija 2012, p. 36–43.

Abstract. The paper compares the content and the structure of the three extant South Slavonic *Synodika*: *Boril's Synodikon* as preserved in the so-called Palauzov copy of the 14th century (HBKM № 289); Drinov's *Synodikon* (HBKM № 432), previously considered to be a 16th century copy of *Boril's Synodikon*, and the recently published South Slavonic *Synodikon* from the 16th century, kept in the library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences (BAR MS. SL. 307). The comparison is supported by a table showing the rubrics and their order in the three *Synodika*. It demonstrates that while *Boril's Synodikon* is based on a translation of Comnenian version of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, and while the *South Slavonic Synodikon* from Romania must be unequivocally attributed to the later Palaeologan version of the Greek text, the so-called Drinov copy represents a compilation of *Boril's Synodikon* in its 14th version and the Palaeologan *Synodikon*. In fact, Drinov's *Synodikon* contains all of the important interpolations and insertions of *Boril's Synodikon* related to specifically Bulgarian circumstances and history, ranging from anti-Bogomilist anathemas to a list of Bulgarian rulers (comprising two historical accounts as well). Its initial part, however, follows the Palaeologan text preserved in BAR MS. SL. The unknown compiler obviously targeted a Bulgarian audience; in all likelihood, he was Bulgarian himself. Some textological features common to both Drinov's and Palaeologan *Synodikon* suggest that the translated part of Drinov's *Synodikon* and the Romanian *Synodikon* must have had a common antigraph. The latter fact allows us to conclude that the translation of the Palaeologan version of the *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* is an integral part of the tradition of the Bulgarian *Synodikon*; the presumed common antigraph was written in Bulgarian Tărnovo orthography, traces of which are found in Drinov's text. As to the location of this translation, we can only speculate that it might have been completed in a monastic centre different than Tărnovo by the end of the 14th century.

Keywords: *Synodikon of Orthodoxy*, Palaeologan and Comnenian versions of the *Synodikon*, Bulgarian translations and versions of the *Synodikon*.

Anna-Maria Totomanova

St. Clement of Ohrid University of Sofia
15 Tsar Osvooboditel blvd.
1000 Sofia, Bulgaria
atotomanova@abv.bg

Mariyana Tsibranska-Kostova (Sofia)

PAULICIANS BETWEEN THE DOGME AND THE LEGEND*

General statement

Of all medieval confessional deviations from the Orthodoxy called by the term 'heresies' the Bogomilism and the Paulicianism have the longest life in the Bulgarian cultural-historical memory. The reasons for the given state of matters in regards of every one of both, as close to each other, as self-dependent, are different, but the final result is the same. As concerns the Paulicianism, at first place it finds expression in a very strong nominative tradition, which survives despite the historical transformations of the former times medieval heretic movement¹ into an ethno-confessional and linguistic-dialect community of the Bulgarian *Paulicians Catholics* as a product of the Modern Times and the Catholic propaganda in the Bulgarian lands from the beginning of the 17th century². If we paraphrase

* This article has been written under the research project *Dualist Heresies in the History of South-East Europe (9th–15th centuries)*, financed by the National Science Centre (Poland). Decision number: 2016/22/M/HS3/00212.

¹ Because of the immense scope of the accumulated literature, here we will refer only to fundamental and quoted bibliographic unities: PETRUS SICULUS, *Historia Manichaeorum*, [in:] PG, vol. CIV, col. 1239–1304; PETRUS SICULUS, *Sermo I–II adversus Manichaeos*, [in:] PG, vol. CIV, col. 1305–1346; РНОТИУС, *Contra Manichaeos*, [in:] PG, vol. CII, col. 15–264; Р.М. БАРТИКЯН, *Петр Сицилийски и его "История павликиан"*, ВВ 43.18, 1961, p. 323–358; N.S. GARSOIAN, *The Paulician Heresy. A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire*, Hague–Paris 1967; P. LEMERLE, *L'Histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques*, TM 5, 1973, p. 1–144; *Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650 – c. 1450*, ed. J. HAMILTON, В. HAMILTON, Y. STOYANOV, Manchester 1998, especially: *The Paulicians*, p. 5–25; К. ГЕЧЕВА, *Богомилството и неговото отражение в средновековна християнска Европа. Библиография*, София 2007, especially: *Манихейство*, p. 93–100; *Павликианство*, p. 100–106; *Sredniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła słowiańskie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2015 [= *SeCer*, 1].

² E. FERMEŃDŽIN, *Acta Bulgariae Ecclesiastica. Ab a. 1565 usque ad a. 1799*, Zagrebiae 1887; Л. МИЛЕТИЧ, *Нашите павликяни*, СЧУНК 19, 1903; М. ЙОВКОВ, *Павликяни и павликянски селища в българските земи XV–XVIII в.*, София 1991; *Документи за католическата дейност през XVII в.*, София 1993; Н. НЕДЕЛЧЕВ, *Диалект на българите католици (северен павликянски говор)*, Велико Търново 1994; Е. ВРАЙКОВА-ГЕНОВА, *Белене. Говор на павликяните католици*, Плевен 2003; M. WALCZAK-MIKOŁAJCZAKOWA, *Piśmiennictwo katolickie w Bułgarii*, Poznań 2004;

the title of the eminent explorer of the European dualism J. Duvernoy, and change the original relation in his article *Les noms et la chose*³, the case in point is one and the same term in which one puts different content, but it keeps alive precisely because it has what to name, that is to say because of the constant presence of the *Paulicians* and the Paulicianism in Bulgarian cultural-historical context. From the contemporary point of view, over the terms ‘*Paulicianism*’ and ‘*Paulicians*’ some stable meanings, word-uses and collocative unities have been shaped:

1. Medieval heretics, followers of the dualistic teaching, which came to birth in Western Armenia in the 7th century, and consequently, during the 8th–10th centuries, spread in Asia Minor, Syria, Byzantium, and Bulgaria (derivative ‘Paulician heresy’).

2. Denomination of a part of Bulgarian ethnos, which adopted Catholicism as a result of the Contra reformation, the Council of Trent (1545–1563), the subsequent purposeful aspirations of the Roman Catholic Church to expand its influence in the Balkans, and especially after the Franciscan order’s mission in the Bulgarian lands head by Petar Solin in 1595 (derivatives ‘Paulician dialect’, ‘Paulican literature’, including a rich nominative tradition of toponymy in the historically raised villages of Paulicianism in North Bulgaria, the region of Nikopol, Chiprovtsi, and around Plovdiv)⁴. In the initial period of proselytism, those Bulgarians still kept their old beliefs of dualist heretics, which, in conditions of the Ottoman domination on the Balkans, were mixed with folk style practices and superstitions because of low educational and social level. They occurred to be the suitable target for the Catholic missionaries being isolated from their Orthodox compatriots and the Greek clergy as Schismatics. Long time before L. Miletich had titled his fundamental work *Our Paulicians*, the “bishop of Great Bulgaria” Filip Stanislavov, himself Paulikyanich by second name, used the same expression: *nostrī Paulinisti, Catholici Bulgariae u Pauliani*; other definitions about them were also *Scismatici quali sono ostonatissimi e difficilissimi a ridursi all’abedienza della Santa Romana Chiesa*⁵.

М. ДИМИТРОВА, *Книжнината на българите католици*, [in:] *История на българската средновековна литература*, ed. А. МИЛТЕНОВА et al., София 2008, p. 744–752; Л. ГЕОРГИЕВ, *Българите католици в Трансилвания и Банат XVIII-първата половина на XIX*, София 2010; Д. РАДЕВА, *Павликяни и павликянство в българските земи. Архетип и повторения VII–XVII в.*, София 2015.

³ J. DUVERNOY, *Les noms et la chose*, *SlOc* 16, 2003, p. 189–198.

⁴ К. СТАНЧЕВ, *Литературата на българите католици през XVII и XVIII в. и преходът от Средновековие към Възраждане*, *ЛМ* 3, 1981, p. 3–11; М. АБАДЖИЕВА, *Езикът на павликянската книжнина от XVIII в.*, *БЕ* 40, 2013, Supplement, p. 262–274; И. ЗЛАТАНОВ, П. ЛЕГУРСКА, *Обречени на малцинство*, Дз 2.4, 2014 – where authors point more than 26 oikonymes from the same motivating roof.

⁵ *Документи...*, p. 27, 42.

3. Derivatives in the dialects which were realized deviations from the true faith, as for instance *навликянче* ‘non-baptized child’, together with *поганче*, *еврейче*, *дяволче*, *некръстче* and others, developing the feature ‘unclean’, ‘non-Christian’, ‘from other faith’, or the famous popular formula in the rite of baptism *дадохте ни го навликянче, на ви го сега християнче* (you gave the child to us Paulician, here we return the child to you Christian)⁶. The dialects know the word *навльо* as a different appellative to Catholic, the second meaning of the term. In Ottoman times, the term *Paulicians* was charged with keeping alive the generic consciousness and preserving the community. However, surmounting the initial proselytism, the confessional group of Bulgarian *Paulicians* stopped self-identifying with this term, because they estimated it already obsolete and pejorative, and replaced it with the more suitable *Catholics*.

The beginning of this long lasting continuum has been started in the Medieval Ages. It is the reason for the variation of the written sources about *Paulicians* from historical or strict dogmatic writings of significant Byzantine Church authorities, some works of whom have been translated in Slavonic, to original, or revised and compiled in Bulgarian environment popular and legendary texts. In the present article, we shall try to compare the way of how *Paulicians* were described in both types of sources by using for this purpose the approach of the linguistic and cultural-linguistic conceptualization of the alterity. Our aim is motivated by the commonly acknowledged fact that in the basic anthropological opposition ‘one’s own – other’ in its social prospective the confessional sign is a key position of comparison. Our concrete tasks will be, by means of linguistic analysis, to reach some essential dogmatic issues in the Paulician doctrine, and to focalize on the perception models towards *Paulicians* with their tangible semantic codes according to the specifics of the Medieval world view. The two chosen texts our analysis will be based on, are as follows:

1. The legendary narrative *Sermon about how the Paulicians have been conceived* (cetera: S). It rejoices at live scholar interest and has already a reliable archeographic record with eight copies known insofar⁷. In their titles, three of them carry out

⁶ М. КИТАНОВА, “Чуждите” деца в българската култура и език, БЕ 61.3, 2014, p. 19–32; data base from the Archive of the Department of dialectology and linguistic geography in the Institute for Bulgarian Language, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

⁷ Й. ИВАНОВ, *Произход на навликяните според два български ръкописа*, [in:] *Избрани произведения*, vol. I, София 1992, p. 111–123; А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Разобличението на дявола-граматик (към историята на старобългарската легенда за произхода на навликяните)*, [in:] *Човек и време. Сборник с научни изследвания в памет на Сабина Беляева*, ed. Р. ДАМЯНОВА, Е. ТРАЙКОВА, София 1997, p. 287–294; ЕАДЕМ, *Отново за разказа за произхода на навликяните*, ВМд 6, 2015, p. 233–240; К. СТАНЧЕВ, *Навликяните – ученици на дявола. Бележки относно финала на апокрифния разказ за произхода на навликяните*, [in:] *Vis et Sapientia. Studia in honorem Anisavae Miltenova*, ed. А. ANGUSHEVA, М. ДИМИТРОВА et al., София 2016, p. 761–768; *Średniowieczne herezje*

John Chrysostom's name to whom refers the typical Bulgarian location of the plot nearby the fortress of Petrich and the area of Bachkovo monastery – one of the centers of fight against the Armenian-Paulician heresy in Thrace, where as early as the 8th century the Byzantine emperors, particularly John I Tzimiskes (969–976) in 975 settled *Paulicians* and Armenians tondrakites, considered to be also *Paulicians*, in the region of Philipopolis, and in this way fostered the Paulician presence in the Balkans⁸. One supposes that the legend occurred among the cultivated low clergy from the region soon after the establishment of Bachkovo monastery 'St. Theotokos' from Gregory Pakourianos († 1086), that is to say not later than the beginning of the 12th century. One unique prototype with several revision changes underlies at the base of the overall text record. According to its most persistent contemporary scholar A. Miltenova the work takes place among the most valuable popular and legendary narrative sources about the Paulicianism and the attitude towards it in Bulgarian environment. It could be also added that the *Sermon* is a testimony from the early period of the Byzantine domination, and it is not excluded its appearance to be stimulated by real historical events as the Paulician rebellion from 1074 nearby Philipopolis⁹.

2. The second text is strictly dogmatic one, and has never been studied in its Slavonic translation for the time being. It is about the 24th title of *Panoplia Dogmatica* (cetera: *PD*) by Euthymius Zigabenus entitled Κατὰ τῶν λεγομένων Παυλικιανῶν ἐκ τῶν Φωτίου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως¹⁰. The Slavonic translation of this "anti-heretic encyclopedia" from the reign of emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1081–1118), commissioned personally by him and compiled as a mature work of the great heresiologist about 1104–1118, raises a series of con-

dualistyczne na Bałkanach..., p. 225–231 – with reedition of the original Slavonic text and translation in Polish language. In modern Bulgarian translation the *Sermon* is inserted among the Bulgarian stories, narratives and revisions of Greek originals in: Д. ПЕТКАНОВА, *Народното четиво през XVI–XVIII в.*, София 1990, p. 302–303; Д. РАДЕВА, *Павликяни...* – photo type reproduction of Adzhar copy according to Ivanov's edition with new Bulgarian translation by M. SPASOVA, p. 521–534.

⁸ *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 23; P.M. БАРТИКЯН, *Византийская, армянская и болгарская легенды о происхождении павликиан и их историческая основа*, Bbg 6, 1980, p. 61.

⁹ Д. РАДЕВА, *Павликяни...*, p. 198.

¹⁰ EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENOS, *Panoplia Dogmatica*, [in:] PG, vol. CXXX, col. 1189–1243; J. WICKERT, *Die Panoplia Dogmatica des Euthymios Zigabenus*, Berlin 1910; M. ANGOLD, *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Komnenoi, 1081–1261*, Cambridge 2000, p. 45–72; A. RIGO, *La Panoplia Dogmatica d'Euthymios Zygabenos. Savoir Encyclopédique et les Hérésies du Présent*, [in:] *Papers presented at the 19th Annual Theological Conference of St. Tikhon's Orthodox University*, Moscow 2008; IDEM, *La panoplie dogmatique d'Euthyme Zigabène: les Pères de l'Église, l'empereur et les hérésies du présent*, [in:] *Byzantine theologians. The systematization of their own doctrine and their perception of foreign doctrines*, ed. A. RIGO, P. ERMILOV, Rome 2009, p. 19–32; N. MILADINOVA, *Panoplia Dogmatike – a study on the antihetical anthology of Euthimios Zigabenus in the Post-Byzantine Period*, Leuven–Budapest 2010; M. BERKE, *An annotated edition of Eyrhimios Zigabenus, Panoplia Dogmatikē, Chapters 23–28*, Belfast 2011.

troversial questions, and still has an unclear destiny. Remarkable fact is that the fifth most important anti-heretic titles, namely against the iconoclasts, the Armenians, the *Paulicians*, the Massalians, and the Bogomils (in the Greek original under numeration 22, 23, 24, 26, and 27 from the second book of the *Panoplia*), in Slavonic translation have been preserved in a unique copy: in manuscript from the Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences in Bucharest BAR Ms.slav. 296 from the first quarter of the 15th century (1410–1420) – the first four mentioned titles, but with different numeration from 19th to the 22th titles; the title against the Bogomils – in the manuscript from the National Scientific Library in Odessa, Ukraine, ОГНБ 1/108. The same title against the Bogomils is absent from the manuscript from the Romanian repository, because the manuscript itself is not entirely preserved, and ends on f. 330v with the title against Massalians unachieved. The title against *Paulicians* here comprises folia 280r–322v¹¹. Some scholars examine the “Bucharest” and the “Odessa” parts of the Slavonic *Panoplia* as two text portions of one and the same manuscript body with one and the same copyist, who has been identified with the Bulgarian Gerasim, famous by copying with his recognizable handwriting important written monuments of patriarch Euthymius’ Literary School, but the alternative hypothesis that the “Bucharest” part of the Slavonic *Panoplia* represents an autograph of anonymous translator, who translated it on Mount Athos, is not to be neglected easily¹². This means that the chronology of the translation in the both opinions still keeps to be divided between the end of the 14th – the first two decades of the 15th centuries, with all questions resulting from about the place, the translator/translators, the existence or non-existence of a presumed official commission by concrete Church or secular power. Insofar, the two manuscripts with different location are the only ones witnesses about the Slavonic translation of the mentioned anti-heretic titles, and the scholarly perspectives in their regards are complexes. The issues on the early *PD* Slavonic translation, in general, seem complicate enough too. Despite these matters will not be a special focus of attention, we estimate the partial publication and analysis

¹¹ P.P. PANAITESCU, *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR*, vol. I, București 1959, p. 395–396. The peculiarities of this textual segmentation are to be discussed further in the article.

¹² К. ИВАНОВА, *О славянском переводе Паноплии догматики Евфимия Зигавина*, [in:] *Исследования по древней и новой литературе*, Ленинград 1987, p. 101–105; Н. ГАГОВА, *Един вероятен преводачески автограф от първата четвърт на XV в. (Още веднъж за ранния славянски превод на “Догматическо всеоръжие” на Евтимий Зигавин)*, Pbg 25.1, 2001, p. 79–94; ЕАДЕМ, *Поръчвал ли е деспот Стефан Лазаревич превода на “Догматическо всеоръжие” от Евтимий Зигавин*, [in:] ЕАДЕМ, *Владетели и книги. Участието на южнославянския владетел в производството и употребата на книги през Средновековието (IX–XV в.): рецепцията на византийския модел*, София 2010, p. 130–140. Indirectly, some matters about the Slavonic translation of *PD* have been touched in other publications, as for example: Я.М. ВОЛСКИ, *Богомилите и светлината на Житието на св. Иларион Мъгленски от патриарх Евтимий Търновски*, Pbg 37.4, 2013, p. 74–81; ИДЕМ, *Autoproscriptae, Bogomils and Massalians in the 14th Century Bulgaria*, SCer 4, 2014, p. 233–244.

of one of the most voluminous anti-heretic titles of the Slavonic *PD*, undertaken for the first time, very useful for further and absolute obligatory researches upon, which, hopefully, will not be late to appear.

Semantic codes

1. For every medieval text is of great importance to be credited with a high authority. The pseudo-attribution to John Chrysostom in some copies of *S* is an approved way of generating prestige to a text from the “law” tradition. On opposite, as still visible in its title, *PD* sticks to one of the most authoritative anti-Paulician Byzantine works all over the Medieval Age. Patriarch Photius’s († 893) work *Contra Manichaeos* served as base for Zigabenus’s compilation, which is acknowledged by the compiler himself: *дѣлжно ꙗко разсмыслити ꙗко ѡзвѣравъ ѡзъ ꙗже ѡже реченнаа ѡ ꙗже въ прочее поѡчненнаа настоѡщомѡс тѣтлѡс въ главнзнахъ. ѡва же, по въсемъ свѣрьнѡ положѣ. по съкращенїѡ дълготы ѡклонне се. нѣкаа же ѡ ѡже въ съписаннѡй реченнаго патриѡха* (col. 1190–1191, f. 285r–v)¹³. The work of patriarch Photius is even more valuable because the author reproduced some first hand testimonies from Peter of Sicily, who in 869–870 had been commissioned by emperor Basil I as ambassador to Chrysocheir, leader of the *Paulicians* in their independent state near the Byzantine–Arab frontier. Since Peter of Sicily’s writing is known according to only one 11th-century Greek copy, and this of patriarch Photius according to 10 Greek copies, but no Slavonic recorded, what has been included in *PD* practically gave to both of them a new life, especially in regard with *the historical and the dogmatic knowledge about Paulicians in Slavic medieval milieu*¹⁴. However, in the title in question, one considers patriarch Photius’s base in Zigabenus’s work so much extended with secondary additional material about the Paulician beliefs, that its cohesion was damaged, and consequently the entire title was not properly used as source about the Paulicianism¹⁵.

2. Onomastic material. The relationship between onymy and heresy is a first-degree code, because that is exactly by the notion and the appellation, the denotate and the designate, the denominating and the denominated enter in close relation.

¹³ From here onwards, we shall mark the comparisons between Slavonic and Greek texts of *PD* following the official standard norms of *PG* edition for the Greek text, and the folia in the Romanian manuscript BAR 296 for the Slavonic one. On the back cover, Ms. slav. BAR 296 brings information of having been counted 330 folia in 1898, all stamped with a seal. We shall designate folia according to this numbering.

¹⁴ The most important Greek sources about Paulicianism are translated in French by authors team: Ch. ASTRUC, W. CONUS-WOLSKA, J. GOULLARD, P. LEMERLE, I. PAPACHRYSSANTHOU, J. PARAMELLE, *Les sources grecques pour l’histoire des Pauliciens d’Asie Mineure*, TM 4, 1970 – among which the commencement of the quoted Photius’s work. *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 5–6.

¹⁵ N. GARSOIAN, *The Paulician Heresy...*, p. 26–79; N. MILADINOVA, *Panoplia Dogmatike...*, p. 7.

Onymic code comprises three primary positions: the name of the heresy; its founders, teachers and disciples, and the geographic area it comes to birth, and spreads.

a) Diverse theories try to explain the origin of the name ‘Paulician’ and its specific reference. *PD* draws it from the double name of the two brothers Paul and John, the sons of the Manichaean Kaliniki: Παυλοῖωάνναι > Παυλικιάνοι, ἢ βυλικστο πάγλο ἰωάνε, παυλικιάνη ἡμενσιῶτ се (col. 1187, f. 280v). *S* keeps an echo of the same denomination. Coming in the Bulgarian lands, the two devil’s disciples Sabotin and Shutil take apostolic names Paul and John, and teach people to worship apostol Paul. The text concludes that the followers who adopted their law must be called *Paulicians* (according to different copies of *S* ПАВЛИКИАНЕ, ПАВЛИЧАНЕ, ПАВЛИКИНЕ, ПАВЛИКЪНЕ). The relationship between the name of the heresy and the proper name Paul is out of doubt, having given birth to both popular and plausible scholarly etymologies. Because of the special respect to Saint Paul’s *Epistles* among *Paulicians*, some etymological explanations specify that ‘*Paulicians*’ more accurately result from παῦλικι < Παῦλος, as the *Epistles* had been called on the base of the personal name of their author¹⁶. According to other explanation, Paul of Samosata (precisely Arsamosata in Armenia), that is to say only one of the brothers, homonym of St. Paul, is to be in the base of the ontogenesis of nomination, but in fact, one deals with triple confusion of different historical personages with the name of Paul. The canonic sources clearly speak about Paulicianists, *Paulicians*, in essence, Trinitarian heresy, followers of Paul, bishop of Samosata in North Mesopotamia (260–268), whose connection with *Paulicians* dualists is not direct, but it often occurred medieval authors to merge them. The famous canonist Theodore Balsamon († after 1195) also mentions the fictional story of Kaliniki and her sons in his commentaries upon the Canon law legacy¹⁷. According to another third

¹⁶ *Български етимологичен речник*, vol. IV, София 1995, p. 997.

¹⁷ For those heretics see the 19th canon of the First Ecumenical Council in Nicea from 325, *Paulicians* – τῶν Παυλιανισάντων, and elsewhere. *Правилата на светата Православна църква с тълкованията им*, ed. С. ЦАНКОВ, И. СТЕФАНОВ, П. ЦАНЕВ, vol. I, София 1912, p. 353–357. Theodore Balsamon’s commentaries on the p. 355. The same heretics are mentioned in Slavonic *kormchayas*, including in the excerpts from the anti-heretic writings of Epiphanius of Cyprus and Timothy of Alexandria, for example in the *Ilovica kormchaya* from 1262, f. 352r–v: ПАВЛИКАНИСТЕ. ИЖЕ СОУТЬ ПАВЛИКИАНЕ. ѿ ПАВЛА САМОСАТЪНСКАГО СЪ ПАВЪЛЬ. НЕСОУЩЕСТВЕНА ХЪ ЗА МАЛЫ ИЗВЪСТЕОУЕТИ. СЛОВО ПРОИЗНОСНО СЕГО НАЗНАМЕНОУЕ. ѿ ЛРЪНЕ ЖЕ И ДО НННА БЫТИ. ПРОИЗВЪСТЕНО ЖЕ ИЖЕ ѿ НЕИ ВЪ БЖТЪВНЫИХЪ ПИСАНИИХЪ РЕЧЕНАИ, ИМАТЬ ОУБО НЕ ВЪ ИСТИННОУ ЖЕ НЪ ѿ ЛРЪНЕИ ДО НННА ѿ ПЛЪТСКАГО ПРИШЕСТВЕНА ИЕГО. ИМЪТИ ИЕМОУ НАЧЕЛО БЫТИО. In comparison to the declared dualism of the Manichaeans, described immediately after: МАНИХЕИ ИЖЕ И АКОНИТЕ ГЛЮТЬ СЕ. СИМАНИНА ПЕРЪБИНА ОУЧНИЦИ. ХЪ ОУБО ВЪРАЗОМЪ ГЛЮТЬ. СЛНЦЕ ЖЕ И ЛОУНОУ ПОЧИТАЮТЬ ВЪЪЗДАИЖЕ И СИЛАМЪ И БЪСОМЪ МОДЕТЪСЕ. НАЧЕЛЪ ЖЕ ДВЕЪ НАОУЧАЮТЬ ЗЛОЕ ЖЕ СОУЩЕ И БЛГОЕ... The passages quoted following the photo type reproduction *Законоправило или Номоканон светога Саве. Иловички препис 1262 г.*, ed. М. ПЕТРОВИЪ, Горњи Милановац 1991. The different meaning between Paulicianists and *Paulicians*, *павлиане* and *павликяне*, is recorded in Slavonic diachronic dictionaries on the base of diverse sources, for instance

explanation ‘*Paulicians*’ derives from the Greek-made variant of the Armenian name Paulikeank, a derogative diminutive from Paul, literally “disciples of little Paul”, presumably a later leader of *Paulicians*, who took them back in Armenia in the 11th century¹⁸. Apparently, various phonetic and semantic associations led to this pluralistic interpretation. A frequent procedure in the law level non official and apocryphal literature is to oppose the real and the fictive in one and the same denomination, and to create an homonymy (by analogy, the mythic founder of the Latin heresy, Peter the Stammerer is an antipode of St. apostol Peter, as well as the mythic brother from the couple John-Paul is an opposite to St. Paul). In *S*, the analogic approach finds supplementary grounds by deriving the devil’s name from another quite similar to the apostolic one – **ПАИЛЪ, ЪПАИЛЪ, ПАВЕЛЪ**. The names **ПАВЛИКА, ПУЛИКА** (*Pavlika, Paulika*) are the devil’s names in the Armenian folklore¹⁹. It is well known, however, that *Paulicians*, as the other dualistic heretics, especially the Bogomils and the Cathars, prefer to identify themselves simply as Christians.

b) Both analyzed texts lay upon the transmission of the primary code of nomination and a strong onomastic continuity, but due to their different nature, the texts differ in historical information and credibility. The rich onomastic material from *PD* continues in a series of concrete names by use of which one describes exhaustively the first Paulician teachers and spiritual leaders, who accepted new names in purpose of imitating apostol Paul’s disciples. The change of name, or the creation of a double name, are significant facts in the Christian paradigm, as they are a symbol of spiritual initiation. In both texts, however, the process of changing names functions with its enantiosem, or the development of an opposite negative connotation versus the entirely positive biblically-shaped process of naming apostles. As a result, the renamed subjects are accused in false observation of the Holy Scriptures, insincerity and hypocrisy. By use of the verbs **ИМЕНОВАТИ, ПРЪИМЕНОВАТИ, ПРЪБЛАГАТИ, ПРОЗЪВАТИ СЪ**, the Slavonic *PD* counters subsequently and in historical chronology the double names of the main Paulician leaders, by the efforts of whom the Paulicianism strengthened its position of teaching with its own dogma and relevant organization. Without its teachers and leaders every doctrine is doomed to failure and death. It is proved that thanks to Photius’s work and its revival in Zigabenus’s compilation Paulicianism stands out as the first heresy in chronological order to be the direct adherent and successor of the Manichaeism, which could explain the stereotypes of merging and identifying Bogomilism, Manichaeism, Massalianism, and Paulicianism during the whole medieval period. Patriarch Photius wrote in the 9th century when *Paulicians* manifested them-

Словарь древнерусского языка, vol. XIV, Москва 1988, p. 112–113.

¹⁸ P. LEMERLE, *L’Histoire des Pauliciens...*, p. 52; *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 7.

¹⁹ Р.М. БАРТИКЯН, *Византийская, армянская и болгарская легенды...*, p. 59.

selves in war conflicts against the empire and proved to had deserved of not being underestimated force (likewise in Peter of Sicily who described the insurrection of Paulician ruler Chrysocheir and the Paulician state with capital Tefrice, which the Byzantine ambassador and writer visited personally; in Zigabenus's lifetime, more precisely in times the Greek *PD* was presumably completed, about 1114, the Byzantine emperor Alexius I Comnenus led a successful military campaign against the *Paulicians* around Philippopolis, and even succeeded in converting some of them into the Orthodox faith)²⁰. For the Slavic studies of Paulicianism, the onomastic data base of *PD* is without precedent in abundance of facts, because they reproduced Photius' grounds, which, in their turn, coincided in numerous points with Peter of Sicily's account²¹. The names of the Paulician leaders are as follows: Constantine-Silvanus (КОНСТАНТИНЪ НМЕНСѢ, ВЪ СІЛВѢНА СЕБЕ ПРѢИМЕНОВА); Symeon-Titus (СУМЕОНЪ — ТІТА Н ТЪ СЕБЕ ПРѢИМЕНОВАВА); Genesius-Timothy (ГЕНЕСІИ ГЕНЕСІЕ НМЕНЕМЪ. ПРѢПРОЗВАВ СЕ ВЪ ТІМОФЕА); Joseph-Eraphroditus (ЧЕТВЕРТИ ІΩΨИФЪ. НЖЕ ВЪ ЕПАΦΡΟΔΙΤΑ ПРѢЛАГАЕМЪ); Zacharias (ЗАХΑΡΙΑ) and Armenian Vahan (ВААНЪ СКВОРЬНЫН — known also with the nickname 'The Fool') remained without a second name; finally Sergius- Tychicus, or in total seven "evils" in the genealogy of Paulician teaching, the last one expressively described ПО НН ЖЕ СЕДМОЕ Н КОНЬЧНОЕ ЗЛО СЕРГІЕ ВЪЗРАСТАЕТЬ. ВЪ ТΥΧΙΚΑ Н СЪ СЕБЕ ПРѢИМЕНОВА. Some couple, as this one of Sergius-Tychicus were closely connected with the names of heretic leaders, convicted until and on the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, 451 AD. The list of those heretics traditionally starts with Arius, Nestorius and famous monophysites, but includes Paul from Samosata and Lucopetrus as well, the last one declared teacher of Sergius, the alleged legendary founder of the 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), and 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 Peribleptos in his famous 11th-century *Epistle* based on authentic contemporary data²². Historically speaking, in some personali-

²⁰ N. MILADINOVA, *Panoplia Dogmatike...*, p. 4; *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 24.

²¹ In M. BERKE (*An annotated edition...*, p. 46–47) the title is reedited under number 25, and with a new textual segmentation, in our opinion, easier for pointing out separated text blocs, and for their comprehension. In his *History of Paulicians*, Peter of Sicily counts up almost the same couples of names, some of which the author skillfully parodies. One of the famous examples is Titus's name interpretation as Κῆτος, because the heretic metaphorically "hides" in the sea depths, as the animal does, but surprises unexpectedly the sailors.

²² G. FICKER, *Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Sektengeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters*, Leipzig 1908, p. 165, 211–219; M. ANGOLD, *Church and Society...*, p. 467; J. GOUILLARD, *L'hérésie dans l'Empire byzantin jusqu'au XII siècle*, TM 1, 1965, p. 299–324; A. SHARE, *Byzantine Orthodoxy and the "Preliminary fast" of the Armenians*, [in:] *Byzance. Hommage à André Stratos*, vol. II, *Théologie et Philologie*, Athènes 1986, p. 669–670.

ties, one alludes both to monophysites and to dualist heresy of Paulicianism. Name is a basic identification for one religious doctrine or another. That is way, recording names in the official *Synodikon of Orthodoxy* was already sufficient orientation mark to which of its parts a given name to be affiliated to – to the glorification or to the anathema²³. From all mentioned Paulician leaders the name of Constantine-Silvanus from Mananalis in Armenia, who lived in times of emperor Constance II (641–668), is to be specially outlined, because he was thought to have established the Christian dualism, as distinct from the Zoroastrism and the Dualism of Persian Mani (216–277)²⁴.

In S ‘the motif of renaming’ is much more simplified and easy to decode for its double-step structure. The devil’s disciples adopted new Christian names, so that the stereotype was kept by virtue of traditional view: every heresy is delusive; it seduces by apparent observation of the true Christianity, but there are irreconcilable contradictions between internal content and visible form. External signs are first-degree level of perception and could easily mislead. Renaming Sabotin and Shutil in Paul and John followed apostolic model with the difference that the second emblematic couple of names was deprived from its leadership. While in the spirit of dualism in S the devil established a parallel world on his own, and communicated as equal with famous figures of the Christianity, as Basil the Great and John Chrysostom, that is namely from him all primer causes for the Paulician delusion originated. The names Sabotin and Shutil can be met in various transcriptions, most of which arisen during the natural changing in different milieu of copying as because of technical mechanic errors, as because of the associative processes of paronymia, paronomasia, popular etymology: **САТИНЪ, СОУБОТИНЪ, САМОБАТИЕ; ШОУТИЛЬ, ШОУТИА, МОУШИНЪ, МОУШОУНЪ**. There are controversial opinions whether they originated from Slavic motivating roots (A. Miltenova points out their presumed parodic meaning from *сѣбота* ‘Saturday’ and *шоутиць* ‘jester’, but we allows us to precise that the second one must be rather understood in the meaning of ‘fool, foolish’, metaphorically ‘insane, madman’, not ‘without horn’), or they derive from Armenian names Smbat, Sumbat, Sheti, Shatila and other variants, encountered in historical works, popular legends and even in the Persian mythology²⁵. Both hypotheses reconcile to one another if one supposes

²³ И. БОЖИЛОВ, А. ТОТОМАНОВА, И. БИЛЯРСКИ, *Борилев Синодик. Издание и превод*, София 2010, p. 308, 329 – where one can read some of the above-mentioned names. Exhaustive identification and most contemporary-sourced historical information about is to be found in the quoted work: *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 10–19.

²⁴ On the given issues we shall refer again to: *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 1–4, 8 – where this distinction is pointed in a very accessible but not less scholarly exhaustive prospective. The name of Constantine-Silvanus could become familiar to Slav interpreters and men of letters according to the mention in George Hamartolus’s *Chronicle* in its Slavonic translation, *vide: Словарь древнерусского языка*, vol. VII, Москва 1980, p. 112.

²⁵ Р.М. БАРТИКЯН, *Византийская, армянская и болгарская легенды...*, p. 61.

that primary Armenian names spread in Armenian legends, once come into contact zone of the two ethnic groups, namely Slavs Bulgarians and Armenian diaspora, could be reconsidered in Slavic prospective. It should be noticed that this approach was also of great frequency in the expressive arsenal of the low-level and apocryphal literature²⁶. We could not leave without attention one echo from obviously popular legendary impact over a song from Sofia region which surprisingly refers to derivatives from the two key names in the Paulician legend. The song in question addresses to four anonymous saints the following words: *като йидете код милого Бога, споменете за йоанинска земя, за земя павликянска* (*when you go to our cherished God, mention him the land of John, the land of Paul – DA*).

c) The recorded toponymes in the Slavonic version of *PD* and *S* testify how some space-shaping and locating mechanism had been put into practice. Accordingly to both texts, one deals with the Paulicianism spread in a precise geographic area. Toponymes are not of less importance in achieving some polemic and accusatory objectives. In *PD*, the high education and knowledge of the author come out from the exact description of the sixth Paulician churches, everyone with its relevant heretic congregation and leader, together with their main centers, villages and fortresses alike. One should remind the famous H. Delehaye's conclusion that the legend obligatory possesses *une attache historique ou topographique*, because of its functional validity to the hagiographic model for the saint and its opposite register for unmasking heretic, as both sanctity and its antipode come to birth in a given space²⁷. The toponymic data increase the level of historical knowledge. *PD* tells how territories of Paulician influence had been organized into Paulician churches on the example of Jesus Christ's apostles in the following religious centers in Armenia, Pontius region in Asia Minor, Phanarolia in Byzantine Anatolia: Paulician church of Macedonia at Cibossa; this one of Achaia at Mananalis nearby Arsamosata in Armenia; Paulician church in Philippi; Laodicean church in Enargan; of Ephesius in the town Mopsuet in Cilicia, Asia Minor, and Colossean Church in Kanohorites, or Konohorion. The church names do not correspond to a real location, but follow important local points of St. Paul's missionary journey. This informational segment from the Slavonic translation follows literally the Greek original of *PD*.

In *S*, narrative plots brought together into *БЪЛГАРСКАТА ЗЕМЛЯ* (*the Bulgarian land*) with center the mention fortress of Petrich (Петръчь, Петръць, Тетръць), where the devil disciples came from Cappadocia. The 'Bulgarian land' was the territory of the subsequent story development with several controversial moments

²⁶ А. МИЛТЕНОВА, *Разобличението на дявола-граматик...*; ЕАДЕМ, *Отново за разказа...* – special focus on scholarly opinions of R. BARTIKYAN, K. UZBASHYAN and others. Р.М. БАРТИКЯН, *Византийская, армянская и болгарская легенды...*, p. 57–62; Д. РАДЕВА, *Павликяни...*, p. 20, 216–251.

²⁷ H. DELEHAYE, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, Paris² 1906, p. 6.

having allowed various interpretation among scholars. Weather the story told about John Chrysostom's arrival in 'Bulgarian land' from Constantinople, or the disciples of the devil were taken to him in Constantinople²⁸?

3. Semantic code 'the heretic teaching, the heretic philosophy, *мѣдрѣваніе*'.

a) The first substantial difference between the two sources is the lack of every hint of reference to Manichaeism as genetic base for Paulicianism in *S*. The relations with the dualistic marks of Paulician beliefs are only sub textual and allegoric. For *S* more important is to draw their ontogenesis directly from the devil, from the Evil in itself. In opposition, *PD* proclaims Manichaeism main ideological base for Paulicianism: *павлікітѣньскѣ ѣресѣ съставше· честь ѣво маніхейскаго неістовьства сѣшѣ*. The same idea is not only repeatedly outlined at various semantic levels, but is accompanied by expressive epithets of total negation and denial. From the very beginning, *PD* narrative reproduces the core of the Byzantine legend for the Paulicianism, in which the linking branch between both heresies is the mother Kaliniki *who had drunk the mire of the Manichaeen heresy*: *жена же нѣкаа каліньнкі іменемь тнню маніхейскыѣ ѣреси вѣсѣ испишшы*. In the whole title, the name of Mani and derivatives from are in frequent use multiple times. The text declares that parallels with doctrinal axioms of dualism could be found in other passages from other titles of the work: *іако ѣ двѣ начелѣ по беззмннѣ ѡнѣ, блго же ѣ лѣкавѣ· показѣ же се ѣво ѣ въ ѣмже на махен тѣтлѣ· покажет же по нѣ ѣ въ настоѣщемь по ѣныѣ разсмѣнѣ; двѣ во начелѣ исповѣдѣють іакоже маніхейскоше во дрѣгаго же ѣво быти ѣ небсѣнаго ѡца· ѣгоже ѣ здешнаго вѣсего ѡвластнѣ лшавая· дрѣгаго же сѣдѣтеля мнрѣ, ѣмже ѣ ѡвласть настоѣщаго вѣка дарѣють*. The main sign of the absolute dualism of *Paulicians* is the belief of two principles and the idea that the celestial father God has not power over the present material world but will have over the coming. The dualistic motivation is confirmed by *PD* structure in which the first book from the two-volume treatise describes 16 heresies from the past, putting Mani and Manichaeism immediately after Jews and Symeon Magus of Samarea, regarded as founder and prime source of all heresies. At the same time, *PD* leans on basic Biblical quotations, references and dictums with general validity to summarize the anti-heretic attitude in surviving semantic fields, as the Gospel parable from Matth. 13: 37–40: *сѣен доброе сѣме ѣ снѣ члѣкы· село же ѣ мнрѣ· доброе же сѣме снѣ сѣть снѣве црѣтвіа· плѣвелн же ѣво сѣ снѣве лѣкаваго· враг же сѣен тѣ ѣ дѣаволь*. Natural for all kind of popular literature, the opposition between good and evil is basic for the studied legendary narrative too.

²⁸ K. Stanchev draws a special attention to the possible interpretations of this passage accordingly to copies' testimonies. К. СТАНЧЕВ, *Павликянците...*, p. 767.

The genealogic relationship between Manichaeism and Paulicianism is drawn on the level of ideological axiom, although *PD* narrative refers to dogmatic disputes and heterodoxies inside Paulicianism, denial of Mani and veneration of the Paulician teachers as Jesus' apostles and διδάσκαλοι. It turned into reason for politic courses the Byzantine central power had undertaken as early as the Paulicianism came to birth in the mid-7th century and onwards, by promulgation of civil laws and procedures against the heresy of Manichaeans, which consequently had been applied to Paulician heresy, treating it as Neomanichaeism. Most eloquent examples were the *Ecloga* of Byzantine emperors iconoclast Leo III Isaurian (717–741) and his co-ruler Constantine V Copronymus (720–740; emperor from 741 to 775), and later, about 870–879, the *Procheiros nomos* of emperor Basil I Macedonian and his sons Constantine († 879) and Leo, the future emperor Leo VI the Wise (886–912). Both provided the death penalty for crimes against the Christian faith. In times of Basil I, who led successful war against *Paulicians* and subjected of their territories, special repressions were applied upon Manichaeans and Donatists. *Procheiros nomos* punished to death by sword former Christians turned into Manichaean heresy no matter of their social position and dignity; the same punishment as prevention was applied to all who knew about but did not bring information to the authorities. Social stigma laid upon Manichaeans even after someone's death, and his heirs, except children, even though Orthodox, were deprived of legacy in favor of the state treasure²⁹.

b) The semantic code 'teaching through teachers and books' deserves some special attention being present in both texts but in a different way. In *S*, it is essential motive. The whole story begins with devil's transformation into grammarian, wise men with as beautiful appearance as nice the writing he produced looked like. The beauty of letters, in this case, signifies wisdom of mind too. In the prospective of medieval Slavonic lexis, some words, adjectives in particular, belong to both esthetic and ethic sphere of reference³⁰. But in the logic of the plot and its rebuking line, the apparent occurs to be delusive, likewise the books diabolic. As early as the first apocrypha appeared, for instance *King Abgar's Letter to Jesus*, 'Written Word' was perceived emanation of *Logos*, and was credited by stronger and more durable power. In accordance, the heretic writing with function of dogma, teaching, should be denied entirely and forever. It was not hazardous in *S* John Chrysostom to have recognized evil-intended nature merely by looking at the written text/letter sent to him much before he saw the face, because *every act, ordered and magnificent, does*

²⁹ I. ЗЕПОС, Р. ЗЕПОС, *Jus Graecoromanum*, vol. 2, *Leges imperatorum Isaurorum et Macedonum*, Athen 1931 [= Aalen 1962], p. 219. The Serbian *Ilovica kormchaya* from 1262, when the Slavonic translation of the whole *Procheiros nomos* appeared, kept all those juridical regulations.

³⁰ Т.И. Вендина, *Средневековый человек в зеркале старославянского языка*, Москва 2012, p. 91.

not come from Man, but from Devil, as stated in the legend³¹. Therefore, the final of *S*, already located in *the Bulgarian land*, reminds once again that, as in the very beginning, when the devil created writings, his serves, renamed but not changed by nature *started teaching people with books*, namely to spread their dogma and beliefs. Several variants in *S*-copies allowed to shape the so called Paulician literacy and “enemy science”: *вражидъ надѣкъ надъчихъ, вражен закон възаше, вражю науку ұзали и писмо*³².

PD englobes detailed information about the development of the heretic movement by organizing meetings, or ‘Paulician councils’, mostly in the meaning of sect-participant assembly, intended to choose apostles, discussing dogma or some wavelengths of heterodoxy and heteropraxy. Frequent uses of words and expressions are *оучительство, пастырѣ, припроповѣдѣють, проповѣтки прѣлагають* and so on. It is to outline that Zigabenus’s encyclopedia of anti-heretic knowledge sets equally out the second more plausible and non-legendary version about the real dogmatic start of Paulicianism with its first scholarly acknowledged founder Constantine Silvanus, official leader of the sect who, in spite of being elected by Paulician assembly, kept his dogmatic revelations in secret. It is not difficult to recognize the motive ‘secret heretic dogma’ among other *topoi* in the overall anti-heretic literature: *дрогое ѿстѣплєнїа съимнше себѣ рѣкополагають дѣнтелиа, съ же дѣо съ лютеѣншыи злодѣнствєва^т недръзнѣтаа. ѣретнчѣскаа дѣо мѣдрованїа писанїѣ прѣдаты не сѣка. ѡбнчаем же ѣ честїинь дѣнтельствѣ ѡ дѣтерѣднєв тѣнновѣство вавшыи се дръжатн.*

c) We reach now the semantic code ‘signs of Paulician dogma’, as expected, truly and exhaustively present in *PD*. In *S*, some allusions for appear, but in conformity with the narrative objectives, they are not set apart in a polemic block bur rather interlace into the plot. The episode in the church during the liturgy on which John Chrysostom invited the devil to unmask him, shows gradually its self-destruction (shattered in pieces) by force of Christian formula and rituals *Paulicians* do not respect. The text implies the following practices: unacceptance of the church oblations, denial of the Theotokos and the sacrament of liturgy, as the pronunciation of the name of God has a death effect upon the devil. This is a clear allusion to dualism. Very interesting passage is the final of *S* claiming that John Chrysostom ordered to strip the skins from devil’s disciples (*повеле ѡдрахѣ имѣ кожѣ ѡти еѣ кожа крѣщєна павличанє; повеле снаше с нихъ кожи крѣщєна павликине; повелѣ ѡдирати кожи ихъ понеже бѣшѣ кожи ихъ крѣстни* – and other variants). *Paulicians* thought this act had made them martyrs and authorized them to take Christian apostle’s names, but the text concluded that all this was for the sake of their enemy law and teaching. K. Stanchev has wright to outline two elements in mutual connection: the fact that in the final story, in Cappadocia, devil’s books were burn,

³¹ Д. Петканова, *Народно четиво...*, р. 303 – undoubted dualistic allusion.

³² К. Станчев, *Павликяните...*, р. 767.

but his disciples received mercy as Christian sons; the second episode implied the stripping off the skins because once baptized, they should be treated apostates. Every heretic is a wolf in a skin of sheep. The very metaphor of changing, or taking skin is typical and wide-spread in the anti-heretic polemic, including in concrete accusations to *Paulicians*³³. At the same time, we should remind the motive of stripping the skin in Peter of Sicily's narrative in regard with Mani, who suffered identical punishment accordingly to the Persian customer law: his body was thrown away to beasts, his skin hang down as a sack³⁴. From one side, it seems to us that *S* keeps some reminiscences from historically controversial attitude to *Paulicians* during different periods, as from their strong claims to be called true Christians by wright. *Paulicians* were as persecuted heretics as rehabilitated Christians from the central Byzantine power. As early as the 8th century, in Leo III's reign (717–741), the process in 730 in Constantinople against the already mentioned Timothy was initiated not because of iconoclast intentions, as *Paulicians* were strongly opposed to all religious images, but rather aimed at examining his loyalty of provincial heretic leader³⁵. The process ended by his rehabilitation as Orthodox given to him directly from the then Byzantine patriarch. The heretic leader gained credit of trust because he adroitly succeeded in putting into operation allegoric perceptions of Christian dogma. Later, as it was referred to Alexius I Comnenus, other Byzantine emperors had also success in converting *Paulicians* to Orthodoxy. On the other hand, the possible lines of interpretation by analogy between historical setting and legendary fabula could not be neglected because the legend has already been a complex amalgam of fiction and polyvalent semiotic codes of historical memory, some of which transform themselves into traveling motives.

PD enters deeply into Paulician doctrine, outlining *многоплетенниѣ* (poly-interlaced, complex, mixed, made by various things) character of their teaching and the projection of already existing postulates: *НЕ Ѡ ЕДННІЕ ЖЕ Н'ККОЕѢ ПР'КЛѢСТН НЪ Ѡ МНОГЫН Н РАЗЛЧНЫН МНОГОПЛЕТЕННОЕ СІЕ СЪСТАВН СЕ ЁРЕШ СЪСТАВЛЕНІА ДРОВАНІЕ*. We shall give in schema with key words some emblematic dualistic statements. M. Berke divides *PD* title against *Paulicians* into 12 subtitles³⁶, the last seven with strongly dogmatic character laying upon excerpts from John Damascene's *Expositio fidei*, Basil the Great's *De Spiritu Sancto*, Gregory of Nazianzus' *In Sanctum Baptisma*, and Gregory of Nyssa's *Oratio catechetica magna*. In BAR 296, they are fully presented as follows³⁷:

³³ К. СТАНЧЕВ, *Павликяните...*, p. 767. Peter of Sicily tells how *Paulicians* change their appearance as polypod, or chameleon, speaking one thing by mouth, one another by heart. Р. БАРТИКЯН, *Петр Сицилійски...*, p. 340.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 326 – text edition in Russian translation, p. 21.

³⁵ *Christian Dualist Heresies...*, p. 15–16.

³⁶ М. БЕРКЕ, *An annotated edition...*, p. 47–50.

³⁷ As it will be proved, this text portion originated from 25th chapter in the Greek *PD*. In Berke's shema both are unified.

- f. 309r–311r: *Їѡ Дамаскинѡ ѿ крѣтѣ;*
 f. 311r–312r: *О стѣѣ крѣщенїи, Великаго Василиѡ ѿ ѡже къ амфѣлѡху іконїискомѣ тридѣсетый главизнь;*
 f. 312r–312v: *Бѡслововѡ ѿ слова повелителнаго, на крѣщенїе;*
 f. 312v–314r: *И ѡще ѡ крѣщенїи нѣскаго григорїа ѿ огласителнаго слова;*
 f. 314r–316v: *И ѡще ѡ крѣщенїи (in marginal left side дамаскиново);*
 f. 316v–319r: *Нѣскаго Григорїа ѡ въсприетїи влѣчнаго тѣла и крѣве, ѿ ѡгласителнаго слова;*
 f. 319r–322v: *И ѡще ѡ въсприетїи влѣчнаго тѣла и крѣве, дамаскиновѡ.*

Precedent dualistic views from Paulician doctrine are:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>Paulicians</i> respect two divine causes as Manichaeans do – celestial father and creator of the world; good and evil (in Slavonic благо и лоукаво); hence, the world originated from the devil. | δύο ἄρχαι, δεῦτε βο начелѣ.. бѡ небсѣнаго ѡца, дрѣгаго же съдѣтелема линос |
| 2. <i>Paulicians</i> called themselves Christian but do not believe in Holy Trinity. | Рекоше дръзостнѣ ꙗко анафема да есѣтъ ѡлци вѣрѣютъ въ ѡца и сѣна и стѣаго дѣа. |
| 3. They defame Theotokos calling her 'Heavenly Jerusalem'. | хѣлеще же прѣстѣѣ влѣцѣс...внешнын прѣтварѣютъ іерусалимь. |
| 4. <i>Paulicians</i> reject the communion. | рекоше тѣлаѡ и крѣвь лѣжесловѣствѣюще влѣнїе глѣи |
| 5. <i>Paulicians</i> reject the cross. | нстннїи же крѣтъ ꙗкоже дрѣвѡ рекоше и злодѣнствннѣ съсѣ. |
| 6. <i>Paulicians</i> deny the Old Testament. | и сѣеннїе прѣрокы и всѣ древнее пїсанїе, и ннѣ ѡбращѣютъ стѣнї. |
| 7. They defame apostle Peter as apostate from Christ. | на и паче же врьховнаго апѣлѡ пѣтра злохѣлеть, |
| 8. <i>Paulicians</i> corrupt St. Paul's writings. | и дѣанїа апѣлѣска и съборна не всѣн ѡ ннѣ съставляютъ дрѣгыннѣ |
| 9. They deny the Holy Church. | съборнѣс же црѣкѣ своа и нарнчѣтъ сънѣлнцѣа. |

10. They reject the baptism. И СПСНОЕ ѿплъкѣаѡ ꙗже крѣщенїе прѣтвараюѡт се прѣматн тѡ
11. They do not admit the clergy. НН ЖЕ СЪБОРНІЕ ЦРѢКВЕ ПРЕСВѢТЕРН НН ЖЕ ПРОЧЕЕ СЦѢННИКЫ ПРѢМАЮТЬ
12. They live in drunkenness and debauchery. ПѢАНТВѢ ЖЕ Н БЛДѢЖНТІЕ ВЪСЕИ ЗДАНО ИМѢТЬ
13. Of special attention is the theological controversy against Paulician idea on the genesis of evil from darkness and fire, and on fire as devil's creation. Zigabenus defends all perceptible world (чювьствѣно) originated from Demiurges God. The conclusion is marked with cinnabar to signalize an especially important passage on f. 286r: И҃КО НЕ ДВ҃Ѣ НАЧЕЛ҃Ѣ, Н҃Ъ ЁДНН҃Ь СЪД҃ѢТЕЛЬ НЕВ҃Ъ И ЗЕМЛН҃ И И҃ЖЕ ПОСР҃ѢД҃Ѣ:

What has been stated insofar reveals the common grounds of the medieval dualistic heresies of Manichaeism, Paulicianism, and Bogomilism which caused their mutual replacement in terms of both dogmatic and nominative prospective. By its geographic origin in Armenia, Christian dualistic teaching of Paulicianism affiliates to Armenian heresy too. Those multi-directional relations transformed it in universal dualistic code. In previous publications, we had the occasion to expose some conclusions based upon Slavonic translated sources of Canon law discipline how the term 'Paulician' became hyperonymic one for representative of heresy, or dualistic heresy in a whole. Data base provided concentrate into so called 'Pseudo-Zonaras penitential nomocanon', the Nomocanon of *Slavia Orthodoxa*, with rules referring to Paulicians, alongside with Jacobites, Armenians and Bogomils, Patarens, as well as against Paul of Samosata (260–272) and Paulicians who are most pitoyable among all heretics – иже горши соутъ всѣхъ еретикъ³⁸. In this way, in this translated Slavonic source the references to Paulicians count three cases, mostly prohibitions against communication, eating and drinking with them. Another example from 14th century Russian *Troitski miscellany* copied upon a Southern Slavic protograph replaced the more frequent appellation еретикуъ with specific term: игоуменъ да не выгонитъ изъ монастыра никогоѡ, тѣкмо иже боудеть павликѣанинъ (*Abbot should not chase away somebody except he is Paulician*)³⁹.

³⁸ M. TSIBRANSKA-KOSTOVA, M. RAYKOVA, *Les Bogomiles et (devant la Loi). Les sources slaves de droit canonique à propos de l'hérésie aux XIV–XV ss.*, RESEE 49.1, 2011, p. 15–33; M. ЦИБРАНСКА-КОСТОВА, *Покаяната книжнина на Българското средновековие IX–XVIII в. (езиково-текстологични и културологични аспекти)*, София 2011, p. 259–380.

³⁹ J. POPOVSKI, F. THOMPSON, W. VEDER, *The Troickiy sbornik (cod. Moskva, GBL, F.304, Troice-Sergieva lavra N 12). Text in transcription*, ПМК 21/22, 1988, p. 52.

Some notes on the Slavonic translation of *PD* accordingly chapter 21st

1. The chapter against *Paulicians* with original numbering 24, in some Greek manuscripts merges with the subsequent one intitled *On the Saint Cross, Saint Baptism, and the Secret of Eucharist*. This is a pure dogmatic exposition whose Slavonic translation was frequently used in Orthodox theological controversies in the 17th century. Nevertheless, the opposite Greek textual tradition, attested by majority of sources, comprises the independent existence of 25th title separately from the precedent⁴⁰. BAR 296 must have been copied upon a Greek apograph belonging to the first line of text spreading. The Slavonic manuscript attests the union between original Greek titles 24th and 25th without use of any mark to separate visibly them. In this way, as true final of the Paulician account should be considered f. 309r (*PG*, col. 1243–1244). Consequently, the statement that the title 25th of Greek *PD* is missing from Bucharest manuscript, should be corrected⁴¹. It is an integral part of the Slavonic translation, and takes place in the 21st Slavonic title against *Paulicians*.

2. Nina Gagova formulated an important conclusion on the scribe's attention to both Slavonic translation of *PD*, and its copy BAR 296, as far as she claimed translator and copyist to have been identic person⁴². We consider this hypothesis reliable and supported by the marginal note on f. 193v, published for the first time also in Gagova's works. The note gives reasons to suppose that the anonymous man of letters not only translated *PD*, but tried to fill up gaps in his prime Greek source by consulting another Greek copy from Vatopedi monastery on Mount Athos. Because the scribe tells the readers he has taken the copy from there – и възъмь изъ Ватопеда тѣѣже книги, it is hardly plausible to presume another explanation except copying to have been located on Mount Athos too. In that optics, the act gives evidence to the mutual relations between monastic Athonite communities. The given testimony coincides with commonly expressed scholarly evaluation that the scribe's handwriting reminds a hesychast scripture, namely Greek-made semi-cursive, typical for monks hesychasts in Tărnovo and on Holly Mountain. Other self-written marginal notes reveal specific moments of copyist's work: he corrected himself for not putting cinnabar on the wright place; made comments on Greek words. Gagova's opinion of translator's working copy, illustrating the process of translation, remains the most plausible insofar. Slavonic chapter 21st is not supplied by marginal notes, except on f. 307v above ици въ дръвѣ⁴³, which may refer to the second Greek source, so that the given information from 21st chapter

⁴⁰ N. MILADINOVA, *Panoplia Dogmatike*..., p. 102.

⁴¹ К. ИВАНОВА, *О славянском переводе*..., p. 102.

⁴² Once again, the author exposed all noted by her peculiarities in: Н. ГАГОВА, *Владетели и книги*..., p. 136–137.

coincides with scribe complaints on f. 148r for lacunas in the first Greek apograph. However, inside the main text, one can observe some corrections or hesitations over the choice of words and constructions, as found in other parts of the manuscript. We shall draw attention only to one significant passage from *PD* accordingly Photius's beginning of the original 24th title, which tries to explain the difference between Paulician absolute dualism and Orthodox Christians' faith, called ρημιλιανη (in Greek *Romaions*). The scribe's self-correction element is as follows: ἡ ἡζκε θεο πο ἡστηνηκ εσψεε χριστηϊανη, ρημιλιανη τρη ω κα | εσζηνηη ημενδϋτη, f. 282v, for Greek τρισαλιτηριοι (*PG*, col. 1193). We shall add some more preliminary opinions and ideas:

- the scribe–translator uses individual marks of stylized effect inside text or in the last line when writing comes out of it; applies modest decoration of small cinnabar initials for text segmentation; carries out an attentive philological work, reconciling constantly the Greek original. Most probably he wrote long time, changed the ink and the letters size (f. 221v–222r; 223v–224r) in order to conform with his paper material. The supplementary watermark ‘enclume’ in 21st title from BAR 296, alongside with ‘dragon’, gives perhaps favor to this supposition. These are two of the sixth watermarks in total, which allow the dating of BAR 296 between 1410–1420r⁴³;
- the predominant amount of marginal notes represents portions of the basic *PD* text, but there are also some comments and explanations. Among the philological ones, some of the more interesting are the substitution of the gr. λεκτριωνη in the main text on f. 90r with the marginal gloss пѣтъль, or the marginal планите to explain the difficult Greek astronomic names πλινκῖ ἡ ἔσπεροςκ ἡ ἄρκτωροςκ on f. 128r in the frames of the 13th title against Appolinarius. A special attention deserves the fact that on ff. 237v–238r the scribe scratches the beginning of the 18th title, which was not placed appropriately before the 16th, but further copies it on the correct place on f. 245r in revised version in regard to the wrong beginning. Thus, in BAR 296, one faces “a critical spot” of the textual history which illustrates once again the process of translation. The most plausible reason for is the uses of two Greek sources;
- it seems to us that the scribe's explanation about the translation of Greek prepositions and conjunctions with Slavonic synonyms, witnesses to the special attention towards the correctness of the verbal sign. This is a typical element of the hesychast logos paradigm. Besides the already described by Gagova case of the couple ень–въ at several places in the manuscript, the same approach refers to the conjunction και–и in the extended explanatory note on f. 61r;

⁴³ Л. ВАСИЛЬЕВ, М. ГРОЗДАНОВИЋ-ПАЈИЋ, Б. ЈОВАНОВИЋ-СТИПЧЕВИЋ, *Ново датирање српских рукописа у Библиотеци румунске академије наука*, АПри 2, 1980, р. 56, № 60.

– interesting lexics and uses, as for instance the way *Paulicians* called Orthodox priests and presbyters **СЪЮТЪХОДЪНИЦИ** and **НОТАРИИ**; everywhere **ОБЛАСТЪ** instead of **ВЛАСТЪ**; **ДЪЛАТЕЛЪНИЦА** in the meaning of ‘place of action’ for Greek **ἐγγραστέρια**, in the context the village of Mananalis was called that way. The frequent comparatives and superlatives are another translating feature **ВРВВР-СТВНЪШЕ, ЛЮТЪКИШЕ, ПО ЛННОГОУ**.

The current observations have only preliminary character but allow us to shape the anonymous scribe as personality with deep notions in Greek and very punctual to his Greek sources.

Conclusion

The two analyzed texts reveal various and purposely-intended data base over the *Paulicians* and Paulicianism, but also some partly intertextual coherence in the basic mechanisms on how the image of the heretics has been shaped. This image, as stated not once in terms of all heresies, came from adversaries and opponents, but this is namely the medieval heresiology in its both highest models and low-level apocryphal branches of literature to remain the most valuable, sometimes unique witness of one heresy background, lifetime and destiny. Analyzing stereotypes of religious and confessional alterity is an adequate perspective methodic and could be applied to various heretic deviations from the sein of Christianity, which were also described and recorded in translated or original medieval texts of different genres (Bogomils, Latins, and so on). This is one of the possible interpretative strategies and approaches, preceded by reliable sourcing and comprehensive historical and philological account, in regard of the Slavonic translation of Zigabenus’s *Panoplia Dogmatica* we do believe forthcoming.

Appendix 1

English translation of S upon the Slavonic copy and its Polish translation in: *Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła słowiańskie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2015 [= *Series Ceranea*, 1], p. 228–231. The translation is made by Marek Majer, to whom I own a great debt of gratitude.

Sermon on the origin of the Paulicians. John Chrysostom’s sermon on how the Paulicians came to be

Bless us, father!

The devil fashioned himself as a grammarian of great comeliness and wisdom, meek, of a gentle speech. And he came to Saint Basil. And Saint Basil, seeing the remarkably fine writing of his hands – such as he had never seen before – and

seeing him so humble, rejoiced deeply, for he did not know that it was the devil. And the devil wanted to deceive Basil. Basil took to him greatly and entrusted him to write books. The devil took two disciples from among the people and wrote magnificent books in Saint Basil's home, so that Basil was overjoyed with him and said to the devil: "O grammarian, write a manuscript with your hand, so that I can send it to our patriarch John Chrysostom; let him see what grammarian I have". The devil wrote it, and Saint Basil sent it to John, saying: "Look, my lord, what grammarian I have. And when you see his fair appearance, you will come to love him greatly." Having received the letter, John recognized that it was of the devil, and he replied to Saint Basil with the words: "It is indeed a good grammarian that you have. I shall come to see him myself too, so that I might rejoice in him." Then the devil revealed[, living in Basil's home⁴⁵]. John, having arrived with all his servants and all his gifts for the church, entered Basil's home[, and they blessed each other].

Basil said: "O my lord, I shall bring before you my grammarian, so that you may see him". Chrysostom answered: "Do bring him!". And John saw the devil, who had made himself appear fair, and he recognized all his deeds.

John entered the temple; having assumed the throne he cried bitterly and said: "O Almighty, our God Jesus Christ, bestow on us heavenly force so that I might crush this devil." Basil said⁴⁶: "Indeed, nowhere is there another grammarian like this one." John kept on watching the devil, summoned everybody to the temple, brought all the church gifts inside and sealed all of the temple treasures with the name of Christ; [afterwards] Saint John entered to celebrate the holy liturgy. When he said "Gospel"⁴⁷, the devil became greatly distressed; Basil saw this and became frightened. When they were bringing the Holy Gifts⁴⁸, the devil turned scary and hit the ceiling of the church, after which he fell to the ground again; all the people became confused and panicked. Saint John was bolstering their spirits. And when he said "especially {for our Most Holy}⁴⁹" – at that moment the devil filled the whole temple; and when he said "the only light"⁵⁰ – then the devil exploded.

Having exited the church, John said: "O Basil, do you not see what kind of grammarian you have? Do you not know, father, that everything in the world that is exceptional and unseemly to the people comes from the devil?" Having collected all of the books written by the devil, they burned them in fire. Basil said to John: "O my lord, what shall become of these two who are his disciples?" John answered: "They are Christian sons, let us protect them until we see what happens, whether

⁴⁵ The most important supplements based on other manuscripts are provided in square brackets.

⁴⁶ In some manuscripts: "John said".

⁴⁷ Part of the liturgy of the Word; a call made before reading the Gospel pericope.

⁴⁸ The so-called Great Entrance during the liturgy – the bringing of the Holy Gifts from the Table of Oblation to the altar.

⁴⁹ Part of the prayer during the Anaphora, dedicated to the Theotokos.

⁵⁰ Another prayer during the Anaphora.

they follow the Christian path.” One of them was called Samobatus, and the other Shutiya; the devil’s name was Upael.

The two disciples of the devil rose and came from Cappadocia to *the Bulgarian land*, and having adopted the apostolic name of Paul, they taught the Bulgarians to worship Paul. And thus the people who accepted this law call themselves *Paulicians*.

Looking for them, John left Constantinople and came to Petrich, where the Theotokos appeared to him in bright light[, as queen]. He sent envoys and they brought these *Paulicians* from *the Bulgarian land*, and on his orders, they were flayed alive, since their skin was baptized and the *Paulicians* considered themselves to be suffering excruciating torments for Christ⁵¹. And then they were calling themselves *Paulicians*, because [they accepted] the enemy’s teaching. Saint Basil⁵² said: “Accursed be the evil teacher’s disciple”.

To our God be the glory forever and ever, amen, amen, amen.

Appendix translated by Marek Majer

Appendix 2

Text sample from the 21st title against Paulicianism accordingly BAR 296, f. 280r–292r, and the true final of the title with the last paragraph concerning directly *Paulicians* on f. 308v–309r, just before the merge with the original 25th title of the Greek *PD*. The extended Slavonic text does not allow to be published entirely, neither objectives of the current subject require. We follow the practice of several partial editions and translations, quoted in the study, dealing also with text samples and purposefully chosen text illustrations. A partial new Bulgarian translation of the *PD* title against *Paulicians* could be found in Д. РАДЕВА, *Павликяни и павликянство в българските земи. Архетип и повторения VII–XVII в.*, София 2015, p. 521–534.

Editorial marks are: | for line ending; || for page ending. The original orthography and segmentation remain unchanged; original text in vermilion rendered here in bold type.

ff. 280r–292r

тѣтаѡ ·ка· на глѣмые павлікїанї: ѡ нже | фѡтїа блженѣншаго прїаѡрха констан|
тїна града ~ Самобата гра | ѿ сурїнскын· въ немже древле манїхенское | вънесе се
мѡдрованїе· жена же нѣкаа калїнннн|кї ѿменемь тнню манїхенскыє ѣрешъ въсѣ |
нспнвшы, двѣ ражають отрочетн павла | н іѡ· снн матерь подражавше нераство-
ре|нїн ѡстѡпленїе сеѡ гадь въспрнеше· видѣвше | же сн съѡстѡпннн прѣспѣвающнн
въ нечѣстїн | н срѣнѣншын, проповѣккы прѣлагають | н зчнтеле· снн же н нна
прнзмнслнвшє бєззѣстна н скверьнна н гвентелна веленїа, | павлікїаньскєѡ ѣрєшъ

⁵¹ In some manuscripts: “although their skin was baptized, and the *Paulicians* considered themselves holy”. According to the tradition, a similar fate was shared by the founder of the Manichaean religion.

⁵² In some manuscripts: “John”.

съставнше· честь ѿ бо манїхенскаго неистовьства сѣшѣ, нѣ|кыниин же приложеньми
 съвзрастѣшѣ, | ѿ сн же збо двоѣ паўла н ѿ ѿ, зченнкѡ н прнн|менованїе || павлі|кїанѡ
 възложн· съложнвшеє се варварствнѣнше, н вьмѣсто паўло іѡане, павлі|кїанн
 нменшют се· врѣменн же мнмошѣшѣ | дрѣгоє ѡтѣпленїа съмнше севѣ рѣкопо|ла-
 гають зчнтелїа· нже кѡнстантїнн нме|нше, вь сїлѣана себе прѣк|менова· таже |
 н сего по прѣмногѣ ѡ каллінікѣннѣ ѡтро|кн нже ÷ ѡтѣпленїа застѣпннцн, на
 прѣ|днаа ѡводеть· сѣ же збо сѣ лютѣншыи зло|дѣнствѡвѣ н недрѣзнѣтаа-
 ѣретнчскаа ѿ бо мѣдрованїа писанїѣ прѣдаты не смѣа· | ѡбнчаем же н честїнмь
 зчнтельствѡ ѿтврѣднвѣ таинѡѡтѣвоавшыи се дрѣ|жати не прѣврѣжѣна
 бл҃гочестїа прѣлагають таинѣства· е҃влїе же збо н апостолѣ та|же н бжѣнныи лѡвзае-
 ть н почнтають хрї|стїаньскыи съборѣ, напнсаннѣ смнмь прѣдастѣ· | рѣчнн же збо
 н нменьмы нчтоже велнко прѣ|мѣнае нн же поѡскврнѡвае слѡва ѡбра|зѣ такоже
 ѡленѣтїань н дрѣсн, вьсь же разѣлмь бл҃гочестїа развращае н сквршае, н вьса тво-
 ре н прнвлаче къ ѡтѣпленїа своего | мѣдрованїѣ· н рѣчн збо, такоже рече давають
 дрѣжаты бжѣнаго е҃влїа н апостола· нн | же приложеньмы нн же ѡмаленьмы вестѣнѣ
 || растлѣвае· прнсьвькѣплатѣть же снмь н | прнвьлагають ѡмншленїа, нмже не
 прн|кладѣтѣтѣ, нчтоже ѡ сѣпннн глѣ· ннедн|ноже смнмь послѣдованїе кѣпнозрнт
 се· | ратѣют се къ дрѣгѣ дрѣгѣ н сѣпротнвѡплатїют се· сїа же збо прѣлагае нчтоже нно
 тѣ | прочнтаты паче е҃влїа н апостола повелѣ|нїе полагають· н ѡвѣ збо по врѣменн
 съра|стан се дшею множае паче тѣлесє· по сїлѣанѣ же снмьнн злѣѣ злочѣствѡаго
 зчнтел|ства прѣстастѣтѣ· тїта н тѣ себе прѣк|меновав· по нн же армѣнннн генесїе
 нменемь | прѣпрозѡв се вь тїмѡфеа· н четврѣтн іѡ|снфѣ· нже вь е҃пафрѡдїта прѣла-
 гаемь· та|же захарїа емѣже не мнвшаа честь е҃ресн | мьздѣ ѡбладають· н зчнтельска-
 го тѣ | прѣначельства недостоїна· шестїн тѣ | прнвывають ваанн скврнныи· по нн
 же сїдмоє н коньчноє злѡ сѣргїе възростають· | вь тѣхїка н сѣ себе прѣк|менова· н
 нже збо | ѡтѣпленїа тѣ зчнтеле· ѡнелнже паўло|ва н ѿ прѣк|менованїа ползчн
 ѡтѣпннн сѣ | н хѡннѡвнѣтннн съборѣ, даже до е҃гоже до | на прншѣшаго лѣта на
 толнко пронзѡвѡше· | ѡно же збо достоїнть разѣмѣты нже ннѣ || ѡтѣпленїа сего
 дѣтн вьнегда же самїе | кто нстезѣтѣ начелннкы таковыє ѡтрь|гнѣты мрѣзостн-
 манента збо н паўла | н ѿ н нѣкыє ннн зсрѣно анафематїсзуютѣ· | кѡнстантїна же
 е҃гоже н сїлѣана нарчѣ· | н снмьнн е҃гоже тїта· н генесїа е҃гоже тїмѡфеа· н іѡснфа
 е҃гоже е҃пафрѡдїта· н скврннѡаго ваана· н сѣргїа е҃гоже тѣхїка, ннка|кѡже ннгдеже
 анафематнсатн прнѣмлю: | н такоже хѡнн апостолн, н бл҃гочестїа | зчнтеле лѡвзают
 же н прнѣмлють· н вь|сн не вьсѣ реченннн пѡвнѣ почнтають· н | нже збо даже до
 ваана н сѣргїа съходешнн· | по равенстн похвалають· ѡ онѣдѣже ра|стрѡгшѣ вь
 сѣпротнвѡворнїе двѣ чѣстн· ѡ|вы збо ваана, сїн же вѡттвореще сѣргїа на | толнкѣ
 е҃же на дрѣгѣ дрѣга рѣвенїе н раздѣ|рь ѡтврѣднвше· тако н до самѡ закланїа про|нзнтн
 тѣ лѡвѡпрнтелнѡе· шестѣ же збо | тѣ црѣквн нповѣдѣзютѣ· ѡ ннже збо маке|донїѣ
 нарчѣтѣ· ахаїѣ же вторѣс· н тре|тїѣ фїлїппсїнскѣ· по сн же лаѡдїкїнскѣ· н | петѣ
 е҃фесїнскѣ· коньчноє же коласїнскѣ· | н нмена збо сѣтъ градѡвѣ нмже н дрѣвнєе |
 познанїе нмаше пїсанїе· н бжѣннн вьспомен | павль· || ѡвы же, нчтоже нельствн-

но нн кръчьмствено | любѡпрещѣ ѡставнты. нн же ѣланка зрѣнїе|мь ѡблнчаюѡт се. нн же снмы ѡмнлѣмь, | македонїѡ збо ѡменюють. градьць нѣ|кын малъ колонїнскы, нарнцѣемь кїѡсса. | въ немже кѡнстантїнѣ ѡже ѡ сїлѡанъ ѡтѡплѣнїе надчн. селѡ самоѡаско ѣ манѡлн | нарнцѣемое ѣже генесїа ѡже ѡ тїмофеѡва | ѡчнтелства въ дѣла- телннца. селѡ ахаїѡ прнѡменюють. ѣлнцн же іѡснфа ѣгоже | ѡ пафрѡдїта ѡ захарїе наѣмннка ѣмѡже | по тѣк пастнрѡ оучнтеле выше, снмь фїліппїсннскю напїсѡють. ѡмже збо въ ѣнаргаїн | граѡѡ малѡ лаѡднкїнскю прнпроповѣ|дѡють. ѡ ѡмже въ моѡѡестїн, въ ѣфесїнскю | прѣпрнтвараюѡтъ. ѡкоже ѡ глѣмье кнѡхѡ|рїты въ кола- сннскѡ възнашаюѡтъ. трем же, | црѡквамь ѡ нарѡ ѡ ѡчнтелствѡ сѣргїѡ ѣмѡ н тї|хннск възложнше. нѡ ѡчнтелствѡ збо ѡ глѣмье | тѣк црѡквн, въ сн. не ѡ ѣдннїе же нѣко- ѣѣ прѣлѣстн | нѡ ѡ многы ѡ разлнчны ѡмнопалетеное сїѣ | съставн се ѣречн съ- ставленїа дѡрѡванїе. двѣ | во начелѣ ѡсповѣдѡють ѡкоже манїхѣн. ре|коше во дрѡга- го же збо бытн бѡ невѡнаго ѡца. | ѣгоже ѡ здѣшнаго въсѣго ѡвластнѡ лншаваюѡ. || дрѡгаго же съдѣтелѡ мїрѡ, ѣмже ѡ ѡвласть | настоѣщаго вѣка дарѡють. ѡ ѡже збо по ѡстнннѣ сѡше хрїстїанн, рнмлнн трѣ ѡ ка | сѡженїн ѡменюють. сѡѣ же званїе ѣгоже тѡжн | въсма ѡстрошїѣ хрїстїанское прнсьвѡ|плаюѡтъ. глѡт же ѡца ѡ снѡ ѡ сѡго дѡа. | рѣчн збо блѡгочствннмы. прнтварающе | же снмь посѣлѣнее нечѣстїе. не во ѡкоже бїкїа | съворнаа ѡ апѡстѡлскаа црѡквн такѡ ѡ снн м|дрѡствѡюще глѡють. нѡ рѣчн ѡ ѡнѡдѡ ѡтрѣ|гнѡвшѣ злѡчнствннмы разлнчнны сїѣ злѡхшннѣ глѡють. ѡ рекоше дрѡзостннѣ ѡко ѡна|ѡема да бѡдѡтъ ѣлнцн вѣрѡють въ ѡца ѡ | снѡ ѡ сѡго дѡа. ѡца не въсѣдрѡжнтелѡ ѡ творїца неѡѡ ѡ землн. внднмым же въѡѣ ѡ невндн|мы- мь въспрѡповѣдѡюще. нѡ ѡца глѡюще, не|вѡнаго ѡвїе прнськѡплающе. ѣмѡже ѡ гос- пѡ|ствѡ ѡ ѡвласть неѡсе ѡ ѡмже на немь ннгде|же ннкакѡже подаваюѡтъ. нѣцїн же збо неѡсе | настоѡтелствѡ ѣмѡ върѡчаюѡтъ. ѡ ѡ ѡже ѡ|въѣмѡющы ѡ снмь не к томѡ. ѡ прѡвое збо тѣк | злѡчѣстїа такѡво. хшлѣще же прѣстѡѡ влѡцѡ | нашѡ бѡѡ- ѡже нн же слѡхѡ нн же пнсанїѡ клѡчннѡ ѣ прѣдѡты, не ѡкасѡшѣ трѣ ѡтѡженїн | глѡты. вѣрѡемь въ прѣстѡѡ бѡѡ. въ нюже вънн|де ѡ ѡнде гѡ. || ѡ глѣмь снмы вншнн прнтвараюѡтъ їерѡсалннмь. ѡ рекоше въ нь прѣднтѣчн ѡ на вънн|тн хѡ. ѡкоже ѡ бжтѡвнн апѡстѡ рече. ѣ же | збо ѣгда ѡдрѡжанн бѡдѡтъ ѡсповѣдѡватн | ѡ двѡ проѡты хѡ. ѣгда лн въсма понѡженн | бѡдѡтъ. съвнше тѣлѡ сънестн того лѡжеслѡ|вѡствѡють. скѡзѣ тѡ збо ѡ ѡкоже потѡкѡмь нѣ|кыннмь проѡзнты. ѡ сїѡ нескѡрннѡ ѡ чнстѡ | двѡцѡ по сѡномь рѡженїн, дрѡгыѣ снмы ѡ | іѡснфа роднты. ѡ прнчѣнїе чѣстнаго тѣ|ла ѡ кръве хѡ бѡ нашего тѡмамы тѡ дѡса|даммн кропѣще, въспрїематн рекоше тѣлѡ | ѡ кръвь лѡжеслѡвѡствѡюще влѡнїе глн. ѣѣже | ѡ рекоше прѣподаваюѡца апѡстѡломь рѣщы | прнѡмѣте іѡдыте ѡ пїнте. нѡ не хлѣвѡ ѡкѡдѡ, ѡн вннѡ прннесша. ѡ жнѡтѡворѣщн | ктѣтъ хшлѣще рекоше томѡ покланѡтн ѡ прн|нмѡты крѡта прѣлѣстннцн ѡ ѡбавннцн, то|го самого прнтварающе хѡ. ѡво тѡ рекоше | въ ѡвразѡ крѡта. рѡцѣк распрѡстрѣтъ. ѡстннннн же крѡтъ ѡкоже дрѣвѡ рекоше ѡ злѡдѣ|нствннн съсѡ. ѡ пѡ клѡтѡю лежещѣе, не | длѡжно ѣ покланѡтн нн же цѣлѡватн. нѡ | збо ѡ сѣннїе прѡроку ѡ въсе дрѡвнее пїсанїе, | ѡ нннѡ ѡвращаюѡтъ сѡнн. разѡвнннны тѣк || ѡ тѡте прнзнѡюще. наѡ паче же върѡвна|го апѡлѡ пѣтра

всма | несбгласнн· житіе же сн̄ испльнь збо̄ ѿ | недръжаніа, испльнь же скверненин̄ не|зреченин̄· ѿ нечнстотъ дѣзмѣннн̄· ка|саю̄т се смѣшеніӣ ѿбо̄н̄ ѿствѣ· къ ѿако̄м̄ | скверннодѣнствѣс̄ бестѣнѣ̄ ѿмѣще ра|звѣ нѣкыӣ ѿ нн̄ рекоше̄ ѿгоже къ роднвыӣ | тькмо̄ зкланѣтн̄ смѣшеніа· пн̄ан̄твѣс̄ | же ѿ блѣдъ житіе̄ всѣн̄ зданно̄ ѿмѣтъ· | ѿ всако̄ нноразнчїе̄ ѿбнчаѣмь хранеть· | ѿ злочестном̄ же семь твѣхїк̄с̄ прн̄де̄ слѡ|во, сѣ̄ прнложѣс̄ нн̄а· сѣ̄ бо̄ ѿного̄ себе̄ лѣ|жеслѡвѣствѡвааше̄ бытн̄ ѿгоже въ посланнн̄ӣ апѡстѡвѣ̄ ѿбноснмаго̄ же ѿ множи|цею̄ памяты̄ похвалнон̄ сподоблѣма· | проповѣннка̄ же ѿ паўла̄ къ ннмь̄ послантн̄· ѿ іаже̄ възвѣщаѣтъ ѿ глеть· не̄ своѣ̄ | ѿм̄с̄ промѣдростн̄ бытн̄, зчешаго̄ же̄ збо̄ ѿ пославшаго̄ паўла̄ завѣщанїе̄ таже̄ | ѿ петн̄мь̄ стомь̄ лѣтвомь̄ ст(а)рѣншыӣ паўль̄ ѿ твѣхїка̄ бывъ· дължно̄ ѿ разсмѣты̄ | іако̄ ѿзъбравъ̄ азъ̄ іаже̄ зже̄ реченнаа̄ ѿ іа|же̄ въ прочее̄ пѣдчнненнаа̄ настоещом̄с̄ тїтл̄с̄ | въ главнзнах̄· || ѿва̄ збо̄, по̄ всѣм̄ сьвернн̄а̄ положн̄· по̄ ськра|щенїс̄ дълготы̄ зклоннв̄ се· нѣкаа̄ же̄ ѿ н̄же̄ | въ сьписаннн̄ӣ реченаго̄ патрїа̄ха̄ ѿ по̄ всѣм̄с̄ прѣтеко̄· ѿнка̄ за̄ глѣбнн̄с̄ разсмѣнн̄ | ѿн̄ ѿ за̄ ѿже̄ сѣлѡ· (ѡ)̄ сплетеное̄ ѿ вьн̄стръ̄ сь|строѣное̄· малнмь̄ збо̄ вѣ̄ прнстѣпна̄ ѿ | бл̄госл̄гна̄· таа̄же̄ же̄ збо̄ прѣс̄тавлѡ|щее̄ кспноразсмѣнн̄а̄ ѿзъбранныӣмь· аще̄ ѿ н̄нѣм̄н̄ рѣчм̄н̄ ѿ ѿно̄ѡбразннмь̄ начнннн̄амь̄ сьпрохо̄жаах̄с̄ се· вса̄ же̄ зказанїа̄ ѿмѣтъ, ѿ ѿлн̄н̄ збо̄ ѿ ѡпостола̄ реченн̄· | сїа̄ же̄ ѿднна̄ прнѣмлетъ̄ почнтаты̄ ѿ зтврь|жѣатн̄, ѡстѣпленїа̄ сїе̄ сьворнше̄ іако̄ ѿ двѣ̄ | начелѣ̄ по̄ беззмнн̄н̄ ѡнѣ̄, бл̄го̄ же̄ ѿ лѣка̄в· показ̄а̄ же̄ се̄ збо̄ ѿ въ ѿм̄же̄ на̄ ма̄х̄ен̄ тї|тл̄к̄· показет̄ же̄ по̄ нѣ̄ ѿ въ настѡещемь̄ | по̄ ѿныӣ разсмѣнн̄ѡ· да̄ речет̄ се̄ збо̄ прѣвѣ̄ | ѡ̄ лѣка̄вѡ̄· ѿгоже̄ лѣка̄в̄ начелѡ̄ ѿ сьдѣтє|лно̄ ѡ̄ похвалъ, сн̄н̄ ѿже̄ лѣка̄ваго̄ зданїа̄ | сѣлѡ̄ злочѣстннѣ̄ прнтворнше̄ ~ | Гл̄ет̄ бо̄ ѡ̄ тн̄н̄ ѿ ѡгнѣ̄ бытн̄ лѣка̄ваг̄· | да̄ въпрашаю̄тъ̄ ѿ· как(ѡ)̄ не̄ здовлѣ̄ тма̄ | тькмо̄ въ бытїе̄ ѿго· како̄ же̄ не̄ тькмо̄ ѡгн̄· | какѡ̄ не̄ начелѡ̄ сїа̄ паче̄· ѿ что̄ вьше̄ ѿ что̄ | творнтъ· ѿже̄ ѡ̄ нн̄ прон̄зъшѣ̄шом̄с̄ вьсх̄ытн̄|вшом̄с̄ начелѣствѡ̄ ~ || Яще̄ чю̄вѣствн̄ ѿ ѡгн̄, чне̄ ѿ дѣлѡ· аще̄ лѣка̄ваго̄, како̄ ѡ̄ него̄ зже̄ ѿ ѡ̄ тьмы̄ гл̄ю̄ про|н̄знты̄ лѣкаваго̄· аще̄ лн̄ же̄ бл̄гаго̄, како̄ | рекоше̄ ннчтоже̄ чьвѣствено̄ сьдѣтє|ствѡватн̄ бл̄гаго̄· мнсл̄но̄ бо̄ ннкако̄же̄ | възмо̄гътъ̄ рещы̄ лѣкаваго̄ ѿже̄ прнвєстн̄· | мнсл̄наа̄ бо̄ вса̄, бл̄гом̄с̄ ѡ̄даше̄· н̄з̄жа̄ | збо̄ вѣ̄жещыннмь̄ тѣ̄ ѿже̄ дѡты̄ лѣка̄во̄м̄ | бытїе̄ ѡгн̄а, іако̄ да̄ не̄ нн̄а̄ збо̄ здатєлѡ̄ | нн̄а̄ же̄ зданїе̄ то̄же̄ ѡблнчаю̄т̄ се̄ блєдє|ще̄· ѿ не̄ хѡтєщын̄н̄ исповѣдѡваты̄ бл̄гаго̄ | бытн̄ ѿ ѡгн̄ сьдѣтєлѣствѡ̄· всако̄ бо̄ чьвѣствн̄н̄ ѡгн̄ ѿнко̄ аще̄ ѿ помрачнн̄ѣ̄ нн̄ же̄ | безначелн̄· нн̄ же̄ прнносѣщн̄мь̄ рек̄с̄ ~ | Яко̄ не̄ двѣ̄ начелѣ̄, н̄ ѿднн̄ сьдѣтєл̄ не̄в̄с̄ | ѿ земл̄н̄ ѿ ѿм̄же̄ посрѣдѣ̄~ Нѣкцїн̄ збо̄ ѡ̄ нн̄ | рекоше̄ бл̄гаго̄ б̄а̄, сьдѣтєлѡ̄ бытн̄ не̄в̄с̄ ѿднн̄ом̄с̄· земл̄н̄ же̄ ѿ ѿм̄же̄ посрѣдѣ̄ твѡрца̄ др̄|гаго̄ прнвѣвѡдєтъ· нѣкцїн̄ же̄ сн̄, мнго̄ѡбразна̄ бо̄ прѣлѣсть· ѿ не̄во̄ самѡе̄ ѿ іаже̄ посрѣдѣ̄ | вса̄ дръзн̄шє̄ рещы̄ твѡренїа̄ врага· н̄ аще̄ же̄ збо̄ ѿ не̄во̄ по̄ ѡнѣ̄ вѣсѡванїс̄ дѣлѡ̄ лѣкаваго̄, како̄ бл̄гы̄ в̄ на̄ не̄всн̄н̄ прѣпочн̄|ваєтъ̄ сьдѣтєлѣствѡвавшын̄ се̄ ѡ̄ лѣкаваго̄· | како̄ же̄ лн̄ сп̄с̄ь̄ наш̄ помолнтн̄ чн̄с̄с̄ ѡн̄с̄ || ѿ зжасн̄ю̄ молнтѣ̄с̄ на̄зчѡває̄ ѿ прѣдав̄ь̄ рє|че̄· ѡче̄ наш̄ ѿже̄ на̄ не̄вс̄· ѿ да̄ в̄дєтъ̄ вѡлѡ̄ | тѡѡ̄ іако̄ на̄ не̄всн̄ ѿ на̄ земл̄н̄· ѿ пакы̄ аще̄ ѡ̄стѡвнтє̄ чл̄кѡ̄ сьгрѣшенїа̄ ѿ, ѡстѡвнтъ̄ ѿ~ || ѿ б̄а̄, ѡц̄ь̄ ваш̄ не̄всн̄н̄· ѿ ѿще̄ же̄ ѿже̄ аще̄ ктѡ̄ | сьтворнтъ̄ волю̄

ѡца моего ѡже на небесе | тѣмъ мнѣ братъ ѡ сестра ѡ мати ѡ. ѡ что ѡще | кто ѡсчитаетъ, ѡже ради небснаго ѡ на небесе спсѣ ѡца въспроповѣдѣть. нѣ какъ | не збнѣицѣ не съкриваетъ вестѣное, ꙗвлеиинѣишее спсѣ глѡущѣ. ѡсповѣдѣиоти ѡце | гни небесе ѡ земли. не тькмо бо зде сего небсн | га нѣ ѡ земли ꙗснословавнть. что сего свѣдѣтельства тврьдѣишее. что же снаниѣишее. | ѡ ѡца га нашего ѡ хѣ, съдѣтелга ѡ га прѣста|внты въсемѣ. ѡ въборнаа заграднты зета, | ѡ петровы же рече спсѣ. дамы твѣ ключе царства небснаго ѡ прочаа. зри же мн ѡ се. крѣтн|в се ꙗс, въсходнтъ ѡвѣтѣ ѡ вѣды. како възда|нїе лѣкаваго по ѡстннѣ сѣшн блѣгаго ѡца снѣ | блгы, крѣтнв се ѡ ѡнѣдѣ въсходнтъ. ѡ се ѡврь|зоше небса. ѡ ѡнозданїе пакы лѣкавѣ рѣкы | по тѣ. чьсо ради ѡврьзоше ѡ чьсого ради. вн|дѣ дѣхъ бжїи рече съходешъ ꙗко голзбѣ. третїе | се нечѣстїа въ малнн глѣхъ ѡблнченїе. како во || въ ѡбразѣ зданїа лѣкаваго бжїи. дѣхъ въ|ображѣет се. ѡ съходыть ѡ дѣлѣ вражнѣ. ѡ | ѡнѣдѣ съходе гредеть на га. четврѣтн | стлѣпъ ѡблнченїѣ нечѣстїа глѣ ѡдавает се | ѡ небсѣ, съ ѡ снѣ мон възлюбленїн ѡ немже | блгѡнзволн. прнзрѣи мы възлюбленне на в|сакын глѣ како тѣ съпроисходнтъ ѡже на не|чѣстїе неїзвѣжное ѡблнченїе. съ ѡ рече | снѣ мон възлюбленїн ѡ немже блгѡнзволн. кто | съ ѡже въ вѣдѣ крышаемнѣ, ѡнѣже ѡврьзоше | небса. на ѡже дѣхъ мон въ ѡбразѣ голзба съ|ходе ѡ небсѣ, съпрнсвѣдѣтельствоветъ | крышаемаго снѣвѣствѣ. вса моѡ рады моѡн тварен мон снѣ, волю ѡсплнѣваемаю | спсѣнїе наздавает мнрѣ. ѡдннѣ дѣхъ ѡблѣстн ѡдннорасльномѣ съпрѣбываюшн. ѡ въспро|повѣдѣшн вѣштѣ прнсное снѣвѣства.~ |

ѡще прѣстолю бжїи нарчѣтѣ ѡже болшее ѡ ѡннѣ | ѡца ѡ ꙗже сѣтъ ѡца вѣдынѣ, пѣножїе же землю. | ѡ гра ѡго ѡросѣлма, како не послѣнѣаго не|чѣстїа. ѡнѣже свѣдѣтель снѣ. сїѡ нѣкыннѣ прѣ|сѣцаты ѡнѣ. ѡ дрѣгаго прѣсѣченннннѣ творн|ты творца. ѡже во всѣ къ спсѣнїѣ нашемѣ | ѡ творе ѡ зче хсѣ бѣ, клетвѣ ꙗко сѣшн прѣкле|товѣства дверь чѣкаго зкланїае жнтїа рече. || азъ же глѡ вамъ не клетнѣ ѡнѣ. нн же въ | небо ꙗко прѣстолю ѡ бжїи. нн же въ землю ꙗко пѣножїе нѣогъ ѡго ѡ. нн же въ ѡросѣлн|ма, ꙗко гра ѡ цѣра велнкаго. нѣ нн же въ | главѣ свою рече. не можешы во нн же ѡдннѣ власѣ вѣлѣ ѡн чрьнѣ сътворнты. главѣ | ѡ ѡросѣлма ѡ землю ѡ небо чѣвѣствнаа, | ѡ ꙗже зрѣнїемѣ расѣжаемаа глѣ. ꙗже ѡдѣлѣмъ вѣше ѡбнчан клетвѣ творнты. нн же | пакы въ баснн ѡ бледн главѣ ѡ ѡрсалннѣ | ѡ землю ѡ небо неїс|товѣство да прѣвращаетъ, ꙗкоже въ многнѣ ѡбнче ѡ недѣмѣнїа творнты. ѡво внднмое небо, ѡ чѣвѣствннѣ землю. ѡ ѡросѣлма. ꙗже дрѣвле ѡбо създана вѣхѣ. по родовѣ же послѣже | наздавает ѡ зкращаетъ. сїѡ збо прѣстолю | зоветь. сїѣ же пѣножїе. съ же гра велнго цѣра. | коѣгоже цѣра ѡ ѡнѣдѣ тѣ ꙗвлеиинѣишее на|чаваетъ. не творнте глѣ домѣ ѡца моего дѣ | къплннн, ѡже въ ѡросѣлннѣ храмѣ, ѡца дѣ | ѡнѣнѣ. ѡгоже ради ѡ ѡросѣлма гра зоветь. | ѡгоже въ ѡнѣже ѡ клетвѣ ѡреченїн велнкѣ рѣ | цѣра, зде ѡца свѣ вѣсловааше. тѣ же ѡ про|дающнѣ вѣлн ѡ вѣце, ѡ голзбнце. ѡтѣчкын | дѣ, къплннѣскаго ѡчнщае зкорнїа ѡзганїаетъ. || ѡ правѣннн тѣ гнѣвъ запрѣцаетъ. ꙗкоже во | зкорнтеле ѡврѣты. ѡ ѡтѣчскаго дѣмѣ ѡ ѡтѣчкы | заповѣды.~ Рече во спсѣ любыте врагы ва|ше. доворотворнте на навндеиинѣ вѣ. ꙗко да | вѣдетѣ снѣве ѡца вашего ѡгоже на небсе. ѡже | възсѣтаветъ слнце своѣ

же съвѣкъплатѣть вьса създавшомѣ и҃ѡ хѡмь. ꙗкоже вьсѣѣ | збо знѣитель ѡць. вьсѣѣ же знѣитель и҃ снѣ. | ѡпце во и҃ неразданно ꙗкоже и҃ство и҃ ѡбласть и҃ црѣво и҃ сна, такъ и҃ съдѣтствво видн|мѣ же и҃ невидимы вьсѣѣ, и҃ еже ѡ несщпыи вь ѣ|же быти приведѣнїе и҃ ѡсщпствванїе :~ | Вь и҃ныи же вѡслово павль рече. е҃дннѣ вь и҃ ѡтць | вьсѣмь и҃же на вьсѣмь и҃ радн вьсѣѣ и҃ вь вьсѣѣ | на. неразлчно же и҃ нераздѣлно, ꙗкоже и҃ство | и҃ вѡлю, такъ и҃ съдѣтельствво и҃ дръжавѣ вѣ|дын ѡца и҃ снѣ. таажѣ и҃ спсѣ дръзновеннѣи|шынымь възнваѣтъ гласѡ. ѡ немже во рече съ|здаше вьса, ꙗже на небсе ꙗвѣ ꙗко и҃ ꙗже на | землн. и҃ ꙗко да не нестввствво, влѣдн | дрѣгыѣ сщпннынмь гласовѡ вьложнтъ, и҃ ещѣ | по прнелженїѣ прѣсказѣтъ, котора сѣтъ ꙗже на небсе и҃ ꙗже на землн. ꙗко ꙗже виднма | и҃ ꙗже невиднма. и҃ сѣа вьса ѡ немь рече създаше. || и҃ его радн и҃ внь. какъ збо ѡтщпное вѣсо|ванїе, виднынмь збо, и҃ного прнстварѣтъ творца. и҃ного же вѣднынмь :~ | Рече вжтвннїи павль ꙗко невѣмаа его снрѣчь | бл҃гаго, ѡ созданїа мнрѣ твореньмь разс|мѣваема зрѣт се. творенїа глѣ настѡещын | мнрѣ, и҃ е҃лка ꙗже по чѣвствѡ. сѣа во аще | не бл҃гаго внше была, не лѣкаваго. не бы|ше вь лѣкаваго твореньи невиднмаа бл҃га|го зрѣла се. и҃ тогда прнсносщмаа его сна и҃ | вжтвво :~ | Аще ꙗкоже хр҃стїи и҃ злочестн|вын продръзваѣтъ и҃зыкь, по земльмаа лѣкава|го сѣтъ, како гл҃ют се ѡпцаго нашего влѣкы и҃ | спса. вь своа во прнде рече, и҃ свон его не прнеше. аще лн же гл҃ють ѡтщпннцн своа збо вытн пррочьскаа словеса. прннты же вь нн хр҃. ѡнѣ же | сего не прнѣтн, виднтѣ лн прѣнзлшное тѣѣ везс|мїе и҃ вестсдїе. првѣѣ збо какъ гл҃ють пррочьскаа | словеса, своа бытн хр҃. тыѣ самыѣ прроку гл҃ющын зданїа бытн лѣкаваго. и҃ вьдхновенїе ѡ него прнѣтн. второе же какъ вь пррочькаа словеса прнде | хр҃. првѣѣ збо вь тѣжѣа прнде по ѡнѣ слѡвѣс. | тѣжѣа во пррочкаа словеса ꙗко ѡ тѣжѣаго вьдхновена, а не ѡ бл҃гаго ба. по тѣ же кынмь | да хр҃ ѡбласть чедѡ вжтѣмь бытн. збо пррочьскѣ | лн словесемь, || и҃ како не дльга влѣдѣ сѣ. словеса во аще | збо ѡ ба сѣтъ, ѡтсдѣд нмѣтъ еже бытн своа вѣ. аще лн же ѡ лѣкаваго, како зже че|да вѣдѣтъ вѣ. и҃ ещѣ же кое словѡ пррочь|ско ѡкрвѣн. и҃ ѡ похоты плтьскыѣ и҃ ѡ похоты мѣжскыѣ родн се, наноснт во. и҃же не ѡ|крвѣн. нн же ѡ похоть мѣжскыѣ, нн же ѡ хр҃тѣнїа плтьска. нѣ ѡ ба родн. котораа и҃же | ѡкрвѣн роженаа словеса. и҃ котораа и҃же | нн. прочее же збо своа нарнчѣ мнрѣ. ꙗкоже | нѣгдѣ и҃ и҃нѣде рече кь зченнѣ, сѣ грѣдѣтъ | ча и҃ ннѣа прнде ꙗко да разндѣтѣ кьжѣ вь своа. каа збо своа глѣтъ здѣ, збо пррочкаа | лн словеса, и҃лн ꙗвлено ꙗко стѣжанїе и҃ вьселенїе когѡжѣ. ꙗкоже здѣ своа не повѣсн|ющѡи се влѣдн пррочкаа словеса глѣтъ, | нѣ когѡжѣ стѣжанїе и҃ своа дѡ, такъ и҃ вьне|гда глѣтъ вь своа прнде, и҃ свон его не | прнеше. своа збо чѣвствннїи мнрѣ глѣ. стѣжанїе же и҃мѣ и҃ творенїе, сѣ пѡвнѣ же и҃ и҃же вь | немь. ѡ ннх же ѡвнн збо прнеше зченїе его. ѡ|внн же нн. и҃ и҃нѣде паку рече, ꙗко пррокъ вь ѡтщпннѣ своѣмь чьстн не и҃мать. а ꙗко своа мнрѣ рече, и҃ ѡ сн и҃ ꙗвѣствво зсмотрѣтъ. | вѣ во рече свѣтъ и҃стннынн и҃же просвѣщаѣтъ || вьсакого чѣка грѣдѣцаго вн мнрѣ. кын | мнрѣ ꙗвѣ ꙗко чѣвствннн. и҃ когда просвѣ|тн. е҃гда прнде в нь. когда же прнде, е҃лїе | вьпїеть. вь мнрѣ вѣ рекоше. вьсако во вь |

чѢВСТВЕНОМЪ МИРѢ СЫ, ГРЕДѢЩАГО ВЪ ЧС|ВСТВЕНІИ МИРѢ, ПРОСВѢЩААШЕ. ТА ЖЕ КО|ТО-
 РАГО БѢ МИРѢ ТВОРЕНІЕ. ВЪ НЕИЖЕ ТѢ БѢ | Н ГРЕДѢЩАГО ВЪ НЬ ПРОСВѢЩААШЕ. НЕ
 Ѡ ННШ|ДѢ ІЕ НАВНКНѢТН, НѢ Ѡ ТѢ САМѢ ЕВѢЛЬСКИЙ | ГЛѢ. Н МИР БО РЕЧЕ ТѢ БЫ. Н МИРѢ
 ІЕГО НЕ ПОЗНА. | ЕЖЕ РАВНО ІЕ ѠНОМѢ ВЪ СВОА ПРИНДЕ, Н СВОИ | ЕГО НЕ ПРИНШЕ :- "ИЩЕ ПО
 ЗЕМЛЬНАА СѢ | АДКАВАГО КАКЪ ТРѢПѢШЕ ПЛѢДЫ ННЫ ЖЕ НЗРА|СТН ЗЕМЛТА ТВОРЕНІЕ АДКА-
 ВАГО. СЕ ѢВО Ѡ | ПЕТЬ ХЛѢБОВЪ, СЕ ЖЕ Н Ѡ СЕДМЫИ МНОГЫ ТАИИ НА|СНТЫТН. КВЛНКО БО
 БѢ БОЛШЕЕ Н ЕВѢПНѢН|ШЕ. НЕ Ѡ ТѢЖИИ ПЛѢДОВЪ, НѢ Ѡ СВОИ СЪЗДАНИИ | ПИТАТЫ
 ТАИИНОѢСТВѢЮЩИИ СЕ ИИМЪ. ПАЧЕ ЖЕ | КАКЪ ВЪСМА ПИЩѢ ИЛИ ПИВѢ ТѢ ПРИНЕСЕ. ІАЖЕ |
 ПЛѢ БѢХѢ Ѡ ДѢЛЪ АДКАВАГО. КАКО ЖЕ ЛИ ѢВО | Ѡ ВЛѢГО ѠЦА ПРОСНТЫ ХЛѢБЪ
 НАСѢЩСТВЕН | НАМЪ ЗАПОВѢДА. Н КАКО ПАКЫ ОЧН СЪДѢТЕЛЬ|СТВЕ СЛѢПОМѢ. НЕ
 Ѡ ДРѢГЫЕ ВЕЩН НѢ Ѡ ЗЕМЛЕ | Н ВѢДЫ ІАЖЕ БѢХѢ АДКАВАГО, ЗРѢНІЕ НОВЪ ТВОРѢ|ШЕ,
 ТЫКМО НЕ СЪРАЗДѢЛАІЕ СЕ ВРАГѢ. Н ѠВОИ ѢВО || ѠСТАВЛЪ МНОЖАИШЕЕ ТВОРНТЫ, САМ ЖЕ
 ЧЕ|СТЬ ИСПЛЫНАВАЕ Ѡ ТѢЖІЕ ВЕЩН, ІАКОЖЕ СВОИ НЕ ИИМѢ. ТА ЖЕ АЩЕ НЕ ЧТО ИИО, НѢ
 САМОЕ ЖЕ | ѢВО ТѢ ѠКАІАНЫЕ ДЛѢЖНО БѢ ѢМЛИТН | ТВОРНТ. Н ѢМОТРНТЫ. СЪЗДАВЫИ
 ОКО ОТ КАЛА, | ТѢ ІЕ ИЖЕ ИЗНАЧЕЛА СЪЗДАВЫИ ЧЛКА Ѡ КАЛА. ІАКОВЫЕ ЧЕСТН МАЛАА ЧЕСТЬ
 ТѢЖЕ ЖЕ Н ВЪСѢ. Н | ІЕГОЖЕ ИИМѢ ВЪСЕ СЪДѢТЕЛА, ТОГОЖЕ Н ЧЕСТЬ :- | ГѢ ЖЕ НАШЪ ІУ ХѢ
 НА СТРАСТЬ ПРИШЪ, ГѢ ТОГО Ѡ|СЛѢ Н ЖРѢВЦѢ ПОКАЗА КЪ ѢЧЕННИКѢ. ИВО ТОГО СЪДѢТЕЛ-
 СТВА Н ТОГО ГОСПѢДСТВА Н ВЛЧТВА ІАКОЖЕ Н МИРѢ | Н ІАЖЕ ВЪ НЕМЪ, ТАКЪ Н СІА, ТѢИЖЕ
 РЕЧЕ. АЩЕ ВѢ ЧТО | РЕЧЕТЪ КТО РУЦѢТЕ. ІАКО ГѢ Н ТРѢВѢТЬ. ѠСТ|ПЛЕНІЕ ЖЕ НЕ ТРѢПНТЬ
 СІЕ. НѢ Ѡ ТОГО ѠБЛАСТН ВЪ|СХЫЩАЮЩН ПѢ СЪДѢТЕЛЬСТВѢ ВЪЧНИІАТЬ АДКАВАГО
 :- "ІЕЖЕ БО НЕЧЕСТВЕНІИ ВЪ ПРѢСТА|ВЛЕНІЕ СВОЕГО ПРѢЛАГАЮТЬ ЗЛОЧЕСТІА. ІАКО ѢВО НАЧЕ-
 ЛЬСТВѢТЬ ПО ЗЕМЛЬНЫИ АДКАВИИ. ПРѢЛЫ|СТНВШЕ Ѡ ЕЖЕ РЕЩН ІЕИ ѢГДА ХѢ ПО ЗЕМЛЬНАА
 ВЪ|СА ЦѢТВІА ПОКА. ІАКО ВЪСА СІА ТЕБѢ ДѢ АЩЕ ПѢ ПО|КЛОИШЫ ЛИ СЕ. СЕ ТѢ ВЪ ЕЖЕ
 НИЧТОЖЕ Ѡ ТѢ ѠБЛАДАТЫ АДКАВАГО, ПРѢВРАТН. ЛЪЖ БО СЫ Н ЛЪЖЪ НА|ЧЕЛНИКЪ. Н НИ-
 КОГДАЖЕ ВЪ ИСТИНѢ СТОЕ ІАКОЖЕ ГѢ | НАШЪ НАѢЧН, САМЪ СЕБЕ НАРЕЧЕ НАЧЕЛНИКА ПО ЗЕМ-
 ЛЫИИ :- ІАКО ЕДННЪ СЪДѢТЕЛЬ ТѢЛА Н ДШЕ. СІРѢ ЧКА :- || "ИЩЕ БЛГЫИ ѢВО ДШѢ
 СЪДѢТЕЛЬСТВѢТЬ ПО ВЕ|ЗМНИИ АДКАВИИ ЖЕ ТѢЛѢ, КАКО ВЪСХОТѢ БЛГЫИ, | СЪЕДНИТН
 ЗДАНИѢ ІЕГО, ТВОРЕНІѢ АДКАВАГО | КАКО ЖЕ Н ПРѢТРѢПѢ ЕДННЬСТВѢ АДКАВИИ. ИВО | СЪЕДН-
 НЕНІЕ ИЛИ БЛГО СЪТВОРНТЬ ТѢЛѢ, НЕ ТРѢВѢТЬ БЛГОИ ЗЛААГО ДѢЛѢ БЛГОТВОРНТЫ, ИЛИ
 | ЗЛО СЪТВОРНТЬ ДШН. ЕЖЕ БЕЗМѢСТНѢИШЕЕ | ВРѢДНТИ БЛГОМѢ СЪДѢТЕЛЬСТВѢ Ѡ АДКА-
 ВАГО | ТВОРЕНІА. Н ИНАКО ЖЕ КОЕ ПРИЦПШЕНІЕ СВѢТѢ | КЪ ТАИѢ. КОЕ ЖЕ ЛИ СЪГЛАСІЕ БѢ КЪ
 ВЕЛІАРѢ :- | АДКАВИИ ѢВО МОЖЕТЪ НА СМЫЩАТЫ. МЫ ЖЕ МО|ЖЕ ѠРАЖАТЫ СМЫЩЕНІЕ
 ІЕГО, ДШЕО ЖЕ Н ТѢЛѢ. | АЩЕ ЛИ ЖЕ ТѢЛѢ НАШЕ МОЖЕТЪ ѠГНАТН ПРИЛО | ІЕГО, Н НЕ СЕ
 ТЫКМО НѢ Н ПОВѢДНТЫ Н ННЗЛОЖИ|ТЫ ІЕИ ВЪСАКѢ КЪЗНЪ, КАКО ІЕ ѠНЪ СНИЖІТЕЛЬ | ІЕГО.
 КАКО ЖЕ ЛИ ѢВО АДКАВИИ НА СВОЕ ЗДАНИЕ | АДКАВЬСТВѢТ СЕ. НЕВЪЗМОЖНО ІЕ НА СПРОТИ|В-
 НАА СЪДѢТЕЛЬСТВА ВЪЗВОДНТЫ СЪДѢТЕЛЬ|СТВО ДШЕ Н ТѢЛЕСЕ :- "ИЩЕ ТѢЛѢ ІЕ АДКАВАГО
 ЗДАНИЕ, КАКЪ ТѢМЪ ВЕЛНКАА Ѡ ИСПРА|ВЛЕНІИ ТВОРИМЪ. ЦѢЛОМѢДРІЕ. ВЪЗДРЪЖАНІЕ; |
 ВДѢНІЕ. СТОІАНИЕ. КЪ ЛЮТИМЪ ТРѢПѢНІЕ. МІЧЕНІА БОЛѢЗНЫ. ІАЖЕ ВЪСА ТѢЛЕСЕ ПАЧЕ
 СѢЩА | НЕЖЕЛИ ДШЕ, ВЪ СЛАВѢ ВЪЗНОСЕТ СЕ СЪДѢТЕЛА. | КАКО ЖЕ ЛИ ѢВО ТВОРЕНІЕ АДКАВА-
 ГО, ДѢТЬ ||

ff. 308v–309r

Многа ѡбо н̄ н̄наа бледеть ѡчнтеле н̄ таинновѡци прѣблежещїе ѣреси. ни же | слѡхъ вѣрныи носима, ни же ѣзикъ бл҃гочтн|выи гл҃ана. вѣрѣ бо н̄ начнешн̄ ѡ прѣблестн, по|слѣдователнѣ въ вѣсѣ прѣблестншѣ. іаже ѡбо | н̄звѡглавленнѣншаа ѡ н̄же въ нн̄ ѣретнчкыи | велѣнн̄, н̄ ѣлка ѡснованїе н̄ корень н̄ іакоже | н̄сточннкъ выше, сїа сѡтъ ѣлка настоѣща|го дѡдеже прѣварнвъ бл҃гочестноео славо ѡ|блнчн. н̄ іакоже пѡдчнннн̄н̄ поставъ раздрѡ|шы. н̄ тмѡ тѣ разгнавъ показа н̄стннѡ. н̄наа | же ѡставншѣ, іако ѡдобенѣ ѡ възражаѡщын̄ | раздрѡшнтн̄ могоща. аще ѡбо покореть сѡщын̄ н̄же ѣреси н̄звѡглавленнѣншыи велѣнн̄ | ѡблнченїа. н̄злншно н̄зоставшннх̄ н̄же || почестн н̄стезанїе възвѣшежѣ ѡбо на пра|вн̄ пѡтъ, ѡдобенѣ вѡдѡтъ шьствѡюще на | всакѡ н̄стннѡ. всакѡ льжѡ іакоже прѣтн|канїе н̄ съблзунъ ѡ срѣдн̄ творещен̄ ѡвзражающе. | аще лн̄ же волею слѣпотьствѡюще помн̄саѡ | н̄ еце къ свѣтѡ. н̄ самн̄ ѡ себѣ мѡжаѡтъ се, | люжеѡ покорнѡемн̄ н̄ не х̄отеше ѡстѡпнтн | ѡ прѣблестншѡго н̄ дѡха. н̄ такѡ пакыи н̄злншно н̄мже почестн съвъзнсқанїегннлн̄ бо | ѡснованїѡмъ въсе прннзѡдаваеть ктѡ. н̄ | неспѣшнъ пѡнметъ трѡѣлма же ѡбо чь|стнн̄ крѡтъ вѡсещствѡють. н̄ ежтѡное | крѡщенїе ѡплаѡбають. н̄ сщѣное прнчещенїе таинные вѡчере ѡвѡрѡгабають. прнлѡжет се н̄ іаже ѡ сн̄, ѡ н̄же стѡннъ ѡцельм̄ по|трѡжѣнн̄ :-

Bibliography

Sources

- BOŽILOV I., TOTOMANOVA A., BIJARSKI I., *Borilov sinodik. Izdanie i prevod*, Sofija 2010.
 EUTHYMIUS ZIGABENOS, *Panoplia Dogmatica*, [in:] PG, vol. CXXX, col. 1189–1243.
 PETRUS SICULUS, *Historia Manichaeorum*, [in:] PG, vol. CIV, col. 1239–1304.
 PETRUS SICULUS, *Sermo I–II adversus Manichaeos*, [in:] PG, vol. CIV, col. 1305–1346.
 PHOTIUS, *Contra Manichaeos*, [in:] PG, vol. CII, col. 15–264.
Zakonopravilo ili Nomokanon svetoga Save. Ilovički prepis 1262 g., ed. M. PETROVIĆ, Gornji Milanovac 1991.

Secondary Literature

- ABADŽIEVA M., *Ezikät na pavlikjanskata knižnina ot XVIII v.*, “Български език” / “Bälgarski ezik” 40, 2013, Supplement, p. 262–274.
 ANGOLD M., *Church and Society in Byzantium under the Komnenoi, 1081–1261*, Cambridge 2000.
 ASTRUC Ch., CONUS-WOLSKA W., GOUILLARD J., LEMERLE P., PAPACHRYSSANTHOU I., PARAMELLE J., *Les sources grecques pour l’histoire des Pauliciens d’Asie Mineure*, “Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d’histoire et civilisation byzantines” 4, 1970.
 BARTIKJAN R.M., *Petr Sicilijski i ego “Istorija pavlikian”*, “Византийский временник” / “Vizantijskij vremennik” 43.18, 1961, p. 323–358.

- BARTIKJAN R.M., *Vizantijskaja, armjanskaja i bolgarskaja legendy o proischoždenii pavlikian i ich isto-ričeskaja osnova*, "Byzantinobulgarica" 6, 1980, p. 61.
- Bälgarski etimologičen rečnik, vol. IV, Sofija 1995.
- BERKE M., *An annotated edition of Euthimios Zigabenos, Panoplia Dogmatikē, Chapters 23–28*, Belfast 2011.
- Christian Dualist Heresies in the Byzantine World c. 650 – c. 1450*, ed. J. HAMILTON, B. HAMILTON, Y. STOYANOV, Manchester 1998.
- DELEHAYE H., *Les légendes hagiographiques*, Paris² 1906.
- DIMITROVA M., *Knjižninata na bälgarite katolici*, [in:] *Istorija na bälgarskata srednovekovna literatura*, ed. A. MILTENOVA et al., Sofija 2008, p. 744–752.
- Dokumenti za katoličeskata dejnost prez XVII v.*, Sofija 1993.
- DUVERNOY J., *Les noms et la chose*, "Slavica Occitania" 16, 2003, p. 189–198.
- FERMENDŽIN E., *Acta Bulgariae Ecclesiastica. Ab a. 1565 usque ad a. 1799*, Zagrebiae 1887.
- FICKER G., *Die Phundagiagiten. Ein Beitrag zur Sektengeschichte des byzantinischen Mittelalters*, Leipzig 1908.
- GAGOVA N., *Edin verojaten prevodačeski autograf ot pärvata četvärt na XV v. (Ošte vednäž za rannija slavjanski prevod na "Dogmatičesko vseoräžie" na Evtimij Zigavin)*, "Palaeobulgarica" 25.1, 2001, p. 79–94.
- GAGOVA N., *Poräčval li e despot Stefan Lazarevič prevoda na "Dogmatičesko vseoräžie" ot Evtimij Zigavin*, [in:] EADEM, *Vladeteli i knigi. Učastieto na južnoslavjanskija vladetel v proizvodstvoto i upotrebata na knigi prez Srednovekovieto (IX–XV v.): recepcijata na vizantijskija model*, Sofija 2010, p. 130–140.
- GARSOIAN N.S., *The Paulician Heresy. A Study of the Origin and Development of Paulicianism in Armenia and the Eastern Provinces of the Byzantine Empire*, Hague–Paris 1967.
- GEČEVA K., *Bogomilstvoto i negovoto oträženie v srednovekovna hristijanska Evropa. Bibliografija*, Sofija 2007.
- GEORGIEV L., *Bälgarite katolici v Transilvanija i Banat XVIII–pärvata polovina na XIX*, Sofija 2010.
- GOUILLARD J., *L'hérésie dans l'Empire byzantin jusqu'au XII siècle*, "Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 1, 1965, p. 299–324.
- IVANOV J., *Proizhod na pavlikjanite spored dva bälgarski räkopisa*, [in:] *Izbrani proizvedenija*, vol. I, Sofija 1992, p. 111–123.
- IVANOVA K., *O slavjanskom perevode Panoplji dogmatyki Evfimija Zigavina*, [in:] *Issledovanija po drevnej i novom literature*, Leningrad 1987, p. 101–105.
- JOVKOV M., *Pavlikjani i pavlikjanski selišta v bälgarskite zemi XV–XVIII v.*, Sofija 1991.
- KITANOVA M., *"Čužдите" deca v bälgarskata kultura i ezik*, "Български език" / "Bälgarski ezik" 61.3, 2014, p. 19–32.
- LEMERLE P., *L'Histoire des Pauliciens d'Asie Mineure d'après les sources grecques*, "Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines" 5, 1973, p. 1–144.
- MILADINOVA N., *Panoplia Dogmatike – a study on the antiheretical anthology of Euthimios Zigabenos in the Post-Byzantine Period*, Leuven–Budapest 2010.
- MILETIČ L., *Našite pavlikjani*, "Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и култура" / "Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i kultura" 19, 1903.

- MILTENOVA A., *Otnovo za razkaza za proizhoda na pavlikjanite*, "Bulgaria Medievalis" 6, 2015, p. 233–240.
- MILTENOVA A., *Razobličenieto na djavola-gramatik. (Kām istorijata na starobālgarskata legenda za proizhoda na pavlikjanite)*, [in:] *Čovek i vreme. Sbornik s naučni izsledvanija v pamet na Sabina Beljaeva*, ed. R. DAMJANOVA, E. TRAJKOVA, Sofija 1997, p. 287–294.
- NEDELČEV M., *Dialekt na bālgarite katolici (severen pavlikjanski govor)*, Veliko Tārnovo 1994.
- PANAITESCU P.P., *Manuscritele slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR*, vol. I, București 1959.
- PETKANOVA D., *Narodnoto četivo prez XVI–XVIII v.*, Sofija 1990.
- POPOVSKI J., THOMPSON F., VEDER W., *The Troickiy sbornik (cod. Moskva, GBL, F.304, Troice-Sergieva lavra N 12). Text in transcription*, "Полата књигописна" / "Polata Knigopisnaja. A Journal Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literature" 21/22, 1988.
- Pravilata na svetata Pravoslavna cārka s tālkovanijata im*, ed. S. CANKOV, I. STEFANOV, P. CANEV, vol. I, Sofija 1912.
- RADEVA D., *Pavlikjani i pavlikjanstvo v bālgarskite zemi. Arhetip i povtorenija VII–XVII v.*, Sofija 2015.
- RIGO A., *La Panoplia Dogmatica d'Euthymios Zygabenos. Savoir Encyclopédique et les Hérésies du Présent*, [in:] *Papers presented at the 19th Annual Theological Conference of St. Tikhon's Orthodox University*, Moscow 2008.
- RIGO A., *La panoplie dogmatique d'Euthyme Zigabène: les Pères de l'Église, l'empereur et les hérésies du présent*, [in:] *Byzantine theologians. The systematization of their own doctrine and their perception of foreign doctrines*, ed. A. RIGO, P. ERMILOV, Rome 2009, p. 19–32.
- SHARF A., *Byzantine Orthodoxy and the "Preliminary fast" of the Armenians*, [in:] *Byzance. Hommage à André Stratos*, vol. 2, *Théologie et Philologie*, Athènes 1986, p. 669–670.
- Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka*, vol. VII, Moskva 1980; vol. XIV, Moskva 1988.
- STANČEV K., *Literaturata na bālgarite katolici prez XVII i XVIII v. i prehodāt ot Srednevekovie kām Vāzražđane*, "Литературна мисъл" / "Literaturna misāl" 3, 1981, p. 3–11.
- STANČEV K., *Pavlikjanite – učenici na djavola. Beležki odnosno finala na apokrifnija rozkaz za proizhoda na pavlikjanite*, [in:] *Vis et Sapientia. Studia in honorem Anisavae Miltenova*, ed. A. ANGUSHEVA, M. DIMITROVA et al., Sofija 2016, p. 761–768.
- Średniowieczne herezje dualistyczne na Bałkanach. Źródła słowiańskie*, ed. G. MINCZEW, M. SKOWRONEK, J.M. WOLSKI, Łódź 2015 [= *Series Ceranea*, 1].
- TSIBRANSKA-KOSTOVA M., *Pokajnata knižnina na Bālgarskoto srednevekovie IX–XVIII v. (ezikovo-tekstologični i kulturoloģični aspekti)*, Sofija 2011, p. 259–380.
- TSIBRANSKA-KOSTOVA M., RAYKOVA M., *Les Bogomiles et (devant la Loi). Les sources slaves de droit canonique à propos de l'hérésie aux XIV–XV ss.*, "Revue des études sud-est européennes" 49.1, 2011, p. 15–33.
- VASILJEV L., GROZĐANOVIĆ-PAJIĆ M., JOVANOVIĆ-STIPČEVIĆ B., *Novo datiranje srpskih rukopisa u Biblioteci rumunske akademije nauka*, "Археографски прилози" / "Arheografski prilozi" 2, 1980, p. 56, № 60.
- VENDINA T.I., *Srednevekovij čelovek v zerkale staroslavjanskogo języka*, Moskva 2012.
- VRAJKOVA-GENOVA E., *Belene. Govor na pavlikjanite katolici*, Pleven 2003.
- WALCZAK-MIKOŁAJCZAKOWA M., *Piśmiennictwo katolickie w Bułgarii*, Poznań 2004.
- WICKERT J., *Die Panoplia Dogmatica des Euthymios Zygabenos*, Berlin 1910.

WOLSKI J.M., *Autoproscoptae, Bogomils and Massalians in the 14th Century Bulgaria*, “Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Centre for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-East Europe” 4, 2014, p. 233–244.

WOLSKI J.M., *Bogomilite i svetlinata na Žitieto na sv. Ilarion Măglenski ot patriarh Evtimij Tărnovski*, “Palaeobulgarica” 37.4, 2013, p. 74–81.

ZEPOS I., ZEPOS P., *Jus Graecoromanum*, vol. II, *Leges imperatorum Isaurorum et Macedonum*, Athen 1931 [= Aalen 1962].

ZLATANOV I., LEGURSKA P., *Obrečeni na malcinstvo*, “Дзяло” / “Dzjalo” 2.4, 2014.

Abstract. The paper compares how *Paulicians* were described in different types of medieval Slavonic sources by using the approach of the linguistic and culturological conceptualization of the alterity. By means of linguistic analysis, it tries to reach some essential dogmatic issues in the Paulician doctrine, and to focalize on the perception models towards *Paulicians* with their tangible semantic codes according to the specificities of the medieval world view. The two chosen texts the analysis is based on, are the legendary Bulgarian narrative *Sermon* about how the *Paulicians* have been conceived, and the Slavonic translation of 24th title of *Panoplia Dogmatica* by Euthymius Zigabenus. The analysis is followed by an English translation of the *Sermon* (insofar known in 8 copies), and a partial edition of the Slavonic translation of Zigabenus’s work upon the unique copy from the manuscript BAR 296, Library of the Romanian Academy of Sciences in Bucharest, dated between 1410–1420. The text account from the Slavonic manuscript is published for the first time, giving supplementary details about the overall Slavonic translation.

Keywords: Slavonic translation of *Panoplia Dogmatica*, *Paulicians*, Ms. slav. BAR 296

Mariyana Tsibranska–Kostova

Institute of Bulgarian language “Prof. L. Andreychin”

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Sofia 1113, № 53 Shipchenski prohod blvd., bl. 17

m.tsibranska@gmail.com

BOOK REVIEWS

DOI: 10.18778/2084-140X.07.14

ZOFIA RZEŹNICKA, MACIEJ KOKOSZKO, *Ab ovo ad γάλα. Jajka, mleko i produkty mleczne w medycynie i w sztuce kulinarnej (I–VIII) [Ab ovo ad γάλα. Eggs, Milk and Dairy Products in Medicine and Culinary Art (1st–7th c. A.D.)] [= *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, część III; *Dietetics and the Culinary Art of Antiquity and Early Byzantium (2nd–7th c. A.D.)*, vol. III], Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, Łódź 2016, pp. VI + 263 [= *Byzantina Lodziensia*, 28].*

The twenty-eighth volume within the series entitled *Byzantina Lodziensia* is devoted to issues common to the fields of the history of medicine, dietetics and culinary art of the period bracketed by the chronological timeframe of the 1st and 7th centuries A.D. Its authors focus on the issue of the consumption and the medical application of animal products which can collectively be described as dairy products.

It is worth emphasising here that Zofia Rzeźnicka and Maciej Kokoszko have been performing research on the cuisine and medicine of Antiquity and Byzantium for the last several and a dozen or so years, respectively, and that their scientific achievements in this matter, which consist of monographs, chapters in collective works, as well as a series of articles published in Polish and foreign periodicals, include descriptions of various food groups, medical procedures that involve the application of food-stuffs, and the dietary characteristics of individual ingredients and complex dishes¹.

The authors' activity in this field of research fits squarely into the dynamically developing trend of studies on Antique gastronomy

and its Byzantine branch. The work performed within the scope of this subject matter returns fruitful results in the form of studies devoted either to more general and introductory issues or more profoundly scrutinised individual areas of research. Simultaneously, the scientific activity of Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko incorporates research in another branch of historiography, which has a significantly older and more grounded place in science, namely the history of ancient (and Byzantine) medicine. The reviewed book is the outcome of the research the authors conducted in both aforementioned fields.

The work, which is divided into ten sections, consists of two major chapters: I. *Jajka w dietetyce, farmakologii, procedurach terapeutycznych i sztuce kulinarnej* [Eggs in Dietetics, Pharmacology, Therapeutic Procedures and Culinary Art], p. 9–58, and II. *Mleko i produkty mleczne* [Milk and Dairy Products], p. 59–182, within which there is a total of eleven sub-chapters (see: therein after) as well as *Wstęp* [Introduction], p. 1–7, *Wnioski końcowe* [Final Conclusions], p. 183–195, *Słownik podstawowych terminów greckich* [Dictionary of Basic Greek Terms], p. 197–203, *Wykaz skrótów* [List of abbreviations], p. 205–206, *Bibliografia* (Bibliography), p. 207–242, including a division into source texts and studies, an English-language abstract (p. 243–252), an *Indeks osób* (Name Index), p. 253–256 and, finally, *Indeks nazw geograficznych i etnicznych* (Index of Geographic and Ethnical Names), p. 257–258. Individual sections (excluding the indexes, the list of abbreviations and the bibliography) have been signed, which, on the one

¹ E.g. M. KOKOSZKO, *Ryby i ich znaczenie w życiu codziennym ludzi późnego antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (III–VII w.)*, Łódź 2005; IDEM, *Smaki Konstantynopola*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyńskim*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Warszawa 2011, p. 471–575; M. KOKOSZKO, K. JAGUSIAK, Z. RZEŹNICKA, *Zboża i produkty zbożowe w źródłach medycznych antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)* [= *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, vol. I], Łódź 2014.

hand, shows each author's input and contribution in the making of the book, and on the other hand, it demonstrates the scope of mutual research which they have been conducting.

Prior to discussing the content of individual sub-chapters, it is worth devoting a few words to the sources used by the authors, paying attention to four issues. Firstly, Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko analysed a vast corpus of Greek and Latin medical treatises (from Celsus to Paul of Aegina) well-known to them, complementing their contemplations with other works, both Greek (e.g. Athenaeus of Naucratis) and Latin (e.g. agronomic treatises). Secondly, the book considers late Antique and early Byzantine authors who wrote after Galen of Pergamon as basic sources of information. Here, their treatises are as important and approached with the same attention as the writings by the famous Pergamenian and earlier medical works. To my mind, such an approach to the sources from between the 2nd and 7th centuries makes the book by Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko a unique item on the publishing market. Next, despite narrowing the chronological timeframe of their work to a 'mere' 600 years, the authors have, in fact, used sources originating from a much longer period. Admittedly, the base of their research may have been treatises written between the 1st and 7th centuries A.D., but in their studies, they occasionally ventured much deeper, from as early as the 5th/6th century B.C. (*Corpus Hippocraticum*) to the 11th century A.D. (writings by Simeon Seth). And this was not limited by the aforementioned two extreme examples, since the sources used by Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko include numerous works created before the 1st century and after the 7th century A.D. This approach allowed the authors to demonstrate the origins of a large number of phenomena which are present in the period of history they scrutinise, and to show – on the one hand – the continuity and permanency of certain phenomena, and on the other hand, the evolution and changes that regard these phenomena. Finally, the reviewed book is not exclusively based on sources which could be described as professional or specialist treatises on such fields as medicine and agronomy, since the authors broadened the spectrum by includ-

ing works classified as the canon of *belles-lettres* (Homer, Aristophanes, Horace, Martial, etc.), epistolography (Cicero, Michael Psellos), edicts and official letters (Diocletian's edict on prices, *The Book of the Prefect*, etc.), philosophical treatises (Plato, Aristotle), and also the works which I would categorise as lexicography (the lexicon by Hesychius of Alexandria, *The Suda*). One must appreciate the effort the authors put into working on such varied groups of sources that require different approaches and interpretative skills. Undoubtedly, the picture of the issue being explored, generated by the comparison of the quoted writings with the medical, dietary, and culinary literature, is more comprehensive and offers a more precise description of reality to the reader.

Naturally, Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko never confined themselves to only analysing the sources. In their work, they made extensive use of the reference literature, both older publications, which nowadays can be described as classical for the issue being scrutinised, and more recent papers on historiography, archaeology, biology and literary studies.

Let us now discuss some of the substantive extracts of the reviewed book. The first chapter opens with Subchapter No. 1 (p. 9–12), in which Rzeźnicka provides the reader with a collection of general information on eggs in the analysed period (e.g. the manners in which they were stored). In Subchapter No. 2 (p. 12–17), she presents the dietary characteristics of the described product, focusing on Galen's opinions, which she complements with descriptions authored by Oribasius. Other medical authors are mentioned more superficially, which is explained by the fact that they were unoriginal, reproductive and dependent on the two aforementioned figures in the field. Subchapter No. 3 (p. 17–20) focuses on the pharmacological nature of eggs within the medical sources and is based almost exclusively on Galen. First, Rzeźnicka discusses the properties he attributed to albumen and yolk, and then focuses on individual types of eggs related to the manner in which they were cooked. In the following Subchapter No. 4 (p. 20–49), she discusses the application of eggs in therapeutic procedures, listing a range of diseases

for which various applications of the described product were recommended (as an ingredient of ointments, compresses, diet, plasters, enemas, suppositories, etc.). Rzeźnicka devoted the last, fifth subchapter (p. 49–58) to the role of eggs in the cuisine of the said period, since medical sources contained a certain amount of information on the issue. On reading this extract, not only do we learn the most typical dishes, which are also present in modern cuisine (boiled and soft-boiled eggs, scrambled eggs), but also much less known, much more complex and multi-ingredient dishes, which are significantly more exotic to the 21st century reader, e.g. sea urchin casserole or *afrutum* (p. 51). Rzeźnicka complements her text with some information stemming from non-medical sources (mainly *De re coquinaria*), which fully demonstrates the multitude of culinary applications of eggs and makes a significant contribution to determining their actual role in the diet of the people living in that period. This is perfectly illustrated by the extract (p. 52–53) in which Rzeźnicka throws light on the issue of the nearly topical Horatian expression (partially present also in the title of the reviewed book) *ab ovo usque ad mala*. She explains that the author of *The Satires* did communicate (I, 3, 6–7) that, customarily, Romans began their feasts by eating eggs, but in other texts he completely ignored them in the context, and, from other sources, it is known that they could appear on the menu at other stages of the feast.

Chapter 2 is the fruit of the collaboration between both authors. In the first subchapter (p. 59–62), the stereotypical role of dairy products in the Antique diet (food eaten by simple or even primitive people such as shepherds and nomads) is explained, which – contrary to popular belief – were not only permanently present in the diet of the poorer and shepherd-related part of society within the Mediterranean region, but also, occasionally, they were a delicacy of the elites who were not normally associated with this type of food (cheese seems to be the only product that does not fit into this popular opinion). The second subchapter (p. 63–95) focuses on the pre-Galenic galactology, i.e. on messages from Celsus and Dioscorides. Besides

discussing the properties attributed to milk and its derivatives, and the therapeutic applications of the products described by both authors, there is also a significant amount of additional information, which reveals – somewhat by the way – more than just the everyday consumption and disease treatment aspects of daily life related to dairy products. The authors focus on such issues as the technology of milk preservation and the prioritised (in the conditions of the times) breeding of milk animals. Subchapter No. 3 (p. 96–127) focuses on the writings by Galen and medical doctors who were active between the 4th and 7th century. Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko begin their reasoning with the Galenic division of milk into whey, coagulum and fat, and then go on to discuss the issue of the influence that consuming various types of milk has on people. A particularly interesting extract seems to be the fragment in which the authors quote remarks related to the relationship between the food eaten by breastfeeding mothers and the health of children, and between the fodder for milk animals and the wellbeing of people who drink their milk (p. 98–99). Rzeźnicka devoted the fourth subchapter (p. 128–134) to present the nature of soured milk (as explained by the Greek term *oksygala*), whose – almost unvaryingly unfavourable – dietary characteristics, medical applications and usage in gastronomy she provided in accordance with the previously applied scheme. Somewhat by the way, she also discusses two other similar products: *schistón gála* (p. 131–132), i.e. the so-called coagulated milk, and *mélke* (p. 133), i.e. a mixture of milk with hot vinegar. In Subchapter No. 5 (p. 134–169), constructed in accordance with the previously applied scheme, the authors focused on cheese, providing detailed information on its production methods, the regions best known for the manufacture of its most famous types, and an extensively long list of ways in which it was served. The final, sixth subchapter, following this pattern, discusses the properties of butter, its medical applications and its role in cooking. The text commences with a presentation of some information derived from Galen, which, in terms of accuracy and specificity, is inferior to the writings by Oribasius, Aetius

and Paul of Aegina, as far as therapeutics is concerned. Apart from extremely detailed descriptions of the medical applications of butter in e.g. gynaecology, urology and laryngology (in the form of cataplasms, ointments, enemas, suppositories, etc.), it is also worth paying attention to other observations made by the authors, who write that for the creators of the analysed source texts, the consumption of butter – as opposed to olive oil – indicated an affinity to the world of northern barbarians (thus, it ought to be noticed here that this was another such pair of products, besides wine and beer, and – to a certain extent – cheese and soured milk, the consumption of which was associated with belonging to either the Greek and Roman culture or the world of the so-called barbarians).

We must not forget that the reviewed book is designed as the third part of the series entitled *Dietetics and Culinary Art of Antiquity and Early Byzantium* (2nd–7th c. A.D.). It may function as a fully independent volume, the reading and understanding of which is not preconditioned by having read the two previous publications (*Byzantina Lodziensia* 16 and 19). And yet, only when accompanied by them can it become a well-organised and clear picture of dietary schemes, medical applications of food, and dietary opinions and statements known in the Mediterranean world in the analysed period. In previous volumes, these aspects were described in reference to cereals (part 1), and legumes, vegetables, meat and offal (part 2). Thus, the book by Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko is, in this respect, a natural and logical complementation of the contemplations on animal products contained in the previous volume.

The author's work is not free of certain inconsistencies. Although they do not significantly impact the general quality of the book, they do require a few words of explanation. One of the issues which ought to be brought up here is the manner of quoting Latin systematic names of species and genera of plants and animals which appear in the book. Occasionally, and it also seems that in reference to names which are less common and not well-known among contemporary readers (e.g. *ajwain*, p. 179), the

authors provide in brackets the Latin terminology binding within the contemporary systematics. Their policy, however, happens to be inconstant, since the rather unknown *portulaca* (p. 39) lacks such an accurate description, and, at times, the same sentence contains several names of plants, some of which are provided in Polish and Latin and some are not. Another doubtful issue is the manner in which Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko refer to the Latin culinary treatise entitled *De re coquinaria*. As determined by the contemporary science (and confirmed by the authors [e.g. on pages 52, 125, 181 and 254]), this is an anonymous work, a compilation most likely written in the 4th century A.D. Therefore, any participation of Apicius – a Roman gourmet who had lived approximately 300 years earlier, or any other potential cuisine experts bearing the same name (although it cannot be ruled out that the compiler included some extracts signed by an Apicius or somebody writing under this name) – has already been excluded. And yet, in the footnotes, Rzeźnicka and Kokoszko consistently refer the reader to Apicius while referring to the fragments of *De re coquinaria* (according to their record, numbered as I and II, where I means the Polish and II the English edition). What is more, contradicting their own statements, at a certain point, they even recognise him as the author of the treatise (p. 54).

Nevertheless, these inaccuracies do not influence a general evaluation of the book, which constitutes a valuable and unique complementation of the aforementioned research fields (the history of medicine and the history of nutrition). And this can primarily be attributed to a vast and profound analysis of the achievements of the Byzantine *ars medicina* (which until today has often been ignored as a reproductive stage between Antique and Arabic therapeutics) within the context of dietetics and nutrition. As a result of the work conducted by the authors, we are presented with a monograph of a high substantive level, closed within a well-constructed and approachable form, which is crucial and uneasy to achieve with such a specific source base and topic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

KOKOSZKO M., *Ryby i ich znaczenie w życiu codziennym ludzi późnego antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (III–VII w.)*, Łódź 2005.

KOKOSZKO M., *Smaki Konstantynopola*, [in:] *Konstantynopol – Nowy Rzym. Miasto i ludzie w okresie wczesnobizantyńskim*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, T. WOLIŃSKA, Warszawa 2011, p. 471–575.

KOKOSZKO M., JAGUSIAK K., RZEŃNICKA Z., *Zboża i produkty zbożowe w źródłach medycznych antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)* [= *Dietetyka i sztuka kulinarna antyku i wczesnego Bizancjum (II–VII w.)*, vol. I], Łódź 2014.

Krzysztof Jagusiak (Łódź)

Uniwersytet Łódzki, Centrum Ceraneum

DOI: 10.18778/2084-140X.07.15

АНЕТА ДИМИТРОВА, *Златоструят в преводаческата дейност на старобългарските книжовници* [The Zlatostruy in the Translation Work of Old Bulgarian Writers], Авалон, София 2016, pp. 456.

The book is dedicated to the *Zlatostruy*, one of the most famous monuments of Old Bulgarian literature from the period of the reign of tsar Simeon (893–927). In particular, the study focuses on the first 45 texts (sermons, or 'slovo's) from the long Slavic redaction. The miscellany's remarkable popularity in medieval Bulgaria (and in the sphere of *Slavia Orthodoxa* in general), attested to by tens of copies, was the effect of several factors. On the one hand, it resulted from the tsar's personal involvement in its compilation, as well as from the reputation of the author of the texts, St. John Chrysostom (350?–407) – one of the most renowned preachers of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The primary reason, however, is probably to be sought in the texts themselves – providing the still newly Christian community with interpretations of the basics of the faith, commenting on fragments of the Holy Bible, glorifying virtues, and condemning sins.

The book by Aneta Dimitrova is an exceedingly meticulous and accurate study of the linguistic and stylistic features of the *Zlatostruy*. It is divided into four parts.

The first part (*Въведение / Introduction*, pp. 9–78) is an extensive introduction into the topic of the research. Following a presentation of the aims and methods applied in the analysis of the sources (which include 6 Slavic and 23 Greek manuscripts), the author contextualizes

the material in both the Slavic and the Greek tradition, lucidly outlining the relations between the various redactions of the *Zlatostruy* (long, short and 'Hilandar') and the compilation of Simeon I the Great; she also describes the latter's links to the Preslav literary school. The introduction features a separate commentary on the biblical quotations found in the *Zlatostruy* and their role in the analysis of the text. Although the author points out (p. 61) that the issue requires a separate, detailed study, she feels she cannot skip it entirely in her description. This is due to its importance and its organic relation with the type of texts involved (an ideal environment for biblical quotations in view of both genre and topic). The author points out the obstacles that may be encountered in the course of such research, especially the high degree of variation in biblical quotations in the Greek text, the fact that the original Slavic translation is lost, and the many discrepancies observed among the existing Slavic manuscripts and redactions of the *Zlatostruy*. The final issue discussed in the introduction is the character of the language of the original Greek text.

The second part (*Коментар на словата L1–L45 / Commentary on the sermons / 'slovo's* L1–L45, p. 79–308) is the core of the monograph, comprising extensive commentaries on all 45 texts of the *Zlatostruy*. Each commentary includes the general information on the text's

location within the collection, the Byzantine original and its variants, the relations between the original text and the translation as well as certain linguistic remarks on the Slavic material. The latter, although understandably not constituting comprehensive studies, refer to several aspects of language – morphology, syntax and vocabulary – thus offering a quite broad view of the topic. In view of the sizable corpus, the author arbitrarily chooses the linguistic problems for her analysis. In the domain of morphology, Dimitrova focuses on the use of archaic forms (e.g. inflectional endings of non-productive declensional types or aorist forms), forms that she considers “innovations” attested in the spoken language from the time, “East Bulgarianisms” or “Balkanisms” (p. 46; the relative pronoun *ижего*, the lack of the ending *-тъ* in the 3rd sg. present, etc.), as well as other forms interesting from the point of view of the history of the Bulgarian language (the various ways of expressing the passive voice, the periphrastic future tense with auxiliary verbs serving to render the Greek synthetic future, etc.). In her analysis of the syntax, the author points out the ways in which the translation handles Greek constructions involving the definite article (substantivized, attributive and participial), infinitive with article, accusative and infinitive, as well as genitive and dative absolute; furthermore, she studies the Old Bulgarian verbal constructions with *da*. As regards the vocabulary of the texts, it may, according to Dimitrova, be divided into the following groups: a) ‘Preslav’ and ‘non-Preslav, Cyrillo-Methodian, archaic’, b) words of Greek, Semitic and Proto-Bulgar origin, c) compounds, and d) theological, philosophical and

abstract terminology. For each text, the linguistic comments are supplemented by examples, often portraying the most interesting solutions and/or mistakes made by the translators.

The individual commentaries and analyses of each word of the *Zlatostruy* provided in the second part of the book enable the author to draw some general conclusions in the third part (*Обобщение и заключение / Generalizations and conclusions*, p. 309–315). These pertain to all of the linguistic aspects discussed above, revealing both similarities and differences among the texts under analysis.

Finally, the annexes – prepared with astonishing fastidiousness – constitute an integral part of the book. They include: a) the distinctive features of the translations (p. 335–356), b) the equivalents of constructions with the article in individual texts (p. 357–365), and c) an Old Bulgarian–Greek and Greek–Old Bulgarian dictionary of selected lexemes attested in the material (p. 367–444).

The impact of this publication on the general scholarship on the *Zlatostruy* is indisputable. Furthermore, one cannot underestimate its value for comparative research on language history and textology. It is only to be hoped that in her future research, the author – after such arduous philological work, part of which could not be included in the publication – will resolve to develop the points she had to forego at this stage, and that she will apply the same impressive level of commitment.

Agata Kawecka (Łódź)

* *Uniwersytet Łódzki, Wydział Filologiczny, Katedra Filologii Słowiańskiej*

DOI: 10.18778/2084-140X.07.16

MARCIN BÖHM, *Rola flot obcych w procesie ostatecznego rozkładu sił morskich cesarstwa bizantyńskiego (1118–1204) [The Role of Foreign Fleets in the Decomposition of the Naval Forces of Byzantium]*, Napoleon V, Oświęcim 2016, pp. 239.

One of the main areas of interest of Marcin Böhm – a historian of the University of Opole and the author of the reviewed book

– is the fleet in the Middle Byzantine period. He dedicated one of his books so far to this subject, which was based upon his PhD thesis titled:

Flota i polityka morska Aleksego I Komnena. Kryzys bizantyńskiej floty wojennej w XI wieku i jego przezwyciężenie przez Aleksego I Komnena [*Fleet and Marine Policy of Alexios I Komnenos. Crisis of the Byzantine Navy in the 9th Century and its Resolution by Alexios I Komnenos*] and several articles¹. The aim of Böhm's new publication is to depict the process of weakening of the military fleet of the Byzantine Empire, which eventually resulted in its fall during the time of the Fourth Crusade. The author ponders over the causes of such phenomenon, pointing out that the main one was the necessity for the Byzantine forces to confront itself with the fleets of its enemies (Normans, Italian cities, Crusaders) in years 1118–1204.

The book is divided into four main parts. In the first one: *Flota bizantyńska w latach 1118–1204. Nowe zagrożenia i stare problemy* [*The Byzantine Fleet in Years 1118–1204. New Dangers and Old Problems*] (p. 23–48), the author, after defining the phenomenon of the *strangeness* towards the Byzantines shown by their various enemies and allies in the author's sphere of interests (p. 23–33), presents the organization of the imperial fleet and the institutional rules of its functions (p. 33–42), and finally characterizes ships used by the Empire and new tendencies in shipbuilding, which could be observed at this time in northern Europe (p. 42–48).

In the second chapter: *Normanowie* [*Normans*] (p. 49–94), Böhm analyzes a case of Norman-Byzantine struggle in years 1113–1194, from the specific angle concerning the use of naval forces. This chapter was divided into three parts. In the first one the author touches the

period of 1113–1146 (p. 49–64), which marks a rapid development of Norman war fleet, that became a grave danger for the Byzantines, who however stayed passive. In the second part Böhm presents a Norman-Byzantine war of 1147–1158 (p. 64–83), with special attention dedicated to the activity of naval forces, including the Italian expedition of Manuel I Komnenos. Eventually, the final part of this chapter analyzes the use of fleet in Norman-Byzantine relations during the latter years of Manuel I reign as well as Andronicus I Komnenos and Isaac Angelos (p. 83–94)

The third chapter: *Komuny północnej Italii* [*The Communes of North Italy*] (p. 95–131), dedicated to the relations between Byzantines and Venetians, Genoans and Pisans, is divided into two parts. In the first one the author follows the changes in the relations between the Empire and Venice, from cooperation to military confrontation (excluding Venetian participation in the Fourth Crusade) (p. 95–116), and in the second presents the history of Byzantine ties with Genoans and Pisans, whose naval forces were meant to replace Byzantine navy and become a counterbalance to hostile Venetians (p. 116–131).

In the fourth chapter: *Krzyżowcy* [*Crusaders*] (p. 133–182), the author describes naval conflicts of Byzantines against crusaders from Second to the Fourth Crusade (from 1114 to 1204). This chapter is divided into four parts. The first one concerns military actions on the seas during the Second Crusade, the following, Byzantine expedition to Egypt in 1169, third, fighting during the Third Crusade and the last one concerns the fleet engagements during the Fourth Crusade.

The book is supplemented with an *Introduction* (p. 7–21), *Conclusion* (p. 183–188) three annexes (p. 189–202), the first concerning Byzantine river fleets (primarily on the Danube) during the reigns of John and Manuel I Komnenos – *Zapomniany front – rola Dunaju i innych śródlądowych cieków wodnych w działaniach Jana II i Manuela I Komnena wymierzonych w Węgrów i koczowników w latach 1127–1167, w świetle relacji Jana Kinnamosa i Niketasa Choniatesa* [*A Forgotten Front – the Role of*

¹ Among others: *Konstantynopolińska eskadra cesarska w dobie panowania Komnenów (1081–1185)*, [in:] *Miasto na skrzyżowaniu mórz i kontynentów. Wczesno- i średniobizantyński Konstantynopol jako miasto portowe*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, K. MARINOW, Łódź 2016 [= BL, 23], p. 47–62; *Remarks on the History of the Navy of the Empire of Nicaea in the Light of the Chronicle of Georgios Akropolites*, ILSHS 74, 2016, p. 54–57; *The Mediterranean Sea in the maritime Policy of the Byzantine emperors in the VI Century*, ILSHS 6, 2013, p. 75–85; *Transport morski normańskich koni w trakcie działań wojennych Boemunda na Bałkanach w latach 1107–1108*, VP 63, 2015, p. 429–443.

Danube and other inland watercourses in John II and Manuel I Komnenos' operations against Hungarians and nomads in 1127–1167 in the light of John Kinnamos and Niketas Choniates] (p. 189–192), the second contains the prosopography of the commanders of Byzantine naval forces in the years 1118–1204 (p. 193–200) and the third a list of rulers (of Byzantium, Venetia, Antioch, Jerusalem, Apulia, Calabria, Sicilia and Germany). Furthermore, the book features an English summary (p. 203–207), bibliography (p. 209–225), maps and illustrations (p. 226–231) and indexes (p. 232–239).

The author made a thorough and broad analysis of the source material and confronted the results with rich literature. This led to the creation of an interesting and original book that constitutes and attempt at determining the causes for the destruction of Byzantine naval forces in the end of Middle Byzantine period.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

BÖHM M., *Flota i polityka morska Aleksego I Komnena. Kryzys bizantyńskiej floty wojennej w XI wieku i jego przezwyciężenie przez Aleksego I Komnena*, Kraków 2012.

BÖHM M., *Konstantynopolińska eskadra cesarska w dobie panowania Komnenów (1081–1185)*, [in:] *Miasto na skrzyżowaniu mórz i kontynentów. Wczesno- i średniobizantyński Konstantynopol jako miasto portowe*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, K. MARINOW, Łódź 2016 [= *Byzantina Lodziensia*, 23], p. 47–62.

BÖHM M., *The Mediterranean Sea in the maritime Policy of the Byzantine emperors in the VI Century*, "International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences" 6, 2013, p. 75–85.

BÖHM M., *Remarks on the History of the Navy of the Empire of Nicaea in the Light of the Chronicle of Georgios Akropolites*, "International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences" 74, 2016, p. 54–57.

BÖHM M., *Transport morski normańskich koni w trakcie działań wojennych Boemunda na Bałkanach w latach 1107–1108*, "Vox Patrum. Antyk Chrześcijański" 63, 2015, p. 429–443.

Miroslaw J. Leszka (Łódź)*

Translated by Łukasz Pigoński

* Uniwersytet Łódzki, Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny, Katedra Historii Bizancjum

DOI: 10.18778/2084-140X.07.17

ΤΕΟΦΥΛΑΚΤΟΣ ΣΙΜΟΚΑΤΗΣ, *Οικουμενική ιστορία* / ΤΕΟΦΙΛΑΚΤ ΣΙΜΟΚΑΤΤΑ, *Historia powszechna*, przekład, wstęp, komentarz i indeksy Anna Kotłowska, Łukasz Różycki, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, Poznań 2016, pp. 499 [Rhomaioi. Źródła do historii Bizancjum, 7].

Οικουμενική ιστορία by Theophilact Simocatta¹, Byzantine historian and author, writing in first decades of the 7th century, constitutes an invaluable source for learning the history of the Byzantine Empire and its relations with the outside world in years 582–602. Due to

¹ Besides *Οικουμενική ιστορία* Theophilact is an author of several other works, namely *Quaestiones physicae*, *Dialogus de praedestinatione* as well as *Epistulae ethicae rusticatae et amatory*, from which the latter was more popular and, which might be especially interesting for the Polish reader, translated to Latin by Nicolaus Copernicus.

the fact that these years coincide with the time when the emperor Maurice held the throne, Theophilact is considered a chronicler of his reign².

The work of Theophilact is also an important source for the history of Slavic people in the Early Middle Ages, which makes it exceptionally interesting for the Polish audience. Certainly that was one of the reasons why Anna Kotłowska and Łukasz Różycki, two Polish scholars

² M. WHITBY, *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare*, Oxford 1988.

from Poznań who represent the younger generation, yet have already a considerable academic output³, took the effort of the translation. The task was undoubtedly not the easy one, because the language of *Οικουμενική ιστορία* is widely considered as difficult, archaic and filled with literary references. The work of Theophilact was translated to modern languages (Russian, English, German and Hungarian) and the authors of those translations were scholars of such renown as Nina V. Pigulevska⁴, Peter Schreiner⁵, Mark and Mary Whitby⁶ and Teresa Olajos⁷.

The main part of the book obviously consists of Polish translation of Theophilact's work with a commentary (p. 31–396). It is preceded by the introduction (p. 9–30) where the information concerning the biography and the work of

Theophilact were presented (p. 9–11) as well as the historical overview of the times described by Theophilact (p. 11–22), rules on how to express various names from the *History* in Polish with bibliographical annotations (p. 22–23); finally, the military functions and ranks were described (p. 23–29). The book is supplemented by appendices (p. 399–444) that consist of: *Rola i miejsce mów w dziele Teofilakta Simokatty* [*The Role and Place of Sermons in the Work of Theophilact Simocatta*] (p. 399–424), *Bitwa pod Solachon w roku 586 w świetle dzieł Teofilakta Simokatty i Teofanasa Wyznawcy* [*The Battle of Solachon in the Year 586 According to the Works of Theophilact Simocatta and Theophanes the Confessor*] (p. 425–438), *Wykaz władców Iranu przed podbojem arabskim* [*A List of the Rulers of Iran Before the Arab Conquest*] (p. 439–440), maps (p. 441–444), as well as bibliography (p. 445–471) and indexes (p. 473–500).

The translation of *Οικουμενική ιστορία* was made with expertise and thoroughness. The authors attempted to stay close to the original, capturing, as far as it was possible in Polish, the specifics of Theophilact's style. In addition, the translation is facilitated by exhaustive commentary, prepared on the basis of rich literature and own research. The texts added in the *Appendix*, concerning the role of sermons in Theophilact's work and the battle fought between Byzantines and Persians at Solachon in the year 586 constitute an interesting input of the authors in the research of Theophilact's work.

The translation of Theophilact's *Οικουμενική ιστορία* by Anna Kotłowska and Łukasz Różycki is a very successful attempt at transmitting this important Early Byzantine historical source to the Polish language. With complete conviction I encourage its authors to pursue further efforts in order to bring other works of Byzantine historians closer to the Polish audience⁸.

³ Anna Kotłowska is the author two books: *Obraz dziejów w Chronici canones Euzebiusza z Cezarei*, Poznań 2009; *Ἀναβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ... Zwierzęta w kulturze literackiej Bizantyńczyków*, Poznań 2013; translations: AMBROSIVS, *De obitu Valentianiani/Św. AMBROŻY, Mowa na śmierć Walentyniana*, trans. A. KOTŁOWSKA, ed. K. ILSKI, Poznań 2007; AMBROSIVS, *De obitu Theodosii/Św. AMBROŻY, Mowa na śmierć Teodozjusza*, trans. A. KOTŁOWSKA, introd. K. ILSKI, Poznań 2008; *Księga eparcha*, trans., A. KOTŁOWSKA, introd. K. ILSKI, Poznań 2010; *Testimonia najdawniejszych dziejów Słowian*, seria grecka, z. 6: *Pisarze wieku XI*, trans. A. KOTŁOWSKA, cooperation A. BRZOSTKOWSKA, Warszawa 2013; while Ł. Różycki published among other things: *Mauricii Strategicon. Praktyczny podręcznik wojskowy i dzieło antykwaryczne*, Poznań 2015, pp. 262 [= La, 13]; *Wszystkie okręty cesarza. Rozważania nad stanem rzymskiej marynarki wojennej za panowania cesarza Maurycjusza (582–602)*, [in:] *Miasto na skrzyżowaniu mórz i kontynentów. Wczesno i średniobizantyński Konstantynopol jako miasto portowe*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, K. MARINOW, Łódź 2016 [= BL, 23], p. 17–45; *Fear – elements of Slavic "psychological warfare"*, *JAHA* 2.1, 2015, p. 23–29; *Description de l'Ukraine in light of De Administrando Imperio: Two Accounts of a Journey along the Dnieper*, *Bsl* 72, 2014, p. 122–135.

⁴ ФЕОФИЛАКТ СИМОКАТТА, *История*, trans. Н.В. ПИГУЛЕВСКАЯ, Москва 1957.

⁵ THEOPHYLAKTOS SIMOKATES, *Geschichte*, trans., ed., P. SCHREINER, Stuttgart, Stuttgart 1985.

⁶ *The History of Theophilact Simocatta*, trans. M. WHITBY, M. WHITBY, Oxford 1986.

⁷ THEOPHYLAKTOSZ SZIMOKATTÉSZ, *Világtörténelem*, trans. T. OLAJOS, Budapest 2012.

⁸ These studies were also published in English: *The Role and Place of Speeches in the Work of Theophilact Simocatta*, *VP* 36, 2016, p. 353–382; *The Battle of Solachon of 586 in light of the works of Theophilact Simocatta and Theophanes Confessor (Homologetes)*, *TM* 19, 2015, p. 315–327.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMBROSIUS, *De obitu Theodosii* / Św. AMBROŻY, *Mowa na śmierć Teodozjusza*, trans. A. KOTŁOWSKA, introd. K. ILSKI, Poznań 2008.

AMBROSIUS, *De obitu Valentiniani* / Św. AMBROŻY, *Mowa na śmierć Walentyniana*, trans. A. KOTŁOWSKA, ed. K. ILSKI, Poznań 2007.

FEOFILAKT SIMOKATTA, *Istorija*, trans. N.V. PIGULEVSKAJA, Moskva 1957.

The History of Theophylact Simocatta, trans. M. WHITBY, M. WHITBY, Oxford 1986.

KOTŁOWSKA A., 'Ἀναβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ... Zwięrzęta w kulturze literackiej Bizantyńczyków, Poznań 2013.

KOTŁOWSKA A., *Obraz dziejów w Chronici canones Euzebiusza z Cezarei*, Poznań 2009.

KOTŁOWSKA A., RÓŻYCKI Ł., *The Battle of Solachon of 586 in light of the works of Theophylact Simocatta and Theophanes Confessor (Homologetes)*, "Travaux et Mémoires" 19, 2015, p. 315–327.

KOTŁOWSKA A., RÓŻYCKI Ł., *The Role and Place of Speeches in the Work of Theophylact Simocatta*, "Vox Patrum. Antyk Chrześcijański" 36, 2016, p. 353–382.

Księga eparcha, trans., A. KOTŁOWSKA, introd. K. ILSKI, Poznań 2010.

RÓŻYCKI Ł., *Description de l'Ukraine in light of De Administrando Imperio: Two Accounts of a Journey along the Dnieper*, "Byzantinoslavica" 72, 2014, p. 122–135.

RÓŻYCKI Ł., *Fear – elements of Slavic "psychological warfare"*, "Journal of Ancient History and Archeology" 2.1, 2015, p. 23–29.

RÓŻYCKI Ł., *Mauricii Strategicon. Praktyczny podręcznik wojskowy i dzieło antykwaryczne*, Poznań 2015, pp. 262 [= Labarum, 13].

RÓŻYCKI Ł., *Wszystkie okręty cesarza. Rozważania nad stanem rzymskiej marynarki wojennej za panowania cesarza Maurycjusza (582–602)*, [in.:] *Miasto na skrzyżowaniu mórz i kontynentów. Wczesno i średnio-bizantyński Konstantynopol jako miasto portowe*, ed. M.J. LESZKA, K. MARINOW, Łódź 2016 [= *Byzantina Lodziensia*, 23], p. 17–45.

Testimonia najdawniejszych dziejów Słowian, seria grecka, z. 6: *Pisarze wieku XI*, trans. A. KOTŁOWSKA, cooper. A. BRZÓSTKOWSKA, Warszawa 2013.

THEOPHŪLAKTOSZ SZIMOKATTÉSZ, *Világtörténelem*, trans. T. OLAJOS, Budapest 2012.

THEOPHYLAKTOS SIMOKATES, *Geschichte*, trans., ed. P. SCHREINER, Stuttgart, Stuttgart 1985.

WHITBY M., *The Emperor Maurice and his Historian Theophylact Simocatta on Persian and Balkan Warfare*, Oxford 1988.

Miroslaw J. Leszka (Łódź)
Translated by Łukasz Pięgoński

DOI: 10.18778/2084-140X.07.18

MATEJ GOGOLA, *Mandylión z Edessy. Rukou-destvorený obraz a jeho miesto v byzantskom umení a duchovnej kultúre* [Mandylión of Edessa. The Image Not Made by Human Hands and its Place Within Byzantine Art and Spiritual Culture], Bratislava: PostScriptum, 2017, pp. 192.

In Slovak historiography, the monograph by Mgr. Matej Gogola, PhD stands out as absolutely unique. It discusses one of the most beautiful Christian legends as well as the image that constitutes its "real" result and proof. The Image of Jesus Christ not made by hands (*acheiropoietos*) underwent an interesting his-

torical development in the Byzantine Empire and was held in very high esteem in connection with both the spiritual and the practical aspects of life.

As a PhD student at Comenius University, under the supervision of Martin Hurbanič, Matej Gogola spent significant time in Vienna

¹ Uniwersytet Łódzki, Wydział Filozoficzno-Historyczny, Katedra Historii Bizancjum

and Moscow; thus, his scholarship reflects both Western and Russian literature on the subject. The work fulfils all the “mandatory” requirements of an academic monograph (high number of primary sources, use of relevant secondary literature, summary of previous research, independent views and reasoning on the topic). The monograph is based on the author’s doctoral dissertation defended in August 2014 at the General History Department, Faculty of Arts, Comenius University in Bratislava. Since the reviewer has the dissertation at his disposal, it may be pointed out that the greater part of the text has undergone extensive editing, supplementation and refinement.

The *Predhovor* [*Preface*], p. 7–11, besides introducing the topic as such, also outlines the structure of the monograph and defines the basic objectives of the work. The introduction first concisely addresses the general object of the work (the Byzantine spiritual world), then the more specific one (the Abgar cycle), to finally approach the direct – one might even say “physical” – object. The latter is the Image of Edessa, which is *acheiropoietos*, i.e. not made by (human) hands. Naturally, the author focuses on the story of King Abgar of Edessa. The ruler, having fallen gravely ill, sent his envoys to Jesus Christ to plead for help. However, unable to visit either Abgar or Edessa, Jesus answered the call by imprinting his face (as per one of the versions of the story) onto a piece of cloth, thus creating his own image. Subsequently, the image became an important and specific element in the historical and spiritual development of Edessa, Constantinople, the Byzantine Empire as well as the whole Orthodox world. In the *Preface*, Matej Gogola sketches out the structural division of the monograph, including some accompanying subtopics. The first part of the monograph approaches the issues of the pagan predecessors of the Image of Edessa not made by hands and lays out a potential foundation for understanding the image on the basis of Scripture. This part also introduces the individual categories of images, including their apotropaic and magical attributes. The second part of the monograph deals with the cycle of legends about King Abgar, based on the analysis of written sources.

The author declares the monograph’s objectives as follows. Firstly, he aims to increase the awareness about the topic amongst both academics and non-specialists through discussing the basis of the cult of images in Christianity and by analysing the relevant source texts. Secondly, he attempts to bridge the existing discrepancies in the pertinent terminology (*mandylion* – *acheiropoietos*). Thirdly, in connection with the previous point, the author argues for a legitimate place of the term *not made by hand(s)* (*rukou-nestvoreny*) in Slovak historiography and historical terminology.

The *Preface* is followed by the introduction, entitled *O ikonách. O obrazoch* [*On icons. On images*], p. 12–15. Here, the content and function of the term *icon* is discussed. The author points out that the semantics of the term may vary, especially taking into account the way the term is understood currently (with regard to the Middle Ages and Scripture).

The *Preface* and the introduction are followed by the first chapter, containing an overview of the previous research. Since only several works devoted to the Image of Edessa exist, the author often dedicates whole short paragraphs to each of the more important ones. Occasionally, this chapter is reminiscent of its original dissertation character; some superfluous information is at times provided. The latter includes, for instance, detailed introductions of authors of secondary literature, their professions, scholarly achievements, dates of birth/death etc. (a reader can easily order the works cited chronologically on the basis of the text of the monograph as well as the publication dates). Similarly, various authors’ views on issues outside of the scope of the monograph are often discussed. In a serious monograph like the one under review, such digressions are hardly warranted. On the other hand, it should be noted that the author generally avoids pointless digressions; he guides the flow of the text in a straightforward manner, carefully using references to sources and secondary literature and maintaining his overall focus on the designated goals. As concerns the secondary literature, its spans both older, 19th century classics (William Cureton, Karl Matthes, Alexander Lvovich Katanskij,

Richard Adalbert Lipsius, Ernst von Dobschütz) and more recent, 20th century works, both better and lesser known (e.g. by Steven Runciman, Averil Cameron, Jelena Nikitichova Meschchenskaja, Hans Belting or Alexey Michajlovich Lidov). In both the *Preface* and the introduction, when dealing with secondary literature, the author aptly highlights those features or “partial questions” that he deems particularly important (e.g. the possible filiation of the legends, tracing the tradition, discussions on usage and terminology, etc.).

The second chapter, entitled *Prologomena k problematike – etymológia a termíny* [*Prologomena to the topic – etymology and terminology*], p. 31–46, addresses the first use of the term *acheiropoietos* (though not related to an image) in the New Testament. It is paradoxical, however, that the work should place the use of the adjective *acheiropoietos* in a papyrus letter from Nearchos to Heliodoros before the Epistle to the Corinthians, the Epistle to the Colossians and the Gospel of Mark: chronologically, this is not coherent. The inclusion of a minor subchapter dealing with terminology is indeed justified. As already observed by the author on the introductory pages, the topic is beset with certain terminological inconsistencies – in particular, the retrospective (and thus anachronistic) use of the later and broader term *mandylion* in reference to the Image of Edessa. However, it would be appropriate to mention the first use of the term *acheiropoietos* (by Pseudo-Zacharias) referring to the Image of Edessa already at this point; this information only appears 20 pages later (p. 51). If the subchapter on terminology and etymology also included commentaries on the use of terminology in the secondary literature (the author is obviously well-acquainted with the relevant facts – he mentions and quotes them properly, although these references are scattered throughout the text) and combined this with a discussion on the terminology used in the primary sources, this part of the book would become a fine, full-fledged chapter of the monograph (together with the discussion of the etymology of *mandylion*).

On the other hand, the structure of the monograph is the author’s decision – and, in fact, the

work does benefit from his choice to continue in a different manner. In the next part of the book (p. 33–34), the text regains its dynamics. This indispensable subchapter providing the crucial context of evolution is entitled *Obrazy v predkřesťanském období* [*Images in the pre-Christian period*], p. 34–36. Images of the *Diipetes* type (the *Trojan palladium*, the images of Artemis from Ephesus and of Serapis from Alexandria) were held in very high esteem and served as a developmental model for images of Christ. The following subchapter continues with a historical overview of the cult of images, focusing on the attitudes of the early Christian Church towards the Old Testament prohibition of the worship of images and idols. It also discusses the status of the legend on St. Luke’s Icon of Mother of God and its credibility. The subchapter analyses the position of Christian communities based on passages from the Bible and from the Church Fathers (Tertullian in particular). The subsequent stage in the development is the *Imago imperialis*, which precedes images related to the Christian cult. This kind of image – more specifically, a portrait of an emperor – served as a deputy for the emperor himself. The image could preside over courts and administrative assemblies and could be venerated. Receiving the imperial image symbolised the legitimization of the recipient’s position.

Inspired by Ernst Kitzinger, Matej Gogola divides the *Křesťanské acheiropoietai v Byzancii* [*Christian acheiropoietoi in the Byzantine Empire*], p. 47–56, into 1) those that had the status of “not made by hands” according to the tradition (Image of Edessa, Shroud of Turin) and 2) those that were mediated by a person but still wield the same power, functioning as a sort of “print” of the archetype (the *Camouliana* as well as two other images which were created as a result of its effect, or the *Keramion*). Such images appear in sources from the second half of the 6th century onwards, but, as emphasized by the author, it is challenging to discover the exact reason behind their emergence. The phenomenon of an image possessing spiritual power was far from being a novelty, as already demonstrated in the previous chapters: in Hellenised areas, the above-mentioned *Diipetes* are relatively

well-documented. The author links this fact to the Byzantine social and spiritual atmosphere, significantly influenced by the state of permanent war and recurring natural disasters. The first source containing an account on the *acheiropoietoi* is the *Syriac Chronicle* by the so-called Pseudo-Zacharias, referring to the *Camouliana* (this topic is covered by the first subchapter of the third chapter). It does not mention the legend of Abgar, but the one of Hypatia of Camulia (in Cappadocia): a pagan woman who witnessed a revelation of Christ's face on a piece of cloth in a fountain. Hypatia took the cloth out of the water and wrapped it inside her own veil; subsequently, the face of Christ was imprinted onto the veil as well. There was another copy of the original image from the fountain in the possession of an unknown woman from Diobulion. Pseudo-Zacharias maintains that a procession with the image enabled the quick recovery of Diobulion after the village had been raided by barbarians in 553/554. The next subchapter focuses on eyewitness accounts, namely a report of Archdeacon Theodosius (520s or 530s) and of a pilgrim conventionally referred to as Antoninus Placentinus in the historiography (560s and 570s). Both of them saw an image of Christ's face imprinted on a column in Jerusalem, in the place where Christ had been flagellated. In addition, Antoninus also witnessed a shining image of Christ's face venerated in the city of Memphis. The next subchapter discusses reports from military operations, which naturally and regularly attract the focus of narrative sources. Thus, the monograph proceeds to analyse accounts of the images not made by human hands possessed by Maurice and Herakleios.

The fourth chapter, *Rukou-nestvorený obraz z Edessy – Mandylyon z Edessy* [*The Image not Made by Human Hand – Mandylyon of Edessa*], p. 57–86, finally reaches the core topic – the Image of Edessa. This chapter highlights one of the very positive aspects of this monograph, namely the ample use of primary written sources. The Image is not to be traced in the oldest legends, since the first account only appears as late as in the 7th century, in the *Acta Thaddaei*. The sources that are the basis of this apocryphal text contain various versions of the Abgar legends.

The Bratislava scholar first discusses Abgar's letter to Christ (as well as Christ's reply) on the basis of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* by Eusebius. The story reflects a strong apostolic tradition, referring to Thaddeus's stay in Edessa. Abgar's letter to Christ (which Eusebius allegedly saw in Edessa) obtains its protective abilities and functions only at the moment of a crisis – when Edessa is under Persian siege – as late as in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* (a travel narrative by a female pilgrim, who claims to have seen the letter, or even two of them, in Edessa on her way to the Holy Land). These parts of the monograph provide the essential critical evaluation of the sources while examining their context and taking into account earlier texts that served as their models; the author also uses a comparative perspective, paying attention especially to the most significant fragments. The *Doctrina Addai* (*Syriac Acts of Apostle Thaddeus*) is the first source to supplement the older legend of Abgar with the image. Christ's and Abgar's exchange of letters is described similarly as in the account by Eusebius; in this case, however, the envoys return with a painted image of Christ, who was unable to travel to Edessa and treat Abgar's disease in person. Logically, the monograph pays due attention to the image, which fact is reflected in the space devoted and in the profundity of the analysis; a comparative approach is applied to the sources in the search for analogies as well as differences. The *Acta Thaddei* (early 7th – early 8th century) is the first source to refer to the image as having been made by Christ himself. The author (as well as the literature cited) considers Evagrius Scholasticus's report an interpolation from 787. In this version, Christ noticed the envoys' intention to have a picture of himself painted – thus, he made their task easier and dried his washed face with a piece of cloth, which preserved the imprint. The final part of this subchapter summarises the development of the image throughout the sources – from Abgar's letter to Christ as reported by Eusebius through the letter and image in the *Doctrina Addai* to the image not made by hands performing a miracle in the *Acta Thaddei*.

The following subsection, entitled *Zmienky o rukou nestvorenem obraze z Edessy počas*

obrazoboreckého obdobia [Accounts of the Image of Edessa not made by human hands during the period of Iconoclasm], p. 80–86, constitutes an excerpt from the more extensive treatment of Byzantine Iconoclasm in the dissertation. The image of Christ “made by his own hand” highlights the general importance of images with regard to the Christian cult and teachings as defined by John of Damascus, Andrew of Crete, a fictional letter to Leo III, Pope Gregory II or the anonymous author of the *Nouthesia gerontos*, among other sources.

The fifth chapter – *Od edesského obrazu k Mandylionu* [From the Image of Edessa to the Mandylion], p. 87–94 – revisits the terminological dispute concerning the term *mandylion*, already alluded to in the introduction. It addresses the oldest etymology of this term, going back to the Arabic *mandil* or Latin *mantelium*. The author explains how the semantics of these expressions gradually changed over the centuries; besides, he clarifies when the name was first used with reference to the image of Christ’s face (in *The Life of Paul the Younger of Mount Latros*). The author’s extensive comments outline the geography of the occurrences of the *mandylion* in art (in the form of mural paintings). Special attention is paid to a 10th century depiction of the Abgar legend and the Image of Edessa in the Monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai as well as to a commentary to the Genoese *Volto Santo*. The author explains the well-known scheme of semantic transformations of the relevant terms. The word *mandylion* acquired a more general meaning when it started to refer to specific iconographic depictions (Christ’s face on a piece of textile) and it is applied retrospectively – though incorrectly – to the *acheiropoiotos* of Edessa.

In the last regular chapter of the monograph, *Powest o obraze z Edessy z 10. Storočia* *Narratio de imagine Edessena ako kompilát prameňov* [The tale of the image of Edessa from the 10th century *Narratio de imagine edessena* as a compilation of sources], p. 95–110, the author reintroduces his textual and critical work while analysing the source previously ascribed to emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. He examines the most crucial issues of the analy-

sis, referring to academic authorities (Katanskij, Lipsius, Pokrovskij, Dobschütz, Illert); moreover, he comments on the issues of authorship, dating, manuscript versions and model texts. Since this source is the most complex and developed one, its narrative digressing into a number of accompanying subtopics, the author dedicates substantial space to its retelling; he also includes his own interpolations, confrontations and comments (p. 97–103). The *Narratio* is an extensive compilation of various versions of legends related to the Image of Edessa. It also contains a story of the creation of the *Keramion* and its subsequent historical development (*translatio*). Similarly, the monograph discusses the historical reality of the Image of Edessa, brought to Sainte-Chapelle in Paris after the Fourth Crusade (sold to Louis IX by Baldwin II in 1247). The image disappeared after 1793 in the midst of the turbulent times following the French revolution.

The chapter named *Exkurz* [Digression]: *Obliehanie Edessy v roku 544 podla Evagrija Scholastika* [The siege of Edessa in 544 as recorded by Evagrius Scholasticus], p. 111–115 follows; it contains the author’s views on the “virtually” oldest report about the Image of Edessa and its miraculous protective power, the *Historia Ecclesiastica* being – in the author’s opinion – an interpolation from 787. Eusebius’s account is confronted with information stemming from other writers, particularly Procopius of Caesarea.

In place of a conclusion, Matej Gogola offers a summarising chapter entitled – *Tradícia obrazu z Edessy a otázka jeho vzniku a pomenovania (namiesto záveru)* [Tradition of the image of Edessa and the question of its name and creation], where he again approaches the question of correct terminology relevant to the Image of Edessa (while explaining other, incorrect terms). He also analyses the roots of the Christian cult of images and conducts a chronological review of the evolution of the legends of King Abgar as well as of the creation of Christ’s *acheiropoiotos*.

The monograph contains several appendices, in particular – numerous depictions of *acheiropoiotos*, imperial images, images of the Theotokos, the *Volto Santo* with a geographical

and chronological identification as well as the Greek version of *Narratio de imagine Edessena* as edited by Ernst von Dobschütz (p. 119–136). As revealed by the author, he hesitated whether to append his own (non-critical) Slovak translation of the whole text, which he had prepared with the present publication in mind and which is at his disposal. In the end, he decided to publish the monograph excluding the translation, arguing that the source is actually rather unknown. This may be perceived as a slight error, as the source is now easily accessible to historians and the 17 pages of the Greek text are of no use for the majority of readers.

There are only rare stylistic and formal shortcomings to be found throughout the text and these can be easily ignored. For instance, the author confusingly refers to himself in the third person singular in two instances, but otherwise uses the first person plural; middle names of authors are sometimes only represented only by the initial (e.g., Richard A. Lipsius); originally Greek works are quoted in Latin, which is paradoxical, bearing in mind the predominantly Greek terminology in the text; in the case of sources named via consensus by histo-

rians (as for instance the *Historia Arcana*), the specification “so-called”, or similar, is lacking. Some parts would require more references (or rather, supplementing quotations), e.g., when the author mentions “an opinion of a group of historians,” or an “ongoing discourse” (while only quoting one participant in this discourse); this would also apply to specifying certain locations, etc. However, these minor imperfections are greatly outweighed by the meticulous analysis of written sources, thorough use of relevant literature and the resulting erudite but readable text; Matej Gogola formulates informed opinions on the particular questions concerning the Image of Edessa and its history. Therefore, the work presents a new and valuable addition to Byzantinological historiography in Slovakia and beyond.

Adam Mesiarkin
(Bratislava)

* Department of Medical History and Health Care Faculty of Medicine of the Comenius University in Bratislava

ABBREVIATIONS

ABu	Archaeologia Bulgarica
ACO	<i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum</i> , ed. E. SCHWARTZ and J. STRAUB, Berlin 1914–
ADGMA	F. MIKLOSICH, J. MÜLLER, <i>Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi – sacra et profana</i> , Vienna 1860–1890
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> , T. I, <i>Von den Anfängen Roms bis zum Ausgang der Republik</i> , Bd. I–IV, hrsg. H. TEMPORINI, New York–Berlin 1972–1973; T. II, <i>Principat</i> , Bd. I–XXXVII, hrsg. H. TEMPORINI, W. HAASE, New York–Berlin 1974–.
AOC	Archives de l'Orient chrétien
AUL.FH	Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Historica
B	Byzantion. Revue internationale des études byzantines
BAus	Byzantina Australiensia
BBg	Byzantinobulgarica
BCH	Bulletin de correspondance hellénique
BEL	Bibliotheca Ephemerides liturgicae
BF	Byzantinische Forschungen. Internationale Zeitschrift für Byzantinistik
BHG	Bibliotheca Hagiographica Graeca
BL	<i>Byzantina Lodziensia</i>
BMd	Bulgaria Mediaevalis
BPT	Biblica et Patristica Thoruniensia
Bsl	Byzantinoslavica. Revue internationale des études byzantines
BZ	Byzantinische Zeitschrift
CC.COGD	<i>Corpus Christianorum Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generalium-que Decreta</i>
CC.SG	<i>Corpus christianorum, Series graeca</i>
CC.SL	<i>Corpus christianorum, Series latina</i>
CFHB	<i>Corpus fontium historiae byzantinae</i>
Chi	Chiron. Mitteilungen der Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts

ČHP	Časopis za hrvatsku poviest
CPG	<i>Clavis patrum graecorum</i> , ed. M. GEERARD, F. GLORIE, Turnhout 1974–1987 et subs.
Cro	Croatica
CS	Cristianesimo nella Storia. Ricerche storiche, esegetiche, teologiche
CSCO	<i>Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium</i>
CSEL	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum</i>
Cyr	Cyrillomethodianum
EO	Échos d'Orient
FBHPJS	Fontes Byzantini Historiam Populorum Jugoslaviae Spectantes / Византијски извори за историју народа Југославије
FF	Forschungen und Fortschritte
FGHB	Fontes graeci historiae bulgaricae / Гръцки извори за българската история
GCS	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten [drei] Jahrhunderte</i>
He	Hesperia. The <i>Journal</i> of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens
Hi	Historia. Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte
IJSLP	International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics
ILSHS	International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JAHA	Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology
JCrS	Journal of Croatian Studies
JEH	Journal of Ecclesiastical History
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
JSI	Journal of Social Issues
JTS	The Journal of Theological Studies
JWg	Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte
La	<i>Labarum</i>
MGH.AA	<i>Monumenta Germaniae historica, Auctores antiquissimi</i>
Mil	Millennium. Jahrbuch zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr. / Yearbook on the Culture and History of the First Millennium C.E.

MNe	Meroitic Newsletter
MSt	Musicological Studies
Mu	Le Muséon
MW	Mówią Wieki
NSSVD	Naučni sastanak slavista u Vukove dane
OCA	Orientalia Christiana Analecta
NVj	Nastavni vjesnik
OCP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica
ODB	<i>The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i> , ed. A. KAZHDAN et al., vol. I–III, New York–Oxford 1991
OV	Orientalia Venetiana
PBA	Proceedings of the British Academy
Pbg	Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика
PG	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca</i> , ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1857–1866
PL	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina</i> , ed. J.-P. MIGNE, Paris 1844–1880
PLP	<i>Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit</i> , ed. E. TRAPP et al., Wien 1976–
PLRE	<i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , vol. I, ed. A.H.M. JONES, J.R. MARTINDALE, J. MORRIS, Cambridge 1971; vol. II, ed. J.R. MARTINDALE, Cambridge 1980; vol. III, ed. J.R. MARTINDALE, Cambridge 1992
PO	<i>Patrologia orientalis</i>
Psl	Palaeoslavica
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , ed. T. KLAUSER, Stuttgart 1950–
REB	Revue des études byzantines
ReH	Res Historica
RESEE	Revue des études sud-est européennes
RLin	Russian linguistics
RQ	Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte
RstI	Radovi Staroslavenskog instituta

SBS	Studies in Byzantine Sigillography
S.C.	Sources chrétiennes
SCer	Studia Ceranea. Journal of the Waldemar Ceran Research Center for the History and Culture of the Mediterranean Area and South-Eastern Europe
SDAWB.KSLK	Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprache, Literatur und Kunst
<i>SeCer</i>	<i>Series Ceranea</i>
SeS	Scripta & e-Scripta
Sla	Slavia
Slo	Slovo
SLOc	Slavica Occitania
SMer	Slavia Meridionalis
SP	Studia Patristica
SR	Slavistična revija
Star	Starine, na sviet izdaje Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb
Thi	Teka Historyka
TM	Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisation byzantines
VSAK	Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu
VP	Vox Patrum. Antyk Chrześcijański
VSAK	Vjesnik Staroslavenske akademije u Krku
Wo	Word. Journal of the International Linguistic Association
WS	Die Welt der Slaven
WSJ	Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch
ZÄSA	Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde
ZAC	Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum
ZNKUL	Zeszyty Naukowe KUL
ZSl	Zeitschrift für Slawistik
ZW	Zeszyty Wiejskie
ZNŽOJS	Zbornik za narodni život i običaje Južnih Slavena

* * *

ВΚΜε	Βυζαντινά Κείμενα και Μελέτες
ΔΕΒΜΜ	Δίπτυχα Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών και Μεταβυζαντινών Μελετών
ΕΕΒΣ	Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν
ΚΕΦΣ	Ὁ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος
Μακ	Μακεδονικά. Σύγγραμμα Περιοδικὸν τῆς Ἐταιρείας Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν
Μβι	Μεσαιωνικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη

* * *

Апри	Археοграфски прилози
БЕ	Български език
БЕт	Българска етнология
БРе	Българска реч
БСт	Български старини
ВВ	Византийский временник
Дз	Дзяло
Епо	Εποхи
ЗИК	Зборник историје књижевности. Одељење језика и књижевности / Zbornik istorije književnosti. Odeljenje jezika i književnosti
ЗРВИ	Зборник Радова Византолошког Института / Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta
ИАИ	Известия на Археологическия институт
ИИБЕ	Известия на Института за български език
ИИИ	Известия на Института за история
ИИз	Интердисциплинарни изследвания
Ипр	Исторически преглед
ИРАИК	Известия русского археологического института в Константинополе
ЛМ	Литературна мисъл
ПК	Полата књигописнага / Polata Knigopisnaja. A Journal Devoted to the Study of Early Slavic Books, Texts and Literature

<i>ПКШ</i>	<i>Преславска книжовна школа</i>
СБАН	Списание на Българската академия на науките
СЛ	Старобългарска литература
СНУНК	Сборник за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина
ТКИБ	Трудове на катедрите по история и богословие
УМ	Учителска мисъл

GUIDELINES FOR THE AUTHORS

1. Sources should be cited as follows:

Theophanis Chronographia, AM 5946, rec. C. DE BOOR, vol. I, Lipsiae 1883 (cetera: THEOPHANES), p. 108, 5–7.

THEOPHANES, AM 5948, p. 109, 22–24.

EUNAPIUS, *Testimonia*, I, 1, 19–20, [in:] *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, vol. II, ed. et trans. R.C. BLOCKLEY, Liverpool 1983 (cetera: EUNAPIUS), p. 13–14.

Book numbers should be given in Roman numerals. Sources with singular structure are cited only in Arabic numerals. Pages are to be cited only when verses are counted on every page separately.

If the same source is cited for a second (or further) time, an abbreviated version of the title (signalized in the first use with the word ‘cetera:’), and not ‘*ibidem*’, should be used, e.g.:

²⁵ ZONARAS, XV, 13, 11.

²⁶ ZONARAS, XV, 13, 19–22.

2. Books by modern authors should be referenced as follows:

²¹ M. ANGOLD, *A Byzantine Government in Exile. Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea, 1204–1261*, Oxford 1975, p. 126.

²² И. ИЛИЕВ, *Св. Климент Охридски. Живот и дело*, Пловдив 2010, p. 142.

If the same work is cited for a second (or further) time, an abbreviated version of the title (consisting of the first word(s) of the title followed by an ellipsis) should be used, e.g.:

²³ G. OSTROGORSKI, *Geschichte...*, p. 72.

²⁴ A. VAN MILLINGEN, *Byzantine Constantinople...*, p. 123.

²⁵ G. OSTROGORSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

²⁶ A. VAN MILLINGEN, *Byzantine Churches...*, p. 44.

3. Articles and papers should be mentioned in the notes as:

L.W. BARNARD, *The Emperor Cult and the Origins of the Iconoclastic Controversy*, B 43, 1973, p. 11–29.

P. GAUTIER, *Le typikon du sebasto Grégoire Pakourianos*, REB 42, 1984, p. 5–145.

In footnotes, names of journals should be used exclusively in their abbreviated versions. The complete list of abbreviations is available at the “Studia Ceranea” website: <http://ceraneum.uni.lodz.pl/s-ceranea/dla-autorow>. Conversely, unabbreviated and fully Romanized references should be used in the final bibliography (see below)

Numbers of fascicles are cited only if pages are counted separately for every volume within a single year.

4. Articles in Festschrifts, collections of studies etc. should be cited as follow:

M. WHITBY, *A New Image for a New Age: George of Pisidia on the Emperor Heraclius*, [in:] *The Roman and Byzantine Army in the East. Proceedings of a Colloquium Held at the Jagiellonian University, Kraków in September 1992*, ed. E. DĄBROWA, Cracow 1994, p. 197–225.

Г. ТОДОРОВ, *Св. Княз Борис и митът за мнимото: избиване на 52 болярски рода*, [in:] *Християнската култура в средновековна България. Материали от национална научна конференция, Шумен 2–4 май 2007 година по случай 1100 години от смъртта на св. Княз Борис-Михаил (ок. 835–907 г.)*, ed. П. ГЕОРГИЕВ, Велико Търново 2008, p. 23.

5. Examples of notes referring to webpages or sources available online:

Ghewond's History, 10, trans. R. BEDROSIAN, p. 30–31, www.rbedrosian.com/ghew3.htm [20 VII 2011].

www.ancientrome.org/history.html [20 VII 2011].

6. Reviews:

P. СПЕСК, [rec.:] *Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople: Short History / Nicephori patriarchae Constantinopolitani Breviarium Historicum...* – BZ 83, 1990, p. 471.

Footnote numbers should be placed before punctuation marks.

In all footnotes, only the conventional abbreviated Latin phrases should be used for referencing literature both in the Latin and in the Cyrillic alphabet.

These are:

cetera:	<i>ibidem</i> (note: only used for secondary literature)	rec. [here: <i>recensuit</i> / <i>recognovit</i>]
cf.	IDEM/EADEM	[rec.:] [here: <i>recensio</i>]
col. [here: <i>columna</i>]	IDEM/EADEM	s.a. [here: <i>sine anno</i>]
coll. [here: <i>collegit</i>]	IDEM/IDEM/EADEM	s.l. [here: <i>sine loco</i>]
e.g.	[in:]	sel. [here: <i>selegit</i>]
ed.	<i>l. cit.</i>	sq, sqq
et al.	p. [here: <i>pagina</i>]	trans.
etc.	<i>passim</i>	vol.

References to the Bible are also indicated using the standard Latin abbreviations:

Gn Ex Lv Nm Dt Ios Idc Rt 1Sam 2Sam 1Reg 2Reg 1Par 2Par Esd Ne Tb Idt Est Job Ps Prv Eccle Ct Sap Eccli Is Jer Lam Bar Ez Dn Os Il Am Abd Ion Mich Nah Hab Soph Ag Zach Mal 1Mac 2Mac

Mt Mc Lc Io Act Rom 1Cor 2Cor Gal Eph Phil Col 1Thess 2Thess 1Tim 2Tim Tit Philm Heb Iac 1Pe 2Pe 1Io 2Io 3Io Ids Apc

Greek and Latin terms are either given in the original Greek or Latin version, in the nominative, without italics (a1), or transliterated (a2) – italicized, with accentuation (Greek only):

- (a.1.) φρούριον, ἰατροσοφιστής
 (a.2.) *ius intercedendi, hálme, asfáragos, proskýnesis*

Classical names and surnames should preferably be Anglicised or at least Latinised. Likewise, names of medieval European monarchs, as well as geographical names, should preferably be rendered in their conventional English versions.

The Editorial Board kindly asks authors to send exclusively texts written in English.

Texts should be submitted in font size 12 (footnotes: 10), with 1.5 line spacing. Authors are advised to use the font Minion Pro. For quotations in Greek, Minion Pro is recommended, for early Slavonic – Cyrillica Bulgarian 10 Unicode, for Arabic, Georgian and Armenian – the broadest version of Times New Roman, for Ethiopian – Nyalá.

Greek, Slavonic, Arabic, Georgian, Armenian, Syriac and Ethiopian citations should not be italicized.

Articles should be sent in .doc and .pdf format to the e-mail address of the Editorial Board (s.ceranea@uni.lodz.pl) as well as, in printed versions, to the mail address:

Centrum Badań nad Historią i Kulturą Basenu Morza Śródziemnego
i Europy Południowo-Wschodniej im. prof. Waldemara Cerana, *Ceraneum*.
ul. Jana Matejki 32/38, pok. 319
90-237 Łódź, Polska

Pictures should be sent in .bmp or .jpeg (.jpg) format, with a minimal resolution of 300 dpi; CMYK colour model is highly recommended. Captions should be attached as a separate .doc file; they must contain the information concerning the source and the copyright as well as the date when the picture was taken. Authors are responsible for the acquiring and possession of reproduction permissions with regard to the pictures used.

An abstract written in English is obligatory. It should not exceed the length of half a standard page (font size: 10, line spacing: 1).

The text should be followed by a final bibliography, divided into primary sources and secondary literature. The final bibliography should be fully Romanised and alphabetised accordingly. The 'scientific' Romanisation of Cyrillic should be strictly adhered to in the final bibliography; the transliteration table is provided below:

(O)CS: (Old) Church Slavic, **Rus.:** Russian, **Blr.:** Belarusian, **Ukr.:** Ukrainian, **Bulg.:** Bulgarian, **Mac.:** Macedonian. Note: for Serbian, the official Serbian Latin script should be used.

Cyr.	(O)CS	Rus.	Blr.	Ukr.	Bulg.	Mac.
a	a	a	a	a	a	a
б	b	b	b	b	b	b
В	v	v	v	v	v	v
г	g	g	h	h	g	g
г̃			(g)	g		

Cyr.	(O)CS	Rus.	Blr.	Ukr.	Bulg.	Mac.
д	d	d	d	d	d	d
ѓ						ǵ
е		e	e	e	e	e
ѐ		ë	ë			
є	e			je		
ж	ž	ž	ž	ž	ž	ž
з	z	z	z	z	z	z
с	dz					dz
и	i	i		y	i	i
і	i	(i)	i	i		
ї	i			ï		
й		j	j	j	j	
ј						j
к	k	k	k	k	k	k
л	l	l	l	l	l	l
љ						lj
м	m	m	m	m	m	m
н	n	n	n	n	n	n
њ						nj
о	o	o	o	o	o	o
п	p	p	p	p	p	p
р	r	r	r	r	r	r
с	s	s	s	s	s	s
т	t	t	t	t	t	t
ќ						ќ
ћ	ǵ					
у	u	u	u	u	u	u
ў			ŭ			

Cyr.	(O)CS	Rus.	Blr.	Ukr.	Bulg.	Mac.
ф	f	f	f	f	f	f
х	ch	ch	ch	ch	h	h
ц	c	c	c	c	c	c
ч	č	č	č	č	č	č
џ						dž
ш	š	š	š	š	š	š
щ	št	šč		šč	št	
ѣ	ѣ	"			ǎ	
ы	y	y	y			
ь	ь	'	'	'	j	
ѐ	ě	(ě)	(ě)	(ě)	(ě)	
э		è	è			
ю	ju	ju	ju	ju	ju	
я		ja	ja	ja	ja	
‘			(omit)	(omit)		‘
ѡ	o					
ѣ	ę					
ѣ	ję					
ѡ	o					
ѡ	jɔ					
ѡ	ks					
ѡ	ps					
ѡ	th					
ѡ	ü					
ѡ	je					
ѡ	ja					

Redaktor inicjujący
Agnieszka Kałowska

Korekta techniczna
Elżbieta Rzymkowska

Wydrukowano z gotowych materiałów dostarczonych do Wydawnictwa UŁ

Wydane przez Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego
Wydanie I. W.08444.17.0.C
Ark. druk. 18,5

Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego
90-131 Łódź, ul. Lindleya 8
www.wydawnictwo.uni.lodz.pl
e-mail: ksiegarnia@uni.lodz.pl
tel. (42) 665 58 63